SENATE—*Wednesday, March 24, 1993*

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 3, 1993)

The Senate met at 9 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable DIANNE FEINSTEIN, a Senator from the State of California.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray:

Commit thy way unto the Lord; trust also in him; and he shall bring it to pass.—Psalm 37:5.

Almighty God, Lord of history, Ruler of the nations, we pray for Your sovereign guidance in the affairs of our Nation. As the Senators work their way through a maze of statistics, amendments, and thousands of words, lead them to a resolution that will guarantee our future. Help us to understand that we do not sacrifice reason when we trust God, that we do not abdicate our responsibility when we commit our way to Him. Let Thy will be done on Earth as it is in Heaven.

We pray in the name of Him who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 24, 1993.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable DIANNE FEINSTEIN, a Senator from the State of California, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEARS 1994–98

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the pending business.

The bill clerk read as follows:

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

The Senate resumed consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Pending:

Lott amendment No. 240 to strike the proposed tax increase on social security income, and to provide that the revenue reduction is offset by a reduction in proposed new spending.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi.

Who yields time on the amendment?

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, why are we even thinking about this tax? Social Security is a separate trust fund. It did not cause the deficit, and it must not be used to solve it. In fact, last year the fund accumulated a $52 billion surplus. The irony here is that this surplus and revenues from the proposed tax increase are not used to reduce our deficit; every dollar of it goes for some spending program. What a monstrous charade this is on our senior citizens, to imply that they are sacrificing to reduce the deficit and then to grab more money out of their pockets to increase spending. Increasing this tax is wrong in principle, and it is unfair to the elderly.

Let us look at a typical case, a widowed schoolteacher whose income from pension, IRA, part-time work, and Social Security is $27,500. This woman is going to be asked to contribute an extra 70 percent of her Social Security payments to the tax base in figuring her contribution to the IRS.

I received a letter this week from Mr. Harry Bynum, a former constituent of mine who now lives in Arkansas. He very eloquently described the inequities of this proposed tax, and I would like to read a portion of his letter:

I am 70 years old. I am disabled due to a heart condition and severe arthritis. I first started paying social security in 1939. It was a covenant agreement between myself and the federal government that I would pay then and they would pay me an amount at 65 years of age untaxed. Since that time, benefits have increased and the amounts paid in have increased. I was never allowed to falter on this agreement. It should not have been taxed in earlier years. The tax should not be increased now.

I make a little over $32,000 a year but I am far from rich. I cannot even afford the cost of the new medicines for arthritis. We live very simply and there is no extra money. I have no way to earn it. Why should older people be singled out to make the greatest sacrifice of all? The campaign promise was that only people making over $200,000 would be taxed. Have we stooped so low now that $32,000 is rich?

In the interest of fairness let us look at what this tax does to many of our senior citizens, few of whom at $25,000 and above can be called rich by any stretch of the imagination. For a single person making $25,000 the tax on their Social Security benefits is increased 70 percent. For heavens sake, you are only asking that we make people earning $250,000 pay a 10-percent surtax. Why do you want to increase this poor senior citizen's marginal tax rate by 70 percent?

In 1983, when Congress initially passed the law to tax Social Security benefits, it made a deal with the American people that only 50 percent of their benefits would be taxed. The rationale for this value was that it represented only the employer's contribution. It was not an arbitrary percentage. What is the basis of 85 percent? Could it be Government greed? The other side of the covenant with Social Security recipients was that the proceeds would go only to the Social Security trust fund. Well, I remember a quote by Sam Ervin, the former distinguished Senator from North Carolina, who said "You can shear a sheep every spring, but you can only skin him once." We have already skinned the sheep.

And, recipients who work, get a double whammy. They are already penalized by the earnings test. For every $3 earned above $10,560, they lose $1 in their Social Security benefits. With this new tax, some beneficiaries who work will actually be worse off if they work harder and earn more wages. For example, let us consider an elderly couple who is still active and has kept working at their small plumbing business. They are lucky and earn enough to pay 28-percent tax rates. After income taxes, self-employment taxes for Social Security, State taxes, and the earnings test, this couple finds that this new tax on their Social Security earnings will force them to pay an extra $1.01 for each $1 that they earn. Is this an incentive for people to work and save for their own retirement? It seems to me the message this tax sends is clear: The harder you work, the higher your taxes.

I have been amazed by my colleagues' reaction to this tax proposal. When I offered my amendment in the Budget Committee markup, my Democratic colleagues voted against it and said we should debate this issue on the floor. Now, I expect Senators will say "There isn't really a tax on Social Security recipients in this package. This is just a bunch of numbers. The Finance Committee will make decisions on the tax

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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

increases." It seems to me that my colleagues believe this should be debated wherever it is not. Come on. The President's budget calls for this tax increase, and the committee instructions include it. We need to take it off the table now.

So I urge my colleagues to take a stand for the senior citizens who have helped to make our Nation a great country. They have spent their lives working hard and paying Social Security taxes to prepare for their retirement. I do not believe we should place an additional financial burden on them—particularly one as unfair as this.

The question here is this simple: Should Social Security recipients—retirees making as little as $25,000 a year—pay a higher marginal rate than any other American taxpayer just so the Federal Government can have more money to fund President Clinton's new spending programs?

If you think so, then vote against my amendment; but, if you agree with me that it is unfair for Social Security recipients to pay a larger portion of their income in taxes than other Americans, then I urge you to vote for my amendment.

Madam President, at the appropriate time I will need to ask for the yeas and nays, but I will defer that for a moment. To begin this morning, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

I support his amendment to strike from this budget a very unfair tax on the senior citizens.

This tax in the Clinton budget turns the Clinton fairness issue into a declaration of war on the elderly. Once more, there is a middle-income tax increase rather than a tax adjustment.

President Clinton has several tax messages for all different groups of Americans. For the rich, he says you have it coming. For the middle income, he says you are going to have to wait just a little bit longer. For the poor, he says you will not pay a dime. And now for the elderly in this part of the budget he says drop dead.

Last night, we heard the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER] talk about seniors who are comfortable, who maybe average in this class $61,000. I do not know about the accuracy of those figures, but whatever the number is, I will bet the class of people we are talking about are the people who worked hard all their lives and saved money for retirement. I wish that the President and our friends on the other side of the aisle would understand one point, and that is there is no class in class warfare.

The elderly of America are amazed at this debate over them and what they ought to pay. They have always been told they are the salt of the Earth; they are the ones who endured the Depression; they are the ones who fought and won World War II; they are the ones who gave their kids an education that they never had.

They saved so that they would not be a burden to their younger people in old age. They paid into Social Security so that they would have a safety net, and they consider that Social Security a very sacred trust. Now they are reading about the deficit being headed toward the ozone.

People who are simplistic in their approach to answers to these problems look for a scapegoat. The liberal press has locked on to the seniors.

There is a bandwagon taking place here. The elderly are being accused of "getting ours" when they take Social Security, "getting ours" at the expense of our children or our grand kids. They are told that they are part of the most affluent; that they do not need Social Security, and if they take Social Security the only reason they are doing it is to pay for their greens fees or take some cruise in the Greek islands.

This is the bandwagon that is taking place in attacks on our senior citizens. I think the President has never seen a bandwagon he has not jumped on. The elderly are somehow all thought to be senile by policymakers today, that they simply do not understand the process; these seniors think that Social Security is insurance; they made contributions; they are entitled, also they do not have to feel like welfare cheats.

And where do they get this idea that this is insurance, this is an entitlement? You kind of get this idea after looking at your paycheck week after week, 40 years in the work force, and you see all the FICA taxes in that box, the money that is taken out of your paycheck.

Then they are told that they received more than they paid in. Well, what do you think insurance is all about?

Seniors, rich and poor, will be stuck with the trickle-down taxes of Clinton—the energy tax, the corporate tax that is going to be passed on, the burden and the cost shifting caused by reduced Government Medicare payments.

Seniors are going to be waiting for the other shoe to drop. They better be waiting, anyway, because there is health care down the road. And you are going to have to wait for all these other shoes to drop before you know whose ox will be gored by the next fairness project that comes out of this administration. That will not be the end though; you have to realize that this administration has more shoes to drop than Imelda Marcos.

So with this seek-the-rich economics, everybody gets wet and only the rich can afford an umbrella. But what the seniors are going to need is hip boots.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Washington.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GORTON. Madam President, this is an unfair tax, and the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi should be adopted. This is an unfair tax for relatively low-income individuals because it represents an increase of as much as 70 percent in Federal taxes on the benefits concerned. It is a particularly unfair tax because when combined with the Federal earnings test, there are certain categories of income in which the additional tax can go more than 100 percent of the additional income.

The disincentive to work and to continue to be productive imposed by this tax on top of that earned income test is overwhelmingly negative for a significant number of our seniors. This is an unfair tax because it was not expected. It was not only unadvertised during the course of the Presidential campaign but the people who will be subjected to it were told by the President that they are not in the category of individuals whose incomes were going to be subjected to new taxes.

This is an unfair tax because it is not being used to reduce the deficit of the United States but simply to authorize more spending.

The amendment of the Senator from Mississippi should be adopted. We should restore at least a modicum of fairness to this budget resolution, and the laws which will inevitably follow.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, how much time have we consumed?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seven minutes have been consumed against your 15 minutes.

Mr. LOTT. I believe equally divided. So 15 minutes would be used on the other side. I would like for them not to have the final 15 minutes. I wonder if we have any information about whether they are going to have anything to give us.

Do we get their 15 minutes if they do not show up? I think we cannot have a situation where they get all of the final 15 minutes. I think they should be on notice. We will have to do something to make sure this is an even debate. They need to come to the floor.

At this point, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. MACK. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Mississippi for yielding.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter in support of this amendment from Martha A. McSteen, president of the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare be printed in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO PRESERVE SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE,
March 22, 1993.

Hon. CONNIE MACK,
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MACK: The National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, which represents about six million mostly senior Americans, including some 264,000 in Florida, supports your efforts to remove the proposed tax increase on Social Security benefits from the Budget Resolution now before the Senate, S. Con. Res. 18. Not only would the proposed tax increase be unfair and fiscally onerous to current beneficiaries, it also could seriously undermine the confidence of American workers that the Social Security system will be there for them.

Consider the numbers: A retiree with income of $40,000 (including $8,000 from Social Security) would pay an additional $784 in income tax. Yet a taxpayer not receiving Social Security with total income of $40,000 (including $8,000 in tax-exempt interest) would have no additional tax liability under the budget proposal. Is this fair? Our members hardly think so.

It is grossly unfair to workers and beneficiaries alike for the government to change the rules of the system after a worker has complied with the law, paid a lifetime of payroll taxes and made retirement plans based on that system. It also is unfair to employers who not only pay similarly significant amounts of payroll taxes, but also establish pension plans for their workers, based in large part on expected levels of Social Security benefits. Continually changing the tax rules undermines any semblance of retirement planning.

As you know, the Social Security program does not contribute to the deficit, not one penny. In fact, Social Security trust funds are running large annual surpluses and surpluses do not create deficits. However, those surpluses are being used to disguise the true size of our budget deficit. This is wrong. The purpose of the trust fund is to pay Social Security benefits, not reduce the deficit.

Senior Americans recognize the critical importance of reducing our federal deficit and are willing to do their fair share. However, they should not be singled out for extraordinary sacrifice.

The National Committee thanks you and supports your effort to remove the proposed additional tax burden from Social Security beneficiaries.

Sincerely,

MARTHA A. MCSTEEN,
President.

Mr. MACK. Madam President, I want to make several points this morning—one point I made last evening had to do with spending. When the President spoke to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States he said "No tax increases until we get spending cuts." He talked about deep spending cuts, real spending cuts, no gimmicks.

Let me tell you what the American people will get if the President's proposal goes through. We will get a six-tenths of 1 percent reduction in Federal spending over the next 5 years.

If the Senate Budget Committee's plan is passed, we will get about 1.5 percent in spending cuts. I know it is difficult to see the difference in those lines. It is difficult for people to believe that there really are any spending cuts in this proposal. Frankly, there are very few.

I do not think there are enough spending cuts to justify asking seniors to pay additional taxes on Social Security.

The message that we are sending to older Americans is that if you postpone spending now and save it for the future, and you accumulate enough to take care of yourself and do not have to rely upon others, the message the President is sending to you is that you must pay more taxes.

That is a disincentive. We have spent hours, and days, weeks, and months debating how we can encourage people to save, to take care of themselves, and the disincentive to save that we are imposing upon older Americans with this resolution is just terribly wrong.

The way I see it is the Democrats are sending a message that we are angry with success, that we want to punish success. This message is also wrong. The message we should be sending is that the Congress is finally going to get serious about cutting Federal spending.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, in view of the time being consumed at the early hour, I would like to propound a unanimous-consent request that the time be extended for an additional 10 minutes equally divided on each side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Would the Senator please repeat his request?

Mr. LOTT. I ask unanimous consent in view of the hour and the fact that there happens to be some traffic delays that we extend the time for an additional 10 minutes equally divided on each side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would object to that in my capacity as a Senator from California.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MACK. Parliamentary inquiry. Why is it that there would be an objection to extending the time limit when there is no one here on the other side to engage in a debate? All we want to do is have the opportunity to debate this issue. It is extremely important to the people of my State. I think it is unfair to be cut off from this debate because no one from the other side is here.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. I believe that any Senator has the right to object. I have taken that right for the time being. That is the way it is.

Mr. MACK. I thank the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I yield 12 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] is recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I note the beautiful smile with the statement "That is the way it is."

I came here, Madam President, on Thursday and Friday and Monday and Tuesday seeking an opportunity to argue a series of amendments which this Senator has offered to the resolution. I came here early this morning thinking that at 9 o'clock there would be an opportunity to have a few minutes.

I support Senator LOTT's amendment because I think that the tax on Social Security recipients is regressive.

For the balance of my 2 minutes, I would like to say that I have four very important amendments pending: First, which would press to have health care reform legislated by September 30 which is the essential ingredient for budget reform; second, to require a unified package so that any additional expenditures would be offset through cuts in programs or increased taxes; third, which would divide drug expenditures 50–50 between so-called supply and demand; and fourth, to establish Federal expenditures to incarcerate those convicted under State career criminal statutes.

It seems to this Senator that on these kinds of four critical issues a Senator ought to have longer than 2 minutes to articulate these propositions.

I take these 2 minutes this morning because under the timetable which is established in this body, it appears that I will have no time to debate and argue. But these issues will only come up on a vote at a later time.

On a matter that is as important to the United States as this budget resolution with as many fundamental changes, I would submit to those who are setting the agenda and the schedule that there ought to be more time at this stage—with the change of administration and very dramatic measures being considered by the Congress and the Senate—that there should be more time to consider these issues.

How much time do I have remaining, Madam President?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has consumed his 2 minutes.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, at this point I want to make sure this is done in a timely fashion. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LOTT. I ask unanimous consent at this point to insert in the RECORD a letter from the Retired Officers Association dated March 22, 1993, in support of my amendment, opposing the Social Security tax increase.

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

THE RETIRED OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, March 22, 1993.

MEMBERS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: We are writing to ask that you oppose the provision in the Budget Resolution which would increase the taxable amount of Social Security from 50 percent to 85 percent. As indicated in the enclosure, the potential tax increase ranges from about 7 percent for a couple receiving the average Social Security annuity to almost 22 percent for a couple earning the maximum Social Security. Upon reflection, we're sure you'll agree that a 22 percent tax increase imposes a disproportionate burden on elderly retirees. In fact, the impact on the elderly is more than double the threshold of pain (i.e., the 10 percent surtax) that President Clinton proposes for wealthy taxpayers earning more than $250,000 per year.

Sincerely,

T.J. KILCLINE.

SHAKING OUT MORE TAX DOLLARS

Clinton's proposed Social Security income tax hike could hit you harder than you think. In the examples below, couple 1 receives the average annual Social Security benefit ($6,000 plus $3,000 for spouse); couple 2 receives the maximum Social Security benefit ($13,000 plus spouse's $6,500). Depending on your income, your taxes could increase up to nearly 22 percent.

CURRENT TAXES BASED ON TAXING UP TO 50 PERCENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY INCOME

	Couple 1	Couple 2
AGI	$32,000	$50,000
SS income	9,000	19,500
Taxable SS	2,250	9,750
Taxable income [1]	22,250	47,750
Tax due	3,338	8,716

[1] Assumes standard deductions and exemptions.

CLINTON PROPOSAL BASED ON TAXING UP TO 85 PERCENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY INCOME

	Couple 1	Couple 2
AGI	$32,000	$50,000
SS income	9,000	19,500
Taxable SS	3,825	16,575
Taxable income [1]	23,825	54,575
Tax due	3,574	10,627
Tax increase (percent)	7	21.9

[1] Assumes standard deductions and exemptions.

Mr. LOTT. I yield the floor at this time.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, how much time do I have remaining on our side on this issue?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, may I inquire how much time remains for the proponents?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Twenty-eight seconds.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, parliamentary inquiry. Twenty-eight seconds?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Twenty-eight seconds.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, parliamentary inquiry. Twenty-eight seconds? I thought we had about 4 minutes left.

Parlimanetary inquiry. Does a parliamentary inquiry count against our time?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes, it does.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I would like the record to show that I resent the way this matter has been handled this morning. This is not the way that I have been led to believe the Senate conducts its business. It is not fair. It is cutting off the small opportunity we have to have a debate on this amendment this morning.

I register my complaint to that.

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, is this counted against my time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, it is.

Mr. SASSER. I object to the Senator objecting on my time.

Madam President, frankly there is a bit of irony in this Chamber this morning and there was last night. We have had the rather curious spectacle of Members on the other side of the aisle lecturing Members on our side of the aisle about the sanctity of Social Security and the vulnerability of Social Security recipients.

If that is not the world turned upside down, I do not know what it is. I cannot help but marvel at this miraculous transformation that is taking place with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, how suddenly enlightenment has come to them, and they are presenting themselves as the stalwarts, the protectors of Social Security. What a change?

I remember back in 1985 when then-Vice President George Bush sat right in that chair where you are sitting this morning, Madam President, and they actually brought in a Republican Senator on a stretcher so that they could break a tie and cut cost-of-living adjustments in Social Security. That is actually what happened. That Senator they brought in on a stretcher is now the Governor of the State of California, the Honorable Pete Wilson. And the Members on the other side of the aisle voted to reduce cost-of-living adjustments for Social Security recipients. That impacted on the most vulnerable of the elderly among us.

That is not in the distant past. That is something that occurred just in the recent past.

I remember a Budget Committee session when those on the other side of the aisle controlled this body and were in the majority when the chairman of the committee offered a black box amendment to cut Social Security by $40 billion. That was after a COLA freeze had been defeated on the floor. I believe that was 1983, I say to the majority leader. The strategy was to hide the intended freeze in an unspecified reconciliation instruction.

Keep in mind, Madam President, as I said earlier, that cost-of-living adjustment freezes come out of the pockets of the most vulnerable beneficiaries of Social Security.

In fact, if you get a COLA freeze today, a cost-of-living adjustment freeze, you would push a half million older citizens immediately right below the poverty line.

What are we talking about here today? My friends on the other side of the aisle would have you believe that President Clinton wants to tax all Social Security beneficiaries and all Social Security benefits. Nothing could be further from the truth. No one is going to pay a tax on Social Security benefits under this provision who is not already paying it.

I hope those on Social Security will hear me this morning and understand that if you are not paying a tax on your Social Security benefits now you will not be paying any tax under President Clinton's proposal. Seventy-eight percent of all Social Security beneficiaries pay no tax on their Social Security benefits. After President Clinton's proposal passes, that same 78 percent will still not be paying taxes.

The tax rate on those who are presently paying taxes on Social Security, rather than 50 percent of their Social Security benefits being used to flow over into taxable income, if they make more than $25,000 and are single or if they have incomes of more than $32,000 and are married, the 50 percent of their Social Security benefits that will be subject to taxation will be changed to 85 percent.

What is the magic number about 85 percent? It simply is an arbitrary figure that has been selected by those familiar with pension funds, and it is the figure that indicates the amount it excludes from taxation, the amount that the beneficiaries paid into the fund before they retired. They are only going to be taxed on those funds over and above what they paid into the fund.

What happens to these Social Security taxes paid by the most affluent beneficiaries of Social Security? It flows into a fund to finance Medicare. That is what is going to happen to it, Madam President. The most affluent 22 percent of the Social Security beneficiaries are going to have a modest rise in the tax on their Social Security benefits above a certain threshold amount, and those funds are going to flow into the Medicare trust fund. That is what is going to happen.

If you listen to our friends on the other side of the aisle, my goodness, you would think that this President was simply going to go out with a mask and gun and rob the old folks. That is exactly what it sounds like.

What do we have before us here? This is simply another effort on the part of our friends on the other side of the aisle to try to derail and dismantle this President's economic plan.

This amendment is simply another legislative hand grenade being lobbed

from a sandbag position on the other side of the aisle in the hope that somehow we can return to gridlock, that somehow there will be a standoff, that somehow immobility can be sustained, that somehow we can unravel President Clinton's plan to do something about this deficit, that somehow we can embarrass this new President, that we can discredit Government and then capitalize on the dissatisfaction of the American people.

Madam President, I see the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has arrived on the floor and I will yield to him 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. EXON. Madam President, I thank the Chair and thank my friend from Tennessee.

I would just like to alert the Senate, and I will read the amendment that will be coming up next after the Senate disposes of the amendment before us offered by Senator LOTT.

We have looked at this problem. We think it is a serious problem. We have a very substantial amendment that we think would solve the problems as far as most of the Members are concerned, and I say that with regard to people on both sides of the aisle.

The amendment that will be offered following disposal of the Lott amendment will be offered by Senator LAUTENBERG and myself and simply says that the revenues set forth in this resolution assume that the Finance Committee will make every effort to find alternative sources of revenues before imposing new taxes on benefits of Social Security with threshold incomes—Madam President, I want to emphasize this—with threshold incomes for the purpose of taxation of Social Security benefits of less than $32,000 per individuals and $40,000 for married couples filing returns.

What we are simply saying is, if you cannot find some other way around this, what we are really going to do is say to the Finance Committee, raise the threshold from the $32,000, as it is now for a couple, to $40,000. We think this adequately takes care of the middle-income Americans who we do not think should be further taxed in this area, recognizing the fact that this Senator supports the concept that higher income people should pay 85 percent on their Social Security receipts for income tax purposes.

I am simply saying, Madam President, that we have here a compromise that I think satisfies most, and the Senate will have an opportunity to vote on that following disposal of the amendment offered by Senator LOTT.

I reserve the remainder of my time, and I yield the floor.

(The VICE PRESIDENT assumed the chair.)

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

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

Let us make it absolutely clear. This amendment would knock out the Social Security tax increase on elderly Social Security recipients. This language in this budget resolution would tax Social Security recipients down to $25,000 for an individual and $32,000 for a couple.

Let us not be fooled by this. There will be a motion to table, and if you vote yea to table my amendment, you are voting for a Social Security tax increase on the elderly middle class and low income Social Security recipients. That is wrong and unfair. Vote for this amendment.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I might proceed for 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, it was about 10 years ago today that the Social Security system sort of teetered on the brink of bankruptcy. We had a commission that did good work, and we made a lot of sweeping changes and had broad bipartisan support. On March 23, 1983, 10 years ago, we passed it and, as a result, the system is sound, doing well, and those were tough times; we had to make tough votes. A lot of colleagues joined together, and we made it work.

I want to remind my colleagues that as a part of that deal—I was on the commission, and I was chairman of the Finance Committee—we sort of made a pact with America's seniors. The beneficiaries of incomes above $25,000 for individuals and $32,000 for married couples were asked to pay income taxes up to 50 percent of their benefits.

A lot of people had reservations about this. That was a very difficult vote. At that time, 26 of my colleagues on the other side, who are still serving here—including the chairman of the Finance Committee, who was a member of that commission, and the majority leader—joined me in voting for that package. It passed with strong bipartisan support. The reason we made it 50 percent is that was the employer's share. We had some rationale to at least stop it at 50 percent. I think what we are doing now, in effect, whether we raise it or not, we are still saying to them that we did not keep our word that we made 10 years ago. We have made tough votes on this side of the aisle on Social Security, as was pointed out earlier.

I ask my colleagues to go back and take a look at the vote, and at the debate in 1983, and I think we will find that we have, in effect, said to our senior citizens, what we said in 1983 was one thing; what we are doing today is something different.

I ask that the vote on that measure be printed in the RECORD.

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

RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS—VOTE NO. 53

(98th Congress, 1st Session, Mar. 23, 1983)

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS/PASSAGE

Subject: Social Security Act Amendments of 1983 (H.R. 1900). Passage, as amended.

ACTION: BILL PASSED

Synopsis:

Pertinent votes on this legislation include Nos. 28–29, 31–43, 46–54.

As passed by the Senate, the purpose of H.R. 1900 is to implement the consensus recommendations of the National Commission on Social Security Reform.

Specifically, the bill includes provisions in the following areas.—

Extension of Coverage.—(1) Extends social security coverage to Federal workers hired on or after January 1, 1984, or upon the enactment of a supplemental Civil Service Retirement System, whichever is later. Members of Congress, the President, Vice President, and the Commissioner of Social Security will be covered as of January 1, 1984 (see Vote Nos. 47–48).

(2) Extends coverage on a mandatory basis to all employees of nonprofit organizations, effective January 1, 1984 (see Vote No. 52).

Termination of Coverage.—Prohibits State and local governments from terminating coverage for their employees.

COLA Delay.—Delays the June 1983 cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) until December (January 1984 check), and provides all subsequent COLA's in December (January checks) (see Vote No. 32).

Stabilizer.—Adjusts, beginning in 1988, Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance (OASDI) benefits on the lower of the increase in the Consumer Price Index (CPI) or the average wage, if the OASDI trust fund ratio (reserves as a percentage of outgo) is less than 20 percent, and provide "catch-up" payments when the trust fund ratio has risen to at least 32 percent (see Vote No. 31).

Fail-safe.—Allows the Secretary of Health and Human Services, upon proper notification of the Congress, to reduce or eliminate the COLA in order to keep reserves from declining to unsafe levels.

Retirement Adjustment.—(1) Raises the normal retirement age to 66, by increasing the age for full benefits 1 month a year for 12 years (between 1999 and 2011) so that the provision will be fully effective beginning with those attaining age 66 in 2015 (see Vote Nos. 29, 35).

(2) Reduces initial benefit levels by approximately 5 percent for workers first becoming eligible for benefits in the year 2000.

(3) Gradually phases out, beginning in 1990, the retirement earnings test for people 65 and older (see Vote No. 42).

Limitation on Benefits.—(1) Eliminates all benefits to felons during their period of incarceration.

YEAS (88)

Republicans (47 or 89%)

Abdnor, Andrews, Armstrong, Baker, Boschwitz, Chafee, Cochran, Cohen, D'Amato, Danforth, Denton, Dole, Domenici, Durenberger, Goldwater, Gorton, Grassley, Hatfield, Hawkins, Hecht, Heinz, Humphrey, Jepsen, Kassebaum, Kasten, Laxalt, Lugar, Mattingly, McClure, Murkowski, Packwood, Percy, Pressler, Quayle, Roth, Rudman, Simpson, Specter, Stafford, Stevens, Thurmond, Tower, Trible, Wallop, Warner, Weicker, Wilson.

Democrats (41 or 93%)

Baucus, Bentsen, Biden, Bingaman, Boren, Bradley, Bumpers, Burdick, Byrd, Chiles,

DeConcini, Dixon, Dodd, Eagleton, Exon, Ford, Glenn, Hart, Huddleston, Inouye, Jackson, Kennedy, Lautenberg, Leahy, Levin, Long, Matsunaga, Melcher, Metzenbaum, Mitchell, Moynihan, Nunn, Pell, Proxmire, Pryor, Randolph, Riegle, Sarbanes, Sasser, Stennis, Tsongas.

NAYS (9)

Republicans (6 or 11%)

East, Garn, Hatch, Helms, Nickles, Symms.

Democrats (3 or 7%)

Heflin, Johnston, Zorinsky.

NOT VOTING (3)

Republicans (1)

Mathias—[2AY].

Democrats (2)

Cranston—[2], Hollings—[2].

Explanation of Absence:
1—Official Business.
2—Necessarily Absent.
3—Illness.
4—Other.

Symbols:
[AY]—Announced Yea.
[AN]—Announced Nay.
[PY]—Paired Yea.
[PN]—Paired Nay.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I thought we were going to vote at half past. I am not objecting, but we have a problem.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, they have used all of their time. Our side has unused time. The distinguished Republican leader asked unanimous consent to get 2 additional minutes to speak.

Mr. CHAFEE. Will we be voting at the end of this?

Mr. MITCHELL. I will take 2 minutes corresponding with the time for the distinguished Republican leader.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, how much time does the leader have?

Mr. MITCHELL. There are 3 minutes remaining. The Senator's time is used. I will take 2 minutes to match the Republican leader's. So that the time used will be exactly equal by both sides.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. Very simply, within a few minutes we will have an opportunity to vote on the proposal to eliminate the increase in tax on Social Security, and there is nobody in the Chamber who does not favor that position. But, realistically, the President has a plan, a plan to get America back to work. And to permit it to be sabotaged at this point would derail any possibility of having this program put into effect.

So, Mr. President, very simply, what we are doing is offering the Senators an alternative, an opportunity to make a decision that would help protect modest income Social Security recipients. After the vote on or relation to the pending amendment, I will join with the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON] to offer an amendment. That amendment will urge the Finance Committee to make every effort to find alternative sources of revenues before imposing new taxes on the benefits of Social Security beneficiaries with threshold incomes of less than $32,000 for individuals and $40,000 for married couples filing joint returns. I ask all of our colleagues to keep in mind that the following amendment will provide you with a chance to express yourself on Social Security, in a way consistent with the President's plan to get the country back to work.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today as a strong supporter and cosponsor of this amendment.

When telling the American people about his economic plan, President Clinton said that his proposed income tax increase would only affect those with adjusted gross incomes above $100,000, that only 1.2 percent of American families would see their income taxes increase, and that low-income families would see the additional taxes offset through increased spending on relief programs or through expanded tax credits.

But, Mr. President, these claims are simply not true as to the impact of the plan on a large portion of our society, our Nation's seniors. The President's proposal to tax 85 percent of the Social Security retirement and disability benefits would increase the taxes paid by senior American couples earning as little as $32,000 a year and individuals earning only $25,000 a year. This is much less than the $100,000 figure he quoted during his State of the Union Address—not to mention the $200,000 figure he cited during the campaign.

Right now, this tax increase will affect roughly 22 percent of all Social Security recipients and, since the $32,000 and $25,000 threshold is not indexed for inflation, this proportion will increase to about 30 percent by 1998. Do the seniors of America deserve to be hit this much harder than the rest of us? Although, in truth, I do not believe that any taxpayer deserves to be hit for higher taxes until Congress does its job and cuts spending.

President Clinton stated that the tax increases would be offset for low-income taxpayers. While it is true that the increased spending for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program and the Food Stamp Program will help some seniors, the expansion of the earned income tax credit will not. A significant portion of the relief designed to offset additional taxes will not reach some of those who need it most—those senior citizens who do not rely on Social Security alone to finance their retirement. These citizens should be rewarded, not penalized. They are trying to supplement their income and rely less on their families and the Federal Government in paying for their living expenses during retirement.

Mr. President, increasing the portion of benefits subject to tax would increase the marginal tax rate for these middle-income retirees by 5 to 30 percentage points, and some working seniors will face rates in excess of 100 percent. President Clinton's proposal will mean that senior citizens will pay an average of $483 in additional tax revenues. For someone earning $32,000, this is outrageous.

Let me share with you an example of how this proposal will affect a retired Utah couple. This couple worked hard all of their lives side by side running a small furniture store in a northern Utah town. They were moderately successful and have now retired on their Social Security benefits, a salary from the wife's part-time job, and the dividends and interest they earn each year from their savings and individual retirement accounts. Under the current law, this couple would pay income taxes of $4,950, including tax on half of their Social Security. Under the President's proposal to tax 85 percent of the Social Security benefits, though, the tax would be $6,403. This is $1,453 higher, Mr. President—an increase of almost 30 percent. The President's plan does not even ask the very wealthy to pay 30 percent more. In fact, one example that I saw of the impact of the proposed tax rate, including the surtax, on those making over $250,000 per year showed an increase in tax under the plan of 14 percent.

Why are we putting this burden on the backs of our seniors?

The marginal tax rates on working seniors that are subject to the Social Security earnings limit would be even more outrageous under the President's plan. When a Social Security recipient continues to work and is subject to the earnings test, the new proposal to tax 85 percent of the benefits could increase the tax rate to above 100 percent, when combined with payroll and State taxes. This means that every extra dollar earned by working harder would result in a higher tax of over $1, leaving the worker with less money than by not working at all.

Mr. President, I believe that we should be repealing the earnings limit, not increasing the penalty for those working toward retirement. The current tax treatment of retirees already creates enormous disincentives to work and save. President Clinton's proposal only exacerbates this flaw and further penalizes those who have saved to provide for their retirement.

Not only is the increase in the portion of benefits subject to tax unfair, it is bad policy. Tax revenues gained from taxing Social Security benefits should be used to pay for Social Security, not new spending. When established in 1984,

the tax on Social Security benefits was designed to make the trust funds healthy again. In light of that intent, Congress required that any money brought in from the tax be credited to the trust fund.

Mr. President, the proposal put forth by President Clinton would use these funds for new spending. Even if the new taxes are technically going into the Social Security trust fund, in reality they will be spent. The Social Security trust fund currently has a huge surplus of over $300 billion, and this surplus is growing every year. As our colleague, Senator MOYNIHAN, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, so eloquently expressed it in 1991, the use of this money for other than Social Security purposes is thievery. I share his view.

Increasing taxes on Social Security benefits and using the money for other purposes worsens our poor policy of using trust fund moneys for non-trust-fund purposes. This will only erode the integrity of the Social Security system and open the door for more trust fund raids.

No wonder the public does not trust Congress on Social Security issues.

I urge my colleagues to rise above partisan politics and support this amendment. Let us show the seniors in America that they merit fair and equitable treatment, not a disproportionate share of the deficit reduction pain.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my friend and colleague from Mississippi, Senator LOTT, in sponsoring this amendment to strike the proposal to increase taxes on Social Security recipients. As a member of the Senate Aging Committee, I am troubled deeply over the economic impact that a Social Security tax increase would have on our Nation's senior citizens. In short, the administration's deficit reduction plan, as reflected in this Senate budget resolution, represents a double-edged sword for America's seniors.

In my judgment, the national debt—which now exceeds $4 trillion—is the most important domestic problem facing our country. Congress must make tough choices to control and reduce our Nation's debt. However, these plans must be crafted fairly. Such plans should not burden our Nation's seniors with unfair tax increases.

Like all Americans, senior citizens are willing to do their part in getting our Nation's fiscal house in order. However, nearly 1 out of every 4 Social Security recipients is being asked to accept a Social Security tax increase—on top of the other new taxes contained in the administration's proposed deficit reduction plan. Frankly, the proposed Social Security tax increase is just one more penalty imposed on seniors earning a limited income, yet facing unlimited expenses.

Mr. President, permit me to summarize briefly how the President's proposed Social Security tax increase will impact senior citizens' tax burdens. Under current law, if a Social Security recipient's adjusted gross income [AGI], tax-exempt income and half of Social Security benefits exceed a certain limit—$25,000 for individuals and $32,000 for couples—the recipient must pay a tax. The taxable amount is the lesser of 50 percent of Social Security benefits or 50 percent of the excess over the income threshold. The proposal would raise the amount of Social Security benefits subject to taxation from 50 to 85 percent.

According to the Congressional Research Service [CRS], this proposed tax increase would mean increased tax bills for approximately 8.1 million Social Security recipients—22 percent of the beneficiary population. However, the earnings thresholds are not indexed to reflect inflation. As a result, the tax increase would impact a growing number of recipients each year. CRS estimates that by 1998, 30 percent of all Social Security recipients would be affected by the proposed tax increase.

Two articles recently published in the Wall Street Journal clearly illustrate the impact of this proposed tax increase on Social Security recipients. I ask unanimous consent these articles be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

Mr. President, America's senior citizens cannot afford to have yet another bite taken from their incomes. The income of our Nation's elderly has not kept pace with living costs. From 1980 to 1992, prescription drug prices skyrocketed 123 percent and health care costs increased 106 percent. During this same period, Social Security cost-of-living adjustments [COLA's] only increased by approximately 69 percent. Yet, the majority party is proposing a 70 percent increase in Federal taxes on some Social Security recipients. Is this a reasoned or reasonable approach?

The time for Social Security reform is long overdue. For example, senior citizens should not be penalized for remaining in the work force. Many elderly Americans cannot afford or do not wish to withdraw completely from the work force. Some need additional earnings to meet living and health care expenses at a time when their principal sources of income are fixed.

The current Social Security earnings limitation is a blatant disincentive for senior citizens to work—even if only in a limited capacity. Retirees between 65 and 69 lose 33 percent of their Social Security benefits for every dollar earned over the earnings limitation. The proposed tax increase on benefits would increase this work disincentive. In fact, for some seniors, this tax increase would cost them $1.01 for every additional $1 earned.

A number of my Senate colleagues and I are cosponsors of S. 30, the Older Workers Freedom to Work Act, which would remove the earnings limitation for those who have reached retirement age. I encourage my colleagues to review and swiftly pass this measure. In the meantime, should Congress approve another earnings disincentive? The answer is "No."

Mr. President, we must develop and implement reasonable approaches to reduce the Federal deficit. There are no easy or painless solutions. However, Social Security recipients should not be singled out to make unfair sacrifices. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 11, 1993]

HOW CLINTON'S TAX PLAN WILL HIT THE ELDERLY

(By Georgette Jasen)

The high cost of growing old may be about to get even higher.

President Clinton's proposal to increase taxation of Social Security benefits would cost many elderly Americans hundreds of dollars in additional taxes each year, and for some the bill would be more than $1,000.

While that may not seem like big bucks to those wealthy individuals who face income tax increases in the tens of thousands of dollars, the proposed increase would add 10% or more to many senior citizens' federal tax bills. Combined with the proposed tax on energy consumption and possible increases in Medicare premiums, many Social Security recipients would be taking a significant hit in after-tax income.

Unmarried retirees with income as low as $35,000 a year would feel some impact, according to calculations done by accountants Price Waterhouse & Co. for the American Association of Retired Persons. "This is not going to keep anybody from eating or paying the rent," says Larry Dildine, director of tax economics for Price Waterhouse in Washington. "But it will put the squeeze on people . . . who are by no means in the wealthy category."

Although the Clinton administration likes to point out that taxpayers with income over $100,000 would bear 70% of the increased tax burden of the tax package as a whole, Mr. Dildine estimates that about 70% of the burden of increased Social Security taxation will fall on retirees with income under $100,000.

Under the Clinton tax proposal, a hypothetical retiree whose $45,000 annual income includes $9,180 in Social Security benefits could face a far bigger tax increase than her yuppie daughter and son-in-law whose combined income is four times that amount. The young couple's substantial itemized deductions for mortgage interest and state and local taxes would push their taxable income below the threshold for the highest federal tax rate. The Social Security recipient is more likely to take the standard deduction if, like many retirees, she doesn't have a big mortgage and lives in a low-tax state, and she would be taxed on more of her Security Security benefits.

"It's a glaring double standard," says Janice Bernstein, a 61-year-old retiree in Los Angeles whose 69-year-old husband receives Social Security benefits. "Most [seniors] in this situation will not be able to re-enter the labor force" to make up for the lost income.

Administration officials say the plan is fair. "Most Americans are being asked in one

way or another to play a part in this" effort to reduce the federal budget deficit, says Barry Toiv, a spokesman for the Office of Management and Budget. "Entitlement programs are a huge part of the budget and retirement benefits are a huge part of entitlements."

Mr. Toiv says the administration rejected the idea of tampering with Social Security's cost-of-living adjustment, "the most direct way to reduce spending," because "the direct impact would have been not only on those who can afford it, but also on those who can't."

Taxation of Social Security benefits began in 1984, based on 1983 legislation. Under that law, individuals with income of more than $25,000 and couples with more than $32,000, including 50% of their Social Security benefits, pay income tax on half their benefits.

The formula for calculating how much tax is due can get complicated. Let's say a couple has annual income of $50,000, including $36,000 from investments, a corporate pension, some part-time work, plus $13,140 in combined Social Security benefits. Half the Social Security benefits—$6,570—would be added to their other income, for a total of $43,430 to determine whether the benefits will be taxed. Under current law, 50% of the Social Security benefit or 50% of the excess over $32,000 is taxable, whichever is less. In this case, 50% of the $11,430 excess is less, so $5,715 would be taxable. Their total tax bill on all their income would be $4,526.

The Clinton proposal, as currently designed, would continue to use 50% of Social Security benefits to calculate income levels, but 85% of the benefit or 85% of the excess, whichever is less, would be taxable. In the above example, the couple would pay tax on $9,716 of their Social Security income. Their federal tax bill would be $5,126, or $600 more than under current law, a 13% increase.

Although the Clinton proposal wouldn't by itself make anyone subject to taxation for the first time, inflation adds more people to the pool each year. The income thresholds, which aren't indexed for inflation, have been the same since 1984. initially, 10% of Social Security recipients had their benefits taxed; it's now 22%. The Congressional joint committee on taxation estimates that the percentage will rise to 30% by 1998.

AARP estimates that 4.4 million families would pay more taxes next year if the Clinton Social Security plan is implemented. There currently are about 41 million Social Security recipients. Switching into tax-exempt investments may lower a retiree's total tax bill but it won't affect taxation of Social Security benefits. Income from tax-exempt investments, such as municipal bond interest, is included when calculating whether income exceeds the thresholds for benefits to be taxed. "I don't know that there's a lot these people can do," says Mark Springer, a partner with accountants KPMG Peat Marwick in Washington. "They're just caught."

The Treasury department has estimated that increased taxation of Social Security benefits would produce $21 billion in additional revenue over four years. The federal deficit for the current fiscal year, ending Sept. 30, is estimated at $319 billion.

For now, AARP says it is busy "educating" lawmakers about the effects of the Clinton proposal on retirees. As a free-standing proposal, AARP would oppose it, says Marty Corry, the association's director of federal affairs, but "we're still evaluating the whole package. We owe it to the President and to the public to see how the package comes together."

THE BURDEN OF BEING OLD

The effects of President Clinton's proposed tax changes on a hypothetical unmarried retiree who takes the standard deduction, compared with a childless two-career couple with substantial itemized deductions for mortgage interest and state and local taxes.

	The retiree	The yuppies
Wages	$0	$175,000
Other income [1]	35,820	5,000
Social Security	9,180	0

[1] Interest and dividends, no capital gains.

Source: Price Waterhouse & Co.

	Current law	Proposed law	Current law	Proposed law
Adjusted gross income	$40,410	$43,623	$180,000	$180,000
Deductions	4,600	4,600	24,951	24,951
Exemptions	2,400	2,400	4,367	4,368
Taxable income	33,410	36,623	150,682	150,682
Tax due	6,397	7,297	41,555	41,890
Increase from current law	.....	900	.....	325
Percent increase	.....	14	.....	1

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 26, 1993]

RETIREES GET SOCKED AGAIN

(By Stephen J. Entin)

When President Clinton claims that his proposed income tax increases will affect only those with adjusted gross incomes above $100,000, he's forgetting about the elderly. Among his proposals is one to tax 85% of the Social Security retirement and disability benefits of couples who earn more than $32,000 a year and singles who earn more than $25,000. Right now, the roughly 20% of the elderly and the disabled who earn more than these amounts pay taxes on just 50% of their Social Security benefits.

If enacted, this change would increase the marginal tax rate on the incomes of many middle-income retirees. Those affected would see their marginal rate increase by five to 10 percentage points. Some could even face rates in excess of 100%.

In fact, the tax on benefits does not fall on the benefits themselves but on a retiree's other, privately earned, income. The operating philosophy seems to be: The harder you've worked to save for your retirement, the higher your taxes are.

The current system of taxing retirees is extremely complicated. Social Security benefits begin to be taxed when something called the "modified adjusted gross income" (MAGI) reaches $25,000 for a single taxpayer or $32,000 for a married couple filling jointly. The MAGI is the sum of ordinary adjusted gross income (wages, interest, pensions, dividends, etc.) plus tax-exempt bond income and 50% of Social Security benefits. Under current law, for each dollar by which a retiree's MAGI exceeds $25,000 or $32,000, 50% of his Social Security benefits become taxable, up to half of his benefits.

This means that as benefits become taxable, for every additional dollar of taxable income a retiree earns, his taxable income increases not by $1 but by $1.50. In other words, the marginal tax rate on that extra $1 of earned income is 1.5 times normal. It increases, for example, from 15% to 22.5%, or from 28% to 42%. This amounts to a penalty on retirees who have worked hard to build retirement incomes. A younger person with the same income pays a lower marginal rate of tax.

But that's not all. The highest rates of all occur when a recipient's "extra" income is from wages, rather than pensions, dividends or interest. This is because Social Security places a limit on what working recipients may earn without a second penalty. In 1993 that limit is $7,680 for those between the ages of 62 and 64 and $10,560 for those 65 to 69. If a recipient between the ages of 62 and 64 has wages above the limit, he loses $1 in Social Security benefits for every $2 he earns. That's an effective tax rate of 50%. If he's between the ages of 65 and 69, he loses $1 in Social Security benefits for every $3 he earns, an effective tax rate of 33⅓%. When this effective tax of 50% or 33⅓% interacts with the taxation of benefits and the Social Security payroll tax on the added wages, the marginal tax rate can zoom above 90%. And that's before state and local taxes. Once a recipient has paid taxes on half his Social Security earnings, his marginal tax rate falls back to the normal marginal rates.

This is how the current system works. But just wait. Under Mr. Clinton's 85% proposal, retirees face an even higher tax burden. Just how heavy that burden will be depends on how the proposal is implemented.

The crucial question, to which the president's budget offers no answer, is how "85%" is interpreted. No one at the Social Security Administration seems to know.

For every dollar of extra income, will $1.85 be immediately taxable? This would be a "phase-in" rate of 85%, and would increase a retiree's marginal tax rate to 1.85 times the normal rate. Under this interpretation, the normal rate of 15% would become 27.8% and the normal rate of 28% would jump to 51.8%. For the working recipient who loses $1 in Social Security benefits for every $2 he earns in wages (an effective tax rate of 50%) and who must pay the Social Security payroll tax on his wages, that could combine to produce an effective marginal tax rate of more than 100%

Or will the phase-in rate continue to be 50%? That is, for every dollar of extra income, will a retiree pay taxes on $1.50 (like today), but (unlike today) will that tax treatment continue until he has paid taxes on 85% (instead of 50%) of his Social Security benefits? Under this interpretation, the phase-in rate would stay the same (50%), but a broader range of retirement income would be hit by today's supernormal rates.

There's a third possibility that must be considered in trying to decipher what "85%" means. Would an 85% rate apply to the percentage of Social Security benefits included in a retiree's MAGI, a percentage that is currently 50%? If that's the case the number of retirees with MAGIs above the tax thresholds of $25,000 or $32,000 would soar.

In his address to Congress this month, Mr. Clinton promised that his proposal wouldn't increase the number of retirees who pay taxes on their Social Security benefits. To keep that promise, he'll have to make sure that the share of Social Security benefits included in the MAGI is not increased to 85%. Of course, there's inflation. Unless the income thresholds for taxation of benefits are adjusted for inflation, as years go by more and more retirees will find themselves with MAGIs above the threshold. At an annual inflation rate of 3%, by 2010, when the baby boom generation is beginning to retire, the thresholds for single and married taxpayers will have fallen to roughly $15,000 and $19,000 in today's dollars.

If Mr. Clinton's object in raising taxes on retirees is to save money for the Social Security System, then a far better way would be to slow the growth of benefits for future retirees. Another solution would be to increase the retirement age at which benefits begin. But the effect of the current system of allowing benefits to grow and then slapping huge taxes on them is to reduce younger tax-

payers' incentives to work and save for their retirements.

The current tax treatment of retirees—even without Mr. Clinton's 85% solution—creates enormous disincentives to work and save. The Clinton proposal would exaggerate this flaw. If his object is fairness, he cannot achieve it with tax rates approaching or exceeding 100%. If his object is to turn Social Security into a means-tested welfare program, there are more efficient ways to do it.

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Lott amendment.

Mr. President, as I have stated earlier during this debate, we should evaluate proposed tax increases on what I would have thought would be commonsense criteria:

Is the tax needed? and

Is the tax fair, without invidious regional distinctions, efficient, and without unnecessary harm to the economy?

If this tax on America's elderly were a tax that was part of a legitimate deficit reduction exercise, where tax increases were part of a larger effort, including serious spending cuts, then perhaps we could consider it. I believe that the call to sacrifice that President Clinton has made would be answered by Social Security recipients, along with others, in such a circumstance.

And I have been willing to take on entitlement spending—even to venture near that so-called third rail of American politics—because I think the American people, including beneficiaries of entitlement programs, understand that something needs to be done about the deficit.

But, of course, that kind of shared sacrifice is not what this budget deal is about. This budget deal is almost entirely a tax increase. The cuts—merely reductions in planned increases, by the way—come only in the outyears—a technical term for what Minnesotans know as never.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, the budget plan proposed by President Clinton lacks any incentives to increase savings and investment. In fact, his plan, as proposed, will do just the opposite as a result of his huge tax increase on senior citizens. The message the President is sending to all Americans is "do stop thinking about tomorrow," contrary to the theme song his campaign adopted in 1992. I say this because the administration aims to balance the budget on the backs of millions of American seniors who have thought about tomorrow, who have been industrious, thrifty, and planned ahead for retirement. Under the President's proposal, some seniors will suffer an increase in income tax of almost 50 percent, or $1,652, for someone with income as low as only $30,000. This is well outlined in an article I would like to have included in the RECORD at the end of my statement. The article, by Nancy Blumberg, appeared in the Wilmington News Journal.

I have been a longtime proponent of increased savings incentives since the day I arrived in Congress. But the big spenders in Congress have continued to discourage would-be savers from planning for tomorrow. Perhaps the worst decision this Congress has made recently in this area is to dramatically restrict Americans from saving in individual retirement accounts. Another is the imposition of the earnings limitation on seniors that would like to continue working, but risk losing their Social Security benefits if they do so. Now, some would like to tie otherwise independent Americans to the limited hand of Government, again. The message that is being sent is, don't save for your retirement, because you'll be punished if you do. You are better off under the Clinton administration if you spend all your money today, and forget about tomorrow. What kind of plan for saving and investment is this?

Let's review the facts. Under the Budget Committee's plan, 23 percent of Social Security beneficiaries will have to pay 70 percent more in taxes on benefits. That's because under current law the maximum amount of benefits subject to the income tax is 50 percent, but if this becomes law then 85 percent of these benefits will be taxed. In addition, since the income thresholds on this tax are not indexed for inflation, more and more beneficiaries will be taxed in the future. In 1994, 23 percent of beneficiaries will have a 70-percent tax hike, but in only 4 short years that percentage will increase by almost a third to 30 percent, according to the Congressional Budget Office [CBO]. Although this will be a 70-percent tax increase on benefits, for some the tax will be even more onerous, and discourage seniors from working, saving, and investing—three things that are vital for a growing economy. If you look at a self-employed senior in the 28-percent bracket, as little as $22,100, by combining the earnings limit, the Social Security tax, the income tax, State income taxes and this new 85 percent of benefits tax, this senior could lose as much as $1.01 for every additional dollar he earns, and most seniors will lose at least 70 cents for every dollar they earn if they simply want to continue to work. Keep in mind that these seniors are not rich. They are earning between $20,000 and $40,000 a year, and yet the marginal tax rates they are facing are higher than anyone else in the country. Far too many politicians today seem to be preoccupied with raising taxes to pay for their programs, without considering the impact these disincentives have on Americans.

Finally, I would like to point out the flaws in the administration's theory that this tax hike will treat Social Security pensions more like private and public pensions. I strongly disagree. In fact, the 85 percent inclusion ratio is not fair; it results in the double taxation of seniors of today and tomorrow, and it is not based on the current rules for other pension plans. In fact, I've written an article on this topic, and it was published just this week in Tax Notes, and I would ask that the entire article be included in the RECORD in its entirety. I would encourage other Members to read this and see for yourself how this tax would punish seniors unfairly.

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

PROPOSED SOCIAL SECURITY TAX HIKE EXPLAINED

(By Nancy F. Blumberg)

President Clinton's proposal to increase the tax on Social Security benefits has raised considerable concern and questions among retirees.

Before evaluating the effect of the proposal, first consider current rules.

Prior to 1984, all Social Security benefits were free from tax. Currently, persons who are single or head of household with income in excess of $25,000, and persons who are married and filing a joint return with income in excess of $32,000, are taxed on some of their benefits.

Therefore, your Social Security benefits may be taxable depending on the amount of your income including Social Security benefits, and on your filing status.

What income is included to determine whether your benefits are taxable? All your taxable income without Social Security benefits plus your tax-exempt interest is included.

Tax-exempt interest is includable in determining whether your Social Security benefits are taxable, even though such interest is not included in calculating your taxable income.

You then add half your Social Security benefits to this income. If your total is above the $32,000 or $25,000 thresholds, then some of your benefits will be taxable.

Under current law, the taxable benefits are the lessor of (1) half your net Social Security benefit, and (2) half the excess of certain income items over the base amount for your filing status.

Those income items include all taxable income—except Social Security benefits—tax-exempt interest and half of your net Social Security benefits. Therefore, the most that will be taxable is half of the benefits you received.

WHAT THE CHANGES DO

Under Clinton's proposal, the taxable portion of your benefit will be a maximum of 85 percent instead of 50 percent. It also may lower the amount of income necessary before you are taxed since 85 percent of your benefits may be added to other income sources. Therefore, more taxpayers may find a portion of their benefits subject to tax.

This change can be illustrated by looking at the calculation of taxable Social Security benefits under the current law and under Clinton's proposal.

Here is an example. You are single and have a Social Security benefit of $8,000. In addition, you also have a pension of $20,000 a year and interest of $4,000. Under current law, you would compute your taxable benefit as follows:

Add 50 percent of your Social Security benefits ($4,000) and income included on your tax return—excluding Social Security benefits ($24,000). The total: $28,000.

The base income amount equals $25,000.

Excess income over base amount is $3,000.

Taxable benefits are the smaller of 50 percent of your Social Security benefit or 50 percent of the excess over the base amount of (50 percent of $3,000): $1,500.

Under Clinton's proposal, the taxable benefits may be computed as follows:

Add it percent of your Social Security benefits ($6,800) and income included on your tax return—excluding Social Security benefits ($24,000) The total: $30,800.

The base income amount equals $25,000.

Excess income over base amount is $5,800.

Taxable benefits are the smaller of 85 percent of your Social Security benefits or 85 percent of the excess over the base amount (85 percent of $5,800): $4,930.

The latter example shows a tax increase of $960 for a taxpayer in the 28 percent bracket ($4,930 minus $1,500 equals $3,430 at 28 percent).

The tax increase can be substantial for some taxpayers receiving taxable Social Security benefits. To illustrate how costly this may be, consider another example.

In this case assume, your Social Security benefits are $14,000 and you have other income of $30,000. You would be taxable on $5,900 more Social Security benefits. This would result in a tax increase of $1,652 in the 28 percent bracket, an increase in tax of almost 50 percent.

There are investments available that could decrease your current income. This will help some retirees reduce their taxable benefits. A tax deferred annuity may be appropriate for some, but caution in choosing a product and evaluating your personal needs is advised.

[From Tax Notes, Mar. 22, 1993]

DOUBLE TAXING SENIORS OF TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Senator William V. Roth, Jr.)

A basic tenet of the U.S. system of taxation has held that taxpayers should be taxed only once on their income, but a new proposal from President Clinton wavers from this policy and double taxes senior citizens. This new proposal will result in millions of people being taxed twice on the same income and strays from the bipartisan agreement reached in 1983 to save the Social Security trust fund from bankruptcy.

I am speaking of the Clinton proposal to increase the portion of Social Security earnings subject to income taxes to 85 percent from 50 percent, which would apply to jointly filing senior taxpayers earning over $32,000, and single taxpayers earning over $25,000.

The rule taxing up to 50 percent of Social Security benefits was part of the "Social Security Amendments of 1983." This compromise included several key elements, including a six-month delay in cost-of-living increases and a one-year acceleration of the 1977 tax increase on contributions. Since 1983, that compromise has kept the Social Security trust fund solvent, and no one has convinced me that cuts in Social Security are necessary in order to solve our budget deficit. Yet, raising the portion of benefits subject to taxation is considered desirable by some because it is one way to allocate any reduction in benefits to higher-income households.

This idea is anything but fair and will result in the double taxation of seniors today and especially the seniors of tomorrow. This is because more and more seniors will become subject to the tax on 85 percent of benefits, since the income thresholds ($25,000 and $32,000) on this tax are not indexed for inflation. For example, from 1989 to 1997, the percentage of families that will pay taxes on their Social Security benefits is expected to grow from 16 to 26 percent, according to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO). In future years, more and more seniors will be subject to this unfair tax.

Under current law, employers pay one-half of workers' combined payroll taxes from before-tax income, while employees pay the remainder out of income that is taxed. The tax rate for OASDI contributions is currently 6.20 percent of wages for both employers and employees, while the self-employed pay 12.40 percent of their earnings half of which is deductible. In 1983, the rationale for taxing 50 percent of the benefits was the need to salvage the bankrupt Social Security trust fund, and the theory that half of taxpayers' contributions are pretax, and half are after-tax.

Some hold that these benefits should be taxed more like public and private employee pensions. In general, that means taxing any previously untaxed benefits paid to retirees. President Clinton's proposal purports to do that. Essentially, this idea calls for an "exclusion ratio" based on the amount of after-tax contributions that current retirees made during their working years, compared to the total amount of benefits they can expect to receive. Because the ratio of after-tax contributions (the employee's share) to Social Security benefits varies with each worker's earnings history and marital status, no single exclusion ratio is correct for all beneficiaries. The administration's plan thus creates a "fiction," by using a uniform exclusion rate of 15 percent, so that up to 85 percent of benefits over the threshold amounts ($32,000 joint; $25,000 single) is taxable. This "fiction" assumes that today's retirees receive no more than 15 cents of their own after-tax contributions of each dollar they receive in benefits, while at least 85 cents is a return of previously untaxed income. The proposal will raise about $31.5 billion over five years according to the CBO and affect 23 percent of today's Social Security beneficiaries.

But there is absolutely nothing in this plan to prevent double taxation. So far in the history of Social Security, beneficiaries have generally been able to count on receiving more in benefits than they contributed in payroll taxes and interest earnings; so theoretically, beneficiaries are not subject to double tax under the 50-percent rule. However, this will not hold true forever, as younger workers who have paid higher taxes on more income begin to retire. In addition, the Social Security system is highly progressive, so that higher-income workers are less likely to recoup their contributions and earnings than lower-income workers, and so be subject to double taxation.

Let me offer a likely but simplified example of how this proposal stacks up against the theory of taxing these benefits like private and public pensions. Assume a single worker, age 65, retires in 1993, having earned the maximum taxable wage since 1949, and thus has lifetime contributions to Social Security totaling $36,670.17, all of which he has paid income tax on (known as the "investment in the contract" under section 72 of the Internal Revenue Code). The employer's contribution for the retiree is equal to the same $36,670.17, but this is a pretax contribution. If you assume that this retiree will collect the maximum monthly benefit of $1,128 and will have an estimated lifespan equal to the IRS single life annuity of 15 years for a 65-year-old male, then the expected return is $203,040. Under Treasury Regulations in section 1.72-4, the "exclusion ratio," or the amount of each payment that should be excluded from tax because tax was previously paid on this money, for this taxpayer is 18.1 percent (36,670.17 ÷ $203,040). Thus, out of each payment, 18.1 percent should not be taxed, or $204.17 of each Social Security check.

But under the Clinton proposal, 85 percent of the retiree's benefits will be taxed, while 15 percent will be excluded from tax. The difference, equal to 3.1 percent of each payment, represents excess taxes over and above the amount that would be payable under a private or public pension. You can easily imagine worse scenarios, and as the baby-boomers grow up, the differences between the taxing of private/public pensions and the new "Clinton rule" will grow more disparate. I have requested a study to estimate the likelihood of double taxation of these future retirees.

Some argue that this formula fails to recognize the benefits of a retiree's cost-of-living increases that are built into the Social Security system. But the tax rules do not consider COLAs. For example, federal employees also receive COLAs, and the formula under section 72 that sets rules for taxing distributions does not consider these COLAs, nor other retirees' COLAs. In addition, under public and private pension plans, beneficiaries are entitled to receive any undistributed benefits when a retiree dies. In the retiree's last return, any excess taxes are taken into account and the beneficiaries receive a tax benefit, designed specifically so that there is no double taxation. By contrast, the Clinton proposal neither taxes Social Security beneficiaries fairly, nor in a method similar to the public and private pensions rules.

Finally, "smoke and mirrors" are being used to sell this idea, since the administration has classified this new tax increase as a "spending cut" so it can make a few invalid claims. One is that middle-class income taxes are not going to go up. Another is that spending cuts are equal to tax increases. Clearly this is not a spending cut. These income tax hikes hit middle-income seniors, and the smoke is getting thicker at the White House.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for the amendment offered by my good friend from Mississippi, Senator LOTT. This amendment would strike the tax increase on Social Security contained in the budget resolution and offset the lost revenue by cuts in the as yet specified stimulus spending.

This tax hike that President Clinton has proposed to place on our seniors is nothing short of draconian. It would subject 85 percent, up from the current 50 percent, of the benefits of some Social Security recipients to Federal taxation. This would hit more than 8 million seniors with tax increases of up to $2,700 a year. None of the new funds generated by this tax increase would go to fund Social Security benefits. Instead, they will be converted into Government IOU's and used to fund other Government programs, including the dizzying array of new initiatives proposed by President Clinton.

In this light, the Lott amendment is very appropriate. It sends a clear signal to President Clinton that we will

not accept new spending initiatives financed by the retirement benefits of our seniors. It also sends a clear signal to the American people that not everyone in this Chamber is swooning over the false promise of Clintonomics, which claims that massive tax increases will lead to job growth, and that massive new spending will lead to deficit reduction.

Mr. President, we have a problem here: The Federal Government consistently spends more money than it collects. If it collects more, it simply spends more. Americans have been suckered into sacrificing more of their hard-earned wages and retirement benefits more times than I can count, thinking that the Government would cut the deficit. Let us for once try something novel by cutting on the spending side. At the very least, we should not be asking senior citizens to sacrifice their retirement earnings while contemplating new spending, new initiatives, and new programs. Let us look first to reversing the growth of Government.

We should concentrate on eliminating waste, eliminating fraud, curbing pork-barrel spending, and axing obsolete programs. Only when we can look into our constituents' eyes and honestly claim that we are spending their money responsibly should we consider asking them for more. We certainly cannot make that claim now.

Mr. President, I saw a poll today that showed that when made aware of the tax increase on Social Security benefits, 66 percent of Americans who initially support the Clinton plan change their minds. Also, Americans support spending cuts over tax increases to reduce the deficit by a 14-to-1 margin. The Lott amendment will allow the Senate to address both of these concerns by eliminating the tax increase and cutting out some of the new Clinton spending. I urge all of my colleagues to listen to the American people and vote for the Lott amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to address the Senate for 2 minutes, and further that the time used by the Republican leader and myself be charged against the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, often what occurs in the Senate is not what it appears to be. That is the case this morning. This amendment has little to do with Social Security, and even less to do with taxes. This amendment is a torpedo aimed at President Clinton. This is an effort to defeat the President's program. This is an effort to undermine the President's program. This is part of a continuing assault on the President's program. This is an effort to slow down the momentum that is gathering for the President and his program in the country.

Obviously alarmed by that, our colleagues are now here making an effort to derail the President's program. So the issue is very simple here: If you want to stop President Clinton, if you do not want to give President Clinton a chance to get his program, if you do not want change in the economic policies of this country, if you want to continue the course that this country has been on for 12 years, accumulating this massive $4 trillion debt, then you ought to support the amendment and oppose the motion to table the amendment.

But if you want change in this country, if you think President Clinton deserves a chance to get his program going, after less than 3 months in office, if you want to be supportive of the President, if you want to turn the economic policy of this country around, if you want to end gridlock here, if you want to start things moving in this country again and see jobs created and bring the deficit down, then you will vote to table this amendment. That is the real issue here.

This is a transparent, virtually undisguised effort to attack the President's program. It is part of this continuing assault we are seeing on this resolution, which we will see on the next bill and on the bill after that.

So the choice we have to make is a very clear and simple one. Do we want to give President Clinton's program a chance, or do we want to torpedo the President's program before it gets underway? That is the choice that is before the Senate. All of the rest of this and all of these charts are window dressing. Let us get on with it and vote for change in this country. Let us give the President a chance, and let us vote againt gridlock. Table this amendment.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, may I ask if we have any time remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is 1 minute remaining.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I see no other colleagues on my side who wish to speak. Has all time expired on the side of the proponents?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes, it has.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back our time, and I move to table the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there a sufficient second on the motion to table?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table amendment No. 240. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 57 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Akaka	Feinstein	Mitchell
Baucus	Ford	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Glenn	Moynihan
Bingaman	Graham	Murray
Boren	Harkin	Nunn
Boxer	Hollings	Pell
Bradley	Johnston	Pryor
Breaux	Kennedy	Reid
Bryan	Kerrey	Riegle
Bumpers	Kerry	Robb
Byrd	Kohl	Rockefeller
Campbell	Lautenberg	Sarbanes
Conrad	Leahy	Sasser
Daschle	Levin	Simon
Dodd	Lieberman	Wellstone
Dorgan	Mathews	Wofford
Exon	Metzenbaum	
Feingold	Mikulski	

NAYS—47

Bennett	Faircloth	McCain
Bond	Gorton	McConnell
Brown	Gramm	Murkowski
Burns	Grassley	Nickles
Chafee	Gregg	Packwood
Coats	Hatch	Pressler
Cochran	Hatfield	Roth
Cohen	Heflin	Shelby
Coverdell	Helms	Simpson
Craig	Jeffords	Smith
D'Amato	Kassebaum	Specter
Danforth	Kempthorne	Stevens
DeConcini	Krueger	Thurmond
Dole	Lott	Wallop
Domenici	Lugar	Warner
Durenberger	Mack	

NOT VOTING—1

Inouye

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 240) was agreed to.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. FORD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Under the previous order, the Senator from New Jersey, Senator LAUTENBERG, is recognized to offer an amendment.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber, please?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order. Senators wishing to conduct conversations will please retire to the cloakrooms.

The Senator from New Jersey.

AMENDMENT NO. 242

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate on Social Security taxes)

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of Senator EXON and myself and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MATHEWS). The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], for himself and Mr. EXON, proposes an amendment numbered 242.

At the appropriate place insert the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON SOCIAL SECURITY TAXES.

It is the sense of the Senate that the revenues set forth in this resolution assume that the Finance Committee will make every effort to find alternative sources of revenues before imposing new taxes on the benefits of Social Security beneficiaries with threshold incomes (for purposes of the taxation of Social Security benefits) of less than $32,000 for individuals and $40,000 for married couples filing joint returns.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, this amendment is designed to put the Senate on record in support of a simple message. It is a message about priorities.

And I would like, if I may, to inquire what is the time allocation for this and how is it divided?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For this measure, 1 hour evenly divided.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. The message is simple. It says the Finance Committee, and we in the Congress, should make every effort to find alternative sources of revenue before we impose new taxes on the benefits of Social Security beneficiaries with moderate incomes.

Mr. President, President Clinton has proposed a bold, aggressive plan to get our economy back on track, reduce our deficit, and get people back to work. And that is what the American people want. They want action. While most understand that the Congress will argue over some fine points, at the end of the day they want us to pull together. They want Democrats and Republicans alike to get the job done. And that is the purpose of this budget resolution. To help it we are proposing this sense-of-the-Senate resolution.

No one likes all of the proposals in the administration plan. But we do need to move forward. That is why I fully intend to support the budget resolution, as I did in the Budget Committee on which I sit.

As my colleagues know, this budget resolution proposes revenues, spending, and deficit targets for the next 5 years. The mission is to reduce the deficit, get people back to work, and get the economy moving again. The resolution directs various committees to develop legislation that achieves certain levels of deficit reduction. However, it does not, and a budget resolution cannot, dictate specific policies.

Having said that, I think it is obvious that the Finance Committee is expected to give the highest priority to the President's recommendations.

In general, the President's revenue recommendations put most of the burden where it rightfully belongs—on the very wealthy and the powerful interests who have benefited disproportionately from the policies of the last 12 years. But one of the concerns that I have about the plan is the proposal to increase the portion of Social Security benefits subject to taxation, to lift that portion from 50 to 85 percent.

I know that President Clinton proposed this tax with the best of motives based on goals with which I generally agree. He has made it very clear that the burdens of deficit reduction have to be distributed fairly across the board so everyone who can afford to contribute joins in the effort.

I think that is the right approach.

At the same time, my concern about the proposal is that it might have an adverse effect on some elderly Americans with relatively modest incomes.

Under President Clinton's plan, as under current law, Social Security benefits would be taxable only if one's adjusted gross income, plus tax exempt income and 50 percent of Social Security benefits, exceed—in the case of individuals, $25,000, or in the case of married couples filing jointly, $32,000.

I know there are those who think that $25,000 or $32,000 is a fairly healthy income. And in fact in many areas it can buy quite a lot. But I have to tell you it does not buy a lot in New Jersey and many of the other high-cost areas of this country. In fact, New Jerseyans who make much more than that are having great difficulty in making ends meet. And I doubt there are many people in the State of New Jersey earning $25,000 who consider themselves rich.

My constituents have some of the highest living costs in this country, and $25,000 does not go very far. Especially for the many elderly citizens who must contend with high medical costs, high taxes, property taxes, high housing costs, and in some cases, expensive nursing home care.

I have received hundreds of letters and phone calls from senior citizens in New Jersey and their children, who are deeply concerned about this proposed tax increase.

People like the retiree from Old Bridge, NJ, who wrote to me recently. He is on a pension of $14,000. His wife makes $22,000. They pay $5,000 in property taxes. When you add in Federal, State and other taxes, and medical costs, they have very little left. Recently the costs of their medical insurance tripled. Meanwhile, their few savings are earning them a return of less than 3 percent. When this New Jerseyan looked at the increased tax on Social Security benefits he said to me: "This to me is not sacrifice, but suffering."

The new tax will also affect people like a widow who wrote me from North Wildwood, NJ. She struggled for years to raise her son, has never sought any government assistance, and has had a tough time making ends meet. She works two jobs, makes a total of about $30,000, and said: "I have never considered myself as even middle-income."

Mr. President, if people really have substantial incomes and low costs, this new tax might not be the end of the world. But for people like these folks from New Jersey who already are struggling to make ends meet, it could impose a serious hardship. They are the types of people whom I am concerned about and it is those people I think the Senate should protect first if we can.

This amendment sends a message to the Finance Committee that they should make every effort to find alternative sources of revenue before imposing new taxes on those senior citizens with moderate incomes. It does not tell them where they should find the revenues. That is up to the committee. That is their responsibility. My point is that just maybe there are various areas where the Finance Committee might look before we create an additional burden for moderate income elderly people, many of whom are struggling to get by.

At this point I want to emphasize that I have great respect for the members of the Finance Committee and the chairman, a friend and colleague. There are few for whom I have higher esteem. Few in this body have earned the respect and the admiration that PAT MOYNIHAN, Senator MOYNIHAN from New York, has earned as chairman of the Finance Committee, as former chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, and someone who is always in the forefront of sensible, progressive legislation. I know there is no one here with a stronger commitment to middle-class Americans, ordinary working people, than the distinguished Senator from New York. And I am confident that the package that will be produced by the Finance Committee under his leadership will be absolutely fair. This amendment leaves him with the discretion that he deserves to put together a solid package.

Let me add there is no magic to the income thresholds included in this amendment. My intention is merely to indicate a general direction in which I hope we can move the President's proposal. In fact, I recognize there are certain retirees with incomes higher than those suggested in this amendment who also are struggling. So if the committee can identify additional tax loopholes that we can close, and wants to raise the thresholds even higher, I certainly will not object and that is not precluded by this amendment.

Again, those decisions will have to be made by the Finance Committee and the Congress as part of the reconciliation process.

In conclusion, Mr. President, the main point of this amendment is that we should put ordinary Americans first. People in New Jersey who have $25,000 in income are not rich people. Many of them are struggling to barely get by. So let us go after these special interest loopholes and other breaks for the rich and powerful before we hit moderate-income senior citizens.

Also, let us also ensure nothing deters us from enacting a bold plan of

economic stimulus and deficit reduction that will get our economy going, and put us on the path toward real fiscal responsibility.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, how much time do we have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighteen minutes.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, the amendment I am offering today with my good friend from New Jersey is a sense-of-the-Senate amendment indicating that the Senate Finance Committee should make every effort to assure that the proposal made by President Clinton to tax Social Security benefits should only apply to those with incomes that exceed $32,000 for individuals and $40,000 for couples if any tax at all is so administered.

As has been discussed, under the current law, up to 50 percent of the Social Security benefits are currently included in taxable income for those Social Security recipients with income and benefits exceeding $25,000 for an individual and $32,000 for couples.

My amendment calls upon the Senate Finance Committee to recommend a course of action that will assure that the threshold limits will be raised as high as possible, yet still enable our President to meet his deficit reduction goals.

Mr. President, let me first say that I believe one of the strong points of the deficit reduction package before us is that it calls for sacrifices from a wide range of groups and interests. In that regard, it is balanced and, for the most part, a fair package that calls for shared sacrifice from most Americans. Our Nation's elderly residents are not excluded from that mix, but are treated fairly if the amendment that we are offering is accepted.

Other tax increases in the plan, however, rightly focus on our wealthiest taxpayers. For example, the new 36 percent tax rate will fall upon couples with incomes of over $140,000 and single filers with income over $115,000. Although the energy tax will have an effect on nearly every American, there can be no doubt that our President's economic plan is at least intended and I think was originally designed to place a heavier burden on those who can most afford to carry the burden.

The President's proposal to raise the taxable amount of Social Security benefits does not meet the fairness test, in my view. That is why we are suggesting this very important change. The tax increases in that proposal begin to have an effect for married couples who have only about $30,000 in other income. Although the tax is phased in for those with incomes near the thresholds, the real impact of the President's suggested proposal hits those couples very hard with other income between $30,000 and $40,000.

Example: For a couple with other incomes of $35,000 and Social Security benefits of $15,000, the increase in taxes is over $550.

While I do agree that some changes could be made in the manner in which Social Security benefits are taxed, I believe that a better approach to the one outlined by our President would be to have the higher level imposed upon those with incomes of at least over $40,000 for a married couple and at least $32,000 for a single filer. If at all possible, even higher thresholds should be put in place. What we are trying to do with this amendment is to address and make sure that middle Americans are not unfairly taxed.

Mr. President, due to the time constraints, I have not been able to determine exactly how much revenue would be lost were the thresholds raised as we have suggested in the amendment. However, we know that the estimated revenue loss if thresholds were raised to a much higher $40,000 for an individual and $50,000 for a couple would cost, or have a loss of about $8 billion. In other words, such a proposal would raise about $24 billion over the next 5 years, instead of the $32 billion as does the proposal offered by our President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. EXON. I ask for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I yield my colleague 2 additional minutes.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I believe the proposal I have outlined would lose probably $4 billion to $5 billion realistically or, to put it another way, it would raise about $27 billion or $28 billion in revenues versus the President's proposed revenue raising of $32 billion.

This Senate amendment does not change the reconciliation instructions being given to the Senate Finance Committee. The Senate Budget Committee in its presentation of the President's plan modified, listed several ways that the Senate Finance Committee could raise additional revenues. In addition, there is a long list of proposals that are assumed in the President's plan modified, that collectively cost more than the proposal contained in this amendment.

My point is simply that the Senate Finance Committee is being given an instruction to report tax increases that will raise nearly $300 billion over the next 5 years, and the proposal that I have suggested will not have a significant impact upon the job that committee must do.

In closing then, let me say this amendment will, however, protect retired citizens who are far from wealthy from shouldering the tax increases that is otherwise assumed in the budget resolution. This sense-of-the-Senate measure will increase the fairness of the President's plan while keeping its principle of shared sacrifice. I urge its adoption. I reserve the remainder of our time and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. How much time remains on that side and how much time do we have under the unanimous-consent agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eleven minutes, 13 seconds for the proponents; 30 minutes for the opposition.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair. I yield myself 5 minutes. Let me indicate that as to the 30 minutes on our side, obviously I do not need anything like 30 minutes for my thoughts on this. I am going to yield rather quickly 10 minutes to Senator SPECTER and the proponent of the real amendment on this is going to have 5 minutes or so and we will see how that all yields out on our side.

Mr. President, let me talk about this amendment, giving the highest respect to my good friend from New Jersey and my friend from Nebraska. The majority leader, Senator MITCHELL, a while ago, in talking about an amendment that actually took taxes out of the order to the Finance Committee to raise taxes—it took out the amount that is represented by the tax on senior citizens and said we are removing that $32 billion so we do not even impose it; so seniors, you do not have to worry about it. So it is a done deal, if you would have adopted the amendment which was defeated awhile ago. So he said during that debate—and that was with his usual great wordsmanship—that the amendment was "transparent." "Transparent" was the word.

Well, let me see if I can borrow from the distinguished majority leader and talk about this amendment.

If there ever was a transparent amendment, this one is of double transparency. This one is more like a transparent figleaf than a real amendment—a transparent figleaf. Why? Because essentially it says, seniors, we are trying to help you and we wish the Finance Committee would not impose a tax on you. That is the first transparency, to tell the seniors you are doing anything for them when you are wishing a committee that has been instructed to raise 300 billion dollars' worth of revenue, and in that $300 billion is the assumption that Social Security recipients will be taxed, will not tax them. That is the first wish.

Then the second wish. Lo and behold, it is determined that the threshold for

taxation is too low in the proposal of the President because seniors are complaining that they did not think they were rich if they made $27,000 Social Security, pension, and everything else combined. So they are wishing a second good thing for the seniors. And that is that we raise the threshold to a new level, $32,000.

Now, frankly, Mr. President, a nice pattern has been set. Any time a Republican or a Democrat raises an issue about the President's plan that is indeed controversial—you remember, we should have courage; we should support the President's full plan. But whenever there is a real controversy, the other side offers a transparency, a sense-of-the-Senate that we are really not going to do that even though the budget resolution says we ought to do it.

We can go through them: Grazing fees, that was one, grazing fees and mining fees. We really do not intend to do that, so we want to tell everybody we are going to save them out there in the West. So we put in a sense-of-the-Senate, saying it is in the budget; it is in the President's plan. We are going to vote for this budget, say those Members who offer these sense-of-the-Senate resolutions on that side. But do not worry, we are going to vote here today and when we are finished voting there will be plenty of votes on the Democrat side to say we really do not intend it. We do not intend that the committee do this; do something else.

Now, my second point, made in all deference to the proponents, is that if this is a little item—$750 billion—one might honestly look out there and say we really do not think they have to do it, and I am going to go home and tell my people not to worry because I do not think they are going to do this to you. But this is one of the largest new tax components in the President's plan. It is $32 billion. Now, are we going to wish it away? Are we going to say to the Finance Committee: We have adopted a resolution, and it says it is the sense of the Senate that we really hope, we really do not think you have to put that tax on. Tax somebody else.

Well, maybe we ought to ask who? You remember Russell Long's famous saying: "Don't tax me; tax the person behind the tree."

Well, here we are saying do not tax Social Security even though it is in the President's plan because we are beginning to hear from a lot of senior citizens that they do not like this. So wish No. 1 is do not do that.

But is there any suggestion as to where we might get $32 billion? The American people understand: $32 billion in new taxes does not grow on trees. You take it away from Americans somewhere because you tax somebody else more. Who? I submit maybe you ought to raise the Btu tax for the $32 billion. That would be a good one, would it not? Raise $32 billion from the Btu tax. Suspend indexing. Cut mortgage interest deductions, State and local tax deductions. You can do any of those items. But do not do what the President said we were going to do, because we are getting a lot of complaints about it.

So, Mr. President, I am going to urge on our side that those who think the way we do vote against this, vote against this transparency, this cover-up, this double transparency, because it truly is a figleaf. It does not do much at all. And yet there are those who would like the seniors to think that they have really saved them with this sense-of-the-Senate resolution.

Now, Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to Senator SPECTER from Pennsylvania, and I yield the floor at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague from New Mexico for yielding me the time, and I compliment him on the statement which he has just made because I believe it goes to the heart of what is happening with respect to this budget resolution.

I believe Senator DOMENICI has coined a good phrase when he talks about controversy and transparency. Every time there is a controversial issue which has been raised, with this side of the aisle objecting to it, as the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, Senator LOTT, did on wanting to change the tax on Social Security, which is regressive—a fancy word which means that it hits low-income people—then immediately we have a sense-of-the-Senate resolution which says we really do not want to do that at all.

Now, within the Chamber we know precisely what is going on. But for the people watching on C-SPAN 2, it is pretty hard to figure out. It is difficult for those watching to understand that this kind of a sense-of-the-Senate resolution is going to be used by Senators when answering their mail from senior citizens protesting this unconscionable raise in Social Security taxes, which hits people of low income. Then the Senator is likely to respond saying well, I voted for the sense-of-the-Senate resolution to exempt people in low incomes.

But the hard part, Mr. President, is in this book. The hard part is in this book on the figures. That is what is going to happen. It is not going to be this sense-of-the-Senate resolution which is going to govern. The hard part is in this book and in these figures.

When my friend from New Mexico, a man who knows more about the budget than anybody else in this town or in this world, says vote against this sense-of-the-Senate resolution, I am not sure I am going to do that. The reason I am not sure I am going to do that is somebody is going to cite ARLEN SPECTER'S vote against this sense-of-the-Senate resolution, saying he does not care about the poor people and he does not vote to have the package modified to take care of the poor people.

So when this vote comes up, I am inclined to vote in favor of the resolution because of the difficulty of explaining it on the so-called 30-second commercial spot.

We are fighting all the time, Mr. President, against commercials that are going to pick a vote out of context here and there and make a representation which is factually untrue but virtually difficult to answer unless you buy a dozen 30-seconds spots and then hope you get the same people.

The American people ought to be aware of what is going on here on this transparency which is set to obscure the controversy.

Mr. President, on the last vote, there were those from the other side of the aisle who took the floor and said that Republicans were trying to undermine and defeat the President's program. That really is not so. I have said both publicly and privately that I want to support the President where I can, but I am not going to give him a blank check.

I think the Btu tax on energy is wrong. I think raising the tax on Social Security recipients, the lower levels, perhaps on any, is wrong. It is the duty of all Senators, elected as I have been by a State of 12 million people, to express our views and to try to improve this package. We have constructive ideas to offer. I have been on this floor for most of the past week since this resolution came up last Thursday and could not find any time. Senator DOMENICI asked me to take on a certain area of argument which I have prepared. I came over to the floor on Friday afternoon to get a few minutes on some other resolution. I came back on Monday and the Senate floor was filled. All day yesterday, the Senate floor was occupied.

I came at 9 o'clock this morning to try to find some time to talk about four resolutions which this Senator has proposed, which I consider to be very important amendments to the budget resolution. We are at a very critical time in our Nation's history, Mr. President. It seems like every time is critical, but there is no doubt about it now, with a new President elected and with control of the same party by a majority in the House and Senate. This budget resolution is our opportunity to make suggestions and to offer amendments if we can get somebody to listen to them.

Mr. President, the Senate is not in order. May we have the conversations cease, please?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank Senator DOMENICI again for yielding me some time so I can spend a few moments on the amendments that I am offering, which I will not get to debate because the time will all be used up under the Senate budget rules. It is not enough to be around here for 12 years to find 10 minutes to speak on the budget resolution affecting $1.5 trillion.

One of my amendments, Mr. President, says that there ought to be a unified package containing offsets for any additional expenditures through cuts and programs or increased taxes.

What we did earlier this month on extending unemployment benefits without paying for it, I submit, was wrong. I voted for it because I think you have to extend unemployment benefits when you have so many Americans who are unemployed, 9 million or more Americans. We should have extended unemployment benefits but we should have paid for them. We ought not to adopt a budget resolution that does not contain offsets for any new programs. It ought to be a unified package. I submit that issue is worth more than 2 hours, but it ought to have at least more than 2 minutes.

The second amendment which I have on the list is to target passage of health care reform legislation for no later than September 30 of this year. Mr. President, the Congress should have legislated on health care a long time ago. This Senator brought an amendment on health care to the floor last July on the energy bill. I was told that it was the wrong place for the amendment. I agreed and said I would withdraw the amendment if the schedule were set so that there be would be a date certain to consider health care reform. I was told that the issue was too complicated. Then I reminded the schedulers that a date certain had been set for consideration of the product liability reform bill. But I could not get it done. We should have legislated last year.

On January 21, the first day we were in business for legislative matters, I took the floor, complimented President Clinton on his speech on inauguration day, and said that I wished he had directed his attention to something more specific on an economic recovery program and on health care legislation.

There have already been statements which have been made by our leaders which raise a question. Congressman ROSTENKOWSKI, the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, has said publicly that he doubts we will have health care legislation this year. The distinguished majority leader has just come to the floor, Senator MITCHELL, who appeared on "Face the Nation" 3 weeks ago, and said that he thought we could have health care legislation finished perhaps this summer. But he said at that time that these issues have been around, as I recollect, for 6 to 8 years. I submit, Mr. President, we are ready to legislate today, and the bill which this Senator introduced on January 21, Senate bill 18, is a critical bill which would provide comprehensive health care reform.

Yesterday, I introduced an amalgam bill containing parts of legislation submitted by Senator COHEN, Senator KASSEBAUM, Senator MCCAIN, Senator BOND, and myself. I am working with Senator CHAFEE'S task force, where we hope to have legislation produced to offer on the floor of the Senate before we have the recess next month. I have no illusions about its success in terms of a party line vote.

I think the American people ought to know that we do not have to wait to legislate on health care reform. We have debated these issues again and again and again. It is past time that we ought to have full deductibility for the self-employed on their health care premiums. It is past time that we ought to have insurance market reforms to provide for groups to be insured. It is past time for primary and preventive care for low-birthweight babies, and it is past time to put in managed health care. It is past time to deal with the problem of terminal health care.

That is why I propose to press this amendment that we ought to act on health care as a priority matter, no later than September 30 of this year.

A third amendment which I have pending, Mr. President, deals with the allocation of $12 billion of Federal funding on the drug program. Right now $8 billion is allocated for the so-called supply side—that is, law enforcement, international interdiction—and $4 billion on education and rehabilitation. I have studied this issue for a long time, since my days as district attorney in Philadelphia, and am convinced that the long-range answer is really going to come in education and to some extent in rehabilitation. I think of my own two young sons who do not smoke because of the education which discouraged them from smoking. I believe that this body ought to debate how we are going to allocate $12 billion and not take by rote an allocation of 8 and 4 but ought to make it at least 6 and 6.

My 10 minutes is close to expiring, Mr. President. I will move on to my fourth amendment. I am describing these amendments in much too abbreviated a fashion because they are important matters. But I have reintroduced legislation——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 10 minutes have expired.

Mr. SPECTER. I ask if my colleague from New Mexico will grant me 1 additional minute.

Mr. DOMENICI. I am pleased to. Would the Senator yield on my time? How much time do we have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eleven minutes, forty-five seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. I want to yield, whenever he gets to the floor, time to Senator LOTT. Then we will see if there are any other Republicans. If not, I will wrap it up and perhaps yield back some time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. President, I have introduced significant legislation to deal with career criminals. The Federal bill was passed in 1984 and amended in 1986 and has become, so say the law enforcement officials, one of the most effective tools against drug sellers and violent crime by taking career criminals, those convicted of three or more serious offenses who were found in possession of a firearm, and giving them a mandatory sentence of 15 years to life.

We have in most of the States, more than 40 States, habitual-offender statutes, which are now not fully used, under which courts could sentence habitual offenders to life in prison.

I believe that we need realistic rehabilitation, Mr. President, for first offenders, juveniles, some second offenders. It is no surprise when somebody leaves jail without a trade or skill, to go back to a life of crime. For habitual offenders, we need life sentences, and the Federal Government ought to provide the funding, even for career criminals sentenced under State law.

I know my time is up. I thank the Chair and my colleague, the Senator from New Mexico.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, let me remind my colleagues again that what we are talking about here is a Social Security tax increase on retirees with benefits down as low as $25,000 for an individual, and $32,000 for a couple.

We had an opportunity on the previous amendment to stop that from happening. Forty-seven Senators voted against a Social Security tax increase on retirees down to middle-income levels and low-income levels.

The sense-of-the-Senate resolution pending before us says, well, we wish that the Finance Committee would look for other sources of revenue to take care of coming up with money which will be spent. Well, I have a novel idea. What we ought to be doing is not looking for more revenues to pay for this elimination of Social Security tax increase. We ought to be cutting new spending that is in the President's budget proposal.

But this is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution. This amendment really does not accomplish anything. It is a wish, We wish, Senate Finance Committee, that you would find some other source of revenue. But, if you cannot, we want you to consider maybe raising the threshold up to $32,000.

Well, whoopee. What about the retirees living on Social Security at $32,000;

are they wealthy? I do not think they would believe they are wealthy. Certainly, they are at least at the minimum of middle income, maybe below that.

Earlier this week in debate, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas called a sense-of-the-Senate resolution a monumental eunuch. It does not mean anything. It is an effort to say we love you seniors; we would rather not raise taxes on social security; we wish the Finance Committee would not do it, but if they do, it is OK if they begin at $32,000 instead of $25,000.

What we have here is a plan for people to ignore their vote on the previous amendment which would really protect Social Security recipients and listen only to their hollow and useless words, that we really do not want to do this, but the devil made us do it.

Seventy percent of the American people do not want us to raise taxes on Social Security beneficiaries down into these low- and middle-income areas. So why in the world are we doing it?

Mr. President, I think when you look at this amendment, what we really have before us, what is being offered, is just an effort to say the previous vote did not really count, and we hope the Finance Committee will find another way to raise this revenue. But the instructions from the Budget Committee, and the proposal of the President clearly say: tax Social Security recipients. This amendment is not going to prevent that from happening.

So I urge my colleagues once again, let us not take this big bite out of the Social Security tax recipient's income. You are probably going to still see 70 percent or more of it come from recipients that make $50,000 and $100,000. Yet, we are being told we do not want to attack the middle-income people. That is not what is happening with this proposal. I urge my colleagues to vote against this sense-of-the-Senate resolution, because it is hollow, and because you are voting, if you vote for it, to have a tax increase on Social Security recipients beginning at $32,000 for an individual, and $40,000 for a couple.

Mr. President, I yield the floor at this time. I notice the Senator from New Mexico is not here. Does the Senator from New Jersey have additional time he is going to use?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. How much time do we have, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eleven minutes, thirteen seconds.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Well, we will be using some of that time.

Mr. LOTT. How much time remains on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Six minutes.

Who yields time?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I yield myself as much time as I take, up to the remaining time for our side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from new Jersey is recognized.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I have listened with some amusement to the descriptions of the amendment I offered with my distinguished colleague from Nebraska. We have had various descriptions, and they use the terms hocus pocus, figleaves, transparencies, double transparencies. This sounds like a session on how to make film, Mr. President.

What we ought to do is speak truth in this place for a change. We listen to the cries of opponents on the other side, who are so upset by the fact that we want to try to deal with this deficit in a realistic fashion and reinvigorate the economy so that we can get people back to work and get ourselves back on track, instead of using all this time to talk about politics and 30-second commercials and the lot.

The Senator from Mississippi will forgive me for the reference, to the "lot." I do not mean Senator LOTT. I mean another lot.

The fact of the matter is that the very Senators who spoke against this resolution had no problem voting for elimination of grazing fees or inland waterway fees. Yes, they wanted to get the money back from taking it from discretionary programs. But their consciences were not touched at all when they suggested we eliminate fees for people who are using public lands to their advantage, making a profit, lots of money in some cases. That was OK.

But what about the senior citizen who has a modest income?

Mr. President, many of these senior citizens have worked all their life, tried their best, saved their money, faced catastrophic illness, maybe ended up in long-term nursing home care. And this amendment is trying to help those people.

Mr. President, if it were up to me, I would prefer that we not tax Social Security benefits at all. Given today's realities, though, that's not in the cards. So the question becomes, who deserves more protection? Ordinary, middle-class Americans or the very wealthy?

I say, let's protect moderate income Americans first. And so I disagree with my colleague from Mississippi, who wants to protect the wealthiest beneficiaries, no matter how much they make.

The fact is, there are senior citizens who have enormous incomes, some from investments. Yet my colleague from Mississippi says, no, not even those people ought to contribute more toward this terrible problem that we face.

Mr. President, this amendment suggests to the Finance Committee that they take another look, a second, third, or a fifth look, if they must, to see if they can find other sources for revenue needed to reduce this deficit from other places. Yet my colleagues on the other side of the aisle suggest that this is just wishful thinking.

Implicit in their argument is an assumption that the tax law is perfect as it presently exists. There are no more loopholes to close. And so, they suggest, it's just wishful thinking to try to help modest income, moderate income Social Security recipients. I don't see it that way.

Mr. President, I also want to correct something that was said earlier suggesting that this budget resolution will force the Finance Committee to adopt specific policies. That is simply not correct. A budget resolution can make suggestions and establish parameters. But it is up to the Finance Committee to do what they think is best. We have good management there. We have good leadership. And we trust that they will develop the best legislation that they can.

Mr. President, I hope that we will support this amendment, because what it says, very simply, to the Finance Committee, and to our colleagues here is: rather than going first to increase taxes on Social Security recipients with moderate incomes, people who have saved all their lives for these days and who face the risk of long-term illness or catastrophic sickness, we ask that you make every effort to find alternative sources of revenues.

It is shocking that those who would vote to eliminate the tax for the highest income Social Security recipients would object to our trying to protect the more moderate income recipients.

I yield such time as my friend from Nebraska wants.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, how much time remains on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five and one-half minutes.

Mr. EXON. We reserve the remainder of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, how much time do we have on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Six minutes and twenty-two seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I probably will yield time back. I am going to have some Senators who want to speak. I am trying to get them here. I do not want to yield my time in advance.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If neither side is yielding time, time will be charged equally.

Mr. EXON. I believe the Senator from Nebraska is yielded 5 minutes of the remaining time.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. All the remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. EXON. I yield myself 4 minutes of that time. Please advise me if I go over that amount.

Mr. President, let me try to put this back in perspective after what I have

been listening to in the opposition from the other side. As far as this Senator is concerned, there is not anything very transparent about this amendment. This amendment simply says that we recognize and realize that everybody is going to have to make some sacrifices if we are going to do anything about the skyrocketing debt of the United States that in the last 12 years, I would remind all, has gone from $100 billion to now over $4 trillion and going up certainly to at least $4.3 or $4.4 trillion in the next few weeks and is going to go on up from there, without any question, to over $5 trillion. The fact that we are paying about $300 billion a year interest on that is something that we must not lose track of.

What this amendment really says and does—and it is not transparent—is to say to the Finance Committee that they have been called upon to do a very, very difficult task to raise about $300 billion, that if it is necessary to place some taxes on Social Security recipients do not tax the Social Security receipts of middle-income Americans.

Everybody can argue about what a middle-income American is. I think most of us would agree that people who are making between $30,000 and $40,000 annual income probably define middle America as best we could.

I simply say and will point out that the basic thrust of this amendment is to tell the Finance Committee that if taxes on Social Security recipients are going to have to be raised do not do anything with the very low people, low-income people, and do not tax further the Social Security receipts of couples unless they make over $40,000.

It would be nice to stand up on the floor, and it is good politics, Mr. President, to say do not tax Social Security. The facts of the matter are I think especially higher income Social Security recipients would be the only ones that would receive additional taxes if this amendment is accepted and lived up to in the Finance Committee, as I think it will be. We are only asking additional tax receipts from the higher income people who are also draining Social Security.

I think most of the higher income people drawing Social Security would recognize that this is a sacrifice they have to make. I think all Americans had better get over this thing that we can solve the horrible fiscal problems of the United States of America simply by talk and simply by political posturing.

The facts of the matter are, if we are going to begin to solve this problem of the fiscal disarray of the Government of the United States of America, we are going to have to have some sacrifices. I believe that higher income people, higher income couples, with incomes over $40,000, can and should pay some additional taxes that they will have to pay under this proposal.

If I am to be besieged with political rhetoric that I am not interested in the Social Security recipients and it is unfair for even high income people——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded the Senator has expired.

Mr. EXON. I yield myself additional time I have remaining.

I would simply say, Mr. President, that this proposal is fair. I would hope that we would endorse it.

I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-three seconds.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG] and our able colleague from Nebraska [Mr. EXON] for bringing this amendment before the Senate today.

What these Senators are saying is that they want to do something about this deficit. They want to reduce this deficit. They have the courage to put their votes where their convictions are. But they are also saying that they want to try to redirect the Finance Committee, if at all possible, to raise the level for taxation to a certain extent.

I commend them for their efforts here today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN). The Senator's time has expired.

Who yields time?

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be charged to the time of the Senator from New Mexico on the amendment.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. How much time does the Senator have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two minutes and twenty-six seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. Does Senator Bond desire to be recognized?

Mr. BOND. I do.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield 1 minute to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BOND. Madam President, I thank my distinguished colleague from New Mexico.

As I look at this amendment, this might be a nice thing for us to do to get on record as saying maybe we should not increase the Social Security taxes, but it seems to me that we just had an opportunity to vote on it for those who really do not believe we should be taxing Social Security benefits or increasing the tax on people with moderate income paying Social Security.

I just ask my distinguished Republican ranking member, Is there any reason why we should not vote for it? We have the vote that really counts. But what does this sense-of-the-Senate resolution do?

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I yield myself the remainder of time.

The Senator raises a good question. Frankly, it seems to me that the amendment really is just an intention and a wish. I hope things do not turn out as the President has suggested.

In that context, if a Senator on either side wants to vote for it, knowing that really does not do anything, the full dollars are still in, all the dollars that are going to be needed on the tax side still are included in the assumption, that $32 billion of it is going to come from Social Security.

So I think any Senator can look at it however they want. If they do not want a risk that this will be something used against them, even though it is meaningless, then perhaps they would like to vote aye and support it.

From my standpoint, I am not going to do that as a Senator on this floor, just because I feel very strongly that we have already had the right vote. I do not want to water down the right vote, nor do I want anybody else to water down the right vote, whether they voted yes or no on the previous vote.

Mr. GREGG. Will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes.

Mr. GREGG. I just had a question.

If we were to actually believe this entire wish list that has been put forth over the last few days—I think this must be the fourth or fifth wish amendment that we have had—would there be anything left of the Clinton budget?

Mr. DOMENICI. Well, frankly, before we wrap up the day, I am going to see how many wishes we had and then I am going to see what is left that is controversial.

Because it seems to me, every time something is seriously controversial in the President's plan, we have somebody with a sense-of-the-Senate saying, "We wish it would not happen," kind of delivering the message to people that they are going to see to it that it is not. We did that on grazing fees yesterday.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, this sense-of-the-Senate amendment is not binding on the Senate Finance Committee. The real vote on Social Security taxes was the one we just cast on the Lott-Mack amendment. The Democrats tabled the real Social Security amendment with 52 votes.

Even if the Finance Committee were to raise the threshold to the levels sug-

gested by this amendment, we would still be going back on the deal we cut with America's seniors 10 years ago.

Ten years ago we asked employers and workers and beneficiaries to make sacrifices to put the Social Security system on a sound financial footing. We made a deal that was fair. It passed with strong bipartisan support.

Ten years later, President Clinton is asking America's seniors to contribute $32 billion in higher taxes—only this time, the money is not going to strengthen the Social Security system.

This amendment tries to deal with the Social Security tax issue by wishing that it will go way. It might persuade the Finance Committee to reduce the amount of the tax increase somewhat. But, the point is that this time around, the money from these higher taxes is being used to finance other spending programs.

I will vote against the Lautenberg amendment.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I plan to vote against this sense-of-the-Senate amendment to the budget resolution. Just 1 hour ago, the Senate voted on an amendment to remove the increase in taxes on Social Security benefits. I voted for that amendment—to remove the tax increase. Unfortunately, the amendment was defeated. That amendment had real teeth—much more so than the sense-of-the-Senate amendment before us now. This amendment says the Finance Committee should find alternative taxes to the Social Security tax proposed by the President. If my colleagues were opposed to increasing the tax on Social Security benefits, they should have voted for the previous amendment. All the current amendment says is that we should find other taxes. Let me be clear—I am against the President's tax increases. We should first focus on spending cuts. I have proposed a plan to reduce the deficit through reducing Government spending. That should be our focus, Mr. President, instead of looking for more and more taxes to raise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG].

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 32, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 58 Leg.]

YEAS—67

Akaka	Boren	Brown
Baucus	Boxer	Bryan
Biden	Bradley	Bumpers
Bingaman	Breaux	Byrd
Campbell	Jeffords	Murray
Chafee	Johnston	Nunn
Cohen	Kassebaum	Packwood
Conrad	Kennedy	Pell
Daschle	Kerrey	Pressler
DeConcini	Kerry	Pryor
Dodd	Kohl	Reid
Dorgan	Krueger	Riegle
Exon	Lautenberg	Rockefeller
Feingold	Leahy	Sarbanes
Feinstein	Levin	Sasser
Ford	Lieberman	Shelby
Glenn	Lugar	Simon
Graham	Mathews	Specter
Gregg	Metzenbaum	Warner
Harkin	Mikulski	Wellstone
Hatfield	Mitchell	Wofford
Heflin	Moseley-Braun	
Hollings	Moynihan	

NAYS—32

Bennett	Durenberger	McConnell
Bond	Faircloth	Murkowski
Burns	Gorton	Nickles
Coats	Gramm	Robb
Cochran	Grassley	Roth
Coverdell	Hatch	Simpson
Craig	Helms	Smith
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Stevens
Danforth	Lott	Thurmond
Dole	Mack	Wallop
Domenici	McCain	

NOT VOTING—1

Inouye

So the amendment (No. 242) was agreed to.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM] is to be recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 249

(Purpose: To strike the individual income tax increase, the energy tax increase, and the Social Security benefits tax increase, and an equivalent amount of new spending)

Mr. GRAMM. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM], for himself, Mr. LOTT, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. MACK, proposes an amendment numbered 249.

Mr. GRAMM. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 41, line 17, decrease the amount by $31,300,000,000.

On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $31,300,000,000.

On page 41, line 24, decrease the amount by $25,000,000,000.

On page 41, line 25, decrease the amount by $25,000,000,000.

On page 42, line 6, decrease the amount by $38,000,000,000.

On page 42, line 7, decrease the amount by $38,000,000,000.

On page 42, line 13, decrease the amount by $51,000,000,000.

On page 42, line 14, decrease the amount by $51,000,000,000.

On page 42, line 20, decrease the amount by $62,000,000,000.

On page 42, line 21, decrease the amount by $62,000,000,000.

On page 41, line 9, decrease the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 41, line 10, increase the amount by $86,000,000.

On page 41, line 11, increase the amount by $333,000,000.

On page 41, line 12, increase the amount by $278,000,000.

On page 41, line 13, decrease the amount by $73,000,000.

On page 38, line 11, decrease the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 38, line 12, decrease the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 38, line 18, increase the amount by $86,000,000.

On page 38, line 19, increase the amount by $86,000,000.

On page 38, line 25, increase the amount by $333,000,000.

On page 39, line 1, increase the amount by $333,000,000.

On page 39, line 7, increase the amount by $278,000,000.

On page 39, line 8, increase the amount by $278,000,000.

On page 39, line 14, decrease the amount by $73,000,000.

On page 39, line 15, decrease the amount by $73,000,000.

On page 2, line 18, decrease the amount by $29,593,000,000.

On page 2, line 19, decrease the amount by $31,022,000,000.

On page 3, line 2, decrease the amount by $40,420,000,000.

On page 3, line 4, decrease the amount by $50,545,000,000.

On page 3, line 6, decrease the amount by $54,440,000,000.

On page 3, line 10, decrease the amount by $29,593,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, decrease the amount by $31,022,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, decrease the amount by $40,420,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, decrease the amount by $50,545,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, decrease the amount by $54,440,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, decrease the amount by $31,300,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, decrease the amount by $25,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, decrease the amount by $38,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, decrease the amount by $51,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, decrease the amount by $62,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $31,300,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $25,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $38,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $51,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by $62,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, decrease the amount by $31,300,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, decrease the amount by $25,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 24, decrease the amount by $38,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 25, decrease the amount by $51,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, decrease the amount by $62,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $31,300,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $25,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 9, decrease the amount by $38,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $51,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $62,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 17, decrease the amount by $1,757,000,000.

On page 6, line 18, increase the amount by $6,108,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, increase the amount by $2,753,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $177,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $7,633,000,000.

On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $1,757,000,000.

On page 7, line 2, increase the amount by $4,351,000,000.

On page 7, line 3, increase the amount by $7,104,000,000.

On page 7, line 4, increase the amount by $6,927,000,000.

On page 7, line 5, decrease the amount by $706,000,000.

On page 7, line 8, decrease the amount by $1,757,000,000.

On page 7, line 9, increase the amount by $6,108,000,000.

On page 7, line 10, increase the amount by $2,753,000,000.

On page 7, line 11, decrease the amount by $177,000,000.

On page 7, line 12, decrease the amount by $7,633,000,000.

On page 9, line 3, decrease the amount by $2,859,000,000.

On page 9, line 4, decrease the amount by $6,104,000,000.

On page 9, line 5, decrease the amount by $6,891,000,000.

On page 9, line 6, decrease the amount by $7,683,000,000.

On page 9, line 7, decrease the amount by $8,462,000,000.

On page 50, line 9, decrease the amount by $29,593,000,000.

On page 50, line 10, decrease the amount by $206,000,000,000.

On page 57, line 7, decrease the amount by $29,593,000,000.

On page 57, line 8, decrease the amount by $206,020,000,000.

On page 39, line 23, decrease the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 39, line 24, decrease the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 40, line 5, increase the amount by $86,000,000.

On page 40, line 6, increase the amount by $86,000,000.

On page 40, line 12, increase the amount by $333,000,000.

On page 40, line 13, increase the amount by $333,000,000.

On page 40, line 19, increase the amount by $278,000,000.

On page 40, line 20, increase the amount by $278,000,000.

On page 41, line 2, decrease the amount by $73,000,000.

On page 41, line 3, decrease the amount by $73,000,000.

Mr. GRAMM. Madam President, I have sent an amendment to the desk that I think is a very easy to understand amendment. I want to try to describe it as simply as I can, and then I want to go through and talk about why it is so very important to the future of America.

First of all, the amendment that I have sent to the desk attempts to address the two sides of the budget equation. It first tries to deal with the massive growth in Government spending that is embodied in the Clinton budget by freezing discretionary spending, by shearing off the add-on spending in new programs and by deleting the increase is spending proposed in the Clinton budget for old programs. It then takes the savings that are achieved by freezing discretionary spending, and by shearing off add-on spending, it takes those savings and uses them to eliminate the new individual income taxes, eliminate the Btu energy tax and eliminate the Social Security tax. In fact, Madam President, you could call this amendment the deficit neutral detaxification amendment.

I have put up here in very simple terms—in fact one of my trusty aides put this together. What he tried to do was to set this out graphically by taking the three parts of the budget and putting them on this chart in their relative size: Taxes, spending and then way down here, these tiny letters which I am sure our dear Presiding Officer cannot see, but that is cuts.

Now, let me explain the problem. Let me just look at 5 years of the Clinton plan and what it does.

If you take the taxes that are already built into our economy, if you take the $295 billion of new taxes and you look over a 5-year period, which is what this budget covers, over this 5-year period revenues are going to rise by $1.332 trillion. In fact, over this 5-year period the average working American is going to pay $12,109 more than that same average working American is paying today.

Also, over this 5-year period, under this budget, nondefense spending is going up by $840 billion. Over a 5-year period, compared to today, we are going to spend $840 billion more than we are spending today.

As I shared with my colleagues at breakfast this morning, a fellow came up to me in Texas on Monday and said, "Senator Gramm, are we going to cut nondefense spending before we raise these taxes?" I looked at him and I said, "I sure hate to tell you, but there are no cuts in nondefense spending in this budget." In fact, while we claim a $7 billion cut over 5 years out of $1.3 trillion a year in spending, the truth is that those are cuts relative to the planned growth in spending, not relative to actual dollars spent. But what is built into this budget is $840 billion worth of new nondefense spending.

Now, what I am trying to do, Madam President, is very simple. I am trying to take about a quarter of this built-in spending increase out, by freezing discretionary spending and by shearing off $136 billion of net new spending that the President is proposing.

Let me tell you why that is so important. That is so important because the Clinton program is giving us a vision of America that nobody voted for and, quite frankly, I do not think most Americans want.

Let me try to reduce it down to two figures. At the peak of the Johnson Great Society program, Government spending for nondefense purposes took 10 cents out of every dollar earned by every American to pay for it. If the Clinton plan is implemented, nondefense spending will take 19.3 cents out of every dollar earned by every American to pay for social spending, nondefense spending.

At the same time, it is very interesting to note that when Jimmy Carter left office, his last defense budget, which Congress and the American people deemed to be inadequate—we had to rebuild defense. We won the cold war. We tore down the Berlin Wall. We liberated Eastern Europe. We transformed the Soviet Union. We are now going to be spending under this budget half as much as a percentage of the total economy on defense as we spent when Jimmy Carter was President.

I do not believe, Madam President, that the vision most Americans have for their country is one of spending twice as much on social programs as a percentage of the economy as we spent when President Johnson was in office and half as much on defense as we spent when Jimmy Carter was in office.

So what my amendment does on the spending side is, very simply, that it deletes about a quarter of the growth in spending that is part of the Clinton budget and then it eliminates the new income taxes, the new energy taxes, and the new Social Security taxes. It ends up not affecting the total deficit reduction number in the Clinton budget, but it does so by controlling spending rather than raising all these taxes. It does not fix every problem in the budget. This is not a substitute. This is an amendment. But it dramatically improves it.

Now, let me talk about these taxes.

Last night and this morning when we talked about Social Security taxes, we talked about the unfairness. We talked about people who have saved all their lives to build up a nest egg to retire. Their income on their W-2 form is $18,000 a year, and the President is going to come along and tax their Social Security benefits, tax 85 percent of those benefits, taking away the benefits from a lifetime of work. We talked about how unfair it was. Senator LOTT and I and others tried to take it out. Unfortunately, that failed.

But, Madam President, I do not want to talk about fairness here. I want to talk about the economy.

There is a big problem with taxing Social Security that goes beyond being unfair. The people who are being taxed by this budget proposal worked all

their lives to build up a private retirement program. If now we come along and we tax their benefits, what it is going to mean is that moderate income people in the future are not going to save for their retirement because they know that the Government is going to take the benefit away from them. So tens of billions of dollars of private retirement funds that we now use to invest and grow America, invest to grow the private sector, those private retirement funds are going to vanish.

As a result, even though the President's budget assumes that people are going to work and build up a nest egg and save and let Government take it away from them, that is not the way Americans behave. I am talking about an impact on growth and jobs and on the future of America, quite aside from fairness. That is why that tax increase needs to be dropped.

Let me talk about the energy taxes. I remember vividly in the State of the Union Address the President said this energy tax is a throwaway tax, $10 a month, $120 a year.

Well, what the President did not tell us was he was only talking about half the cost, because his budget says that the cost is $120 a year directly in higher gasoline prices and higher utility bills. But it also says that the average American will see everything they buy from groceries to airline tickets go up another $200. So the President's actual projected cost for the average American family on the energy tax is not the $120 we heard in the State of the Union Address, it is $320.

Now, outside groups have started to look at this Btu tax, and people like Dr. Schlesinger, who was Energy Secretary under President Carter, have said that this tax is probably about $500 a year on every working family. These are the same middle-income Americans who President Clinton said under his program they could choose between lower rates or higher deductions for their children.

Madam President, where is their choice? Where do they get to make that choice? They got to make that choice only when they voted. Now that they have voted, all of a sudden we are talking about raising their taxes—one of the great electoral betrayals that I have personally witnessed.

Madam President, the second thing we do in this proposal is we take out the Btu taxes.

Finally, let me talk about income taxes. If you listened to the debate about income taxes, you get the idea that we are taxing all these rich people, that only rich people are paying these taxes.

Madam President, what is missing in all this is that 1.4 million small businesses file as subchapter S corporations under the IRS Code as individuals. In fact, every estimate that I have seen indicates that at a minimum 60 percent of the income taxes paid by the highest income tax filers are paid not by individuals but by proprietorships, by partnerships and by subchapter S corporations.

So the President talks about taxing all these rich people, but it is not John Q. Astor that is being taxed. It is Dicky Flatt & Sons Stationery Shop in Mexia, TX. They are the people who are being taxed. Their retained earnings are being taxed away. Their ability to grow their business, to create jobs, to make America prosperous is being taxed away.

So, Madam President, what this amendment does is very simple. It freezes discretionary spending; it shears off the President's new spending; and it takes that money and uses it to offset the elimination of the individual income tax rate increase, the energy tax, and the Social Security tax and is able to maintain the total deficit reduction number in the President's budget.

The net result is that if this amendment is adopted, Government spending over the next 5 years will grow about 25 percent less than it will grow if the amendment is defeated. And we will not be imposing these taxes which will have the impact of putting America out of work.

The real question, Madam President, is do we want to grow America or do we want to grow the Government? Do we really want to tax Social Security recipients, average working families with an energy tax, and do we want to tax small businesses and family farms all to fund more Government spending? If people do not see anything else in my amendment, remember this one point: By freezing discretionary spending, and by sheering off the add-on, the spending the President has proposed, we can cancel for all practical purposes, eliminate new income taxes, energy taxes, and Social Security taxes. Why are those taxes in this budget? They are in this budget to fund new spending, not to reduce the deficit.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, I see the distinguished Senator from Maryland on the floor. I would be pleased to yield to him such time as he might desire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee for yielding me time.

Madam President, this is an interesting amendment. It does deserve some careful consideration. It does reflect some very important differences.

Essentially what the Senator from Texas is doing is he is eliminating the investment dimension of the President's proposal. He in effect would freeze all spending. Of course, the President has been very up front about this issue. The President has said he is trying to accomplish two things. He is trying to accomplish deficit reduction and also accomplish an investment program in the future strength of the American economy. In order to achieve those objectives he seeks to find the resources from two sources: Cuts in other spending programs in the budget, and additional revenues.

The President has been very clear about that. I commend him for it. His strategy is to reduce the deficit, which he recognizes in an important national objective, and provide additional investment in the future strength of the American economy.

Then you say how are you going to do this? The President says that we are going to find the pool of money that is necessary to do this in two ways: We are going to cut other spending which will provide additional moneys, and we are going to raise some revenues.

What the Senator from Texas has said is I do not want to raise revenues, and I do not want to do investments. That is essentially his equation.

First of all, do we need these investments? Is there a problem in investing in America's future and in its strength in the years to come and enhancing our ability to compete internationally?

This is a chart that shows real net investment as a percent of real net national product. As you can see, net investment fluctuated up and down throughout the sixties and seventies. It came down during the early seventies, then back up again, down low in the early eighties, back up again. But over the last 7 or 8 years we have had a steady decline in our real net investment.

If you do not invest in the future, the economic health of the Nation will suffer. I think most people recognize this, and they make investments for the future strength of their economy. In fact, a lot of businesses go out and incur debt premised on the proposition that the future growth of their business will sustain it.

I want to show how our current investment compares with what is being done in other countries because someone may say that investment has been declining in the United States as a percent of national product on a historical basis, but we are still doing better than other countries. This chart shows fixed investment as a share of GDP in the 10 largest economies: Japan, Spain, Australia, Germany, Netherlands, France, Italy, Canada, and the United Kingdom, all spend more on fixed investment than the United States.

President Clinton recognizes this. President Clinton is saying we have to do better on the investment front. We have to have an investment strategy. That is what is contained in his budget proposal. It is a public and private sector investment strategy for the future

strength of the country. There are a number of provisions in this proposal and in the stimulus package which encourage private and public sector investment.

Some people contend that public sector investment does not serve a purpose. But this is incorrect. Where does the transportation network come from? As a trucking executive said to me: If my truck sits in a traffic jam for 4 hours, that comes right out of the efficiency of my operation. My productivity is being undermined by an inadequate transportation network.

The Germans are investing in apprenticeship programs, at about five times the level we do in the United States. They are investing in the education and training of their work force.

This chart compares funding on nondefense research and development beginning in 1971, in the United States, Japan, and Germany. In the early seventies we were fairly close to German and Japanese levels, though we were still below them. But since then, West Germany and Japan increased their investment significantly, while the United States did not. So we have a large gap now in nondefense research and development.

My own view is that in part helps to explain the trade deficit. Other countries are investing in their future. They are on the cutting edge of modern technology in their research and development. Then they beat us on the trade front, because they are able to create products that are very competitive in the international arena.

Finally, I just want to show the relationship between productivity growth and public investment. This chart shows that countries with high levels of public investment also have high levels of productivity growth. Japan which has significant levels of public investment, also has significant levels of productivity growth.

Mr. SASSER. When the Senator says public investment, what does the Senator mean?

Mr. SARBANES. I am essentially talking about infrastructure. This is physical capital, not human capital, not education, which is another important criterion. If I had a chart on that, again we would have problems compared to other countries. But this is physical capital. The United States is far behind on public investment and low on productivity growth.

Mr. President, if anyone stops and thinks about it, most people would realize that we need to make investments for the future strength of the country. People do that. They save money to send their children to college and get an education.

Businesses invest in the future, and the Government needs to invest on behalf of our country. They need to encourage private investment, and they need to make directly the public investments that are essential to the efficient functioning of our economy.

Other countries are making these investments. If you look at the investment strategies that prevail in the European Community, or in the Pacific rim countries, the comparison with the United States is dramatic. They are not bound up by rigid ideologies. They are making practical, pragmatic judgments about the future strength of their economies. The Europeans now have laid out a major investment strategy for international rail. They are going to have a rail system that is going to be the marvel of the world. And we are still trying to see if we can get ours up to a passable level in the great urban corridors of the country where urban rail makes enormous sense.

What is the consequence of these other countries having investment strategies? The consequence is that we start running large trade deficits with them. We ran trade deficits beginning in the early 1980's, and they have continued until today. It improved a little last year because we received payments from other countries for the Persian Gulf operation. We got paid for the use of our military forces, and that temporarily brought the current account deficit up in the balance. It is now on its way back down again.

In the real competition of the last decade of the 20th century and into the 21st century which, in my judgment, is on the economic and trade front, we are in a negative position. The consequence of running these trade deficits is that our position as a creditor nation is deteriorating. We are now a debtor nation. The United States has been a creditor nation ever since World War I. All through the 1920's, the 1930's, and obviously through the war and the post-World War II period, we sustained a creditor position. Then we began running these large trade deficits, and our position deteriorated, and we moved into a debtor status, and that is where we now find ourselves.

So I think the President is right. We need an investment strategy, both in human capital and in physical capital, both in the public sector and in the private sector. We need to address the health of our people. We need to address the education and training of our people. We need to address research and development. We need to address infrastructure. We need to address investment in modern plant and equipment. We need to encourage all of the things that will make us more productive, and more competitive. These investments are essential to put us on a high-skill, high-wage path for the future.

At the same time, we need to bring down the very large deficit that has been incurred, essentially, over the last 12 years. President Carter was excoriated because he had a deficit of $50 billion. I can remember that: $50 billion. Everyone was up in arms, and President Carter was trying to address that problem. Then during the Reagan and Bush years, we ran very large deficits, and those large deficits have been handed to President Clinton. It is not as though he showed up and there was no deficit and he is going to run a deficit. He was elected and there is a huge deficit, and President Clinton is trying to figure out how to get the trend line on the deficit down, so we can start addressing our economic problems.

Some people ask: why do you not just get rid of the deficit all at once? Let us just do it next year. Of course, if you were to do that, you would put such contractionary pressure on the economy, you would precipitate it into a downturn. Ross Perot said as much when he laid out his economic plan, in terms of what he was trying to do the first and second year of the plan. He recognized that he had to worry about the growth path of the economy. Of course, President Clinton is trying to get the economy growing enough that when you attach deficit reduction to it, it will not precipitate the economy into an economic recession.

That is the argument on the investment side, the necessity to make these investments, coupled with a necessity to bring down the deficit. The President has put forward, by the judgment of objective observers, the most credible deficit reduction program that has been offered in the last decade. We get people on Wall Street and on Main Street who may not agree with all parts of it, but they are prepared to concede that the President is offering a credible deficit reduction program. He has coupled deficit reduction with an investment strategy. Now he seeks to find the resources for it out of spending cuts, which are very substantial in this budget, and out of revenue increases.

My colleagues on the other side now want to eliminate all of the revenue increases. Essentially, they will eliminate the revenue increases, and they will eliminate the investment strategy because, as I understand it, their proposal keeps the deficit reduction part of the proposal. They accept the deficit reduction proposal, but take out the investment strategy, and the revenue increases.

Let us see what it is they are concerned about on the revenue increase front, and I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question on this particular point.

Will the chairman tell me what percent of the money on the revenue side in the President's proposal would come from high income individuals?

Mr. SASSER. The top 1.2 percent pays 64 percent of the revenue. The top 1.2 percent pays 64 percent. With regard to the top 5 percent, the figure would be considerably larger, and I do not have that at my fingertips right now,

although I may have it in 1 second. If I could just see this chart here, I think this might demonstrate graphically to my friend from Maryland where the President's revenue is coming from. This indicates that 64.2 percent of the President's revenue will come from those making $200,000 or more.

Bear in mind that $200,000 figure is not gross income. That is $200,000 after all deductions and exemptions have been taken.

The next 8.7 percent will come from those making between $100,000 and $200,000. So, if you add those figures together, 75 percent of them is coming from those in the upper income brackets and almost 65 percent of the revenues are coming from those who make over $200,000 a year.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, now we are getting to the heart of this issue.

Mr. SASSER. Yes, we are.

Mr. SARBANES. Yes, we are. Now we are getting to the heart of the issue.

The President says: "I want to have an investment strategy to build America for tomorrow. We want to invest in our children. We want to invest in our working people. We want to give business incentives to build new plant and equipment. We want to upgrade our infrastructure. We want to increase funding for research and development. And we want to bring the deficit down. We are going to try to accomplish all of these imperative objectives."

You say to the President, "How are you going to do that?"

The President says, "We are going to do spending cuts, substantial spending cuts, and we are going to raise some revenues."

My colleagues on the other side say: "We do not want to raise those revenues. No, sir. We do not want to raise those revenues."

Seventy-five percent of the revenues that the President is proposing to raise and that are in this budget resolution come from people making $100,000 and above, and that is not gross income. It is $100,000 and above.

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, if the Senator will yield for just one moment, I might demonstrate to my colleague from Maryland that in 1979 the effective tax rate on the top 1 percent in income in the country was 33.7 percent. Under present law that was instituted during the Reagan-Bush administrations that 33.7 percent effective tax rate on the top 1 percent was cut to 27.9 percent.

What President Clinton seeks to do to finance this investment program is to raise on the top 1 percent the effective tax rate to 33.1 percent, still slightly below where it was in 1979, I say to my friend from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. I appreciate that very much. I think that the chart the chairman has shown is a very important chart and it fits right in with this one.

69-059 O—97 Vol. 139 (Pt. 5) 8

This is a little complicated. I am going to take a moment to describe it. The top 1 percent over the last 15 years has raised their pretax income from $305,000 per family a year, to $566,000. Their taxes have gone up from $108,000 to $163,000. So their pretax income has gone up 85 percent. Their taxes have gone up 50 percent, reflecting the cut in the rates and their aftertax income, which is this large block here, this red block has gone up 105 percent.

What has happened is, because of those tax rates which the chairman just demonstrated to us, there has been a huge increase and improvement in the income status of the top 1 percent of the population.

I want people to prosper, but I also want them to carry their fair share in meeting the economic problems of the country.

There has been a big party in the last decade, but only a small number of the American people have been the partygoers. And that is demonstrated here by the change in the share of income by income groups.

This is the bottom 20 percent of the population. They have less of a share of the income today than they had in 1979. This is 1979–89, which is when the figures were available for the comparison. The first fifth is minus 18 percent. The second fifth is minus 14 percent. The third fifth is minus 8 percent. The fourth fifth is minus 5 percent. The next 10th is minus 1.6 percent. Ninety percent of the population by income group has less of a share. The top 10 percent have increased their share and particularly the top 1 percent. The top 1 percent have increased their share of income 60 percent over this period.

The 1990 budget agreement alters this distribution somewhat. We do not yet have that data. But I am prepared to concede that it would alter it somewhat, but it would not change the basic message of this chart.

So what the President is saying, very simply, is that those who benefited so inordinately by the policies of the 1980's ought to step up to the plate now and help us to address our problems, help us to address the deficit problem and the investment problem. We do not only have a deficit problem in this country but we also have an investment deficit, and a trade deficit. And very frankly we have a growth and jobs deficit that we are currently facing in this country.

We have a lot of people unemployed. We have a higher unemployment rate today, 23 months after the trough of the recession, than we had at the trough of the recession. The unemployment rate today is higher than it was at the bottom of the recession. We have never experienced that in any recession in the post-World War II period. In every previous recession in the post-World War II period at this point in the recovery the unemployment rate was well below what it had been at the bottom of the recession. Today it is above what it had been in the bottom of the recession.

Mr. RIEGLE. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question on this chart that he laid out?

Mr. SARBANES. Certainly.

Mr. RIEGLE. Would it not be fair to say when you show the change in income distribution, all the money was running up to the top 1 percent of the income scale and people down the income scale were losing a large share of income?

The plan the President put out is not designed as perhaps it should be to go back to this group over this 10-year period of time and say, "Give some of this back." An argument could be made for that.

What he is saying is let us not add to this, let us not keep tipping the balance away from most of the people in society and taking the money up to the top 1 percent of the income scale, especially when that group is not turning around and reinvesting that money in our country and in job growth. If that were happening, then there might be some argument, at least on the surface, for why this kind of distribution might be appropriate.

But what the President is saying is that rather than allow this to continue and allow more and more of the wealth of this country to accumulate at the top 1 percent, let us try to level it out just a little bit.

Let us try to let people in the working class, in the bottom 80 and 90 percent of the population by income in the country, have a chance to participate, as well.

I will bet you that if we probably took the campaign contribution lists for people who were advocating this program and we laid the campaign contributions down side-by-side with the people who got all this income, I will bet it is the same list. I will bet it is the same list.

We have to break that. And the way to break it is to stop this business where more and more of our national wealth is accumulating in the top 1 percent and see to it that the rest of the people of this country have a chance to participate and have a chance to get a job.

Senator SARBANES talks about a jobless recovery. It is the most extreme thing we have seen at any point since the end of World War II.

This chart right here reflects that fact. If you look, as he said, at what has happened since the trough of the recession, if you look at previous recessions, we ought to be up here right now with respect to job recovery after this recession. That is what the last seven recessions have looked like.

Instead, we are way down here. We have not even gotten the jobs back that we lost in the course of this reces-

sion. We are down here. We ought to be up here.

That is 4 million people right now who do not have jobs in this economy. We have to invest in job growth in America. That is what the President is talking about.

I hear this shopworn set of arguments from the people on the other side of the aisle; we tried your plan for 12 years and it did not work. The American people reached that judgment last November. They sent that crowd out. They brought in a new President, who came in with an economic plan for this country, an economic and jobs growth plan for this country, to start investing in America again; not just have an economic program for Kuwait and Communist China and every other country around the world, but have one for this country.

When you look at public investment in infrastructure and compare it with other countries, this is Japan, spending far more than we are; Italy, France, Canada, Germany, the United Kingdom, and way down at the bottom of the list, the United States. That has been the track we have been on. That is why we are not getting the jobs and the growth in income in this country, because we have not been investing in ourselves.

Now this President comes along. Having been elected by the American people to bring economic change and to bring a new plan, he brings a plan in here. He has in there incentives to create private sector job growth.

And the first thing we see happening is people on the other side want to come along and they want to try to prevent that program from having a chance to go into effect, even though their program did not work. They have just been invited to leave the executive branch of Government because they did not have an economic plan for America.

Now you have a President who has an economic plan for America and who does not like, as I do not like, these unfair income distributions that have accumulated from Reaganomics and supply-side economics over the last dozen years.

You cannot just take all the money in this country and give it to the most wealthy 1 percent and have this country work right. That is why there is so much hopelessness in the inner cities. There are not enough jobs to go around. People do not see a way to get in the economic system, and that has to change. The President has given us a plan to change it, and it ought to be supported.

Mr. SASSER. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Madam President, I would like to yield some time to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, but before doing so, I ask unanimous consent that, following the disposition of the pending Gramm amendment, No. 249, any recorded votes ordered relative to the five amendments ordered to follow the disposition of the Gramm amendment occur immediately following the vote on or in relation to the Dole substitute.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, reserving the right to object, and I will not, I want to say to Senators on our side that I think this is an accommodation to Senators so we will not be in and out every 15 minutes, but rather the next 5 amendments will be stacked. They will be debated for 10 minutes each, or whatever the allowed time, and then we will go to the Dole-Domenici, and others, substitute and then we will vote on it and those that have been debated today.

Mr. GRAMM. But this amendment will be voted on when we finish?

Mr. DOMENICI. As I understand it, when the time is up, we will dispose of it.

Mr. SASSER. When all time is gone on the Gramm amendment, it will be disposed of by a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SASSER. I thank the Chair.

Madam President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I appreciate the time from the Senator from Tennessee.

The Senator from Maryland, I think, has done a very interesting and useful job in beginning to strip away the petals of this flower so that we can debate the real debate. One group wants to keep doing what we have been doing in this country, what we have been doing for 12 years that has not worked. One group wants fundamental economic change in the direction of this country. That is the real debate.

The Senator from Maryland showed us that major new taxes in this country were paid by people who enjoyed massive increases in income in the 1980's. But these people have not paid nearly the amount of tax they ought to pay.

We had a study last year over in the U.S. House that showed that the top 1 percent of Americans have virtually doubled their income but have paid only 50 percent more in taxes. This means they are only paying half as much taxes as they should pay on the increase in income they received.

So we are asking them to pay a little more. They can certainly afford to do that. Let us use that money to invest a little in the future of this country.

All of our friends here keep talking about family. They say you cannot do this with your family checkbook. You cannot overspend your family checkbook. You cannot overspend your business checkbook. That is true.

How would we deal with this if we were a family? We are spending more money than we have, a billion a day, often on things we do not need. How would we deal with it as a family?

We would sit down and we would say: "All right, we are spending more than we have. Let us cut some spending."

That is what the President has proposed.

Then we would say: "Let us see if there are other ways to bring more money in."

That is what the President has proposed; and he is raising revenue from those people who have done very well in the last decade.

Then we would say something else. We would say: "Let us see if there are other things we can do in this family to increase the means of the family and improve our earnings potential."

Yes. One of the things we can do is distinguish between spending and investment. If our family took $2,000 and bought a lot of cigarettes, that would be spending. After smoking 2,000 dollars' worth of cigarettes, we would have nothing to show for that spending.

If we took the same $2,000 and invested it in some sort of technical training for our kids who might go out and find better jobs, that would be investment that would improve our family.

The author of this amendment would have those who watch this debate believe that we are in trouble because of a massive explosion of new spending by an uncontrolled Congress. We are vending machine politicians: Find a national vending machine, put in a quarter, and out comes a national program. That is what he would have the American people believe.

But the facts are really quite different. The Senator offering this amendment would understand, if he had a different chart that showed the American people where the spending increases really are, that they occur in three areas.

Health care costs have exploded. And if we do not do something about them, we are not going to control the deficit.

Interest on the debt has exploded. We know that. You have to pay the interest on the debt. The only way you solve that is to ratchet down these deficits.

Social Security is growing. More people are retiring, causing Social Security outlays to increase. We raised the Social Security tax to pay for this.

So if you take a look at spending over 30 years, let us see what has happened. This chart, a very small chart, shows that Medicaid has increased, Medicare has increased, Social Security has increased, interest on the debt has increased, and all other nondefense

spending has actually decreased as a percent of gross domestic product. And that is fact.

Now, we can debate this on the old terms we have used for 12 years. Supposedly one side is for lower taxes and lower spending and on the other side are some profligate politicians who want to grab more taxes and spend more money. This is not a very fruitful or very useful debate.

A year ago I stood on the floor of the other body, and I looked at the budget of a conservative President. He sent us a budget and said, "Mr. and Mrs. Congress, I would like you to follow me." He said, "I am a conservative President and I would like to add $2.21 trillion to the debt in the next 5½ years. Won't you please buy into this conservative plan?"

I stood up on the floor of the other body and spoke at some length about that conservative plan.

When it comes to deficit spending, there is not a plug nickel's worth of difference between conservatives and liberals in this town.

The only difference is between those who want to solve the problem and those who want to preach about old dogma.

Do we want to solve this problem? If we do, we must, it seems to me, find additional revenue to ratchet down the deficit. We must find a way to screw up enough courage to reduce spending and, yes, that includes spending that affects all of us.

I say to some of my friends across the aisle: I would, today, this minute, if I had the opportunity, cut out all funding for the space station; cut out all funds for the super collider; and cut out all funds for SDI. Do you know what that would do? It would save $7 billion next year. Those are pretty good savings. Those are real budget cuts.

It seems to me our challenge at this point is to stop talking past each other and start deciding how do we raise revenue, and we must; how do we cut spending, and we must—in real, honest, and effective ways. And also, as the Senator from Maryland so aptly said, how do we invest in the American family? I am talking about the national family, all of us together, working together for a better future. How do we invest in our common potential? How do we invest in our human potential to give this country a chance to grow again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SASSER. I am pleased to yield the Senator an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DORGAN. Last year we had the chief economist of the Deutsche Bank's subsidiary in Japan testify before the Congress. He said that in 1997 Japan will become the world's largest manufacturer, and after 2000, the world's largest economy. Why? Because each year Japan invests $440 billion more in new plants and equipment than we do in this economy.

If we do not get our finances straightened out and sorted out and sifted through; if we do not start doing the things necessary to put this country back on track; if we fail to give our kids a shot at a better standard of living; then none of us deserves to be here.

This plan from this President means fundamental economic change for this country. It is time all of us stood for fundamental reform and effected the changes that will put this country back on track.

I thank the Senator from Tennessee for yielding me the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. SASSER. I thank the Senator from North Dakota and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I want to make a couple of quick responses. Our dear colleague showed us what happened from 1979 to 1989. And our colleagues love to talk about 1979 to 1989. Do you know why? Because Jimmy Carter was President every day in 1979, and every day in 1980. In many respects, 1980 was the worst year in American history for the working people of this country, except for the Great Depression years. But you know when you take 1979 to 1981, when Jimmy Carter was President, every income group in America got poorer. From the day Ronald Reagan's tax cut went into effect, January 1, 1982, to 1989, every income group in America got richer.

There is a fundamental choice here. Our colleagues tell us that Government investment—a new term—do you notice they never talk about taxes and they never talk about spending? They talk about revenues and resources and contributions. And they talk about investment. Let us call a spade a spade. Our colleagues on the left want to raise taxes to increase spending. What we are trying to do here is take one quarter of the spending increase built in over 5 years in the President's budget, take it out and get rid of these taxes that are going to destroy jobs.

We want to grow investment. But we want investment in the private sector of the economy. If socialism carries the day this program will work. But it has never carried the day. It has been rejected everywhere in the world except Cuba and North Korea and China and in Washington, DC.

I do not believe it will work.

I yield to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DORGAN). The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. I thank the Senator from Texas for yielding me this time.

Mr. President, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been talking for most of the last hour about change. This is no change. We saw this in the late 1960's, we saw this in the late 1970's. They are talking about more taxes, tax increases, and more spending. It is the same old stuff. That is what is really being talked about here. Nobody wants to talk about the fact that the problem with this proposal is it has major spending increases.

If the President wants to talk about changing the makeup of how money is spent, changing the mix to improve infrastructure, we will work on that. But the problem is they want to raise more taxes and it is not just on the wealthy. You are talking about Social Security—low-income people. You are talking about energy taxes that hit everybody. So we can do what? Same old deal. Increased spending. And here is a chart that shows what we are talking about.

They talk about how they are going to cut spending. The proposed spending cut is infinitesimal, the little bitty blue line down here. Yet, over the 5-year period this red bar represents the total proposed Government spending. As you can see, it goes way up. We are talking about trillions of dollars. The Government plans to spend over $8 trillion over the next 5 years.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LOTT. I only have 4 minutes. I apologize. We will get some more time.

Now, to address these so-called spending cuts: The proposed spending cuts are only 1.7 percent of the proposed total Federal spending. What are they? Some $18 billion of user fees. Where I came from, that is a tax increase. That is not a spending cut. Next, $74 billion—for $112 billion, depending on your baseline—of defense cuts. Oh, yes, always. We get in that defense cookie jar and get more spending cuts. Then, $64 billion of proposed interest savings. And finally, nondefense savings—about $7 billion. A little old bitty piece. What we really have in this package are spending increases. This amendment would eliminate those and provide some real spending restraint. During the campaign do you remember his motto, "It is the deficit, stupid." I have a variation: The problem with the deficit is spending. I will not add the last word because I do not want anybody to think I am talking about them. But that is what we want to do here, freeze domestic discretionary spending authority for 5-years. This would save $71 billion. The American people do not understand why they should have more taxes to have more spending and not reduce the deficit. They would make the tough choices if we were really getting tough choices here. But, this is the same old stuff.

Our amendment would also drop the proposed discretionary add-ons and

mandatory add-ons. It would require spending offsets to fund the stimulus package we will turn to next, and pay for the recently passed unemployment compensation. We ought to pay for these new spending increases.

Our amendment takes that savings and eliminates tax increases. It eliminates the new income taxes on individuals. We do not need them if we control spending. It also eliminates the new energy tax, a regressive tax that hits rural and agricultural areas and poor States—all Americans. Let us eliminate the Social Security taxes; 47 Senators have already voted for that. Seventy percent of the American people say we should not be raising taxes on Social Security recipients.

So, by eliminating the spending we could eliminate all of those taxes. And our amendment would also provide an incentive for savings and investment by enacting the Roth IRA plan. This amendment would strike the spending, it would eliminate the taxes, and it would have a savings incentive by a significant improvement in IRA's.

But this is just a starting point. I would still like to eliminate all tax increases. The problem is not too much revenue. The problem is too much spending. This year, we are going to spend $1.5 trillion. Let us control it. Let us agree to the amendment of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I yield to Senator DOMENICI from New Mexico 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I wonder if my friend will modify that? I would like to give 2 minutes of that to Senator STEVENS, and I will just take 2 minutes. Is that satisfactory?

Mr. GRAMM. That is fine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I think there are so many things we could discuss here but I just wanted to take two.

First of all, I do not believe anybody should leave this debate today thinking that Japan is beating America economically simply because they invest more in their public infrastructure than we do. That may be a fact. But I have not found anyone who understands Japan's formidable strides who would say the principal reason is because they spend more of their taxpayers' money. I just do not find anybody saying that.

Then my good friend, the occupant of the chair, said it right, except there is nothing in the President's proposal to do anything about it. He said the Japanese invest more in plant and equipment every year. What is there in this plan that will encourage that? Nothing. There is one little incentive called investment tax credits. I ask that you look at it. It does not help small business at all. What little bit it does, it does it for big businesses in America and it is minutia; it is almost nothing.

So what is really the difference? The difference is the Japanese save money and we do not save money, because our laws are disincentives to savings. And there is nothing in the Clinton plan to encourage savings. I challenge anybody to come up with anything significant. That issue has been ignored in this whole debate about growth and prosperity.

This amendment does a simple thing. The American people will understand that they are being taxed so we can spend money on new programs. It is as simple as day and night. I request 30 more seconds.

Mr. GRAMM. I yield the Senator 30 more seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. It is simple as day and night. This amendment proves the point. Take out in new taxes the amount in new spending—equal. I would bet today if you put that proposition to the American people it will get an 85- to 90-percent response. That is what we thought we were doing. We thought we were cutting spending in order to increase taxes and get the deficit under control.

So I commend him for it. I think it makes the point perfectly, and to dance around the issue of what makes Japan stronger, as if more American taxes are going to make us stronger—let me tell you one last fact.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DOMENICI. Can the Senator give me 30 seconds?

Mr. GRAMM. I yield 30 seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, for the first time in this century, the top tax rate in the United States will be higher than England. Under this high tax rate, the British economy has stagnated for most of this century, while the United States prospered, largely because we did not have these ruinous tax rates. We are in the name of new jobs and growth leaning in the direction of marginal rates as high as England, which have proved disastrous. They are going to prove the same in the United States.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I want to say with all due respect to my colleague from Texas who has been leading the opposition to this amendment that if this were not serious business, I would have to say that some of the comments he just made were laughable. I make this point with respect to his comments that we have to do it all in the private sector and yet he has been the champion on this floor of the superconducting super collider, which is public money, public money to help build our scientific infrastructure.

Some think we should not have it and some think we should. The Senator from Texas is a champion of thinking we ought to have it. But it is public money. And then the space station. Ah, we get all this beating of the chest about the private sector. Then the Senator turns around and champions the space station. That is public money.

And then we had the S&L's. We are going to lay out $130 billion and about half of it is going to go into Texas for the abuses of the owners of the S&L's in Texas for which the rest of the country is paying.

So we get all of this beating of the chest, but what we have is we have socialism for Texas, as far as the Senator from Texas is concerned, and free enterprise and markets for everybody else. So, to come out here and give us a speech and then turn around on another day and get up and give a big speech for the superconducting super collider—which will cost $8 or $10 billion as projected out. Public money. A big speech for the space station which will cost $30 to $40 billion as projected out. Public money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SASSER. I yield 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. SARBANES. And then the S&L's. The operators of those S&L's took the provision in the law that said you could get Federal deposit insurance but your powers would be governed by State law. These are State chartered institutions whose deposits were covered by Federal insurance. Texas then had a law which allowed them to engage in the widest indeed wildest sort of activities. They would engage in speculation that would make a prudent person blush.

So they went out and did it, my distinguished colleague's constituents, the operators of these S&L's and then it all fell apart. We had to honor the deposit insurance. We are now going to do that to the tune of about $130 billion, and about half of that is going to go for these practices on the part of S&L's in Texas.

And then he comes out here on the floor and we get one of these lectures: It is all going to be in the private sector; and yet we are pouring public money into Texas into the superconducting super collider, the space station, and the bailout of the S&L's.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAMM addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I often have found when people cannot debate the issues, they want to engage in attacking people or their States. I hope my colleagues will remember that I offered the amendment to assess the S&L's $15 billion, to close down troubled thrifts and each Member will have to answer for how they voted.

Let me also say I will not vote to raise taxes to fund programs in my State. Taxes are already high enough. I am proposing a 25-percent cut in spending, and if that means less Federal money available for Texas, it is a good bargain because we are not going to build Texas and America by raising taxes and funding more Government spending. We are going to do it through the private sector. We are spending 1.9 percent of all Government spending on science. We spent 5.2 percent 25 years ago. So to argue that we have a deficit problem because we are investing in science and the future is, I think, simply at variance with the facts.

I yield 3 minutes to Senator BOND.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] for 3 minutes.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, this amendment is about what we think our economy needs. Do we need more taxes or do we need less spending? Raising taxes has never created a private sector job, except maybe, of course, lawyers or accountants.

So why do our colleagues on the other side of the aisle and the administration decry the so-called jobless recovery and then do everything in their power to kill off job creation? Calling higher taxes for higher social spending and investment is a marvelous example of new speech. It is the same old tax-and-spend philosophy but we just call it investment.

Make no mistake about it, the Btu tax will cost jobs, the inland waterway tax will cost jobs, and if you look at this chart which is a replication of others, by the year 2000 we will be back up to the same deficit under the Clinton figures as we are now going to $400 billion.

Some of my colleagues said that credible objective observers have supported the Clinton plan.

I urge my colleagues to read the compilation of comments by prize-winning economists that occurred in yesterday's Wall Street Journal. They recognize the problems.

Several of my colleagues have heard my complaints about the reliance on taxation in this package; a ratio of nearly $4 in taxes to $1 in spending cuts will not work. And folks in America are going to be mighty disappointed when a program heralded as a deficit reduction plan results in higher deficits. Four times we have raised taxes the last 10 years and the deficit has continued to go up.

Last week in wrapup I referred to rabbit stew. I referred to it because the President did an excellent sales job in his State of the Union Message of selling the sizzle. But when you looked at it, the meat was not there. It reminds me as I said then, when he was equally divided between spending cuts and tax increases, of a rabbit stew sold in a cafe in a small town near my home. A fellow went in one day and said, "I'll have some of your famous rabbit stew." When he took a bite of it, he said, "Wait a minute. That doesn't taste like rabbit. That tastes like horse meat." He called the chef out. He said, "I can't taste the rabbit." The chef said, "I extended it a little bit with equal parts horse meat and rabbit." He said, "What do you mean?" The chef said, "One part horse and one part rabbit."

That is, Mr. President, what we have here. We have about equal parts, 313 billion dollars' worth of horse meat taxes, $81 of spending cuts, and only $7 of that domestic spending. I think it is time we took the horse meat out of the rabbit stew and supported this amendment.

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

Mr. SASSER. I see the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee on the floor. I yield 10 minutes off the bill to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from South Carolina for 10 minutes.

Mr. GRAMM. Point of order, Mr. President. Can time be yielded off the bill on this amendment? We are under unanimous consent. Is that in order? As I understood the unanimous-consent agreement, there is no time on the bill. Time is allocated to the individual amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would advise the Senator from Texas that it is the Chair's understanding, pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement that was entered into last evening, while this amendment is pending, time may not be yielded off the resolution.

Mr. GRAMM. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. SASSER. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina. Parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, do I control time under the resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator does control the time under the resolution.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, after time is yielded on the amendment, may I then yield time on the resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would advise the Senator from Tennessee that under the unanimous-consent agreement it was understood that all time would be used on this amendment after which there would be an immediate vote.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to my friend from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. What time is that—30 seconds?

Mr. SASSER. Thirty seconds.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I can tell you here and now we did have a vote on Social Security taxes, and we had that vote on April 24, 1991. And the distinguished Senator from Texas voted to increase Social Security taxes on Joe Six-Pack by $24.6 billion in 1992, $27.6 billion in 1993, $38.2 billion in 1994, $44 billion in 1995, and $61.7 billion in 1996. By their fruit shall ye know them.

I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. SASSER. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. To the distinguished Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, in an edition of the Washington Post published last week, its writer on economics, Robert Samuelson wrote an appreciation of the life and work of C. Northcote Parkinson, the author of several Parkinson's laws. The particular Parkinson's law to which Mr. Samuelson referred was that which, only slightly paraphrased, states that Government expenditures will rise to meet Government receipts and then some.

Never has Parkinson's law been more aptly and amply illustrated than it is by this budget resolution; $295 billion in new taxes are proposed in order to allow a huge increase in domestic spending in the United States. And then some. The result of course is that 6 or 7 years from now the deficit will be larger than it is today even by the President's own figures and by his own estimates. This has been true in the past in the United States. It has been true in every Western democracy. It will be true as a result of this budget resolution.

Now, however, we do not call it spending. We call it investment. And it is the curious position of the Senator from Maryland that people do not make investments with their own money. Somehow or another, they waste that money; that only Government can make investments that work.

One would have thought that the history of Russian civilization during the course of the last 50 years would illustrate the differences between Government economic investment and people economic investment. One would have thought the history of the United Kingdom in the last 50 years would illustrate that.

No, we are presented with a proposal to raise our tax rates to higher than the maximum tax rates in the United Kingdom and presumably to catch what is known as the English disease. The Gramm-Lott amendment will prevent that from taking place. It will create infinitely more jobs in the private sector where they will be lasting, permanent, and good jobs. It is an excellent amendment and should be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, the Republican whip.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I thank the Chair, and I thank my friend from Texas.

I was very impressed with his response to the Senator from Maryland with regard to some pretty powerful comments made, and it comes from the heat of the debate. It is ironic how we see now that all the buttons are being pressed in America because it is just a matter of time before the American public understands what is really going on here.

We all want to see—I really believe this—President Clinton succeed. Why should we want him to fail if in turn the country should fail?

I admire Mrs. Clinton and what she is trying to do with health care. We visited with her. She is trying desperately to breathe reality into the American public as to what we have here and what we must do, and what employers are going to have to do, employees are going to have to do.

Now, we cannot have the Tax Code subsidizing insurance for designer eyeglasses and hairpieces, although that seems intringuing to me; and dental work and other things of that nature which do not fit in any kind of description of what is a core health care program.

So we pray that she will be giving us some important things. And we have a Republican task force on health care, Senator CHAFEE doing a beautiful job for us on that. But what we are doing here is new taxes, and that is not what the campaign was about. The campaigns of George Bush and Bill Clinton, with Ross Perot acting as resident goad in the operation, all were saying "cut spending."

That was what the whole campaign was about. This resolution is not about cutting spending; this is increasing taxes. There are the figures: A net of $294 billion in new taxes, any way you slice it.

So when we propose these things on our side of the aisle, we remember the anxiety as we sat and watched them—from that side of the aisle—punch holes in and great gouges in George Bush and Dan Quayle. I know the pain.

But I can tell you, when those on the other side of the aisle say this is a disguised attempt to cut the heart out of the Clinton plan, or this is a torpedo aimed at the President's plan, and other similar descriptions of all Republican amendments, the American public knows that is not true. Because what we are going to be doing here—and will continue to do even if we go down in a great rush of flames—is to say what the American people were saying during the course of the campaign, which was: Cut spending, stupid.

That is what they were saying. They never would have dreamed that the whole pitch here was new taxes under the guise of investment, and never dealing with the entitlements. Let us forget the term entitlements and call it Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. Let us all get in this game together. And we all know what we have to do. Every one of us knows what we have to do, and we will not do it. We all talk a good game. But the entitlements are sucking us up.

We have seen the evidence presented by the Senator from Texas and others, that the administration's plan relies almost wholly on new taxes as the primary means of reducing the deficit. New taxes would total $294 billion over the next 5 years, and this would buy the American public only $7 billion in domestic spending cuts.

There are so many reasons why this administration plan is the wrong way to go, but the biggest one has to be that in the long run it will do little to change our long-term deficit crisis. With entitlements going up 24 percent in last year alone, there is no way that we can raise taxes fast enough to keep up. Spending cuts have to be made. On the Republican side we have now offered several amendments all of which have been voted down—that would reduce the amount of new spending in the package.

I would simply ask my colleagues—what is the heart of the President's plan? Is it deficit reduction? Or is it new taxation?

I ask, because the amendment from the Senator from Texas would not hurt the plan's ability to reduce the deficit. It would leave all of the deficit reduction intact. So if the heart of the plan is deficit reduction, there is little to fear from this amendment.

This amendment only attacks the heart of the plan if the heart of the plan is new taxation. It seeks to reduce the amount of necessary new taxes by simply not proposing to embark on a huge new spending spree. That is all that it does.

So once again I commend the Senator from Texas for putting the question most directly to this Senate—we have a chance here to decide whether the goal is to reduce the deficit, or simply to increase taxation and spending. Because, as the Senator from Texas has ably showed, the same amount of deficit reduction can be achieved without expanding Government in the way that this plan would propose.

I thank my colleagues and I urge them to support the Gramm amendment.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, some attention has been given to promises that were made by the President during the campaign that he has now abandoned. I want to focus on two of these broken promises that are embodied in this budget resolution.

We all know the President pledged to reduce taxes for middle-income taxpayers. In addition, he strongly opposed a hike in the tax on gasoline, and was very critical of those political opponents who advocated an increased gas tax.

Unfortunately, once the election was conveniently over, we all witnessed a disturbing transformation in the new President and his agenda.

In a thinly disguised energy tax proposal based on Btu's, the President has not only dropped his pledge for a middle-income tax cut like a rock, he has also substantially increased the tax on gasoline.

The administration has admitted that this energy tax will hit low- and middle-income taxpayers. But, they argue these tax increases will be mitigated by other parts of the package, such as an expanded earned income tax credit, and increased low-income heating funds.

Well, Mr. President, these may help some taxpayers. But, it is important to remember that LIHEAP only helps low-income taxpayers and the EITC does not even apply to single or married taxpayers who have no children. Maybe this is the President's indirect way of being profamily. But, instead of giving families a tax break, he will just increase their taxes a little less than single individuals.

And remember, even with an expanded EITC, anyone making over $30,000 will not get any help or benefit at all. Of course, these are the people that the administration has determined are rich and do not need any help anyway.

To make matters worse, the administration has also been low-balling the amount of the resulting tax increase on average families. The President argues his energy tax will only cost the average family of four $17 a month or $204 a year. In Iowa, the Department of Natural Resources has estimated that the President's energy tax will cost the average family of four over $300 per year. I know that does not sound like much to many Members of Congress who make over $133,000 a year, but in

Iowa, a $300 tax increase is a major tax increase that this Senator cannot support.

So, I hope that the people of America will look very closely at the President's proposal. Because once they get past the feel-good rhetoric, the harsh reality will set in. And, hopefully, this plan will be sent back to the drawing board.

Mr. GRAMM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, we have had a good debate here today. Before we vote, I want to sum up again what the amendment does. Over the next 5 years, under this budget, with a built-in increase in domestic spending that is already the law of the land, nondefense spending will grow by $840 billion. What this amendment does is it takes about a quarter of that increase out, and eliminates new income taxes on individuals as well as the Btu tax and the Social Security tax—and ends up not increasing the deficit, but dramatically changing the budget that is before us.

We can say tax with many different words. We can say spend with many different words. We are now in a debate that engages in doublespeak. There is a new language that has been created because people do not want to say tax, and because they do not want to say spend. But what this amendment does is it freezes discretionary spending; it eliminates the President's add-ons for new spending; and then it takes those savings to offset the elimination of individual income tax increases, to take out Social Security taxes, and to take out energy taxes.

Our colleagues have talked about these rich people, these people making over $200,000 a year. Let me remind my colleagues of the following facts. According to the Internal Revenue Service, there are 849,635 tax returns filed where the income reported is over $200,000 a year. The number filed by proprietorships over that amount is 254,836. The minimum number filed by subchapter S corporations is 329,108. So 68 percent of the tax returns filed that have over $200,000 a year of income are not coming from rich people; they are coming from proprietorships and subchapters S corporations.

So when our colleagues talk about taxing rich people, they are really talking about taxing small businesses and family farms. They are talking about taxing the very groups that create the jobs that make America grow.

Debating the budget this year has been very difficult, Mr. President, because I have never seen a bigger gap between the rhetoric and the reality. We have gone, in a few short months, from a promise of $3 of spending cuts for every $1 of revenues—$2 in spending cuts for every $1 in revenues when Senator Bentsen was before the Senate during the confirmation process and when Congressman Panetta was before our relevant committees; and the President, in the State of the Union Address, said $1 in spending cuts for every $1 in taxes—to now, when we take the word of President Clinton's designated numbers authority and the CBO says $3.84 in taxes for every $1 in spending cuts. Those spending cuts are basically in defense.

We heard throughout the campaign: We are going to tax rich people. We now find that the tax which was supposed to really get rich people—that 68 percent of those returns are filed by proprietorships, partnerships, and subchapter S corporations. We are not taxing John Q. Astor; we are taxing Joe Brown & Sons Hardware Store.

We heard the energy tax was a throwaway. Now Dr. Schlesinger, the Energy Secretary under President Carter, says it is $500 a year. We said we were going to tax rich people, and now Social Security recipients with a W-2 form income of $18,000 a year are going to have their taxes go up dramatically.

Mr. President, we have tried on this side to get the facts out. But quite frankly, we have not gotten the facts out. The President is a great salesman. I commend him. He has done an excellent job. Maybe we are not great salesmen.

But I want to leave may colleagues with this point: 16 months from now, when these tax increases and these spending increases have taken effect, the American people are going to discover what is in this budget. And it is my humble opinion—only my opinion—that when they do, they are going to believe that they have been duped. Many of them are going to go back to the Presidential campaign, and they are going to blame the President.

But democracy is about accountability. We are going to have a vote here on this budget. We are going to vote "yea" or "nay." Those who are voting "yea," those who are voting for this budget, are voting for the largest tax increase in American history, and the largest 5-year increase in nondefense spending in the history of our country. If you believe that is the way to prosperity, then that is the vote you ought to cast.

I do not believe it is the road to prosperity. I believe it is the road to economic decline. So I am going to vote "no."

When the facts are in, when people know what is in the budget, maybe they will say: Well, I should have known. There were a bunch of people trying to tell me. I did not want to believe it. It is my fault.

Maybe they will say that. I do not think they will say that. I think they will say: I was deceived. Maybe AARP, which has let the partisanship of their leadership stand in the way of supporting the Lott amendment, will say: It is our fault; we should have told people Social Security was being taxed.

I do not think they are going to do that. I think ultimately we are going to be held accountable.

That is exactly as it should be.

If this program works—and I hope it will, because it is the country of Republicans as well as Democrats—then I congratulate our colleagues for doing something that no other country in the world has ever really been able to do; that is, through growing Government, through increasing taxes on the working men and women of the country, by expanding Government spending, by having Government pick winners and losers, promote prosperity, while the whole world is going in the other direction. The whole world is rejecting Government as a source of prosperity and freedom.

Yet, here in this great temple to democracy, there is this desire to prove that the world is wrong, and that socialism may yet work.

I suspect, Mr. President, deep down in my heart, that socialism survives not because it works economically, but because it works politically; because socialism creates political constituencies.

But, in any case, we are going to get the proof.

I can stand here and say this is a bad budget. My colleagues can stand here and say it is a good one. But, ultimately, we will know when we look at the economy.

I say this, Mr. President: I am against this budget because I believe it will not work. It will not bring down the deficit. It will not put people to work.

If you want to dramatically improve it, if you want to freeze spending—which the American people say they are for—if you want to drop this add-on spending in the President's budget and make us cut $1 for $1 if we want to add some of these new spending programs and then take out income taxes, energy taxes, Social Security taxes—taxes that will stifle job creation, that will slow down the economy, and that will put Americans out of work—I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MURRAY). All time has expired on this amendment. The vote occurs on the amendment No. 249 offered by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, I move to table the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 59 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Akaka	Feinstein	Mikulski
Baucus	Ford	Mitchell
Biden	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Graham	Moynihan
Boren	Harkin	Murray
Boxer	Heflin	Nunn
Bradley	Hollings	Pell
Breaux	Johnston	Pryor
Bryan	Kennedy	Reid
Bumpers	Kerrey	Riegle
Byrd	Kerry	Robb
Campbell	Kohl	Rockefeller
Conrad	Krueger	Sarbanes
Daschle	Lautenberg	Sasser
DeConcini	Leahy	Simon
Dodd	Levin	Wellstone
Dorgan	Lieberman	Wofford
Exon	Mathews	
Feingold	Metzenbaum	

NAYS—44

Bennett	Faircloth	McConnell
Bond	Gorton	Murkowski
Brown	Gramm	Nickles
Burns	Grassley	Packwood
Chafee	Gregg	Pressler
Coats	Hatch	Roth
Cochran	Hatfield	Shelby
Cohen	Helms	Simpson
Coverdell	Jeffords	Smith
Craig	Kassebaum	Specter
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Stevens
Danforth	Lott	Thurmond
Dole	Lugar	Wallop
Domenici	Mack	Warner
Durenberger	McCain	

NOT VOTING—1

Inouye

So the motion to table the amendment (No. 249) was agreed to.

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MITCHELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 254

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate, consistent with the position of the Clinton administration, that fuels used for home heating purposes are exempt from the supplemental Btu tax on oil)

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of myself and my colleagues, Senator KERRY, Senator LIEBERMAN, Senator DODD, Senator LEAHY, Senator JEFFORDS, Senator PELL, and others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for himself, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. DODD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. PELL, and Mr. MITCHELL, proposes an amendment numbered 254.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

It is the sense of the Senate that revenue figures contained in this resolution assume, consistent with the position of the administration, that the Btu tax will be imposed at the same rate on all fuels purchased by households for home heating purposes and therefore that the supplemental tax on oil will not be imposed on such fuels.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I understand there is a time agreement, am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. There will be 10 minutes of debate, equally divided.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I ask that the Senate be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, one of the very constructive aspects of the administration's energy policy was to reject a number of different alternatives in finding a fair way to tax energy and settling on what is called the Btu tax, and by doing that to try to have as fair and as equitable distribution of the burden across the country as possible.

The administration also included an additional surtax on the use of oil. And we understand the reasons for that.

But one of the unfortunate consequences, when the administration added that supplemental tax, is that it hit home heating oil. Of all of oil's usage, only 2 percent is used for home heating. But half the homes in New England use heating oil.

So if we are not successful in providing an exemption for home heating oil, we would have a situation where one home was heated by gas, one by oil, and there would be a very significant disparity in that particular result.

So the purpose of this amendment is to try to carry forward what the administration, I think, was doing correctly, and that is to have equity and fairness across the country in the utilization of heating different homes.

With the acceptance of this amendment, we move ourselves a long way down the road. This is essential in terms of the New England homes. It is also enormously important to schools, to colleges, and to hospitals, which are largely dependent on home heating oil, as well as propane.

So, Madam President, I appreciate the willingness of the leaders to accept this amendment. It is of enormous importance.

I yield the remaining time to the majority leader.

Mr. MITCHELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I rise to support the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts to clarify that the proposed Btu supplemental tax on oil will not apply to home heating oil and other heating fuels. This is a very important issue to my State of Maine as well as other States in New England.

The President has proposed a bold initiative for deficit reduction and long-term economic growth that includes a new tax on energy. The proposal includes a basic tax of 25.7 cents per million Btu's on coal, oil, natural gas and other energy, as well as a supplemental tax of 34.2 cents per million Btu's on oil.

Although the Clinton administration has proposed a higher tax on oil, the plan does assume that heating oil will be treated differently. The proposal is silent with respect to the treatment of propane and kerosene, two other fuels purchased by households for home heating purposes.

One of the objectives of the administration in developing its Btu energy tax was to design a tax that minimized the difference in tax burdens among different parts of the Nation. Compared to a carbon tax or a gasoline tax which would impose disproportionate burdens on different regions, the administration intended its Btu tax to be relatively neutral between different States.

That objective would not be obtained, however, if the supplemental Btu tax is imposed on home heating oil. According to the information I have, the highest tax States would be Alaska, Maine, Connecticut, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Delaware. Their average residential tax burden would be almost 50 percent greater than the average burden in the rest of the Nation.

The Clinton administration agrees that this should not be the case and therefore it supports a different treatment for home heating oil. That is clearly stated in the Treasury Department's explanation of the administration's tax proposals. Over the last several weeks, I have spoken with several officials in the Clinton administration about this issue and the administration is in agreement that the supplemental tax on oil should not apply to fuels used for home heating purposes.

The result would be that oil-derived home heating fuels would be treated the same as natural gas and coal. This would remove the large regional disparity that would otherwise exist.

Propane presents a special case. This fuel, which is primarily used as a heating source among poorer and more rural households, is derived from either oil or natural gas. About two-thirds of current consumption is derived from natural gas but the administration proposal is not clear whether all or only some of the propane consumed would be subject to the supplemental tax.

This sense-of-the-Senate makes clear the intent of the administration and

Congress with respect to the Btu tax by stating that the supplemental portion of that tax will not apply to home heating fuels. The effect would be to treat families, States, and regions more fairly with respect to the burden of the Btu tax.

The effect of this amendment on the overall revenue collected from a Btu tax is quite minor. Home heating oil comprises less than 2 percent of all energy consumption. Therefore, while this amendment is very important to households consuming home heating oil—and to States heavily reliant on this form of energy for residential heating—the effect on the Btu tax is negligible.

I have spoken to the President about this issue and he agrees that the supplemental tax on oil should not apply to home heating oil. With this sense-of-the-Senate we are simply expressing congressional intent, consistent with the intent of the Clinton administration, that oil-derived home heating fuels all be taxed the same as other fuels that are used to heat homes.

Madam President, Members of the Senate, this amendment is consistent with the President's position on the Btu tax. The President has stated, throughout discussions of the matter, that home heating fuel would be treated equally.

As proposed, the tax imposes a higher level on oil. Unless special provisions were made for home heating oil and other home heating fuels, the result would be that a home heated with natural gas in one part of the country would pay a much lesser tax than a home heated with oil in New England or some other region.

The entire purpose of this amendment—again, as I stated, consistent with the President's proposal and in accordance with the President's previous statement on the subject—is simply to say that any fuels used to heat homes will be taxed at the same rate.

So that if a person heats his or her home with natural gas in the western part of the country, that would be the same tax level as someone heating with propane in the midwestern part of the country and it would be the same level as someone heating with oil in the northern part of the country. It is an effort simply to establish a fair and equal tax for home heating fuels.

I commend the Senator from Massachusetts for his leadership on the subject. I commend the President and the administration for their willingness to include such a provision in the President's proposal.

I reserve the remainder of the time of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. We have 5 minutes on our side, is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New Hampshire and 2 minutes to the Senator from Alaska, and I will take 1 minute in wrapup.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I certainly agree with the intention and sentiment of the amendment, but let us not try to upstage the issue.

The fact is, the Btu tax, as proposed by the executive branch, is extremely discriminatory against cold regions of this country. The rate of tax under the Btu tax as proposed—there is nothing about it not being proposed—as actually, physically proposed by the administration is 2½ times the rate of tax on gas and on electricity. And that means the citizens of States like New Hampshire, States in northern New England, and States in the colder areas of this country are going—whether low income, middle income, or high income—are going to be paying an extra penalty as a result of this tax.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair.

Madam President, I have not heard it said that they did not intend this tax on home heating oil. They simply say we are going to give it a 1-year exemption.

This amendment really does not—being that it is a sense-of-the-Senate amendment—bind this body.

This is the fourth time I have stood before this body and indicated that I have an amendment pending, No. 204, to strike the surtax. We are going to vote on that this afternoon. We are going to vote up or down.

Madam President, the reality of this is that we propose a relief, if you will, from this surtax of 34 cents per million Btu's. It would be offset by current new spending.

Specifically, what? Well, we have a new program here called crosscutting high performance computing, whatever that means.

That program cost $784 million over 5 years. The Btu tax, which I am proposing that we strike, would cost $648 million over 5 years.

The reality of this speaks for itself. It is unfair.

We are going to vote on it today and we should vote on it because we should not rely on a committee to make this resolve for us. Otherwise, this whole process is a charade, which it appears to be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair, and I thank Senator MURKOWSKI.

I want to make two points. The distinguished majority leader speaks of discrimination for those homes that use fuel oil. What happens, when you start changing the President's plan, you discriminate. We permit other discrimination, but not the kind that is causing some political problem somewhere.

Everybody using crude oil derivatives is discriminated against in the Btu tax, everyone, not just those who are using it for fuel oil. All the businesses that use it instead of natural gas are being discriminated against.

What I see this as—and I urge everybody to vote for it; it is meaningless—is an SOS. I finally decided what these sense-of-the-Senate amendments are: SOS, the international signal of distress. It is political distress.

It is distress; it is political distress. So along we come and we say we do not like what the President proposed but we like everything else. Just take this piece out somehow, somewhere, sometime. Nonetheless, I do not think anybody ought to be against the proposition that this entire tax is discriminatory as far as petroleum products from crude oil.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY. I will take the remaining minute.

I listened to our good friends across the aisle talk about this administration and the Btu tax. It was their President who put in the oil import fees and supported the oil import fees for year after year after year, for New England. So if we are talking about the history of where we are, trying to get a fair and equitable energy policy, I do not think they come to this particular issue with great credibility.

Madam President, I understand our time has expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. Who yields time? The Senator from New Mexico has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thought we were out of time. Will the Senator speak for another minute?

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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I do not want this on my time, it is an inquiry. But I thought I was given 2 minutes. Clearly that was not the communication because the Chair called time on me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair apologizes. The time remaining was 1 minute and 40 seconds. I apologize.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Anyway, the point was made if you take the recommendation of my friend from Massachusetts we are going to vote on an innocuous

sense-of-the-Senate resolution that is nonbinding. I am going to support it. But this body is going to have the opportunity to vote up or down on whether to waive this unfair tax. And that is what we should have, as opposed to just recommending to some committee that does not represent all 100 of us.

So that is the point. We are going to have a chance to vote on it and America is going to be watching your vote, because your vote will determine whether you wish to subject America to this unfair and inequitable tax, especially on those who are dependent on oil and who have no other alternative.

I yield the remainder of my time to the assistant floor manager.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, I want to commend my friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts, for proposing this amendment. As always, he is concerned with equity, with looking out for those who might fall through society's cracks, whose plight we might overlook if we examined only the aggregate data and ignored the specific impacts of our policies.

I am a strong supporter, as is my colleague, of the President's plan to cut the deficit and increase investment—including his energy tax which I believe will increase our Nation's energy conservation and decrease our energy dependence. However, it is clear that the surplus tax on oil will extract an extremely high price from those whose homes use heating oil.

Families who heat their homes with heating oil are fully exposed to the higher tax on oil—they cannot substitute a different form of energy because converting their homes is prohibitively expensive. The differential, therefore, will simply punish those families who use home heating oil—many of whom are still suffering the effects of the recession and can barely make ends meet today.

Madam President, this discrepancy hurts New England families particularly hard since a greater proportion of New England families use heating oil than families nationwide. Roughly 50 percent of the housing stock in the New England region is oil-heated compared with about 14 percent nationally.

New Englanders do not use more oil out of choice, but out of historical necessity. The region lacks indigenous hydrocarbon resources. Coal has been difficult to transport to the region and natural gas pipelines have limited penetration in the region. As a result, petroleum has emerged as New England's single major energy alternative.

Our commercial sector has made as many adjustments as it can away from oil. New England industry responded to the oil crisis of the 1970's by reducing energy use to the point where overall energy use per capita in New England has fallen to three-quarters the national average—despite the long New England Winters. New England industry also switched the mix of its fuel consumption so that oil consumption in New England dropped from over 80 percent of energy use in 1970 to its present level of roughly 60 percent. Our businesses have done a great deal, and I am sure they will do more.

But families cannot shift as easily. As a result, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that the proposed tax would raise direct energy costs more in the Northeast than in any other region. I received a phone call late last week from a father of four who lives with his family in western Massachusetts. Their home is heated with heating oil and they can't switch to natural gas. He asked me why he and others like him in New England should sacrifice more than those who have easier access to natural gas in other parts of the country.

It is out of concern for families like his that I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I am pleased to support the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts' amendment to provide a greater measure of equity to the President's energy tax proposals.

The President's energy tax proposal imposes an excise tax on all fossil fuels at a basic rate of 25.7 cents per million Btu's, with a supplemental tax of 34.2 cent per million Btu's applicable solely to oil. The amendment that Senator KENNEDY is offering today, expresses the sense of the Senate that this supplemental tax should not apply to oil used for home heating purposes.

The administration's own estimate of the effect that the energy tax proposal will have on heating oil users clearly demonstrates the need for this amendment. They estimate that as a result of this tax, both electricity rates and natural gas rates will increase by 4 percent. However, heating oil rates will increase 8 percent. I do not think any of us could argue with a straight face that this is an equitable outcome.

The typical Rhode Island heating oil consumer would incur about $83 in additional taxes as a result of this proposal. This is $50 more than consumers of natural gas will pay. Since 35 percent of Rhode Islanders rely on oil to heat their homes and businesses, this disparity will hit my State particularly hard.

Heating oil consumers throughout New England have done a great deal to conserve energy over the past 15 years. Average consumption has declined by more than 30 percent over this period, primarily by efficiency upgrades of oil heat equipment, insulation, and other energy improvements. This energy tax proposal effectively penalizes them for having been so conscientious.

The heating oil industry is a small business industry. There are thousands of heating oil distributors throughout New England employing about 50,000 people. By taxing oil higher than other forms of energy, this proposal will jeopardize these jobs.

Mr. President, the administration realizes the negative impact that their energy tax proposal will have on heating oil consumers, which is why they proposed to delay the imposition of the tax for 1 year. But delaying the tax by 1 year is not good enough. Heating oil users are willing to pay their fair share of the deficit reduction burden, but the administration's energy tax proposal requires them to pay more than their fair share. I hope my colleagues will join me in expressing the sense of the Senate that the energy tax must treat all energy on an equal basis.

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, parliamentary inquiry. Am I correct in understanding that the Senate will vote on or in relation to the Kennedy amendment after disposition of the amendment of the Republican leader, Senator DOLE?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct, now that the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. SASSER. I thank the Chair. I advise my colleagues, then, that the Kennedy amendment will not be voted on until later this afternoon.

I see the Senator from Texas is on the floor with an amendment. Under the unanimous-consent agreement he would be next to be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order the Senator from Texas will be recognized. There will be 10 minutes of debate, equally divided. The Senator from Texas.

AMENDMENT NO. 256

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that any amounts saved as a result of any reorganization and streamlining of the Federal Government should be applied to offset the cost of any economic stimulus package enacted in fiscal year 1993 and for deficit reduction)

Mr. KRUEGER. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas [Mr. KRUEGER] proposes an amendment numbered 256.

Mr. KRUEGER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE USE OF SAVINGS FROM GOVERNMENT STREAMLINING.

It is the sense of the Senate that any amounts saved through the efforts of the National Performance Review Task Force headed by the Vice President and as a result of any other reorganization and streamlining of the Federal Government should be applied to offset the cost of any economic stimulus package enacted in fiscal year 1993. Any amounts saved in excess of those necessary to offset the cost of any such economic stimulus shall be applied to reduce the Federal budget deficit and for no other purpose.

Mr. KRUEGER. Madam President, over the preceding hours of discussion, I have heard my colleagues disagree with aspects of this budget resolution and propose modifications to others. But in these discussions and those that preceded them, I hear general accord about the need to streamline Government, to reduce the deficit, and to be judicious in advancing a fiscal stimulus package. I rise today to propose a budget resolution amendment that recognizes my colleagues' general accord on those three issues.

In 6 months, the National Performance Review Task Force headed by Vice President GORE will issue a series of recommendations for cutting costs, enhancing efficiencies, and reorganizing functions of the Federal Government. I seek a sense of the Senate resolution that amounts saved as a result of the audit will be turned to a pair of worthy ends. First, amounts saved as a result of this Governmentwide audit will match the cost of any economic stimulus package enacted in fiscal 1993. Second, I seek a sense of the Senate that additional savings—and there will be some—be applied to reduce the budget deficit and for no other purpose.

Last month I introduced the Federal Efficiency Improvement Act, which called for the kind of Governmentwide audit the Vice President is now conducting.

When I introduced that measure, I spoke of prudence, of actions that would be equitable to all groups of Americans and all generations of Americans. I argued for Government that is leaner and more efficient and makes fewer dollars to yield greater results. And I spoke, above all, about accountability.

The administration has in effect implemented many aspects of the Federal Efficiency Improvement Act by Executive order. The administration is taking steps to achieve the greater prudence and equity and efficiency and accountability that I spoke of. The amendment I now propose anticipates that success of Vice President GORE's task force. I am confident of that success. The amendment underscores the importance of the program by asking that its savings be directed toward two important purposes.

The exact dollar amount of applied savings from the audit will not be known until it is completed in 6 months. But I am certain they can be sizable, because this new program is modeled after a Texas plan which is a proven performer. The Texas performance review of State government operations in 1991 unearthed over $4 billion in savings out of a $30 billion budget, a 12-percent savings.

A 12-percent savings in the Federal budget would yield $150 billion—150 billion would cover entirely the $112 billion in 5-year investment spending increases proposed by the budget resolution and have $38 billion left over to trim our deficit. It would go a long way to offsetting $295 billion in proposed revenue raisers over the next 5 years.

So I ask my colleagues to consider how this amendment addresses economic challenges while addressing concerns many Senators have expressed.

Many Senators support fiscal stimulus but resist adding to the deficit. Others hold deficit reduction as the highest priority and resist spending increases until it is achieved. This amendment moves toward reconciling these separate viewpoints. Having embarked on one goal we all favor—improving the operation of Government—this amendment earmarks the savings to pay for the stimulus and pay down the deficit.

Unfortunately, the congressional budget process requires a vote in advance of September 7, when the audit generates specific numbers. We cannot now correct this budget resolution to reflect the spending reductions which are certain to flow from this program. But a good idea like the Texas plan takes some time, however, short, to work.

Given these circumstances, and while we await the specific expenditures which the Texas plan will target for elimination, this amendment recognizes the contribution which our program will bring. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and to expect significant results when the Texas plan audits are completed in less than 6 months' time.

Madam President, I ask how much time remains on my side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has 20 seconds remaining.

Mr. KRUEGER. I withhold my 20 seconds, Madam President.

Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, let me say to my friend from Texas, I was very hopeful that I could support this as something that was meaningful and would really yield some savings for the Federal Government and would cut expenditures. But I regret to tell the Senator from Texas that essentially this sense-of-the-Senate amendment does absolutely nothing. There are no dollar numbers, and that is what a budget resolution is about: you add or subtract dollars.

It is saying that the Vice President, whom I have great respect for, is conducting a commission-type activity to see if we can save money in the Federal Government. This amendment says if he does, we ought to apply some or all of that savings against the new expenditures that are going to be approved under the label of stimulus. I think everybody knows they are not really a stimulus. Actually, they are paying for a lot of new programs; and a lot of programs that were underfunded, they are going to fund.

We are saying to the American taxpayer: Do not worry about that. That is $16 billion in new expenditures; just add it to the deficit. But it does not amount to much. Anyway, we are going to tax you $295 billion in new taxes, and that is where we are really going to get the deficit reduction from.

This says, without any certainty, that we are not really going to do that because somehow or another, we are going to save money on the streamlining and modernization of Government study that is going on.

I remind the Members of the Senate that even if recommendations are made under this Executive order to study, Congress has to vote on them, approve them, and decide what they want to do with them. And for us to beg all of those issues and make an advance kind of decision about it—that it is all going to be helpful, and we are not going to waste the stimulus package and we are not going to really have to pay for that; we are really not going to add that much to the deficit because somehow or another this resolution says we are going to do a lot better than that—we do not know exactly how or when and if it will really work.

But I would like everybody to know this says, if and when that happens, I want to relieve the taxpayers of the burden they are paying for the stimulus, other than the first year.

So, again, it is innocuous. It does not do anything. I was hopeful that it did. If Senators want to vote for it, it is a wish and a hope that this reform commission does some good things; and then, if they do some good things, that Congress will do some good things and not spend the money they save, but rather apply it to the deficit.

I do not think that is really specific enough to have any impact on the budget of the United States.

As I indicated, because of that, I truly do not believe it does very much.

Do I have any time remaining, Madam President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has 1 minute and 20 seconds remaining.

Mr. DOMENICI. I reserve the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. SASSER. Will the Senator yield me 30 seconds?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 20 seconds remaining.

Mr. KRUEGER. I yield the 20 seconds I have to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, I want to commend the distinguished Senator from Texas for offering this amendment which will direct that any savings that come from the National Performance Review Task Force be applied against the deficit and also used to help finance the jobs program of the President. This is new, innovative thinking we need to deal with the deficit problem.

I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from New Mexico has 1 minute and 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I guess one way to look at it is that the budget before us is filled with unspecified cuts. In fact, in the last round, when the American people were told there were more cuts being made than President Clinton has in mind, nobody bothered to tell the American people where those cuts were coming from, where those reductions in Government were coming from. Just $31 billion was plugged into the budget under a little box in which you put these kind of numbers.

We cannot even do that for this one. We do not have any dollars to put down in an unspecified way, because we have no idea whether they are going to be real dollars or not. Frankly, I believe this is the way we should not vote on budget resolutions. It gives a false hope, leaves a false impression, and does little or nothing to affect the deficit.

So I hope that anyone who votes for it will vote for it in that context.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment before us is now laid aside and the vote will occur following the disposition of the Kennedy amendment No. 254.

Mr. PRYOR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS] be recognized to offer a sense-of-the-Senate amendment on agriculture that I am authorized to offer under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Pryor amendment is in order, and there will be 10 minutes of debate equally divided. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 257

(Purpose: Expressing the sense of the Senate that farming and related businesses receive relief from the energy tax)

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I rise to offer an amendment in the nature of a sense-of-the-Senate amendment on behalf of myself, Senator PRYOR, Senator DORGAN, and Senator CONRAD.

The purpose of my amendment is to show that it is the sense of the Senate that relief from the proposed Btu tax should be provided to American agriculture. I understand that my colleague from Montana has addressed this subject on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will withhold, the clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS], for himself, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. CONRAD, and Mr. DORGAN, proposes an amendment numbered 257.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the resolution, insert the following new section:

SEC. . RELIEF FROM ENERGY TAX FOR THE AGRICULTURE INDUSTRY.

It is the sense of the Senate that any energy tax enacted during the 103d Congress should provide such relief to the agriculture industry as is necessary to ensure that the industry does not absorb a disproportionate impact of that tax.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, essentially, this is an amendment offered on behalf of myself and Senators PRYOR, DORGAN, and CONRAD, to show that it is the sense of the Senate that relief from the proposed Btu tax should be provided to American agriculture.

I understand that my colleague from Montana, Senator BURNS, has addressed this subject, and I agree very much with him that agriculture is disproportionately affected on its face under the budget resolution. It is the purpose of my amendment to show that it is the sense of the Senate, that agriculture not be so disadvantaged.

My amendment, Madam President, gives the Senate an opportunity to agree that some relief from the Btu tax for the agriculture industry is necessary. It is necessary to ensure that Americans continue to enjoy the safest, most abundant, and most low-cost food supply in the world.

At the same time, my amendment recognizes that the form and magnitude of such relief should be crafted by the Finance Committee in the course of its work on the revenue-raising provisions in the reconciliation bill. In its current form, the broad-based Btu tax will result in fewer American farmers, decreased agriculture production, reduced agriculture exports, and higher food prices for Americans.

In particular, the Btu tax hits farmers in three ways: First, farmers would have to pay a tax on the energy used on the farm for such things as irrigation and operation of equipment; second, they would pay the Btu tax on raw materials for food production, like fertilizer and crop protection chemicals; and finally, as a result of the Btu tax, the farmer would face an increase in transportation costs to get his products to market.

The increased costs cannot and will not be passed on by farmers. Instead, a farmer will absorb these costs and experience a continued decline in income. These are not increased costs on the wealthy; they are taxes on rural America, one of the hardest hit sectors of the economy in the past decade.

President Clinton has expressed a willingness to work with us, to work with the Congress in balancing the impact of this package on agriculture, and in the West in general. I plan to work with the administration; with the chairman of the Finance Committee, Chairman MOYNIHAN; and with my colleagues on the Finance Committee to mitigate the potential impact of the Btu tax on the agriculture industry and to work toward the enactment of an economic package that results in the economic growth and deficit reduction that the country so sorely needs.

Madam President, I very deeply thank my colleagues from Arkansas for allowing me to offer this amendment at this time.

Madam President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CONRAD addressed the Chair.

Mr. DOMENICI. How much time does the Senator have remaining?

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, how much time on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two minutes and five seconds remaining.

Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I yield myself 3 minutes. I am hopeful that if the Senator needs a minute or two, I might give him some of my time in a little bit.

Madam President, this is another one of the SOS amendments. If we do enough of them on the Btu tax, there will not be any Btu tax left. We have all kinds of sense-of-the-Senate amendments. Everybody is saying they are meaningless but, nonetheless, they attempt to say the Btu tax is discriminatory and we are not going to be discriminatory.

Now, this one says we are not going to discriminate against agriculture. What that essentially does is just gut the President's plan. We just have to face it. If that was done, the President's Btu tax is just about denuded

because the President's energy tax places a very high, high tax, kind of a surtax on anything that comes from crude oil—diesel fuel that is used on the farm. All those on-farm uses, they come from that source. That is a very big user of derivatives of crude oil.

I do not know why the President decided to tax crude oil twice as much as the others, clearly twice as much as coal, but that was the essence of some environmental theme. So now we come along and say we are all for that. I do not, but apparently when we vote this resolution in, we are going to say we are for that Btu tax, but do not put it on my constituents.

So here is another one that has no meaning but in a sense is an effort to politically cover yourself so you can make believe that, indeed, you protected a group of constituents that are important to you.

I think if we had another day my prediction would be lived up to; there would be an amendment on every part of the Btu taxes. You would be exempting hospitals pretty soon, then all public buildings and municipalities, and then we would have one exempting heavy manufacturing where their competitors are using natural gas. We would not want them to be in a discriminatory position.

So however the Senate wants to vote on it, I think I have stated as best I can what it means and what it does not mean and what it is in terms of seeking some kind of political cover.

If I have any time remaining, I yield it to Senator CONRAD.

Mr. CONRAD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 2 minutes, 6 seconds.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Chair and I thank my colleague from New Mexico.

As a representative from an agricultural State, by some measures the most agricultural State in the Nation, agriculture is facing a triple whammy. Agriculture is facing cuts in the basic farm programs, cuts which, we have just learned from studies that were done at Texas A&M University, when applied to a specific farm in my State of North Dakota—in fact two specific farms—would reduce farm income 28 percent in one case and 37 percent in the other case.

These are not modest cuts. These are not insignificant reductions. That does deep and dramatic damage to the underlying economy of a State like mine. And this is before any Btu tax is imposed. It is before cuts in the REA program are imposed.

Madam President and my colleagues, this is something we have to pay attention to. Rural America has been hit by a decade of low farm income. In fact, the decade of the 1980's is the lowest period of farm income of any decade since they started keeping records in the early 1900's.

That is the backdrop. We have a projection that farm income before any cuts, before the imposition of a Btu tax, before REA cuts, is going to decline each and every year of the last farm bill.

So, Madam President, the proposal by the Senator from Montana, the sense-of-the-Senate resolution, is something that deserves our support. The health of the agricultural part of this economy demands our attention because it is central to the economic health of the country.

Madam President, I thank the Chair for this time and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BAUCUS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BAUCUS. I yield myself the remaining time.

Madam President, the points we make in this resolution were very well summarized by the Senator from North Dakota. I might say that the committee of jurisdiction, the Finance Committee, is the committee that very much understands this problem. The Senator from Arkansas, the Senator from North Dakota, and Senator DASCHLE, the Senator from South Dakota, are all members of that committee as well as myself, and we very much plan to deal with this on a fair, even-handed basis.

I understand some of the frustrations of the ranking member of the Budget Committee when sense-of-the-Senate resolutions come up. I think we all must remind ourselves, however, that this is part of the process. Sense-of-the-Senate resolutions are a good way for the Senate to express its view on the budget, express its view to the various authorizing committees how the authorizing committees should deal with these matters. They are not binding, that is true, but they are a sense of where the Senate is, a statement of the Senate.

There will be many, many opportunities in many different circumstances, different hearings, and so forth, to finally forge and fashion an economic package this year. It is not only the budget resolution. It is also going to be the stimulus package. It is the appropriations bills; the reconciliation bill this summer. It is all part of a process. I understand the Senator's frustration, but I think he also recognizes that this is a part of the process as we achieve a final solution at the end of this year is more in accordance with the views of Americans in all parts of the country.

Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, my opposition to the Btu tax is well-documented, but some points need to be reemphasized. Simply put, it is regressive, inflationary and promises—promises—to stall our recovery. That is particularly true of its impact on agriculture.

Bill Clinton did not make agriculture very many promises in the recent campaign. I guess we can be thankful for that. We are only 6 weeks into his administration, and already promise limbo is pretty crowded.

Bruce Reed, a senior advisor to President Clinton, stated that the energy tax would not "result in an excessive burden on rural America." The White House may be well-intentioned, but it is clear that the administration proposed the Btu tax without any regard for the livelihood of this Nation's farmers and ranchers.

Just a few numbers, Mr. President: A Btu tax would directly cost a typical 430-acre Midwest grain farm $800 a year. The indirect costs—that is, costs that have been passed on to the farmer—would be another $800 a year. Transportation costs—having farm inputs delivered and moving produce/livestock to market—would cost extra. Taking more than $1,600 off the farmer's bottom line would put many farmers in the red, and out of business.

Other businesses may grudgingly accept such a tax, well aware that they can pass these costs onto consumers. But farmers are price takers, not price setters; farmers cannot tack on another 10 cents a bushel to the selling price of corn; they cannot expect a premium at the market for their hogs to pass on the higher costs that they themselves absorbed due to this tax. Thus, farmers pay both ways. It has been said that farmers pay retail, sell wholesale, and pay freight both ways. That is certainly true with this tax proposal.

And farmers are not the only ones who will be hurt by this tax. Six in ten Iowa jobs relate to agriculture. Thus, as goes farming, so goes many jobs. Moreover, rural communities depend on their cars to travel to off-farm jobs, and doctors, grocers, and other merchants often located at great distance. Iowans use 500 gallons of gas a year per capita, while a New Yorker uses about half of that. Under a Btu tax, Iowans would pay twice as much as New Yorkers. Where is the fairness in that?

Though agriculture comprises only 1.8 percent of domestic spending, it will shoulder 6.4 percent of the cuts proposed by President Clinton over the next 4 years. Since 1982, agriculture has been a prominent part of every deficit reduction package. Farm program spending has been cut by 50 percent since 1986, while many areas of Federal spending have gone untouched.

Mr. President, despite being the production envy of the agricultural world, and the shining star of U.S. foreign trade, the Clinton administration in-

sists that agriculture is the goose that laid the golden egg. We all know how that fairy tale ended, and it appears, viewing the Clinton tax package in its entirety, that the same fate awaits agriculture.

Farmers in this country have survived grain embargoes, high interest rates, inflation, droughts, floods, poor crop prices, and unfair foreign subsidies, just about every calamity known to man including Washington. God helping us, we farmers may—I repeat, may—survive the Clinton administration and this package of taxes.

Mr. BAUCUS. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be set aside, and the vote will occur following disposition of the Krueger amendment No. 256.

Under the previous order, the Senator from Arizona is to be recognized for an amendment.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, I am advised that the Senator from Arizona is on his way to the floor at the present time. I will simply suggest the absence of a quorum in anticipation of his timely arrival, charging it equally against both sides.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, before we do that, may I ask the Senator a question and make an observation.

Mr. SASSER. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I have no difficulty in waiting for a while, but I do think it is fair to tell the Senate that we are on this schedule because we are hopeful, if we stay on it, all of the freestanding amendments that are not going to get debated will have an opportunity to get voted on and we will finish by tomorrow at 12:30 noon. To be fair, we clearly have to stay more or less to the schedule for these debatable amendments or we are going to cut a lot of Senators out of a vote.

How much time does the Senator think we ought to take before we go to the next amendment?

Mr. SASSER. I suggest to my friend from New Mexico that we take 7 or 8 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Could we take a temporary recess for 7 minutes?

Mr. SASSER. Why not, I say to my friend from New Mexico, let us have this short quorum call to see where we are.

Mr. DOMENICI. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, a quorum call is ordered, the time to be equally divided.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, the Senator from Arizona has arrived. His amendment is next in order under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Arizona.

AMENDMENT NO. 226

(Purpose: To require that a deficit reduction account be established)

Mr. DECONCINI. Madam President, I thank the Chair.

I have an amendment at the desk and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report Amendment No. 226.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI] proposes an amendment numbered 226.

Mr. DECONCINI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. . DEFICIT REDUCTION ACCOUNT.

(a) LEGISLATION.—It is assumed that as a procedure appropriate to carry out the purposes of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Act of 1974 (within the meaning of section 301(b)(4) of such Act), the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives would, as an integral part of the changes in law reported pursuant to section 7 (b)(7) of this concurrent resolution, report legislation to—

(1) establish a separate account in the Treasury into which 100 percent of the amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenue should be increased as set forth in section 2(1)(A)(ii) of this resolution as well as contributions resulting from the changes in law reported pursuant to section 7(b)(7) and (c)(12) of this resolution would be deposited;

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

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

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—Legislation reported pursuant to subsection (a) shall not be considered to be extraneous for purposes of section 313 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

Mr. DECONCINI. Madam President, the amendment I offer today I offer for the millions of taxpayers across this country who are being asked in this budget and eventually through reconcilation and other processes here, to pay additional taxes in order to reduce the growing national debt.

My amendment would ensure that all new tax revenues proposed by the administration and those agreed to by the Congress will be used solely for deficit reduction.

These funds would be deposited in a deficit trust fund to be established within the Department of the Treasury that could only be used to retire the outstanding debt obligation of the U.S. Government. None—I repeat none—of the revenues deposited in this account would be available for appropriations for new or additional spending programs.

Madam President, this amendment directs the Senate Finance Committee and the Committee on Ways and Means to report legislation establishing this account in the Department of Treasury.

I included this provision so that the appropriate committees could use their expertise to ensure that the deficit trust fund would not become another gimmick. With their expertise and leadership I am convinced that such an account can be established which will ensure that our tax dollars would be used for what they were intended deficit reduction.

This is not a new idea. It is not even a new proposal. In fact, the amendment I offer today is almost identical to language that was included in the 1988 budget resolution. Unfortunately, as best I can determine, neither the Senate Finance Committee nor the Committee on Ways and Means reported legislation which would have created a deficit trust fund.

This proposal has merit. I believe the American people deserve to see this idea created today. If the deficit reduction fund cannot be crafted in substantive, meaningful way then I will be the first to say so. But I believe it can.

If a deficit trust fund cannot be crafted in a substantive, meaningful way then I will be the first to say so. I believe, however, that if we are going to ask the American people to pay more in taxes than we should at the every least do everything in our power to ensure that any new revenues be used for deficit reduction.

THE SPECIFICS

President Clinton's comprehensive 5-year proposal reduces the Federal deficit by a total of $502 billion. To accomplish this over the next 5 years, the plan calls for a $332 billion reduction in Federal spending with an increase of $295 billion in net revenues.

Thus, Madam President, by creating a deficit trust fund we can ensure that the additional $295 billion in revenues would be used exactly for what they are intended—deficit reduction not additional Government spending.

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S CALL TO ARMS

I believe President Clinton has submitted an honest proposal—one that tackles the tough choices of both spending reduction as well as increased tax revenues. I would argue that it is the most honest budget proposal submitted by a President since I first came to the Senate in 1977.

President Clinton has asked the American people to answer the call to arms for shared sacrifice in combatting our national debt. The American people have responded in kind indicating

time and time again that they are willing to sacrifice for the future of their country and their children's futures if we are serious about tackling the deficit monster.

Madam President, I would offer one caveat to the American people's willingness to accept the notion that there will no longer be the proverbial free lunch. In my home State of Arizona, I have spoken to many people who are willing to pay more now to ensure a better future but they want to ensure that increased taxes are directed at deficit reduction.

CONCLUSION

The American people understand that the current budgetary system has built in loopholes. They also understand that these loopholes are large enough to drive a truck through. Clearly, you cannot create a $4 trillion national debt without these loopholes.

Madam President, we were wise to include an identical proposal in the fiscal year 1988 budget resolution. We were foolish not to follow our own advice. We owe ourselves, our constituents, and our country a second chance.

I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin. I thank him for his support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PRYOR). The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise to commend the Senator from Arizona for this amendment. I think it is an important addition to the budget resolution. I think it is important because we need to restore public confidence, especially when it comes to tax increases that are proposed in the budget resolution.

I think some of these revenue increases are going to be necessary to solve the deficit problem. But the Senator from Arizona is absolutely right. We have to show the public that we can actually use these dollars to reduce the Federal deficit.

As I hold town meetings around my State, people say they want the President's plan, but the thing they most want to believe is that we will actually be able to use whatever dollars come out of the plan for deficit reduction and that we are able to restrain spending.

This amendment is designed to make it clear that the new taxes called for in this resolution will actually be used for deficit reduction and not for new spending.

I feel especially strongly about this because we had an experience in Wisconsin that is not completely different from what could happen here. In Wisconsin, a few years ago, our voters approved a constitutional amendment that for the first time would allow us to have a lottery. But the lottery dollars were supposed to be used only for property tax relief, not for general State spending. Everybody in the public understood that. But somehow the folks at our State capitol, and our Governor, did not. As a result, some $200 million that was supposed to go to direct property tax relief was spirited away for general State spending.

I had the opportunity as a State senator, on behalf of the taxpayers of the State, to bring a lawsuit to require that those proceeds not be used for general State spending but be used to give the taxpayers relief. Fortunately, we won that lawsuit and were able to stop the practice of diverting lottery proceeds into general expenditures.

The cry in Wisconsin at that time was, "Where is our lottery money?" everywhere we went.

What I want to see happen here is that we do not have a cry a few years from now here in the United States that says "Where is our deficit reduction money?" That is what is going to happen if we do not have the kind of approach the Senator from Arizona is offering here with his amendment.

The amendment is consistent with the numbers in the Senate budget resolution because there are more than enough spending restrictions and reductions to pay for the new spending. The resolution provides for $295 billion in new revenues, $332 billion in total spending reductions, and $124 billion in new investment spending. All of the new revenue could thus be used for deficit reduction, as would two-thirds of the spending reduction.

So I wanted to briefly indicate my strong support for this concept. I thank the Senator from Arizona. I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, my friend from Arizona knows the high esteem in which I hold him. I really wish, I would be thrilled, if setting up a deficit reduction trust fund for new taxes would help solve the deficit or the debt of our country. If that were the case, I would merely suggest we should have done it when the deficit started growing, say back in 1969; said all new taxes go into the trust fund and they are called trust fund to reduce the deficit.

But you see, there are only two ways to reduce the deficit of the United States, only two. You reduce or cut spending, or you raise revenue. There are no 5 ways or 10 ways, just 2. You reduce spending, or you raise revenues, or some combination of the two.

A deficit reduction trust fund does neither, because you see, you would set up a trust fund and—let us just use as an example, President Clinton's plan. You would put $295 billion in a deficit reduction trust fund. But, if you then looked at the budget of the United States, you would find that in 4 years under the President's plan the deficit is going to be starting back up.

So what do you do with a trust fund if Government grows?

Is the trust fund in some way an inhibitor to the deficit growing?

You see, it is all fungible. If you say only use it to buy down debt, on the one hand you buy down debt, and on the other hand as the deficit grows again, you issue more debt.

So I regret to say that the idea is a good one. It sounds great. We provided it in a budget resolution before, I think. Is that not right? I think that is correct. Really, the reason we do not do it is because it will not work.

So I wish it would work, as I indicated. In fact, I wish I could say that Senators found a brandnew way to help with the deficit reductions. But essentially, taking taxes when you are in a deficit position and saying put them in a trust fund, does nothing to reduce the deficit, because if Congress does not reduce the deficit, sooner or later you borrow more money. If you say there is a trust fund there, you can only buy down the debt, the existing debt, what do you do when you have to issue some more debt because you have not cut expenditures sufficient to keep the momentum of a deficit coming down.

So, again, I know my friend from Arizona, with whom I have worked on many issues—and he has supported the Senator from New Mexico, and I have supported him on many things. I regret to say that if I thought this was a way to help with our deficit, I would be his cosponsor and be clamoring for its passage, but I really do not think it will work.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator for his vote of confidence in this new approach here. I appreciate that the Senator has been on the Budget Committee all the time that I have been in the Senate. But I feel that, as the Senator from Wisconsin pointed out, sometimes you need new approaches. We have never created a deficit reduction trust fund. In the budget of 1988, there was similar language directing the Senate Finance Committee to establish a deficit trust fund. I only urge the Senator to give it a shot. Maybe he is right.

Maybe nothing works except reducing expenditures. We have all talked about that, and we have all come in here and voted for more expenditures, whether it be for defense, the WIC Program, or whatever we think is important. But this is an identifiable tracing of the dollars that are going to be raised in taxes, so the American people are going to know where it is their dollar is going. It is not going to go for some new program. It is going to retire the debt. That still leaves us and the administration responsible for reducing expenditures.

I hope the Senator from New Mexico will at least let this proposal have a chance to breathe. Maybe he would be surprised if we had a deficit reduction fund. I thank the Chair, and I thank the Senator from Tennessee, the chairman, for permitting me to move on this effort here for the purpose of including it in this budget agreement. I think we have to find some new ap-

proaches here. I am ready to vote on the amendment.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, has all time been used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FEINGOLD). All time has expired.

Is there a request for the yeas and nays?

The amendment is laid aside. The vote will occur following disposition of the Baucus amendment No. 257.

Mr. SASSER. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. I thought under the unanimous-consent request that only recorded votes would be delayed. I was under the impression that no one was requesting a recorded vote on this particular amendment. The proponent is not, and I am not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The question will occur on the amendment then.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have no objection. I assume we can voice vote the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 226) was agreed to.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I have been advised that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] will not be offering his amendment on student loans, as under the previous order.

Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the Kennedy amendment be removed from the list of amendments provided for under the previous order.

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

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, pursuant to the unanimous consent order, the Dole substitute amendment is next in order.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I say to my friend from Tennessee, this came rather quickly, because in looking at the list, our Republican leader would have assumed we still have another 10 minutes or so. I wonder if we can put in a quorum call while I go advise him that his leadership amendment is up now.

Mr. SASSER. I suggest the absence of a quorum and request that it be charged equally against both sides.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Under the previous order the Republican leader is recognized to offer an amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 258

(Purpose: To provide for a budget that would reduce the deficit from $310 billion in fiscal year 1993 to $162.9 billion in fiscal year 1998 and cause the deficit to continue to fall thereafter, without raising taxes on the American people)

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of myself, Senator DOMENICI, Senator PACKWOOD, Senator SHELBY, Senator ROTH, Senator GRAMM, Senator GORTON, Senator HELMS and each of our Republican Senators BENNETT, COVERDELL, FAIRCLOTH, GREGG, and KEMPTHORNE, and others of my colleagues, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], (for himself, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. ROTH, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. GREGG, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. LOTT, Mr. BOND, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURNS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. DANFORTH, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. GORTON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HELMS, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MACK, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WALLOP, and Mr. WARNER) proposes an amendment numbered 258.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I understand there are 2 hours on the amendment equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOLE. I guess we lost some time here on the quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time was not charged on the quorum call.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I have sent this amendment to the desk and we now have 35 cosponsors.

Over the past several weeks, there has been a lot of talk about Republican alternatives, whether or not there was a Republican alternative; if so, what it was. We had a number of Republican amendments, as I understand, the 34 amendments offered in the Budget Committee.

So I think it is fairly clear to those who watch the process closely, that there have been a lot of Republican input into the process, just as when we controlled the Senate, there was a lot of Democratic input in the process. I would say that it is more difficult to get out the message when you are in the minority and particularly more difficult when the other party, in this case the Democrats, control the White House.

Whether we understand it or not, the President of the United States, whether he or she be a Democrat or Republican, is going to get instant coverage on almost anything by having a press conference or making a statement. That is the message that many times the American people receive.

I do not fault that system. That is the way it works. I do not think it is going to change very quickly.

I just suggest to those who are concerned about what we are actually doing here, those who want to see what is in the package, those who want to see what is in the package, those who want to see the details, and those who wish to understand how much taxes are in President Clinton's package, how much net savings, nondefense savings, how much defense savings, and how many billion dollars in fees, I think perhaps we would like to make that clear, if we can, in the short time that we have.

I think it is significant that the cosponsors of this amendment are the five freshmen Members of the U.S. Senate on this side of the aisle. They have just been elected. Some are brand new in politics. They have been through the process, in fact, in one case four different elections. I think the Senator from Georgia, before he got here, had four elections last year, and he understands very well what the people of Georgia have been telling him. I think the same is true of the other freshmen colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Unless I miss my guess, and I do not think the people in Kansas are much different than people in any other State, the American people do not have much faith in the Congress of the United States. They do not have a great deal of faith in the executive branch in our Government.

If you ask the average Americans, whether they be in Kansas, Wisconsin, Tennessee, New Mexico, or anywhere else, what we ought to do, they will say: You ought to cut spending first, because we believe, if you increase taxes someone is going to spend the money and you are never going to get around to cutting spending, and the taxpayers are going to be the losers, and they know that, because there is a lot of precedent for it. It has happened over the past years when Democrats, Republicans, whoever, it might be, were in control.

So, I just suggest what we are going to try to do in this time we have, is to point out there is more than one way you can reduce the deficit. You can take the approach adopted by President Clinton, and I applaud him for addressing the deficit. I just do not like his plan. You can take the Clinton approach and just raise taxes. Or you can take the Republican approach and con-

trol Government spending. You can choose between the President's world record tax increase and our world record spending restraint, and I happen to believe that is the difference. If you want more taxes, you go one way; if you want more spending cuts, you go the other way.

A lot of Americans could live with the combination of each, but there is not much spending reduction. If you look carefully at President Clinton's plan as we assess it, based on CBO estimates, there are about $295 billion in net tax increases over 5 years, $74 billion in additional defense spending cuts, but only $7 billion in nondefense spending cuts, and there is also $18 billion in fees. In my State, fees are taxes.

So if you add it up, it is 79 percent taxes and some defense cuts, and I think we have gone too far in that area, and a little bit of nondefense spending reduction. That is it. So you get some interest savings, but it is all taxes, and that is not what the American people voted for when they talked about change last November. They wanted us to change. They wanted us to reduce spending and to reduce the bloated Government and reduce a lot of things we do in the Congress and the executive branch, and every Government agency. They did not want us to pick their pockets for more taxes.

So, we believe our plan would provide real permanent deficit reduction for America. Let me say that many of us who are sponsoring this amendment have been there. We have made the tough decisions. We made tough decisions in 1985 when this Senator was the majority leader of the Senate, and about 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning we passed the deficit reduction bill of, I think, about $296 billion over 3 years in real spending cuts and no taxes, and one Democrat supported that package, one, the late Ed Zorinsky from the State of Nebraska.

So we understand how difficult it is, and I give credit to my colleagues on the other side who are having some success with their tax package. We know how difficult it is.

In putting this package together, our No. 1 priority has been to lay the groundwork for a sound economic future by controlling Government spending, holding the line on taxes, and creating good, private-sector jobs that will last.

We do this by asking Government, not the American people, to sacrifice. This plan relies on real cuts to reduce the deficit by $460 billion over 5 years. We take the steps that President Clinton, and those who support the President's plan, should have taken if they were serious about controlling the deficit.

We eliminate all of the President's new spending—any spending increases must be paid for with additional spending cuts. We eliminate the President's entire record $295 billion tax increase. We eliminate $18 billion in proposed user fees. We accept—we are working with the President—all of President Clinton's proposed mandatory and discretionary spending cuts except that we add back $20 billion to defense over 5 years to allow for a more orderly build-down. We add a nondefense discretionary freeze that allows for a $500 million increase—or investment—for childhood immunization and the WIC Program for fiscal year 1994.

We had a vote on WIC yesterday. We recognized the importance of this program. And as a long-time supporter of that program, we have included additional funds for the WIC Program.

And we add a cap on Medicare and Medicaid that would limit the growth of these programs to population, plus inflation, plus an additional percent each year for 4 years, and population, plus inflation plus an additional 2 percent in the fifth year.

Mr. President, the difference between our bipartisan proposal and the President's tax and spend plan could not be more clear. If you listen for 5 minutes, you would understand the difference. One is all taxes, no taxes in this package, and one is all spending cuts. That message ought to be fairly clear.

And I doubt that 10 percent of the American people understand what is in President Clinton's package. They think it is deficit reduction. They are for deficit reduction, so some are for the package not knowing it contains $295 billion in new taxes over 5 years and $178 billion in increased fees.

Our plan would cut the deficit from $319 billion this year to $168.4 billion by 1998. Because we are making real cuts, our plan would continue moving the deficit toward balance in the outyears. By contrast, the President's plan, as modified by the Senate Democrats, reduces the deficit to $213.5 billion in 1988, if you get all the things they say you are going to get—and that is very doubtful.

Because their plan fails to control Federal spending, outyear deficits will continue to rise. That is not what the American people are hearing from the White House, and it is not what the American people expect from us—the Congress, the President, and everybody else.

Mr. President, I am not going to go through all of the details. Senator DOMENICI will do that here in a minute. There are a number of Senators who contributed to this plan who can speak to the details.

But, I would like to make one point.

If we learned anything over the weekend, it is that Russia and the world is still a dangerous place in which to live; that we are the only superpower economically and militarily and we have a lot of responsibility, which we do not want necessarily.

A lot of Americans do not want this responsibility, but who else is going to share it? There is not anybody else to share it.

So we have to carry that burden and responsibility, because we are talking about democracy in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe and we have a lot of things to be concerned about when we think about the future; look to our children and our grandchildren, what their futures may be if we live in a world of peace.

On top of all of this, all the danger in the world, President Clinton wants to cut defense another $112 billion on top of the $60 billion already advocated and already cut by President Bush. In fact, it was about $75 billion.

So I just suggest we are going too far on defense. We ought to slow down. We ought to cut defense, yes, but we should not gut defense.

Only 2 percent of the savings in their plan come from nondefense Government programs. Two-thirds of the Government is being asked to contribute a grand total of $7 billion over 5 years.

Now, that is a lot of money, but in the range of things we are talking, it is not a drop in the bucket. It is about a pinch of salt, and that is about all your going to get.

Mr. President, I quote my friend from New York, the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee:

> It will be the largest tax increase in the history of public finance in the United States, or anywhere else in the world.

That is a pretty big tax increase. It calls for $3.86 in new taxes and fees for every dollar of spending cuts. That is not shared sacrifice.

So for all the reasons I can think of, and I think the people in my State of Kansas, the farmer, the truck driver, the nurse, the senior citizen, and all those people out there we are supposed to be concerned about, this is actually dealing with the deficit. This is going to make their lives better. It is going to open up opportunities, because the economy is going to grow if you cut spending, not if you raise taxes.

And, as our colleague, Senator PACKWOOD from Oregon, has pointed out time after time, never in the history of the world has any country that has raised taxes stimulated the economy. And if President Clinton succeeds, he is going to have a new recipe for more taxes all around the world.

Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for joining in cosponsoring this legislation.

I yield the floor.

I yield the time on our side to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I want to yield to some Senators who have helped us with the specifics of this package and with the real support that they have given us for doing some-

thing real on the spending side of this budget.

So I will reserve time for myself later on, but I want to now yield to—which of our freshman Senators was here first?

I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Georgia. That is going to have to be sufficient. Is that all right?

Mr. COVERDELL. That would be fine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Georgia for 5 minutes.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity that our leadership has given to the new Senators to participate in this Republican alternative proposal.

I am not on the Budget Committee. I am only 75 days from the field, so to speak. But I do bring, I believe, a perspective and observation that is important, coming so fresh from the electorate, to this debate between what is now two plans.

We have the administration's proposal and we have the Republican alternative.

We have heard a great deal about the so-called Clinton economic plan. But, in the final analysis, every concept, every piece of legislation, each idea, comes down to a core, a trunk, so to speak, the fundamental piece. When you strip away all the glitter and all the words, there is that single heartbeat and soul of the idea.

At the heart of the President's proposal is the largest tax increase in American history; in the neighborhood of $300 billion. The President's plan envisions enlargement of the Federal Government, an era of new spending, historic tax increases, and historic spending.

As we heard throughout the campaign and during the inaugural festivities, President Clinton promised us that his plan would be centered on spending cuts. A close look at the plan reveals that nondefense cuts have all but disappeared to a $7 billion figure that does not occur until 1997, beyond even the next Presidential campaign. The heart of President Clinton's plan is higher taxes, more spending and minimal spending cuts.

Now comes the Republican alternative. What is its core? Where is its center? Where is its heartbeat? His spending cuts, reducing the size of Federal expenditures, putting reins and throttles on the growth of the Federal Government. It envisions no tax increase, no broad new spending and no expansion of the Federal Government. It is driven by a concept of restraint.

What is the result of this clash of philosophy and ideas? On the one hand you have a firm belief that America is best served when her resources are in the command of the individual citizen and of the private entrepreneur, that that is where we find innovation and creativity and the appropriate utilization of this nation's vast wealth. On the other hand we have the philosophy that government is the great resolver, that in government we find equitable solutions, that a bigger Government is better.

I believe that we would be better off as a nation, and more prosperous, if we left these $300 billions in the hands of America's families and businesses. And I believe if we shift this massive tax increase, $300 billion, from the private sector to the public, from a private economy to a Government economy, we will stagnate the economy which is fragile and just beginning to recover. It will cost us jobs. It will cost us economic security.

Mr. President, the people of Georgia have told me repeatedly, "Cut spending first, don't raise taxes." This is precisely what the Republican alternative seeks to do, and I urge my colleagues to support this proposal.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. DOMENICI. I am sorry but I cannot do it. We have run out of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Hampshire for 3 minutes.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I rise in support of this substitute which has been put forth by the Republican leadership here in the Senate. It is an excellent substitute. It addresses the core issues which I think divide the two parties, and which I believe the American people have asked be addressed, which is that we replace the Clinton plan, or the modified Clinton plan, or whatever you wish to call it. In fact what you wish to call it, I think, can be subject to some debate. I am sort of calling it the Crazy Eddie plan, because to a great extent it has a lot of touches of Crazy Eddie, who is a fellow we are all looking for today who ran a bit of a hoax on the American people out in New Jersey.

The Clinton plan has that same sort of aspect. Because it said, if I recall, that there will be spending cuts where there are not spending cuts. It said there will be no taxes on the middle class. Well, it has taxes on the middle class, substantial taxes on the middle class in New England in the area of the Btu tax. And of course you have the Social Security tax in there. And it claimed that the new spending would go for investment, whatever that means in the way of Federal terms.

Actually, when you look at these new spending programs, look at the supplemental they are talking about, they have spending in there for swimming pools, they have spending in there for lighting in some States, they have spending in there for new atlases for the fish and game folks, and a lot of other programs that are really investment in votes, not investment in this country.

So to replace that plan I think is appropriate. Let us replace it with something the American people want. What the American people want is for us to address the deficit, not by hitting them up with a $300 billion tax increase but to address the American deficit on the spending side of the ledger. What has been brought forward by the Republican leader, Mr. DOLE, is a program that accomplishes that. It represents a freeze on discretionary spending. It puts in place a spending restraint on entitlements. And it results in elimination of the new taxes which the President has proposed in his budget.

It gets to the same deficit reduction over the 5-year period, producing almost $450 billion of deficit reduction. But it does it the way I think the American people asked us to do it. It does it through spending restraint. It does not allow the Government to expand. It does not allow the Government to add $124 billion of new spending but rather limits the tax burden on the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. Who yields time? The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to Senator KEMPTHORNE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Idaho for 3 minutes.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, we have all been sent here to be a very loud and clear voice on behalf of the people who sent us here, our constituents. The message I have heard from the people I represent is very clear and simple. It is: Cut spending first.

We have two very clear choices in this case. We have the administration's package which, as has been pointed out, is the largest tax increase in the history of this Nation. Or we have the Dole-Domenici amendment, of which I am proud to be an original cosponsor, which simply says we are going to cut spending, we are going to cut the size of the Federal Government, and we are not going to tax the American people in doing this.

We are a voice for the people we represent. I would like to just share with you, Mr. President, a letter I received which I think really reflects what so many of my constituents are saying.

DEAR SENATOR KEMPTHORNE: Contrary to popular belief, we have no more to give. If this tax increase is allowed to take effect we will not be able to make ends meet. Our income has decreased by 29 percent. This is not an exaggeration. We will not make it.

We do not appreciate the use of the term "contribution." Please do not fall into this trap. We are not so ignorant that terminology can make us go along with another tax increase.

We must see a marked reduction in spending. Not a decrease in the rate of increase. This is not acceptable.

Again, we urge you to stop this tax madness.

From a farm supply company in the rural town of Paul, ID. They simply write:

These are not taxes on the wealthy. They are taxes on rural America, one of the hardest hit sectors of our economy in the past decade. The ultimate effect of these taxes is higher food costs, which hits every American, particularly the poor, and spurs inflation.

Again, Mr. President, we have two very clear choices with this amendment by Senators DOLE and DOMENICI. The freshmen Senators who are here—we are new but we are fresh from the front lines where I think the message was delivered to us that we are to come here and we are to vote to cut spending. We are here to cut the size of the Federal Government. But we are not here to raise more taxes on the American public. That is the message.

I yield the floor back to Senator DOMENICI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator. I yield 3 minutes to Senator BENNETT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Utah for 3 minutes.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the other evening I spoke in this Chamber about my business background and business approach to this circumstance. If I might continue that for just one thought here, I have earned my living on occasion as a consultant to sick businesses. I think it is perhaps not a stretch of the imagination to say that our Nation right now comes under the definition of being very much like a sick business. We have a lot of red ink on the bottom line.

If you want to solve the problem of a business that is running red ink, you have three choices. You can cut your expenses, you can increase your sales, or you can raise your prices. In this debate, putting it in that context, the President of the United States has told us that we need not cut our expenses. We can cut them in some places but we will turn around and spend it over in other places in an attempt to increase our sales—that is, make the economy grow more rapidly.

But the heart and soul of his approach has been to raise prices, or in Government terms that is raise taxes. Raising prices in a business is a good way to get money if your customers continue to buy. But if you raise prices the way General Motors did and Toyota comes in with something that is cheaper, you find yourself in the status that General Motors is in, where the whole operation is ultimately forced to do what they should have done in the first place, which was to cut their internal costs.

The proposal we have in front of us is a proposal that says we are not going to raise prices on our product. We are going to cut the cost of operating the business and see that gets taken care of, because we found if we raise prices people will react to that and do other things. We know that raising taxes does not automatically increase Federal revenue. It has been tried time and again. And we have seen the example in the business world with General Motors. We need to get the Toyota philosophy going in this circumstance, instead of the General Motors philosophy, because that is the business analogy that shows us that we can, indeed, make the right kinds of decisions.

It is awfully hard to cut. It is hard in a business to cut. You end up firing people who you hired who were your closest friends. But it is the thing that has to be done if you are going to survive long term.

So, to the degree I have any expertise at all from the business world, I offer the same here in the Senate, which is let us not raise prices—or in this case raise taxes—let us cut our internal costs.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have many Senators on my side who want to speak. I hope they will be patient. I cannot give them very much time since we are operating under time limits. I think at this point I better accept our leader's challenge and yield myself only 7 minutes.

Mr. President, it is pretty clear that the American people and a number of Senators are saying: Let us not increase taxes until we have cut spending. The problem is that there is no way to do that under President Clinton's budget because the only spending that we will be cutting is defense, and everybody knows that is going to be cut. There are no net cuts anywhere else.

So if you are frustrated about how to delay the tax increases until you get real cuts in domestic programs, you cannot even delay the taxes under that budget because there are no net domestic cuts.

So what we have done is accept the challenge of the American people that before any new taxes are requested from them, we truly get the expenditures of the Federal Government under control. I call to everyone's attention that even under our proposal, which gets us more deficit reduction in 1998, $40 billion—$40 billion more than the President's proposals and we do that with no new taxes. There is still a $169 billion deficit left in 1988 under our plan.

Under the President's proposal with all the new taxes, there is still a $216 billion deficit in 1998. So if the American people had been kind of suspicious that they are going to pay all these new taxes and not get the deficit under control, they are right.

What we decided is we would give the Senate an opportunity to truly restrain the expenditures of our Government, cut expenditures and do that, and finalize it. Then, if somebody wants to look at taxes because they think we ought to do better than a $169 billion deficit in 5 years, at least the American people would absolutely know that we have cut, and cut permanently, the growing deficit.

How do we do that? I am going to try to be quick.

I notice some are wondering what do we do with immunization? Essentially, we increase immunization and WIC by $500 million. If you want to be technical, the last budget—the one that is before us now—only had $197 million available for WIC. It is not anywhere close to what the President had.

Having said that, we are going to drop all the other President's add-ons. This will make it clear to the American people that the President intended to spend more money while he is taxing. He called it an investment. We just call it spending. We are going to eliminate his entire tax proposal. As I said, we are not going to do any taxes until we have cut spending and put spending on a path that is going downward.

We are going to eliminate the user fees from reconciliation and let the committees decide where they want to do those and how much, but not under the gun of deficit reduction.

In addition, we are going to accept all of the President's mandatory and discretionary cuts both in domestic and military. We propose to put $20 billion, not a huge amount, but something, back in defense. Among our worries on defense are we know you are going to lose more jobs than you ever pick up under anyone's proposal if you cut defense rapidly as proposed by the President.

Then we come to an exciting proposal that we believe sooner or later the Senate of the United States, Congress, and the President, will say we are going to adopt. Let me talk about the mandatory expenditures of our national Government without Social Security.

For anybody who is interested, this chart on health care and deficit is found in the President's February vision statement. The green line is what the President hopes we will save when we reform Medicare and Medicaid. This red line is the budget deficits under the President's proposal. But when you are finished with health reform, the President in his proposal says we are going to then cut health care and bring it down so that you have $118 billion in additional mandatory spending restraint because of health reform.

Our proposal says put a cap on Medicare and Medicaid, create deficit tar-

gets with enforcement across the board and establish discretionary spending caps for defense and nondefense. When we put our cap on, we only cap Medicare and Medicaid, and we say to those programs, here is what you can do with them: You can permit them to grow in 1994 by 9.6 percent; in 1995, by 10.7 percent; in 1996, by 10.4 percent. That is established by putting on a cap that is based on growth for the consumer price index plus demographics. The cap accommodates the new people added to these programs, plus 4 full percent growth.

Everybody should know that we are going to do it exactly the same way the President proposes to do it, because in his budget proposal, a Vision of Change for America, he says when we reform health care, we are going to save that amount of money, $118 billion. We only ask for $93 billion of that in our cap proposal. So we think we should right now send a signal to the health care reformers that we believe the President is right. And we ought to send a signal to them right now that the caps are in place so they can measure reform against this new quality performance approach which will permit spending to increase dramatically, but not as dramatically as it is currently projected to grow.

We do not cut anything. We just slow down the growth of the program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator he has spoken for 7 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I will take 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, it is obvious to this Senator that the President has boasted about being the first President in history who is going to cut the deficit and invest in America, invest in our future. I think it is obvious now that what we have is a tax plan that is so big that it is the only real deficit reduction. The taxes increase also allow you to spend money on investments, excepting you are using the taxpayers' dollars to let Government grow on, and calling that an investment.

I expected that because I think our President has found that if you call spending an investment, as he said in 1988, if you call spending an investment, the people are more apt to buy a tax. That is the whole premise.

We are not going to go through all these so-called investments, but frankly, they are just new spending programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has spoken for a minute.

Mr. DOMENICI. Thirty seconds, and I will not speak again.

So we are very clearly sending the American people the right approach. We will stand on this, and if it is implemented, we believe we will have a real deficit-reduction plan.

I yield to Senator SLADE GORTON for 3 minutes, and then, thereafter, 3 minutes to Senator MCCAIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, in his State of the Union Address, our eloquent and compelling President spoke of an opportunity to create in the United States a growth in jobs and in economic opportunity while at the same time we reduce the budget deficit which is a burden on all Americans, present and future. He devised the budget which is now before us, as a way in which to accomplish both of those goals.

The American people overwhelmingly agreed and continue to agree with those Presidential goals. The American people desperately and correctly wish this President, who after all is the only President, to succeed. They are, therefore, still reluctant to believe, even as more and more of them have come to believe, that this budget will, in fact, accomplish neither goal.

We have no record of increased taxes increasing productivity and job opportunities and economic growth. We have no indication, even using his own figures, that this budget will permanently reduce the deficit which so greatly plagues us.

We know that our history and that of all other free countries is that every increase in taxes is inevitably followed by an increase in spending, and that the only way to limit spending on the part of Government is to limit the tax revenues which it receives.

As a consequence, we are faced with a budget which is a failure on its own terms, and an even greater failure inevitably by the results of our economic activity. This alternative, offering greater budget deficit reduction without an increase in taxes, is truly the budget of opportunities for Americans, a reduction in their budget deficit and a return to the prosperity which all of us so greatly desire and for which all of us aim.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arizona for 3 minutes.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Chair.

I wish to make one salient point to start that really crystallizes what this debate is all about. The Federal Government will spend more than $8 trillion during the next 5 years under the President's plan. However, his proposal will cut domestic programs by just $7 billion during that time. Simply stated, President Clinton is proposing to cut Federal spending by less than one-tenth of 1 percent.

Mr. President, I happened to be listening to the news on the radio this morning while I was riding into work and heard the Presiding Officer make a comment, and that was—I believe I paraphrase it correctly—the American people understand that in order to bring the deficit under control we have to have increases in revenues.

Mr. President, I would just point out that in the last 10 years, five times we have told the American people we were going to raise their taxes, in return for which we were going to reduce the deficit. In fact, the result has been exactly the opposite; spending has gone up, taxes went up, and the deficit went up to the point where the national debt is now over $4 trillion.

So to allege that increasing taxes will somehow reduce the deficit flies in the face of the dismal record Congress has had. In fact, Ross Perot said recently that giving the Congress more money to spend—which is what this President's proposal is all about—without a balanced budget amendment and a line-item veto is like giving a friend with a drinking problem a liquor store; they will only spend the money.

Mr. President, if next year at this time the deficit is less than it is today, I will come to this floor and publicly apologize to the President. If it is, then it will fly in the face of the last 10 years when we have promised the American people we will cut spending in return for raising your taxes, when in fact the opposite has been true and the debt is now well over $4 trillion.

Mr. President, I wish to discuss one aspect of this proposal that is important to me because of my background, and that is what we are going to do to Federal employees and the men and women in the military, most of whom earn less than $30,000 a year. It is an issue that has not been talked about. It is something that needs to be talked about. These are the men and women who served in sacrifice to their country and we show our thanks by freezing their pay. They have already experienced over the last 10 years as much as a 10- to 11-percent decrease in real salary because of the failure of their pay raises to keep up with the cost of living.

Mr. President, most of the men and women in the military are enlisted and make less than $20,000 a year, and we are going to freeze their pay. I say that is unconscionable. I think it is unacceptable. I hope my colleagues will vote in favor of the amendment that I will have which lifts the freeze on Federal employees and military pay proposed by President Clinton, and which will restore their fiscal year 1994 and future pay raises, as well as locality pay, to levels authorized under current law.

Mr. President, the American people do not think we need more spending. The American people do not think we need more taxes, especially to pay for more Government spending. The American people want us to cut spending and leave their taxes alone.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REID). The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, I rise in support of Senator DOLE's amendment to cut the deficit by cutting spending, the only way you are going to cut it, not by raising taxes. The choice before the Senate is simple. You either vote for change by passing the Dole amendment or you vote for a report of the 1990 budget agreement by voting for the Clinton tax increase.

The Clinton budget repeats the 1990 deal which raised taxes on the American people in the name of deficit reduction. We all know what happened. We got the tax increase, the deficit only went higher, and we extended the recession.

Mr. Clinton's budget raises taxes $295 billion, the largest increase in history. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New York, and chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator MOYNIHAN, himself has conceded that the Clinton tax increase is the largest tax increase in our history. Instead of cutting spending, the Clinton budget also increases domestic spending $124 billion on top of $245 billion in spending increases already built into the budget.

Congress has balanced the budget one time in 32 years, but in 28 out of those 32 years Congress has increased taxes, usually in the name of reducing the deficit. None of these tax increases has reduced the deficit. Now the President wants to increase taxes again. Increasing taxes never reduces the deficit. Increasing taxes gives Congress the authority to use the increase for leverage for increased borrowing and spending.

What makes anyone think that the 29th tax increase is going to do any better job of reducing the deficit than the failed 28 before it? I do not believe it, and the American people do not believe it. There is no change in the Clinton budget. It is more of the same—more taxes, more spending, all cloaked in the rhetoric of change.

The Dole amendment represents true change, a freeze on domestic discretionary spending—for the first time ever, a reasonable limit on the growth rate of mandatory spending. No tax increase. Social Security is protected. If we pass the Clinton budget, the President's own figures show the deficit will be increasing after 5 years even with the largest tax increase in the history of the country.

If we control spending with the Dole budget, we will have a lower deficit in 5 years and no tax increase.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. I ask 1 more minute.

Mr. DOMENICI. I cannot give the Senator 1 more minute.

I will give the Senator half a minute.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. The Dole budget is real because the deficit reduction targets will be enforced with across-the-board cuts if Congress tries to weasel out of spending cuts in future years.

There has been a lot of talk about fairness from the other side of the aisle about cutting, but when we put a $500 tax on the average family with the Btu tax, that is the most unfair tax that can be levied on anybody. The poor people pay more of it.

Raising taxes is not fair. Raising taxes costs jobs. It is common sense to cut spending, because Government cannot spend us rich.

I came to Washington to change things by cutting spending, so I plan to vote for the Dole amendment. I ask unanimous consent that a study by Paul Craig Roberts entitled "Now It's Blind Side Economics: The Clinton Plan," be printed in the RECORD.

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

[The Institute for Political Economy, March 1993]

NOW IT'S BLIND SIDE ECONOMICS: THE CLINTON PLAN

(By Paul Craig Roberts)

President Bill Clinton's budget plan neither reduces the budget deficit nor provides a stimulus to the economy. Moreover, the economic rationale for the plan is unknown and has not been explained. The tax increases (primarily on personal and corporate income and on energy) are substantial larger than the "fiscal stimulus" provided by the plan. If evaluated in terms of the Keynesian theory, the plan is contractionary. A supply-side evaluation leads to the same conclusion. The higher personal and corporate income tax rates would raise the cost of capital more than the limited investment incentives would lower it. The overall effect would be less after-tax earnings and a supply-side contraction of the economy. My conclusion is that the claims being made for the plan are propagandistic and not real.

A growing national debt: Figures published in President Clinton's budget plan, "A Vision of Change for America," which was released on February 17, 1993, show that the new president is headed for a redink record. According to the plan, $916 billion will be added to the national debt over the next four years. That is $183 billion more than Reagan's cumulative first-term deficit and $238 billion more than Reagan's second-term deficit. Clinton's plan is an astonishing failure, because it is going to add more to the national debt by raising taxes and cutting defense spending than Reagan did by cutting tax rates and raising defense expenditures. If Clinton's plan works as claimed, it will add five and one-half years of Reagan deficits to the national debt in only four years. Obviously, this is not deficit reduction.

There are no net spending cuts in the budget plan. The plan creates an illusion of reduced expenditures by counting user fees, higher taxes on Social Security income, and more price controls on doctors and hospitals serving Medicare patients as spending cuts.

A contractionary policy: On March 3, 1993, the Republican Study Committee on the U.S. House of Representatives released its analysis of Clinton's plan showing that the net effect was a $253 billion tax increase over the 1994-1997 period. From both the demand-side and supply-side economic perspectives, tax increases stifle economic activity. Moreover, the broad-based energy tax will raise production costs throughout the economy. Energy-intensive industries such as the airline companies which are already struggling, will be especially hurt and so, in turn, will the aircraft manufacturers.

The higher energy costs will both squeeze profits and raise prices. Consequently, the economy could falter while inflation indices rose, causing confusion at the Federal Reserve about the appropriate monetary policy.

If the economy contracts as a result of the plan's increased taxation of consumption and investment the cumulative budget deficit will be much larger than the $916 billion that the plan projects. The combination of an aborted economic recovery with Clinton's new spending initiatives could mean a very large budget deficit.

Clinton's plan is an unusual one for Democrats to offer. Traditionally, Democrats have stressed the link between strong consumption and economic growth. Formerly they argued that "the reason businesses invest is that people buy." Tax increases and deficit reduction were regarded as counter-productive measures that would constrict consumption and investment and cause a downward spiral and mounting unemployment.

Today Democrats sound like Republicans of 60 years ago. They argue that higher taxes will help the economy by reducing the deficit and lowering interest rates. They assume without offering theory or evidence that the stimulus from lower interest rates will more than offset the contraction from the higher taxes, leading to an increase in output. They claim that a recent drop in long-term interest rates is the bond market's endorsement of their budget plan. However, they have not explained how adding almost $1 trillion to the national debt during the next four years causes borrowing costs to fall! It seems more likely that interest rates fell because the bond market sees a recession in Clinton's plan.

Among Clinton's top advisers there are many advocates of "industrial policy". Renewed recession before there is a complete recovery would result in more job layoffs and endanger some large corporations. It would create an environment in which a new hero—Industrial Policy—can save jobs and shareholders' equity and prevent the "deindustrialization of America." Once jobs are saved with subsidies, trade protection would follow. If Clintonomics is seriously pursued, it will lead to the break-up of the free-trade system.

Clintonomics seems to be primarily an emotional or psychological response to Ronald Reagan, who stressed that government was the problem and not the solution. This offended American liberals, who associate the growth of government with moral progress. They assume that all unmet needs are in the public sector where there are many claims on the taxpayers' money. The incoherence of Clinton's economic program is, perhaps, best understood as a dogmatic reassertion of the moral primacy of big government.

Higher taxes, higher deficits: Clinton says that his policy represents change. In fact, it is modeled on George Bush's 1990 budget plan. If Clinton's plan is enacted, it will be the fifth repetition of the tax-hike approach to deficit reduction that failed in 1981, 1982,

1984, and 1990 (along with smaller tax increases along the way).

A review of the previous efforts to reduce deficits with taxes shows the failure of this approach. In 1981, budget director David Stockman convinced President Reagan that scaling back the personal income tax rate reductions from 30 percent to 25 percent and delaying their implementation until the second half of his term would permit a balanced budget in 1984. Stockman got his way. Consequently, fiscal policy provided no stimulus to offset Federal Reserve chairman Paul Volcker's independent recessionary monetary policy during 1981–82. The economy fell into recession, and the deficit estimate for 1984 jumped from $0 to $128 billion.

The Reagan Administration responded to the fiasco of its first deficit-reduction program with a second deficit-reduction program. This time Stockman promised that the 1982 Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act (TEFRA), which took back most of the prior year's tax reduction for business, would reduce the deficit to a mere $59 billion by 1987. TEFRA was enacted to much fanfare, but by December of 1982 Stockman's estimate of the $229 billion. The $59 billion deficit promised for 1987 had become $280 billion.

Other tax increases followed. The 5 cents a gallon gasoline tax and the 1983 Social Security Amendments were supposed to raise $118 billion over a multi-year period. However, no headway was made on the deficit. In 1984 taxes were raised again. The Deficit Reduction Act of 1984 (DEFRA) took back the remainder of the business tax cut and was supposed to raise $100 billion, but the deficit was unfazed.

None of this accumulated failure made any impression on Richard Darman when he occupied the Office of Management and Budget under President Bush. Darman forecast massive deficits unless President Bush broke his "no new taxes" pledge and signed on to a $165 billion tax hike. Bush gave in, and an ecstatic Darman made his budget deal with congressional Democrats. The budget for FY 1992 (issued early in 1991) projected a balanced budget in 1995 and a $20 billion surplus in 1996. Here it is 1993, and Clinton projects $300 billion deficits for these years unless he gets his tax increase.

The way out: It is irresponsible for the Clinton Administration to follow a course so thoroughly marked with failure. If $612 billion of tax increases has not reduced the deficit, Clinton's tax hike won't either. There has to be another way, and there is: either a budget freeze or a milder policy of permitting federal spending to grow, but by less than the annual increase in revenues that economic growth produces.

In 1987 Reagan practically froze the budget. That year federal spending increased only $13.6 billion compared to $44 billion in 1986 and $95 billion in 1985. As a result of this near-freeze, most of the $85 billion revenue growth that the economy produced that year went to deficit reduction. The budget deficit fell from $221 billion to $150 billion—a decline of one-third—in one year. If Reagan had repeated this feat a second year, he would have rid his record of the deficit issue. Instead, with the 1988 presidential election approaching, spending resumed, rising by $60 billion and absorbing that year's revenue growth.

From 1985 to 1989, federal tax revenue growth averaged $64 billion annually. If this revenue growth is projected into the future, a three-year budget freeze would reduce the annual deficit by $192 billion, which would more or less solve the problem. Three factors make it practical to freeze the overall spending level: the vast room for maneuver within a $1.5 trillion budget, documented waste, fraud, and abuse, and declining defense expenditures.

Huge budget offers room for maneuver: If the budget of the U.S. government were a country, it would be the fourth largest economy in the world. The federal budget is equal in size to the combined Gross Domestic Product of Canada and Latin America. The U.S. government spends every year more than the entire population of Great Britain or Italy—the fifth and sixth largest economies—can produce.

Every year in these economies, all sorts of adjustments take place. Investment flows shift, employment patterns change, and resources are reallocated while some industries grow and others shrink. In Mexico, Argentina, and Russia, privatizations are under way involving large sums of money and large numbers of people. It is preposterous to think that reallocations to meet pressing needs are not possible within a budget that is two to three times larger than the Canadian economy and about six times larger than the Mexican economy.

During recessions, the private sector gets by with less income than it had the year before. For example, in 1974 and 1975 the real GDP of the U.S. was less than in 1973, in 1980 it was less than in 1979, and in 1982 it was less than in 1981. During the Great Depression things were much worse for much longer. In 1933, for example, the real Gross National Product was 30 percent less than in 1929.

If the private sector can endure declines in income, the government can go two or three years without a raise. With economic growth producing about $65 billion in new tax revenues every year, a three-year overall budget freeze would bring revenues in line with spending. (A variant of this plan would be a shorter freeze followed by several years of holding the growth in spending below the normal growth in revenues.)

Responsible organizations, such as Citizens Against Government Waste, document $167 billion in waste, fraud and abuse in the annual federal budget—a sum two to three times as large as the annual growth in Social Security and Medicare entitlements and interest on the debt. The General Accounting Office agrees that large sums are wasted but doesn't know the precise amount.

To put this estimate of waste, fraud, and abuse in the federal budget in perspective, it is equal to the Gross Domestic Product of black Africa and is as large as the combined GDP of Colombia, Venezuela, Chile and Peru. The federal government wastes every year four to five times more than Nigeria produces and 22 times more than Kenya produces.

Even our state and city budgets are gigantic. New York City's budget is approaching $30 billion—a figure as large as the GDP of Chile. New York State's budget is larger than the GDP of oil-rich Venezuela. California's budget is equal in size to the national income of Argentina or South Africa. In the aggregate, state and local government spending totals approximately $1 trillion. If this sum is added to federal spending, total government spending in the U.S. is approaching the size of the Japanese economy.

New Yorkers do not get equivalent services in exchange for delivering the value of the Chilean economy to the mayor's office. Californians certainly do not receive services from the state equal in value to the national income of Argentina, and U.S. taxpayers get very little in exchange for turning over to Washington income that the entire French nation—including the French government—could live on comfortably. The government services that Americans receive certainly do not approach in value the output of the Japanese economy.

A budget freeze is the only plausible approach to deficit reduction. Once revenues catch up with spending, a simple rule will maintain budget health. Spending can grow every year, but by less than the revenues from the normal growth of the economy. The difference would be used to pay down the national debt. This budget rule would also stop the growth of government relative to the private economy that has been gradually crowding out property rights and the market. In 1900, government at all levels took less than 10 percent of GDP, leaving the private sector with more than 90 percent. By 1990, government claimed 33 percent of GDP, leaving the private sector with only 67 percent—the proportion that was left to medieval serfs.

The plan's prospects: The contradictions in Clinton's plan and its heavy reliance on tax increases have made Congress uneasy. Commentators have pointed out that the tax increases are not limited to the rich but affect retirees and people making only $20,000 per year. The Congressional Budget Office showed that the plan actually fell $55 billion short of its own claims in spending cuts. House Democrats have vowed to add $63 billion in spending cuts to the plan, and Senate Democrats talk about adding $90 billion in spending cuts.

Perhaps some real spending cuts will become part of the plan. However, the talk about additional spending cuts may be a poly designed to make the plan look less unbalanced. The Democrats are embarrassed that Clinton has so dramatically broken his vow not to raise taxes on the middle class. They are also fearful that the plan may hurt the economy, and they have realized that the plan does not reduce the budget deficit below Reagan's. The deficit reduction claimed by the plan is measured against projections of high baseline deficits in the future. No one knows how realistic these projections are or if they have been exaggerated in order to make Clinton's plan appear to be successful. For example, Clinton claims that in 1994 the deficit would be $300 billion, but that his plan will reduce it to $262 billion. He could make his plan look even better if he were to claim that the deficit would be $350 billion without his plan.

If Republicans resist the plan and point out its contradictions, it will lose support. The Democrats have trapped themselves with their anti-Reagan propaganda. They have committed themselves to "reversing the legacy of the Reagan years." Some people misinterpret this goal to be deficit reduction. However, what Clinton means is higher taxes and higher spending. Clinton's plan calls for the federal government to spend $9.6 trillion during the years 1993–1998. His smallest annual budget is $1.475 trillion compared to Reagan's largest budget of $1.064 trillion.

Modern economic studies show that federal spending is a drag on the economy, and taxes certainly are. By expanding government relative to the private economy, Clinton is going in a different direction from the rest of the world, which is trying to recover from the socialist excesses of the 20th century. If Clinton does not get in step with anti-government reforms elsewhere, the United States will become a reactionary force in world affairs.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader has presented an alternative here this afternoon to the President's economic plan. Frankly, we have not had time to study the alternative. It was presented to us almost contemporaneously with the introduction of the amendment on the floor. But as you can see, this is a one-page document which is offered as a substitute for President Clinton's "Vision for Change in America."

As I say, we only received it less than an hour ago, but one thing is clear, Mr. President. This alternative is no substitute for President Clinton's bold and far-reaching program, not only of deficit reduction but also of economic growth.

My friends on the other side of the aisle would have you believe that this is a genuine, bona fide, legislative alternative. But I say that is not the case. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are simply trying to sell the same old snake oil that they have been trying to sell, and with some success, for the past 12 years—the illusion of budgetary restraint without any specific policy cuts, all smoke and mirrors. It is all formulas, freezes, caps, all the same tired litany. But when you blow all the foam off of it, what you find is precisely why the American people said in November, we have had enough. It is time for a change.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield for a question at that point on my time?

Mr. SASSER. If the Senator will let me—I did not interrupt the Senator.

Mr. DOMENICI. Of course.

Mr. SASSER. I want to complete my remarks.

Let us scratch this Dole amendment a little bit and see what is under it.

I have the highest regard for the minority leader. He knows I have the greatest respect for him. We have worked together almost 17 years now. But when you look at his amendment, what do you find? Does it contain any new ideas? None. Nothing new. The same, tired, old formulas we have seen year after year after year; the same, tired, worn-out, discredited budgetary proposals that quadrupled the national debt of this country in 12 years.

I say to my friends from the other side of the aisle, some are talking about what the sad state of affairs things are in. Who got us in that sad state of affairs? It took this country 200 years to build up a national debt of less than $1 trillion. It took the Presidents, three Presidents, three terms—two Reagan terms, one Bush term—to quadruple the national debt that it took us 200 years to build up for.

So are there any new ideas here? None. Is there anything positive, constructive? Well, they did, Mr. President, adopt President Clinton's proposal with regard to childhood immunization of $200 million. I want to congratulate them for adopting the President's proposal in that regard.

But when you get beyond that, is there anything different from the empty promises that left this country at the doorstep of economic ruin? You tell me. Just look at what is at the heart of this alternative amendment—entitlement caps. How many times have we been down the road of entitlement caps? We know what entitlement caps mean. It is a way of dodging the tough decisions of deciding what to do about the exploding Medicare and Medicaid costs, Mr. President. That is where 85 percent of the growth in entitlements is. When you add on Social Security, that is where 95 percent of the growth in entitlements is.

But how do they deal with this problem?

Well, we are just going to stuff a cap on top of it, and walk off and leave it; say we are going to pay no more, no less. You know what that means. It means that as health care costs continue to grow, more of the burden of paying for it is pushed off on the elderly under Medicare.

Many of our new colleagues here on the other side were—we are pleased to have them here; fine people. But they were talking about what they saw as they campaigned across their States. I wonder if any of them had any Medicare recipients come up to them and say, Mr. Candidate, would you please put a cap on Medicare so the Government will pay less Medicare expense, and I will have to pay more? I want to pay more of my own cost of Medicare. I daresay that very few people told them that.

What else do we have in here? Preservation of the tax breaks for the wealthiest among us. Somehow our friends on the other side of the aisle always put that right at the forefront. That is what they will fight to the last ditch for, preserving the tax breaks for the wealthy that were at the heart of the Reagan supply-side program in the 1980's.

After 12 years of neglecting the problems of this country, 12 years of failing to invest adequately in the education of our young people, 12 years of experiencing exploding criminality across the cities of this country—now spreading into the rural areas—12 years of seeing the health care system deteriorate to the point that now we have 37 million people who are working, and most of them do not have any health care coverage.

What is the response of our friends on the other side of the aisle with their alternative to the Clinton economic plan? They say, let us put a freeze on education. Let us put a freeze on funds for crime prevention and criminal justice. Let us put a cap, in essence a freeze, plus a little bit of growth for inflation, on health care. In other words, everything the American people want and voted for in November, they want to shove it into the deep freeze and walk off and leave it.

Mr. President, entitlement caps are just another name for political duck and cover. The critics of the plan given to us by the distinguished President of the United States—these critics do not want to be specific. They do not want to take out a blue pencil and cut the programs as the President did. He sat down there with his Director of Office of Management and Budget, his Cabinet, leading experts from around the country, some of the Members of this body, day after day, week after week, night after night, weekend after weekend, going over this budget and making the tough choices piece by piece by piece.

This President took out the blue pencil, and he cut programs. But our friends on the other side of the aisle have not done that. They do not want their fingerprints on the budget. I do not think they want anybody's fingerprints on it.

The entitlement caps under this amendment would create great mischief; as I said earlier, it would harm some of our neediest and frailest senior citizens.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SASSER. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. SARBANES. I think the Senator is making a very important point when he says this amendment harms some of our neediest citizens. What happens is you get the concept up to such a level of generality that people do not understand what is really being done. They say we are going to put on an entitlement cap. Once you start working through the proposal, you realize that means you are going to cap Medicare and Medicaid spending.

Mr. SASSER. That is right.

Mr. SARBANES. The President wants to do health care reform because the costs of medical care are significantly outrunning the consumer price index. He wants to try to address that problem. That is the rational way to try to do it because he is talking about doing it in a context in which you are going to have universal health care coverage.

But what this proposal will mean, when it works its way down, is that senior citizens, and the poor, are going to need health care and are not going to be able to get it. Make no mistake about it. That is what entitlement cap means, once you have worked all the way through it, especially in the dimensions which they are talking about in this proposal.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield on that point, what we are seeing now are doctors and physicians across this country who are refusing to take Medicare patients, because they think Medicare does not pay enough by way of compensation.

We are seeing hospitals that refuse to take Medicare patients and Medicaid patients.

And what the distinguished Senator from Maryland is saying is, if these entitlement caps go into place, you are going to see more and more doctors saying: We are not taking any Medicare patients here, because Medicare is not paying enough. More and more hospitals are going to say: No Medicare patients here, no Medicaid patients here; we want the patients that have Blue Cross/Blue Shield, high option, or we want the wealthy patients, and the old and the poor need not apply.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I have a college roommate who is a pediatrician in a small town of about 40,000 people. He is the only pediatrician in that town who will take the Medicaid payment. Under Medicaid, you are required, if you render certain services, to take the standard Medicaid fee. All of the other doctors have opted out of it, because they do not make any money out of it.

This dear friend of mine does not make any money out of it either, but he feels that someone has to serve this population, and he is prepared to try to do it. He actually ends up putting in very, very long hours because there is no one else in town. He and his son are the only two in town prepared to serve people on Medicaid. They practice together.

Now the entitlement cap is going to cut further, and my friend's experience is going to repeat itself in communities all across the country. You say "cap entitlements." What does it mean in real life, at the grassroots level? What does that mean? What does that represent? We know what it represents. It means people who need medical care are not going to get it. What are you going to do with them?

Mr. SASSER. I think the Senator from Maryland raises an excellent point, Mr. President. I am not alone in my disdain for entitlement caps. Looking at it from a budgeteer's standpoint, they offer the illusion of large savings in Federal spending, but they purposely fail to specify where the cuts would fall.

Let me tell you what Dr. Alan Greenspan, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, appointed by Ronald Reagan——

Mr. SARBANES. And reappointed by George Bush.

Mr. SASSER. The Senator is quite correct.

Here is what Dr. Greenspan had to say before the Senate Budget Committees about entitlement caps when he was asked about them:

"Entitlement caps are wholly noncreditable" to the markets.

What did Dr. Robert Reischauer, the Director of the nonpartisan, bipartisan, highly respected Congressional Budget Office have to say about entitlement caps? He said:

They are, in a sense, a procedural promise to do something in the future, and a threat that if something isn't done, the sky will fall. And these have not been very successful in the past.

So any way you look at entitlement caps, from the point of view of the elderly Medicare beneficiaries, who will either have to pay significantly more for their health care—and by the way, did you know that Medicare recipients today are paying more for health care than they did prior to the inception of Medicare? I just learned that fact the other day. And what these entitlement caps will do, they will simply transfer more of the costs, health care costs, to the old. And it will mean for the poor: Well, you are out of luck. We are going to treat you like they treat them in Nicaragua, or El Salvador, or Guatemala. You just do not get any health care. You are out of luck.

Mr. President, the savings from an entitlement cap are far from magic. They are difficult to achieve. We have seen caps offered here for years. Mr. Richard Darman, President Bush's Director of the Office of Management and Budget, offered entitlement caps many, many times, but they came to naught.

Mr. President, the problem is not entitlements. The problem is health care costs, I say to my colleagues. If you backed Medicare and Medicaid out of the entitlements we would all be saying: Look around, entitlements are making us money. This year, Social Security will have between a $60 billion and $70 billion surplus. It is Medicare and Medicaid and health care costs that are driving the entitlement deficit.

So what do you do? You approach this problem precisely the way the President is approaching it. He is working at this very moment, and his administration is working at this very moment, and coming up with a comprehensive plan to deal with the health care crisis in this country, including health care costs controls.

That is the way you deal with the problem of Medicare and Medicaid. You deal with health care costs, not by simply putting a cap on it, and when the costs flow out around that cap, tell the old folks: You know, it is your tough luck; you have to pay for it.

Comprehensive health care reform is the answer to the entitlement problem.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time remaining is 42 minutes.

Mr. SASSER. Just a moment or two, and I want to defer to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

It is interesting to me, in looking at the plan that has been brought forward here by our friends on the Republican side of the aisle, that they place a freeze on domestic discretionary spending. We are going to freeze education. We are going to freeze the criminal justice programs. We are going to freeze the job training programs. We are going to freeze the people programs across the board, which really amounts to a cut. And these are the programs that have really taken it on the chin during the past 12 years.

But where do they add money, Mr. President? Well, you guessed it: $20 billion more for the military. President Clinton is proposing spending $1.316 trillion over the next 5 years for the military of the United States of America. But that is not enough for our friends across the aisle. The military has to have $20 billion more.

Let us put this in perspective. President Clinton proposes to spend, in 1994, $277 billion for the military of this country. Bear in mind, $277 billion, after the Soviet Union has collapsed. Our chief adversary is no more. We are the sole remaining superpower on the face of the Earth. We are going to still spend $277 billion for military hardware, and a whole host of things, such as building new aircraft carriers, new airplanes, B–2 bombers, you name it.

Historically, what did we spend for the military? In 1975, under the Nixon-Ford administration, we spent $232 billion in constant dollars—I am not comparing apples and oranges; we are talking about constant dollars here—$232 billion in constant 1994 dollars in 1975, and $277 billion in constant dollars in 1994.

The question comes: Why should we be spending $45 billion more on the military in 1994 than we did in 1975, when Brezhnev reigned supreme in the Kremlin, and they stood on top of Lenin's tomb every May Day and watched the power of the Soviet military machine parade past? That is not there anymore.

But even $277 billion is not enough for our friends across the aisle. They want to freeze investment in the United States, but add $20 billion to the military industrial complex. Strange priorities, Mr. President, strange priorities indeed.

I do not want to keep my friend from South Carolina waiting. He was here earlier today.

As my colleagues know, he is the chairman emeritus of the Senate Budget Committee and now the chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee. He is knowledgeable and learned in matters of the budget. I yield to him such time as he may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has 37 minutes remaining and the Senator from New Mexico 15½ minutes.

The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished chairman.

With the Senator from Tennessee's handling of the budget, it is a compliment. For several years, considering what we have been doing, it would have

been a dubious distinction to be known as emeritus chairman.

But in any event, I think the distinguished chairman is right on target. We said the other day in the morning of the debate that under this present budget that we are about to pass—I am convinced we will pass it here at 12 o'clock tomorrow—it is important what happens on defense, and I am the Senator who proposed the 5-percent increase in defense expenditures under Jimmy Carter. We got it through the Senate but could not get it through the House. The distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts even voted with me on that. I voted along with President Reagan on his increase in the defense budget, but the truth of the matter is that President Clinton will spend some $200 billion more for defense in his first term than what President Reagan spent for defense in his first term, despite the disappearance of the Soviet threat, other than the threat of attack by nuclear-tipped missiles. There is no marching Red army threatening Europe, and there is no Russian military involvement in Third World countries.

I would like to be able to correct the record of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG] when he said a moment ago that we are going to fund fish farms, white-water rafts, and cemeteries. Those things were removed from the stimulus package in the Senate Appropriations Committee. Let us not get confused.

It has been noted that the budget resolution calls for the largest tax increase in history. The largest tax increase in history is needed to pay the largest bill we ever had in history. We would not need any of these taxes under the Clinton approach if interest costs on the national debt were not eating us alive. Put in Senator ROTH's plan. Put in Senator HOLLINGS' plan. Put in any Senator's plan, and we are still going to have to eat $23 billion in increased interest taxes next year alone. Let us call them taxes.

You know, you can avoid the luxury boat tax. We came back and repealed it. You can avoid the catastrophic health insurance tax. We came back and repealed it.

But the only way to repeal the tax of interest payments is to pay the bill, and that is what anybody coming into Government has the most difficult time doing. The biggest waste that we have ever seen is the $2.4 trillion that we have spent in gross interest costs for no Government at all, just for Government profligacy and waste over the 12-year period, or $1.7 trillion in net interest payments over that 12-year period. Up, up, and away.

So they ignore the waste of interest payments and they offer the same old nostrums of tax and spend like a bunch of political puppets on a string angling for a 20-second sound bite.

Finally, President Clinton put that approach to bed last November. They have not awakened to the point. I really rejoice in a former Governor coming to Washington, having paid the bills down in Arkansas and realizing there is a role for Government. There is a job to be done here.

This is embarrassing to me. At the top of this Dole-Domenici amendment, it says: Government, not the people, should be the first to sacrifice.

Come on. That is just PR nonsense. We are the Government, and we just got elected. We might not want a term limitation, but they tried to limit mine. And we are glad to get back here, and we can call a spade a spade.

Specifically, I am willing to say what the Senators on the other side of the aisle said they do not want to say. I want to say the word "tax."

They said, "There is no record of increased taxes producing growth."

That is absolutely false. If you come from a State like Arkansas or South Carolina, you learn right quickly you are not going to get investment in growth until you pay your bills. So the first duty I had back in the 1950's was to increase taxes to get a AAA credit rating to finance a technical training program, and to go out and solicit new industry for my State. That is the way all State and local government operates, for instance, a city mayor trying to improve the downtown section to get rid of the crime and trying to improve the recreational facilities, the museums, the arts, and everything else, that make your viable city. Governors do the same thing.

Yet we come up here in Washington like political puppets: We tax and spend, tax and spend. That is the whole idea. The only trouble is that crowd on the other side of the aisle for 12 years was using just that slogan to reelect themselves using the Government not for the interest and purposes and opportunities of the people, not for investing in people. They ridiculed the word investment.

President Clinton has come to town and he says, yes, we are going to invest, and I salute him.

Incidentially, let us get right quickly at the budget before my time is up. They do agree. Let the record show they agree with President Clinton's mandatory and discretionary cuts of $241. You would have never gotten those kinds of cuts out of Stockman. You would have never gotten them out of Darman.

But what they do is restore $20 billion in defense, and I take it from the Senator from Arizona he wants to increase the pay for the military, as well. We are not increasing the pay of anyone else.

They pamper anything in uniform, but they ruthlessly freeze domestic discretionary accounts. The freeze of domestic discretionary is totally out of whole cloth, totally unrealistic. They know it. We had about four votes on it, had it even in the Budget Committee, a 5-year freeze on education. No way. We came up here to provide for education, to spend for education, for law enforcement, for Head Start, and for health care.

And as the distinguished Senator from Maryland has just pointed out, it is also absurd to talk about a cap on Medicare. What such a cap says to Americans is you better hurry up and get sick before the first of June because after June 1, if you get sick, we are out of money and you are not going to get Medicare.

Let us get realistic about the whole thing.

Eliminate, they say, highway construction. The highway users and gas purchasers have paid the taxes to build highways. That crowd over there said, "Oh, no, let us use the highway trust fund as a slush fund." That is what we have been doing. No new highways. They call that increased spending. That is simply using the trust fund for its intended purpose.

I want to enact a value-added tax. The only point with which we agree is we are not going to solve the deficit problem—it is too big a problem—with this singular plan here. But with health cost containment here later this year and with additional revenues, we might be able to approach it.

I know my colleague, the former Governor of South Carolina, now the Secretary, went to the Department of Education and he was going to provide for new education programs. The first thing they gave him was a $2 billion bill for the shortfall in Pell grants. They have been using that as a slush fund.

We have been raiding and ravishing the Government in every respect—trust funds, Pell grant funds—anywhere we could find money. Political puppets on a string, 20-second bites, tax and spend. "Reelect me and don't do anything. The Government is the problem." They ought to be ashamed of themselves.

It was John Adams years ago, in the earliest of days of the Republic, who said "a declaration of hostility by a people to a Government produced by themselves and conducted by themselves is an insult."

Well, we just got elected here to do a job. And we know, the southern Governors, how to, by gosh, grow the economics in poor States through increased taxes and by paying the bills.

Ask the Black Caucus, who supported the increase in the sales tax here just a few years ago for the Education Improvement Act in South Carolina. That is the purpose of Government. The purpose is not to use all these trick charts and slogans and symbols just to reelect yourself and do nothing.

That is why the highways are cracked, the bridges are falling, the

education plant is down, and the technology is behind.

In the entire population of the 18- to 24-year-old age group, 73 percent either cannot find a job, they are unemployed, or if they find a job they cannot find one that pays a living wage. That is a condemnation of this 12-year nonsense.

But they all come up with: President Clinton's promises; Clinton's promises. Do not get off that track.

Mr. Clinton did not get elected on any of his promises. He got elected on the promise that President Bush made. And President Bush promised to do nothing, to do absolutely nothing, about the economy; has not done anything in 4 years; neither did Reagan, except just cut back, cut back, cut back, and we are in a position of devastation now.

So President Clinton comes. Yes, he wants to get the Government going and he wants to invest. Yes, he wants to pay for it; that is, taxes, yes. And while investing, he also calls for cuts. At least they agreed to $241 billion in cuts. Yes, he wants to freeze your pay and my pay. Yes, he wants to streamline the Government. Yes, he has taken on, with his wife, the health care problem, and we are moving forward.

But the opposition says over and over again: Just taxes; scare the voter with a 20-second bite.

They do not talk about the reality that the largest tax is Federal interest costs quadrupling, the debt putting us in a downward spiral, where the debt is growing faster than the economy.

When President Bush came to office, he had a $5 trillion economy. When he left, he had $6 trillion. It grew by $1 trillion. But the debt grew from $2.5 trillion, when he came into office, to over $4 trillion, $4.1 trillion, $4.2 trillion.

So the debt is growing faster than the economy itself and we have got to rebuild, as President Clinton wants to do here.

Yes, he wants to invest. But it is not willy-nilly for nothing. He is trying to get us moving and to be responsible legislators up here. But others want to still play the political game: Reelect me; do not do anything; say I voted against all taxes.

Well, I hope we get some more taxes, because the only way we are going to cut spending for interest costs is to increase the regular taxes, like a value-added consumption tax. Mr. President, if we can put that in, maybe we can get on top of this runaway beast of interest costs taxes. Do not call them just interest costs. Call them interest taxes that continue to increase by spending and borrowing and borrowing and spending and raiding and turning trust funds into slush funds.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has 22 minutes remaining and the Senator from New Mexico has 15½ minutes remaining.

Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI. I want to yield 4 minutes to Senator ROTH.

I wish to thank him for the comprehensive deficit package that he introduced. We cannot vote on everyone's package, but his was invaluable in putting ours together. I think a close look at it will show that many of the principles have been incorporated in this. I thank him for that.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. President, this budget substitute represents a defining moment—a time to determine in which direction do we want to see the country move. The President's budget represents higher taxes and bigger Government. Our budget alternative offers a different path—one which will result in real reductions in Government spending and the deficit, without the massive tax increases proposed by the President. Ultimately, my concern rests not only with the size of Government, but the amount of taxes that the Federal Government will absorb from the rest of the economy.

Let there be no mistake, my biggest concern with the President's budget is that it will stifle economic growth and job creation. Just as the economy is showing signs of strength, I am concerned that his budget will hurt growth, not help it. I am concerned that the tax increases in the President's budget, like the tax increases in the 1990 budget agreement, will lead to slower economic growth and a loss of jobs. Mr. President, you cannot tax America into prosperity.

The President's energy tax alone will cost thousands of jobs and lead to higher rates of inflation. This one tax will impact virtually every family, every business, every State and local government—each and every one of us everyday. The complete budget substitute offered today by Senators DOLE, DOMENICI, and myself offers a clear alternative—no tax increases, but real deficit reduction through a reduction in Government spending.

Not only am I concerned that the increased taxes will stifle economic growth and lead to a loss of jobs, I am concerned that the new taxes in the President's budget will simply lead to higher spending. As Budget Director Leon Panetta has admitted, there is no existing mechanism to ensure that increased taxes will go to reduce the deficit. It is impossible under current law to ensure that new taxes will not be spent. Nor does the administration want such a law. In fact, the President's budget calls for more than $160 billion in new spending beyond the increases available to hold most programs harmless for inflation and an increasing number of beneficiaries.

Under the President's budget, the insatiable appetite of the Congress for new spending has been handed a full tray of desserts. Until spending is restrained, the deficit will continue to grow. Some of our colleagues would have you believe that the deficit is due to a lack of Federal revenue. The fact is that revenue to the U.S. Treasury doubled between 1980 and 1990. Unfortunately, spending more than doubled during this period. History demonstrates that for every $1 in tax increases, the Congress spends $1.59. The President's program is clearly leading down this path.

The President challenged us. He said that those who disagree with his proposal should present an alternative. Just last week, I presented an alternative budget which provided $558 billion in deficit reduction, primarily through spending cuts and no tax increases. I am pleased to see that the leadership alternative includes many of the recommendations included in the plan I presented. Like the plan that I proposed, this budget alternative adopts domestic and entitlement spending reductions beyond those proposed by the President. And like my alternative, this plan accomplishes significant deficit reduction without touching Social Security and without any increase in taxes.

If we are truly going to reduce the deficit, we must start by cutting Government spending. Unfortunately, the President's plan fails to achieve that goal. In fact, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the President's budget, on a net basis, would increase nondefense spending in each year of the President's term of office. It would not be until 1998—2 years after the end of this term of office that there are net reductions in nondefense spending.

And we all know what happens when the sugar is presented up front and the sacrifice later—we never get to the hard part—the Congress and the President simply negotiate another budget summit. This alternative budget provides real spending reductions up front. This is what the American people want. This is what the American people deserve.

Because a number of newspapers, including the New York Times and Washington Post, headlined that Fed Chairman Alan Greenspan endorsed the President's budget, I asked him this morning in the Finance Committee whether he endorsed the President's budget. He said he did not endorse any plan, including the President's.

He said any plan relying on tax increases will not solve the deficit problem. Only by addressing spending can we control the deficit, he said.

The Dole-Domenici-Roth budget substitute we are offering presents a clear choice—a choice between bigger Government and higher taxes under the Clinton proposal versus smaller Gov-

ernment and lower taxes. I have heard from the people in Delaware, and to me, the choice is clear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator from Delaware for his kind remarks and very good explanation of where we are and where we are going to be if the Clinton package is adopted.

I yield 3 minutes to Senator NICKLES from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. NICKLES. I wish to compliment the Senator from Delaware for an outstanding statement. I hope people listened to that statement. I would also like to complement the Senator from New Mexico, and Senator DOLE, for putting together what I believe is a very good, thorough, and comprehensive package. It is also a clear contrast. This is about as stark a contrast between two major philosophies and two budgets that we have had since I have been in the Senate—for years.

President Clinton's package is massive. It is a massive tax increase. Senator ROTH referred to the 1990 tax increase. This is much more than the 1990 tax increase and in my opinion will do much more damage to the economy than the 1990 tax increase. It is going to put a lot of people out of work, probably hundreds of thousands of people out of work.

President Clinton's package relies almost exclusively on tax increases. The only spending cuts in his package really are defense cuts. Again, I think he is going to be putting a lot of people out of work with those defense cuts. I think he goes too far and he goes too fast.

If you look at his nondefense cuts, you see he only cuts spending by $7 billion. That is over a 5-year period. Yet he raises taxes by a net of $295 billion, but I will mention his gross is $360 billion in new taxes and additional $18 billion in user fees.

So he relies exclusively on tax increases and cutting defense, while Senator DOLE's budget relies exclusively on cutting spending.

I have heard my colleagues say this is draconian, we cannot afford it. But we are spending over $8.5 trillion in the next 5 years. Surely we can afford to cut spending by an amount of $460 billion.

It is really a question if you think we should be taking money out of taxpayers, as President Clinton's budget does, or we should be taking money away from Government. I think we are spending too much. So this, Senator DOLE's substitute, is an excellent substitute. Some people said we could not and we should not be capping entitlements. I just disagree. The 1990 package did not cap entitlements. Frankly, if we look at the 1990 package, it was not successful in reducing the deficit.

I have heard my colleague from Tennessee say it was primarily Medicare and Medicaid. No question, Medicaid compounded at 29 percent last year and Medicare 13 percent. But the earned income tax credit went up last year by 55 percent; unemployment compensation last year by 47 percent; food stamps last year went up by 20 percent; AFDC went up by 15 percent. We need to cap entitlements. We need to cut spending. That is what this substitute will do.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent a series of Federal spending categories from the CBO be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL SPENDING CATEGORIES

[In billions of nominal dollars]

Year	Outlays	Growth	Percent growth	Percent of GDP
Mandatory (except Social Security):				
Social Security:				
1980	$174.4	.....	.....	6.4
1981	202.7	$28.3	16.2	6.7
1982	218.8	16.1	7.9	6.9
1983	243.1	24.3	11.1	7.1
1984	230.2	(12.9)	−5.3	6.1
1985	263.6	33.4	14.5	6.5
1986	263.2	(.4)	−.2	6.2
1987	265.1	1.9	.7	5.8
1988	277.4	12.3	4.6	5.7
1989	295.8	18.4	6.6	5.6
1990	320.9	25.1	8.5	5.8
1991	367.4	46.5	14.5	6.4
1992	426.1	58.7	16.0	7.2
International:				
1980	12.8	.....	.....	.5
1981	13.6	.8	6.2	.4
1982	12.9	(.7)	−5.1	.4
1983	13.6	.7	5.4	.4
1984	16.3	2.7	19.9	.4
1985	17.4	1.1	6.7	.4
1986	17.7	.3	1.7	.4
1987	15.2	(2.5)	−14.1	.3
1988	15.7	.5	3.3	.3
1989	16.6	.9	5.7	.3
1990	19.1	2.5	15.1	.3
1991	19.7	.6	3.1	.3
1992	19.2	(.5)	−2.5	.3
Social Security:				
1980	117.1	.....	.....	4.3
1981	137.9	20.8	17.8	4.6
1982	153.9	16.0	11.6	4.9
1983	168.5	14.6	9.5	4.9
1984	176.1	7.6	4.5	4.7
1985	186.4	10.3	5.8	4.6
1986	196.5	10.1	5.4	4.6
1987	205.1	8.6	4.4	4.5
1988	216.8	11.7	5.7	4.4
1989	230.4	13.6	6.3	4.4
1990	246.5	16.1	7.0	4.5
1991	266.8	20.3	8.2	4.7
1992	285.1	18.3	6.9	4.8
Domestic:				
1980	129.1	.....	.....	4.8
1981	136.5	7.4	5.7	4.5
1982	127.4	(9.1)	−6.7	4.0
1983	130.0	2.6	2.0	3.8
1984	135.3	5.3	4.1	3.6
1985	145.7	10.4	7.7	3.6
1986	147.5	1.8	1.2	3.5
1987	147.2	(.3)	−.2	3.2
1988	158.4	11.2	7.6	3.2
1989	169.0	10.6	6.7	3.2
1990	182.5	13.5	8.0	3.3
1991	195.4	12.9	7.1	3.4
1992	213.9	18.5	9.5	3.6
Defense:				
1980	134.6	.....	.....	5.0
1981	158.0	23.4	17.4	5.2
1982	185.9	27.9	17.7	5.9
1983	209.9	24.0	12.9	6.2
1984	228.0	18.1	8.6	6.0
1985	253.1	25.1	11.0	6.3
1986	273.8	20.7	8.2	6.4
1987	282.5	8.7	3.2	6.2
1988	290.9	8.4	3.0	5.9
1989	304.0	13.1	4.5	5.8
1990	300.1	(3.9)	−1.3	5.4
1991	319.7	19.6	6.5	5.6
1992	304.3	(15.4)	−4.8	5.1
Net interest:				
1980	52.5	.....	.....	1.9
1981	68.8	16.3	31.0	2.3

FEDERAL SPENDING CATEGORIES—Continued

[In billions of nominal dollars]

Year	Outlays	Growth	Percent growth	Percent of GDP
1982	85.0	16.2	23.5	2.7
1983	89.8	4.8	5.6	2.6
1984	111.1	21.3	23.7	2.9
1985	129.5	18.4	16.6	3.2
1986	136.0	6.5	5.0	3.2
1987	138.7	2.7	2.0	3.1
1988	151.8	13.1	9.4	3.1
1989	169.3	17.5	11.5	3.2
1990	184.2	14.9	8.8	3.3
1991	194.5	10.3	5.6	3.4
1992	199.4	4.9	2.5	3.4
Earned income tax credit:				
1980	1.3	.....	.....	0
1981	1.3	0	0	0
1982	1.2	(.1)	−7.7	0
1983	1.2	0	0	0
1984	1.2	0	0	0
1985	1.1	(.1)	−8.3	0
1986	1.4	.3	27.3	0
1987	1.4	0	0	0
1988	2.7	1.3	92.9	.1
1989	4.0	1.3	48.1	.1
1990	4.4	.4	10.0	.1
1991	4.9	.5	11.4	.1
1992	7.6	2.7	55.1	.1
Unemployment compensation:				
1980	16.9	.....	.....	.6
1981	18.3	1.4	8.3	.6
1982	22.2	3.9	21.3	.7
1983	29.7	7.5	33.8	.9
1984	17.0	(12.7)	−42.8	.5
1985	15.8	(1.2)	−7.1	.4
1986	16.1	.3	1.9	.4
1987	15.5	(.6)	−3.7	.3
1988	13.6	(1.9)	−12.3	.3
1989	13.9	.3	2.2	.3
1990	17.5	3.6	25.9	.3
1991	25.1	7.6	43.4	.4
1992	36.9	11.8	47.0	.6
Medicare:				
1980	34.0	.....	.....	1.3
1981	41.3	7.3	21.5	1.4
1982	49.2	7.9	19.1	1.6
1983	55.5	6.3	12.8	1.6
1984	61.0	5.5	9.9	1.6
1985	69.7	8.7	14.3	1.7
1986	74.2	4.5	6.5	1.7
1987	79.9	5.7	7.7	1.8
1988	85.7	5.8	7.3	1.7
1989	94.3	8.6	10.0	1.8
1990	107.4	13.1	13.9	1.9
1991	114.2	6.8	6.3	2.0
1992	129.4	15.2	13.3	2.2
Medicaid:				
1980	14.0	.....	.....	.5
1981	16.8	2.8	20.0	.6
1982	17.4	.6	3.6	.6
1983	19.0	1.6	9.2	.6
1984	20.1	1.1	5.8	.5
1985	22.7	2.6	12.9	.6
1986	25.0	2.3	10.1	.6
1987	27.4	2.4	9.6	.6
1988	30.5	3.1	11.3	.6
1989	34.6	4.1	13.4	.7
1990	41.1	6.5	18.8	.7
1991	52.5	11.4	27.7	.9
1992	67.8	15.3	29.1	1.1
Food stamps:				
1980	9.1	.....	.....	.3
1981	11.3	2.2	24.2	.4
1982	11.0	(.3)	−2.7	.3
1983	11.8	.8	7.3	.3
1984	11.6	(.2)	−1.7	.3
1985	11.7	.1	.9	.3
1986	11.6	(.1)	−.9	.3
1987	11.6	0	0	.3
1988	12.3	.7	6.0	.3
1989	12.8	.5	4.1	.2
1990	15.0	2.2	17.2	.3
1991	18.7	3.7	24.7	.3
1992	22.6	3.9	20.9	.4
Family support (AFDC):				
1980	7.3	.....	.....	.3
1981	8.2	.9	12.3	.3
1982	8.0	(.2)	−2.4	.3
1983	8.4	.4	5.0	.2
1984	8.9	.5	6.0	.2
1985	9.2	.3	3.4	.2
1986	9.9	.7	7.6	.2
1987	10.5	.6	6.1	.2
1988	10.8	.3	2.9	.2
1989	11.2	.4	3.7	.2
1990	12.2	1.0	8.9	.2
1991	13.5	1.3	10.7	.2
1992	15.6	2.1	15.6	.3
Farm price supports:				
1980	2.8	.....	.....	.1
1981	4.0	1.2	42.9	.1
1982	11.7	7.7	192.5	.4
1983	18.9	7.2	61.5	.6
1984	7.3	(11.6)	−61.4	.2
1985	17.7	10.4	142.5	.4
1986	25.8	8.1	45.8	.6
1987	22.4	(3.4)	−13.2	.5

FEDERAL SPENDING CATEGORIES—Continued

[In billions of nominal dollars]

Year	Outlays	Growth	Percent growth	Percent of GDP
1988	12.2	(10.2)	−45.5	.2
1989	10.6	(1.6)	−13.1	.2
1990	6.5	(4.1)	−38.7	.1
1991	10.1	3.6	55.4	.2
1992	9.3	(.8)	−7.9	.2
Federal retirement and disability:				
1980	26.6	.....	.....	1.0
1981	31.2	4.6	17.3	1.0
1982	34.3	3.1	9.9	1.1
1983	36.5	2.2	6.4	1.1
1984	38.0	1.5	4.1	1.0
1985	38.5	.5	1.3	1.0
1986	41.3	2.8	7.3	1.0
1987	43.7	2.4	5.8	1.0
1988	46.8	3.1	7.1	1.0
1989	49.1	2.3	4.9	.9
1990	51.9	2.8	5.7	.9
1991	56.0	4.1	7.9	1.0
1992	58.7	2.7	4.8	1.0
Veterans benefits and services:				
1980	$14.0	.....	.....	0.5
1981	15.4	1.4	10.0	.5
1982	15.8	.4	2.6	.5
1983	15.9	.1	.6	.5
1984	16.0	.1	.6	.4
1985	15.9	(.1)	−.6	.4
1986	15.7	(.2)	−1.3	.4
1987	15.7	0	0	.3
1988	17.6	1.9	12.1	.4
1989	17.7	.1	.6	.3
1990	15.9	(1.8)	−10.2	.3
1991	17.3	1.4	8.8	.3
1992	19.6	2.3	13.3	.3
Other mandatory:				
1980	48.4	.....	.....	1.8
1981	54.9	6.5	13.4	1.8
1982	48.0	(6.9)	−12.6	1.5
1983	46.2	(1.8)	−3.7	1.4
1984	49.1	2.9	6.3	1.3
1985	61.3	12.2	24.8	1.5
1986	42.2	(19.1)	−31.2	1.0
1987	37.0	(5.2)	−12.3	.8
1988	45.2	8.2	22.2	.9
1989	47.6	2.4	5.3	.9
1990	49.0	1.4	2.9	.9
1991	55.1	6.1	12.4	1.0
1992	58.6	3.5	6.4	1.0

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. Who yields time?

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma was stating a moment ago that unemployment compensation benefits went up last year. Of course they did. They went up last year in response to a terrible economy. They went up in response to the longest recession that this country has experienced since the Second World War. That is what this Clinton economic plan is all about: To try to get this economy moving again, to try to take these people off unemployment compensation and put them back into good, well paying jobs.

On the subject of unemployment compensation, that is not just something that is paid out of the Federal Treasury by the taxpayers. There is a trust fund into which employers and working employees pay. That is called the unemployment compensation trust fund. When I last looked, that trust fund had a surplus. Maybe that surplus is depleted now, but it will be built back up later when the economy recovers.

Yes, there is no question about it, more people were on food stamps last year, the last time I looked, than at any time in the history of the United States. One out of every ten Americans, 10 percent of our fellow citizens, on food stamps. And those who operate these food stamp offices tell us they see people applying for food stamps like they have never seen before. These are people who were middle-level managers; people who held well paying jobs, people who worked for some of the blue chip corporations in this country who, because of this recession and the economic policies that this country has pursued for the past 12 years under Presidents of my friend's choice—they have lost their jobs. They are on food stamps. They are drawing unemployment compensation.

That is what the Clinton plan is trying to address. It is trying to put some energy into this economy and into an economic recovery.

How do our friends on the other side respond to that? First, after they have increased defense spending, or military spending, by $20 billion, after they protect the wealthiest taxpayers in the country who benefited greatly from the Reagan tax cuts of 1981—after those two things are done, then they turn around and say we are going to put spending on people here in the United States and initiatives here in the United States—we are going to put them in the cold storage locker.

Do they want to cut the Head Start Program? Even President Bush wanted to fund that at a higher level. All the data indicates if you take these children who are disadvantaged and put them in the Head Start Program they are going to do better academically later on. Rather than ending up on welfare somewhere, or as juvenile delinquents, they have a better chance of ending up as educated, taxpaying citizens of this country who make a contribution.

Do they want to cut President Clinton's summer jobs for needy youth, to get these young people when they come out of school in the summer off the streets and put them in a workplace so they can learn the basic mores and habits and culture of the workplace? Or do they want to leave them on the streets so we will have another long, hot summer and wait for some spark to come, like occurred in Los Angeles, to ignite another national disgrace?

Do they want to cut the Community Policing Program? That is an initiative that is offered by the President in this economic proposal before us. The Community Policing Program will put cops on the beat, walking it. It will get them out of the cars, walking up and down the street, knowing what is going on in the neighborhoods that they are supposed to protect, knowing when something may be out of order, knowing the people who live in that neighborhood. And it is the people knowing they can live free of fear because there is a policeman working that beat now and they can see him or her rather than somebody whizzing by in an automobile at 35 miles an hour, they do not know who they are, and they whiz by maybe once or twice a day.

In the President's program there is something called a Police Corps Program.

This will put 100,000 new, young, college-educated policemen on the streets over the next few years. What the Clinton program does is it says to young people who may have difficulty going to college: If you will agree to serve in a police force of a city which requests your services for a period of years—I forget precisely how many, 3 or 4—then we will help defray your college education under the Police Corps Program. And that means that within 4 years, young people will be coming out of colleges learned in subjects like criminology, psychology, sociology, how deal with the criminal element and the culture that produces them. And these young people will be in these police forces. They will be benefiting the cities where they work and they will be benefiting themselves also because at the termination of the end of their time of service, they will not have enormous college loans to pay off and they will be able to go to college.

Many who study this program say that some of these young people coming out of college who go into police work will find they like it. So over a period of time, you are going to develop a higher caliber of police force all across the country. As the college-educated people stay in and move up through the ranks, you are going to have a more competent police force in city after city.

My friend on the other side say, "H'm, we want to put that in the deep freeze, we want to forget about that."

Is it not interesting, the American people so many times are way ahead of us in Washington, way ahead of those of us who run for elected office? The American people know that things need to change, and they know that if things are going to change, we are all going to have to make a contribution.

The Wall Street Journal and the National Broadcasting Co., now called NBC, I guess, recently took a poll and they asked the respondents in a scientific sample across this country: Do you prefer the economic plan offered by President Clinton, even though it calls for increased taxes? Or do you prefer the plan offered by the Republicans that does not raise taxes?

Sixty-two percent of the American people said give us the Clinton plan, even though there are some increased taxes in it; 30 percent chose the alternative. By over a 2-to-1 margin, they said: We want change and we are willing to make a contribution to try to change this country for the better.

Mr. President, when you boil this budget amendment down, what is really at stake is what the American people want and what this new President wants. They both want a change in the way we do things. The American people have rejected the misguided economic

policies of the past 12 years. They know what got us into this mess. The 1981 tax cut President Reagan foisted on this Congress—and everybody was for it—turned what was a fiscal problem with our budget into a fiscal crisis. The American people want to get that behind them. They want to move on. They want to do something about creating jobs for our people again, good jobs at good wages. They do not want to continue to read these headlines everyday about IBM lays off 30,000; American Airlines lays off 20,000, people being laid off who know they will never ever be recalled to work in these blue chip companies that they once worked for.

Contrast this desire for change, this desire to move forward, this desire to get this economy moving again, this desire to put tax equity back into the tax structure so that the wealthiest among us once again have to pay their fair share, put this desire to do something about the health care crisis, put that altogether and that is the change that they want and they voted for and the change they are willing to make a contribution toward.

But what has the minority offered in response? It wants the status quo. This alternative budget resolution offered by our Republican colleagues maintains the status quo. I say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, if you want to keep on doing the same things we have done for the past 12 years that has quadrupled the national debt in 12 years, that has put 1 out of every 10 Americans on food stamps, that has given us some of the highest unemployment for the longest period of time we have had since the Second World War, that has given us the longest recession we have had since the Second World War, then vote for the status quo. Vote for the plan offered by our Republican colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

But, on the other hand, if you think this country needs to change, if you think we need to do something about creating good paying jobs, if you think we need to do something about competing effectively against our trading partners and trading adversaries around the world, if you think we need to do something about this exploding budget deficit, and if you think we need to do something about dealing with this health care crisis by coming up with a comprehensive health reform program, then vote for this Clinton budget as modified by the Senate Budget Committee.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle are very concerned about the fact that there are revenues or additional taxes in this Clinton proposal. But what they do not acknowledge is that more than 98 percent of the families in this country will have no increase in their income tax rates under the Clinton plan. It is only the top 1.2 percent—at the very top—who make over $200,000 a year who are going to experience the lion's share of these increases. They have to pay almost 65 percent of them.

In fact, more than 73 percent of the revenue increases in this whole Clinton proposal will be borne by families with incomes in excess of $100,000 and their increase will be modest at that level. People in the top 1 percent, and that is a family of four, that have a gross income of more than $333,000 will pay more than 60 percent of all of the new taxes under this Clinton proposal.

So clearly, it establishes once again some measure of tax fairness and some measure of tax equity.

May I inquire of the Chair how much time I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELLSTONE). The Senator has 7 minutes left.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time and yield to my distinguished friend from New Mexico if he wishes to speak.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield up to 6 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Alabama, and I thank him for coming to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon in support of the substitute. Why? Because I have serious reservations about the pending budget resolution and the President's revenue and spending plan upon which it is based.

I have three main reservations about the plan. First, the plan relies, I believe, too heavily on taxes as opposed to spending cuts. The weight of tax increases to cuts is at least 3 to 1—3 to 1, Mr. President, not 2 to 1, not 1 to 1, but 3 to 1 heavily weighted toward taxes.

Second, the plan calls for $124 billion in new discretionary spending—new discretionary spending.

That is a lot of money. I firmly believe that all tax increases should go to deficit reduction rather than to offset new spending. The best investment I believe we can put in our future in this country is a reduction in Government spending and our long-term deficit. That is what we need and that is what I believe most American people are crying out for.

Finally, the plan embodied in this resolution will not result in long-term deficit reduction. We have been there before. In 1998, the deficit will at least begin to increase again, if not before then.

Mr. President, the Clinton plan will no doubt require Congress to ask for more sacrifice in 4 or 5 years, if not sooner. The present resolution buys 4 years of time, putting off judgment day at a price, at a price, Mr. President, of $300 billion.

In contrast to the present resolution before the Senate, the substitute that I support will achieve at least $440 billion in deficit reduction through the same period. But more importantly, it will accomplish this task without raising taxes and will continue to reduce the deficit because it will reel in out-of-control mandatory spending in Medicare and Medicaid. Nearly two-thirds of Federal spending is mandatory in nature. Without significant steps to control such spending, we will not even begin to approach real debt and deficit reduction in this country; $300 billion in new taxes will not get to the heart of our deficit problem.

The substitute amendment which I support will cap Medicare and Medicaid spending under a formula that still allows for fair growth but at a substantially reduced rate. Aside from restoring $20 billion in defense spending, the substitute accepts the Clinton cuts, it drops the new spending, and it freezes domestic discretionary spending.

Such a freeze, Mr. President, will have us $92 billion over the next 5 years. The overwhelming message from my constituents in the form of letters, phone calls, and faxes is cut spending first. Cut spending first, Mr. President. This amendment does exactly that. It does, however, allow for a $500 million increase in funding for WIC and immunization, worthy and I believe successful programs I have always supported

Mr. President, I believe that before our Government can ask for taxes, it must prove it can spend those taxes wisely. To that end, this amendment eliminates $295 billion—$295 billion—in tax increases and $18 billion in user fee increases, yet because of its spending restraint it still creates deficit savings of $440 billion through 1998 and, unlike the other plan, will continue to save money after that period.

Asking for taxes before we look for every option to cut and control spending is not, I believe, what the American people want. I am convinced that it is not the taxpayers' patriotic duty to pay an ever greater amount of their income to a government that has not responsibly managed itself.

Mr. President, only when we restrain spending will we have the credibility to ask for taxes. The present plan, sold under the guise of deficit reduction, runs the risk of further damaging the severely limited credibility this Congress has with the American people.

In 1990, just 3 short years ago, we raised $160 billion in new taxes and are now back 3 years later asking for more. I have no reason, Mr. President, to believe that it will be any different this time around. This amendment, which I support, cuts spending first, does not raise taxes, and makes long-term progress toward deficit reduction rather than putting a finger in the debt dike in the form of the largest tax increase in the history of the American people.

The President's plan, many believe, is long on taxes and short on spending restraint. For this reason, I support the substitute amendment as the credible alternative for deficit reduction and spending restraint without new taxes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, do we have any time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has 2 minutes 7 seconds remaining.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the minority whip, and the 7 seconds also—2 minutes and 7 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority whip is recognized. He has 1 minute 52 seconds.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the Chair. I will speak very quickly. Do not take that 7 seconds off, Mr. President.

I want to thank Senator DOMENICI for what he does. He is a loyal warrior for our side. This is a tough issue that the American people are only just suddenly beginning to figure out. I think they really do believe, silly souls, that the election, to the winner, was about cutting spending and doing something about America run amok, run amok in the area of the entitlements programs. This President can do everything he wants to do and he will not get to first base. This will be a disaster for him. In 18 months, the American people will not be talking disappointment. They will be talking betrayal, because they will see what has happened to them.

New taxes. It will come to pass just about a year from now when they get the bill, April 15, 1994, that they have been truly had. And they thought they were hiring on a President to cut spending. All they got was $265 billion in new spending and never did a thing with the entitlement programs. There is not a soul here, including the Budget Committee chairman and the ranking member, who does not know in their heart and soul that you will never get here messing around with $2 billion here or $5 billion there. You do something with Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. The rest of it is fanciful phantasmagoria. And we know that. Every one of us knows it. So finally you get to an amendment which is almost a laugher in the sense of we are going to do a little bit here, just a little, to stop growth—4 percent, 2 percent. It will not get us there. It is going to continue to grow 8, 12.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 2 minutes 7 seconds.

Mr. SIMPSON. I will take the additional 7 seconds and appeal the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that it be charged against no one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, has leader time been reserved?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I would like to use about 2½ minutes of my leader time and yield the remainder to the distinguished manager on the Republican side, Senator DOMENICI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I want to make one point. I think it has been made a couple of times. I think if the American people understood what is in the Clinton package, I think the American people, by, say, a margin of 70–30 would be opposed to it. If they knew there was $295 billion in tax increases over 5 years—that is net really because it is more than that—net tax increases, and only $7 billion in nondefense spending reductions over 5 years, $7 billion compared to $295 billion in taxes, then another $74 billion in cuts in defense, then $18 billion more in user fees, which in our part of the country is a tax, that is 79 percent of the package is taxes.

We go too far on defense. The last time I looked around the world there were a lot of trouble spots. We are going to be putting—I think the Senator from New Mexico could tell you how many young men and women back on the streets looking for work. It is going to be very difficult.

I think I can say fairly accurately that, if you polled all the people who came through the Capitol today, this building, from all over America, and explained to them, gave them a little fact sheet on what is in the Clinton package, and said, Do you support it or not? I would be prepared to say that they are overwhelmingly against the package, whether you are a Democrat, Republican, or Independent.

The American people want us to cut spending first. In Minnesota, in Arkansas, in Tennessee, in Kansas, in New Mexico, in Idaho, everywhere in America, they do not trust us. They know, if we raise taxes, somebody is going to spend it. That is what this Clinton plan does, $136 billion in new spending. So it seems to me that it will take a while to get the message out. The President is new, he is popular, does a good job, he is a good salesman. The American people want the facts. This budget resolution will pass. Our amendment will be defeated. But we felt we had a responsibility to tell the American people that we have a plan that saves more money without any taxes and it is real spending cuts—real spending cuts.

So I just want to thank all the cosponsors of this amendment. I do not have any illusion we are going to win, because the Democrats have a majority. If they want to tax and spend and tax and spend, they have the votes. But let us not hear this old line about the rich, the rich, the rich. A lot of these rich are men and women out there in business, in subchapter S corporations, in partnerships, in sole proprietorships, creating jobs, and trying to make it work for America. They are called rich under the Clinton plan. They are going to pay a lot more taxes and create a lot less jobs.

So we would like to have a majority vote for our plan. Then I think the American people would see the economy jump up, we would see the Fed take appropriation action, and we could see jobs created in the private sector. For all of the reasons I stated previously, I think it is a good plan. I want to thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for all his efforts in helping us craft this, what I consider to be a very good plan.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I yield myself the remainder of the leader time as he indicated.

Mr. President, my friend Senator SASSER opened his remarks by displaying a very specific summary of the Republican package we handed out as if to indicate that they had a very big package before us with sheaves of paper and we had nothing.

So let us just compare them so everybody knows. This is the entire budget proposal that the Democrats have brought before us to the floor of the Senate. This is ours. As you can see, they are both the same size. We can just go weigh them if you like. But it stands to reason that our amendment has to correct almost everything in their resolution.

For starters, we both have a plan. They are both comprehensive. But they are very, very different in terms of what we choose to do.

I want to make a couple of points real quick. My friend from Tennessee himself suggested that we have had caps before on entitlements and they never worked. He was very careful because, after he said that, he said Director Darman suggested caps. But the truth of the matter is we never adopted caps that are enforceable on the mandatory programs of this country. We propose in our resolution that we do that for the first time, except for Social Security, and that we permit Medicare and Medicaid to grow in the following manner: 9.6 percent in 1994, 10.7 percent in 1995; and 10.4 percent in 1996.

And we got that idea from the President of the United States because in his vision for our country, he said we are never going to get the deficit under

control until we reform health care and save money in health care.

This green line on this chart from the President's plan for getting the deficit under control, and I say to my friend, Senator DOLE, it is nothing more, nothing less than being very, very close to what our caps would require by way of reform. In fact, it is almost identical, $118 billion in savings, and we do not even ask for that much. We ask for $97 billion. So for those people who want to run around and say we are hurting people, I submit the President must have an idea that we are going to get those under control and reduce the deficit by $118 billion. We just want to put it in a formal, binding resolution so that those who are reforming health care will have those targets to move against as they reform the health care system.

My friend, Senator SASSER, has referred to snake oil. I do not know whether he was referring to me or to the Republicans. But let me tell you, if you do not put those caps on, you have a real snake oil budget, especially when you ask the American people to pay $295 billion in new taxes, and you do not bring the budget under control. Without the caps here, they are absolutely right, the deficit is not brought under control.

They believe we really will not cut spending and we will spend their taxes. And I am telling you right now, they do not even have to mistrust us for that. I mean, we can assure them that is going to happen, because without putting non-Social Security entitlements under control in this budget resolution—in an enforceable way, you do not have any significant spending restraint.

Having said that, we then hear that the President has a bold new plan, and that we ought to get out of the way and let the bold new plan take effect because it is going to create jobs, it is going to change America, it is going to get rid of the deficit.

Let me suggest it will change America for the worse in that it will not generate jobs. We will have less. It will not get the deficit under control, but will impose new taxes.

So we think we have a job issue. We think the issue is we will have more taxes and more spending, called investments in our future. Will his plan create or cause more American private sector jobs? I believe it is going to cost jobs.

Let me make two points.

On the marginal tax rates that have been alluded to here, my numbers say that we are going to increase the marginal rates on the American taxpayer by 32 percent and 28 percent. And I might suggest, this increase exceeds the marginal rate increase under Herbert Hoover. He was known for big marginal tax rate increases. This exceeds even that, in terms of a marginal rate increase.

Seventy-five percent of the Americans in the new higher tax brackets are small businesses, who leave their earnings in their business, because that is the way they grow. We are going to say to them, we are increasing the tax on you by 32 or 28 percent, and we take it right out of your retained earnings. What do you think that is going to do to small business for the next three or 4 years? It is going to cost us jobs. That is where American jobs come from, and there is nothing in the Democratic budget proposal that says we are going to cause savings to accrue. It just says we are going to tax you because we think you are rich. The Democratic plan says we are really not aware of the fact, and the voters are not, that it is going to be small business America that pays most of this tax, because of the way we have structured our subchapter S corporations, where they are treated as individuals. They leave their money in their businesses to grow, and we say we do not want you to grow. Take it out and give it to the Government for what we think are new investments, and we know what is better to invest in than you. We are saying that to business people and average Americans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All of the Republicans' time has elapsed.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask for an additional minute.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I have no objection to the distinguished Senator having 1 additional minute, but not off of my time.

Mr. DOMENICI. No, I will speak off of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have a current poll from the United States Association, and it is just a very current one. Let me give you a couple of thoughts. The American people are beginning to understand this budget, and when they do, they will not support it. By a margin of 66 percent to 20, people who initially supported the Clinton plan changed their minds when told that there will be increases in taxes on Social Security benefits. They are not aware of that yet out there in our country.

By a margin of 51 to 41, Americans would vote against the tax hikes included in the Clinton budget. By a margin of 61 to 19½, people who initially support the Clinton plan changed their minds when they were told about the fact that the national debt will actually increase nearly $1.2 trillion over the next 5 years.

Given a choice, proposed alternatives to the Clinton plan, Americans choose alternatives by margins of anywhere from 58 to 23 and 56 to 25.

I hope everybody knows that we have tried our very best to get the message out. I do not know if we succeeded, but when the plan is incorporated into the fiscal policy, I am sure it will show up on the negative side.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS].

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I will yield back any time I do not use. The Senator from New Mexico charged the Senator from Tennessee with calling this plan snake oil. I am disappointed in the Senator from Tennessee, because I think that is a charitable description of it.

I can remember back in 1981 when we got all these painless solutions to the deficit. The debt was a whopping $920 billion, and the whole world was standing on its head saying, "the apocalypse is at hand." The Republicans took over this body—56 Republican Senators—and Ronald Reagan took over the White House, and they said: "We have a simple solution. We are going to cut your tax rates from 70 percent to 50 percent, then to 28 percent double defense spending and balance the budget."

If I had not had a little country native intelligence, having come from a town of 1,000 people in Arkansas, I might have bought into that. You talk about a siren song. That is about as irresistible an offer as I ever heard. The Congressman from Little Rock, RAY THORNTON, I remember his 84-year-old father-in-law saying, "what a dynamite idea. I wonder why nobody ever thought of that before." Well, we have now quadrupled the debt to $4 trillion, so we know why nobody ever thought of that deficit strategy before.

Mr. President, we have the very same people—and they are friends of mine—on the floor of the U.S. Senate this afternoon that we had back in July 1981, telling us that they have this magic, painless solution. It did not make any sense then or now. We now know it was sheer lunacy then. But even the American people, who are entitled to be wrong occasionally, bought into it.

Do you know why we are here working on this economic plan today? It is because we bought into that strategy in 1981 and we brought this deficit and debt disaster, this economic disaster, to this Nation. We have jeopardized the future of my children and my grandchildren, as nothing else in the history of this country has ever done. I can tell you one thing: You can put any light you want on this, but this deficit and debt problem is not going to go away painlessly, as those who offer this amendment would have you believe.

This afternoon, they are saying: You know you do not get prosperity by raising taxes. You know you are not going to bring prosperity to this country and put people back to work by raising taxes. Well, we now know you do not do it by cutting taxes and increasing spending either.

Do you know something? I agree with Justice Brandeis when he said, and it is

not very popular when you say it back home with folks. He said, "Taxes are the price you pay to live in a civilized society." That is exactly what they are. And unless we belly up and start doing what we know we have to do, no matter how painful it may be, we are not going to live in a civilized society.

Do you think I enjoy going home and telling my seniors that I am going to vote to require the top 22 percent of them to pay income taxes on 85 percent of their Social Security benefits instead of 50 percent?

I am reluctant to say this publicly, but I urged the President to make the top marginal rate 40 percent instead of 36 percent. I told him he would have to compromise and to ask for more than he had to have. I also said, "Mr. President, you are not just this country's last best hope; you are this country's last hope. We are either going to get deficit reduction done in the next 4 years, or it is going to be too late. I do not like to be a prophet of doom, but I must say I do not know what is sustaining us now.

Yes, I do, too. I will tell you what is sustaining us. It is the hope of the American people that the economic plan of this young, new President in the White House is going to work.

Hope springs eternal in this country, and I intend to support the President who advocates change. I do not know if his plan will work. Four years from now he will either be reelected because his program succeeded and is working, or he will not be because people are unhappy with his health plan and the deficit is not headed South.

I can tell you that, if you buy into this snake oil that we are about to vote on in a minute, when you buy into proposals like that, proposals that say we can do it painlessly you're voting for the same snake oil we bought back in 1981.

The only reason I suggested to the President that he go for a 40-percent marginal income tax rate was because the people on that side of the aisle will fight 36 percent just as hard and furiously as they will 40 percent. So, we might as well fight for as much deficit reduction as we can get.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I told the President, "You are going to be lucky to get a 36-percent marginal rate, if that is what you ask for. You may get 36 percent if you ask for 40 percent."

You are looking at one person here, and I do not mean to sound self-serving, who can afford to pay more in taxes. I guess I am in the top 1 percent of income earners, as are all my colleagues in this Chamber. We certainly can afford to pay more in taxes to save this country. Voting for a freeze on our wages for next year is just a small token. It would be good if we cut more to show the American people that we are serious.

Mr. President, I will just close by saying, it is a terrible thing to tell the American people but the truth will set you free. The truth is this deficit and debt crisis is not going to be solved without a lot of pain and a lot of grief. This afternoon it is time for Senators to stand up and be counted, and for God's sake do your duty to this country.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, it is important that I make myself clear on the fact that I do not vote for the Republican alternative because I support higher spending on defense programs. I support the Dole alternative in spite of the additional DOD moneys because I believe that the other proposals included in the Republican package are important to the economic viability of our Nation and worthy of acceptance.

This Republican alternative budget resolution would eliminate the almost $300 billion in new taxes proposed in the President's economic plan. I have been inundated with letters and calls from Oregonians asking Congress to cut spending first before we ask them to pay more in taxes. Previously, I have expressed my concern regarding certain taxes that are assumed within the President's plan. The so-called Btu tax has many potential implementation problems, is inherently regressive, and potentially devastating to certain energy intensive industries in the Pacific Northwest.

Another extremely important point in support of the Dole amendment is the provision for significant entitlement reform. I was one of the few who voted in support of implementing caps on non-Social Security mandatory spending during last year's budget resolution. This part of our budget has been out of control for some time now. Some 96 percent of the spending increases over the next 5 years will be in mandatory programs. Attempting to control these costs recognizes that the heart of our budget difficulties lie not in the lack of revenues, but in the lack of control over runaway growth in certain Government programs.

My vote for the Dole amendment notwithstanding, I cannot agree with those on both sides of the aisle who claim that the defense budget is absorbing inordinately large cuts. Of course each billion saved out of the Pentagon's budget is significant and has an effect upon our national security posture. But several military analysts have shown us that it is possible to achieve significant savings in defense in this time of lessened external threats. I believe we can go beyond the Clinton proposal.

This is not the last opportunity for Congress to consider this year's defense budget. It is certainly not our best opportunity, for we do not have our hands on any budget documents from the new administration, which could give us a clue as to where the changes will be made. As we move on to the authorization and appropriations process, I will continue to argue for deep—and responsible—reductions in military spending.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed using my leader time.

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

The Senator has the right to proceed.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, last November the American people voted for change. They voted to change Presidents. They voted to change the course in which this country was going. They voted, most of all, to change the economic policies of this country.

Today, in just a few minutes we will determine whether anyone in the Senate is listening to the American people. The substitute amendment is the same old thing. It is a continuation of the policies of the past 4 years.

If the Senate were to adopt the substitute amendment, it would be as though the election of last November had not occurred. It would be as though President Clinton had not been elected. It would be as though the American people had said they wanted to continue on the same course. That is not what they said.

If there is one message that came out of the Presidential election of last November, it is that the American people want change.

I urge my colleagues to listen to the American people, to honor the views of the American people, to change the course of this country, and most importantly change the economic policies of this country.

This amendment is one more—we are up to now 25 or 26 amendments; we have 29 scheduled before the end of the day—that has one purpose, and that is to defeat President Clinton's program.

They do not want to give President Clinton a chance. He has been in office just 2 months, and what we have had here are 5 consecutive days of an unremitting assault against the President's economic program, an effort to keep in place the very policies of the past 4 years that the American people just rejected, an effort to deny our new President a chance to get his program in place.

So the issue is very simple here. If you like the status quo, if you like the economic policies of the past 4 years, if you do not think there ought to be any change in this country's policies, if you want to keep going the way we have been going in the last years, piling up this impossibly high debt and telling the American people there are not any

problems and we can do this all in a very easy way, why if you believe that, then you vote for this substitute amendment.

But if you think this country ought to change the course it is on, if you think this country ought to have a different economic policy, if you think this country ought to have a policy that looks to the future, not the past, if you think that President Clinton ought to have a chance, just a chance to get started in office, then you ought to defeat this substitute amendment and pass this budget resolution so that we can get going to address the serious problems facing the country.

Finally, Mr. President, there is one other thing that the American people said last November, and they said it to all of us here. They are tired of gridlock. They are tired of trying to stop things from happening. They want action. They want change. This is another guardians-of-gridlock amendment. This is another amendment that is in the nature of a roadblock, an obstruction, a way to prevent, stop, delay, halt.

We should listen to the American people. We should heed their word. We are here as their servants and their elected representatives, and they voted for change in November.

So, I urge my colleagues to vote for change, reject the status quo, reject the policies of the past 4 years, and set a new path for the country; defeat this substitute amendment and vote for the budget resolution.

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

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I have 15 seconds remaining; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

First, I ask unanimous consent that the three votes ordered to occur immediately following disposition of the Dole Amendment No. 258 be limited to 10 minutes each.

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I want to call to every Senator's attention, those present, those listening, and those will be advised by staff what the managers just agreed upon and what the Senate agreed upon.

The first vote will be for the regular time. The second, third, and fourth votes will be limited to 10 minutes.

Therefore, I ask the staffers to notify Senators as they come in. Senators should be on notice that we are going to try to conduct these votes within the time limitations set forth, and Senators should remain in the Senate to conduct these votes so we can move forward on this business.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

69-059 O—97 Vol. 139 (Pt. 5) 9

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield.

Mr. DOMENICI. I want to echo those remarks and merely indicate that we did this by stacking these few votes to accommodate Senators so they were not going to be in and out of here every 25 minutes. We hope they will be as accommodating to the U.S. Senate and let us finish this business.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, does the time limitation of 10 minutes apply to subsequent votes after these scheduled now.

Mr. DOMENICI. Not yet.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Republican leader. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WOFFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 57, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 60 Leg.]

YEAS—42

Bennett	Faircloth	McConnell
Bond	Gorton	Murkowski
Brown	Gramm	Nickles
Burns	Grassley	Packwood
Coats	Gregg	Pressler
Cochran	Hatch	Roth
Cohen	Hatfield	Shelby
Coverdell	Helms	Simpson
Craig	Kassebaum	Smith
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Specter
Danforth	Lott	Stevens
Dole	Lugar	Thurmond
Domenici	Mack	Wallop
Durenberger	McCain	Warner

NAYS—57

Akaka	Feingold	Mathews
Baucus	Feinstein	Metzenbaum
Biden	Ford	Mikulski
Bingaman	Glenn	Mitchell
Boren	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Boxer	Harkin	Moynihan
Bradley	Heflin	Murray
Breaux	Hollings	Nunn
Bryan	Jeffords	Pell
Bumpers	Johnston	Pryor
Byrd	Kennedy	Reid
Campbell	Kerrey	Riegle
Chafee	Kerry	Robb
Conrad	Kohl	Rockefeller
Daschle	Krueger	Sarbanes
DeConcini	Lautenberg	Sasser
Dodd	Leahy	Simon
Dorgan	Levin	Wellstone
Exon	Lieberman	Wofford

NOT VOTING—1

Inouye

So the amendment (No. 258) was rejected.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BREAUX. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

A VALUE-ADDED TAX REMAINS THE KEY TO DEEP DEFICIT REDUCTION

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I have opted to withhold my VAT amendment to the budget resolution. It is clear that a strong consensus exists in the Senate to keep this bill clean and intact, essentially as proposed by the administration.

However, I remain more convinced than ever that a VAT tax is both necessary and inevitable if we are serious about deep deficit reduction. And I take heart from the bipartisan support that has grown for my VAT initiative since I first proposed it in 1987. Senator TED STEVENS joined me in cosponsoring this particular VAT amendment, and a growing list of distinguished Senators have come forth with VAT variants of their own, including Senators DANFORTH, DOMENICI, BOREN, BAUCUS, BRADLEY, JOHNSTON, ROTH, RIEGLE, CONRAD, DORGAN, SIMON, and DODD.

I have the utmost respect for President Clinton's courage in taking on the deficits. However, I must point out that for all the ambitiousness of the Clinton plan, the probability is that the deficit 4 years hence will remain roughly where it is this year, in excess of $300 billion.

Three years ago, then-President Bush crowed that his budget summit package would reduce deficit spending by $500 billion—and it largely did just that—but meanwhile the deficit has increased from $278 billion in fiscal year 1990 to $361 billion in fiscal year 1993. Now, today, President Clinton also promises nearly $500 billion in deficit reduction, and I don't doubt that he will achieve his goal. However, because the underlying deficit is expanding at a runaway rate, and because of ballooning interest costs, the President's austerity package will at best allow us to tread water; there will be little or no reduction in the size of the nominal deficit, which I predict will remain stuck in the $300 billion-plus range in 1997.

Mr. President, there is no education in the second kick of a mule. We must be under no illusions that the administration's package—for all its courage and ambitiousness—will result in a significant reduction in the current level of the deficit.

My point is this: If we are serious about deep deficit reduction—if we are serious about bringing the deficit down below $200 billion by 1997—then we must move much more aggressively on the revenue front. And that is exactly why I favor a 5-percent value-added tax. A VAT would be the most efficient vehicle for raising significant new revenues to truly drive down the deficit.

Mr. President, we are not babes in the woods with regard to Federal deficits. We have been pretending to reduce the deficit for more than 12 years, now, and all we have to show for our efforts is a quadrupling of the national debt. Let us look at the historical record.

Twelve years ago, the new President stepped forth with an audacious plan to slash taxes by one-third, drastically increase the defense budget, and trimming domestic spending. President Reagan promised that his plan would balance the budget in a year's time. Then-majority leader Howard Baker called Reaganomics a riverboat gamble, but he urged us to vote for it as a solid bet, and a majority of Senators went along with that gamble. I, for one dissented. I voted against the Reagan tax cuts. Any simpleton should have foreseen that Mr. Reagan's riverboat gamble would leave us up the creek, drowning in deficits.

And, sure enough, by fiscal year 1982, the deficit was already skyrocketing. However, President Reagan remained blissfully undisturbed. He issued new assurances that his policies would balance the budget in several years' time. To those of us who were disturbed by the soaring deficit numbers, majority leader Baker issued a challenge. He said we should put up, or shut up. So I put up, and Senator Baker politely told me to shut up. I offered a tough, across-the-board budget freeze, and Senator Baker quashed it.

To no one's surprise, the deficits continued to rise. We saw our first $100 billion-plus deficit in fiscal year 1982, and our first $200 billion-plus deficit just 1 year later in fiscal year 1983, with a sharp upward trajectory for the years to follow.

In desperation, in late 1985 I joined with two conservative Republican colleagues to pass the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings amendment, which locked in ambitious deficit-reduction targets to be enforced, if necessary, by an across-the-board sequester. Gramm-Rudman-Hollings was designed to require truth in budgeting. And, initially, it was enormously successful. It drove down the deficit from $221 billion in fiscal year 1986 to $150 billion in fiscal year 1987.

However, beginning with the budget for fiscal year 1988, Congress and the President began resorting to an spectacular jambalaya of accounting tricks and gimmicks in order to finesse the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings deficit-reduction targets. Once again, the deficit began to sprawl out of control. Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, which was intended to be a sword for deficit cutting, was instead was used as a shield—just so much camouflage to hide the fact that we were doing nothing serious about the deficit. It was in this environment, with the prospect of deficits spiraling out of control, that I first offered my value-added tax proposal. My VAT was a last resort, a last-ditch effort to get a grip on the deficits while they were still at a manageable level.

In 1989, I asked for a divorce from Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, which had become hopelessly corrupted and subverted in the course of a series of so-called budget summits. Of course, the whole purpose of those budget summits beginning in late 1987 was not to meet the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings targets, but to avoid those targets. The budget summits were the cancer, not the cure.

Specifically, the whole purpose of the 1987 summit was to circumvent the deficit-reduction requirements of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, and thereby allow President Bush to avoid breaking his read-my-lips pledge on taxes. The 1990 budget negotiations began as a similar attempt to finesse Gramm-Rudman-Hollings and avoid new taxes, but the realities of an exploding deficit proved too much; the President was obliged to yield on taxes.

Finally, the coup de grace was administered to Gramm-Rudman-Hollings during the infamous 1990 budget summit. President Bush and Dick Darman conspired with a bipartisan group in Congress to repeal the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings targets. The predictable result was another big surge in the deficit, which for the first time passed $300 billion in fiscal year 1991.

Earlier in 1990, in the Budget Committee, I once again proposed a strict, across-the-board outlay freeze—a hard freeze that would have shaved $40 billion off the fiscal year 1991 deficit. The initial vote on my freeze was 10 to 10, with three abstentions, though it was defeated in the end. Again, frustrated in my efforts to slash spending and desperate to avoid a deficit-induced recession, I renewed my push for a value-added tax. Again, my arguments fell on deaf ears.

Today, because of this sorry record of past inaction and avoidance, the annual deficit stands at $361 billion. What's more, the Congressional Budget Office projects that deficits will sprawl toward $600 billion annually by the end of the decade. This is a 12-year record of abject failure on the part of Congress and the Executive.

The trajectory of the national debt is all too clear. The debt hit $1 trillion in 1982, $2 trillion in 1986, $3 trillion in 1990, and $4 trillion in 1992. In the early 1980s, it took 4 years to add another $1 trillion to the national debt. In the early 1990's, it takes only 3 years to add another trillion to the debt. By the end of the decade, we will add $1 trillion to the debt every 2 years—unless we act decisively now.

Certainly, President Clinton has made a courageous attempt to halt the upward surge of the deficit. However I fear that this is all he will accomplish: A halt to the growth in the deficit over the next 4 years. The package now before us does not raise taxes enough or cut spending enough to reduce the deficit in absolute terms. For all of our pain and caterwauling, we will at best stabilize the deficit in the range of $300 billion through fiscal year 1997. Beyond fiscal year 1997, CBO projects a sharp surge in the deficit, rising to $600 billion annually by the turn of the century. I must point out that the plan before us offers nothing whatsoever to address that looming fiscal catastrophe.

It is only in light of these realities that I have chosen to resort to the harsh medicine of a national value-added tax. If we are serious about deep deficit reduction, we will have to accomplish it through sharply higher revenues. A VAT tax is the fairest and most efficient means toward that end. I assure my colleagues that circumstances will force us to revisit the issue of a VAT tax in the very near future.

When that time comes, I will revive the essential elements of the amendment I have chosen not to offer on this budget resolution; a 5-percent national value-added tax, with no exemptions, and with all revenue set aside in a new trust fund, 75 percent of which would go to deficit and debt reduction and 25 percent to health care reform. Such a VAT tax would allow us to come to terms in a real and decisive fashion with the deficits that are destroying our economy.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 254

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to amendment No. 254 by the Senator from Massachusetts. There will be a 10-minute rollcall vote.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 61 Leg.]

YEAS—62

Akaka	Durenberger	Mitchell
Baucus	Exon	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Feingold	Moynihan
Bingaman	Feinstein	Murray
Bond	Ford	Nickles
Boren	Graham	Pell
Boxer	Gregg	Pressler
Bradley	Harkin	Pryor
Bryan	Hatfield	Reid
Bumpers	Hollings	Riegle
Burns	Jeffords	Rockefeller
Byrd	Kennedy	Roth
Campbell	Kerry	Sarbanes
Chafee	Kohl	Sasser
Cohen	Lautenberg	Simon
Conrad	Leahy	Smith
D'Amato	Levin	Specter
Daschle	Lieberman	Stevens
DeConcini	Mathews	Wellstone
Dodd	Metzenbaum	Wofford
Dorgan	Mikulski	

NAYS—37

Bennett	Gramm	McCain
Breaux	Grassley	McConnell
Brown	Hatch	Murkowski
Coats	Heflin	Nunn
Cochran	Helms	Packwood
Coverdell	Johnston	Robb
Craig	Kassebaum	Shelby
Danforth	Kempthorne	Simpson
Dole	Kerrey	Thurmond
Domenici	Krueger	Wallop
Faircloth	Lott	Warner
Glenn	Lugar	
Gorton	Mack	

NOT VOTING—1

Inouye

So the amendment (No. 254) was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MITCHELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 256

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 256 offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. KRUEGER]. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll. It will be a 10-minute vote.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 62 Leg.]

YEAS—96

Akaka	Faircloth	McConnell
Baucus	Feingold	Metzenbaum
Bennett	Feinstein	Mikulski
Biden	Ford	Mitchell
Bingaman	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Bond	Gorton	Moynihan
Boren	Graham	Murkowski
Boxer	Gramm	Murray
Bradley	Grassley	Nickles
Breaux	Gregg	Nunn
Brown	Harkin	Packwood
Bryan	Hatch	Pell
Bumpers	Hatfield	Pressler
Burns	Heflin	Pryor
Byrd	Helms	Reid
Campbell	Hollings	Riegle
Chafee	Johnston	Robb
Coats	Kempthorne	Rockefeller
Cochran	Kennedy	Roth
Cohen	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Conrad	Kerry	Sasser
Coverdell	Kohl	Shelby
Craig	Krueger	Simon
D'Amato	Lautenberg	Simpson
Daschle	Leahy	Smith
DeConcini	Levin	Specter
Dodd	Lieberman	Stevens
Dole	Lott	Thurmond
Domenici	Lugar	Wallop
Dorgan	Mack	Warner
Durenberger	Mathews	Wellstone
Exon	McCain	Wofford

NAYS—3

Danforth	Jeffords	Kassebaum

NOT VOTING—1

Inouye

So the amendment (No. 256) was agreed to.

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 257

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on amendment No. 257 by the Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS]. The yeas and nays have been ordered. This will be a 10-minute rollcall vote.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 6, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 63 Leg.]

YEAS—93

Akaka	Faircloth	McCain
Baucus	Feingold	McConnell
Bennett	Feinstein	Metzenbaum
Biden	Ford	Mikulski
Bingaman	Glenn	Mitchell
Bond	Gorton	Moseley-Braun
Boren	Graham	Moynihan
Boxer	Gramm	Murkowski
Breaux	Grassley	Murray
Brown	Harkin	Nickles
Bryan	Hatch	Nunn
Bumpers	Hatfield	Packwood
Burns	Heflin	Pell
Byrd	Helms	Pressler
Campbell	Hollings	Pryor
Chafee	Jeffords	Reid
Coats	Johnston	Riegle
Cochran	Kassebaum	Rockefeller
Cohen	Kempthorne	Roth
Conrad	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Coverdell	Kerrey	Sasser
Craig	Kerry	Shelby
D'Amato	Kohl	Simon
Daschle	Krueger	Simpson
DeConcini	Leahy	Specter
Dodd	Levin	Stevens
Dole	Lieberman	Thurmond
Domenici	Lott	Wallop
Dorgan	Lugar	Warner
Durenberger	Mack	Wellstone
Exon	Mathews	Wofford

NAYS—6

Bradley	Gregg	Robb
Danforth	Lautenberg	Smith

NOT VOTING—1

Inouye

So the amendment (No. 257) was agreed to.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I inquire of the Chair. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator repeat the question?

Mr. SASSER. I inquire of the Chair. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is, the Senator from Tennessee is authorized to offer amendments.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Virginia is seeking recognition for about 30 seconds to introduce a bill.

I yield to the distinguished Senator from Virginia for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. WARNER pertaining to the introduction of S. 647 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

AMENDMENT NO. 262

(Purpose: To ensure that further Federal health care savings will be accomplished as part of comprehensive health care reform)

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER] proposes an amendment numbered 262.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DODD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the resolution, insert the following:

SEC. . REDUCING FEDERAL HEALTH CARE COSTS THROUGH COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH CARE REFORM.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the vast majority of rising mandatory program costs is due to increasing federal health care costs, and these costs are assumed in the levels set forth in this resolution;

(2) health care reform is essential to curb the escalating costs of health entitlement programs to reduce the deficit;

(3) the reduction in health costs in this budget resolution should be augmented by further savings in federal health outlays as a part of comprehensive health care reform which will be reflected in future budget resolutions; and

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

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I offer for the consideration of my colleagues this evening, a sense-of-the-Senate amendment which puts the Senate on record in the following way.

First, we recognize that the problem in rising entitlement spending is health care costs, that that is the principal energizer behind escalating entitlement costs.

Second, comprehensive health care reform is essential to cure escalating health care costs for all Americans as well as curbing health care cost in the Federal budget.

Third, we made a significant downpayment on health care costs in this budget resolution.

Fourth, further savings in health care spending should be achieved through comprehensive health care reform and will be reflected in future budget resolutions and in future deficit reduction.

Mr. President, many of my colleagues are concerned about the escalating entitlement costs in the Federal budget. I also am equally as concerned.

When we look at the two significant growth areas in the Federal budget, we find that there are two segments of the budget that are growing at a prodigious rate.

One, of course, is interest on the national debt, and that is something we have been trying to deal with here today, by urging on our colleagues, the passage of the Clinton budget as modified by the Senate Budget Committee, which is the largest deficit reduction package and will reduce the deficit by the largest margin of any budget that has been proposed in the history of the country.

But the second problem is the escalating, indeed exploding costs in so-called entitlement programs.

As I have told my colleagues in times past, 95 percent of the increase in the entitlement programs comes from three programs; 95 percent of the increase in the so-called entitlement or mandatory programs is involved with just three programs. One is Social Security. Two is Medicare. Three is Medicaid.

If you back Social Security out of that equation, the growth falls to about 85 percent of the entitlements encompassed in growth in Medicare and Medicaid costs. I think it makes sense to back Social Security out of the equation, because Social Security is not the problem. The Social Security trust fund, the old age and survivors trust fund this year will generate $60 billion more in revenues than it will pay out to beneficiaries.

Now, what is the problem in Medicare and Medicaid? Why is it going up so fast? Medicare and Medicaid are simply reflecting, Mr. President, the explosion in health care costs that have encompassed the whole health care economy, so to speak, and the health care economy with its very, very rapid growth, growing at two, three, and four times the consumer price index, year after year, after year. The health economy threatens to subsume the whole of this country.

Some are urging on us, and we may hear more about this later, so-called entitlement caps, aimed primarily at putting a limit on what the Federal Government will pay by way of formula for Medicare and Medicaid costs.

Mr. President, it is my position, and the position of the Clinton administration and the view of President Clinton himself, as enunciated through his statements on health care and through the statements of his Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Mr. Leon Panetta, that simply limiting what the Federal Government will pay for health care will not solve the problem. Because if we put a cap on Medicare and Medicaid, what we are saying is, the Federal Government is going to pay so much, and only so much, and we do not care how much higher the health care costs go.

What that means, in effect, if we put a limit on or we impose caps, it is going to mean that when older citizens who are Medicare beneficiaries go to a physician for treatment, they are going to find that more and more physicians simply refuse to take Medicare patients.

We are seeing that now all across the country, particularly in some of the higher-cost areas where the cost of living is high, such as New York City or perhaps even here in the Nation's Capital of Washington, DC.

The physicians are saying, we do not want to take Medicare patients because Medicare will not pay enough.

Now if we put a limit on what the Government will pay for Medicare and health care costs continue to go up faster than the rate of inflation, then this will spread across the country and you are going to have tens of millions of Medicare recipients, elderly people who cannot get treatment because physicians simply either will not take Medicare patients, or they will say, "OK, we will take the Medicare patient but the Medicare patient has to pay a large sum out of his or her pocket in addition to what Medicare pays."

That is not what the Medicare program was all about when it was put into law under the administration of President Lyndon Johnson.

The problem today is that I have seen figures that indicate that even under Medicare our elderly citizens are paying more for health care than they did prior to the passage of Medicare.

Well, what happens if the Federal Government limits what if pays for Medicaid? As the Presiding Officer knows, Medicaid is a cooperative program between the Federal Government and State governments to provide health care for the very poorest among us who otherwise would receive no health care or simply be at the mercy of whatever charity might be available.

If we put a limit on what we pay for Medicaid, it simply means that the State governments, which are already, some of them, on the verge of collapsing fiscally because of the terrific explosion in Medicaid costs, it means the State governments would be required to pay more.

In my native State of Tennessee, the State government cannot pay more for Medicaid. My Governor has told me that he has reached the end of the line. They simply do not have the funds to go any further with State payment of Medicaid.

So if the Federal Government limits what it is paying in the relatively poor per-capita States like the State of Tennessee, like the State of Arkansas, perhaps even like the State of New Mexico—I do not think that is a high per-capita income State—it means that those of us in low per-capita income States, where a State government has a low revenue base to raise revenue for its citizens, it means that its poor people are either not going to get adequate health care or get none at all.

It is going to mean that hospitals and doctors will refuse to treat Medicaid patients. That is happening now all over the country. All over the country hospitals refuse to take Medicaid patients and doctors refuse to treat Medicaid patients because Medicaid simply does not pay enough, these doctors and these hospitals say, to even defray their cost of operation.

So if we put a limit on what the Federal Government pays, then the poor people, as well, and State governments, as well, are left in a ditch.

Well, what is the solution? I am proud to say, Mr. President, that, fortunately, there is a solution over the horizon. At long last in this country, after looking the other way for many, many years, trying to pretend as if a problem did not exist, there is an administration in Washington and there is a President in the White House who recognizes the fact that something has to be done about the cost of health care. He and his wife are working very hard on developing a comprehensive health care program that will deal with the whole health care problem.

Because it is the overall cost of health care that is the problem. It is a problem that the Federal Government is having to pay so much, and that is increasing the cost of the entitlements and increasing the deficit. That is a problem. But the problem is the overall problem with health care in this country, the overall expense of the health care system and the health care apparatus here in the United States.

Mr. President, the sense-of-the-Senate amendment that I am offering here this evening is simply an affirmation of the President's approach, which says that we must take on the health care system in toto, get our arms around the whole thing.

It does not make sense, according to the President, to simply be controlling the public sector system, while allowing the overall cost of health care to go through the roof.

I think, Mr. President, that is a ticket to disaster. It is a ticket to a health care disaster for the American people.

President Clinton has said that we are going to have a comprehensive health care proposal in this Congress or proposed by the administration before the month of May is out, if memory serves me correctly.

Some are saying, "Well, let's go ahead and cap Medicare."

I say, what sense does it make to cap Medicare now? I see an entitlement cap as simply one more attempt, frankly, to derail the President's plan for economic recovery and economic change.

The cap on Medicare and Medicaid simply puts hardship, as I have said earlier, on the most vulnerable seniors and our most impoverished citizens. What the cap ultimately does is, it shifts the cost of the health care system back onto the private insurance system.

So it means the Federal Government is paying less; older people are going without the health care they would otherwise have gotten under Medicare—some are probably going without health care—poor citizens are going without health care, or getting more inferior health care than they are getting now; and in the private sector those who have private insurance companies, their health care premiums are going to continue to go through the roof. And you still will have out there, at present count, about 37 or 38 million Americans who have no health care coverage at all. You will still have them out there. And that sector of the population will be growing.

So President Clinton is right. I think any reasonable, rational examination of this problem by unbiased individuals—or even biased individuals—would indicate that the way to deal with this problem is to deal with it in a comprehensive fashion and not fasten on a little Band-Aid called entitlement caps and allow the hemorrhage and the blood to keep flowing around that little Band-Aid until the patient bleeds to death. That, essentially, is what I think would happen.

So, Mr. President, I offer this sense-of-the-Senate amendment for the consideration of my colleagues. I urge its adoption.

I will be pleased to yield to any other Senator who wishes to speak in opposition or any Senator who wishes to speak in support of the proposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, as I understand it, if I am opposed, managing on this side, I have one-half hour on this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. How much time does Senator SASSER have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has 14 minutes and 22 seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. I want to yield some time now to Senators who are here on the floor.

Senator BOND has been working on this issue diligently and has some very good ideas about what we ought to do. I do not believe it is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution. But I think he ought to talk about caps on these mandatory expenditures as he views them, and what he recommends. I yield 10 minutes to Senator BOND.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank our distinguished ranking member for giving me some time. I find myself in the unusual position of agreeing with the chairman of the Budget Committee about the problem. I think he has clearly stated, if Congress and the administration are serious about getting us to a balanced budget, serious about ending the deficit, then we have to attack the growth in the entitlements. Willie Sutton, we are told, robbed banks because, "That is where the money is." If we are serious about deficit reduction, then it is the entitlements where we must focus our attention.

Unfortunately, I do not believe the solution of, "Take our word for it, accept it on faith, we are going to get our hands all the way around all these health care costs," is enough. The reason we have budgets, the reason we have some limitations in this body, is to force us to come to grips with the problems we face.

I have talked earlier today, and earlier this week as well as last week, about the heavy reliance on taxation in this package. Almost 4 to 1 taxes-to-spending cuts just will not do, and I believe the folks in America and the folks back home in my State will be mightily disappointed when once again a much-heralded plan to reduce the deficit fails to meet its goals.

We raised taxes four times in the last 10 years in order to get the deficit under control, and the deficit is twice the size it was when we started. That is because Congress has shown no ability to use the new revenues for anything but new spending.

The Joint Economic Committee says spending increases $1.59 for every $1 that taxes rise. That is why I have continued to say we need more rabbit meat spending cuts in the stew of taxes that the President has supported.

Last year the economic package of candidate Clinton was $2 of spending cuts for every dollar of new taxes. Earlier this year the Budget Director, Mr. Panetta, also repeated the claim. Unfortunately, while the President and his team keep selling the package as one part spending cuts, one part tax increases—it is anything but that. This is precisely the problem with the Clinton economic plan: Great advertising, great sizzle, but there is not much rabbit in the rabbit stew. Fortunately, we are going to have an opportunity to do something about getting spending under control.

I cannot support the sense-of-the-Senate resolution that is before us now as the solution. Instead, I urge my colleagues to consider the arguments and do something that is significant, and that is to support the amendment which will be brought forward by the distinguished Senator from Georgia. That amendment will do something to remedy the problem by providing the backbone and discipline Congress so obviously needs actually to attack spending.

If we do not address the growth in entitlements, and the Clinton plan, and the plan reported out of the Budget Committee does not do so, then by the year 2000, instead of ending the deficit and balancing the budget, we are right back where we started from. That does not meet my test of serious deficit reduction and I doubt it meets anybody else's test.

Let us take another look at this chart.

This is a small chart. All you have to be able to see is the blue line. It starts off, the deficit is $300 billion. And as the proposed plan cuts military spending, it gets down to around $200 billion annual deficit, 1996–1997. But, unfortunately, it is back up to $300 billion a year in annual deficit, by the year 2000. And it goes back up to a $400 billion deficit by the year 2003.

What kind of deficit reduction plan is this? Mr. President, I suggest it is not a serious one. That is what brings us back to the subject of entitlements.

Several Senators, four Republicans, three Democrats, have stepped forward to say we must reform and control and do something about entitlements. To me that is true political courage. That amendment will say attack health care costs; reform the earned income tax credit if it is growing too fast; reform our foster care program if it is the problem.

Basically it says reform any program that is growing faster than inflation, plus a caseload growth, plus 4 percent. And if Congress does not reform these fast-growing programs, then a sequester of the offending programs will occur.

This is a slightly different twist than past entitlement caps in that it sequesters only the programs causing the problem, if there is a problem, instead of taking funds out of programs which are already growing very slowly.

Opponents of the entitlement caps say if we want to cut entitlements then we should do it, not just rely on procedural gimmicks or Budget Act reforms. Just do it. That might be the best way of describing this approach.

If we were to do it, that would be one thing. But it seems when amendments are offered to change entitlement programs, the same people who do not say impose some discipline, do not support the cuts.

So who is hiding the real agenda? For example, in the Senate Budget Committee I offered an amendment which would save over $20 billion in the Medicaid Program over the next 5 years by

requiring States to adopt a managed care program and put it in place for their Medicaid patients. My effort was defeated.

So why did I offer it, and why am I so confident of it? Because we have adopted that kind of Medicaid reform in Jackson County, MO. Other States have dealt with it—Arizona, the city of Baltimore. When I was Governor we put in place a managed care program that said to the Medicaid recipients, you get to choose who you want to provide your health care, whether it is one of the very fine community health centers we have in Kansas City, or whether it is the Truman Hospital, or whether it is one of the preferred provider organizations.

It basically changed the incentive, because the chosen health care provider got a set sum of money every month, a capitation grant for each person, whether that person stayed healthy or got sick. And guess what, it put the incentive on keeping people healthy.

Do you know something, amazing things happened. The providers went out and provided primary care. They provided preventive care. They used staff for outreach. They brought patients in to take care of them, to keep them healthy and to treat them early when they got sick. They had fewer low-birth-weight babies, less time lost to sickness, fewer hospitalizations, less time in the hospital.

The people involved in the program like it more than anyplace else in Missouri because they have a fee for service program, because somebody was paying attention to them, because the incentive was to keep people healthy and, oh yes, it saved money. It saved a bunch of money for the State and for the Federal Government.

That is the kind of meaningful health care campaign that we ought to launch. We need a campaign to change the way that we provide incentives for health care in this country.

But Congress is not willing to stand up and make these tough choices unless we mandate that they do so. Let us not kid ourselves, Mr. President. Part of the problem around here is that we do not have the discipline to act. What this amendment says is you will get a couple of years to do it. If you do not do it, knowing the deadline is there, there is going to be an automatic sequester of those fast-growing programs and that, Mr. President, is the kind of discipline that is needed to make sure we take some real and significant action to do a better job of providing health care, to keep people healthy and to save on the costs of these fast-growing health care programs.

I urge my colleagues not to be deluded by the sense of the Senate. The sense of the Senate is fine that we ought to control the costs, but is not a substitute for serious reform. So I say let us get serious about it. Are we going to do something about the deficit? If we are, then we are going to have to get health care costs, Medicare, Medicaid under control. I suggest the Nunn-Domenici amendment, which will come up after this amendment, is the way to do it.

I thank my colleague from New Mexico and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I see the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania on the floor. He has long been active in the whole issue of health care. Indeed, his efforts a couple of years ago I think highlighted the whole health care crisis. He has been a catalyst in this body and I think outside of this body in focusing national attention on what has become known as the health care crisis.

So I yield such time to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania as he might wish to consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will notify the Senator from Tennessee that he has 13 minutes and 40 seconds remaining. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WOFFORD. Mr. President, I rise to support and to cosponsor the amendment of the valiant Senator from Tennessee. About half of all Federal spending pays for entitlements and mandatory spending. This is, of course, spending done by formula, and spending not constrained by annual appropriations bills. Let us be clear though what we are talking about: Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid and also the student loan program, employment compensation, food stamps.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, total entitlement spending will increase from 12.5 percent of our entire domestic economy this year to 14.3 percent in 1998 if we do not take action. Medicare and Medicaid are the fast growing entitlement programs. Medicaid costs have exploded over the past several years, not only for the Federal Government but, as the Senator from Tennessee has pointed out, as we all know from our States, the explosion hits the States as well.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, Medicaid accounts now for almost half of all spending for so-called means tested entitlements and fuels two-thirds of the projected growth of such spending over the next 5 years. CBO estimates that Federal Medicaid spending will increase 82 percent over that time.

The rate of growth for Medicare rivals those of Medicaid. Medicare is projected to increase from $146 billion this year to $259 billion in 1988, a 77 percent increase. These are not driven by increased enrollment. The cost of health care services is the prime culprit.

As my former colleague and now Secretary of Treasury Bentsen said on the Senate floor last year, the abstract concept of an entitlement cap cannot be turned into reality without squarely addressing the underlying problem of health care costs.

As the President has repeatedly said, we are kidding ourselves if we believe we can contain the Federal deficit and provide long-term economic growth without getting those costs under control. That is why he said in his February economic message that we have to take action on health care not next year, not 5 years from now but right now. And that is why he is preparing to introduce his comprehensive proposal in just a few weeks.

The problem with the amendment that will be proposed by my friends from Georgia and New Mexico is that it is treating the symptoms without curing the disease. It provides no solution to the underlying problem of skyrocketing health care costs. Indeed, it would make a solution even harder to find. In my view, a vote for that amendment would be a vote against comprehensive health care reform. It is a vote against controlling health care costs for families and businesses. It is a vote against expanding access to health care for millions of Americans who are today without coverage.

This amendment would remove a part of the puzzle to solving the health care crisis for everyone. We have to understand that the puzzle will never be solved by pulling the pieces apart.

I would like to read a letter from an 11-year-old boy. It is the kind of letter I used to try to write when I was 11 years old: Eric Stodola from Erdenheim, PA, wrote to me to support the Clinton economic plan. Here is what he wrote:

> I like Clinton's plan and his thinking. I don't think it should be changed at all. I can see from the numbers and facts that in the long run the deficit will be lower and my mom and dad will be paid more. I don't think you should rip the plan apart because plans only work when they are all in one piece. I mean that the plan is like a puzzle and if you remove a piece, it doesn't work.

Mr. President, the amendment by my friends from Georgia and New Mexico would jump the gun, jump the gun on the comprehensive health care proposals that we are about to get in the month of May. Nobody wants to see that gun go off more than I do. There is nobody in this body who wants more than I do to see health care costs controlled, but it must be controlled as part of a comprehensive health care reform. The way to do that is to adopt the amendment today by the Senator from Tennessee that affirms our determination to move forward to comprehensive health care reform and fundamental cost control reform and to not adopt the entitlement cap, the broad-brush approach that moves ahead, puts the cart before the horse, and the horse is the comprehensive health care reforms that this country

needs to pull us forward in a way that will give us growth in our economy and will give us the ability to control the deficit.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield 10 minutes to Senator DANFORTH, from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, this amendment and the amendment that follows which will be offered by Senator NUNN call attention to the great missing element in the budget resolution now before us. They indicate that something is, in fact, missing, and what is missing is any significant effort to deal with the fastest growing part of the budget, which is the entitlement programs.

This budget resolution does not adequately or significantly deal with the growth in the entitlement programs. Senator NUNN is shortly going to offer an amendment which does provide caps on the growth of the entitlements. I am sure that Senator NUNN will explain his amendment to the Senate. But the essence of it is that beginning in 2 years, the growth of the entitlements, absent Social Security—that will be kept out of this package—will be limited to 1 percent over the Consumer Price Index plus the growth in population.

This particular amendment that is offered by the chairman of the Budget Committee is simply an effort, in the opinion of this Senator, to attempt to siphon off votes from the Nunn amendment. The Sasser amendment is both meaningless and wrong, meaningless because it is yet another sense-of-the-Senate provision, has no teeth in it whatever, and wrong because it includes within it the statement that it is the sense of the Senate that comprehensive health reform will result in long-term savings both for the public and private sectors of the American economy.

The assumption of this sense-of-the-Senate amendment is that health reform will yield long-term savings to the public sector as well as the private sector and yet the memorandum that has been widely publicized in the press, that has been circulating around the Clinton administration indicates that the cost of the Clinton proposal will be anywhere from $30 to $90 billion per year.

That is money that is totally unaccounted for in this budget resolution.

We are told in the newspaper that according to the memorandum circulating in the Clinton administration, in addition to everything else we are going to be doing, we have a little problem that we have to account for, and the problem is that the new health plan is going to cost the Government $30 to $90 billion each year during the term of this budget resolution.

The New York Times has the figure a little bit more precisely pinpointed. They say that over 5 years the cost to the Treasury will be $175 billion.

Now, Mr. President, the point of this resolution is that whatever is done by way of health care reform, we cannot afford to create a program that is going to increase the cost of health care to the Government by $175 billion over 5 years.

Where are we going to come up with that money? Where is it going to be? It is not mentioned anywhere in this budget resolution.

So what is being said in the Nunn amendment is that whatever we do in health care reform, whatever is accomplished in health care reform, we will have 2 years to do it. Whatever is done in health care reform, we have to have a program which limits the cost of the entitlement programs for health care to CPI plus 1 percent plus the population change.

And if we are not going to have limited costs in health care, how are we going to afford to have a program?

I was at the Chamber of the House of Representatives along with the rest of the Senate during the State of the Union speech and heard the fervor in the President's voice about the need to control the cost of health care. The President told us both in his text and in his extemporaneous comments during that speech that we absolutely have to control the cost of health care.

What we are saying in the amendment that will be offered by Senator NUNN is, all right, let us control the cost of health care——

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANFORTH. Let us control the cost of health care to the private sector and also to the public sector.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANFORTH. I wish I could, but we only have 30 minutes on this side, so I am going to hold on to my time, if I can.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield, if the Senator will yield me time, to answer a question?

Mr. SASSER. I would be pleased to yield such time as the Senator may want.

Mr. DANFORTH. Of course.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield?

What does the Senator understand will be the increase in health care costs over the period of the next 3 years? If we do nothing in this country, what is the Senator's understanding will be the increase in the health care costs?

Mr. DANFORTH. I think it is going to be very dramatic.

Mr. KENNEDY. It is going to be $300 billion. It is going to be $300 billion. The President has said that the savings are going to come from a reduction of the increase, and within that is going to be the $40 or $50 billion additional in terms of coverage.

So I do not understand the Senator's argument about saying, well, the President was talking about health care. His program is going to cost about $40 billion. Everyone understands that.

The purpose of the President's program is to put a cap not only on the expenditures of entitlements but those that are in the private sector.

I hope the Senator from Missouri as well as the Senator from Georgia will say now that they will go for cost containment of inflation plus 1 plus the growth in the elderly population. That would be great news to the President of the United States. If the Senator from Missouri will say that and the Senator from Georgia will say that, that is going to have a very—and our colleagues on the other side of the line will say that—that will provide a greater savings.

Does the Senator have an idea of what that would be, if you put cost containment in for the public and private sector of inflation plus 1 percent? Does the Senator know what the savings would be over the period of the next 3 years? One hundred twenty billion dollars.

Let us put this in some kind of perspective. I just cannot understand the Senator's arguments about not dealing in a comprehensive way, which the Senator from Tennessee is trying to do.

And the other point, if the Senator will agree with me, what will happen by putting a cap on entitlements, 85 percent of which is health care? It is going to make it much more expensive for the private sector, for the business of this country, let alone what it is going to do in closing out various hospitals. Understand that you get to a top grade of about 63 percent of Medicare in a hospital and they go bankrupt because you limit them. I do not know how many in Missouri are going to go belly up, but I think the Senator would be concerned about that.

Mr. DANFORTH. I very much thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his question. And I would simply say that people on this side of the aisle have been intensely interested in dealing with the comprehensive problem of health care, private and public cost of health care. We have been meeting every Thursday morning that the Senate has been in session for 2 years on the subject. We have had a retreat in Annapolis, MD on the subject.

People on this side of the aisle have been very, very intent on trying to do something responsible across the board on health care. And what the Senator from Georgia is going to do in his amendment is to say, all right, give the President 2 years to get his program in place, no caps on anything for 2 years.

We can have the cost to the Government go through the roof during that 2-year period of time. But when all is said and done, when we have a health care program in place, please let us make sure that it works. Let us do something for a change around here that works.

What we are saying is that whatever we come out with, whatever we come out with, entitlements as a whole, as a whole after we finish this program 2 years hence, should only go up by population plus cost of living plus 1 percent. And if we do not get entitlements under control, then instead of going from 30 percent to 50 percent of the budget, which they have done since the 1960's, they are going to go to 60 percent, 70 percent, who knows what else.

Mr. KENNEDY. Just one question. Would the Senator agree to have the same kind of cost containment on the rest of the health care budget as he is supporting here tonight?

Mr. DANFORTH. I would agree to have a total cap on entitlement programs, putting Social Security aside, of CPI plus 1 plus the growth of the population for the totality of the entitlement programs. That is what the Senator from Georgia is going to be proposing.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am talking about the total health care costs.

Mr. DANFORTH. I am saying that under Senator NUNN's proposal, when all of the entitlements are aggregated—maybe health care will be over 1 percent, but all of the entitlement programs, absent Social Security, combined must be CPI plus 1 plus population. And if it exceeds that, then no effort that we are making to try to balance the budget by raising taxes is going to be sufficient to get our economy on a sound foundation.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if I could get an answer in terms of health care policy. The Senator is prepared to put a cap on one-quarter of the health care budget, which is effectively the Medicare and Medicaid Programs. That is effectively one-quarter. I am asking whether the Senator will agree, if he is so concerned about the increase in cost, to sign on to put a cap on the others.

Mr. DANFORTH. The Senator from Missouri is saying, Mr. President, he supports—along with probably almost all of the people on this side of the aisle—a comprehensive health care program which covers all of health care.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will it have the same cap?

Mr. DANFORTH. When all is said and done, Mr. President, when we finish the program, then the entire growth of entitlements absent Social Security should not be allowed to go up more than 1 percent over the cost of living index.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Missouri has expired.

Who yields time?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I thought the exchanges were on my time. I ask that in whatever time I have left, the Senator be permitted to conclude his 2 or 3 minutes' remarks.

Mr. SASSER. The Senator from Massachusetts is very generous with my time, Mr. President.

Does the Senator from Missouri need additional time?

Mr. DANFORTH. I am finished, Mr. President.

Mr. SASSER. I will be pleased to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. For just 1 minute.

Mr. President, the proposed limitation on caps on health care just ain't going to work. You are taking one-quarter of the total health care budget and trying to treat it one way. And that has probably been the basic problem over the period with the Medicaid Program. And now you are wrapping Medicare, the Medicare parts, into it as well.

The Senator from Tennessee is absolutely right. We have a President who is committed to having a program. Here on the floor of the U.S. Senate, with comprehensive cost controls, we hear occasionally: Let us put a cap on one part, but not put a cap on the other.

What is necessary is that we put the cap on—or some kind of effective cost control on—the total of the program.

I think from just this debate, Mr. President, we see that this would be an incremental state that I think would do grave violence to what the President's efforts have really been on cost containment for millions of people, and for decent health care.

I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, what time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has 4 minutes 4 seconds; the Senator from New Mexico has 9 minutes 41 seconds.

Mr. SASSER. I see the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has arrived on the floor. I will be pleased to yield to him such time as I may have.

At the expiration of that, when we go on to the next amendment, perhaps the distinguished Senator will wish to remain and speak on that amendment, also.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, the Senator is entirely happy with that arrangement.

Mr. SASSER. I yield to the distinguished Senator the remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has 3 minutes 35 seconds.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, it is very clear what is happening here. The purpose of this amendment could not be clearer. I, obviously, strongly support the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee. By adopting this amendment, we will state directly and emphatically that reforming our country's battered health care system is the way to achieve long-term prosperity, deficit reduction, and a society that more properly cares for its people.

Any person who thinks that we can achieve budget deficit reduction without doing health care reform is absolutely wrong. The whole concept of putting the cap on entitlements—where we have already taken $55 billion out of Medicaid; where the overwhelming majority, I think it is 82 percent or something like that, in addition, would then come out of Medicaid and Medicare; which would then close down hospitals, and would close down physicians' offices to poor people and to seniors, since they would decline to give them the services because they were not being reimbursed under either Medicaid or Medicare in proper fashion—is a travesty.

It is an absolute travesty.

The way to do deficit reduction is by doing health care reform. In fact, if you take the deficit budget, even with the $0.5 trillion that we propose to reduce it over the next 5 years, with all the courage the President has shown—and, frankly, the courage the folks on this side and some on the other side have shown—on this issue, even if we do all of that, the budget deficit will begin to come back up in about the year 1996 or 1997, where the amendment that will follow this amendment, the amendment of the Senator from Georgia, would begin to take effect. And that is precisely where we need health care reform and cost containment for health care reform.

But when you are doing health care reform, you are doing something very, very major.

I do not know what the position of the Senator from Georgia is about health care reform. I think he thinks we cannot get it done this year. In fact, I think he told me that last night. The view of the Senator from Tennessee is entirely different; he feels we can get it done. And by a combination of his amendment and doing health care reform, we achieve what we want to achieve.

This amendment is directly an alternative to the very different proposals that we are told will be brought up next by the senior Senator from Georgia. That proposal, yet another plan to cap entitlements, could not be more different in its approach or in its effect, and it fails in both.

In my view, the idea of capping entitlement programs—and that must be very clear; it mostly means cutting Medicare and Medicaid, Medicare already having been cut—is equivalent to abdicating our responsibility.

In contrast, Senator SASSER's amendment echoes both the sentiment and

the expectation of the American people. The public is demanding health care reform. The Sasser amendment notes the Government's increasing health care costs are responsible for the lion's share of the increase in costs of the mandatory programs. The Senator is right. We all know this. We all know that the only real way to achieve cost containment is with comprehensive health care reform.

So I urge my colleagues very strongly to adopt the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee. I hope that it will prevail, as much as I hope the following amendment will fail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, is any time remaining on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time remaining on the side of the Senator from Tennessee. The Senator from New Mexico has 9 minutes 40 seconds.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, following the conclusion of the debate on the pending Sasser amendment, it be laid aside until the conclusion of the debate on the Nunn amendment, and that the votes on or in relation to both the Sasser and the Nunn amendments occur in that order at the conclusion or yielding back of time on both amendments.

Mr. DOMENICI. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I wonder if the chairman will permit me to add to that request. And I request that the 9 minutes 40 seconds that I have remaining be transferred to the Nunn amendment as part of my support for that.

Mr. SASSER. I have no objection to that, Mr. President. I say that with the hope that the distinguished ranking member will not use all of that time, though, when we get to the Nunn amendment. I have no objection.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I do not pledge that. But if the arguments are calm and mild on the other side, I might yield back a lot of time.

Otherwise, I may use every bit of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee so modify his request?

Mr. SASSER. I so modify the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the pending amendment offered by the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee and ask to be made a cosponsor. The purpose of this amendment could not be clearer. by adopting this amendment, we will state directly and emphatically that reforming our country's battered health care system is the way to achieve long-term prosperity, deficit reduction, and a society that more properly cares for its people.

In fact, I hope all of my colleagues see this amendment as an opportunity to assure the American people that we get it. That we hear their cries for doing something about the health care costs that are crushing family budgets; that we intend to respond to the businesses of every size that can't afford to provide the coverage to workers that they'd like to; that we intend to help State and local governments get their hemorrhaging health care budgets under control. That we recognize that passing this budget resolution, even with its bold plan for reducing the deficit, will not be enough to secure the country's economic future—not until, and not unless we enact comprehensive health reform.

This amendment is an alternative to a different proposal that we are told will be brought up next, by the senior Senator from Georgia and others. That proposal, yet another plan to cap entitlements, could not be more different in approach and in its effect. In my view the idea of capping entitlement programs—and let us be very clear, that mostly means cutting Medicare and Medicaid—is equivalent to abdicating our responsibility. It is yet another notion of how to put the Federal budget on automatic pilot, and shirk making the tough decisions ourselves.

In contrast, Senator SASSER's amendment echoes both the sentiment and the expectations of the American people. The public is demanding health care reform that will finally get a handle on health care costs. Business, labor, families, States—all of us want and need these unsustainable costs checked.

The Sasser amendment notes that the Federal Government's health care costs are responsible for the lion's share of the costs of mandatory programs. We all know this. We all know the only help is comprehensive health care reform. That is the only way we will be able to preserve our existing entitlement programs and make sure that every American has access to basic health care services.

What's most important is that this amendment recognizes that there is a context for reduction of health care costs. The integrity of our efforts reduce both the deficit and health care costs depends on our addressing the real issues, and getting to the real cost drivers, not arbitrarily capping entitlements for the poor and the elderly. If we ever hope to really reduce this deficit, we must look at its prime escalators and get to the heart of the problem. It's not the individual programs—it's the system. Senator SASSER's amendment expresses what should be our real intent—to tackle the problems and to responsibly fix this once and for all.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment, and make the record very clear that we intend to make this year when we put our economy on track, get the Federal budget in control, and reform our health system by deciding what's best for the American people—and not by putting Medicare and Medicaid through a shredder called a cap on entitlements.

As part of our dedicated effort to reduce the deficit, I support the careful review of every single solitary item in our national budget—with no exceptions. Most of my colleagues do as well.

But I will fight at every turn attempts to place arbitrary caps on entitlement programs, whether purely for health care programs or for all entitlement programs. Entitlement caps are unjust, they often attack the most vulnerable segments of our society. They're mean. They can hurt the people we're here to represent and to protect. Mr. President, I adamantly oppose the Nunn amendment.

The hard truth is the entitlement caps proposed in the Nunn amendment will do nothing to address what is really ailing our national economy and jeopardizing our children's futures. Capricious, across-the-board caps will provide a superficial budgetary fix, not real relief. Caps merely stave off making the hard decisions that can restore integrity to our budget and preserve our existing entitlement programs. The only thing that will permanently protect the Federal Government and our States from skyrocketing health care inflation and increased deficit burden is comprehensive health care reform. Indeed, I challenge the authors of this amendment to join me in fighting for comprehensive reform that will get to the root causes their amendment purports to address—ever escalating costs with no restraints.

The answer—the only answer—is health care reform with brutal cost containment. Not entitlement caps.

As chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and chairman of the Medicare and Long-Term Care Subcommittee, I have some very specific concerns that I want to share with my colleagues. I want every Member to be aware that a vote to cap entitlements can mean a vote to deny a service-connected, disabled veteran his benefits, or a Medicare beneficiary hospitalization coverage for which they've already paid. A flat cap is that indiscriminate. It denies that veteran who has earned his health care benefits through his combat service and the Medicare beneficiary that has contributed through payroll taxes, alike. This distinction is important. Regardless of merit, benefits will be denied to those that rightfully are counting on their protection. A generic cap will not make any distinctions. We are accountable for making them.

And I would like to suggest that we should learn from the past. Around this time last year, a similar attempt was made by a small group of my col-

leagues. It failed. It failed big time. It failed because Members of this body refused to ignore their responsibility to be as fair to the American people as possible, especially in tough economic times.

Mr. President, the only cap we should be endorsing is a cap on all of our national health care spending. And I believe that cap only makes sense as part of our delivering on the promise our of new President, and the long held commitment of many of my friends in this distinguished body, to finally provide every American with access to basic health care benefits.

Again, I welcome the authors of this amendment to work with the President and those of us in Congress who are serious about shoring up the budget and reducing the deficit—join us in doing something that counts. It's time to stop lashing out at the people we should be trying to help. It's time to stop offering the false hope of quick fixes that are incapable of solving the systemic problems that are corroding our budget and economic future. Let's get to the business of comprehensive health care reform.

AMENDMENT NO. 206

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 206, offered by Senator HATFIELD, will be called from the desk, be deemed agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

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

Mr. SASSER. We interrupted the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, Mr. President. I will be pleased to yield time to him now to continue his remarks, or yield to the distinguished proponent.

I yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, if the Senator from West Virginia would like to complete his remarks, I will be delighted to accommodate him.

Mr. SASSER. Let me say to my friend from Georgia, I think he has to lay down his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator from Georgia he needs to send the amendment to the desk.

AMENDMENT NO. 263

(Purpose: To put a permanent, enforceable cap on the amount of non-Social Security mandatory spending beginning with fiscal year 1996)

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN] for himself, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. ROBB, Mr. DANFORTH, Mr. KERREY, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. BOND, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. PACKWOOD, proposes an amendment numbered 263.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, first, in response to my friend from Massachusetts and my friend from West Virginia, might I say that I do not recall making any prediction that health care reform cannot pass this year.

I think it is going to be very unlikely that it can be put on a reconciliation bill this year, but I do not preclude the possibility that it could pass some time in the fall. If we can have it ready and thought through at that time, I would welcome that.

The second point is that I am not opposed to comprehensive health care reform. But what I hear, I believe, coming from the Senator from Massachusetts, and perhaps to some extent the Senator from West Virginia, and the Senator from Tennessee, on the comprehensive health care reform that is going to be sent up here, is that they must be very dubious that we are going to save any Federal money in it. Because all this cap does—and I will explain it in a moment—is give 2 years for this proposal to be put into effect. We have no cap at all in fiscal year 1994, and no cap at all in fiscal year 1995. It does not really have a cap until 1996.

If we are going to have a health care reform legislation up here that does not save any money for the Federal Government by 1996, what are we reforming health care for? I know we want to cover the uninsured, but I cannot believe that after all of the conversations I have had with President Clinton—and I know the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Massachusetts have had just as many on this subject—he is absolutely dedicated to saving money for the Federal Government. That is what he said as recently as yesterday. As a matter of fact, he said we were going to save hundreds of billions of dollars a year. I know he was including the private sector in that, but he was also including the Federal budget.

I cannot believe that there is so little confidence that we are going to have a comprehensive reform, but we are not willing to say we are going to save money. I do not believe that is the position of the President.

There are reasons to oppose this amendment, but I cannot conceive of the reason being that we do not believe that the President is going to have a comprehensive health reform plan that does anything about the Federal budget, because if it does not, we are out of business; we are out of business. We might as well understand that no matter what we do with taxes, no matter what we do with defense, if we do not get health care under control in the Federal budget, as well as in the private sector, this country is not going to be competitive. Our children and grandchildren are not going to be able to pay the taxes needed to keep the current health care system going, let alone even start to pay the taxes that they are going to have to pay to eliminate the budget deficit.

Mr. President, I want to explain the amendment, but I wanted to make sure that everybody understood that this amendment is based on what I thought was a reasonable expectation that health care reform is going to save the Federal taxpayers money. I want to make it clear that if that is not the case, then we better start over with this whole budget resolution, because we are not raising enough taxes and we are not cutting enough domestic discretionary, and we are not doing enough in defense to ever get the budget under control.

I do not favor more taxes and more defense cuts. That is all we have in this resolution in terms of deficit reduction. We have taxes and we have defense cuts. The domestic spending cuts are just about equal to the add-backs.

Mr. President, this amendment would not reduce entitlement spending. What it would do is reduce the rate of growth of entitlement spending to the increases needed to cover the increases in the number of beneficiaries.

I want everyone to look at this chart that shows us the amount that we are going to be spending over the next 5 years 1994 to 1998, compared to the previous 5 years, from 1989 to 1993. We are going to save in the next 5 years, about $200 billion in defense. On domestic discretionary, we are going to spend about $300 billion more than we did the previous 5 years. On interest on debt, we are going to spend about $250 billion more than we did the last 5 years. And on entitlement programs, which are the subject of this amendment, we are going to be spending about $1.4 trillion more than we spent in the last 5 years. Anybody who wants to quarrel with the numbers can do so. They came right out of the budget resolution.

Mr. President, I also want to make clear what is happening to the Federal budget, for those who are interested. I know the managers of the bill already know this. It is no mystery to them. The deficit dropped until 1976 and then started going up. Look what happened to the deficit in the 1980's. Look what happened to entitlements. It has gone right straight out the window.

So the Federal deficit is growing less than entitlements are growing. If the deficit was growing as fast as entitlement spending is growing, the Federal deficit would be even worse. So we are going to have to understand that fundamental point if we are going to come to grips with this.

Let us look at this chart, so we can see where we have been. The Senator from Tennessee said we should not go back to 1985 on defense; that we ought to have a reasonable period of time. Let us look back to 1963 and take the last 30 years. In 1963 we had President Kennedy in office. In 1963, if you look at defense share of the budget, at that time 53 cents out of every Federal dollar went to defense. In 1993, 22 cents out of every Federal dollar goes to defense, and that number is coming down very dramatically.

In 1963, 23 cents out of every Federal dollar went to entitlements. In 1993, 49 cents out of every Federal dollar goes to entitlements. The interest on the debt has gone from 7 percent of the budget in 1963 to 14 percent, and the so-called investment accounts, including education and many other programs that are highly regarded in this body and in the country have stayed about even from 1963 to 1993. They were 17 cents out of every dollar in 1963, and in 1993, 16 cents out of every dollar.

So, Mr. President, this is what is happening to the Federal budget. I think we all have to understand that, however we decide to vote on this amendment.

Mr. President, this amendment would limit the rate of growth of future entitlement spending to the increases needed to cover any increases in the number of beneficiaries that are added to the program, plus increases for inflation, plus an extra allowance that phases out by 1998. If a mandatory program exceeds the cap, there would be a grace period of not less than 60 days for the Congress to enact legislation that would bring that program's spending back into line. If such legislation is not enacted, a sequester on that specific program will result. We would not require any one entitlement program to suffer because another entitlement program exceeded its limit.

I hope everyone understands that is the fundamental difference between this amendment and what Senator DOMENICI and I proposed last year. We dealt with it last year all in one group. If one went over and that resulted in an overall entitlement cap being breached, everything would have been cut across the board. This year we are aiming at the specific offending programs. For example, if we go over in health care, we would not automatically cut food stamps, as long as that program did not exceed the allowance for increases in population plus the rate of inflation. I hope everybody understands that.

Under this budget resolution, during the next 5 years, we will be spending, as I just demonstrated, $1.4 trillion—not billion, trillion—more on entitlements than we did in the last 5 years. From 1989 to 1993, we will spend $3.2 trillion on entitlements, and on these same programs in the next 5 years, from 1994 to 1998, we will spend $4.6 trillion. Domestic discretionary spending will go up $300 billion. Defense will come down $200 billion. That is where we are going compared to the previous 5 years.

I think the conclusion is obvious, Mr. President. The part of the budget that has had constraints on it—that is the discretionary side, including both defense and domestic discretionary, has really been controlled. It may not have been controlled as well as we could have, but it has been controlled. The mandatory programs or entitlement programs that have not been subject to Gramm-Rudman or any discipline, they are out of control. We all know it. We may have different approaches as to how we want to deal with it. I know there are logical reasons for some people to oppose this amendment.

But the point is we have to deal with entitlements, and if health care reform is not going to save the Federal Government money, then we are really in very, very bad condition in this country.

Mr. President, let me simply restate what we are talking about when we discuss capping entitlement growth. Words like "cap" and "cut" get used pretty loosely sometimes, and that is particularly true in the news media.

In this budget resolution, the defense budget is actually going to have less money this year than we did the year before. That is a decrease. That is a cut. Federal workers will not get a pay raise next year, if we pass the President's budget. They will not get any less money, but their salaries will not get any bigger. That is a freeze. That is not a cut. That is a freeze.

What we are proposing for the entitlements is not a decrease, and it is not a freeze. We are saying we are going to add more money to entitlements, we are going to add more money every year to entitlements. Under our amendment, we are going to add enough money to keep up with inflation. We are going to add enough money to keep up with all the additional people who come under the entitlement programs.

We are saying, let us not do any more than that. Let us not do anymore than the amount that will cover the people that would be added, plus inflation, plus 1 percent for 2 years.

Is that a cut? Absolutely not. It is a growth in entitlements. Is it a freeze? No; it is not. It is a basic formula that says can't we have some goal, can't we have some limit, can't we have some accountability.

If the people who do not favor this amendment will tell us what their goal is, that would be fine. Do they have any goal for entitlement restraint? It is not in the budget resolution. This resolution saves $50 billion out of the $1.4 trillion growth. We are cutting $50 billion. That is commendable, but it is not enough.

(Mr. KERREY assumed the chair.)

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, someone once paraphrased Isaac Newton saying for every action, there is equal and opposite criticism.

Last year when we proposed the Domenici-Nunn amendment on caps, there was one criticism that was repeated over and over again, and I have seen it in a number of editorials, and that is an entitlement cap is not specific.

They asked the question: Why do you not have specific cuts? Let me make one thing absolutely clear. The entitlement cap is no less specific than any other recommendation in this budget resolution.

If anyone can name one single specific cut that is set forth in this budget resolution, I want them to show me the language. Where is it? I do not know where it is. It is not in here.

Mr. President, where are the defense cuts coming from? Where are they coming from? We have $50 billion in Bush cuts to make. We have $60 billion in Clinton cuts to make plus another $62 billion that come from inflation savings and pay freezes. Between the Clinton defense cuts and the Bush defense cuts in the next 5 years, we have to find $170 billion. Does anybody tell us where that is coming from? No; it is not in the budget resolution.

Mr. President, when CBO recently said the Clinton administration had overstated the deficit reduction in the President's plan, the Budget Committee decided to make additional cuts, and they were assumed in the resolution. These $31 billion of additional cuts were made to the President's proposed investment package. If anyone can find the specifics of that $31 billion, I hope you will inform me.

I do not know what those cuts are. I think the President might want to know. Was it highway funding? Was it Head Start? Was it National Service? Perhaps someone could inform us.

Where is that $31 billion coming from? Where are the $170 billion we are going to have to cut in defense coming from?

Let us get specific. If we are going to get specific, let us not just talk about entitlements. Let us get specific on all the cuts.

Let me give one more example. On page 5 of the report accompanying this resolution—this is the instruction to the tax writing committee—it says as follows:

> As is the case with all reconciliation instructions, the tax writing committees are not bound to adopt any particular set of policy options to achieve additional revenues specified in this budget resolution. In fact, they may incorporate whatever statutory changes they desire.

Is that specific? That is as broad, Mr. President, as universal salvation. You can do anything you want. This whole budget resolution is that way. That is what we do on budget resolutions.

Mr. President, I hope we do not hear the charge that the Nunn-Domenici proposal is not specific again unless those who make that charge are willing to say where that $31 billion is coming from, and where the $170 billion in defense cuts is coming from.

Mr. President, there are several reasons why this cap on the growth of the entitlement makes sense.

First, simply math. I noticed that no matter who gets elected President, whether Reagan, Bush, or Clinton, arithmetic does not change. It does not change. Adding and subtracting stays the same.

If they agree we have to get the deficit under control, it is obvious we cannot continue to exclude 50 percent of the whole Federal budget, and that is what we have done. We have excluded 50 percent of the whole Federal budget and pretended we were going to get the deficit under control. It is impossible.

The second reason is accountability and responsibility. Even if we did not have a crippling budget deficit and debt, leaving half the budget on automatic pilot is a bad way to run our fiscal policy.

The third reason is common sense. If this amendment passes, our entitlement cap says programs can stay at the current level, with current benefits, and grow with the general rate of inflation plus the number of people that are eligible to receive those benefits.

Mr. President, in my view, this is a straightforward rule of thumb the American people can understand, and I think when they understand it they will support it.

Fourth, this cap is not a cut, and I have said that, and I have said it rather emphatically, but I think everyone ought to know this is not a cut. This is a reduction in the growth of programs that is growing out of control. That is what we are doing.

Mr. President, some people have said—and will say again in this debate—that we cannot control entitlement spending, because it would make health care reform impossible.

Again, I ask the question: What are we going to do in health care reform if we are not going to save any Federal dollars? I know we want to save the private sector money. I know it is a complicated situation. I have tremendous confidence Mrs. Clinton is going to come up with a real plan and the President is going to propose a real plan, and we are going to have some real options for cost control. I do not understand the logic of saying we cannot have an entitlement cap because health care is included.

Mr. President, one of the problems in the last 10 years in the Congress is that virtually every serious budget debate or amendment, no matter who is in power, no matter who is in the White House, whether in the first 2 years of the Reagan administration or the first 2 years of the Bush administration or the first 2 months of the Clinton administration, every time we have an amendment out here, it is treated as if it is going to bring down the White House, if they do not favor it. If they do not favor it, it is going to bring down the White House and it is going to do great harm to the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I think it is time for us as Republicans and Democrats to get beyond this rather simplistic treatment of the problems facing our country. I hope that we will begin examining issues on the basis of whether we are voting for or against our children and our grandchildren, not the White House, not the Democrats in the Congress, not the Republicans in the Congress.

What are we going to do around the turn of the century—and there may be some people here still in the Senate—I prabably will not be—when our children and grandchildren come up to us and say: "Look, I just read in the paper this country is going absolutely broke. Where were you, grandmother or granddaddy, when all that spending was taking place back in the 1980's and the 1990's? What did you do? Did you do anything? Did you do anything? Why, grandmother or granddaddy, why do we owe to the Social Security fund billions and billions of dollars? What are we going to do when we retire? Did you think about that?"

What are we going to do when we get to around the year 2015 and we see that we now owe the Social Security trust fund, not $4 billion, but $4 trillion?

This is something that no one talks about. I did not even hear Ross Perot talk about it last year.

Everybody assumes we are going to keep on borrowing from the Social Security trust fund. We raised the taxes in 1983. If those taxes had not been raised, Ronald Reagan could not have governed for the last 8 years.

We raised Social Security taxes. The purpose was to provide for the day when we were going to have the baby boomers retire. We were going to put that money in a trust fund so that we would be able to retrieve it when it came time to pay the baby boomers their retirement, because we did not want to raise taxes to the point, in the year 2015, where our children and grandchildren would go broke and the country would go broke.

Now what happened to that Social Security trust fund?

Mr. President, I want to look at the figures. I want people to understand that. We are borrowing, in the operating fund, $47 billion from the Social Security trust fund this year.

Now we already have borrowed $327 billion from that Social Security trust fund since 1982. That money is borrowed by the operating fund. We do not even pay the interest. The interest comes due and we need another Treasury bill. So the Social Security fund that everybody believes is in such great surplus, what does it have? A whole lot of Treasury bills. How are they going to be paid back?

Let us look at what we are doing to our children and grandchildren if we do not get these entitlement programs under control.

We are saying, basically, to our children and grandchildren, for the first time in history, a generation is saying, we want to keep our standard of living up, so we are wrecking yours. That is basically what we are doing.

Mr. President, in 1993, we will borrow $55 billion from the Social Security trust fund. In 1994, we will borrow $62 billion from the Social Security trust fund. In 1995, we will borrow $69 billion from the Social Security trust fund. In 1996, we will borrow $77 billion from the Social Security trust fund. In 1997, we will borrow $85 billion from the Social Security trust fund. In 1998, we will borrow $95.5 billion from the Social Security trust fund.

In 1999, we will borrow $105 billion. In the year 2000, we will borrow $117 billion. In the year 2001, we will borrow $129 billion.

In 2005, we will borrow $184 billion. In 2010, we will borrow $253 billion. In 2015, we will borrow $265 billion. And that is when we pay the piper.

Because in 2015, we stop taking in as much money from the payroll tax as we start paying out from the Social Security fund. And at that stage, we are going to be indicted, we are going to be indicted by the people who are living in America at that time.

They are going to look back and say:

> How did you do this to us? How could you have been that irresponsible? How could you have done it in the 1980s? How could you have done it the 1990s? How could you have talked about balancing the budget and never even told the American people that?

Even when we are projecting balanced budgets—which we do every now and then here in our wildest dreams and assumptions—even then, we are using that Social Security trust fund.

Who is going to pay for the Social Security recipients in the year 2016 to the year 2035? We will have to raise taxes to the point this country cannot be competitive if we keep going the way we are.

So I say to those who oppose this amendment, fine; fine. But come up with your own entitlement cuts. Come up with your own. And if we are not going to do anything about them, then let us confess we have failed the future generations of America.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator from Georgia yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. NUNN. Yes.

How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fourteen minutes and five seconds.

Mr. NUNN. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I say to the Senator, if you ever find some spare time from Armed Services, we would welcome you on the Budget Committee, either side. If you cannot find a niche on their side, we will ask you to join our side. Thank you for your eloquent remarks.

Mr. President, let me just make a couple of points. I cannot do much better than Senator NUNN has done, but I would suggest one of the problems we all have is that there is an instant reflex action by groups out in America; somebody prompts them. We did not have this amendment ready until today. Yet, Senator SASSER has passed out to everybody here in the Senate a list of 25 American organizations, including 2 church organizations, all of whom say that the Nunn-Domenici amendment will hurt them.

And, frankly, they are talking about last year's amendment. So I am hopeful that they will ask those who are sponsoring this amendment what it does, because the way we have done this amendment is different.

We will not be sequestering any of those nonoffending programs, and almost everything they are worrying about are nonoffending programs.

So let me, from that point, go on to why I think the Senate ought to adopt this.

Senator NUNN has told us that, without adopting some kind of a control, a cap on the major entitlement budget busters, Medicare and Medicaid, we are never, never, never going to control the deficits of the United States.

Now I remind everyone who is going to vote tonight or tomorrow on the budget resolution that is pending, that they are going to vote for $295 billion in new taxes, and there will not be one penny in genuine reform of the entitlement programs of this country.

So I just wonder if those who are going to vote for that would not feel that the American people are being done much more justice if you really cut the budget so that the $295 billion does not go down the drain?

Having said that, I believe what I just said helps the President of the United States, because I think the people really believe we are getting the budget under control with $295 billion new taxes. But, as my friend from Georgia indicated, we are not.

Right here to my left is a very simple chart. And I did not invent it. The President of the United States put that chart in his vision statement.

If you look at the red line—the red line is what is going to happen to the U.S. deficit when we adopt President Clinton's plan, as most people plan to do here tonight or tomorrow—you see the deficit goes down and then goes back up.

In his own plan, in his vision book, he puts a green line in. And the green line reflects that you have to get mandatory expenditures under control and, more specifically, the President of the United States says, "Budget deficit with health reform savings."

That is the green line. That green line cuts just about as much off the deficit as the Nunn-Domenici amendment.

The President is saying that is where we are going to be, that is where he wants to be. But there is nothing in this budget that says we are going to be there, unless you adopt the Nunn-Domenici, and others, amendment.

Then you will give the President what he has asked for and you will say to the reformers of health care, "When you put together the basic benefit package, be sure that you do that with targets in mind that come out of this mandatory cap."

I believe, without it, we will have no significant cost containment within reform.

And for those who say, "What about the non-Government section of health care?", I will just say, I have talked to experts. I have asked them if you can save money of this type in the reform effort on the Government side without sending those costs to the private sector? Their answer has been unequivocally, yes, there need not be any shifting, if you reform it right and you reform the basic minimum package and, in the process, reform both Medicare and Medicaid.

So I am delighted to be a cosponsor. We put this idea together last year, Senator NUNN and I, with some prominent people in this country.

Tonight we get to present it to the Senate of the United States as one of the principal ways to get the deficit of our country under control. I urge that we adopt it. And then I urge that the Senate put it in absolute mandatory sequester legislation and we will then be a long ways down the line to getting the deficit of the United States under control.

I yield whatever time I have remaining back to Senator NUNN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, would the other side like to be heard on this point? Or I would be happy to yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has 30 minutes. The Senator from Georgia has 9 minutes.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I will just make a few points. Then there are a number of speakers on the floor who wish to speak.

Mr. President, the point has been made here this evening, it appears to be the belief on the part of some of the proponents of this Nunn-Domenici amendment, that we have done nothing about entitlements in this budget resolution. The truth is that President Clinton's budget, as modified by the Senate, cuts $56.2 billion in 5 years out of entitlements. That is four times more than President Bush cut in his last budget of $14 billion from entitlements.

So it is not as if we are asleep at the switch. I mean, we are reducing, or attempting to reduce, entitlements in this budget resolution and we are doing it by cutting reimbursements to beneficiaries.

Using the chart of my distinguished friend from New Mexico, which he took, I think, out of the back of the President's proposal, we see what happens in the President's proposal if his health care plan is not adopted—what happens to the deficit. It comes down until 1997 and then starts back up.

But see what happens when the President's health care reform package is adopted, according to the calculations of, I assume, OMB. The deficit begins to stabilize—stabilizes, goes up just slightly but still stays at a relatively mangageable level. So this is, I think, an argument in favor of us letting the President present his health care proposal to this body, which he will do shortly, and then deal with the whole health care problem in one package.

There has been no dispute here this evening that the real problem in the growth of entitlements is the growth of health care costs. We are going to have a comprehensive health care reform package presented to us shortly. So I do not understand why we want to move down this track of trying to deal with, as the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts said, a quarter of the health care problem here this evening and leave 75 percent of it out there, not dealing with it at all. It appears to me we will be trying to do it on the backs of Medicare beneficiaries and on the backs of Medicaid beneficiaries.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia had some charts up there a moment ago. He had one going back to 1963. It showed how small entitlements were compared to other things at that time. Sure, there was no Medicare Program in 1963. What has happened in this period is millions of elderly people are now covered by Medicare when in 1963 they were left to the charity, many of them, of their children. And many of their children had to make a decision about whether to send little Joey to college or put mama in the hospital.

That is what Medicare was intended to deal with. What has happened during this period from 1963 to I think it is

1991, or whatever it was on the chart of the distinguished Senator, is millions of elderly have been lifted out of poverty by a combination of Social Security and Medicare. Social Security is almost 50 percent of the total entitlement payout that is shown in the growth of entitlements there on the chart of the distinguished Senator. And Social Security is developing a surplus of $60 billion, just this year. And of course we have been dipping out of the Social Security fund to finance the general revenues of Government. But I did not hear a lot of complaints about that in the early eighties, when people in this body were voting for the Reagan tax cuts that deprived the Federal Treasury of 20 percent of the revenues. I did not hear any complaints about that and I did not see anybody coming out here—at least very few—complaining about the growth in military spending during that period of about 30 percent in real dollars. Some say it was higher. There were no complaints about that.

But not all of a sudden we are very worried about the cost of entitlements and the cost of health care. I am worried about it too. I think the proponents of this amendment are genuine in expressing their concern. There is no dispute here. The only dispute is how do we deal with it? We all know we have a problem. We all, I think, in good conscience want to deal with it.

What I am saying here this evening to my colleagues is we have a President now who is going to deal with it. Let us see what this administration and what this President does in dealing with the whole universe of health care costs. That is what we need to do. For us to stand here this evening and try to put into a budget resolution something that is going to deal with 25 percent of the whole universe of health care costs I do not think that is very productive. I do not think that is very productive and I do not think it is going to get the job done.

Why do I not stop here now and yield some time to other colleagues who want to speak?

The distinguished Senator from West Virginia wishes to speak and then the distinguished Senator from Arkansas and the able Senator from Minnesota and the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee was here a moment ago and he indicated he wished to speak.

May I ask my friend from West Virginia how much time he would require?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Four or five minutes, just to make a few points.

Mr. SASSER. I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I thank the Presiding Officer.

I would say through the Chair to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that I am not sure that we disagree on the problem. I think what we disagree on—and very explicitly—is the cure.

Basically, if we were to adopt the cap that the Senator from Georgia wants to do, we would be cutting $123 billion under no formula, just totally arbitrarily, out of Medicaid and Medicare from the years 1996 through 1998—$123 billion. There is no thought about how that is to be done. It is just simply done.

Let me give an example of why the Senator from Tennessee is so correct and why his amendment is so good. And why the Senator from Georgia's is so deficient, in this Senator's judgment. Take, for example, Medicaid. Because President Clinton cares about health care—cared about it all during his campaign, cares even more about it now—and because he cares about deficit reduction and now joins both health care and deficit reduction in his thinking—as was pointed out by the chart over there, you cannot do deficit reduction unless you do health care reform—you have to have a plan when you do these things. You do not just cut $123 billion out of Medicaid and Medicare with no plan, just by a mathematical formula that sweeps it away.

I will give an example: Drugs. Medicaid pays for prescription drugs, which my distinguished friend, Senator PRYOR, knows about far better than I do. This health care reform package has not yet been done. The Senator from Georgia surely understands that it is in the process of being done but has not yet been done. That puts us in a weaker position to argue, because we cannot say what it will be. The decisions have not been made. But one decision that may be made is that any drug company that raises its price of prescription drugs more than the cost of inflation will lose all of its tax benefits in Puerto Rico. As a result, the pharmaceutical companies come into my office and other offices saying, we will do this on a voluntary basis, just do not put it into law. Well, who knows about that?

But do my colleagues understand the relationship between having a health care reform plan in which there is a rule written about what will be the cost of prescription drugs in terms of their increase in price on an annual basis, and then the effect in turn of that on Medicaid? See, that is called planning. That is called thinking about what you are doing.

You just take a meat ax and cut out $123 billion—will the Senator from Tennessee yield? I just have a couple more thoughts that occurred to me. This Senator would enjoy having another 2 or 3 minutes.

Mr. SASSER. I will be pleased to yield to the Senator another 3 minutes.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, the Senator is very gracious.

You talk to the concept of cutting $123 billion. What does that mean for businesses? That means that they are faced on an arbitrary basis with enormous cost shifting. There is no plan, no concept of universal coverage in this cap on Medicare and Medicaid. It is just an across-the-board cut done, I will not say coldheartedly, done without any thought; done with just budget in mind—not people; not medicine; not health care; frankly, not the deficit in mind—just done so they can say it has been done, we cut it; and go home and talk about it.

Business would be furious because that means they are stuck with cost shifting forever because there is no concept of universal coverage, which President Clinton is now working on, along with some of the rest of us.

Talk to physicians about the idea of this $123 billion cut. Physicians would simply stop seeing Medicaid patients. They would stop seeing Medicare patients. hospitals would stop seeing both of those because there is no plan. Now, if you put together cutting Medicaid and cutting Medicare with a plan, then that can make some sense. And, indeed, the President has already cut $56 billion out of Medicare, an extraordinary cut. I never thought that I, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Medicare and Long-Term Care, would even be part of that when it is not applied to health care or long-term care, but is applied to deficit reduction.

It is a very earnest effort at deficit reduction, all out of Medicare, but I have confidence because I am working with the President and his wife and the task force on a plan so that if there are more cuts to come, it will be within a plan called universal health reform. I cannot emphasize how important that is. If you do something across the board, it is thoughtless. It might make somebody feel good; it might make somebody look good. But it is a disaster for deficit reduction and it is a disaster for health care reform; an absolute disaster for health care reform.

In fact, I will say further, it would eliminate any real possibility of there being meaningful health care reform because you have taken all the cards off the table before you even begin to talk.

To my friend from Tennessee, I will say those are all the comments I will make at this particular moment.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from West Virginia. I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. PRYOR. I thank the Chair for recognizing me. I thank the distinguished chairman for giving me these 5 minutes.

Mr. President, in approximately 6 weeks, we are about to see a very, very unique thing happening to the U.S. Congress and for the American people because in 6 weeks, we are about to see,

for the first time, a comprehensive health care bill come to the Congress of the United States for us to begin debating upon.

Mr. President, this will be the first time in some 40 years, or 30 years, that this Congress will have had the opportunity to look at a comprehensive health care plan. That is 6 weeks from now.

Should we adopt tonight—and I have the greatest respect, Mr. President, for the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN]. He has made an eloquent argument. But his argument falls, because I truly believe—and I say this respectfully—this particular proposal, if adopted by the Senate and ultimately by the other body, will do more to damage the prospects of the health care plan offered by this new administration to the Congress and the American people, because at that time we will see a health care plan that is totally, exclusively driven by numbers and not by policies. We will have set an arbitrary ceiling upon the costs and the escalation, as Senator NUNN has said, of the cost of Medicare and Medicaid.

But what is the basic and root problem? What is the elemental problem with this proposal offered by our distinguished friend from Georgia tonight, Mr. President? It is the fact that we are going to see the U.S. Senate take a position saying that we are tackling the problem from the wrong end. I repeat that: Should we adopt the Nunn amendment, we are going to be tackling this problem from the wrong end.

Where we need to attack this problem is from cost containment. This is where the Clinton proposal is going to address the problem. The Nunn proposal does not address the problem from cost containment.

I am wondering if the distinguished Senator and the very fine colleagues who are supporting this amendment would be willing to also tonight say: OK, tonight, arbitrarily, we are going to set a cap on what a doctor can charge for a liver transplant or a heart transplant or a bypass or a lung cancer operation. Are we willing to set those caps? Are we willing to freeze those costs? Are we willing to arbitrarily, tonight, with no hearings and very little debate, make a monumental decision to basically paralyze the upcoming Clinton proposal on health care?

Mr. President, later in this year, there may be the proper opportunity to discuss what the distinguished Senator from Georgia is proposing to us tonight. There may be that chance. If there is, I will reconsider my position. But until we see how the new proposal offered by the new administration addresses the root of the problem, which is health care cost containment, in a comprehensive manner, I only beg my colleagues not to support this plan at this time and to vote the Nunn amendment down.

Give this new President a chance. Give this new administration an opportunity to present to the Senate and to the House and to the American people the first option, the first meaningful option that we have been given in the past 4 years to do something about health care costs and the cost of inflation of health care, and then we will be attacking the problem from the right end and not the wrong end.

Mr. President, I have a lot more to say about this issue. I see a lot of our colleagues who desire to speak. I yield back any time that I might have remaining.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I have about five people who would like to speak. I want to make sure the Senator from Virginia has 4 minutes. If he could do it a little quicker than that, I have others who would like to speak.

I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I thank the chief patron of this particular legislation. I will try to be brief.

Let me say at the outset that I have enormous respect for our new President. I have waited a long time for my party to nominate someone about whom I could be truly enthusiastic. I have tremendous respect for what he is doing. I have waited a long time for the kind of address that we had in the joint session about 4 weeks ago. He truly challenged this country and this Nation to solve some problems, and he made us think about us and not me. He left all of us, I think, with the feeling that we had a mission and the ability to accomplish it.

My concern—and the reason that I am supportive, again, of the Nunn-Domenici amendment—is that with all of the good work, all of the challenge, all of the boldness that this President put into that address, if we do not do more than the plan accomplishes at the end of 4 years, those who felt they were making a sacrifice and making real progress are likely to be disappointed. And I do not want that to happen. I do not want people to be disappointed with a President who has so much potential to bring about the kind of change that I think is so critical for America.

This program, this particular proposal, is a very modest proposal. It does nothing for the first 2 years. In year 3, it simply begins to restrain the growth in entitlement programs. It still gives 1 percent above inflation, 1 percent above the new costs, 1 percent above program growth. And then the next year, it is 1 percent, and then zero.

This simply provides an outside force against which the President and his advisers can work to bring about the kind of cost reduction that I believe they are determined to bring about through the health care reform proposals.

I commend the President for what he has done. I am supportive of the President's package. I believe this helps the President accomplish his goal. And because I have a number of colleagues who are waiting to speak, I will yield back any additional time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. NUNN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. NUNN. I yield to the Senator from Oregon 1 minute.

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, an entitlement program is a program that goes up automatically without any further action of Congress. You get $100 in Social Security. If there is 10-percent inflation, you get $110. A discretionary program does not go up automatically. Education gets $100. If you have 10-percent inflation, it does not go up to $110.

Today, what we call entitlement programs, the automatic programs, plus interest, take 54 percent of the budget and everything else gets 46 percent. In 10 years, those very same four programs, Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and other military and civilian retirement, will take 69 percent of the budget and everything else will get 31 percent. If we do not restrain the entitlement programs, you face two choices: Cut everything else—I do not mean defense; I mean everything else—or raise taxes to pay for it. The Nunn-Domenici amendment will push us toward restraining those entitlement programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee——

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I will yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts 3 minutes and then I have others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, just a moment of history. The question of universal comprehensive health care was in Teddy Roosevelt's package in the progressive movement at the turn of the century, universal health care at a price people could afford. We have been fighting for this program for a long period of time as a country. Harry Truman was asked, "What was your greatest failure as President of the United States? The failure to achieve it."

Everyone understands that the principal mistake has been because we have been taking incremental action which would supposedly solve the problem. How glad we are that there are so many people who are interested in health care this evening on cost containment and cost control. Where have they been all this period of time? Where have they been?

Well, Bill Clinton has a program and it does have cost containment and it does have universality.

Tonight we hear these eloquent words talking about the budget, aimed at the budget, and it hits the elderly people and the poor people. Entitlements are for whom? They are for the neediest people in our society. They are the children, poor children; they are on an entitlement; they get Medicaid; they need more services. Well, let us do something about that tonight at 1 percent.

Who is going to tell those children who need the services? Who is going to tell the Medicaid recipients, increasing 25 percent in the last year, 13 percent increase in the number of people who are eligible? What are you going to do with those people? You cannot get doctors in this country to treat people on Medicaid. OK, that is too bad about entitlements.

Mr. President, this is a very, very serious mistake. It is a distortion of the thoughtful, hopeful, trusting American people who want comprehensive care and have a commitment by this President to do it. Let us do it that way. Let us reject the kinds of half solutions that have really brought us to the place where we are this evening with millions of poor children, elderly people who fear for their lives in terms of failure to have any health care coverage at a cost they can afford.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I think the Senator from Pennsylvania rose first. How much time does the Senator wish?

Mr. WOFFORD. Two and a half minutes.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Two and a half minutes. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. WOFFORD. Mr. President, I was sent to the body by the people of Pennsylvania to get action on universal affordable health care. So if I thought the amendment by my good friends from Georgia and New Mexico would take us in that direction, I would be here, come what may, voting for it. I believe, on the contrary, that moving forward now before we have the chance to consider the comprehensive proposal for health care reform to control costs from the President of the United States would turn upside down a process that is going to work, has a chance to work, and we need to give the President's proposal a chance.

I was off the floor for a few minutes and did not learn whether the Senator from Massachusetts got an answer to his question put to the Senator from Missouri: Do you mean you are going to cap the whole of health care costs or do you just mean you are going to cap Government costs?

And of those Government costs, let me remind you, that are going up hundreds of billions of dollars, more than $100 billion a year, for each dollar we spend on health care, 27 cents is for Medicaid and Medicare, 14 cents is for other Government programs. The rest is paid by the American people by private insurance and out-of-pocket costs.

Are we only going to deal with 27 cents of the dollar with what we are talking about? If so, then we are talking about balancing the budget on the backs of the elderly and the poor. To deal with this deficit, we have comprehensive health care reform that has a cap over the whole of the health care cost system, and we will have a chance to do that beginning in May. Do not let us lose that chance by putting this cart before the horse that we have to put on the track in May.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. NUNN. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has 5 minutes 16 seconds; the Senator from Tennessee has 6 minutes, 54 seconds.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I wonder whether it would be possible——

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, why do I not yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, there are several other people who wish to speak. I wonder if it would be possible to extend this debate 5 minutes on each side.

Mr. SASSER. This is a very interesting debate, but let me tell my colleagues that after we conclude this and have two rollcall votes, we have about 30 amendments to vote on.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I take it that is an answer to my question?

Mr. SASSER. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota 2 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, before I get started, a disclaimer. I was a teacher. I am now supposed to talk about this in 2 minutes. I will give it my best.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, 2 minutes. I do not even know how to do this. Why? Why this proposal, arbitrary, capricious, when we have now talked about a 4-year plan of deficit reduction, some investment, and we have a President of the United States, and I hope a Congress, committed to universal health care coverage which includes cost containment? Why? Because if it does not work, then you are going to be cutting benefits from Medicaid and Medicare people, and it is the cruelest thing you can do. And you have no plan. It is not tied in with any changes of how we deliver health care. Why? Because if you do not reach the caps this way, the Senator from Massachusetts is absolutely correct, zero on budget and policy priorities. Who are we going to cut? The School and Child Assistance Program for school lunch children? Are we going to cut the supplemental security income program for Social Security recipients? Did I not hear a lot of discussion on the floor today about how awful it was to raise taxes on the highest income Social Security beneficiaries?

Mr. President, the question is why? And, boy, we can be abstract on the floor of the Senate. But these statistics mean something in human terms, and this would be cruel and it would be unconscionable and the timing of it is off, when we finally have a President, and I hope a Congress, that is going to take action on these very issues.

Was that 2 minutes, Mr. President?

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I think he was under 2 minutes, if I am not mistaken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is correct.

Mr. SASSER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, listening to the decibel level in this place, I must say to my colleagues I cannot wait for real health care reform to begin.

Somebody just recently challenged all of us who are standing up here supporting this amendment to say where have we been? Well, most of us, and those you will hear from tonight, have been for 15, 16, 17 years trying to get real health care reform, so I hope that is not lost on anybody.

I rise to compliment the bipartisanship of this amendment. I think that should not be lost on anybody because it is not lost on anybody in America.

And the people on the other side of the aisle can debate all they want about the fact we are anticipating something. The reality is you have in front of you a bipartisan effort to deal both with the problem of the deficit and the problem of the health care reform. If there are two things people in America and Minnesota care about, this is it. I really do not understand why we have this debate.

My colleagues from Arkansas said we ought to wait 6 weeks. We are. This is just the last chapter of the book. This is the one people turn to that says how much money we are going to save from all of this. This gives a very good indication of how much we can save. You can see it on the public programs, CPI plus one beginning in 1996. Just 3 years to get your reform going.

You can see the same thing in your private program. We can include that

private program here with some very obvious reasons.

The reality is—Minnesota is the proof of it—you come back to Minnesota in the middle or late eighties, we did risk contracting for Medicare. Everybody bought the Medicare program. We were at CPI plus one in those days. But the reimbursement formula killed the program. That is how simple it is.

Now we are doing the same thing on private programs. We are bringing those costs down. We were 10 percent above the national average 10 years ago, 15 below the national average today, we are headed for 30 percent. It can be done. I hope the President comes and shows us exactly how it can be done.

But the framework, the goal is in this amendment. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment. It will help the President. It will tell the President we are ready to take on the tough issues, to take up the elderly program; we are ready to take on the private program. That is the statement that I hear from this amendment. I strongly support it particularly because it is a bipartisan approach to solving the problem. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New York and then to the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Finance Committee, I rise not simply to state my opposition to this amendment but my dismay that it has been offered. This sense-of-the-Senate amendment includes language that calls for spending limits on mandatory spending programs excluding Social Security.

Sir, we have been talking about Medicare throughout this. Medicare is title 18 of the Social Security Act. It gives recipients a right to receive their benefits for which they have paid, through contributory insurance, the Federal Insurance Contribution Act. If we can strip this right from citizens, what else can we not do?

Sir, mark me: We put the Social Security system in shape in 1983. It is in surplus. The Senator, my friend from Georgia, says the surplus goes on for another quarter century.

If we adopt this amendment, how far are we from the point where we say we will cut retirement benefits in half? The Social Security Act extends to retirement benefits, disability, survivors insurance, and medical insurance.

If we are going to be so loose with language as to say title 18 of the Social Security Act is not Social Security, when will the day come when retirement benefits are not Social Security? When will the day come that we will have breached a contract with the American people that was entered into in 1935, has been meticulously adhered to for more than half a century, retirement benefits never a day late or a dollar short for half a century? Here we are putting it at jeopardy due to our desires to keep some other programs going, the paid for contributory insurance of the American people.

If you want to put the Social Security system entirely at jeopardy, vote for this amendment, but I plead with you, vote no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two minutes, forty-eight seconds.

Mr. NUNN. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Kansas.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, just two points. I am a cosponsor of this amendment and I am proud to say that I think it does what, in a strong bipartisan fashion, all of us believe must be done here; that is to say, mandatory spending should not be put off limits. Second, as someone who cares a great deal about comprehensive health care reform and believes that President Clinton has spoken quite eloquently to why it is important, that is in no way relevant to this particular amendment tonight.

It is 2 years before it even starts. I have confidence, Mr. President, that in that time we are going to fashion a strong comprehensive health care bill.

I yield any time remaining.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, let me just say very briefly that there is a combination of failures in the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

It is cruel for reasons which have been expressed in that it decimates at the rate of $123 billion over years, seniors, poor people, and children.

It is foolish in that it brings with it no plan, no thought, simply a meat ax which takes $123 billion off something called entitlements.

It is destructive because it is an absolute broadside on the President's health care reform plan, which completely negates what the good Senator from Kansas has just said, because there is every relationship between the Senator's amendment and health care reform.

I will remind our colleagues that our parliamentary situation is that we first had the Sasser amendment. I hope they will vote for it because it is sensible; we then have the Nunn amendment. I hope they will vote against it, because it is not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. NUNN. How much time do I have remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute forty-seven seconds.

Mr. NUNN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHAFEE. We all agree these deficits are intolerable. Even under the proposal submitted by President Clinton, the debt of the Nation increases by $1 trillion in 4 years. So we have not gotten a handle on this problem at all. Second, we all agree that the entitlements are the principal driving force in our deficit.

The opponents of this object. They object to the approach of the Senator from Georgia and the rest of us. They say it is not pertinent. But it is also a fact, Mr. President, that the opponents have been opposed to all attempts to handle the entitlement problem that we face in this Nation.

We have had a whole series of votes on this matter. Those who have voted against it have never once voted to do anything about the entitlements on this floor. So it seems to me we can keep going with the present intolerable situation, or we can try to do something about it. There is a lot of talk about health care reform, as though that is going to solve the problem. But the facts are that health care reform is going to cost money in the first years of its initiation.

So I think this is a worthy try. I hope that my colleagues will support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. NUNN. How much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-four seconds to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. NUNN. I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-seven seconds to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I rise to ask unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 3 minutes, not charged to either side. I have a question to ask and I would like to have Senator NUNN answer the question, then Senator SASSER or whoever is on the other side. Three minutes only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I do not want to object, but I might ask: Would the questions generally be in opposition to the Nunn amendment? I would like to have 3 minutes for Senator NUNN in the event that is the case.

Mr. EXON. I respond to my friend. This Senator has not decided how to vote. I have been listening to this very interesting debate. I have a question that I would like to pose. We could have been through with it by this time,

I think, if we had not had this exchange. May I have 3 minutes, no more, no less?

Mr. DOMENICI. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DASCHLE). The chair hears no objection. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I would like to pose this question to Senator NUNN and then Senator SASSER, or whoever would like to answer the question on the other side.

The White House, in two or three calls to me, within the last hour and a half, said that if this passes, it is going to eliminate any chance whatsoever for comprehensive health care reform. I, for one, have recognized for a long time that it was going to cost money to get into this matter of comprehensive health care.

My question is, first, to Senator NUNN. The White House says your measure will kill their plan. Please tell me why the White House is wrong.

And then, to Senator SASSER, or whoever would like to answer on that side of the aisle, in a minute, tell me both sides, because I still have not decided at this moment how I will vote. I yield 1 minute to Senator NUNN.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I say to my friend from Nebraska, if the White House is putting out that word, it can only be based on the assumption or the premise that the White House does not believe its own Health Care Reform Act is going to save the American taxpayers any money, or any appreciable money, and that the White House must believe that the health care costs to the taxpayers of America, beginning in 1996, even after a 2-year reform, are going to grow more than the rate of inflation, plus all the population you plug in, plus 1 percent for 2 years.

That would be the only conceivable explanation I would have. I do not think that is consistent with any of President Clinton's past statements. It is not consistent with the chart that OMB puts out, or with the hundreds of billions of dollars that have been projected as savings, nor with the fiscal soundness of our Nation.

Mr. EXON. May I ask for a response from Senator SASSER?

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I am advised that the White House views this as detrimental to their health care proposal for a number of reasons, not the least of which are any savings that come from cost control; and there will be some cost control imposed here by this entitlement. It would be imposed unevenly and inequitably, in my judgment. But the cost controls and savings that will come from that are needed to finance the comprehensive health care proposal.

I think that is what the White House is saying. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia is much more knowledgeable in health care issues than I and, frankly, I would like to defer to his wisdom on this matter.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three minutes have expired. The vote now occurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The yeas and nays have not been ordered.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Sasser amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Nunn amendment to follow the Sasser amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SASSER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, without prolonging this unduly, I ask for an additional 30 seconds of the Senator from Nebraska, provided I answered his question precisely and——

Mr. STEVENS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, there is a group of us that have 40 amendments here, and we do not get to say one word, and we have gone over 10 minutes on this amendment. Why is it that time can be allocated to those who already have spoken an hour and no time at all for those who have not had 1 minute to speak?

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I withdraw the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment by the Senator from Tennessee.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 64 Leg.]

YEAS—95

Akaka	Cochran	Gorton
Baucus	Cohen	Graham
Bennett	Conrad	Gramm
Biden	Coverdell	Grassley
Bingaman	Craig	Gregg
Bond	D'Amato	Harkin
Boren	Daschle	Hatch
Boxer	DeConcini	Hatfield
Bradley	Dodd	Heflin
Breaux	Dole	Hollings
Brown	Domenici	Jeffords
Bryan	Dorgan	Johnston
Bumpers	Durenberger	Kassebaum
Burns	Exon	Kempthorne
Byrd	Feingold	Kennedy
Campbell	Feinstein	Kerrey
Chafee	Ford	Kerry
Coats	Glenn	Kohl
Krueger	Moseley-Braun	Roth
Lautenberg	Moynihan	Sarbanes
Leahy	Murkowski	Sasser
Levin	Murray	Shelby
Lieberman	Nickles	Simon
Lott	Nunn	Simpson
Lugar	Packwood	Smith
Mack	Pell	Specter
Mathews	Pressler	Stevens
McCain	Pryor	Thurmond
McConnell	Reid	Warner
Metzenbaum	Riegle	Wellstone
Mikulski	Robb	Wofford
Mitchell	Rockefeller	

NAYS—4

Danforth	Helms
Faircloth	Wallop

NOT VOTING—1

Inouye

So the amendment (No. 262) was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 263

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote now occurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN].

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I move to table the Nunn amendment and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER] to table the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN].

The yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BOREN (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, the Senator from Hawaii being absent, were he present, Mr. INOUYE would have voted in the affirmative. I would have voted in the negative. I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 65 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Akaka	Feinstein	Mathews
Baucus	Ford	Metzenbaum
Biden	Glenn	Mikulski
Boxer	Graham	Mitchell
Bradley	Harkin	Moseley-Braun
Breaux	Heflin	Moynihan
Bryan	Hollings	Murray
Bumpers	Jeffords	Pell
Byrd	Johnston	Pryor
Campbell	Kennedy	Reid
Conrad	Kerry	Riegle
Daschle	Kohl	Rockefeller
DeConcini	Krueger	Sarbanes
Dodd	Lautenberg	Sasser
Dorgan	Leahy	Simon
Exon	Levin	Wellstone
Feingold	Lieberman	Wofford

NAYS—47

Bennett	Chafee	Craig
Bingaman	Coats	D'Amato
Bond	Cochran	Danforth
Brown	Cohen	Dole
Burns	Coverdell	Domenici

Durenberger	Kerrey	Robb
Faircloth	Lott	Roth
Gorton	Lugar	Shelby
Gramm	Mack	Simpson
Grassley	McCain	Smith
Gregg	McConnell	Specter
Hatch	Murkowski	Stevens
Hatfield	Nickles	Thurmond
Helms	Nunn	Wallop
Kassebaum	Packwood	Warner
Kempthorne	Pressler	

PRESENT AND GIVING A LIVE PAIR, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—1

Boren, against

NOT VOTING—1

Inouye

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 263) was agreed to.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, once again we are here at entitlement cap junction dealing with an amendment brought forward by my colleagues Senator NUNN and Senator DOMENICI.

We have been down this road before and at that time only 28 Senators voted for an entitlement cap, 4 Democrats and 28 Republicans. That was on April 10, 1992.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the recorded vote for that amendment be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

[102d Congress, 2d Session, Apr. 10, 1992]

FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION, 1993 (VETERANS' COMPENSATION)

Bill No.: S. Con. Res. 106 (H. Con. Res. 287); amendment No.: 1779.

Subject: Mitchell amendment (to the Mitchell amendment No. 1778 [to the Domenici, et al., substitute amendment No. 1777] exempting Medicaid from the required cap and cuts) which exempts Veterans' compensation programs from the cap that would be imposed on all entitlement programs by the Domenici, et al., substitute amendment. (The Mitchell amendment No. 1778 fell when the Domenici, et al., substitute amendment No. 1777 was withdrawn.)

S. Con. Res. 106 (H. Con. Res. 287): Vote Nos. 68–80, 110.

Result: Amendment agreed to.

YEAS (66)

Democrats (50 or 93%)

Adams, Akaka, Baucus, Bentsen, Biden, Breaux, Bryan, Bumpers, Burdick, Byrd, Conrad, Cranston, Daschle, DeConcini, Dodd, Exon, Ford, Fowler, Glenn, Gore, Graham, Harkin, Heflin, Hollings, Inouye, Johnston, Kennedy, Kerrey, Kerry, Kohl, Lautenberg, Leahy, Levin, Lieberman, Metzenbaum, Mikulski, Mitchell, Moynihan, Pell, Pryor, Reid, Riegle, Rockefeller, Sanford, Sarbanes, Sasser, Shelby, Simon, Wellstone, Wofford.

Republicans (16 or 40%)

Burns, Coats, D'Amato, Grassley, Hatch, Jeffords, Kasten, McCain, McConnell, Murkowski, Packwood, Pressler, Seymour, Specter, Stevens, Thurmond.

NAYS (28)

Democrats (4 or 7%)

Bingaman, Boren, Nunn, Robb.

Republicans (24 or 60%)

Bond, Brown, Chafee, Cochran, Cohen, Craig, Danforth, Dole, Domenici, Durenberger, Gorton, Hatfield, Helms, Kassebaum, Lott, Lugar, Mack, Nickles, Roth, Rudman, Simpson, Smith, Symms, Warner.

NOT VOTING (6)

Democrats (3)

Bradley—2, Dixon—2, Wirth—2.

Republicans (3)

Garn—2, Gramm—2, Wallop—2 AN.

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE

1—Official Business.
2—Necessarily Absent.
3—Illness.
4—Other.

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea.
AN—Announced Nay.
PY—Paired Yea.
PN—Paired Nay.

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE

Party Cohesion

Democrats—93%.
Republicans—60%.

Measure of party support on this vote

For (66)

Democrats—50 or 76%.
Republicans—16 or 24%.

Against (28)

Democrats—4 or 14%.
Republicans—24 or 86%.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, now we are going to get into a debate very shortly about numbers—about billions and billions of dollars.

We will hear how the Nunn-Domenici entitlement cap will save billions of dollars and control the growth of entitlements.

But what about the effects of this entitlement cap? How does it affect veterans, farmers, senior citizens, Medicare and Medicaid beneficiaries and the like. How do the organizations representating these individuals feel about this entitlement cap.

Well, they opposed the entitlement cap in 1992 and they oppose the cap now.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars representing 2.2 million men and women oppose the proposal.

The disabled veterans oppose the cap. They note that the budget agreement of 1990 already has cut veterans spending by over $3 billion between 1990 and 1995. They say that "to repeal current sequestration protections afforded veterans' entitlements and once again reduce veterans benefits—especially as a result of increased spending by other Federal programs—is unconscionable."

The National Council of Senior Citizens notes, perhaps quite correctly, that once you cap trust fund financed programs, the next target will be Social Security.

The Child Welfare League of America notes that the entitlement caps will devestate foster care and adoption assistance programs.

The National Conference of State Legislatures says that entitlement caps will simply shift the cost and burdens to State and local governments in order to continue to provide the same levels of benefits.

And the Food Research Action Center notes that the Congressional Budget Office would prevent approximately 12 million children currently receiving nutritional benefits from getting a nutritionally adequate diet.

So, I repeat Mr. President, here we are again. And if you want to indiscriminately cut benefits for veterans, disabled veterans, Medicare beneficiaries, civilian and military retirees, kids needing nutritional assistance, people receiving supplemental security income and the like—vote for the Domenici-Nunn amendment.

Only 28 Members of the Senate voted for this sort of proposals in 1992, and I can see no reason why any more should vote for this sort of policy now. And if you do vote for an entitlement cap, talk to your veterans, talk to your farmers, talk to your senior citizens, talk to your military retirees, talk to the people in your State that need nutrition programs, or Medicare and Medicaid, and ask them whether they should get an across-the-board reduction in their benefits.

The answer will be a resounding no. A resounding no.

So I say to anyone who did not vote for an entitlement cap in 1992, why would you want to vote for one now? Ask yourself that question as you vote on the very same proposal that was so soundly defeated in 1992.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letters of support be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSED TO NUNN-DOMENICI ENTITLEMENT PROPOSAL

Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
Disabled American Veterans.
The American Legion.
Vietnam Veterans of America.
National Council of Senior Citizens.
National Association of Retired Federal Employees.
Families U.S.A.
Children's Defense Fund.
American Public Welfare Association.
Child Welfare League of America.
American Hospital Association.
Association of American Medical Colleges.
American College of Emergency Physicians.
American Protestant Health Association.
Catholic Health Association.
Federation of American Health Systems.
National Association of Children's Hospitals.
National Association of Psychiatric Health Systems.
National Association of Rehabilitation Facilities.
Voluntary Hospitals of America.
National Conference of State Legislatures.
American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees.
Service Employees International Union.

Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.
Food Research and Action Center.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, March 24, 1993.

Hon. JIM SASSER,
Chairman, Committee on Budget, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the 2.2 million men and women of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, I wish to convey our strong objection to a proposal that would direct spending caps on only selected mandatory spending programs. Should this cap become law it would result in veterans' entitlement programs being subjected to sequestration because of growth in other direct spending programs.

As you are well aware, Federal spending on VA benefits and entitlements have been reduced from approximately 4.8 percent in 1975 to a current level of approximately 2.4 percent. Certainly, VA entitlements are not a major contributing factor in the escalating Federal deficit. In fact, while veterans benefits were being reduced or eliminated other Federal entitlements have increased dramatically.

Again, Mr. Chairman, the VFW opposes direct spending caps and commends you for pointing out the inequities in this ill-advised proposal.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. CARNEY,
Commander in Chief.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Washington, DC, March 24, 1993.

Hon. JIM SASSER,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Disabled American Veterans (DAV) shares your deep concern that should a proposed program of direct spending caps on mandatory spending become law, it would subject certain veterans' entitlement programs to sequestration as a result of growth in other direct spending programs.

Senator Sasser, as you are well aware, VA entitlements are not a major contributing factor in the ever increasing federal deficit. Quite to the contrary. The number of veterans and their survivors who receive service-connected disability and death compensation payments has been on the decline for the past several years. Additionally, the percentage of federal outlays spent on VA benefits and services has been cut in half from 5.0 percent in 1975 to 2.4 percent in 1993.

I also wish to point out that the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 (OBRA) required VA to reduce spending on veterans' entitlements by $620 million in Fiscal Year 1991 and a total of $3.35 billion through Fiscal Year 1995. To meet these spending reduction requirements, VA was required to: suspend payments to certain incompetent veterans; institute a $2.00 copayment for prescriptions; repeal provisions which permitted reentitlement to survivors' benefits upon termination of a former spouse's or child's marriage; limit vocational rehabilitation to certain service-connected disabled veterans; limit burial benefits to wartime veterans and delay a COLA for service-connected disability and death benefit recipients.

While veterans' benefits were being reduced or eliminated, other federal entitlements were being enhanced. The remarriage provisions for CIA surviving spouses was liberalized and increased protection was being afforded to incompetent Social Security beneficiaries. Suffice it to say, that veterans were not treated fairly under OBRA.

Additionally, President Clinton's, as well as the House of Representatives' Fiscal Year 1994 budget calls for an overall reduction of veterans' benefits and services by $5 billion over the next five years.

To repeal current sequestration protections afforded veterans' entitlements and once again reduce veterans' benefits—especially as a result of increased spending by other federal entitlement programs—is unconscionable.

Senator Sasser, DAV certainly appreciates your efforts to point out the inequities contained in a proposed program of direct spending caps and we look forward to your continuing advocacy on behalf of America's service-connected disabled veteran population.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. HEILMAN,
National Legislative Director.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, DC, March 24, 1993.

Hon. JIM SASSER,
Chairman, Senate Committee on the Budget, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The American Legion cannot accept any budget proposal which places spending caps on entitlements unless all entitlements are included, such as, social security, Medicare and Medicaid. This is especially the case if such a proposal would subject veterans' entitlement programs to sequestration due to growth in other spending programs.

Many of the veterans who receive these benefits are on a fixed income and their livelihood depends on annual cost-of-living-adjustments (COLAs). Many of those who receive these benefits paid a dear price such as the loss of an arm or a leg or even the death of a spouse or parent. To deny them an annual COLA is to ignore their sacrifices.

The national deficit cannot and must not be balanced on the lives of those who had nothing to do with its creation. If every federal agency had practiced the same budgetary restraint that the Department of Veterans Affairs has, there would be a national surplus rather than a deficit. Progress can be made to reduce the red ink, but it must be based on prudent decisions. Economically crippling those who can't help themselves is not the right approach.

Thank you for your continued leadership on this and other issues concerning America's veterans. Your favorable consideration of the Legion's concern would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

ROGER A. MUNSON,
National Commander.

VIETNAM VETERANS OF AMERICA, INC.,
Washington, DC, March 24, 1993.

Chairman JIM SASSER,
Senate Budget Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SASSER: Vietnam Veterans of America, Inc. is adamantly opposed to the entitlement caps amendment to the Senate Budget Resolution proposed by Senators Nunn, Domenici and others. Not only is this bad economic policy because the random, across-the-board cuts of an automatic sequester allow no prioritization of programs subject to reduced funding, but also because one group of entitlement beneficiaries, Social Security recipients, is given an up-front exemption from any sequester.

Given the current crisis in this nation, in which all Americans are asked to sacrifice in the short term in order to reduce the budget deficit and rebuild for the future, it would seem that this entitlement cap proposal singles out one population for which sacrifice is not required. Provision for any exemptions is simply unacceptable. If the legislator's "I-can-cut-more-than-you-can" game must be played such that specific constituencies are granted exemptions from entitlement caps, the only group that should be singled out is veterans-individuals who have already sacrificed of themselves for the benefit of this nation.

Again, I reiterate that the proposed entitlement cap is simply unacceptable because of the blatant disregard for the concept of equal sacrifice.

Sincerely,

PAUL S. EGAN,
Executive Director.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF SENIOR CITIZENS,
Washington, DC, March 24, 1993.

Hon. JIM SASSER,
Chairman, Senate Committee on the Budget, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SASSER: The National Council of Senior Citizens (NCSC), on behalf of our five million members and 5,000 clubs and Councils nationwide, urges you to oppose Senators Nunn's and Domenici's proposal to place a budget cap on entitlement programs. We find this to be the most outrageous attack on the elderly we have seen in years.

This proposal could do serious harm to such critical programs as Medicare, Medicaid, veterans' benefits, civil service, military and railroad retirement, food stamps and SSI. All of these are vital programs for the elderly and their families which NCSC has long worked to defend. Moreover, once Congress has acted to cap trust fund financed programs, such as Medicare and railroad retirement, we foresee targeting Social Security for the next cap.

Senator, the National Council of Senior Citizens urges you and all other members of the Senate to do all that is in your power to stop this assault on the elderly, the poor and the most vulnerable of our society. Thank you.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE T. SMEDLEY,
Executive Director.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JIM SASSER,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Budget Committee's modified version of President Clinton's budget proposals would be greatly harmed by an amendment expected to be offered by Senators Nunn, Robb, Domenici and Danforth. This amendment would include a provision to place annual caps on total entitlement spending beginning in fiscal year 1996.

If Congress failed to pass reconciliation legislation that met the cap, an automatic sequester of entitlement programs, excepting social security, would occur. Federal retirees know what it is to have their inflation protection sequestered unfairly. A repeat of that unfairness on top of the sacrifices already made is totally unacceptable.

The sacrifices already made by federal retirees sum to $31.6 billion for the period '82–'92. NARFE members and other federal retirees have accepted their portion of painful cuts—delayed and diet COLAs and increased enrollee costs for health care. Our ability to

sustain sacrifice must know some limit and we must draw the line at an amendment that could again unfairly deny equity in inflation protection.

Sincerely,

C.W. CARTER,
President.

FAMILIES, USA,
Washington, DC, March 23, 1993.

Hon. JIM SASSER,
Chairman, Budget Committee, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SASSER: I understand that an amendment to the President's economic package may be offered that would put a cap on Medicare and Medicaid spending. Such an amendment would bring disastrous results.

Isolated cuts in Medicare and Medicaid, without comparable cuts in private sector health spending, would exacerbate three existing problems.

First, they could result in higher out-of-pocket health costs—through added premiums, deductibles and copayments for poor people and seniors. For too many program beneficiaries, these costs are already unaffordable.

Second, by reducing Medicare and Medicaid payment levels for health care providers, fewer physicians and hospitals would keep their doors open for the elderly and the poor. Already there is a large discrepancy between what doctors and hospitals receive from privately insured patients versus payments from Medicare and Medicaid. If that discrepancy grows, discrimination will increase as fewer seniors and poor people would have access to care.

Third, doctors who continue to treat seniors and the poor would make up for lost Medicare and Medicaid income by shifting more health-care costs onto everyone else. Thus, the health-billing shell game would continue to get worse. Costs would be shifted to middle-class families and to businesses but not contained.

A major contribution to deficit reduction would result from reining in all health-care spending—including Medicare and Medicaid—by placing effective limits on what Americans are charged for our health care. Capping Medicare and Medicaid in isolation would cause more harm than good. We support your efforts to defeat this harmful amendment.

Sincerely,

RON POLLACK,
Executive Director.

CHILDREN'S DEFENSE FUND,
Washington, DC, March 23, 1993.

Hon. JIM SASSER,
Chair, Senate Budget Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to express my dismay that some members of the Senate are once again considering placing a cap upon entitlement programs. Children, our nation's future, will be the primary victims of such an arbitrary rule. Children already face enormous burdens and obstacles in our country, and the entitlement programs for them are already the stingiest and most limited. Placing a cap upon entitlement programs will only exacerbate these problems. At a time when we have opportunities to make a real difference for our children, it is unacceptable, both morally and politically, for Congress to pass such an arbitrary rule.

Last year, the Congressional Budget Office listed the following programs which benefit children and their families as covered by an entitlement cap, if one becomes law: Foster Care and Adoption Assistance, Medicaid, Unemployment Compensation, Food Stamps, Family Support (AFDC), Child nutrition programs, Supplemental Security Income (SSI), and guaranteed student loans. These are the very same programs which are rescuing children and their families during these tough economic times. It is the very fact that they are not capped which has provided the much-needed, if wholly inadequate, "safety net."

The costs of health care are the source of the large entitlement spending increases. But capping Medicare and Medicaid is the wrong answer at a time when access to health care for the elderly and the poor is worsening. The nation needs a national strategy to guarantee access to health care while restraining costs in the entire health sector. Capping just Medicare and Medicaid without attacking the problems of the health care system will not control health care inflation, but it will shift costs and reduce access to quality care for the most vulnerable populations. It would be particularly ironic—and outrageous—if, just as the new Administration is about to propose health care reform, Congress made it much more difficult to secure by passage of such a cap.

Including an across-the-board cap on other entitlements that have not been growing except when driven up by recession or other crises will mean that basic programs desperately needed by children and their families, those listed above, would be cut simply by rising health costs. This is illogical and inhumane. It effectively undermines all of the very laudatory purposes which the Congress had in mind when it created these programs.

The plight of America's children and their families is worsening. There are now over 14 million children in our country living in poverty. Over 100,000 of our children go to sleep homeless each night. An entitlement cap will arbitrarily wreak additional havoc in vulnerable lives which need support and stability from their government.

Thank you for your continuing leadership in opposing the entitlement cap amendments. If I or my staff can be of assistance to you, please let me know.

Sincerely,

MARIAN WRIGHT EDELMAN,
President.

AMERICAN PUBLIC WELFARE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, March 24, 1993.

Hon. JIM SASSER,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SASSER: We understand the Senate will shortly consider an amendment to cap entitlement program spending.

Although we recognize the amendment includes an inflation factor adjustment, we must register our strong concern that this amendment would be very damaging to low income families and children.

Programs that serve these vulnerable populations can be affected by many unpredictable changes, particularly economic downturns and health care costs. A more appropriate solution to the latter problem is national health care reform.

We strongly urge you to oppose this amendment.

Best regards,

A. SIDNEY JOHNSON III.

CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.,
Washington, DC, March 23, 1993.

DEAR SENATOR: The Child Welfare League of America (CWLA) strongly supports the FY94 Budget Resolution, S. Con. Res. 18, and opposes any amendments which would impose a cap on means-tested entitlement programs or otherwise harm America's growing numbers of vulnerable and at-risk children and families.

CWLA is a membership organization composed of 700 public and private nonprofit agencies in every state struggling to provide a range of services to some of the most vulnerable in our country—seriously abused or neglected children, children in foster care and children awaiting adoption. As the numbers of such children have escalated rapidly in recent years, and their seriousness and complexity of their problems have multiplied, help and assistance for these infants, children and youth has been increasingly inadequate. S. Con. Res 18 supports crucial new investments in the lives and well-being of these children and their troubled families.

Efforts to cap on means-tested entitlement programs—particularly Foster Care and Adoption Assistance and Medicaid (Titles IV-E and XIX of the Social Security Act)—would be especially harmful to these children.

The Federal Foster Care and Adoption Assistance Program is a means-tested entitlement which provides the primary source of basic support for abused and neglected children who must be separated from their parents and placed in foster care, as well as for such infants and children seeking loving and permanent adoptive homes. These children have severe problems, ranging from prenatal exposure to crack cocaine and alcohol, serious handicaps and emotional disabilities, and efforts to limit IVE support would only add to their problems.

Medicaid is another means-tested entitlement program of vital importance for abused and neglected children, children in foster care and children awaiting adoption. Many of these children exhibit significant physical, mental, emotional and developmental problems associated with the traumas they have suffered and rely on Medicaid to help them overcome these problems and lead healthy and productive lives. Capping Medicaid assistance could be especially threatening to these youngsters.

We urge you to vote in favor of S. Con. Res. 18 and oppose any amendments to cap means-tested entitlement programs or other efforts to cut back on essential investments in America's children and families.

Sincerely,

DAVID S. LIEDERMAN.

AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION, ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN MEDICAL COLLEGES, AMERICAN COLLEGE OF EMERGENCY PHYSICIANS, AMERICAN PROTESTANT HEALTH ASSOCIATION, CATHOLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION, FEDERATION OF AMERICAN HEALTH SYSTEMS, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CHILDREN'S HOSPITALS AND RELATED INDUSTRIES, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PSYCHIATRIC HEALTH SYSTEMS, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REHABILITATION FACILITIES, VOLUNTARY HOSPITALS OF AMERICA,
March 23, 1993.

Hon. DANIEL K. AKAKA,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR AKAKA: As organizations representing health care providers, we strongly urge you to reject any attempt to place caps on Medicare, Medicaid, or other entitlement spending during your consideration of the fiscal year (FY) 1994 budget resolution.

Imposing caps on Medicare and Medicaid spending, as well as other entitlements, would arbitrarily restrict spending on health care without any rational basis and avoids dealing with the reasons for health care cost inflation. By not addressing the underlying causes for the growth in health spending, this proposal would aggravate, rather than relieve, the defects inherent in our health care system. Spending caps would not spur necessary fundamental change in the health delivery system so that it is more patient-centered, but would simply lock in the status quo without any real reform.

The President has already called for $48 billion in savings from the Medicare program and $10 billion in savings from Medicaid over the next five years through a variety of reductions in payments to hospitals, doctors and other providers. Furthermore, the Administration has labeled these reductions in the Medicare program as a "stop-gap" measure, linking them directly to the need for comprehensive health care reform and to the fair treatment of providers and consumers alike.

Over the years, Medicare and Medicaid have seriously underpaid most of America's providers for the care they render. Further cutbacks could only have an adverse impact on the ability of providers to continue offering the same level of high quality care.

While we recognize the difficulties of achieving meaningful deficit reduction, we do not believe that placing arbitrary caps on entitlement spending should be a basis for accomplishing this end. Neither will it result in sound health policy. We, therefore, strongly urge you to oppose any effort to place caps on entitlement spending as you develop your FY 1994 budget resolution.

Sincerely,

The Above-listed Health Care Organizations.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATE LEGISLATURES,
Washington, DC, March 24, 1992.

Hon. PETE DOMENICI,
Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DOMENICI: As an organization that represents state governments, we recognize that the reduction of the federal deficit and the restoration of sound fiscal policy are critical to the economic future of America. However, while serious deficit reduction may require reducing federal entitlements, your amendment to cap the federal share of mandatory spending does not reduce the cost of these programs. It simply shifts the cost and burden to state and local governments in order to continue to provide the same level of benefits.

States are participants in the current delivery and funding of federal entitlement programs. For some time, we have been required to assume many of their costs and burdens. While the growth of entitlements has adversely impacted the federal budget, a similar effect has occurred at the state level.

If you decide to proceed with your amendment to cap entitlements, it should include statutory or regulatory changes to existing law that would authorize options for states to restructure, reduce or limit services; eligibility or payments to beneficiaries. Moreover, if entitlement programs are capped or reduced without these corresponding changes, states must be absolved from legal obligations to provide services to entitled individuals.

It is imperative that states participate as full partners in reshaping entitlement programs and reducing their rate of growth. We look forward to working with you on this goal.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM T. POUND,
Executive Director.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES, AFL–CIO,
Washington, DC, March 24, 1993.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the 1.3 million members of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), I am writing to express our strong opposition to the entitlement cap amendment to the Fiscal Year 1994 Budget Resolution expected to be offered by Senator Nunn (D–GA).

It is our understanding that this amendment would seek to place an annual cap on total entitlement spending. There are a number of problems with such a cap at this time. First, it would be a procedural fix to a substantive problem, resulting in false expectations in that it calls for deficit reduction without specifying where the savings would come from. It also fails to recognize the significant savings already called for in President Clinton's Economic Plan, which we support. It also does not do anything to address the root cause of rising entitlement costs, specifically spiralling health care costs. And, finally it would raise serious equity issues if it could be implemented.

For these and other reasons, we oppose the entitlement cap amendment and urge the Senate to reject it.

Sincerely,

EDWIN S. JAYNE,
Associate Director of Legislation.

SERVICE EMPLOYEES INTERNATIONAL UNION, AFL–CIO, CLC,
Washington, DC, March 23, 1993.

Hon. JIM SASSER,
Budget Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SASSER: On behalf of the one million members of the Service Employees International Union, I urge you to oppose any amendment to cap entitlements. Entitlement caps are blunt budgetary tools that penalize the poor, the elderly, the medically needy, and other at-risk populations.

If a budgetary cap were passed, efforts to enact comprehensive healthcare reform would be thrown into disarray. President Clinton's Healthcare Task Force is currently working to find means to bring healthcare costs under control while fundamentally extending access to under served populations. This ticklish process includes consideration of a complex mixture of new revenues and stringent cost controls. An entitlement cap would undermine the Task Force's work and severely constrain President Clinton's options for healthcare reform.

The entitlement cap would add additional financial pressures to state and local governments. Federal entitlement programs are already a severe strain on state and local governments. Capping the federal commitment to the programs would rob state and local governments of the resources necessary to carry out the federal entitlement programs.

Finally, capping entitlements would not remove the need for the programs, it would only aggravate the crisis.

Again, I urge you to oppose all entitlement caps.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. SWEENEY,
International President.

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA,
Washington, DC, March 23, 1993.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, I wish to express concern over any proposed amendment to the 1994 Budget Resolution that would cap entitlement spending. An entitlement cap would severely damage entitlement programs for low income people. Cutting back vital safety net programs for low income people is not the answer to rising entitlement costs.

Entitlement growth in recent years has been due primarily to ever increasing medical costs. Between 1980 and 1990, the cost of all entitlements other than Social Security and the health care entitlements actually declined both in inflation-adjusted terms and as a share of the Gross Domestic Product. Yet a cap on medicaid and medicare at this time could negatively impact the potential for real health care reform. Universal access to comprehensive health care with effective cost controls not entitlement caps is a more appropriate response to rising entitlement costs.

I urge you to vote against any amendment that would cap entitlements.

Sincerely,

KAY S. DOWHOWER,
Director.

FOOD RESEARCH AND ACTION CENTER,
Washington, DC, March 22, 1993.

Hon. JAMES SASSER,
Chairman, Senate Budget Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We are writing to express our opposition to proposed annual caps on entitlement spending. As an organization dedicated to alleviating hunger and poverty in this country, these entitlement caps will have devastating implications on our agricultural and nutrition programs. Last year, Senator Domenici offered a proposal capping all entitlement programs, including nutrition. The Congressional Budget Office estimated that such an entitlement cap proposal would prevent approximately 12 million children currently receiving nutritional benefits from getting a nutritionally adequate diet. We urge you to defeat all attempts to cripple vital anti-hunger programs by placing arbitrary entitlement caps on them.

A cap on entitlement programs is not the answer to growing program costs. Most experts agree that the root cause of the increased cost lies in the area of health care. Health care costs are spiralling at such alarming rates that even if caps are proposed, health care costs will exceed their cap. The answer is health care reform, including cost containment, not caps on nutrition programs for low income, vulnerable populations.

In a year when reports documenting childhood hunger continue to demonstrate the need for stronger anti-hunger programs, we feel the direction that some supporters of a cap are taking is ill-advised. Families facing hard times must be able to depend upon strong and viable food assistance programs. A cap on the food stamp and child nutrition programs would inevitably lead to program cuts resulting in the exclusion of eligible participants and benefit reductions. Cutting across the board does not determine which programs are needed and which are not. It is not government by choice but by decree.

We urge you to vigorously oppose all efforts to place these egregious caps on entitlement programs.

Sincerely,

EDWARD M. COONEY,
Deputy Director.
ELLEN S. TELLER,
Staff Attorney.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, and Members of the Senate, we are now at a point in these proceedings that is without recent precedent. We have utilized all of the 50 hours prescribed by the Budget Act on the budget resolution. We have disposed of 30 amendments and consumed the full 50 hours.

A number of Senators have filed amendments which have not yet been considered. Some of them are germane to the resolution, some are not. In order to accommodate the sharply conflicting interests of Senators in this situation and permit us to complete action in a reasonable time, I am going to momentarily suggest the absence of a quorum so that the Republican leader and I and the managers can meet briefly to discuss the best way to proceed in an effort to respond to the numerous requests I have had this evening, now exceeding 20 or 25, about what time are we going to leave, how long are we going to go, when are we going to finish and questions of that type.

I think it makes sense to at least attempt to discuss and determine a procedure for handling the situation that accommodates as many people as possible. I do not expect that to last more than just a few minutes. I ask our colleagues to forebear and be patient during that period.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, and Members of the Senate, under the Budget Act all of the 50 hours on the resolution having been used, there is no further time for debate. However, under the same act, any Senator who now wishes to do so may offer an amendment on which a vote would occur immediately. We have many differences on issues, but I think we can all agree on one thing, that this is a very poor way to legislate.

Amendments can now be offered in which no one knows what is in them, no one knows if they are germane, no one knows if they are subject to a point of order, no one knows if they have anything to do with the resolution. Some of them I believe will involve subject matter which has been the subject of previous amendments on the resolution. Whether or not we ought to change the rules is a subject for another day. We have to deal with the situation as it now exists. Therefore, the distinguished Republican leader, the managers, and I have discussed it, and we believe there is no alternative but simply to proceed to begin to take up the amendments and to act on them.

Since almost all of the large list of amendments are being proposed by Republican Senators, we have agreed that the Republican leader, acting on behalf of his colleagues, will designate the first several of the amendments to be offered, and that we will then act upon each of those amendments without debate or any intervening action.

I now direct an appeal to my colleagues on the Democratic side.

I repeat this is a poor way to legislate. You are being asked to vote on amendments which you have not seen, which you have not read, which you have not had a chance to consider, which you do not know whether or not they are germane to this resolution. You do not know whether they are subject to a point of order, you do not know whether they have anything whatsoever to do with the resolution. We must complete action on this resolution by noon tomorrow under prior agreement.

Therefore, I have concluded that the only responsible way to deal with this situation is simply to table every amendment, not attempting to pass a judgment on the merits of it, because I cannot say to you, I cannot represent to you, that an amendment is without merit if I have not seen the amendment. Neither can you make that judgment. But the fact of the matter is we have debated this for a full 50 hours as permitted under the act. We have acted on 30 amendments. I think it is time to move on. The only way we are going to get through this, the only way we are going to get this done and get it over with, is simply to proceed and act on the amendments.

So I ask my colleagues to join with the chairman of the Budget Committee and simply vote to table every amendment. If it is a meritorious amendment, there will be a proper place to deal with it. This is a budget resolution which is an internal congressional document which does not in any event become law. The Constitution requires that in order for an action to become law, it must be passed by both Houses of the Congress and presented to the President for signature.

This resolution will not be presented to the President for signature. Therefore, if someone has a serious amendment which they want to become law, there will be an appropriate legislative mechanism to present it. This is not that mechanism. Anything that we do have is not going to become law. Therefore, I strongly urge and encourage my colleagues to join the chairman of the committee, and myself, in voting to table these amendments so that we can get through this business and get it over with.

I want to say that I apologize to anyone who offers a meritorious amendment. Obviously every person offering an amendment will believe it to be meritorious. Otherwise they will not be offering it. But I know of no other way to deal with this in a reasonable and responsible way. There simply is not time for anyone to evaluate an amendment. There is hardly time to discern the title. Since there is no opportunity to debate, we just do not have the chance to have a full understanding of the matter.

At the last count, I had—I am certain I am not up to date on this—there were nearly 50 amendments that have been filed. Of course, the rules do not require that an amendment have been filed in order to be offered.

I know that my colleagues on the Republican side are making a genuine, good faith effort to reduce the number that will actually be offered and voted on. But at this time we do not have any way of assurance on what that total number will be.

So I have concluded my statement on this subject. I suggest we proceed. Before we do, I would like to yield to the distinguished Republican leader for any comments that he may wish to make and to the managers if they wish to do so.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Would the majority leader yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Under the circumstances would it not make sense to have 10-minute rollcalls without any 5-minute lag period so we can keep going?

Mr. MITCHELL. That is what we are going to do.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, in fact we think we can have—I discussed this with the majority leader—10 minutes on the first, and 7½ minutes on the subsequent votes.

Mr. President, let me indicate that it is not the best way to legislate but many of my colleagues on this side, not because of any fault of their own, did not have an opportunity to debate the amendments during the 50 hours. It used to be 100 hours under the budget; we cut it back to 50 hours.

In 1981, there were 31 amendments to the budget resolution. I do not think there were any motions to table made. They were all, with one exception, defeated. They were to restore immunization funds, restore veterans, a lot of restoration funds in the budget. But I think there is one difference between now and the past; that is, there is a 12 o'clock noon deadline tomorrow.

So on this side it is obviously in our interest to proceed as the majority leader indicated because we may be cut out tomorrow if we come back and start at 9:30, with 7½ minutes per vote

or whatever it takes tomorrow morning. At 12 noon we are finished.

Many of our Members would like to have a vote. They have not had a chance to debate, but they would at least like to have a vote on their amendment.

So it is my suggestion to do as the majority leader suggested. Let us proceed and move as rapidly as we can. If Members will stay here, we can dispose of 10 or 11 of these in a fairly short time. That would only leave 10 or 11 tomorrow morning. We are trying to reduce the list. Right now, I think there are 29 amendments that have been filed, and we would also suggest that we have some agreement that this is the list, that we have a finite list, and we do not add anymore overnight. We will try to get that agreement after the next vote.

So we are prepared to proceed, so that we can accommodate all of our colleagues, and at the same time protect those who have had no opportunity to debate their amendments but do want to vote.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AKAKA). The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, let me say to the Senate—in particular to the Republican Senators, first of all—I do not want to leave the impression, nor do I think the majority leader did, that because Republicans still have amendments, that we are somehow dilatory, or we are asking for some kind of special treatment. The truth of the matter is, we have been very cooperative. As a matter of fact, this is the first time since we have done this—and I have been on all of them—we have gone out of our way to get the amendments printed. I was here one time until 3 in the morning, and Senators were calling them up and sending them up there. There was such frustration that people were trying to get an answer as to what was in them.

We started early saying let us do them right, so that when Senator COHEN calls up an amendment, he will say number such and such. If you want to get ready in advance, you can pass out his amendment. That is a much better way to do it than we have ever done.

I thank our Senators for being cooperative in that regard. With reference to how people vote, I suggest that your leader suggested one way. I submit there are going to be just as real votes as we have had in the last 4 or 5 days. If on that side of the aisle everybody chooses to table them, I think you are going to know what your are tabling. Some of them are going to be very important amendments, as they have been in the past, to issues in our respective States.

So we are going to be ready on our side. We have a list. We hope you are all going to be satisfied with our efforts to start a list of 10, and then we will work quickly for another list of 10. We hope to get as many of them, if not all, completed in the time allowed before 12 noon tomorrow. I thank the leader.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, if I might state in response, first, I did not, either explicitly or implicitly, suggest that there was bad faith on anybody's part. Quite the opposite. We have been attempting to do this in a cooperative way, and the fact of the matter is, as everybody here knows, I am sure, if we were acting in bad faith, we could offer an unlimited string of second-degree amendments to the first Republican amendment that came up, and there would not be any votes on any Republican amendments. I, obviously, could make a nondebatable motion to adjourn until noon tomorrow, and there would not be any Republican amendments. Obviously, we are not going to do that, because there is no desire to cut anybody off. Rather, it is an attempt to accommodate in good faith what is an unusual situation, to say the least.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, if I might say to the Members on this side, be prepared in the order we have. Unless there is objection on the other side, this is the order: Senator BURNS, Senator CRAIG, Senator DURENBERGER, Senator STEVENS, Senator MURKOWSKI, Senator WARNER, Senator MCCAIN, Senator THURMOND, Senator SPECTER, Senator KASSEBAUM, and Senator BROWN.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is the majority leader's intention that the only people offering amendments would be the Republicans? I would like to offer one at least after the first two or three, or whatever the majority leader feels would be appropriate.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, so far, the list that we have, and I do not know the exact number. The last I heard, it was nearly 50, and they were Republican amendments. I was unaware of the amendment the Senator wishes to offer. No Senator can be precluded from offering an amendment. Any Senator who wants to do so may do so.

I hope Senators will not do so. We really have to finish action on this. I just want to comment further on what the Senator from New Mexico said about the significance of these amendments. We are all aware of what is occurring. Amendments are going to come up here that may be popular on a particular issue. It may have nothing to do with this resolution. Obviously, you will be on record at least on a motion to table.

But I do not know what the alternative to this is. It seems to me that it is a rational explanation that, first, a tabling motion is not a final disposition of the measure. Secondly, this is a budget resolution that is not going to become law. It cannot become law.

So I hope that my colleagues will refrain from offering amendments and will join in tabling the amendments that come up, so we can proceed and get on with this.

Mr. LEVIN. If the majority leader will yield for a question, is the current unanimous consent agreement that we vote at noon tomorrow on final passage, whether or not there are pending amendments?

Mr. MITCHELL. That is correct. At noon, whatever amendment we are on will be disposed of, and there will be no further amendments.

Mr. LEVIN. They will just fall by the way side?

Mr. MITCHELL. Any amendment not offered and disposed of will not be in order.

Mr. DODD. Is there a time agreement on each amendment that has already been agreed to?

Mr. MITCHELL. There is no time.

Mr. DODD. Will there be 10 or 15 minute votes?

Mr. MITCHELL. I am going to shortly request that the votes be 10 minutes. I am hoping that all Senators are present or within easy reach of the Capitol, and that this discussion has given those who are not an opportunity to get here.

Mr. STEVENS. If the majority leader will yield for a question, Mr. President, I would like to ask the majority leader this. Some of us were here on the floor several times seeking time. I did on several occasions. The Members on your side used their time exclusively, totally, and we were not involved at all even in getting time allocated on some of these amendments. The leader indicates these are not pertinent, and that implied somehow to me that there is some ulterior motive in these amendments.

If that is the case, I am very sad, because the amendment I have, I filed on Monday. I have had no time. As a matter of fact, I did not know about the unanimous-consent agreement that cuts the amendments off by noon tomorrow. The law says we are entitled to offer amendments.

In any event, I wonder about this concept of tabling every amendment without any knowledge at all of what is in the amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, if I might explain, first, I did not intend to suggest an ulterior motive by the Senator from Alaska or anybody else. I surely would not have done that in any event. Secondly, the only thing worse in my mind in tabling an amendment that you do not know the contents of is to vote for the amendment that you do not know the contents of.

We are forced into a difficult situation. First, on the resolution, the time was equally divided. There should be no implication that Members of the Democratic side got more time than the Republican Senators. They did not.

The time is equally divided under the Budget Act, and the responsibility of handling the matter on each side rests with the managers.

So I do not know what happened to the Senator's amendment. I have no way of knowing. I am very sympathetic to him. As I said, there might well be some amendments I believe to be meritorious and would otherwise vote for them. As I said, asking a Senator to vote for an amendment on which he does not know the subject, he does not know what is in it, I think is not a prudent thing to do. I would prefer for myself—and I am urging my colleagues, and I respect the Senator—to vote to table it, and give the Senator offering it an opportunity at some later time—perhaps in some cases on a more appropriate legislative vehicle—to present it.

This does not foreclose any action in the future on any measure.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I hate to prolong this debate, but I would just like to suggest to the majority leader that I sent a dear colleague letter around last year. I was ready to offer mine on Friday and was asked by the other side of the aisle to wait. I was prepared to go Monday and was asked if I could wait until Senator KENNEDY got back in town on Tuesday. On Tuesday I was shut out by major amendments on the floor yesterday.

So I have been waiting in the wings, Mr. President. It is an amendment regarding direct lending to student loans that are not familiar to some people on the floor.

There are some of us who did try to find a slot and were trying to be accommodating.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, throughout this process, my understanding has been that the managers have alternated between Democratic amendments and Republican amendments, and the decision on which Republican amendments to be offered was made by the Republican leadership, as is appropriate, and the decision on which amendments were to be made on the Democratic side was made by the Democratic manager.

I do not know what else to do under the circumstances, and I am truly regretful and sympathetic to the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, there is no way for the distinguished majority leader to know this without my statement. I was here on Monday, which was a day that few of us were here, and my manager said: "Put your amendment up and debate it," which I did within the timeframe that he gave.

So when the majority leader said no one knows about it, my amendment is in Monday's RECORD, was debated 10 minutes, and the amendment and the debate is in the RECORD. It is germane and relating to national defense.

I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 190

(Purpose: To reduce the revenue level contained in the budget resolution by an amount sufficient to assume an exemption under the Btu energy tax for off road fuel use and to offset lost revenues by reducing spending increases)

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask that we call up amendment No. 190, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana, [Mr. BURNS], proposes an amendment numbered 190.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. STEVENS. I object. The amendment under the rule must be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, decrease the amount on line 18, by $420,000,000.

On page 2, decrease the amount on line 19, by $440,000,000.

On page 3, decrease the amount on line 2, by $460,000,000.

On page 3, decrease the amount on line 4, by $480,000,000.

On page 3, decrease the amount on line 6, by $500,000,000.

On page 3, decrease the amount on line 10, by $420,000,000.

On page 3, decrease the amount on line 11, by $440,000,000.

On page 3, decrease the amount on line 12, by $460,000,000.

On page 3, decrease the amount on line 13, by $480,000,000.

On page 3, decrease the amount on line 14, by $500,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 6, by $420,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 7, by $440,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 8, by $460,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 9, by $480,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 11, by $500,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 15, by $420,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 16, by $440,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 17, by $460,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 18, by $480,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 19, by $500,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 1, by $420,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 2, by $440,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 3, by $460,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 4, by $480,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 5, by $500,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 11, by $420,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 12, by $440,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 13, by $460,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 14, by $480,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 15, by $500,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 22, by $420,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 23, by $440,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 24, by $460,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 25, by $480,000,000.

On page 6, decrease the amount on line 1, by $500,000,000.

On page 6, decrease the amount on line 7, by $420,000,000.

On page 6, decrease the amount on line 8, by $440,000,000.

On page 6, decrease the amount on line 9, by $460,000,000.

On page 6, decrease the amount on line 10, by $480,000,000.

On page 6, decrease the amount on line 11, by $500,000,000.

On page 41, decrease the amount on line 17, by $420,000,000.

On page 41, decrease the amount on line 18, by $420,000,000.

On page 41, decrease the amount on line 24, by $440,000,000.

On page 41, decrease the amount on line 25, by $440,000,000.

On page 42, decrease the amount on line 6, by $460,000,000.

On page 42, decrease the amount on line 7, by $460,000,000.

On page 42, decrease the amount on line 13, by $480,000,000.

On page 42, decrease the amount on line 14, by $480,000,000.

On page 42, decrease the amount on line 20, by $500,000,000.

On page 42, decrease the amount on line 21, by $500,000,000.

On page 50, decrease the amount on line 9, by $420,000,000.

On page 50, decrease the amount on line 10, by $2,300,000,000.

On page 57, decrease the amount on line 18, by $420,000,000.

On page 57, decrease the amount on line 19, by $2,300,000,000.

On page 71, decrease the amount on line 13, by $460,000,000.

On page 71, decrease the amount on line 14, by $460,000,000.

On page 71, decrease the amount on line 16, by $480,000,000.

On page 71, decrease the amount on line 17, by $480,000,000.

On page 71, decrease the amount on line 20, by $500,000,000.

On page 71, decrease the amount on line 21, by $500,000,000.

Mr. STEVENS. The purpose of the amendment was not read. I will object every time unless you say what the purpose of the amendment is.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is this the Senator's amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. No.

I continue to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a 10-minute rollcall vote on——

Mr. SARBANES. Give 15 minutes on the first one.

Mr. SASSER. Fifteen. I withdraw the request.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Alaska has requested, and I am not certain what he had asked.

Would he restate the request.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment was not even read before the motion to table was made. I do not see any reason to make a motion to table before at least the body is informed of the purpose of the amendment. It is just a sentence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, it was the offeror of the amendment, Senator BURNS, who asked that the reading be dispensed with.

Mr. FORD. What I was getting ready to say is he asked for the yeas and nays. We did not. And the manager of the bill on this side moved to table.

Mr. STEVENS. It was his request, not the request of the leader.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, let me say I am prepared to stand on this floor until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. I will be delighted to listen to the reading of all amendments, and I will be pleased to go through 15 minutes of rollcall votes on all amendments if that is what the Senators desire to do. But the majority leader is simply trying to shorten this thing and in such a way so that all amendments can be dealt with in an expeditious way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I suggest the following: Let us proceed with the first amendment. With respect to the second amendment and each amendment thereafter, I request that the majority and minority staffs combine their formidable talents and develop a brief statement of the intention of the amendment that be read at the time of each amendment as it arises, and I mean brief. If it cannot be agreed to on both sides, then it is not going to be read so that we can proceed to get this done. I do not want to get into the situation where a statement of the intention of the amendment is a mechanism for avoiding the time for debate. The longer we go on this and the more time we spend, the less we are going to accomplish.

The first vote is going to be a 15-minute rollcall under the ordinary rules because we do not know where all Senators are or how much notice they had. Following that, I will make a determination on how best to proceed.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SARBANES. If the regular order is invoked is the regular order now the presentation of the amendment, a reading of the amendment, and a 15-minute vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That would be the order.

Mr. SARBANES. That would be the regular order.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I offered the amendment in that way to expedite it and I thought the understanding of the leadership was to expedite the votes tonight. That is the reason I offered it in the manner I did.

I am sorry I created any confusion among my colleagues, but I called up the amendment and I will ask for the yeas and nays if we have to start all over again.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Montana is saying, and I thank him for it.

If there is nothing more to be said at this moment, I make a motion to table the amendment of the Senator from Montana and ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Montana. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 66 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Akaka	Campbell	Graham
Baucus	Conrad	Harkin
Biden	Daschle	Hollings
Bingaman	DeConcini	Johnston
Boren	Dodd	Kennedy
Boxer	Dorgan	Kerrey
Bradley	Exon	Kerry
Breaux	Feingold	Kohl
Bryan	Feinstein	Krueger
Bumpers	Ford	Lautenberg
Byrd	Glenn	Leahy
Levin	Moynihan	Robb
Lieberman	Murray	Rockefeller
Mathews	Nunn	Sarbanes
Metzenbaum	Pell	Sasser
Mikulski	Pryor	Simon
Mitchell	Reid	Wellstone
Moseley-Braun	Riegle	Wofford

NAYS—44

Bennett	Faircloth	McConnell
Bond	Gorton	Murkowski
Brown	Gramm	Nickles
Burns	Grassley	Packwood
Chafee	Gregg	Pressler
Coats	Hatch	Roth
Cochran	Hatfield	Shelby
Cohen	Heflin	Simpson
Coverdell	Jeffords	Smith
Craig	Kassebaum	Specter
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Stevens
Danforth	Lott	Thurmond
Dole	Lugar	Wallop
Domenici	Mack	Warner
Durenberger	McCain	

NOT VOTING—2

Helms	Inouye

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 190) was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. SASSER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG].

AMENDMENT NO. 197

(Purpose: To reduce the Federal deficit by $3.290 billion in fiscal years 1994–98, increase efficiency and economy in Federal procurement, provide new job opportunities, increase competition for Federal construction contracts, promote small and minority business participation in Federal contracting, and eliminate unnecessary paperwork and reporting burdens, by providing for the repeal of the Davis-Bacon Act of 1931 and for conforming revisions in the Copeland Act of 1934)

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I call up amendment 197.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. HATCH, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. FAIRCLOTH, proposes an amendment numbered 197.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to repeal the Davis-Bacon Act of 1934.

(Several Senators addressed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, do we have at the desk the purpose as stated by our leader?

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment will be described by the clerk.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Craig amendment 197 regarding Davis-Bacon.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 5, line 1, decrease the amount by $460,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, decrease the amount by $470,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, decrease the amount by $470,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, decrease the amount by $480,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, decrease the amount by $500,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $460,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $470,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $470,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $480,000,000.

On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by $500,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, decrease the amount by $560,000,000.

On page 5, line 24, decrease the amount by $750,000,000.

On page 5, line 25, decrease the amount by $850,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, decrease the amount by $930,000,000.

On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $560,000,000.

On page 6, line 9, decrease the amount by $750,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $850,000,000.

On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $930,000,000.

On page 6, line 17, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 6, line 18, decrease the amount by $560,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $750,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $850,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $930,000,000.

On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $560,000,000.

On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by $750,000,000.

On page 7, line 4, decrease the amount by $850,000,000.

On page 7, line 5, decrease the amount by $930,000,000.

On page 7, line 8, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 7, line 9, decrease the amount by $760,000,000.

On page 7, line 10, decrease the amount by $1,510,000,000.

On page 7, line 11, decrease the amount by $2,360,000,000.

On page 7, line 12, decrease the amount by $3,290,000,000.

On page 8, line 7, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 8, line 8, decrease the amount by $560,000,000.

On page 8, line 9, decrease the amount by $750,000,000.

On page 8, line 10, decrease the amount by $850,000,000.

On page 8, line 11, decrease the amount by $930,000,000.

On page 41, line 17, decrease the amount by $460,000,000.

On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 41, line 24, decrease the amount by $470,000,000.

On page 41, line 25, decrease the amount by $560,000,000.

On page 42, line 6, decrease the amount by $470,000,000.

On page 42, line 7, decrease the amount by $750,000,000.

On page 42, line 13, decrease the amount by $480,000,000.

On page 42, line 14, decrease the amount by $850,000,000.

On page 42, line 20, decrease the amount by $500,000,000.

On page 42, line 21, decrease the amount by $930,000,000.

On page 71, line 13, decrease the amount by $470,000,000.

On page 71, line 14, decrease the amount by $750,000,000.

On page 71, line 16, decrease the amount by $480,000,000.

On page 71, line 17, decrease the amount by $850,000,000.

On page 71, line 20, decrease the amount by $500,000,000.

On page 71, line 21, decrease the amount by $930,000,000.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I move to lay the amendment on the table. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 197) of the Senator from Idaho.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], is necessarily absent.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BOXER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 29, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 67 Leg.]

YEAS—69

Akaka	DeConcini	Kennedy
Baucus	Dodd	Kerrey
Biden	Domenici	Kerry
Bingaman	Dorgan	Kohl
Boren	Durenberger	Krueger
Boxer	Exon	Lautenberg
Bradley	Feingold	Leahy
Breaux	Feinstein	Levin
Bryan	Ford	Lieberman
Bumpers	Glenn	Mathews
Byrd	Gorton	Metzenbaum
Campbell	Graham	Mikulski
Chafee	Harkin	Mitchell
Coats	Hatfield	Moseley-Braun
Conrad	Heflin	Moynihan
D'Amato	Hollings	Murkowski
Danforth	Jeffords	Murray
Daschle	Johnston	Nunn
Packwood	Robb	Simon
Pell	Rockefeller	Specter
Pryor	Sarbanes	Stevens
Reid	Sasser	Wellstone
Riegle	Shelby	Wofford

NAYS—29

Bennett	Gramm	McConnell
Bond	Grassley	Nickles
Brown	Gregg	Pressler
Burns	Hatch	Roth
Cochran	Kassebaum	Simpson
Cohen	Kempthorne	Smith
Coverdell	Lott	Thurmond
Craig	Lugar	Wallop
Dole	Mack	Warner
Faircloth	McCain	

NOT VOTING—2

Helms	Inouye

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 197) was agreed to.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. FORD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DURENBERGER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

AMENDMENT NO. 222

(Purpose: To reduce the level contained in the budget resolution by an amount sufficient to assume an exemption for biomass-derived ethanol under the administration's Btu energy tax and to offset lost revenues by reducing new spending increases)

Mr. DURENBERGER. Madam President, I call up an amendment, for myself, Senator DOLE, Senator GRASSLEY, Senator BOND, and, Senator LUGAR, numbered 222 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota, Mr. DURENBERGER, for himself, Mr. DOLE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BOND, Mr. LUGAR, and Mr. PRESSLER, proposes an amendment numbered 222 relating to biomass-derived ethanol Btu exemption.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, decrease the amount on line 18, by $1,000,000.

On page 2, decrease the amount on line 19, by $10,000,000.

On page 3, decrease the amount on line 2, by $19,000,000.

On page 3, decrease the amount on line 4, by $26,000,000.

On page 3, decrease the amount on line 6, by $26,000,000.

On page 3, decrease the amount on line 10, by $1,000,000.

On page 3, decrease the amount on line 11, by $10,000,000.

On page 3, decrease the amount on line 12, by $19,000,000.

On page 3, decrease the amount on line 13, by $26,000,000.

On page 3, decrease the amount on line 14, by $26,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 6, by $1,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 7, by $10,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 8, by $19,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 9, by $26,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 11, by $26,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 15, by $1,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 16, by $10,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 17, by $19,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 18, by $26,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 19, by $26,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 1, by $1,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 2, by $10,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 3, by $19,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 4, by $26,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 5, by $26,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 11, by $1,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 12, by $10,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 13, by $19,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 14, by $26,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 15, by $26,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 22, by $1,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 23, by $10,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 24, by $19,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 25, by $26,000,000.

On page 6, decrease the amount on line 1, by $26,000,000.

On page 6, decrease the amount on line 7, by $1,000,000.

On page 6, decrease the amount on line 8, by $10,000,000.

On page 6, decrease the amount on line 9, by $19,000,000.

On page 6, decrease the amount on line 10, by $26,000,000.

On page 6, decrease the amount on line 11, by $26,000,000.

On page 41, decrease the amount on line 17, by $1,000,000.

On page 41, decrease the amount on line 18, by $1,000,000.

On page 41, decrease the amount on line 24, by $10,000,000.

On page 41, decrease the amount on line 25, by $10,000,000.

On page 42, decrease the amount on line 6, by $19,000,000.

On page 42, decrease the amount on line 7, by $19,000,000.

On page 42, decrease the amount on line 13, by $26,000,000.

On page 42, decrease the amount on line 14, by $26,000,000.

On page 42, decrease the amount on line 20, by $26,000,000.

On page 42, decrease the amount on line 21, by $26,000,000.

On page 50, decrease the amount on line 9, by $1,000,000.

On page 50, decrease the amount on line 10, by $82,000,000.

On page 57, decrease the amount on line 18, by $1,000,000.

On page 57, decrease the amount on line 19, by $82,000,000.

On page 71, decrease the amount on line 13, by $19,000,000.

On page 71, decrease the amount on line 14, by $19,000,000.

On page 71, decrease the amount on line 16, by $26,000,000.

On page 71, decrease the amount on line 17, by $26,000,000.

On page 71, decrease the amount on line 20, by $26,000,000.

On page 71, decrease the amount on line 21, by $26,000,000.

Mr. SASSER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. SASSER. I move to table the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 68 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Akaka	Feinstein	Mikulski
Baucus	Ford	Mitchell
Biden	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Graham	Moynihan
Boren	Harkin	Murray
Boxer	Hollings	Nunn
Bradley	Johnston	Packwood
Breaux	Kassebaum	Pell
Bryan	Kennedy	Pryor
Bumpers	Kerrey	Reid
Byrd	Kerry	Riegle
Campbell	Kohl	Robb
Conrad	Krueger	Rockefeller
Daschle	Lautenberg	Sarbanes
DeConcini	Leahy	Sasser
Dodd	Levin	Simon
Dorgan	Lieberman	Wofford
Exon	Mathews	
Feingold	Metzenbaum	

NAYS—43

Bennett	Faircloth	Murkowski
Bond	Gorton	Nickles
Brown	Gramm	Pressler
Burns	Grassley	Roth
Chafee	Gregg	Shelby
Coats	Hatch	Simpson
Cochran	Hatfield	Smith
Cohen	Heflin	Specter
Coverdell	Jeffords	Stevens
Craig	Kempthorne	Thurmond
D'Amato	Lott	Wallop
Danforth	Lugar	Warner
Dole	Mack	Wellstone
Domenici	McCain	
Durenberger	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—2

Helms	Inouye

So the motion to table the amendment (No. 222) was agreed to.

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 234

(Purpose: To eliminate assumed reductions in Federal civil service survivors' annuities in order to protect the economic survival of the widows and widowers of Federal employees who would otherwise be faced with a reduction in their annual income by an average of about $1,500)

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for himself, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, and Mr. LUGAR, proposed an amendment numbered 234.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 30, increase the amount on line 24 by $30,000,000.

On page 30, increase the amount on line 25 by $30,000,000.

On page 31, increase the amount on line 6 by $61,000,000.

On page 31, increase the amount on line 7 by $61,000,000.

On page 31, increase the amount on line 13 by $93,000,000.

On page 31, increase the amount on line 14 by $93,000,000.

On page 31, increase the amount on line 20 by $127,000,000.

On page 31, increase the amount on line 21 by $127,000,000.

On page 32, increase the amount on line 2 by $162,000,000.

On page 32, increase the amount on line 3 by $162,000,000.

On page 41, decrease the amount on line 17 by $30,000,000.

On page 41, decrease the amount on line 18 by $30,000,000.

On page 41, decrease the amount on line 24 by $61,000,000.

On page 41, decrease the amount on line 25 by $61,000,000.

On page 42, decrease the amount on line 6 by $93,000,000.

On page 42, decrease the amount on line 7 by $93,000,000.

On page 42, decrease the amount on line 13 by $127,000,000.

On page 42, decrease the amount on line 14 by $127,000,000.

On page 42, decrease the amount on line 20 by $162,000,000.

On page 42, decrease the amount on line 21 by $162,000,000.

On page 50, decrease the amount on line 21 by $30,000,000.

On page 50, decrease the amount on line 22 by $473,000,000.

On page 55, decrease the amount on line 21 by $30,000,000.

On page 55, decrease the amount on line 22 by $473,000,000.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that an article be printed in the RECORD.

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

HARDSHIP FEARED FOR WIDOWS

(By Daniel J. Roy)

Retirees fear a hard economic blow would strike their survivors, especially widows, if

Congress approves President Clinton's change in the formula for survivors benefits.

Widows will suffer the most from a plan to reduce the survivors annuity, said Judy Park, legislative director for the National Association of Retired Federal Employees. Women tend to outlive their spouses, she said, and many women married to retirees have no other income source.

Under the proposal, surviving spouses of retirees would receive between 8 percent and 10 percent less each month than they do now, Park said.

"The wives of a lot of people in my generation stayed home to take care of the kids," said Milton Lichtman, a GS-15 Treasury Department attorney. "They have no other source of income."

The vast majority of retirees belong to the Civil Service Retirement System. They didn't pay into Social Security and do not reap that added income at retirement. They are more dependent on their government annuity, retirees said.

Almost two-thirds of the federal work force is covered under CSRS. The ratio of CSRS to Federal Employment Retirement System employees increases by age group, since fewer than 3 percent of eligible workers switched into FERS.

Current retirees would probably not be affected by the formula change, since the Clinton proposal seems to focus only on those who elect survivor benefits after Oct. 1, 1993, Park said.

In a letter to President Clinton, Rep. Constance Morella, R-Md., asked if employees who have already elected a survivors annuity would be affected. The White House has not yet responded.

People in both retirement systems can elect survivors benefits in exchange for a reduced annuity.

Currently, survivors benefits are equal to a percentage—up to 55 percent in CSRS and 50 percent in FERS—of a retiree's annuity before its reduced. Clinton's proposal would base the survivors benefit on a retiree's reduced annuity.

For example, a CSRS retiree who normally would receive a $10,000 annuity would receive about $9,000 if he or she elects a survivors benefit.

As the law now stands, when the retiree dies, the survivor would receive an annuity based on a percentage of the $10,000. Clinton's plan would base the survivors annuity on the $9,000 instead, giving the survivor about $800 less a year.

"The president said anyone under $30,000 wouldn't get severely hit," Lichtman said. "The average annuity for a survivor is less than $10,000. It's unconscionable to hit widows."

Although Lichtman had not planned to retire for several years, he is eligible and could change his mind if it looks like Congress will go along with Clinton's plan.

Even under the current formula, the vast majority of survivors—80.7 percent—receive benefits of less than $12,000 a year, according to Office of Personnel Management figures. As of Sept. 30, 1991, 39 percent received less than $6,000 a year.

Kathleen Rust, a widow in Clarksville, Ark., said the president is unaware of the significant impact the formula change would have on widows.

"I feel very strongly that there would be many women at or below the poverty level if they had their annuity cut," Rust said. "I can't believe my friend—and he is my friend—Bill Clinton, is going to balance the budget on the backs of widows of federal annuitants."

If Rust lost 5 percent to 10 percent of her annuity, she would have to change her lifestyle considerably.

"I would have to conserve in every area, particularly on travel and seeing my children," Rust said.

Harold Brockwell, of Waldorf, Md., has been retired since 1970. He said his wife would face great hardships if her survivors annuity were reduced.

Brockwell pointed out the increased costs of medical care for the elderly and said the lack of options for earning extra money should be considered when cutting benefits.

"We just can't take the cuts," he said.

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, I move to table the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 69 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Akaka	Feingold	Metzenbaum
Baucus	Feinstein	Mikulski
Biden	Ford	Mitchell
Bingaman	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Boren	Graham	Moynihan
Boxer	Harkin	Murray
Bradley	Hollings	Nunn
Breaux	Johnston	Pell
Bryan	Kennedy	Pryor
Bumpers	Kerrey	Reid
Byrd	Kerry	Riegle
Campbell	Kohl	Robb
Conrad	Krueger	Rockefeller
Daschle	Lautenberg	Sarbanes
DeConcini	Leahy	Sasser
Dodd	Levin	Simon
Dorgan	Lieberman	Wellstone
Exon	Mathews	Wofford

NAYS—44

Bennett	Faircloth	McConnell
Bond	Gorton	Murkowski
Brown	Gramm	Nickles
Burns	Grassley	Packwood
Chafee	Gregg	Pressler
Coats	Hatch	Roth
Cochran	Hatfield	Shelby
Cohen	Heflin	Simpson
Coverdell	Jeffords	Smith
Craig	Kassebaum	Specter
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Stevens
Danforth	Lott	Thurmond
Dole	Lugar	Wallop
Domenici	Mack	Warner
Durenberger	McCain	

NOT VOTING—2

Helms	Inouye

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 234) was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. KERRY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 204

(Purpose: To exempt home heating oil from the proposed surtax on energy based on Btu's)

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I call up amendment numbered 204 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI], for himself, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. CHAFEE, and Mr. SMITH proposes an amendment numbered 204, regarding home heating oil.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, line 19, decrease the amount by $24,000,000.

On page 3, line 2, decrease the amount by $120,000,000.

On page 3, line 4, decrease the amount by $216,000,000.

On page 3, line 6, decrease the amount by $288,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, decrease the amount by $24,000,000.

Page 41, line 17, strike "−$3,900,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "−$3,940,000,000";

Page 41, line 18, strike "−$3,400,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "−$3,440,000,000";

Page 41, line 24, strike "−$6,800,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "−$6,868,000,000";

Page 41, line 25, strike "−$6,500,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "−$6,568,000,000";

Page 42, line 6, strike "−$8,300,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "−$8,394,000,000";

Page 42, line 7, strike "−$8,000,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "−$8,094,000,000";

Page 42, line 13, strike "−$10,400,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "−$10,546,000,000";

Page 42, line 14, strike "−$10,000,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "−$10,146,000,000";

Page 42, line 20, strike "−$10,600,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "−$10,745,000,000";

Page 42, line 21, strike "−$10,700,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "−$10,845,000,000";

Page 71, line 13, strike "$516,900,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$516,806,000,000";

Page 71, line 14, strike "$544,700,000,000" insert in lieu thereof "$544,606,000,000";

Page 71, line 16, strike "$527,300,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$527,154,000,000";

Page 71, line 17, strike "$543,300,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$543,154,000,000";

Page 71, line 20, strike "$544,000,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$543,855,000,000";

Page 71, line 21, strike "$561,200,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$561,055,000,000";

Page 16, line 11, strike "$21,200,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$21,240,000,000";

Page 16, line 12, strike "$21,600,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$21,640,000,000";

Page 16, line 19, strike "$23,000,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$23,075,000,000";

Page 16, line 20, strike "$21,900,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$21,975,000,000";

Page 17, line 2, strike "$23,600,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$23,709,000,000";

Page 17, line 3, strike "$22,600,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$22,709,000,000";

Page 17, line 10, strike "$24,600,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$24,778,000,000";

Page 17, line 11, strike "$23,300,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$23,478,000,000";

Page 17, line 18, strike "$24,500,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$24,678,000,000";

Page 17, line 19, strike "$23,500,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$23,678,000,000";

Page 37, line 7, strike "$13,600,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$13,593,000,000";

Page 37, line 8, strike "$14,900,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$13,593,000,000";

Page 37, line 14, strike "$414,500,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$14,485,000,000";

Page 37, line 15, strike "$14,900,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$14,885,000,000";

Page 37, line 21, strike "$15,100,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$15,068,000,000";

Page 37, line 22, strike "$15,300,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$15,268,000,000";

Page 38, line 3, strike "$15,500,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$15,467,000,000";

Page 38, line 4, strike "$15,700,000,000," and insert in lieu thereof "$15,667,000,000";

On page 3, line 12, decrease the amount by $120,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, decrease the amount by $216,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, decrease the amount by $288,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, decrease the amount by $24,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, decrease the amount by $120,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, decrease the amount by $216,000,000.

On page 4, line 11, decrease the amount by $288,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by $24,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by $120,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by $216,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by $288,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, decrease the amount by $24,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, decrease the amount by $120,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, decrease the amount by $216,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, decrease the amount by $288,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $24,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $120,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $216,000,000.

On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by $288,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, decrease the amount by $24,000,000.

On page 5, line 24, decrease the amount by $120,000,000.

On page 5, line 25, decrease the amount by $216,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, decrease the amount by $288,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $24,000,000.

On page 6, line 9, decrease the amount by $120,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $216,000,000.

On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $288,000,000.

On page 41, line 24, decrease the amount by $24,000,000.

On page 41, line 25, decrease the amount by $24,000,000.

On page 42, line 6, decrease the amount by $120,000,000.

On page 42, line 7, decrease the amount by $120,000,000.

On page 42, line 13, decrease the amount by $216,000,000.

On page 42, line 14, decrease the amount by $216,000,000.

On page 42, line 20, decrease the amount by $288,000,000.

On page 42, line 21, decrease the amount by $288,000,000.

On page 50, line 10, decrease the amount by $648,000,000.

On page 57, line 19, decrease the amount by $648,000,000.

On page 71, line 13, decrease the amount by $120,000,000.

On page 71, line 14, decrease the amount by $120,000,000.

On page 71, lines 16 and 7, decrease the amount by $216,000,000.

On page 71, lines 20 and 21, decrease the amount by $288,000,000.

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, I move to table the amendment, and ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER] to table the amendment of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI].

The yeas and nays have seen ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 70 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Akaka	Feingold	Mikulski
Baucus	Feinstein	Mitchell
Biden	Ford	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Glenn	Moynihan
Boren	Graham	Murray
Boxer	Harkin	Nunn
Bradley	Hollings	Pryor
Breaux	Johnston	Reid
Bryan	Kennedy	Riegle
Bumpers	Kerrey	Robb
Byrd	Kerry	Rockefeller
Campbell	Kohl	Sarbanes
Conrad	Krueger	Sasser
Daschle	Leahy	Simon
DeConcini	Levin	Wellstone
Dodd	Lieberman	Wofford
Dorgan	Mathews	
Exon	Metzenbaum	

NAYS—46

Bennett	Gorton	Murkowski
Bond	Gramm	Nickles
Brown	Grassley	Packwood
Burns	Gregg	Pell
Chafee	Hatch	Pressler
Coats	Hatfield	Roth
Cochran	Heflin	Shelby
Cohen	Jeffords	Simpson
Coverdell	Kassebaum	Smith
Craig	Kempthorne	Specter
D'Amato	Lautenberg	Stevens
Danforth	Lott	Thurmond
Dole	Lugar	Wallop
Domenici	Mack	Warner
Durenberger	McCain	
Faircloth	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—2

Helms	Inouye

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 204) was agreed to.

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. FORD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 193

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I call up amendment 193 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] proposes an amendment numbered 193 regarding defense contingencies.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, after the table of contents that begins on line 7, insert in Section 1 the following new subsection:

"(c)(1) It is the sense of the Senate that the Congress should promptly reconsider the amounts determined and declared by the Congress in this resolution to be the appropriate levels of new budget authority, outlays, new direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1994 through 1998 for the National Defense (050) functional category, in the event of a material change in situation affecting the security interests of the United States.

"(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), a material change in situation affecting the security interests of the United States includes, but is not limited to—

"(A) an attack, or events indicating the significant potential for attack, on the United States, the armed forces of the United States, or a treaty ally of the United States, including the Republic of Korea;

"(B) a return to nondemocratic government in the Republic of Russia;

"(C) a substantial deployment of United States military forces in support of humanitarian or international peacekeeping or peacemaking missions, including in the former Yugoslavia; or

"(D) the establishment of a government hostile to the interests of the United States in a nation now or in the future possessing the capability to deliver nuclear weapons upon the United States, the armed forces of the United States, or a treaty ally of the United States.".

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, I move to table the amendment.

Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I wonder if I might ask the majority leader if there is any chance we can begin to move toward 10-minute rollcall votes?

Mr. MITCHELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I was previously advised that if I put the request, objection will be made to it. I will now, during this vote, canvas Members and see if it is possible to do it.

Mr. DOMENICI. Might I just say I appreciate that very much, Mr. Leader. I kind of assumed when we entered into the unanimous-consent agreement that we would expedite as much as we could, and we had our mutual commitments

to that effect. I hope there will not be any disagreement to moving toward a shorter time agreement.

Mr. MITCHELL. The Senator is correct in that regard but there were assumptions going the other way and our assumption was that the number of amendments to be offered after the 50 hours would be reduced. The initial discussions were down to about 11 or 12. In subsequent discussion the numbers have increased. And now, of course, they are still unlimited. So I think we are all acting in good faith.

Mr. DOMENICI. We did reduce 8 or 10. We had 38 or 39 at one point. We did our best.

Mr. MITCHELL. I understand that. And I am doing my best on this side.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FEINGOLD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 71 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Akaka	Exon	Metzenbaum
Baucus	Feingold	Mikulski
Biden	Feinstein	Mitchell
Bingaman	Ford	Moseley-Braun
Boren	Glenn	Moynihan
Boxer	Graham	Murray
Bradley	Harkin	Pell
Breaux	Hollings	Pryor
Bryan	Johnston	Reid
Bumpers	Kennedy	Riegle
Byrd	Kerrey	Rockefeller
Campbell	Kerry	Sarbanes
Conrad	Kohl	Sasser
Daschle	Lautenberg	Simon
DeConcini	Leahy	Wellstone
Dodd	Levin	Wofford
Dorgan	Mathews	

NAYS—48

Bennett	Gorton	McConnell
Bond	Gramm	Murkowski
Brown	Grassley	Nickles
Burns	Gregg	Nunn
Chafee	Hatch	Packwood
Coats	Hatfield	Pressler
Cochran	Heflin	Robb
Cohen	Jeffords	Roth
Coverdell	Kassebaum	Shelby
Craig	Kempthorne	Simpson
D'Amato	Krueger	Smith
Danforth	Lieberman	Specter
Dole	Lott	Stevens
Domenici	Lugar	Thurmond
Durenberger	Mack	Wallop
Faircloth	McCain	Warner

NOT VOTING—2

Helms	Inouye

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 193) was agreed to.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 233

(Purpose: To restore military and Federal civilian pay levels, and ECI-based pay raises and locality pay to current law. Spending add-ons will be reduced by a corresponding amount)

Mr. MCCAIN addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I call up amendment 233.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment. The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] for himself, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. WALLOP, and Mr. GRAMM, proposes an amendment numbered 233 regarding military and Federal pay.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 10, increase the amount on line 4 by $1,033,000,000.

On page 10, increase the amount on line 5 by $981,000,000.

On page 10, increase the amount on line 11 by $1,820,000,000.

On page 10, increase the amount on line 12 by $1,777,000,000.

On page 10, increase the amount on line 18 by $2,455,000,000.

On page 10, increase the amount on line 19 by $2,417,000,000.

On page 10, increase the amount on line 25 by $3,112,000,000.

On page 11, increase the amount on line 1 by $3,071,000,000.

On page 11, increase the amount on line 7 by $3,343,000,000.

On page 11, increase the amount on line 8 by $3,321,000,000.

On page 41, increase the amount on line 17 by −$294,000,000.

On page 41, increase the amount on line 18 by −$242,000,000.

On page 41, increase the amount on line 24 by −$534,000,000.

On page 41, increase the amount on line 25 by −$490,000,000.

On page 42, increase the amount on line 6 by −$847,000,000.

On page 42, increase the amount on line 7 by −$809,000,000.

On page 42, increase the amount on line 13 by −$1,130,000,000.

On page 42, increase the amount on line 14 by −$1,089,000,000.

On page 42, increase the amount on line 20 by −$1,152,000,000.

On page 42, increase the amount on line 21 by −$1,131,000,000.

On page 43, increase the amount on line 3 by −$739,000,000.

On page 43, increase the amount on line 4 by −$739,000,000.

On page 43, increase the amount on line 10 by −$1,287,000,000.

On page 43, increase the amount on line 11 by −$1,287,000,000.

On page 43, increase the amount on line 17 by −$1,608,000,000.

On page 43, increase the amount on line 18 by −$1,608,000,000.

On page 43, increase the amount on line 24 by −$1,982,000,000.

On page 43, increase the amount on line 25 by −$1,982,000,000.

On page 44, increase the amount on line 6 by −$2,190,000,000.

On page 44, increase the amount on line 7 by −$2,190,000,000.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. SASSER addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. SASSER. I move to table the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second on the motion to table? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 72 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Akaka	Exon	Metzenbaum
Baucus	Feingold	Mikulski
Biden	Feinstein	Mitchell
Bingaman	Ford	Moseley-Braun
Boren	Graham	Moynihan
Boxer	Harkin	Murray
Bradley	Heflin	Nunn
Breaux	Hollings	Pell
Bryan	Jeffords	Pryor
Bumpers	Johnston	Reid
Byrd	Kennedy	Riegle
Campbell	Kerrey	Robb
Chafee	Kerry	Rockefeller
Conrad	Kohl	Sarbanes
Daschle	Leahy	Sasser
DeConcini	Levin	Simon
Dodd	Lieberman	Wellstone
Dorgan	Mathews	Wofford

NAYS—44

Bennett	Glenn	McConnell
Bond	Gorton	Murkowski
Brown	Gramm	Nickles
Burns	Grassley	Packwood
Coats	Gregg	Pressler
Cochran	Hatch	Roth
Cohen	Hatfield	Shelby
Coverdell	Kassebaum	Simpson
Craig	Kempthorne	Smith
D'Amato	Krueger	Specter
Danforth	Lautenberg	Stevens
Dole	Lott	Thurmond
Domenici	Lugar	Wallop
Durenberger	Mack	Warner
Faircloth	McCain	

NOT VOTING—2

Helms	Inouye

So the motion to table the amendment (No. 233) was agreed to.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. FORD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 243

(Purpose: To ensure adequate funds for the Department of Defense to continue military pay adjustments as prescribed under current law)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. COATS, proposes an amendment numbered 243 regarding military pay.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 10, line 4, increase the amount by $1,033,000,000.

On page 41, line 17, increase the amount by −$769,000,000.

On page 43, line 3, increase the amount by −$264,000,000.

On page 10, line 5, increase the amount by $981,000,000.

On page 41, line 18, increase the amount by −$717,000,000.

On page 43, line 4, increase the amount by −$264,000,000.

On page 10, line 11, increase the amount by $1,820,000,000.

On page 41, line 24, increase the amount by −$1,356,000.

On page 43, line 10, increase the amount by −$465,000,000.

On page 10, line 12, increase the amount by $1,777,000,000.

On page 41, line 25, increase the amount by −$1,312,000,000.

On page 43, line 11, increase the amount by −$465,000,000.

On page 10, line 18, increase the amount by $2,455,000,000.

On page 42, line 6, increase the amount by $1,831,000,000.

On page 43, line 17, increase the amount by −$624,000,000.

On page 10, line 19, increase the amount by $2,417,000,000.

On page 42, line 7, increase the amount by −$1,793,000,000.

On page 43, line 18, increase the amount by −$624,000,000.

On page 10, line 25, increase the amount by $3,112,000,000.

On page 42, line 13, increase the amount by −$2,318,000,000.

On page 43, line 24, increase the amount by −$794,000,000.

On page 11, line 1, increase the amount by $3,071,000,000.

On page 42, line 14, increase the amount by −$2,277,000,000.

On page 43, line 25, increase the amount by −$794,000,000.

On page 11, line 7, increase the amount by $3,343,000,000.

On page 42, line 20, increase the amount by −$2,495,000,000.

On page 44, line 6, increase the amount by −$847,000,000.

On page 11, line 8, increase the amount by $3,321,000,000.

On page 42, line 21, increase the amount by −$2,474,000,000.

On page 44, line 7, increase the amount by −$847,000,000.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS] would vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 73 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Akaka	Feingold	Mikulski
Baucus	Feinstein	Mitchell
Biden	Ford	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Glenn	Moynihan
Boren	Graham	Murray
Boxer	Harkin	Nunn
Bradley	Hatfield	Pell
Breaux	Hollings	Pryor
Bryan	Johnston	Reid
Bumpers	Kennedy	Riegle
Byrd	Kerrey	Robb
Campbell	Kerry	Rockefeller
Chafee	Kohl	Sarbanes
Conrad	Krueger	Sasser
Daschle	Lautenberg	Simon
DeConcini	Leahy	Wellstone
Dodd	Levin	Wofford
Dorgan	Mathews	
Exon	Metzenbaum	

NAYS—42

Bennett	Gorton	McConnell
Bond	Gramm	Murkowski
Brown	Grassley	Nickles
Burns	Gregg	Packwood
Cochran	Hatch	Pressler
Cohen	Heflin	Roth
Coverdell	Jeffords	Shelby
Craig	Kassebaum	Simpson
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Smith
Danforth	Lieberman	Specter
Dole	Lott	Stevens
Domenici	Lugar	Thurmond
Durenberger	Mack	Wallop
Faircloth	McCain	Warner

NOT VOTING—3

Coats	Helms	Inouye

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 243) was agreed to.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. SARBANES. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 235

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Congress that health care reform legislation receive priority attention by the U.S. Congress with a target date of enactment no later than September 30, 1993)

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I call up amendment number 235.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] proposes an amendment numbered 235, sense-of-the-Congress on health care.

The amendment is as follows:

It is the sense of the Congress that health care reform legislation receive priority attention by the United States Congress with a target date of enactment of such legislation being no later than September 30, 1993.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, we have examined the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I have discussed it with him. We think the amendment is well taken, and we would be prepared to take it this evening by a voice vote in an effort to try to spare our colleagues at least one rollcall vote this evening and try to expedite matters.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chairman. That is acceptable to this Senator.

If I might just read it. It is very short.

It is the sense of the Congress that health care reform legislation receive priority attention by the United States Congress with a target date of enactment of such legislation being no later than September 30, 1993.

I thank my friend from Tennessee for accepting the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment number 235.

The amendment (No. 235) was agreed to.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SASSER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SASSER. Could we have order, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, the distinguished Republican leader, the managers, and I have been reviewing the progress made on this measure to date.

It is our unanimous view that we should complete action on the Kassebaum amendment, which is the next in line. That will be the 10th amendment on which we will have acted following the completion of the 50 hours. That should be the last vote tonight.

It is my view that we should discontinue the session and return at 9:30 tomorrow morning and make a good faith effort to complete as many additional amendments between then and the noon hour, when action will terminate on this measure.

I invite the Republican leader to comment, if he wishes to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Republican leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, we have completed 10 amendments, as we asked to do. It is our hope that we can reduce

the number of amendments on this side—we are in the process of doing that now—so we can complete action by noon tomorrow. If we have the finite list, I hope maybe we could have 10-minute votes, too.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, the vote on the Kassebaum amendment—I believe the distinguished chairman will move to table that—will be the last vote this evening. We will resume at 9:30. Senators should be prepared to vote promptly at that time.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, if we can agree on a finite list, is it possible to get consent that we have 10-minute votes—we are going to reduce the number—then we would not be here all morning just voting?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, we can do that, if we can agree on a finite list.

Although I do not have authority to give that consent, I will make every effort to do so. I was notified there would be objection to any request. I will make every effort to obtain that, if we can agree on a finite list.

Mr. DOLE. I think we even now ought to reduce the number by 7 or 8. I think if we make a good faith effort for additional reductions, then we could reduce rollcalls to 10 minutes and we would not be here all morning voting.

Mr. MITCHELL. What I will say is that there will be no votes prior to 9:30 tomorrow morning. This will be the last vote this evening. There will be no votes prior to 9:30 tomorrow morning.

Mr. President, I yield the floor so that the Senator from Kansas may be recognized.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 227

(Purpose: To reduce the reconciliation instruction to the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee and offset by reducing nondefense discretionary spending increases)

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I call up amendment number 227.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM] proposes an amendment numbered 227, regarding labor reconciliation instructions.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 51, line 14, decrease the amount by $3,288,000,000.

On page 53, line 19, decrease the amount by $3,288,000,000.

On page 71, line 13, decrease the amount by $508,000,000.

On page 71, line 14, decrease the amount by $508,000,000.

On page 71, line 16, decrease the amount by $1,281,000,000.

On page 71, line 17, decrease the amount by $1,281,000,000.

On page 71, line 20, decrease the amount by $1,499,000,000.

On page 71, line 21, decrease the amount by $1,499,000,000.

On page 25, line 11, increase the amount by $508,000,000.

On page 25, line 12, increase the amount by $508,000,000.

On page 25, line 19, increase the amount by $1,281,000,000.

On page 25, line 20, increase the amount by $1,281,000,000.

On page 26, line 2, increase the amount by $1,499,000,000.

On page 26, line 3, increase the amount by $1,499,000,000.

On page 42, line 6, decrease the amount by $508,000,000.

On page 42, line 7, decrease the amount by $508,000,000.

On page 42, line 13, decrease the amount by $1,281,000,000.

On page 42, line 14, decrease the amount by $1,281,000,000.

On page 42, line 20, increase the amount by $1,499,000,000.

On page 42, line 21, increase the amount by $1,499,000,000.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. It is regarding direct student loans.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement of mine and of Senators COCHRAN, COATS, COHEN, LUGAR, PRESSLER, and JEFFORDS be made a part of the RECORD.

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

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 227) of the Senator from Kansas. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRYAN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 74 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Akaka	Dorgan	Lieberman
Baucus	Durenberger	Mathews
Biden	Feingold	Metzenbaum
Bingaman	Feinstein	Mikulski
Boren	Ford	Mitchell
Boxer	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Bradley	Harkin	Moynihan
Breaux	Hollings	Murray
Bryan	Johnston	Pell
Bumpers	Kennedy	Pryor
Byrd	Kerry	Reid
Campbell	Kohl	Riegle
Conrad	Krueger	Robb
Daschle	Lautenberg	
DeConcini	Leahy	
Dodd	Levin	
Rockefeller	Sasser	Wellstone
Sarbanes	Simon	Wofford

NAYS—47

Bennett	Glenn	McConnell
Bond	Gorton	Murkowski
Brown	Gramm	Nickles
Burns	Grassley	Nunn
Chafee	Gregg	Packwood
Coats	Hatch	Pressler
Cochran	Hatfield	Roth
Cohen	Heflin	Shelby
Coverdell	Jeffords	Simpson
Craig	Kassebaum	Smith
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Specter
Danforth	Kerrey	Stevens
Dole	Lott	Thurmond
Domenici	Lugar	Wallop
Exon	Mack	Warner
Faircloth	McCain	

NOT VOTING—2

Helms	Inouye

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 227) was agreed to.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. SARBANES. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 222

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, yesterday, unfortunately, the Senate went on record against a sense-of-the-Senate resolution—which I supported—calling for the exemption of ethanol and certain other alternative fuels from the Btu tax.

Today, I offer another approach to the ethanol aspect of this problem which I hope finds wider support.

And I would hope it is adopted, in order to send a clear, positive signal to both the ethanol community and the Finance Committee.

The amendment goes beyond expressing the sense of the Senate. Rather, it lowers total revenues in the resolution by the amount the Joint Tax Committee estimates would be raised were ethanol subject to the tax. Expenditures are lowered in the allowances account by the same amount.

Thus, my amendment provides the Finance Committee room to reduce the tax on ethanol by reducing both revenues and spending. It indicates our intention to exempt ethanol from the Btu tax, but would not result, implicitly or otherwise, in any increase in any other tax.

The reduction in revenues, and offsetting reductions in expenditures, amount to $1 million in 1994, $10 million in 1995, and a total of $82 million over the term of the budget resolution. Because there has been concern expressed on other amendments when changes to this function were proposed, I would like to make it clear that the allowances function of the committee-reported budget resolution already contemplates approximately $40 billion in unspecified cuts; my amendment increases that amount by a relatively tiny proportion, a total of $82 million—an addition of about two-tenths, of 1

69-059 O—97 Vol. 139 (Pt. 5) 10

percent to those unspecified cuts. No needed program should be put at risk by your vote for my amendment. After all, during the next 2 years alone, we will be spending at least $1.079 trillion—that's over $1,000 billion for discretionary programs.

I welcome Secretary Bentsen's announcement that the administration intends to urge the exemption of ethanol and other alternative fuels from the Btu tax. But, of course, that announcement does not bind the Finance Committee, or the House. And unless total revenues, and spending, in the resolution are reduced, we will only wind up raising taxes on some other part of the economy.

Because yesterday there were concerns expressed about the merit of the Government's policy of encouraging ethanol, I would like to take just a moment to address those concerns.

Now why should ethanol be exempt from the Btu tax? Currently the U.S. Government has invested in ethanol through incentives. Ethanol has a 7-cent-a-gallon edge over regular gasoline. The reason for this is that the Congress agreed that ethanol was better for our environment. It is better because it reduces smog and gives us cleaner air to breathe. It is that simple.

When I came to the Senate in the late 1970's, there was a great deal of interest in gasahol, a fuel that is 10 percent ethanol and 90 percent gasoline, because of the energy problems facing the Nation. As our consciousness of environmental degradation increased during the 1980's we recognized the health and environmental benefits of ethanol as well.

Besides cutting down on smog, ethanol has another environmental advantage. One of the most serious pollution problems in our northern cities in the winter time is carbon monoxide. When you start a car on a cold winter morning, the fuel does not burn well and carbon monoxide is produced in enormous quantities, enough to be a threat to those with heart problems and pregnant women.

Ethanol reduces carbon monoxide pollution because it contains more oxygen molecules than other components of gasoline and can improve the combustion process even in cold engines. Many of the 40 cities that do not meet Federal carbon monoxide pollution standards are looking for ethanol as a partial solution to the problem.

In 1990, the Senate approved my amendment to the Clean Air Act requiring the Environmental Protection Agency to issue regulations for gasoline that will reduce smog-forming emissions by 15 percent in 1995. The Senate, the House, and the President agreed with me that ethanol will help us make our air cleaner.

Ethanol production is still getting off the ground, however, and without the investment—to use a Clinton word—that the Government currently makes in ethanol, we could ruin the industry. That would be bad for the environment but it would also be bad for America's farmers—especially those in Minnesota.

Not only do the farmers grow the corn that makes the Nation's ethanol, but they have invested in the ethanol facilities themselves. Without the American farm community, the reformulated gasoline amendment to the Clean Air Act would have never been approved.

Mr. President, with corn prices below $2 a bushel, the corn farmers in Minnesota are not only hurting—they are on the brink of disaster. Industrial uses of corn are the future for these farmers and the rural communities that rely on them.

So far Minnesota farmers and farm cooperatives have invested $109 million in 4 ethanol plants that produce 40 million gallons of ethanol annually. There are plans to build another 8 ethanol plants in rural Minnesota that will produce an additional 126 million gallons of ethanol yearly. Just in the construction of these new plants, an additional $8.6 million will be invested in rural Minnesota communities.

Mr. President, we were unable to roll back the entire energy tax. And we were unable to provide a clear expression of the sense of the Senate on ethanol when there were no offsets.

But we will have the opportunity to provide a real incentive for a renewable, environmentally sound energy source—or, to put it differently, today we have the opportunity to prevent an additional tax being levied on the back of the American farmer.

And we can do it in a way—in as binding a way as we possibly can in a budget resolution—that will make sure that our intentions are honored all the way through the process.

I urge my colleagues to support the pending amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 227

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, the main assumption underlying the Budget Committee's reconciliation instruction to the committee is that the current Guaranteed Student Loan Program will be replaced by a direct loan program.

As a practical matter, adoption of this budget resolution means adoption of full-fledged direct lending. Because other changes which might be made in the Guaranteed Student Loan Program do not have the advantage of the special accounting methods used in calculating direct loan savings, it is all but impossible for the Labor Committee to meet the reconciliation instruction by any means other than adopting direct lending.

Although I admittedly have serious reservations about direct lending, I am not offering this amendment to preclude the committee from adopting such a program. Rather, I am offering it to avoid a situation where the committee is forced to do so—even if further review shows this to be the wrong course to pursue.

Specifically, my amendment would reduce the reconciliation instruction to the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources from $6.697 billion to $3.409 billion. The cost of this amendment will be offset by a reduction in increases in nondefense discretionary spending in fiscal years 1996, 1997, and 1998.

The reconciliation instruction included in my amendment would, in fact, exceed the $3.2 billion savings assumed in the President's budget from implementation of direct lending. That figure, however, was developed by the Office of Management and Budget, while the Budget Committee's assumption is based on Congressional Budget Office estimates that direct lending would save $6.052 billion over 5 years. This nearly $3 billion difference alone indicates that there is enormous confusion and uncertainty regarding the direct loan concept.

This confusion and uncertainty is not limited to what level of savings might be achieved from direct lending. There are many questions which remain to be answered about the untested direct lending concept. To cite just a few:

What is the overall economic impact of replacing the private capital now used in the program and adding at least $15 billion annually to the Federal debt?

Is the Department of Education capable of assuming the enormous additional administrative responsibilities this program would entail? Unfortunately, the department's track record in the management of loan programs has not been exemplary. As noted in the General Accounting Office's series of reports on high-risk programs, "[T]he inventory of known problems in the Department's administration of guaranteed student loans raises questions about its ability to adequately manage a direct lending program."

Is Internal Revenue Service collection to be part of the program, and if so, is the agency able to have a collection process up and running in a short period of time?

Direct lending assumes the elimination from the program of banks, guaranty agencies, secondary markets, and other current participants. Given this, how will the over $60 billion in outstanding guaranteed loans be monitored and collected?

It seems to me that we are taking an enormous risk in dismantling the current Student Loan Program, financing a new program solely with new Federal debt, and putting its administration in the hands of Federal agencies which may have difficulties in assuming new management responsibilities—with no

real debate or deliberation of what we are doing.

Yet, without the opportunity to explore any of these issues, the Senate is being asked to endorse today a full-fledged, direct lending program. Let me repeat, adoption of my amendment does not preclude the committee from developing a full, direct lending program, if it is determined that questions about it can be satisfactorily addressed. However, failure to adopt this amendment will leave the committee with little choice but to do so.

Moreover, adoption of my amendment would continue to require that the Labor and Human Resources Committee consider substantial student loan reforms. The reconciliation instruction under my amendment calls for significant savings, and student loans are the only area under the jurisdiction of the committee where these savings can be achieved. I hope you will join with me in supporting this amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of some frequently asked questions about my amendment appear in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ABOUT THE KASSEBAUM AMENDMENT TO THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

Q. What is the Kassebaum amendment?

A. The Kassebaum amendment revises the reconciliation instruction to the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources to make it possible to consider student loan reforms other than full implementation of a direct lending program.

Q. What does the budget resolution say about direct lending?

A. The budget resolution contains a budget reconciliation instruction that the Committee on Labor and Human Resources achieve a savings of $6.7 billion over five years. The main assumption behind this instruction is a switch to direct lending ($6.1 billion savings).

Q. What is direct lending?

A. Direct lending is a program where student loan capital would be provided directly from the federal Treasury rather than from the private sector (banks). Institutions of higher education would "draw down" funds from the Treasury and either make loans themselves or contract with an outside agency to administer the program. Loan collection would be the responsibility of the Department of Education or the Internal Revenue Service, which would contract with collection agencies.

Q. Why is the Kassebaum amendment essential?

A. Adoption of this budget resolution means adoption of full-fledged direct lending. It is all but impossible for the Labor Committee to meet the reconciliation instruction by any means other than by adopting direct lending.

A. The Kassebaum amendment would give the committee a real choice in deciding how to achieve savings in the student loan program, without being tied to a proposal that remains highly controversial and little understood.

A. Senator Kassebaum does have serious concerns about direct lending, for a variety of reasons. However, this amendment does NOT preclude the committee from endorsing a direct lending plan. It merely gives the committee the latitude to examine this issue through hearings and the normal legislative process. The budget resolution's instructions amount to a legislative mandate to implement direct lending—by completely bypassing the committee's jurisdiction.

A. The cost savings estimates on direct lending which are driving the inclusion of this instruction are in dispute. The resolution's instructions use the Congressional Budget Office's (CBO) estimate that direct lending would save $6.1 billion, which is nearly double the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) figure of $3.2 billion.

A. In the Higher Education Act Amendments of 1992, Congress authorized a direct lending pilot program so that we could test the theory on a small scale. Congress compromised on the pilot program, largely because it was thought to be imprudent to move forward with a full-fledged program before we knew how it would work. To require the committee to move now to direct lending, when the demonstration has yet to begin, defies common sense.

Q. Is there another way for the Committee on Labor and Human Resources to meet this instruction other than moving to direct lending?

A. Only cuts in mandatory spending and assessment of user fees can be used to comply with reconciliation instructions. The student loan program is the only mandatory spending program under the jurisdiction of the Labor and Human Resources Committee where these savings could be achieved.

A. Proponents of direct lending indicate there would be billions of dollars of savings associated with the program because it would no longer be necessary to make "special allowance" payments to banks to provide student loans. However, even if the committee makes drastic cuts in all of the following: the special allowance payment made to banks, the administrative cost allowance paid to guaranty agencies, the percentage that guaranty agencies can retain on defaulted loans they collect, and the federal government guarantee to lenders, CBO indicates that the committee will not save even half of the amount that this instruction would require.

A. The main source of savings that CBO and OMB count is the payment of the special allowance to the federal government under direct lending instead of to the lender under the current program. Even eliminating the special allowance payment to lenders would not save as much as direct lending. Short of charging students a higher interest rate, the committee cannot raise the revenues required to meet the reconciliation instruction by altering the current program. The instruction can only be achieved by moving to direct lending.

Q. What is the SAP, or special allowance payment?

A. The special allowance payment is the interest subsidy paid to lenders to reimburse them for the administrative costs of issuing and servicing the loans and for assuming the credit risk associated with the loans beyond what the government currently guarantees.

Q. Where will the money come from to offset the Kassebaum amendment?

A. The Kassebaum amendment would reduce the reconciliation instruction to the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources from $6.697 billion to $3.409 billion. Adoption of the amendment would continue to require that the Labor and Human Resources Committee consider substantial student loan reforms.

The cost of this amendment ($3.2 billion less in savings) will be offset by a reduction in new nondefense discretionary spending in fiscal years 1996, 1997, and 1998. The reconciliation instruction assumes the committee will increase spending in the first two years. Thus, Congress would not need to address where the money would be cut by the Kassebaum amendment until fiscal year 1996.

Q. Why is the CBO cost savings estimate of switching to direct lending so high?

A. The CBO cost savings estimate of switching to direct lending is $6.1 billion.

However, OMB's cost savings estimate is only $3.2 billion. The General Accounting Office says that direct lending will save $4.7 billion. The Congressional Research Service says that a switch to direct lending will either save no money or cost more in administrative expenses and increased defaults. Still, others (Sallie Mae, Peat Marwick) say that a switch to direct lending will cost significantly more than the current program.

It is obvious that there is no consensus on the cost or savings which would be generated by direct lending. However, it is clear that CBO estimates are the highest, and riskiest, to hold the committee to if they are wrong.

A. The CBO cost savings estimate is misleading because it assumes that the federal government will administer a student loan program at a cheaper cost than the private sector. The private sector is driven to be cost-efficient by market competition and the need to earn a profit. The federal government is not. CRS budget analysts question whether the federal governnment can administer student loans at a lower per-unit cost. The inflated costs of government contracting are also a problem about which even OMB Director Panetta has expressed concern.

AMENDMENT NO. 227

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I wish to express my strong support for the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Kansas, Senator KASSEBAUM, concerning the proposed changes in the Higher Education Act direct loan program. The Kassebaum amendment meets the goals of the budget resolution by allowing the committee to decide how to achieve savings in the student loan program, without being tied to a proposal that remains highly controversial and little understood.

Last year, during the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, a great deal of time was devoted by the House-Senate conference committee in setting the parameters of the demonstration direct loan program included in the final bill enacted by Congress. Many of my colleagues at that time believed that a permanent Higher Education Act direct loan program was not needed.

Now, even before the demonstration direct loan program has taken effect, we are witnessing an attempt to put a permanent direct loan program on a "fast track." Specifically, there is a proposal to completely overhaul the current student loan system without benefit of the demonstration program's result. The Senate budget resolution assumes the transition to direct lending this year. It adopts fast-track consideration of a direct loan program.

Is the Senate aware that the Department of Education is having a difficult time getting any postsecondary institution to volunteer for the demonstration direct loan project? Is the majority of the Senate aware of the direct lending program being put on a fast track? Shouldn't we follow closely the results of the demonstration projects before effectively endorsing direct lending through this resolution?

In South Dakota, the guarantee agency for the student loan program is the Educational Assistance Corporation [EAC]. A letter I received from Clark Wold, the Deputy Director for Financial Aid Services of EAC, dated February 23, 1993, outlines major concerns with the direct lending proposal. He is concerned about disturbing the continuity of loan funds to students. He questions the projected cost savings of an untested program. South Dakota's guarantee agency has one of the lowest default rates in the Nation—only a 1.25-percent default claim for 1992. I value that agency's advice. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wold's letter, with enclosures, be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The secondary market in South Dakota is the Student Loan Finance Corp. Steve Kohles, vice president of the SLFC, urged caution in his March 9, 1993, letter, because of "much conflicting information about the benefits and proposed cost savings of a direct lending program." Again, this agency has one of the lowest default rates in the Nation—2.78 percent compared to a national average among banks of 17.8 percent. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Kohles' letter, with enclosures, be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Finally, Mr. President, I submit for the RECORD, a letter from Jon Veenis, senior vice president of Norwest Corp., dated March 5, 1993. He lists five points in opposition of the direct loan program which I would like to summarize. First, he states the projected "budget savings are highly suspect." Second, the "direct loan program carries a high degree of risk." Third, "significant doubts exist regarding the Department of Education's abilities" to deal with this program. Fourth, "Federal borrowing would increase." Mr. Veenis' final point is a very good one: "The current program operates effectively." I ask unanimous consent that his letter be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

In conclusion, Mr. President, we cannot afford to make decisions that potentially would add to the deficit and put the student loan program unnecessarily at risk. An unproved, untested, direct loan program could very well do just that. That is why I support the amendment offered by Senator KASSEBAUM.

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

EASTERN EDUCATION CORP.,
Aberdeen, SD, February 23, 1993.

Senator LARRY PRESSLER,
Hart Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR PRESSLER: I am writing to express our concern about the Administration's proposal to implement a *direct lending student loan program* immediately rather than allowing the pilot project which has already been authorized to test its validity. We believe that immediate implementation is ill advised, and will work to the disadvantage of South Dakota students. Following please find a brief list of our concerns:

The details describing a "fast track" direct lending program are too skimpy to make such an important decision. Substantially more information is necessary to fairly judge the proposed system against the current system.

The Administration's information describing the potential cost savings from a direct lending program conflicts with other credible information about the costs of direct lending. In the face of conflicting information, we believe sufficient time is necessary to analyze the data and to agree to its validity. A "fast track" implementation schedule will not permit a careful study.

Quickly replacing the existing student loan program with an untested direct lending program will disturb the continuity of loan funds to students. Assuring students of a reliable flow of funds with which to finance their education must remain a high priority.

The reasons direct lending is attractive elsewhere do not exist in South Dakota. Our default rate is among the lowest in the nation (1.25% default claim rate for 1992); the level and quality of service we offer schools and lenders are second to none; South Dakota students have no problems with access to student loans;

We believe that allowing the pilot project to proceed as authorized in the Higher Education Act of 1990 will provide a fair test of the direct lending program. We ask that you resist attempts to implement an expansion of direct lending.

Sincerely,

CLARK J. WOLD,
Deputy Director for Financial Aid Services.

EDUCATION ASSISTANCE CORPORATION—MARCH 2, 1993

Education Assistance Corporation was designated as the student loan guarantor for South Dakota in 1978. Following are statistics that illustrate the number of loans and dollar volume of loans processed since our first loans were guaranteed in January, 1979.

Stafford Loans (subsidized):		
Applications, duplicated	352,510	
Volume processed		$761,558,891
Stafford Loans (unsubsidized):		
Applications, duplicated	4,969	
Volume processed		10,441,067
PLUS/SLS:		
Applications, duplicated	24,257	
Volume processed		68,266,274
Consolidation Loans:		
Applications, duplicated	911	13,694,274
Totals	382,647	853,961,090

Following please find data that illustrates the applications processed and volume generated for the 1991–92 processing year.

Stafford Loans (subsidized):		
Applications processed	36,719	
Volume processed		$84,713,473
Stafford Loans (unsubsidized):		
Applications processed	2,768	
Volume processed		5,850,534
PLUS/SLS:		
Applications processed	4,825	
Volume processed		14,111,559
Consolidation Loans:		
Applications processed	253	
Volume processed		4,078,617
Totals	44,565	108,754,183

Eac currently employs 70 people in its Aberdeen offices.

DIRECT LENDING: QUESTIONS AND ISSUES—MARCH 2, 1993

Following please find several questions and issues concerning direct lending, national service for student loan repayment and using the IRS to collect student loans.

The details describing a "fast track" direct lending program are too skimpy to make such an important decision. Substantially more information is necessary to fairly judge the proposed system against the current system.

The Administration's information describing the potential cost savings from a direct lending program conflicts with other credible information about the costs of direct lending. In the face of conflicting information, we believe sufficient time is necessary to analyze the data and to agree to its validity. A "fast track" implementation schedule will not permit a careful study.

Quickly replacing the existing student loan program with an untested direct lending program will disturb the continuity of loan funds to students. Assuring students of a reliable flow of funds with which to finance their education must remain a high priority.

The reasons direct lending is attractive elsewhere do not exist in South Dakota. Our default rate is among the lowest in the nation (1.25% default claim rate for 1992); the level and quality of service we offer schools and lenders are second to none; South Dakota students have no problems with access to student loans;

College graduates will earn substantially more than non-college graduates during their working lives. Forgiving a portion of their student debt through national service will result in all taxpayers subsidizing persons who can expect to earn substantially more in their lifetimes.

Collecting student loans through the IRS effectively raises the marginal tax rate of working persons throughout their lifetime. Higher marginal tax rates can act as a disincentive on their work effort. In addition, the IRS may not be equipped to track deferments and other features unique to student loans.

We believe that the unanswered questions pertaining to direct lending, national service and IRS repayment are too serious to allow immediate implementation of any of those options. EAC supports the direct lending pilot program provided in the Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act of 1993.

STUDENT LOAN FINANCE CORP.,
Aberdeen, SD, March 9, 1993.

Senator LARRY PRESSLER,
Hart Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR PRESSLER: Thank you for allowing your assistant, Linda Benning, the time last week to meet with myself and Clark Wold. We appreciate your and Linda's interest in the Guaranteed Student Loan Program and your desire to insure that the program operates efficiently and for the benefit of students.

We share that same desire. That is why we are concerned about the Administration's

proposal to implement a direct lending student loan program immediately rather than allowing the pilot program authorized by Congress in 1992 to test the validity of direct lending. There is much conflicting information about the benefits and proposed cost savings of a direct lending program. A "fast track" implementation schedule will not permit a careful study, and it could disrupt the reliable flow of funds to students that exists today.

I want to emphasize that we support the concept of national service, but we don't believe it needs to be tied to a direct lending program. National service, as well as income-contingent repayment, can co-exist with the existing student loan program. In fact, the implementation of these could take place almost immediately under the existing program.

The existing partnership between the Federal Government and private enterprise works. Over $14 billion of private capital is delivered to approximately four million students every year. The latest Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act should go a long way toward reducing defaults. There are other potential cost savings such as risk sharing in defaults or a further reduction in government-provided subsidies to lenders that could also be implemented.

Under a direct loan program, federal borrowing would increase between $15 and $20 billion annually. In addition, it is questionable if the Federal Government can operate the program more efficiently than private enterprise. Also, a direct loan program will not reduce default costs, and the Federal Government will bear the entire burden of default costs.

I have attached an introduction to Student Loan Finance Corporation and a summary of a study conducted by the Congressional Research Service (CRS) concerning the existing student loan program versus a direct student loan program. Because of concerns that lenders may be making too much money from the student loan program, I have also included a synopsis of how Student Loan Finance Corporation would fare under the reauthorized program given the past history of interest rates. I hope this will assist you in drawing your own conclusions.

Please stop in and see our operation when you are in Aberdeen. In the meantime, we would be happy to provide any additional information you may require. Again, thank you for your time and efforts.

Sincerely,

STEVE KOHLES,
Vice President, Accounting and MIS.

Student Loan Finance Corporation is a private non-profit corporation that acts as a secondary market for student loans made under the Higher Education Act. We buy and service student loans from banks in South Dakota and surrounding states. We have provided over $750 million in private capital since 1979 for the funding of student loans. We have worked with over 180,000 student loan borrowers during that same time period.

Current statistics:

Loans outstanding	$358,546,000
Number of borrowers ...	103,000
Number of employees ..	75
Default rate (percent) ..	[1] 2.78
Debt outstanding	[2] $578,594,000

[1] This compares to a national average among banks of 17.8%. We have one of the lowest default rates in the country.

[2] We have issued over $1.5 billion in debt since 1979 and have developed a good reputation in the bond market.

FEDERAL FAMILY EDUCATION LOANS: REDUCED COSTS, DIRECT LENDING, AND NATIONAL INCOME

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE—FEBRUARY 22, 1993

The Congressional Research Service (CRS) was requested by the Congress to conduct an economic analysis of the Federal Family Education Loan (FFEL) programs verses direct student loan lending. CRS's conclusions are as follows:

Conversion to a direct student loan program cannot be justified on the basis of either budget savings or increases in overall economic welfare.

Problems with the current FFEL programs cannot be fixed by conversion to a direct loan program, however inviting such a proposal might appear.

The FFEL program for which lenders receive a subsidy would generate little in the way of reduced budget outlays if switched to a direct loan program.

With direct lending, budget outlays for administrative costs are likely to increase beyond what is currently being incurred by the private sector FFEL programs.

The shift of lenders' subsidies to the federal government would not be a budget gain, for it represents nothing more than the failure of federal bookkeeping to record outlays for a direct loan program.

It is uncertain whether creation of a monopoly lender (the federal government) would be successful in stimulating a competitive loan origination and servicing market.

The job of delivering student loans was given to the private rather than the public sector perhaps partly in the expectation that the former might perform it at least cost.

It appears that the savings claimed for direct loans is attributable primarily to the current program providing lenders a more-than-competitive interest rate, a situation that can be remedied without a switch to direct lending.

Direct lending will not reduce default costs.

Earnings Spread on Student Loans for Student Loan Finance Corporation (SLFC). (Based on interest rates over last 5 years and the current program after Reauthorization).

Year	Average 90 day T-Bill [1]	Special allowance rate [2]	Total Earnings on loan [3]	Cost of funds commercial paper [4]	Earnings spread	Servicing costs [5]	Net earnings
1988	6.90	3.10	10.00	8.49	1.51	1.50	0.01
1989	8.40	3.10	11.50	9.71	1.79	1.50	0.29
1990	7.75	3.10	10.85	8.73	2.12	1.50	0.62
1991	5.55	3.10	8.65	6.55	2.10	1.50	0.60
1992	3.52	3.10	6.62	4.42	2.20	1.50	0.70

[1] Average coupon equivalent rate. Based on quarterly averages for the year. (this is the T-Bill rate that is used in the Student Loan program).

[2] The Special Allowance rate is paid to lender to give them a competitive return. With Reauthorization, the interest rate to the student is a variable rate of T-Bill +3.10% with a cap of 9%. Therefore the lender does not receive special allowance unless the cap is exceeded. (Please see [3] below.)

The formula to calculate Special Allowance paid to lenders is: Special allowance paid to lender = T-Bill + 3.10% − interest rate paid by student.[3]

Year	Borrower interest (percent)	Special allowance (percent)	Total earnings (percent)
1988	9.00	1.00	10.00
1989	9.00	2.50	11.50
1990	9.00	1.85	10.85
1991	8.65	0.00	8.65
1992	6.62	0.00	6.62

[3] SLFC would have received Special Allowance only in years 1988, 1989, and 1990.

[4] Average cost of commercial paper for the year for Student Loan Finance Corp.

[5] Servicing costs for SLFC range between 1.25% and 1.50% of loans.

Other Considerations:

(A) Cost of Funds for Sallie Mae would be close to the 90 day T-Bill.

(B) Under current arrangement, lender suffers loss if there is improper servicing of the loan. With direct loans, the Federal Govt suffers the loss.

(C) If it is felt that lenders are receiving to much compensation, that can be dealt with without a switch to direct lending. The Special Allowance rate could be reduced or there could be some sort of risk sharing implemented (lender wouldn't receive a 100% guarantee on defaulted loans). Please consider though that lenders need some incentive to participate in the program. Even for SLFC, some profit margin is necessary to provide for contingencies and to keep us viable to continue to obtain private capital to invest in student loans.

NORTHWEST BANKS,
Sioux Falls, SD, March 5, 1993.

Hon. LARRY PRESSLER,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR PRESSLER: Once again, thank you for your time on March 1 to discuss the important Direct Student Loan Proposal that may be included in President Clinton's budget. As a follow-up to our discussion, I want to emphasize that Norwest Corporation does not support the proposed full implementation of direct lending by 1997 for the following reasons:

1. The purported budget savings are highly suspect based upon studies completed by the Congressional Research Service, KPMG Peat Marwick, and Sallie Mae.

2. An untested direct loan program carries a high degree of risk if it is not successful. Student, schools, and others associated with higher education could be very negatively impacted.

3. Significant doubts exist regarding the Department of Education's abilities in administering a direct loan program.

4. Federal borrowing would increase by $15 to $20 billion per year.

5. The current program operates effectively despite its shortcomings.

Norwest's recommended course of action is to allow the Higher Education Act amendments of 1992 to be fully implemented. These amendments facilitate improvements to the existing program through standardization and simplification, elimination of fraud and abuse, and increased access to loan funds for students and parents. The amendments also include a direct loan pilot due to begin on July 1, 1994 that should be implemented and fully tested before abandoning the current system.

Furthermore, Norwest and other lenders stand ready to work with President Clinton to implement his national service and income contingent repayment initiatives within the framework of the existing program. We also believe that the current program is in concert with the President's goals of solidifying public/private partnerships and in reducing, or in this instance not expanding, the Federal bureaucracy.

Please call me at 605/339-7455 if I can provide you with additional information.

Sincerely,

JON A. VEENIS,
Senior Vice President.

AMENDMENT NO. 227

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of Senator KASSEBAUM's amendment to reduce the reconciliation instruction to the Senate

Committee on Labor and Human Resources from $6.7 billion to $3.4 billion. Until the Committee on Labor and Human Resources has had an opportunity to analyze fully both the merits and potential problems of a direct lending program, I think it is extremely unwise for this body to essentially direct the committee through its reconciliation instructions to undertake such a program. As a Senator who is not a member on this committee, I rely on the discussions and analysis that take place during committee hearings to help me evaluate various proposals. Given the amount of Federal money involved and the number of students affected by a direct lending proposal, I believe that direct lending is one proposal that requires evaluation by the committee of jurisdiction.

Let me be clear. I am not saying that I will either oppose or support a direct lending proposal if a vote on this issue comes to the floor. I simply ask that the Senate seriously consider and support Senator KASSEBAUM's amendment which will allow greater flexibility to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources by lowering the amount that the committee is directed to save. If the committee eventually decides that the merits of a direct lending proposal warrant implementation of such a plan, it can still do so. Under the current budget resolution, however, the committee can only meet the $6.7 billion savings by implementing a direct lending proposal, which has not yet been carefully evaluated. In fact, the direct lending pilot program, which was authorized by the Higher Education Act Amendments of 1992, will not even begin until next year. Results of this program will be essential to demonstrating how direct lending works on a small scale. It simply makes no sense that the Senate force the Committee on Labor and Human Resources to meet its required savings with direct lending on a large scale when the demonstration project has not even started. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support Senator KASSEBAUM's amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 227

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am convinced that one of our greatest national assets is our college and university system. Most of the world's greatest postsecondary institutions are in the United States. Our institutions of higher learning are not only outstanding, they are accessible, and therefore worthy of emulation by the rest of the world. Unlike most other nations, we are proud that any American who wants to go to college has the opportunity.

In fact, during the 102d Congress, the Senate overwhelmingly adopted, and President Bush signed into law, the Higher Education Amendments of 1992, significantly expanding Federal grant and loan programs to ensure that all students have access to a postsecondary education.

This legislation, Public Law 102-325, was developed over 2 years, with bipartisan support among members of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources. However, the direct lending proposal which would change the federally supported guaranteed student loan program by removing banks, and private capital from the process, replacing them with a program administered by the Federal Government and with dollars borrowed from the Federal Treasury, was a subject of much debate and controversy.

Proponents of the direct lending proposal claim that billions of dollars in savings justify this dramatic change. They argued that savings, based on elimination of the special allowance paid to banks—3.1 percent—as a service charge for handling the loans coupled with a default reduction plan to allow a more lenient payback option for borrowers, would help to pay for new education programs.

Opponents of the proposal question the cost saving estimates, which are also disputed by OMB and Peat, Marwick & Sons. The cost of implementing the new program could also add $10 to $12 billion in the first year to the Federal debt. We don't need a new, costly, and unproven program, which could add billions to the Federal debt while the private sector is willing and able to provide the capital for the loans.

Conferees ultimately reached a compromise and agreed to a direct lending demonstration program for 5 years. The bill authorized $750 million to be allocated to 500 selected colleges for direct lending. After 5 years, we would assess the effectiveness of the program and determine if institutions are able to process the loans, if the Department of Education has the expertise to make it work, and most important, if the cost saving estimates were accurate.

I truly believe this compromise was developed with the best interest of students and our outstanding higher education system in mind.

Now, less than a year later, before the direct lending demonstration has begun, we are considering the adoption of a full-blown direct lending program through the budget process. In addition to forcing the adoption of an untested program we are misusing reconciliation, which was designed to achieve compliance with budget numbers not to make nondebatable policy changes.

The budget resolution under consideration instructs the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources to reduce spending by $6.697 billion over 5 years. The only way these savings can even be claimed is through a full direct lending program.

The arguments are the same as they were last year. Only, I am even more convinced now that this is a bad idea. On February 22, 1993, the Congressional Research Service released a report to Congress which reflects greater doubt on the soundness of converting the current student loan program to direct lending. The CRS report says:

> Conversion to a direct student loan program cannot be justified on the basis of either budget savings or increases in overall economic welfare.
>
> Problems with the current Federal Family Education Loan [FFEL] programs cannot be fixed by conversion to a direct loan program, however inviting such a proposal might appear.
>
> The FFEL program for which lenders receive a subsidy would generate little in the way of reduced budget outlays if switched to a direct loan program.
>
> With direct lending, budget outlays for administrative costs are likely to increase beyond what is currently being incurred by the private sector FFEL programs.
>
> Direct lending will not reduce default costs.

Some say banks are making a killing off the special allowance payments made to help offset costs incurred in administering the Federal student loan programs. In Mississippi, this is not the case. The Federal student loan programs represent a small but important part of their portfolio.

I received a letter last week from a student loan manager at a Mississippi bank, which includes this statement:

> It is my understanding that the ultimate goal of this administration is to lower the deficit. How does this help if the Federal government would have to borrow up to $75 billion dollars in the next five years, before accounting for increases in the costs of education? Could not this growth in the national debt jeopardize the availability of loan funds to meet all students' needs, particularly in this time of pressure to reduce federal spending?
>
> The reauthorization of the Higher Education Act of 1992 has already eliminated many lenders due to the complexities and unknowns of the program. It appears to me that the reputation of commercial lending is at risk, as government represents that it can provide retail credit better and less expensive than banks. It is hard to comprehend that the government is prepared to replicate the present delivery system in order to implement this Program.

Mr. President, this program, if enacted, will be enormously expensive. The Department of Education estimates it will require 650 new full-time staff or contractor personnel to administer it at a time when government is supposedly downsizing. Staff salaries alone are estimated to cost over $52 million in the first 5 years.

A direct lending program will eliminate, at great expense, all of the efficiencies the private market has created. Furthermore, there is no assurance the new program would solve any of the problems which have plagued the current student loan program. The Department of Education would still have to hire and monitor contractors to collect loans in repayment and in default; it will have to ensure that the loans are being properly originated and serv-

iced and that schools are not abusing the program. The Department finds it difficult enough to do these things effectively now. Under this new program the situation will deteriorate.

Only very large universities can afford the staff and computer systems necessary to do the loan origination and followup involved in a direct lending program. I predict that it won't be long before we will be voting on a request for more taxpayer funds for the increased expenses incurred by this new program.

In the face of such uncertainties, does it make any sense to adopt such a sweeping change as part of the budget resolution?

It would be far wiser to adopt the reconciliation figure of $3.409 billion in the Kassebaum amendment. This figure is more than the $3.2 billion in savings estimated in the President's budget for implementation of the direct lending program and would give some flexibility if we decided at some time that direct lending is not in the best interest of students, schools, and the American taxpayer.

Mr. President, I support the Kassebaum amendment and urge other Senators to vote for it.

AMENDMENT NO. 227

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Kansas, Senator KASSEBAUM. This amendment will inject both reality and equity into the reconciliation instructions for the Labor and Human Resources Committee.

For the past few years there has been growing interest in overhauling our system of financing higher education for American students. Every one of my colleagues—especially those like me who have college age children—knows that the costs of higher education have become higher and higher, and our students are being buried under greater and greater amounts of debt. Additionally, the subsidies paid by the Federal Government to encourage lenders to participate in a program providing no-risk loans are far too costly.

We took some steps in the last reauthorization of the Higher Education Act to deal with this problem—such as making the interest rate repayment on student loans variable rather than fixed and reducing the special allowance paid to lenders from 3.25 percent above T-bill to 3.1 percent above T-bill. Interestingly enough, when I tried to reduce this special allowance even further, arguing that the profit made by lenders was too high, I lacked the votes of many of the same individuals who are now supporting direct lending under the guise of reducing excess costs in the program.

In addition to acting to contain costs of the existing program, we set up a pilot program in the higher education reauthorization to begin in 1994, to test the concepts of direct lending by the Federal Government and income contingent loan repayment.

There are two principal reasons for moving to a direct loan program. First, by eliminating the private banks from the role they currently play, the Federal Government may be able to save the money now paid to those banks. CBO estimates that this will save approximately $1 billion a year.

Second, and more importantly, those savings could be passed on to students, reducing somewhat the costs of their education. If they can borrow money at the Federal Government's cost, they can obviously save some over what they would pay for commercial or quasi-commercial credit.

There are substantial problems that direct lending poses compared to our current system, particularly access for students and families, Federal and institutional administrative capabilities, and the sheer capital requirements. My own view is that if we can save students money and these problems can be surmounted, we should move to a direct lending system.

Let me repeat that. If we can save students money, we should move to a direct lending system.

But what does all this have to do with the amendment and underlying resolution before us? The answer: everything.

The reconciliation instructions for the Labor Committee are about $6.7 billion over 5 years. As Willie Sutton might have noted that means student loans, because that's where the money is in the Labor Committee. And indeed, all of those savings are presumed to come from higher education financing, particularly the adoption of a direct lending program.

But the figure of $6 billion struck me as high given that last year, unofficial estimates for savings from direct lending pointed to something much less. I asked my staff to check this out. How could the savings be so great from moving to a direct lending system if the savings flowed through to the students?

Well, in retrospect, the answer is easy. The budget resolution assumes we will not pass on the savings of direct lending to the students. Put more bluntly, we will levy a tax on student borrowers if we adopt this reconciliation instruction without the Kassebaum amendment.

This is the way it works. Basically, the current program provides either subsidized loans or unsubsidized loans to student applicants.

For subsidized loans no interest is paid by students during the time they are in school. Instead, the Federal Government pays the interest, which is equivalent to the cost of a 91-day T-bill plus a premium of 3.1 percent above the T-bill to the lender. The amount paid above the T-bill is called the special allowance payment and is used to pay a profit and cover the administrative costs of issuing and servicing the loan. Under a direct lending program there is one significant difference—with the Federal Government providing the capital for the student loan there is no need to pay a special allowance to the lender. The estimated savings from removing the special allowance paid to the lenders is approximately $1 billion.

Unsubsidized loans work in a slightly different manner. Under the current program, lenders provide loans to students and interest accrues while that student is in school. The cost to the student is the sum of the T-bill plus 3.1 percent or the special allowance. All interest and principal goes to the lender. The Federal Government does not become involved unless the loan goes into default—in which case the Government reimburses the lender because the loan is fully guaranteed. Under a direct lending program, the student would pay principal and interest, not to a bank, but to the Federal Government. That means, the Federal Government gets reimbursed for principal, plus interest, plus 3.1 percent from the student.

In effect, a bulk of the savings achieved by moving to a direct lending program comes from the unsubsidized loan program and the extra 3.1 percent students are charged above the T-bill. Any attempt to lower this amount—to lessen the costs to students—would be stymied because savings, of the amount needed to justify our budget reconciliation, would not be possible if the 3.1 percent were lowered.

As many of my colleagues remember, I have been a longtime advocate of reducing the 3.1 percent. 3.1 percent is too much to pay lenders for administrative fees and it is too much to ask our students to pay. Without the Kassebaum amendment though, we will be unable to reduce the burden that this places on our students because a decrease in this number produces a decrease in the savings this committee is able to produce. But, bear in mind, the savings are predicated on costs borne by the students. In effect, by agreeing to the current budget reconciliation numbers this body will force students to repay their loans at rates well above the costs incurred by the Federal Government to borrow this money. In other words, we will be taxing students for borrowing money to go to college.

So instead of passing the savings from direct lending on to students, we put them in our pocket. This deficit-driven sleight of hand is not why this Senator is interested in direct lending, and I am somewhat surprised some of my colleagues seem to be willing to engage in it.

If you want to save money for the Federal Government and save money for students, you must vote for the

Kassebaum amendment. What it will do will scale back our reconciliation instructions so that we need not tax kids who are borrowing to pay for a higher education.

AMENDMENT NO. 227

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, there are many reasons to oppose the amendment offered by my colleague from Kansas. The amendment calls for further cuts in the President's investment package, and these are cuts that we cannot afford to make. The amendment would set the precedent of allowing Members of Congress to pick and choose the budget estimates that they prefer. That is not the way the budget process should work.

But I would like to focus my time on the real target of the amendment: President Clinton's bold plan to revamp the Federal student loan program.

Mr. President, the Federal Government now pays for two separate student aid systems: a fairly simple system for delivering Pell grants, and a complex and expensive system for delivering guaranteed student loans.

The administration's proposal is straightforward: instead of using a Federal guarantee through banks, the Government will provide the loans directly, so that we can have one student aid delivery system. It would be integrated into the current Pell grant system, which already works well. For collection of payments on the loans, I support using the IRS, but the budget resolution is conservative and does not assume that. It assumes that the Education Department will contract with some of the same companies that do the collections today.

I am confident that the program will work because it builds on what we already do today, and we know from experience that it works.

This commonsense proposal faces opposition, though, because it steps on some very powerful financial toes. Just in the past few months, banks, Sallie Mae and others who profit off of the current system have hired some of the most powerful lobbyists in Washington. In fact, one of the biggest opponents has been the Student Loan Marketing Association—created by the Federal Government. The President of Sallie Mae, according to GAO made $2.1 million in 1991. But this is a Student Assistance Act, not a Sallie Mae Assistance Act.

Mr. President, Sallie Mae is trying to confuse this issue. In a letter to college presidents sent earlier this month, the president of Sallie Mae said that the Federal Government would have to replicate the GSL system. This is intended to create a fear of a massive new Federal bureaucracy, a takeover of the current student loan system.

Don't let Sallie Mae sell you that illusion, because nothing could be further from the truth. Why would the Federal Government want to provide aid to students at 7,000 schools by paying money to 8,000 banks working in various combinations with 46 different guaranty agencies which are also subsidized by taxpayers? There is no reason, except that it is the current system, and the status quo is hard to change.

Direct lending is a much simpler system than the guaranteed student loan program, and it saves money. The Kassebaum amendment helps bankers, not students.

I urge my colleagues to read the financial audit of the GSL program, completed just last week by the General Accounting Office. It concludes that the structure of the guaranty system "is not conducive to good financial management." The report identifies "serious problems in the program's structure." Among the findings:

Guaranty agencies assume little financial risk and are not compensated in a way that provides sufficient incentives to prevent defaults.

[M]any guaranty agencies have expanded their operations to activities that create serious conflicts of interest with their stewardship responsibilities.

By assuming servicing and ownership roles, guaranty agencies are, in effect, responsible for regulating their own activities.

None of the 10 guaranty agencies we visited reconciled quarterly and yearly data and only one reconciled its monthly bills to its quarterly reports submitted to the Department.

We compared the information on tape dumps submitted to Education with guaranty agency source documents for 30 randomly selected loans and found that 19 had errors in the reported status of loans and student enrollment.

Lender billings to Education often include loans guaranteed by several different guaranty agencies. However, the guaranty agencies we visited limited their reviews (of lenders) to the loans they guaranteed * * * [T]hey could not project an estimate of the accuracy of a lender billing (to the Department) and thus could not provide the Department with assurance that these billings were accurate.

Discrepancies in data "could result in Education not receiving millions of dollars of loan origination fees owed by lenders."

Mr. President, all of the effort—and error—involved in auditing and determining payments to banks, and overseeing guaranty agencies, would disappear in a direct loan program. Sallie Mae wants you to believe that these tasks would be shifted somewhere else. But these tasks are unnecessary. Even the Bush administration recognized this. An Education Department analysis 2 years ago concluded.

A Direct Loan program would be easier to manage and would greatly reduce opportunities for error and abuse. A centralized data base would improve data integrity and auditability. Department monitoring could be focused entirely on the postsecondary institutions and the collection contractors.

Mr. President, direct lending is simpler and it saves money. Two reports by GAO, and estimates by CBO and OMB confirm this.

Direct lending makes income-contingent repayment possible. This is a priority of President Clinton's.

Direct lending is supported by the higher education groups. I ask unanimous consent that information from some of the education groups be printed in the RECORD.

I urge my colleagues to vote to table the pending amendment.

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

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION,
Washington, DC, March 22, 1993.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of our 1700 college and university members and the students who attend them, I urge you to vote against the amendment that will be offered by Senator Kassebaum to the Budget Resolution. The amendment proposes to reduce to $3.409 billion the savings assumed in the reconciliation instruction to the Labor and Human Resource Committee, and to offset the $3.288 billion in forgone mandatory savings with $3.288 billion in unspecified cuts to domestic discretionary programs in fiscal years 1996, 1997, and 1998.

While we appreciate Senator Kassebaum's desire to preserve loan availability for students, we do not concur that the replacement over a five year period of bank-based guaranteed loans with direct loans will cause the effects that are of concern to Senator Kassebaum. We support the President's effort to shift the loan programs toward direct federal lending. (See attached.) Further, we fear that passing on $3.288 billion in cuts to domestic discretionary programs poses a far greater danger to students in terms of constraining the future potential for increased grant assistance, thereby rendering students even more reliant on loans than is currently the case.

We urge you to uphold the provision of the Budget Act that prohibits transfers of funds from mandatory to discretionary spending categories, and to defeat the Kassebaum amendment.

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. ATWELL,
President.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION,
Washington, DC, March 2, 1993.

The higher education associations listed below today released the following statement concerning direct lending:

During the 1992 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, the higher education community enthusiastically supported a direct loan demonstration project, in which institutions of all types would participate in making loans to students. Throughout the term of this pilot project, extensive evaluation of the efficiency and viability of such a program was to be conducted, and a decision reached as to whether the program should be extended to include all postsecondary institutions.

The Clinton Administration's FY 94 budget proposal assumes full conversion to a direct lending program and a phase-out of bank-based lending by July 1997. The higher education associations listed below support this transition and urge that it be approached in a manner that does not exclude any institution that desires to participate, nor prematurely require the participation of institutions that are unable or unwilling to administer such a program.

We look forward to active and full participation by the higher education community

as the details of this proposal are developed. We support the Administration's direct lending proposal as an important part of a larger framework aimed at expanding opportunities for all who aspire to attend college.

On behalf of:

American Council on Education.

American Association of Community Colleges.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Association of American Universities.

Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities.

Association of Community College Trustees.

Association of Governing Boards.

Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities.

Council of Independent Colleges.

National Association of College and University Business Officers.

National Association for Independent Colleges and Universities.

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

AASCU OFFERS ANALYSIS OF DIRECT LENDING ISSUE

There are two possible forms of government credit financing, both of which have been used in federal student financial aid. One mechanism of federal financing is that of federal guarantees on loans made by third parties, and the other consists of lending out capital raised from the private capital markets by the federal government directly. Students and institutions are quite familiar with the federal guarantee mechanism through the Guaranteed Student Loan Program (GSL).

Direct lending is also quite well-known to the higher education community through the Perkins program and its predecessor the National Defense Student Loan (NDSL) program. The basic distinction between the two alternatives is that in direct lending, the federal government raises the capital needed for loans itself from the private sector and owns the resulting loan portfolio in its entirety, whereas under a guaranteed lending system, the government pays private intermediaries a premium to induce them to make the needed loans and agrees to buy (and therefore owns) only the weakest portion of the resulting portfolio—defaulted loans and loans canceled due to death, disability or other statutorily defined reasons.

Because the federal government borrows at the lowest market rate, cost of capital under direct lending is less expensive than under the guarantee mechanism. In addition, because under the guaranteed student loan program the government assumes the two most important financial risks involved in any lending operation, the credit risk as well as the interest-rate risk, the GSL system is a particularly expensive form of financing for the taxpayers.

Credit risk is the risk that a certain percentage of amounts borrowed will not be repaid, and interest-rate risk is the risk associated with lending out money at a fixed rate (or at an adjustable rate with a maximum cap) that may fall below the cost of capital for the lender over time. The federal government holds lenders absolutely harmless from the risk of default because it in effect acts as the cosigner of every student loan. In addition, the government also assures the profitability of the GSL program for banks through the payment of "special allowance" indexed to the 91-day Treasury bill. The special allowance, until recently set at 3.25 percent and reduced during the last reauthorization to 3.10 percent, guarantees that regardless of how high interest rates may go, lenders will always make a profit in the GSL program.

The enormous and over-escalating cost of the GSL program can be traced directly to the federal government's complete assumption of interest-rate risk and credit risk, the first of which can be substantially reduced through the use of less expensive federal capital in place of costlier private funds while the second can be reduced through a reconfiguration of the student loan system that is possible only under direct lending.

The simple and obvious thesis that the least expensive source of funds is the best source to tap for use in a federal lending program has been attacked by the various financial intermediaries who benefit from the existing GSL system. These include not only the thousands of participating lenders, but the 46 guaranty agencies that administer the loan guarantees on behalf of the federal government and 35 secondary markets, the largest of which is the Student Loan Marketing Association (Sallie Mae).

While a 1992 Education Department study indicates that the student loan business was the second most profitable lending operation for banks, surpassed only by credit cards lending, the main force of political opposition to direct lending will undoubtedly be those entities that rely primarily on the GSL system for their existence, the guaranty agencies and the secondary market. Sallie Mae and some guaranty agencies have charged that the proponents of direct lending have overlooked certain important questions. The following answers some of those charges:

WILL ACCESS TO LOANS NOT BE THREATENED UNDER DIRECT LENDING?

No. Direct lending as contemplated in President Clinton's reform plan and as feared by the financial players in the GSL system is a replacement for the existing GSL entitlement program for lenders with an entitlement program for students. As such, it is an entitlement which will not be subject to artificial annual appropriations battles as are the Pell and Perkins programs. Any student who currently qualifies for a GSL will qualify for a direct federal loan at a much lower net cost to the federal government, which indicates that better terms and conditions or a greater number of loans or both are more likely under direct lending than GSL.

Much has been made of allegations that government borrowing to raise capital for direct lending would be difficult and increase the deficit. Given the respective sizes of the national debt and the annual federal budget deficit, it is easy to see that the government knows how to borrow money, which the Treasury Department does through the sale of a variety of Treasury instruments. Therefore a highly efficient and reliable system for borrowing is already in place, for which the additional borrowing for direct student loan capital is but a drop in the bucket. Furthermore, the additional indebtedness incurred by the government is not counted towards the $300 billion deficit, but the $4 trillion national debt, and is, more important, offset by the assets purchased by the government, i.e. the loan paper that currently generates more than a billion dollars of profits for the middlemen.

Savings from direct lending, $6.052 billion over five years in the House and Senate budget resolutions, could not only be used to offer additional assistance to students, it could also decrease the deficit. The entire outstanding GSL loan volume appears in the budget as a 100 percent contingent liability (debt) to the federal government.

CAN THE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT HANDLE DIRECT LENDING?

Yes. This catch-all objection fails to note the functional complexity of the present GSL arrangement. The General Accounting Office recently rated the GSL program one of the six riskiest federal credit programs, in large part due to the difficulty of streamlining a program with thousands of lenders, 46 guaranty agencies, 35 secondary markets, and tens of servicers and collectors.

The system that the department now administers is on the face of it a peculiar way of having the government make loans available to students at institutions. This essentially triangular relationship is turned into a polygon with sides that include the department, the school, the student, the lender, the guaranty agency, the secondary market, the servicer, the collector and the Internal Revenue Service. The radical simplification that would ensure under direct lending would allow for vastly better oversight and accountability.

CAN INSTITUTIONS HANDLE DIRECT LENDING?

Yes. Any institution that administers the Pell program or runs the Perkins program can handle direct lending. Direct lending will free institutional resources by reducing the number of steps involved not only for the student and the department, but also for the institution.

The Direct Lending Demonstration program authorized by the 1992 amendments to the Higher Education Act makes federal capital available to the institution and allows its financial aid office to start and finish the loan origination process by doing what it now does as the first of several functional steps involved in the GSL program. Today the aid office must take the form filled out by the borrower, verify the borrower's eligibility, fill out the school section and mail the form to the particular bank indicated by the student. Then it must wait for the bank to obtain a guarantee from the guaranty agency and upon receiving the funds a number of weeks later, go through the same verification of student eligibility process again to ensure that the student's status has not materially changed.

Under direct lending the financial aid office will have originated the loan in the very step and the funds can be immediately posted in the student account, resulting in better service to both the institution and the student. It is important to note that schools that don't wish to actually administer direct lending will have the option of joining a loan origination consortium, which would allow them to continue to operate as they do under the present system.

Much has been said about school liability for servicing and collecting loans. Schools will not be required to service or collect the loans, and therefore will not be liable any more than they are under the GSL system, though some may decide they wish to do so to provide better service to students or to reduce default rates, which they will be allowed to do through separate contracts with the department.

WHY IS DIRECT LENDING A BETTER ALTERNATIVE TO GSL FOR BORROWERS?

By reducing the number of intermediaries and, most important, by eliminating the existing profit-driven incentive structure, direct lending will permit alternative terms and conditions that will be to the taxpayers' and borrowers' benefit. The savings from di-

rect lending, estimated by the Congressional Budget Office to be at least $6.052 billion over the next five years, can either be reinvested in new programs of federal support for higher education or they can provide better terms for borrowers.

The large-scale, default-related industry that has emerged in the GSL system has created a fundamental impasse on the issue of defaults that only direct leading can resolve. Better repayment terms and particularly income-contingent repayment of loans for students facing default, would not only be a more lenient and appropriate treatment of financially strapped borrowers, but will save money by avoiding the vast majority of defaults.

The system as it now operates punishes those for whom educational borrowing did not work and it gives the wrong incentives to the financial middlemen in the form of costly and ineffective "default prevention" subsidies that direct lending would release as subsidies for students.

The simplicity of direct lending would be sufficient justification in itself for opting for it rather than the existing system. The current system's bewildering array of vested interests and financial intermediaries may be an administrative nightmare for schools, but it has tragic consequences for a large number of students who go into default because they do not know who owns the loan, which guaranty agency they must deal with and what the particular (and widely different) policies of these entities are.

President Clinton's budget, as well as the House and Senate budget resolutions, rely on the savings from direct lending. The financial intermediaries in the GSL system understand the threat and have activated a sophisticated lobbying campaign against direct lending in Congress and among institutions. They have also volunteered alternatives under GSL to come up with the savings—mainly through cutting subsidies to students—to maintain their own revenues. AASCU's Division of Governmental Relations and Policy Analysis can provide members with technical assistance on this issue.

AMENDMENT NO. 227

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I rise today to oppose the amendment by the distinguished Senator from Kansas reducing anticipated budget savings from a new direct student loan program by approximately $3.3 billion.

I oppose this amendment, Mr. President, because I am a strong supporter of fundamental changes in Federal student loan programs—changes that will save taxpayers money and provide students and families with improved financial access to college.

I also believe the savings anticipated by the budget resolution is conservative, and definitely achievable—especially under the kind of fundamental change in student loan programs that Senator SIMON and I have previously proposed, the kind of change that President Clinton is now also embracing.

I realize, Mr. President, that the details of whatever program we use to meet these anticipated savings remain to be worked out. I also realize that the program these savings are based on doesn't presume income-contingent repayment through the IRS.

But the President is strongly committed to combining the concepts of direct lending and income-contingent repayment. So am I.

And an important reason for my hope that these concepts will both emerge in legislation we adopt this year is my strong belief that including income-contingent repayment in a new direct loan program will produce even more savings—especially long-term.

Mr. President, Members of this body know of my longstanding personal interest in linking direct lending and income-contingent repayment.

Almost 2 years ago, I introduced legislation previously authored by Representative TOM PETRI to create a new direct student loan program called IDEA.

Several months later, Senator SIMON joined me in introducing a modified version of IDEA that shifted more than $3 billion in annual savings to the Pell Grant Program and created a new excellence scholarship program for high achieving low income students.

I've met with students and parents and higher education leaders all over Minnesota—to discuss the IDEA proposal and to listen to their concerns about current student loan programs.

I've found overwhelming support everywhere I've gone.

Support from students and their parents—who are frustrated with a system they believe is unresponsive and unnecessarily bureaucratic.

Support from college administrators and financial aid officers—who know the current system is inefficient and who know that they could do better, if only given the chance.

And perhaps most important, support from middle income parents of our next generation of students—parents who are terrified that their kids won't have the same opportunities they had to gain the rich rewards that a college education can offer.

I mention my own past experience with IDEA, Mr. President, to help make the point that direct lending is not a partisan issue.

And, I want to use at least part of my time here today, to explain why Republicans should be at the forefront of this debate—in favor of fundamental changes in student loan programs. In fact, almost 50 Republicans have already made that choice in the House of Representatives by cosponsoring Congressman PETRI's IDEA proposal.

It's often argued during these debates, that the options before us are an innovative, consumer-responsive private sector—on one hand—and a stodgy, inefficient governmental bureaucracy, on the other.

My own experience suggests that, in this case, the usual distinctions between public and private sector roles really don't apply.

I have a hard time, Mr. President, even thinking of current student loan programs as part of the private sector, when there's a guaranteed rate of return to banks making the loans, and no financial risk if the loans end up in default.

I also have a hard time defending the efficiency and user friendliness of private sector student loan programs that produce as much confusion and outrage as I hear from my constituents who use them.

I'd maintain that this really isn't a question of private versus public sector programs, at all.

What we are really talking about, Mr. President, is making a public sector program work better and more efficiently.

Like many of my Republican colleagues, I have felt the administration's economic recovery program has been long on tax increases, short on real spending cuts, and woefully inadequate on the kind of fundamental reforms that produce both better quality Government and lower cost.

But, the direct loan program we're debating today is a welcome response to the need for real and fundamental reform in how we as a Federal Government do the public's business.

Direct loans are what reinventing Government is all about. Both Republicans and Democrats should give strong support to a proposal like IDEA that accomplishes more for less.

Mr. President, a direct loan program like IDEA also promotes the important Republican principal of individual responsibility.

Last year, there were almost $3.0 billion in defaulted student loans in this country. Federal taxpayers ended up being responsible for meeting that unmet obligation.

But, under programs like IDEA, the responsibility for paying off loans stays with students—even during hard economic times—but in a way that's fair and feasible.

When incomes are low, no payments are due. When incomes go back up, so do the size of payments.

A program like IDEA is also consistent with the principal that higher education pays off, by linking the size of loan payments to post-college income—ending the current link between access to student loans and precollege family assets or income.

And, finally, Mr. President, a program like IDEA makes a wider range of personal, family, and career choices financially feasible to more Americans.

One of those choices might be to take some period of time away from a career—as a parent at home with young children. No longer would the financial obligation of an outstanding student loan prohibit that option.

Another choice available to recent college graduates, under a program like IDEA, would be to devote some period of time to community service in a low-paying job or even as an unpaid community volunteer.

This latter option is consistent with the President's objectives in launching a new national service program. But, it makes that choice available to recent graduates at no cost to the Government.

For all of these reasons, Mr. President, I believe fundamental changes in student loan programs can and should be enacted by this session of Congress. I also hope they include all the fundamental elements of IDEA.

I believe the CBO estimates are not only credible—but conservative. I believe those savings will be even greater if an income contingent repayment program like IDEA were fully implemented.

I realize that strong special interests are threatened by these changes. But, I urge all of us to remember what and who student loan programs are really for.

By enacting the fundamental changes assumed by the budget resolution, we can focus savings on students and families, not on protecting the interest of collection agencies or Sallie Mae.

I urge the defeat of this amendment, Mr. President, and I look forward to working with its author—and all of our colleagues on the Labor Committee—to design a new student loan system that serves today's generation of students—and all those who will follow.

AMENDMENT NO. 227

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I must regretfully oppose the amendment offered by Senator KASSEBAUM.

Let me say at the outset that I most definitely share the Senator's concerns regarding the savings the Labor Committee will be required to come up with. They are, to my mind, too high and too restrictive. If these numbers prevail, I am very fearful that they will place us irretrievably on a narrow path to a very specific direct loan proposal. We will have little room to maneuver. And, we will be required to enact very precise legislation that anticipates unforeseen problems and pitfalls. This would be exceptionally difficult, to say the least. And, for those of us who have preferred a demonstration approach, this is very troubling.

Safeguards are also absolutely necessary if we are to protect the availability of adequate loan funds for deserving students. And that should be our ultimate concern. For no matter the shape of the program, our commitment must be to making sure that students have access to the loans they need to finance a college education.

My views with respect to direct lending are, I believe, well known. I prefer accessing private capital. I also question whether or not a direct loan program will actually save us money. I am deeply concerned that many institutions may not have either the capacity or the desire to run a direct loan program. And, I must frankly admit that I am not at all sure that the Department of Education is administratively in the best condition to oversee a program of this magnitude.

I recognize that the Administration favors a direct loan program. I counsel it to move slowly and carefully in that direction. And I stand ready to lend whatever assistance and advice is necessary to help the administration fashion a reasonable and workable program. I have a deep commitment to making sure that students will have the loans they need regardless of the shape of the program.

Regarding income contingent loan repayment, I agree wholeheartedly with the President and am prepared to help put that concept into law.

As my colleagues know, I have been a longtime advocate of National Service, and am heartened by the President's deep commitment to this idea. I know that he views changes in the loan program as an integral way to help finance National Service. And that, I am afraid, is the primary concern I have with the amendment by my friend and colleague from Kansas, for it could well put the President's National Service program at risk.

According to the provisions of the Kassebaum amendment, a reduction in required savings in the loan program would be offset by a reduction in increased investment spending. National Service requires increased investment spending. So if you reduce investment spending, you could well be striking at the heart of National Service. I, for one, would regret very much if action on National Service had to be trimmed or perhaps even curtailed as a result of passage of the Kassebaum amendment.

In sum, while I share many of the concerns of my colleague from Kansas, I must urge my colleagues to oppose this way of resolving the issue.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, nearly 40 years ago, a group of Indiana businessmen made a decision which was to provide impetus for vast new opportunities in American higher education. Recognizing that bright young Hoosiers were unable to attend college because they lacked the credit history and collateral necessary to obtain financing, these leaders decided to group together to provide security for loans for Indiana students.

These Hoosier businessmen formed a nonprofit organization and began to guarantee loans—confident that the investment in our young people was sound. This Indiana initiative served as a model for our first National Defense Student Loan Program.

Today, 50 percent of all the full-time students in the State of Indiana receive Federal assistance in pursuit of postsecondary education. Over 6 million students across our Nation depend upon the Federal Government for assistance. The Federal Student Loan Program is essential to the future of these students and to our Nation—we owe it to them to act carefully and prudently when considering changes in the Student Loan Program.

Yet, the budget resolution before us today contains a provision which would force us to adopt drastic changes in the Student Loan Program. The reconciliation instruction to the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources would require the committee to achieve a savings of $6.1 billion over 5 years in the Student Loan Program—the same savings the Congressional Budget Office [CBO] claims would result from direct lending as Senator KASSEBAUM has explained in great detail, adoption of the budget resolution would hence require the adoption of a full-fledged direct lending program.

During last year's reauthorization of the Higher Education Act [HEA], our committee held hearings to discuss the feasibility of replacing the guaranteed student loan structure with a direct lending program. Senators from both sides of the aisle voiced concerns about this transition and agreed that we should proceed cautiously. The committee determined that direct lending should first be tested.

The reauthorization resulted in a huge direct lending demonstration program of about a half a billion dollars. Mr. President, this pilot program has not even begun, and yet, here we are talking about a complete conversion to direct lending. This rapid transition is being fueled by claims of extensive savings. But great disagreement exists as to how much savings could be achieved—if any.

Where CBO claims $6.1 billion in savings, the General Accounting Office [GAO] places this figure at $4.7 billion. The Office of Management and Budget [OMB] estimates a savings of $3.2 billion, while the Congressional Research Service [CRS] and numerous other organizations, insist that direct lending will either result in no savings or even increased costs.

Mr. President, the disparity in these savings estimates is symbolic of the uncertainties related to direct lending. We can stand here all day and argue back and forth about the savings of direct lending, but the very fact that there is such a large degree of disparity, should send up red flags. We need to study and examine direct lending's impact before we jeopardize the entire Federal student loan structure.

We are being asked to decide today, without the benefit of the demonstration project, to commit the financial aid future of millions of students to direct lending. Mr. President, I believe that too many questions remain unanswered:

What effect will direct lending have on students?

The effect direct lending will have on students, in terms of access to loans and ability to choose lenders which meet their needs, has not been explored.

How will direct lending impact the schools?

GAO and CBO did not sufficiently take into account the financial impact of direct lending on schools.

The management firm of Peat Marwick estimate that schools would incur between $160 and $190 million in transition costs and between $130 and $179 million in additional annual administrative costs.

Schools will be expected to expand their administrative role with no compensation from the Federal Government.

Will the Department of Education be able to administer a program of this magnitude?

Concerns have been voiced from both sides of the aisle about the Education Department's ability to administer a program of the size and complexity of direct loans.

Will parents still be able to take on student loans for their children?

The concept of direct loans to parents by institutions has not been fully developed leading to uncertainties about parent access to student loans, or, conversely, poor credit decisions by schools, leading to overborrowing by families unable to meet repayment obligations.

What will happen to default rates?

Default rates under direct lending could be higher than comparable Federal Family Education Loan Programs [FFELP] during the transition period.

Mr. President, these are just a few of the questions that need to be answered before we can entrust our student's financial assistance to a full-blown direct lending program. These questions have not been adequately addressed, which is why Congress felt the need to create a demonstration program, last year.

For these reasons, I join the distinguished ranking member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, Senator KASSEBAUM, in sponsoring this amendment and urge my colleagues to join us. We cannot commit the future of our Nation's student financial aid program to an untested system which could jeopardize the avilability, quality, and cost of higher education.

AMENDMENT NO. 233

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the amendment I am offering today is a simple one. It would restore pay levels for military and Federal civilian employees to those authorized under current law. It would eliminate President Clinton's proposed freeze on military and Federal civilian pay during fiscal year 1994, as well as the proposed reduction in cost-of-living based pay raises during fiscal years 1995–97 and locality pay revisions.

The reason for the amendment is equally simple. The plan put forward by President Clinton, and adopted by the Budget Committee, places a disproportionate share of the burden on military and Federal civilian employees, the vast majority of whom could not be considered rich under even the most contrived of definitions, and many of whom do not even make poverty level wages.

These individuals are being asked to not only pay higher income taxes and higher energy taxes, but to have their wages frozen as well. In fact, the direct financial burden imposed on many Federal workers will be much greater under President Clinton's plan than will be borne by non-Federal workers earning much more. This isn't fair and it isn't right.

During his campaign, President Clinton said that only those Americans making more than $200,000 would be called upon to pay for his deficit reduction plans. He even called President Bush shameless for suggesting that persons making as little as $36,000 would be required to sacrifice under the Clinton plan. As we now know, President Bush actually overshot the mark and individuals making much less will be required to sacrifice to support new spending programs.

We sometimes talk about the pay of Government employees as if we were discussing some privileged class. Actually, Federal employees are generally paid less than their civilian counterparts, and many barely earn enough to maintain what would be considered a basic middle-class life style. In fact, the average Federal civilian employee makes $36,000, with some workers making as little as $12,000.

The situation is even dire with respect to those men and women who serve in our Nation's Armed Forces. They too are Government employees, and most are enlisted personnel who receive comparatively low pay. In fact, 70 to 80 percent of enlisted personnel earn less than $30,000, with the lowest paid personnel earning just $9,777 per year plus allowances. Some 20,000 enlisted personnel and their families are eligible for food stamps.

Moreover, during the past 10 years, military personnel pay has significantly lagged behind inflation and private sector salaries. Inflation has outpaced military salary increases by 7.8 percent and military pay has fallen behind private sector pay levels by an additional 11.8 percent.

The men and women who serve in the military volunteer for a career where they are often asked to risk their lives in the national interest. Even during peacetime, they are subject to constant relocation and reassignment, which often means that military spouses find it difficult to keep jobs or develop careers.

Mr. President, it simply isn't fair for us to ask those who already give so much to our country to give even more.

While fairness is the principal reason I am introducing this amendment, there are other important reasons as well. For example, the President's plan completely undercuts the congressional intent underlying the Federal Employees Pay Comparability Act [FEPCA], which was designed to establish a system to more closely tie Federal salaries to local wage rates and make them more competitive with the private sector. We should live up to the commitment we made with FEPCA.

In addition, I would note that a majority of all nondefense discretionary savings in the President's plan and in the budget resolution are derived from Federal employee accounts, across-the-board Federal pay reductions and unspecified administrative or attrition savings.

While it may be appropriate to realize some savings in this area, what the American people have told us, loudly and clearly, is that we should be eliminating unnecessary Federal programs, not hurting those that can least afford to be hurt. Once again, the Congress is attempting to avoid making the tough decisions to reduce or eliminate Federal spending programs which are supported by favored constituencies and special interests. Therefore, the costs of this amendment would be offset with commensurate reductions in the $112 billion in new program spending proposed in the President's plan and assumed in the budget resolution.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to play fair with those who serve in the military and the Federal Government and support this amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 234

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this amendment offered by myself, Senator KASSEBAUM and Senator LUGAR tries to correct an unconscionable provision of the proposal before us. Mr. President, under current law when a Federal employee retires, that person can elect to provide an annuity for surviving spouse. If the employee does that, the employee receives a reduced amount of retirement for the balance of his or her life. When the employee dies, the survivor receives a portion of the annuity that the employee has been receiving.

The provision that we would strike would require that the surviving spouse annuity be based upon a percentage of the retiree's reduced amount. What it means simply is that if you look at employees who retired around 1980, the average annuity of about $11,000 would go to the surviving spouse. This proposal would take $1,500 from those people who are currently getting 50 percent of the deceased spouse eligible annuity. It means $1,500, basically, from a sizable portion of our society who are widows of people who spent their lives working for the Federal Government.

I cannot think of anything that I have seen in this proposal that is worse. I make this statement now because I hope every Member of the Sen-

ate will look at our amendment No. 234 and delete this provision. It would literally take money from a widow who is getting one-half of the amount that her husband would have been entitled to receive if he had not indicated prior to his death that the survivor would receive a portion of his total eligible amount.

This portion should be stricken, and I hope the Senate will support amendment No. 234.

AMENDMENT NO. 240

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the Lott amendment. Under President Clinton's leadership we are now engaged in the difficult business of beginning to solve the Government's fiscal crisis. Rest assured that if we don't take care of the deficit, it will take care of us. It is clear that the deficit must be reduced and it is equally clear that any measures aimed at reduction must be fair and even-handed.

President Clinton is mindful of the issue of equity and has called for a sharing of the burden, but only by all who can genuinely afford to contribute, and this would include some seniors. Presently, one out of five social security beneficiaries pay some tax on 50 percent of their benefits. The Clinton proposal would increase the rate of tax to 85 percent. Two important features need to be noted. First, these tax rates only become effective after one's income rises above certain threshold levels. These thresholds are designed to protect low- and middle-income beneficiaries from paying taxes they cannot afford. Presently, the thresholds are $25,000 for an individual and $32,000 for a couple, but it is conceivable we could raise these thresholds if fairness an equity demanded it.

Second, this approach does not extend the tax to new seniors but is addressed to the more affluent. For example, the Congressional Research Service projects the scenario of a retired couple with $15,000 in Social Security benefits and $35,000 in other income from private pensions, interest and dividends. These folks would pay an additional tax of $551, or viewed another way, $46 per month. Analysts point out that since even the most generous private pension plans rarely pay ordinary retirees more than about $20,000 a year, this couple would have to have a significant investment portfolio of several hundred thousand dollars. On balance, therefore, I think these folks are able to participate, to bear a share of the deficit reduction. And I honestly think that many seniors would willingly do so, because they know the deficit has to be dealt with if the country is going to get back on track and have a future.

Finally, I wish to add that the Clinton administration has indicated that all the revenues raised from this tax will be funnelled into the Medicare Program which seriously needs fiscal attention. In other words, these funds will still be used to serve seniors.

The Lott amendment proposes to maintain the status quo of a fiscal house in disorder. It fails to restore equity into the tax system and it favors the well to do at the expense of the rest of society. It's effect will be to send benefits to those that may not have a genuine need. This amendment looks to the past, not the future, and it needs to be defeated.

AMENDMENT NO. 243

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the Thurmond amendment to continue military pay adjustments as prescribed under current law.

Mr. President, as requested by the Clinton administration, the budget resolution before us freezes military pay in fiscal year 1994 and decreases cost-of-living adjustments for military personnel in the future. From the outset, let me say that I vehemently oppose this initiative.

While we in Congress may disagree on the merits of various defense programs and priorities, personnel compensation should not be a partisan issue. The U.S. military is an All-Volunteer Force that endures great sacrifice in the line of duty. Personnel on deployment are routinely separated from loved ones for as much as 6 months at a time. The remuneration that they receive for their service can hardly be considered generous.

Under the existing base force plan we are eliminating 500,000 active duty personnel from the Armed Forces, many against their will. In addition, President Clinton has advocated cutting an additional 200,000 personnel by 1998, which is certain to trigger widespread involuntary separations. At a time when manpower reductions are causing such uncertainty and anguish throughout the ranks, I find it unconscionable that Congress would even consider cutting the pay of our military personnel.

Mr. President, during the cold war we relied upon the U.S. military to safeguard our security. They did not let us down. Now that peace has been achieved, we must not let them down. The amendment before us would correct a terrible inequity and reinstate funding for the military pay adjustments prescribed under current law.

I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment and I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 254

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], in introducing this amendment to send a strong message to the Finance Committee that residential consumers of home heating oil should not be forced to pay a disproportionate share of the Btu energy tax. As my neighbor in Massachusetts well knows, we in New England are placed in a very difficult position because our region relies heavily on home heating oil to keep us warm during the cold winter months. In fact, 35 percent of the homes in Rhode Island are heated with home heating oil, compared to only 14 percent nationally. We are willing to pay our fair share, but the supplemental oil tax portion of the Btu tax will have a significant and unfair impact on the residents of my State. With this supplemental oil tax, we are requiring that households using home heating oil either pay a premium over and above what their neighbor pays for energy or face the considerable cost of converting their home to an alternative energy source. And the cost of conversion are not inexpensive, running on the order of $2,000–$3,000.

The reality of the budget deficit and a decade of neglect in domestic investment has forced us to look at the tax as well as the spending side of the budget. And while I am not elated at the prospect of raising taxes, I do recognize that we have to make difficult choices if we are going to put this country back on track. I support an energy tax as a revenue raising option and believe the flat Btu tax spreads the burden across the broadest base of fuels and is the most fair regionally. However, the President's plan includes a major differential on oil that will hit home heating oil consumers much harder than others and I must express my objections to this inequity in an otherwise fair plan.

Although the administration recognized the inequity of home heating oil consumers by proposing a one-year delay in the phase-in of the supplemental tax on home heating oil to ease the transition for households that switch to another form of energy, many of these consumers lack the resources to convert and will therefore be fully exposed to the differential in oil prices.

The people of my State and the American public in general have voiced their willingness to share the burden of reducing the budget deficit if that burden is spread fairly. This supplemental tax imposes significant additional costs on residential consumers of home heating oil, and I am pleased that my colleagues have accepted this amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 258

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, it is important that I make myself clear on the fact that I do not vote for the Republican alternative because I support higher spending on defense programs. I support the Dole alternative in spite of the additional DOD moneys because I believe that the other proposals included in the Republican package are important to the economic viability of our nation and worthy of acceptance.

The Republican alternative budget resolution would eliminate the almost $300 billion in new taxes proposed in the President's economic plan. I have

been inundated with letters and calls from Oregonians asking Congress to cut spending first before we ask them to pay more in taxes. Previously, I have expressed my concern regarding certain taxes that are assumed within the President's plan. The so called Btu tax has many potential implementation problems, is inherently regressive, and potentially devastating to certain energy intensive industries in the Pacific Northwest.

Another extremely important point in support of the Dole amendment is the provision for significant entitlement reform. I was one of the few who voted in support of implementing caps on non-Social Security mandatory spending during last year's budget resolution. This part of our budget has been out of control for some time now. Some 96 percent of the spending increases over the next 5 years will be in mandatory programs. Attempting to control these costs recognizes that the heart of our budget difficulties lie not in the lack of revenues, but in the lack of control over runaway growth in certain Government programs.

My vote for the Dole amendment notwithstanding, I cannot agree with those on both sides of the aisle who claim that the defense budget is absorbing inordinately large cuts. Of course each billion saved out of the Pentagon's budget is significant and has an effect upon our national security posture. But several military analysts have shown us that it is possible to achieve significant savings in defense in this time of lessened external threats. I believe we can go beyond the Clinton proposal.

This is not the last opportunity for Congress to consider this year's defense budget. It is certainly not our best opportunity, for we do not have or hands on any budget documents from the new administration, which could give us a clue as to where the changes will be made. As we move on to the authorization and appropriations process, I will continue to argue for deep, and responsible, reductions in military spending.

CRAIG AMENDMENT

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Idaho which would repeal the Davis-Bacon Act. The Davis-Bacon Act requires the Federal Government to pay workers on Federal construction projects the prevailing local wage for similar labor on comparable construction work. The Davis-Bacon Act is important law, and deserves the support of this body. I urge my colleagues to defeat the Craig amendment.

Passed in 1931, the Davis-Bacon Act is designed to protect local contractors and local workers. Prior to the passage of Davis-Bacon, local contractors and workers could not gain access to Federal projects because of competition from out-of-town, fly-by-night firms which would come to a locality and underbid local contractors. The fly-by-nights were able to underbid local contractors not because they were more efficient, but because they came to a locality and undercut local wages and work standards. This nefarious activity by fly-by-nights had several effects. It hindered the growth of local enterprises and local employment, it artificially caused local wages to be lowered, and it led to a credibility gap between those people in a community for whom the project was to benefit and the out-of-town, wage-cutting contractors.

Davis-Bacon ended those practices, strengthening the diversity of the contracting industry, ensuring the employment of local people, and guaranteeing that workers on Federal projects are fairly paid. These achievements are particularly important in my State of Alaska. Living costs in Alaska are significantly higher than those in the lower 48. This is true for a variety of reasons, including the lack of an industrial infrastructure, high travel and shipping costs, and severe weather conditions. As a result of these factors, a study commissioned by the State of Alaska found that the cost of living in Anchorage, the largest city in Alaska, was some 14 percent higher than the cost of living in the nearest city in the continental United States, Seattle.

That 14-percent difference is the key to understanding the importance of Davis-Bacon to Alaska. Without Davis-Bacon, an outside contractor could come to the State with a bid based on the hiring of workers from outside. Those workers would be subject to the costs of living in Alaska only for the duration of the project; they would never pay higher Alaska mortgages, never pay higher costs to feed and clothe their families, and never stay and contribute to the economic and social well-being of their communities and the State. Without those costs, these outside workers could in fact undercut the wages of Alaskan workers. Ultimately, I believe that such an economic distortion would ensure that there would be no resident labor force in Alaska.

However, with Davis-Bacon ensuring that local wages are not undercut, contractors have no incentive to bring in outsiders. Instead, contractors hire Alaskans for Federal projects, men and women who contribute every day to making the State stronger economically and socially. These Alaskans make up one of the most highly skilled and diverse resident labor forces in the country. That is why, Mr. President, I feel as strongly as I do about keeping Davis-Bacon on the books, and I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

Having said that, let me also speak briefly on another matter of great concern to working men and women: That is the issue of striker replacement legislation. As you know, legislation has been introduced in this body which would prohibit employers from hiring permanent replacement workers in cases of labor disputes involving economic matters. While it is already illegal to hire permanent replacement workers if the issue is one of unfair labor practices, this new legislation would extend that prohibition to workers hired during strikes based on economic concerns.

Mr. President, I oppose the so-called striker replacement legislation for much the same reason that I support Davis-Bacon. The reason is simple: I want to keep jobs, not lose them. Striker replacement legislation would alter the current balance between business and labor, a balance which has been in place for more than 50 years, and which has served both parties fairly. Striker replacement legislation would give enormous new power to unions, but I believe that power would ultimately be to the detriment of the interests of the working men and women of this country.

First, I believe that striker replacement legislation would have a negative impact on American competitiveness in the global marketplace, and could force the transfer of American businesses. Foreign companies which manufacture and export goods to the United States would not bear the cost of such legislation, and so American companies would be encouraged to relocate from the United States to overseas. We have already lost many American jobs to foreign nations were labor costs are lower. We do not need to further this trend.

Second, though some of the proponents of this legislation say that it is antilabor to oppose it, nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, it would be against the interests of labor to support such legislation. Disproportionately increasing the power of the strike weapon will force many businesses to close, unable to weather extended strikes without the employees needed to maintain operations. This reality will force many more businesses to work hard to avoid union activity. A company's refusal to accept a union's offer is often dictated not by the desire for greater profits, but by the absolute imperative to reduce costs and operate more efficiently and competitively in an increasingly demanding global economy. If a company can't compete, it closes down, and those jobs are lost.

If striker replacement were to become law, businesses which have employed union labor in the past would avoid doing so again in the future and businesses currently employing nonunion labor would redouble their efforts to stop attempts to organize their workers. This is particularly true in a business such as the construction industry in Alaska where companies can-

not risk extended strikes which can shut down entire projects because of the short construction season, affecting a multitude of contractors and subcontractors. Striker replacement would so alter the balance of power between labor and business that business would simply opt out, and that is no victory for working men and women.

Mr. President, I believe that we in this body should stand up for good paying, long-term American jobs. That is why I support Davis-Bacon, which has done so much to ensure the strength of local businesses and local employment throughout the country. That is why I oppose striker replacement legislation, a misguided idea which will harm America's working men and women. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to join me in defeating the pending amendment to repeal the Davis-Bacon Act and I urge my colleagues to oppose striker replacement legislation when it comes to the floor.

EXTENDING LOW-INCOME HOUSING TAX PROVISIONS

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I would like to address a question to the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee. My question concerns the resolution's assumptions with respect to the extension of certain tax incentives for affordable housing.

The low-income housing tax credit and the mortgage revenue bond programs are integral elements of Federal housing policy. Since its enactment, the tax credit has contributed to the development of more than 420,000 rental apartments for families earning less than 60 percent of median income. The mortgage revenue bond program has provided low-cost financing to more than 1.4 million families earning less than 115 percent of median income, allowing those families to purchase their first homes. Both of these programs have the dual benefit of creating jobs in the construction industry as well as expanding housing opportunities for low- and moderate-income families. I was quite pleased that the President's economic package called for permanent extension of these two valuable programs.

Mr. President, there is some concern that the assumptions behind the Senate budget resolution before us today might back off from the commitment to extend the low-income housing tax credit and the mortgage revenue bond programs permanently. I would like to take this opportunity to ask my colleague from Tennessee, the distinguished chairman of the Budget committee, if, in putting together this resolution, there was any intention to suggest that these important housing tax incentives should be extended for only 2 years?

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I am pleased to respond to my colleague from Maryland. I share his interest in maintaining these important affordable housing tax provisions. I have supported permanent extension for both the low-income housing tax credit and the mortgage revenue bond programs many times in the past. The Senate budget resolution before us today is in no way intended to suggest otherwise.

As you know, authority for both the low-income housing tax credit and the mortgage revenue bond programs expired on June 30, 1992. This hiatus has caused considerable disruption in the affordable housing delivery system. Housing projects require a long lead time for site acquisition and planning. Permanent extension is the only solution if we want to reassure the low-income housing community that they can go ahead with their plans. Permanent extension will prevent disruptions in the future.

Twice last year Congress provided permanent extension of these tax provisions in bills subsequently vetoed by President Bush. I too am pleased that the new administration has supported permanent extension, and I plan to work with our colleagues on the Finance Committee to secure permanent extension, once and for all, in this year's tax bill.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his remarks and look forward to working with him to secure permanent extensions of these programs.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the Clinton proposal, as we all know, imposes a tax of nearly 26 cents per million Btu's on fossil fuels. While I strongly oppose this unfair tax, that is not what I am here to discuss. What I am here to discuss is the additional 34 cents per million Btu's surtax on oil alone. I am most concerned about the people in New Hampshire and the Northeast corridor who use oil to heat their homes. Oil now accounts for 45 percent of residential heating consumption in New Hampshire. Imposing a total tax of nearly 60 cents per million Btu's tax on oil will force some people in New Hampshire to make a choice between putting food on the table or keeping their children warm.

I believe that there are at least two things that need to be addressed before we allow this surtax to be imposed. Who does this tax hit the hardest and what good will come of this additional surtax?

First, who does this tax hit the hardest? While the majority of this unfair tax will be levied on those in the upper income tax bracket, the fact remains that the upper income bracket has the money to pay for it. With regard to the very poor, President Clinton has realized that this surtax will impose a heavy burden on people that are just trying to get by. Consequently, he has proposed increases for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program. This provision may offset the new tax burden on the very poor. However, I am not confident of this. Having said all that, who do you think will be the hardest hit? It is the middle and lower class. This tax is not fair. This tax does not impose equity. This tax will drive the middle class, especially those who are unemployed and on shaky fiscal ground, right into poverty.

Second, what good will come of this additional surtax? This tax is expected to raise only $1.1 billion. Where are our priorities when we are frivolously spending billions and billions of dollars, yet we are voting to impose an unreasonable tax burden on our lower and middle classes? I would also like to point out that the estimated $1.1 billion that will be raised as a result of this surtax will not even be used to offset our national debt that now looms at around $4 trillion.

Mr. President, I believe that we have a responsibility to allow the lower and middle classes to keep their money and use it to heat their homes, put food in their children's mouths, and clothes on their children's backs. Consequently, I urge all Senators to vote in favor of the Murkowski amendment.

TO EXEMPT COMMERCIAL FISHING INDUSTRY VESSELS FROM THE BTU TAX

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I am today offering an amendment to exempt fuel used by vessels operating in the commercial fishing industry of the United States from the Btu tax as proposed by the President.

I believe this amendment is needed for several reasons. The seafood industry is a valuable component of this Nation's economy. It is one of the few areas where the United States consistently has a trade surplus, which has a positive impact on our economy and on the United States' standing in the economic world.

Our commercial fishermen produce healthy protein for a hungry world, and employ thousands of individuals in coastal States. Jobs are provided for many thousands of others in transportation, seafood processing and distribution, wholesale and retail sales, and so forth.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, the industry is not in the best of health. Prices for many fish species are low, and many experts will tell you that a large number of fishermen and fishing companies are operating on the edge. This tax could well push them over the edge.

If what we are trying to do is create jobs, let us not take actions that would result in losing them in large numbers.

My colleagues may have seen recent news accounts of civil unrest among fishermen in France and other countries, due to the poor shape of European whitefish markets. The situation in the United States is not that much different. The reason for that is that seafood prices are set by a world market, not by local markets. Dumping of whitefish products in Europe has a di-

rect effect not only on French fishermen, but on our own as well. Similarly, the growth in salmon farming production in Norway, Great Britain, Chile, Canada, and a host of other countries has had a direct impact on salmon fishermen in Alaska and the Pacific Northwest, and on American salmon farmers.

At this sensitive time, adding an additional tax is exactly the wrong action. It places the fishing industry at great risk, along with all the jobs it creates both directly and indirectly.

It also places at risk the U.S. supply of healthy, ocean-grown protein, such as the millions and millions of pounds of high-quality fish caught each year off the coast of my own State of Alaska.

This is not just a question of jobs, it is a question of where the country should be putting its emphasis. Let us think about what we are doing. We have had much debate recently on the subject of health care, and I believe there is general agreement that Americans would be healthier if they ate more seafood. Yet what are we doing? We are preparing to adopt a tax that will both reduce the amount of seafood available to consumers, and increase our dependence on imported foreign seafood, much of which—according to FDA studies—is not as carefully and safely processed as American-caught seafoods.

Mr. President, the seafood industry would provide a very limited amount of income through the Btu tax—approximately $45 million in fiscal year 1994, increasing to $134 million in fiscal year 1996 and beyond—but the tax would have a tremendously damaging impact on the industry, on seafood-related jobs, on the viability of Government and private loans already made to the industry, and perhaps to public health.

We here in the Senate often pride ourselves on being able to take the long view of the issues of our time. I urge my colleagues to take the long view on this issue, and realize that exempting fishing industry vessels from the Btu tax will be by far more productive than the alternative.

VOTES ON GRAZING FEES AND MINING LAWS

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, the Senate was confronted yesterday with two votes that were intended to ensure that fees charged to ranchers for grazing on public lands and the royalty fees for hardrock mining on Federal lands be established to ensure a viable ranching and mining industry. On the surface, it would appear that a Member supporting one amendment would support the other. However, that was not the case.

The Bingaman amendment simply expressed the sense of the Senate that the fees established on grazing lands and royalties on hardrock mining ensure viable industries. However, the amendment from the Senator from New Mexico did not include the specific numbers in the budget that would need to be adjusted to achieve the stated goal. Ranchers and miners are vital to South Dakota. I support their continued viability.

On the other hand, the amendment from the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WALLOP] achieved the intent of both amendments and, at the same time, provided specific numbers that the Appropriations Committee could follow to ensure the future good health of our ranching and mining industries.

While I supported the spirit of the Bingaman amendment, I was compelled to vote against it. It was imperative that the Senate provide the specific budget details needed to achieve fairness for our ranchers and miners. Those specifics were included in the amendment from the Senator from Wyoming and that is the reason I supported the Wallop amendment on grazing and mining fees.

THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, this budget resolution speaks for itself. If we look on page 3, line 6, we see the following:

PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:
Fiscal year 1994: $4,723,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $5,082,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $5,428,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $5,780,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $6,161,400,000,000.

That is what people in the business community would call the bottom line. After all the claims and counterclaims, when the dust settles, this Nation will be more than $6 trillion in debt.

Again, let us read the resolution. On page 41, line 7, we find the following:

The corresponding levels of gross interest on the public debt are as follows:
Fiscal year 1994: $307,458,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $326,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $345,874,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $362,860,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $380,168,000,000.

Given those staggering numbers, it is hard to believe that the Senate is debating a budget that would add $140 billion in new spending over the next 5 years.

I have heard a lot of talk in this Chamber about the investment deficit in this country. I have seen graphs and charts that compare the levels of investment among industrialized nations.

Mr. President, those charts ignore one very important point: No other nation in the world is $4 trillion in debt. I am certain that there are many families in New Hampshire that would like to invest more money in education, or a better roof over their heads. But they cannot invest what they do not have.

Mr. President, the Federal Government cannot spend what it does not have—and we do not have money. Under the best-case scenario—if everything goes as planned, this is what will happen to the budget deficit under the Clinton plan:

1994—$268.1 billion.
1995—$257.0 billion.
1996—$220.0 billion.
1997—$204.9 billion.
1998—$228.5 billion.

With all the different budget estimates discussed in the Senate, it is easy to get confused. The American people, however, need only to remember the following three numbers.

First, $228.5 billion—that is the minimum amount of the deficit in 1998 according to the Clinton plan. It will likely be much higher.

Second, $380.2 billion—that is the minimum amount the Federal Government will pay in interest in 1998 according to the Clinton plan. It will likely be much higher.

Third, $6.2 trillion—that is the minimum amount of the national debt in 1998 under the Clinton plan. Again, it will likely be much higher.

Mr. President, that is not progress, it is pathetic. Mark my words, if this plan is adopted, I predict that:

The deficit will exceed $300 billion in 1998.

Interest on the debt will exceed $400 billion in 1998.

The National debt will be $6.5 trillion in 1988.

President Clinton's budget represents a complete retreat from candidate Clinton's promises.

Candidate Clinton promised a tax cut for the middle class. President Clinton's plan will increase taxes on families earning more than $25,000.

Candidate Clinton proposed $60 billion in defense cuts over the next 5 years. President Clinton has proposed defense cuts of $112 billion—without offering any specifics.

Candidate Clinton promised policies that would invest in people and create good jobs at good wages. President Clinton has proposed a new energy tax that will destroy jobs and stifle economic growth.

Mr. President, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the Clinton plan asks Americans to pay $3.80 in additional taxes for each $1 of spending cuts. That is not shared sacrifice. It is offering taxpayers up as sacrificial lambs.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Clinton budget. It speaks for itself.

JOB CORPS

Mr. SIMON. I would like to thank the chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator SASSER, for engaging in this colloquy with me.

The issue I would like to discuss today is Job Corps. I was very pleased with President Clinton's commitment to fully funding the Job Corps 50–50 plan by the year 2001. The Administration has proposed $133 million for Job Corps fiscal year 1994, as well as $30 million to eliminate maintenance backlogs. These funds are badly needed, and I fully support these funding levels. I know that the chairman of the

Budget Committee is very supportive of this proposal as well.

Mr. SASSER. That is correct. I, too, fully support the administration's Job Corps proposals.

Mr. SIMON. With adequate appropriations levels, 50 new Job Corps centers can eventually be opened. Opening new centers will help the program ultimately serve 50-percent more youths than are currently served. There are many areas of the country that desperately need these centers. I have been pushing for appropriations to open a Job Corps center in Chicago for many years. Chicago is the largest urban area that does not have a center now. In addition, there is a large population of at-risk young people there.

I know the Senator from Tennessee has also worked hard to locate a center in Nashville. I believe both these sites have a great deal of merit, and it is my hope that the priorities set out by the Clinton administration with regard to Job Corps will help to finally get these centers off the ground.

Mr. SASSER. I agree that both Nashville and Chicago would be excellent sites for Job Corps centers. We finally have leadership from the administration in this area, and a commitment for adequate funding levels. This leadership is long overdue. I look forward to working with my colleague from Illinois on this issue in the future.

THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RESOLUTION AND VETERANS PROGRAMS

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I rise to support the resolution as it was reported by the Budget Committee. The resolution's treatment of veterans programs embodies the recommendations in President Clinton's budget. On March 5, our committee provided to the Budget Committee our views and estimates regarding the budget for veterans programs. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, this is a budget that recognizes the importance of meeting this Nation's solemn obligations to those who have served and sacrificed to protect our country—and to their families and survivors. The President has not proposed—and this resolution does not contain—provisions that would jeopardize the compensation paid to service-disabled veterans, their families, or their survivors. It does not unfairly single out veterans for cuts in cost-of-living adjustments or other benefits that remain untouched in similar, nonveteran programs.

President Clinton did not forget veterans in his plans for economic recovery and investment in America's future, recognizing the important role that veterans programs can play in these efforts. It is essential to veterans and all Americans that we move quickly, after adopting this resolution, to enact the economic stimulus package that the President has recommended.

As President Clinton has said, significant sacrifices will be necessary to bring the huge Federal deficit under control after 12 years of borrow-and-spend policies that have mortgaged our children's future. Veterans proudly sacrificed during military service and they have told us again and again that they will do their fair share for the economic security of our country.

Mr. President, this is what one veterans service organization said at a recent hearing before our Committee:

> [P]riorities have to be set and painful, unpopular decisions have to be made. * * * Parochial concerns * * * cannot be controlling as we address the related questions of our economic health and the federal deficit.

Almost all of the major veterans groups have made similar statements that demonstrate that veterans and their families—like the overwhelming majority of Americans—clearly stand ready to share in the sacrifices President Clinton has called for in his budget.

Mr. President, as we move ahead into the appropriations process, we must keep in mind two major concerns.

First, for several years, the budgets for the Department of Veterans Affairs and veterans programs in other Federal agencies have not kept up with inflation. Funding shortfalls have caused real reductions in vital medical care and other services.

The current level of VA medical care does not meet many critical health-care needs of veterans. For example, VA currently is not meeting the full needs of veterans suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder or with special disabilities such as blindness or spinal cord injury. And in order to meet day-to-day operating expenses, VA medical centers have used money that was meant for replacing broken and outdated medical equipment, creating an enormous backlog that will approach $1 billion at the end of the current fiscal year. VA medical research, which is so important to VA's efforts to address the health needs of veterans and to recruit and retain qualified medical professionals, has been cut back severely. VA research has produced thousands of important breakthroughs in medicine and improvements in the delivery of medical services—results that benefit not only veterans, but all Americans. President Clinton wants to invest in our Nation's future by investing in productive research—VA medical research is a good place to start.

Second, I am very concerned about suffering reductions that would threaten delivery of veterans' medical-care services or other benefits that veterans earned through service to our country. Our committee has been very active in ensuring that VA has the necessary tools to attract and retain highly qualified nurses, doctors, and other medical professionals. But we must make sure that VA has the funds it needs to use the tools we have provided, such as the system of locality pay for nurses.

Most important, Mr. President, we should not add to VA understaffing by imposing arbitrary, across-the-board personnel cuts.

Mr. President, today, our committee held a hearing on the terrible delays that veterans and their families face in trying to receive the benefits to which they are entitled. Governmentwide personnel reductions could dramatically increase already unacceptable delays in processing VA claims and providing rehabilitation counseling and other services to veterans. Staffing reductions in these functions would not reduce bureaucracy and delays—in fact, they would increase both.

Finally, Mr. President, I want to emphasize that the Senate and House Veterans' Affairs Committees this year will consider major reforms affecting eligibility for veterans health care. We already are working closely with the national health care reform task force headed by Hillary Rodham Clinton to ensure that VA's future role in the national health care system is addressed. It is inevitable that changes in VA health care will have budgetary effects we currently cannot estimate. We intend to work closely with the Budget Committee in addressing the budget impact of VA health care reforms we consider.

Mr. President, this is a good budget for veterans and for all Americans. After the failure of 12 years of borrow-and-spend budgeting, our new President deserves the chance—has the responsibility, in fact—to try a new approach. He has the overwhelming support of the American people and he deserves nothing less from their elected representatives in the U.S. Senate.

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, March 5, 1993.

Hon. JIM SASSER, Chairman, Hon. PETE V. DOMENICI, Ranking Minority Member,
Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR JIM AND PETE: Pursuant to section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the approval of a majority of the members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, our Committee hereby reports to the Committee on the Budget our views and estimates with respect to the FY 1994 budget for veterans' programs within the jurisdiction of our Committee. This report comprises our Committee's recommendations for programs in Function 700 (Veterans' Benefits and Services) and for certain veterans' programs included in Function 500 (Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services). We offer our recommendations to assist you and your

Committee in developing a budget that meets our nation's obligations to veterans and their families and we hope that you will consider our views carefully in formulating the budget resolution.

INTRODUCTION

President Clinton has outlined a budget that recognizes the importance of meeting this nation's solemn obligations to those who have served and sacrificed to protect our country—and to their families and survivors. The President has not proposed budget cuts or legislation that would jeopardize the compensation paid to service-disabled veterans, their families, or their survivors. He has not unfairly singled out veterans for cuts in cost-of-living adjustments or other benefits that remain untouched in similar, non-veteran programs. President Clinton's budget also includes veterans in his plans for economic recovery and investment in America's future, recognizing the important role that veterans programs can play in these efforts.

We congratulate President Clinton on choosing Jesse Brown as Secretary of Veterans Affairs and commend Secretary Brown for his role in putting forth a generally positive budget for veterans programs.

As President Clinton has pointed out, significant sacrifices will be necessary to bring under control the huge federal budget deficits that have accumulated and grown over the last 12 years. Veterans proudly faced sacrifice during military service and we know they stand ready to do their fair share for the economic security of our country. At a recent hearing, one veterans service organization, in remarks echoed by others, recognized that "priorities have to be set and painful, unpopular decisions have to be made.* * * Parochial concerns * * * cannot be controlling as we address the related questions of our economic health and the federal deficit." Veterans and their families clearly stand ready to share in the sacrifices President Clinton has called for in his budget.

For several years, the budgets for the Department of Veterans Affairs and veterans programs in other federal agencies have not kept up with inflation. Funding shortfalls have caused real reductions in vital medical care and other services for veterans and drastically increased the time it takes veterans and their families to receive benefits the veterans earned through service to our country.

Although we do not have the detailed FY 1994 budget, we are pleased that the President has recognized the important role VA can play in fostering an economic recovery. We strongly support his proposal to provide $235 million in the current fiscal year (FY 1993) for vital repair and maintenance projects at VA medical centers and other VA facilities, as part of an overall economic stimulus package. We also support President Clinton's proposal to invest in VA medical care by providing $279 million over the current services baseline for FY 1994 (almost $2.5 billion over the next four years).

The proposed government-wide personnel reductions could have devastating effects on veterans health care and dramatically increase already unacceptable delays in processing VA claims and providing rehabilitation counseling and other services to veterans. Staffing reductions in these functions would not reduce bureaucracy and delays—in fact, they would increase both.

The Senate and House Veterans' Affairs Committees this year will consider major reforms affecting eligibility for veterans health care. We already are working closely with the national health-care reform task force headed by the First Lady to determine the effects of national reforms on VA medical care and VA's future role in the national health-care system. It is inevitable that these changes will have budgetary effects we currently cannot estimate. We intend to work closely with the Budget Committee in addressing the budget impact of VA health-care reforms we consider.

The views and recommendations expressed in this letter are based on very limited information, since the President has not yet completed his decision-making regarding VA's FY 1994 budget and, consequently, we do not yet have documents that estimate and justify expenditures for specific services and benefits funded from each account.

Based on the best information available, to provide adequate services to our nation's veterans, we believe VA's FY 1994 budget should include a total of approximately $800–900 million above the current-services levels for VA discretionary accounts, including the $279 million for VA medical care allocated in the President's health-care investment package.

VETERANS MEDICAL CARE

Without knowing the exact funding level to be proposed for the Medical Care account, it is impossible to judge whether the amount would be sufficient to provide even minimally acceptable levels of care. The current services baseline for medical care includes an increase to cover the costs of inflation, but the adjustment is based on the general inflation rate—not the much higher medical-care inflation rate. Therefore, baseline funding for medical care could require real reductions in VA health-care services.

Perhaps most important, there are vital health-care needs—right now—that VA is not able to meet within its current budget.

During 1988, Congress became aware of a fiscal crisis that had been growing in the VA health-care system. During the mid-to-late 1980s, Administration officials had disguised large shortfalls in VA's medical care account funding and reassured the Congress that the Administration-requested funding levels were adequate. Despite substantial congressional add-ons, funding deficiencies grew. VA medical centers were forced to use funds originally appropriated for long-term purposes, such as hospital repairs and medical equipment, for daily operating expenses, such as staff salaries, supplies, and medicines.

In the paragraphs below, we have described the most pressing needs in VA medical care today.

Medical equipment procurement backlog. VA faces a huge, continuing backlog in replacing aging and outdated medical equipment, largely as a result of having to divert funds intended for medical equipment to personnel, medicines, and other daily operating expenses. The amount of old, unsafe equipment that VA cannot replace within current funding levels is interfering with the quality and timeliness of the care VA is able to provide and threatens the safety of VA patients. The backlog will be almost $900 million at the end of FY 1993.

Addressing this issue is critically important to the quality of VA health care. A three-year plan adding $300 million a year would have a significant impact on reducing the problem. However, additional funds will accomplish this goal only if VA clinical programs receive adequate funding. If they do not, VA medical center administrators can be expected to continue, of necessity, to use replacement-equipment funds for immediate operational needs.

Waiting times for care and treatment. The amount of time a veteran must wait to receive certain types of VA health care are unacceptable.

Specialty Clinics: For certain specialty clinics in many VA medical centers, veterans must wait six to nine months for an appointment. For some patients with low-level, chronic conditions, a six-month interval between appointments may be acceptable. But for most patients, including those requiring initial diagnosis, such long delays in securing appointments with specialists in unacceptable.

Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD): Combat service frequently leads to development of PTSD. Meeting veterans' needs for diagnosis and treatment of PTSD must be a very high priority of the VA health-care system. But many veterans do not receive the treatment they need in a timely manner. Specialized Inpatient PTSD Units (SIPUs), which provide intensive care for PTSD in a hospital setting, have been plagued for many years by chronic waiting lists. Almost 1,000 veterans currently are waiting for care at SIPUs. The average waiting time for these veterans to receive treatment is almost four months. At one facility, the wait for treatment is over a year. The VA Special Committee on PTSD found that treatment inaccessibility further harms patients suffering from PTSD.

To eliminate waiting lists for screening and treatment, VA should establish additional SIPUs, PTSD Clinical Teams, and PTSD/substance-abuse units. In addition, VA should expand education, clinical training, and research related to PTSD diagnosis and treatment.

Nurse staffing. VA surveys show that nurse-to-patient ratios in VA hospital acute-care units are well below those at non-VA hospitals. The VA Inspector General recently confirmed this deficiency. He found that, even including physicians, health-care staff levels at VA medical centers were less than two-thirds of the staffing levels at public university teaching hospitals affiliated with VA medical centers. Historically, VA has had high nurse vacancy rates because of low pay. The VA Nurse Pay Act of 1990, which established a locality-pay system for VA registered nurses, has helped to alleviate this problem, but other difficulties now are arising. Inadequate on-call pay and mandatory shift-rotation patterns contribute to VA's nurse-recruitment problems. VA experiences shortfalls in other health-care professions as well. Changes to overcome these problems involve additional costs in the short run. In the long-run, however, they can improve recruitment, retention, and job performance of health-care personnel—and thereby save money in VA's delivery of health care.

Non-acute-care services. Preventive services, home-care services and other non-institutional alternatives to nursing homes, and hospice services are in the mainstream of U.S. health care. These services are very cost-effective, despite their start-up costs. Preventive, home-care, and hospice services all increase the physical and mental well-being of the patient and the patient's family and friends.

VA is falling behind the non-federal public and private sectors in providing these services. These services are not available at many VA medical centers and, when they are available, waiting lists often are long. Setting up hospital-based home-care programs at each of the 97 VA medical centers that do not have programs would cost almost $64 million. There are now 15 adult day health-

care (ADHC) programs in VA medical centers. At an annual cost of approximately $452,000 for each program, establishing 85 more programs, as recommended by veterans organizations, would cost over $38 million. VA estimates that a six-bed, inpatient hospice unit costs $112,200 a year to operate. By the end of FY 1993, 28 VA medical centers will have inpatient hospice units. Establishing similar units at 100 VA medical centers would cost approximately $11 million.

Prosthetics and special-disabilities programs. VA's prosthetics and special-disabilities programs (including spinal cord injury, blind rehabilitation, and traumatic brain injury programs) are particularly significant components of the VA health-care system. They offer what is often the only source of vital services for conditions that commonly result from wartime service. These programs go to the core of VA's health-care mission. As a result of more than a year's effort by the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, funding shortages for prosthetics largely have been resolved.

Other special-disabilities programs—particularly spinal cord injury and blind rehabilitation—need funding increases to address significant and growing needs for services. VA has been unable to implement its strategic improvement plan for blind rehabilitation because of inadequate funding. These programs have not received the same attention or experienced the same improvements as the prosthetics program.

Decentralized Hospital Computer Program. The Decentralized Hospital Computer Program (DHCP) uses standardized software and hardware to support varied administrative and clinical functions at VA medical centers. For the past three years, OMB has rejected VA requests for funding necessary to ensure that the DHCP keeps pace with rapidly changing technology. This prevents increased administrative efficiency and improved patient services that the DHCP has shown it can produce.

Non-recurring maintenance and repair. We strongly endorse President Clinton's proposal to provide $235 million from the economic stimulus package to address the $800-million backlog of non-recurring maintenance and repair (NM&R) projects. These are important, smaller-scale projects necessary to keep aging facilities functioning. It includes projects to repair roofs; maintain heat, ventilation, and air-conditioning systems and boilers; and repair electrical and utility systems. Reducing this backlog is very important to VA's ability to provide modern, effective health services in safe and efficient settings. This money will produce more than 4,000 jobs over an eight-month period.

VETERANS MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

VA's research program improves direct patient care in the short run, is integral to the recruitment and retention of high-quality physicians and other health professionals, and has made great contributions to medical-care advances now available to veterans and the general population alike.

VA also has unique research responsibilities with respect to the physical and psychological traumas of combat and the many other health risks of military service. As a large, centrally managed health-care provider, VA also is in a unique position to research and evaluate various methods of delivering health care and organizing and managing health-care services.

However, funding for VA research has decreased severely in recent years. VA's funding rate for worthy, investigator-initiated projects has dropped from 61 percent in FY 1984 to less than 33 percent in FY 1993.

The FY 1993 appropriation for the Medical and Prosthetic Research account, $207 million, represents an 8.8-percent cut from the FY 1992 funding level.

An increased research budget is necessary to enable VA to fund a greater proportion of research projects already approved by peer-review panels, including health-services research that could be very helpful in illuminating the debate on the future of national health policy and the VA medical-care system itself. Continued reductions in funding for VA research, on the other hand, would harm VA and the entire nation.

BENEFITS

Claims processing and adjudication. Each year, VA Regional Offices receive approximately 4.5 million claims for benefits and veterans and survivors appeal approximately 46,000 cases to the Board of Veterans' Appeals (BVA), the highest adjudicatory body within VA. Adjudication of benefits claims has become more complex and the timeliness of adjudication has deteriorated since the establishment in 1989 of the U.S. Court of Veterans Appeals, which reviews final BVA decisions, and the 1990 enactment of legislation requiring VA to provide more complete information in notices of its decisions. VA has experienced particular difficulty implementing the Court's decisions. It is important to note that, despite the detrimental effect on adjudication timeliness of the Court's decisions, the veterans' service organizations have strongly supported the Court's decisions, which are having the effect of requiring VA to follow the law and its own regulations.

The added time that it takes to process claims has resulted in growing backlogs of pending claims. The timeliness problem has been further exacerbated by employment cuts within the Veterans Benefits Administration (the organizational entity to which the Regional Offices belong) due to inadequate funding in VA's General Operating Expenses account.

At the Committee's May 20, 1992, hearing, VA testified that the time to process a claim at the Regional Office level had increased an average of 25 percent and that an additional 464 full-time equivalent employees (FTE) would be required just to meet the increased workload associated with judicial review and another 700 to 800 FTE would be required to enable VA's Veterans Benefits Administration (VBA) to process claims in the same amount of time as in FY 1990. Also, more intensive training is needed for VA adjudicators to enable them to handle their responsibilities.

Lengthening processing times, due to personnel shortages, and VA's failure to apply new Court standards properly, due to unmet training needs, have led to bitter complaints from veterans and veterans service organizations. Funds for additional staffing and training are needed in order to provide veterans with the timely, accurate service they deserve.

Veterans services. Public Law 101-510 requires VA to cooperate with the Departments of Labor and Defense to furnish counseling, assistance, and information to members of the Armed Forces who are within 180 days of separation. VA's FY 1993 budget provides no funding for VA staff for this responsibility and thus calls for the use of existing staffing resources diverted from other activities.

To enable VA to provide the type of services required by the almost 400,000 men and women who will be separating from the military in FY 1994, adequate staffing will be critical for VA's services program. It is not realistic to expect VA to divert resources from other activities that will also experience increased workloads due to the downsizing of the Armed Forces. Public Law 102-484 authorized $6.5 million for VA in FY 1994 and this authorization should be fully funded.

Vocational rehabilitation and counseling. VA vocational rehabilitation and counseling (VR&C) services directly respond to the needs of service-disabled veterans—those whose sacrifices deserve the highest priority. At the funding level provided for FY 1993, service-disabled veterans will have to wait an average of 91 days for an initial appointment. VA's own standards allow an average waiting time of 30 days.

The time required for a veteran who has completed educational or training courses to become employed and able to maintain employment, which averaged 272 days in FY 1992, will increase to 285 days in FY 1993. VA's goal for this period 90 to 120 days. It is imperative that the VR&C program provide more responsive services. Unacceptable delays between application for services and initial face-to-face counseling can reduce the applicant's level of motivation and morale, give the impression that the system is unresponsive and uncaring, and increase the possibility of depression and psychosomatic symptoms for a person who has become disabled.

The growth and success of VR&C's disabled transition assistance program (DTAP), designed for servicemembers who are being separated for medical reasons, will add to the VR&C workload problem for FY 1994.

Information resource management. VBA's automated data processing and telecommunications systems that support benefit programs for veterans and their families. Full funding of VBA's planned improvements in this program would cost $121.1 million in FY 1994.

This includes $71.8 million and 731 FTE to support current systems in FY 1994—the benefits delivery network and the insurance system, maintenance of VBA's first-stage modernization plan equipment, training in the use of new technology, and implementation of a quality assurance program.

It also includes $49.3 million and 54 FTE for continued VBA modernization. Since 1985, VBA has undertaken efforts to improve the delivery of benefits and services through modernization and extension of its technology base. The next phase of the modernization plan will replace data systems at VBA's two benefits delivery centers—systems that support VBA's central applications and its data exchange with other agencies. This phase of the system modernizations will cost $23.6 million. The remaining $25.7 million is needed for continued computerization of payroll, travel, training, supplies, and maintenance contracts; equipment upgrades; and technology enhancement initiatives.

Veterans home-loan programs. Current budget scorekeeping rules require the budget to include costs of loan-servicing staff while ignoring the savings to the government from reduced foreclosures as a result of the increased servicing that the additional staff would provide. A pilot program in Houston documented net savings of over $11 million a year from the addition of just 10 FTE—an average net savings of $1.1 million for each FTE. During FY 1991 (the most recent fiscal year for which data are available), VA docu-

mented a savings of $51 million in reduced guaranty payments as a result of the loan-servicing efforts of 231 FTE. Taking into account VA's average FTE cost in FY 1991 ($34,572) the average net government savings for each FTE was more than $1,896,000 in FY 1991—equivalent to $202,000 in current dollars.

Using even the most conservative of these two estimates, the government actually can save over $200,000 for each additional FTE dedicated to loan servicing.

We urge your Committee to change the budget scorekeeping rules to reflect the true budgetary impact of adding employees who would produce these savings. Funding should be provided for the cost-effective addition of loan servicing personnel.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR VETERANS' EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

Transition Assistance Program. Public Law 101-510 gave the Department of Labor (DOL), in conjunction with the Departments of Defense and VA, the responsibility to conduct the Transition Assistance Program [TAP], which assists servicemembers who are within 180 days of being discharged to make the transition from active duty to civilian employment. Public Law 102-484 authorized $8 million for DOL's TAP efforts in FY 1994. Full funding for this program is necessary to enable the federal government to help those who served so well when our defense needs were greater make the transition to civilian life and employment.

State grants programs. Chapter 41 of title 38, United States Code, prescribes the staffing levels for both the disabled veterans' outreach program [DVOP] and the local veterans' employment representative [LVER] program. State personnel provided through the DVOP and LVER grants programs provide job counseling, training and placement services for eligible veterans, in addition to providing TAP services. For the last two fiscal years, the funding levels requested and appropriated have been below those required by statute. Without full funding, DVOP and LVER shortages will leave unemployed veterans underserved and hinder efforts to provide transition assistance services.

Job training programs. Title 44G of Public Law 102-484 authorized $75 million for payments to employers under the Service Members Occupational Conversion and Training Act of 1992. Assistance may not be paid on behalf of an eligible person who applies initially for a program of job training after September 30, 1995, or for any such program that begins after March 31, 1996. Increased downsizing of the active-duty Armed Forces will require a $25-million increase in the authorization level, to a total of $100 million, and a two-year extension of the September 30, 1995, and March 31, 1996, limiting dates.

GOVERNMENTWIDE STAFFING REDUCTIONS

We are concerned about the effect on VA of proposals to make across-the-board cuts in government employment and in funding as a result of government "streamlining." These reductions could have an especially harsh effect on veterans medical care and on VA's ability to deliver benefits in a timely manner.

Cuts in FY 1993 or 1994 funding for veterans programs below the "current services" baseline will not improve services. The Reagan Administration repeatedly proposed spending cuts in VA budgets that it attributed to unspecified efficiency improvements. It is clear that these cuts helped produce the continuing fiscal crisis in VA health care and benefits delivery.

VA needs increases above current-services levels to provide adequate health care for veterans and reduce intolerable delays in delivering veterans benefits. VA certainly should pursue long-term efforts to achieve savings through greater efficiencies, but we should not hurt veterans programs by cutting funding in expectation of major savings from unidentified and untested plans to improve efficiency.

DEFICIT-REDUCTION (RECONCILIATION) PROPOSALS IN THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

The President has proposed changes in direct-spending programs within our Committee's jurisdiction that the Office of Management and Budget estimates will reduce the deficit by a total of $328 million during FY 1994 and a total of $3.7 billion over the next 5 years. With certain caveats, we believe that this represents an achievable target for our Committee's fair share of the President's deficit-reduction program.

The President's budget recommends nine legislative provisions that OMB estimates will achieve these reconciliation targets. At this time, we express no opinion on the substantive merit of each provision; we need more time to review them and to consult with veterans service organizations, VA, and other concerned parties regarding their impact on VA programs and any alternatives that might be preferable. Initially, we consider the overall targets reasonable and fair to veterans, considering the budget-deficit crisis and the other, very positive parts of the President's economic plan will help veterans—and all Americans.

We note that the deficit-reduction targets are based on OMB estimates of the legislation proposed in the President's budget. Senate consideration of the reconciliation legislation itself will be governed by estimates made by the Congressional Budget Office—not OMB. If the CBO estimates differ significantly from the OMB estimates for these provisions, it will be critical to base our Committee's reconciliation instructions in the budget resolution on the CBO, not OMB, estimates.

Finally, as the authorizing committee with jurisdiction over these important veterans programs, we understand that we will have the flexibility to satisfy our reconciliation instructions through legislation we consider most appropriate. For example, we might wish to seek alternative to certain proposals in the President's budget that could have serious, adverse effects on the VA home-loan guaranty program.

CONCLUSION

With the foregoing reservations, our Committee generally supports the broad outlines of what President Clinton has proposed with respect to the budget for veterans programs. Recognizing the pressing need to address the federal budget deficit, veterans are prepared to do their part in regaining control over our nation's financial well-being. However, we wish to ensure that the sacrifices that veterans are asked to make do not impair the government's ability to meet its obligations to the nation's veterans and their families.

These views reflect the best judgment of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs as of this date. If we or the Committee staff can provide further assistance in your consideration of this report, please feel free to call upon us.

Sincerely,

DENNIS DECONCINI.
JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER IV.
GEORGE J. MITCHELL.
BOB GRAHAM.
DANIEL K. AKAKA.
THOMAS A. DASCHLE.
BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of committee were submitted:

By Mr. NUNN, Committee on Armed Services:

Maj. Gen. Albert J. Edmonds, USAF to be lieutenant general (Reference No. 45)

Maj. Gen. Eugene E. Habiger, USAF to be lieutenant general (Reference No. 46)

Maj. Gen. Carl G. O'Berry, USAF to be lieutenant general (Reference No. 47)

In the Air Force there is 1 appointment to the grade of brigadier general (Charles R. Holland) (Reference No. 48)

Lt. Gen. J.H. Binford Peay III, USA to be general and to be Vice Chief of Staff, U.S. Army (Reference No. 49)

Gen. Dennis J. Reimer, USA for reappointment to the grade of general (Reference No. 51)

Maj. Gen. John H. Tilelli, Jr., USA to be lieutenant general (Reference No. 52)

Rear Adm. David B. Robinson, USN to be vice admiral (Reference No. 61)

In the Marine Corps there are 11 appointments to the grade of major general (list begins with Jeffrey W. Oster) (Reference No. 65) [See January 20, 1993 for list.]

Total: 19

By Mr. MOYNIHAN, from the Committee on Finance:

Lawrence H. Summers, of the District of Columbia, to be an Under Secretary of the Treasury.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself and Mr. DOMENICI):

S. 643. A bill to establish the Jemez National Recreation Area in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. NICKLES:

S. 644. A bill for the relief of Armando Taube Moreno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOHL:

S. 645. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the eligibility of veterans for mortgage revenue bond financing; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 646. A bill to establish within the Department of Energy an international fusion energy program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. DECONCINI):

S. 647. A bill to assist in the effective management of the civilian work force of the Central Intelligence Agency, and for other purposes; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

By Mr. GREGG (for himself, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. COATS, Mr. LOTT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BOND, Mr. HELMS, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. WALLOP, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MACK, and Mr. SMITH):

S. 648. A bill to provide Federal payments for Federal mandates imposed upon State and local governments; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SIMON, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. WOFFORD):

S. 649. A bill to ensure proper and full implementation by the Department of Health and Human Services of Medicaid coverage for certain low-income Medicare beneficiaries; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

S. 650. A bill to amend the National Apprenticeship Act to require minimum funding for certain outreach recruitment and training programs, to restore a national information collection system, to limit the authority to conduct reductions in force within the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training of the Department of Labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. PELL (for himself, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S.J. Res. 69. A joint resolution providing for the United States to assume a strong leadership role in implementing the decisions made at the Earth Summit by developing a national strategy to implement Agenda 21 and other Earth Summit agreements through domestic policy and foreign policy, by cooperating with all countries to identify and initiate further agreements to protect the global environment, and by supporting and participating in the high-level United Nations Sustainable Development Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MITCHELL (for himself and Mr. DOLE):

S. Res. 82. A resolution to authorize the production of records by the Committee on Governmental Affairs; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself and Mr. DOMENICI):

S. 643. A bill to establish the Jemez National Recreation Area in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

JEMEZ NATIONAL RECREATION AREA ESTABLISHMENT ACT

• Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of my colleague from New Mexico, Senator DOMENICI, and myself, to introduce a bill to authorize the establishment of the Jemez National Recreation Area in New Mexico. This national recreation area will be managed primarily to conserve, protect, and restore the recreational, cultural, archaeological, ecological, scenic, and wildlife resource values within this unique area of the Santa Fe National Forest. A plan for the national recreation area will be developed as an amendment to the Santa Fe National Forest Land and Resource Management plan to assure that this management emphasis will be carried out.

The Jemez National Recreation Area is approximately 57,000 acres in size. It is a place of volcanically formed mountains with beautiful valleys, stands of mixed conifer and deciduous trees, small hidden ponds, and steep canyons ringed with brilliantly colored rimrocks. Within the area is the east fork of the Jemez River, 11 miles of which has been designated as a national wild and scenic river. The Jemez National Recreation Area will further insure the river's beauty and recreational value. The area also holds an abundance of spectacular prehistoric sites.

This action will ensure for the future the interests of the over 300,000 visitors to the area each year. The Jemez Mountains area has long been valued by the citizens of Albuquerque, Santa Fe, Los Alamos, Espanola, and the surrounding communities for its exceptional recreational opportunities, the plentiful water and clean air, the numerous hot springs, the abundant wildlife, and just the sheer beauty of the place. People who visit again and again form special emotional attachments to the area. These are people who enjoy the area for hiking, camping, rock climbing, back packing, fishing, hunting, snowmobiling, swimming, and cross country skiing—in the Jemez Mountains they have the opportunity to do all of this.

With the rapid population growth in Santa Fe and Albuquerque, even greater demands will be made upon the area for these recreational opportunities. Recreational and interpretive facilities and a visitor center will be constructed with minimal impacts on the scenic values and primeval character of the recreation area. Maintenance of both new and existing facilities in the national recreation area will be emphasized from the start.

The Jemez Mountains are one of the richest areas in the Southwest for the evidence of ancient Indian occupation. Human habitation stretches back at least 4,000 years in this area. There have been major finds nearby at Bandelier National Monument, Jemez Mountain, and Puye Cliff. Survey in the area has recorded thousands of sites—from surface scatters of artifacts to large multiroom pueblos. In fact, some of the ruins are much larger than any within the National Park System. Site density is estimated at approximately 15 sites per square mile—there could well be 30,000 sites in the national recreation area. The proposed boundaries include the Virgin Mesa area, in which are found the most impressive cultural resource sites in the mountains. This bill directs that there will be particular emphasis given to the preservation, stabilization, and protection of these invaluable cultural resources.

Today, to the people of the Jemez pueblo, this land remains sacred for them as it was for their Tewa-speaking ancestors; it contains significant religious sites and shrines. The bill directs the protection of these cultural and religious sites and assures nonexclusive access by Indian people for traditional cultural and religious purposes. Further, upon request of an Indian tribe, an area may be temporarily closed to the general public in order to protect the privacy of religious and cultural uses in that area. The Governor of the Pueblo of Jemez and chief executive officers of other Indian tribes in the area will be consulted in these matters during preparation of the national recreation area management plan.

The Jemez National Recreation Area is important habitat for the peregrine falcon, the goshawk, the meadow jumping mouse, the Jemez Mountain salamander, the Mexican spotted owl, and the wood lily—all species on State or Federal listings of endangered or threatened species. Emphasis will be given to the preservation and protection of these wildlife and botanical resources.

The bill will not affect traditional uses—grazing, hunting, and fishing will continue in the area at the request of many local citizens.

Timber sales for personal fuelwood, for vigas and lattilas, and for purposes of public safety, wildlife needs, recreation and administration may continue. The Los Griegos sale, scheduled for fiscal year 1993, is specifically allowed on condition that uneven-aged management, including individual tree selection, will be used. Monitoring of this sale, as it proceeds and after its completion, will provide the Forest Service with valuable information for the planning of future timber sales throughout the Southwest. The methods prescribed for this sale might well be used more and more by the Forest Service in the future for the purposes of protecting threatened and endangered species, assuring biological diversity, and further controlling erosion in our fragile southwestern environment.

The largest elk herd in New Mexico migrates through this area. Hunting

and fishing in the area will continue to be permitted: they are important both for subsistence and recreational activities.

Grazing may be permitted within the national recreation area in accordance with regulations; riparian areas will be managed to protect their important resource values.

Local support for this bill is high; residents have been enthusiastic in their efforts to preserve the resources of the Jemez Mountains for future enjoyment. The Forest Service also supports the designation of a national recreation area in the general area proposed. Areas like the Jemez Mountains are in need of our committed protection; they must be cherished for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations. The legislation I am introducing today will see that this necessary protection and conservation of the Jemez happens.

Mr. President, last Congress the Senate passed legislation virtually identical to this bill I am introducing today, but due to procedural problems it failed to pass the House in the final days of the 102d Congress. This year, the House has already held a markup on companion legislation introduced by Congressman RICHARDSON, in whose district the Jemez NRA will be established. I hope that both Houses of Congress will move to speedily pass this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be placed in the RECORD.

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

S. 643

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 "Jemez National Recreation Area Establishment Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act:

(1) RECREATION AREA.—The term "recreation area" means the Jemez National Recreation Area established by this Act.

(2) SECRETARY.—Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF JEMEZ NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—To conserve, protect, and restore the recreational, ecological, cultural, religious, and wildlife resource values of the Jemez Mountains, there is established the Jemez National Recreation Area, to be administered by the Secretary.

(b) AREA INCLUDED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The recreation area shall be comprised of approximately 57,000 acres of land and interests in land within the Santa Fe National Forest, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Jemez National Recreation Area—Proposed" and dated September 1992.

(2) MINOR REVISIONS.—The Secretary may from time to time and in consultation with local tribal leaders make minor revisions in the boundary of the recreation area to promote management effectiveness and efficiency in furtherance of this Act.

(c) MAP AND DESCRIPTION.—

(1) FILING.—As soon as is practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and legal description of the recreation area with the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(2) FORCE AND EFFECT.—The map and legal description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary may correct clerical and typographical errors in the map and legal description.

(3) PUBLIC INSPECTION.—The map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Chief of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the recreation area—

(A) in accordance with this Act and the laws applicable to lands within the National Forest System; and

(B) in a manner that will further the purposes of the recreation area.

(2) MANAGEMENT.—Management of the natural resources within the recreation area shall be permitted only to the extent that the management is compatible with and does not impair the purposes for which the recreation area is established.

(3) RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES.—Permissible recreational activities within the recreation area shall include hiking, camping, hunting, fishing, skiing, backpacking, rock climbing, and swimming.

(b) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop a management plan for the recreation area as an amendment to the Santa Fe National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan. The management plan shall—

(A) reflect the establishment of the recreation area, including newly designated land within the recreation area and adjacent National Forest land; and

(B) conform to the requirements of this Act.

(2) CONGRESSIONAL INTENT.—Nothing in this Act is intended to require the Secretary to revise the Santa Fe Forest Land and Resource Management Plan pursuant to section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604).

(c) CULTURAL RESOURCES.—In administering the recreation area, the Secretary shall give particular emphasis to the preservation, stabilization, and protection of cultural resources located within the recreation area in furtherance of the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (16 U.S.C. 470aa et seq.) and the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.).

(d) NATIVE AMERICANS.—

(1) PROTECTION OF SITES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In recognition of the past use of portions of the recreation area by Indian peoples for traditional cultural and religious purposes, the Secretary shall protect Indian religious and cultural sites and provide occasional access to those sites by Indian peoples for traditional cultural and religious purposes. The access shall be consistent with the purpose and intent of Public Law 95-341 (42 U.S.C. 1991) (commonly known as the "American Indian Religious Freedom Act").

(B) TEMPORARY CLOSINGS.—In accordance with such joint resolution and upon request of an Indian tribe or pueblo, the Secretary may from time to time temporarily close to general public use one or more specific portions of the recreation area to protect the privacy of religious activities and cultural uses by Indian peoples. Any closure shall be made so as to affect the smallest practicable area for the minimum period necessary.

(2) CONSULTATION WITH NATIVE AMERICANS.—In preparing and implementing management plans for the recreation area, the Secretary shall request that the Governor of the Pueblo of Jemez and the chief executive officers of other appropriate Indian tribes and pueblos make recommendations on methods of—

(A) ensuring access to cultural and religious sites;

(B) enhancing the privacy and continuity of traditional cultural and religious activities in the recreation area; and

(C) protecting traditional cultural and religious sites in the recreation area.

(e) WILDLIFE RESOURCES.—In administering the recreation area, the Secretary shall—

(1) give particular emphasis to the conservation and protection of wildlife resources within the recreation area (including species listed as sensitive by the Forest Service); and

(2) comply with applicable Federal and State laws relating to wildlife, including the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

(f) HUNTING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Within the recreation area, and subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing on lands and waters under the jurisdiction of the Secretary in accordance with applicable Federal and State law.

(2) LIMITATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may designate zones where, and establish periods when, hunting and fishing shall not be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, fish and wildlife management, or public use and enjoyment.

(B) CONSULTATION.—Except in emergencies, designation by the Secretary under this paragraph shall take effect only after consultation with the appropriate State agencies responsible for hunting and fishing activities.

(g) TIMBER HARVESTING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may permit timber harvesting in the recreation area for commercial purposes (including vigas, latillas, and the gathering of fuelwood) and for purposes of public safety, recreation, wildlife, and administration, to the extent that the harvesting is compatible with the purposes of the recreation area.

(2) DAMAGED TIMBER.—Trees that are damaged or downed as a result of fire, disease, or insect infestation may be utilized, salvaged, or removed from the recreation area as authorized by the Secretary in accordance with the purposes of this Act.

(3) TIMBER SALES UNDER CONTRACT.—Nothing in this Act is intended to affect timber sales under contract on the date of enactment of this Act.

(4) LOS GRIEGOS TIMBER SALE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), nothing in this Act is intended to affect the Los Griegos timber sale in the Los Griegos Diversity Unit number 0322, as shown on the West Half Diversity Unit map of the Santa Fe National Forest dated November 1991.

(B) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary shall manage the sale using uneven aged management,

including the individual tree selection method.

(h) GRAZING.—The Secretary may permit grazing within the recreation area in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary. Riparian areas shall be managed in such a manner as to protect their important resource values.

(i) TRANSPORTATION PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare a transportation plan that provides for the most efficient use of roads and trails in existence on the date of enactment of this Act to accomplish the purposes of this Act. The plan shall provide for a comprehensive trails system that permits dispersed recreation while minimizing the impact on significant archaeological and religious sites.

(2) ROADS.—The Secretary shall construct, maintain, and close roads within the recreation area only in accordance with the plan prepared pursuant to paragraph (1).

(j) RECREATIONAL FACILITIES.—The Secretary shall provide for recreational facilities within the recreation area. The facilities shall be constructed so as to minimize impacts on scenic beauty and the natural character of the recreation area.

(k) VISITOR FACILITIES.—The Secretary shall establish a visitor center and interpretive facilities in or near the recreation area to provide for education relating to the interpretation of the cultural and natural resources of the recreation area.

(l) POWER TRANSMISSION LINES.—In accordance with Federal and State law, the Secretary may permit a utility corridor for high power electric transmission lines if the Secretary determines that—

(1) there is not a feasible alternative for the location of the corridor;

(2) damage to the recreational and scenic quality of the recreation area will not be significant;

(3) it is in the public interest that the corridor be located in the recreation area; and

(4) a plan to minimize harm to the resources of the recreation area has been developed.

(m) SCIENTIFIC INVESTIGATIONS.—The Secretary may permit scientific investigations within the recreation area if the Secretary determines that the investigations are in the public interest and are compatible with this Act.

SEC. 5. ACQUISITION OF LAND.

(a) STATE LAND.—Land and interests in land within the boundaries of the recreation area that are owned by the State of New Mexico, or a political subdivision of New Mexico, may be acquired only by donation or exchange.

(b) OFFERS TO SELL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary may acquire land and interests in land within the boundaries of the recreation area by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange.

(2) LIMITATION.—No land or interest in land may be added to the recreation area after the date of enactment of this Act without specific authorization by Congress and the consent of the owner of the land or interest in land.

SEC. 6. MINERALS AND MINING.

(a) LIMITATION ON PATENT ISSUANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no patents shall be issued after May 30, 1991, for a location or claim in the recreation area under the mining laws of the United States.

(2) CLAIMS FOR PROPERTY RIGHTS.—Notwithstanding any statute of limitations or similar restriction otherwise applicable, and not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, a party claiming to have been deprived of a property right by the enactment of paragraph (1) may file in the United States Claims Court a claim against the United States seeking compensation for deprivation of the property right. The United States Claims Court shall have jurisdiction to render judgment upon the claim in accordance with section 1491 of title 28, United States Code.

(b) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, lands within the recreation area are withdrawn from location under the general mining laws and from the operation of the mineral leasing, geothermal leasing, and mineral material disposal laws.

(c) RECLAMATION.—No mining activity involving any surface disturbance of lands or waters within the recreation area (including disturbance through subsidence) shall be permitted except in accordance with requirements imposed by the Secretary, including requirements for reasonable reclamation of disturbed lands to a visual and hydrological condition as close as practicable to their premining condition.

(d) MINING CLAIM VALIDITY REVIEW.—

(1) EXAMINATION OF CLAIMS.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall undertake and complete an expedited program to examine all unpatented mining claims within the recreation area, including those claims for which a patent application has been filed.

(2) DETERMINATION OF VALIDITY.—If the Secretary determines that the elements of a contest are present, the Secretary of the Interior shall immediately determine the validity of the claims. If a claim is determined to be invalid, the Secretary shall promptly declare the claim to be null and void.

(e) USE OF MINERAL MATERIALS.—The Secretary may use mineral materials from within the recreation area for public purposes (including the maintenance and construction of roads, trails, and facilities) if the use is compatible with the purposes of the recreation area.

SEC. 7. ADJOINING LANDS.

The Secretary may evaluate lands adjoining the recreation area for possible inclusion in the recreation area and make recommendations to Congress. Lands evaluated may include the area authorized for study by section 5 of the Baca Location No. 1 Land Acquisition and Study Act of 1990.

SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.•

• Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am pleased to rise today to cosponsor this legislation, which is sponsored by the other Senator from New Mexico, Senator BINGAMAN, and which has a companion bill that has been introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman RICHARDSON. During the 102d Congress, this language was passed by the Senate with similar legislation passed by the House of Representatives. This legislation will assure that some of the best natural and cultural values of our Nation, which have been appreciated for so long by native New Mexicans and visitors to New Mexico, will continue to be accessible and available for all Americans through the establishment of the Jemez National Recreational Area. This legislation addresses the concerns and is supported by local land owners, Jemez Pueblo and other native Americans, and the New Mexico environmental community.

With fewer than 20 national recreation areas within the entire country, a national recreation area designation represents the best of the best of our recreational resources. The approximately 57,000 acres included within the proposed Jemez National Recreation Area deserves to be included as one of the best. Designation of the Jemez National Recreational Area would provide present and future Americans enjoyment, particularly those seeking outdoors recreational opportunities in an area that the public has long recognized for its premier values.

The Jemez Mountains located in northern New Mexico have long provided spectacular beauty and a site for native American habitation. The area is within 30 miles commuting distance from major population centers whose major industry is tourism, an industry which is experiencing tremendous increases. Recreation activity related to overnight camping and day uses are intensifying. Within the past decade, vehicle use along State Highway 4 which passes through the area has increased by more than 220,000 vehicles. This kind of dramatic increase is also occurring for other uses, like hiking, picnicking, bicycling, and fishing in the summer, elk and deer hunting in the fall, and cross-country skiing and snowmobiling in the winter.

Few areas offer the abundance of natural beauty and cultural heritage of the Jemez Mountains. The Jemez Mountain area offers exceptional landscapes accentuated with the signs of human existence. The area is but a short drive to the Bandelier National Monument, an area that has shared the rich history of native American life and settlement.

The Jemez National Recreation Area designation will complement the special management of rare natural resources. The Jemez National Recreation Area is an important habitat for species on State or Federal listed endangered or threatened species, like the peregrine falcon, the goshawk, the meadow jumping mouse, the Jemez salamander, the Mexican spotted owl, and the wood lily. The East Fork of the Jemez River, which has 11 miles designated as a national wild and scenic river, will also be complemented by a corresponding national recreation area designation.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to move rapidly on this important legislation, to authorize the Jemez National Recreation Area to ensure that the area is properly managed and its recreational, ecological, cultural, religious and wildlife resource values are conserved, and protected.•

By Mr. KOHL:

S. 645. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the eligibility of veterans for mortgage revenue bond financing; to the Committee on Finance.

MORTGAGE REVENUE BOND FINANCING

• Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today to reintroduce legislation that will help Wisconsin and several other States extend one of our most successful veterans programs to Persian Gulf war participants and others. This bill will amend the eligibility requirements for mortgage revenue bond financing for State veterans housing programs.

Wisconsin uses this tax-exempt bond authority to assist veterans in purchasing their first home. Under rules adopted by Congress in 1984, this program excluded from eligibility veterans who served after 1977 or who had been out of service for more than 30 years. This bill would simply remove those restrictions.

Wisconsin and the other eligible States simply want to maintain a principle that we in the Senate have also strived to uphold—that veterans of the Persian Gulf war should not be treated less generously than those of past wars. This bill will make that possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 645

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) paragraph (4) of section 143(l) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (defining qualified veteran) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) QUALIFIED VETERANS.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'qualified veteran' means any veteran who meets such requirements as may be imposed by the State law pursuant to which qualified veterans' mortgage bonds are issued.".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to obligations issued after the date of the enactment of this Act.•

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 646. A bill to establish within the Department of Energy an international fusion energy program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

INTERNATIONAL FUSION ENERGY ACT OF 1993

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to redirect the Department of Energy's fusion energy program in a way that will ensure that the United States works closely with the international fusion community toward the near-term goal of evaluating the scientific and technical feasibility of fusion energy. It is my firm belief that this restructuring of the Department's fusion program is necessary if the United States is to be in the position to realize the full potential of this energy source in the next century.

The Department of Energy now spends close to $350 million annually on its fusion research program, most of which is focused on magnetic fusion. A significantly smaller part of the program is focused on inertial confinement fusion. Inertial confinement fusion has been developed largely through the defense programs part of the Department of Energy, with a very small portion funded by the energy research program.

The Department's magnetic fusion research focuses on the use of strong magnetic fields to confine an extremely hot gas which undergoes fusion and produces heat. The physics of fusion, the energy process that powers our sun, is well understood. How to contain and harness that energy is not. Great strides have been made in the magnetic fusion program over the past several years. But there has also been significant restructuring of this program as it has become clear that Federal expenditures for research will be increasingly scarce. As a result, progress in this program has been difficult to measure.

Congress needs to make basic decisions about the fusion program. We must develop reasonable and near-term goals against which we will be able to measure progress. And we must work more closely with the international community toward those goals. We must streamline this program so that it is clearly focused on achievement of the next major milestone in magnetic fusion—the international thermonuclear experimental reactor, also known as ITER.

The legislation I am introducing today would do just that. It would direct the Secretary of Energy to focus the Department's magnetic fusion energy program on the development of ITER with the ultimate goal of developing a fusion demonstration reactor.

Last year, the United States entered into an agreement with Japan, Russia, and the European Community to design ITER. The agreement provides for completion of the design by 1996, with the cost of design activities borne equally by the four countries. The agreement addresses only the design phase of ITER, however, and any further agreement on the siting or construction of ITER has yet to be negotiated. If a decision is made to go ahead with sitting and construction, it is anticipated that construction of ITER would take 7 years from the time of site selection.

ITER is expected to embody most of the features of a fusion powerplant. ITER is being designed to produce 1,000 megawatts of energy, which is about half of that produced by an average-sized conventional electricpower plant. The purpose of ITER is to demonstrate the scientific and technical feasibility of magnetic fusion energy and to prove that a sustained fusion reaction can be maintained at an energy level sufficient to generate electricity in commercial quantities. Today, we can produce a fusion reaction for only a second or two. ITER will also test the types of materials and components that will be needed in a fusion demonstration reactor.

Once ITER proves that a sustained fusion reaction is possible and tells us what materials will be needed for a fusion reactor, an actual demonstration fusion reactor can be built. It is my expectation that ITER will resolve these issues sufficiently so we will be able to move forward to a demonstration reactor. But I also believe that we should not continue to spend substantial amounts of money studying the engineering problems associated with fusion if we cannot reach an agreement with the international community to develop ITER or if we decide ITER will not lead to a fusion demonstration reactor.

The United States has spent billions of dollars trying to make fusion energy a practical and commercial reality. It is time to focus our efforts on demonstrating the engineering feasibility of fusion through our participation in ITER. And our existing programs must be restructured accordingly to support that effort. While some level of basic research in fusion would still be appropriate in the absence of ITER, it would not be appropriate to continue the level of effort of today. Therefore, the bill directs the Secretary to reduce the magnetic fusion energy program to a basic energy program in the event it becomes apparent that we cannot or should not proceed with ITER.

We are at a critical juncture for the magnetic fusion program. It is time for the United States to make a commitment to ITER and to work with the international community to complete this project. The Secretary of Energy must be given authority to negotiate with the other countries involved in the ITER project. The bill provides the Secretary with such authority.

To develop ITER we need to plan to tell us how to get there. The bill would direct the Secretary to develop such a plan identifying the budget, critical path, milestones, and schedules for ITER. While other countries such as Japan have already selected a candidate host site for ITER, the United States has yet to begin a candidate selection process. If we want to compete to host ITER here in the United States, we need to start that process today. With the international community, we will also need to select a final host site as soon as possible so that construction can begin when the design is complete. To get this process moving along, the bill requires the Secretary to find a candidate host site within the United States for ITER and to identify the steps necessary for section of a final host site by the international community.

ITER will tell us whether fusion is the energy of the 21st century. The ITER design effort is well underway, and I am pleased that the United States is an active participant in that effort. But we must also be ready to take the next step to see this project to fruition. We are at a point that our magnetic fusion program must be focused entirely on ITER, and we must develop a plan to tell us how to get there. We should find a host site, be it here in the United States or abroad, so we can begin construction of ITER. The bill I am introducing today will commit the United States to such a process.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my statement.

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

S. 646

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "International Fusion Energy Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS, PURPOSES AND DEFINITIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) fusion energy has the potential to be safe, environmentally attractive, secure and economically affordable source of energy;

(2) the United States Department of Energy's magnetic fusion energy program has made significant progress toward realizing fusion as a viable source of energy;

(3) other industrial nations have also invested in significant magnetic fusion energy programs;

(4) an integrated program of international collaboration will be necessary for continued progress to demonstrate the scientific and technological feasibility of magnetic fusion energy;

(5) there is international agreement to proceed with the engineering and design of the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor to prove the scientific and technical feasibility of fusion energy and to lead to a demonstration reactor;

(6) the United States should focus the Department of Energy's magnetic fusion energy program on the design, construction and operation of the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor;

(7) the continuation of an aggressive fusion energy program requires the Department of Energy, industry, utilities, and the international fusion community to commit to the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor as soon as practicable; and

(8) an effective U.S. fusion energy program requires substantial involvement by industry and utilities in the design, construction, and operation of fusion facilities.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are to—

(1) redirect and refocus the Department's magnetic fusion energy program in a way that will lead to the design, construction and operation of the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor by 2005, in cooperation with other countries, and operation of a fusion demonstration reactor by 2025;

(2) develop a plan identifying the budget, critical path, milestones and schedules for the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor;

(3) eliminate from the Department of Energy's magnetic fusion energy program those elements that do not directly support the development of the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor or the development of a fusion demonstration reactor; and

(4) select a candidate host site within the United States for the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor and to identify the steps necessary to lead to the selection of the final host site by the international community.

(c) DEFINITIONS.

(1) "Department" means the United States Department of Energy;

(2) "ITER" means the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor; and

(3) "Secretary" means the Secretary of the United States Department of Energy.

SEC. 3. INTERNATIONAL FUSION ENERGY PROGRAM.

(a) PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall redirect and refocus the Department's magnetic fusion program in a way that will lead to the design, construction and operation of ITER by 2005 and operation of a fusion demonstration reactor by 2025. The Department's magnetic fusion program shall be referred to as the ITER program and shall be carried out in cooperation with the international community.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In developing the ITER program, the Secretary shall—

(1) establish as the main focus of the Department's magnetic fusion energy program the development of ITER;

(2) provide for the development of fusion materials and other reactor components to the extent necessary for the development of a fusion demonstration reactor;

(3) eliminate those components of the magnetic fusion energy program not contributing directly to development of ITER or to the development of a fusion demonstration reactor;

(4) select a candidate host site within the United States for the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor;

(5) negotiate with other countries involved in ITER to select a final host site for ITER and to agree to construct ITER as soon as practicable;

(6) provide for substantial U.S. industry and utility involvement in the design, construction and operation of ITER to ensure U.S. industry and utility expertise in the technologies developed; and

(7) provide for reducing the level of effort in the ITER program to the levels prescribed in section 4(b)(2) in the event the ITER program is terminated in accordance with subsection (g).

(c) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—(1) Within 180 days of the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare and implement a management plan for the ITER program. The plan shall be revised and updated biannually.

(2) The plan shall—

(A) establish the goals of the ITER program;

(B) describe how each component of the Department's ITER program contributes directly to the development of ITER or development of a fusion demonstration reactor;

(C) set priorities for the elements of the Department's ITER program, identifying those elements that contribute directly to the development of ITER or to the development of a fusion demonstration reactor;

(D) provide for the elimination of those elements of the magnetic fusion energy program not contributing directly to the development of ITER, or to the development of fusion materials or other reactor components that are necessary for the development of a fusion demonstration reactor;

(E) describe the selection process for a proposed host site within the United States for ITER;

(F) establish the necessary steps that will lead to the final selection of the host site for ITER by the countries involved in the ITER program by the end of 1995;

(G) establish the necessary steps that will lead to the design, construction and operation of ITER by 2005 and operation of a fusion demonstration reactor by 2025;

(H) establish a schedule and critical path, including milestones, and a budget that will allow for the design, construction and operation of ITER by 2005 and operation of a demonstration fusion reactor by 2025;

(I) provide mechanisms for ensuring substantial industry and utility involvement in the design, construction and operation of ITER;

(J) set forth any recommendations of the Secretary on—

(i) the need for additional legislation regarding the ITER program; or

(ii) the possibility and desirability of accelerating the design and construction of ITER or the development of a fusion demonstration reactor; and

(K) provide for reducing the level of effort in magnetic fusion to the levels prescribed in section 4(b)(2) in the event the ITER program is terminated in accordance with subsection (g).

(d) INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS.—(1) The Secretary may negotiate or enter into agreements with any country governing the design, construction and operation of ITER or facilities related to ITER.

(2) The Secretary shall seek to enter into agreements with other countries to share in the cost of the facilities and components of the ITER program that contribute to the design, construction or operation of ITER or to the development of a fusion demonstration reactor.

(e) REPORT ON ITER NEGOTIATIONS.—The Secretary shall submit an annual report to the Congress on the status of negotiations with other countries regarding ITER. The report shall—

(1) identify the issues to be negotiated with other countries involved in the ITER program;

(2) identify impediments to reaching agreement on a host site for ITER, or on issues relating to the construction or operation of ITER;

(3) identify the steps needed to reach agreement on a host site for ITER or on issues related to the construction or operation of ITER;

(4) establish the timetable for agreement related to the siting, operation and construction of ITER;

(5) assess the likelihood of reaching agreement on a host site for ITER and on issues related to the construction or operation of ITER; and

(6) set forth the Secretary's recommendation on whether a special negotiator should be appointed to carry out negotiations on behalf of the United States with the countries involved in the ITER program.

(f) CERTIFICATION.—Prior to seeking funds for construction of ITER, the Secretary shall certify to the Congress that there is agreement in place or there is a substantial likelihood agreement will be reached with the countries involved in ITER on the siting, construction and operation of ITER.

(g) TERMINATION.—(1) The Secretary shall report to Congress if the Secretary determines that—

(A) ITER is no longer essential to the development of a fusion demonstration reactor;

(B) no agreement can be reached on the final host site for ITER;

(C) no agreement can be reached on the final design of ITER or on issues related to construction of ITER; or

(D) there is an insufficient commitment to the final ITER design by U.S. industry and utilities.

(2) Within 30 days of submission of the report under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall initiate the termination of the ITER program.

(3) In the event the Secretary terminates the ITER program, the Secretary may continue to carry out research in magnetic fusion, but only at the levels authorized in section 4(b)(2).

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) LIMITATION ON APPROPRIATIONS.—No more funds may be appropriated to carry out the purposes of this Act than the amounts set forth in subsection (b). This Act shall be the exclusive source of authorization of appropriations to support any activities of the Secretary relating to magnetic fusion energy.

(b) APPROPRIATIONS.—(1) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for carrying out the purposes of this Act $350,000,000 for fiscal year 1994, $390,000,000 for fiscal year 1995, $475,000,000 for fiscal year 1996, and such sums as may be necessary thereafter.

(2) In the event the Secretary terminates the ITER program, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary $50,000,000 for 1994, $50,000,000 for 1995 and $50,000,000 for 1996 for activities relating to magnetic fusion energy.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. DECONCINI):

S. 647. A bill to assist in the effective management of the civilian work force of the Central Intelligence Agency, and for other purposes; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY VOLUNTARY SEPARATION INCENTIVE ACT

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Central Intelligence Agency Voluntary Separation Incentive Act (S. 647). The legislation will provide some protection to CIA careerists as the CIA draws down its personnel levels in the coming months and years. It authorizes the Director of Central Intelligence to offer financial incentives to CIA personnel to resign or retire voluntarily—that is, on their own initiative. By offering financial incentives for voluntary departures, CIA expects to be able to minimize or eliminate altogether a need for CIA to involuntarily dismiss employees.

The legislation will accomplish four important objectives.

First, it will assist the CIA in managing its drawdown so that the resulting work force has the right mix of skills and experience to conduct CIA's mission effectively in the future.

Second, the bill will help ensure fair treatment of CIA personnel. CIA employees—and in particular those with clandestine duties—have served their country with distinction, often at great personal sacrifice and sacrifice by their families. The CIA must keep faith with them, especially if we are to continue to get people of the same high quality and dedication to serve in the CIA in the future.

Third, the legislation will save taxpayers' dollars. By offering now a financial incentive to an employee to leave CIA service voluntarily, CIA will not incur greater costs in the outyears.

Finally, the legislation will contribute to maintaining the proper secrecy of U.S. intelligence activities.

Federal law already grants the Secretary of Defense authority to provide similar incentives for voluntary separation to Department of Defense employees, to assist in downsizing that department. Thus, intelligence personnel employed by the Department of Defense already are covered by a voluntary separation incentive statute. Enactment of the bill I am introducing today will provide similar authority for voluntary separation incentives for CIA employees.

Senator DECONCINI, who chairs the Select Committee on Intelligence on which I serve as vice chairman, has cosponsored this important legislation to assist CIA employees. With bipartisan support for the legislation, I hope that the Congress can enact it promptly.

The legislation is essential to enable us to protect the interests of CIA employees as CIA carries out the planned prudent reductions in the size of its work force.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the section-by-section explanation of the legislation be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

SECTION-BY-SECTION EXPLANATION

The Central Intelligence Agency Voluntary Separation Incentive Act will assist the Director of Central Intelligence in managing effectively the reduction of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) civilian work force and help ensure fair treatment of CIA personnel as that reduction is accomplished. The legislation will allow the Central Intelligence Agency to offer limited financial incentives to CIA employees to volunteer to resign or retire, thereby minimizing the need for involuntary separations (i.e., layoffs) of CIA personnel. With the normal attrition of employees over time and with the voluntary separations of employees induced by the financial incentive this legislation would authorize, the CIA will be able to eliminate or minimize involuntary separations of CIA personnel in carrying out the planned drawdown of CIA personnel. Congress has already enacted similar legislation for military personnel (10 U.S.C. 1175) and for Department of Defense civilian employees, including DOD civilian intelligence employees (5 U.S.C. 5597).

The legislation will accomplish four objectives:

Assist the CIA in *managing the CIA personnel drawdown effectively*, so that the resulting smaller CIA work force can accomplish the CIA's intelligence mission effectively;

Ensure fair treatment for CIA personnel during the drawdown, and in particular the personnel of the clandestine services, who have performed extraordinary services for the nation entailing personal sacrifice;

Save taxpayers' dollars, by offering a limited financial incentive to employees to leave CIA service voluntarily, which will avoid the cost of the employees' future salary and benefits; and

Assist in *maintaining proper secrecy* of U.S. intelligence sources, methods and activities, by ensuring that CIA personnel who depart have done so voluntarily, in good morale, and with an orientation toward fully protecting national secrets in accordance with their legal obligations.

The bill consists of two sections. Section 1 entitles the bill the "Central Intelligence Agency Voluntary Separation Incentive Act." Section 2 of the bill authorizes the Director of Central Intelligence (the "Director") to establish a program of financial incentives to encourage the voluntary resignation or retirement of CIA employees. Section 2 consists of subsections 2(a) through 2(i).

Subsection 2(a) authorizes the Director, in his discretion, to establish a program under which the Director may pay a financial incentive to eligible CIA employees to encourage them to volunteer to resign or retire. The commitment of the authority to agency discretion is intended to make clear that the exercise of the authority under this legislation is not subject to judicial review (see for example 5 U.S.C. 701(a)).

Subsection 2(b) describes the CIA employees who would be eligible to receive the financial incentive in exchange for their volunteering to leave CIA service.

Paragraph 2(b)(1) provides that an employee must be serving under an appointment without a time limitation. Thus, an employee serving under a temporary appointment of specified duration, such as an employee hired for a summer job or an employee appointed for a two-year period to accomplish a specific task, would not qualify for the voluntary separation incentive program.

Paragraph 2(b)(2) requires that an employee have served the Central Intelligence Agency for not less than 12 months to qualify for the voluntary separation incentive program.

Paragraph 2(b)(3) authorizes the Director to establish additional requirements for an employee to qualify for the voluntary incentive awards program. The Director could, for example, determine that the CIA has an excess of personnel trained in particular skills, occupations, or foreign language capabilities and provide the voluntary separation incentives only to an appropriate number of individuals with those skills, occupations, or foreign language capabilities. This authority will assist the Director in ensuring that, at the end of the planned drawdown of the CIA's work force, the work force will have the correct mix of skills and experience needed to carry out the CIA's mission effectively.

Paragraph 2(b)(4) excludes rehired Federal annuitants from the voluntary separation incentive program. Such annuitants are currently excluded by law from the similar DOD program (5 U.S.C. 5597).

Paragraph 2(b)(5) excludes Federal disability retirement eligible employees from the voluntary separation incentive program. Such employees are currently excluded by law from the similar DOD program (5 U.S.C. 5597).

Subsection 2(c) grants the Director authority to extend the voluntary separation incentive program to a CIA employee who does not meet the requirements in subsection 2(b). Because of the unusual nature of much of CIA's work, and in particular its clandestine activities, a situation could arise in which the voluntary separation incentive program should apply to a CIA employee other than an employee who meets the requirements in subsection 2(b). Accordingly, subsection 2(c) allows the Director, on a case-by-case basis, to extend the program to such an employee. Unlike the other authorities granted to the Director by the legislation, the Director cannot delegate this authority. Also, because of the unusual nature of the authority granted by subsection 2(c), the Director is required to report each instance of its exercise to the intelligence committees of the Congress.

Subsection 2(d) sets limits on the dollar amount of the financial incentives that the Director may provide under the voluntary separation incentives program. Under no circumstances may the amount provided to an employee exceed $25,000. The amount provided to an employee will be less if a lesser amount will accomplish the objective of achieving the needed voluntary separations. The legislation leaves the Director the flexibility to offer differing amounts of financial incentives to different employees and allows the Director to change from time to time the amounts CIA will offer as an incentive for voluntary separation. The legislation also leaves the Director the flexibility to determine how to structure the payment of the incentive, such as lump-sum payment or payment in installments over time.

Subsection 2(e) provides explicit authority to the Director to terminate, in connection with the voluntary separation incentive program, the obligation of a CIA employee under any agreement the employee has with CIA to render service or reimburse the United States for not rendering service. For example, under Section 506 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1987 (50 U.S.C. 403j note), the Director may fund an individual's education under an agreement by which the individual agrees to serve in the CIA after graduation or, if the individual decides not to so serve, to reimburse the U.S. for the costs of the education. The legislation allows the Director, in connection with providing the voluntary separation incentive to an employee under subsection (a), to extinguish any service or reimbursement obligation the employee has to the CIA. Subsection 2(e) ensures that the situation will not arise in which CIA asks an employee to volunteer to leave, provides the voluntary separation incentive, and then charges the employee under a pre-existing service or reimbursement agreement for failure to complete the service. Subsection 2(e) grants authority to extinguish the service or reimbursement obligation; it should not be misconstrued as functioning as a "waiver" of a debt to the United States, because no debt to the United States ever arises under the service or reimbursement agreement when the obligation to serve or reimburse is extinguished.

Subsection 2(f) requires the Director to administer the voluntary separation incentive program so that, over the life of the program, it does not cost the taxpayers money. Savings are likely to occur because the cost of the incentives paid to employees to leave CIA service voluntarily will be less than the cost of continuing to pay their salaries and benefits.

Subsection 2(g) sets forth the relationship of amounts paid as a voluntary separation incentive to other Government benefits, specifying that it is separate from and not the basis for computation of other benefits. For example, the amount of a voluntary separation incentive would not be added to an employee's salary during this last year of CIA service for purposes of computing the salary base used in determining a retirement pension under a Federal retirement system. Subsection 2(g) does not in any way affect the application of tax laws to the amount paid as voluntary separation incentive; the tax status of the amounts paid as voluntary separation incentives is determined by applicable revenue statues.

Subsection 2(h) provides that the Director may not pay a voluntary separation incentive in connection with a voluntary separation occurring after September 30, 1998. The legislation is intended to assist the CIA with the planned drawdown of its civilian work force; that drawdown is expected to be accomplished by September 30, 1998. The termination of authority in subsection 2(h) is tied to the date on which the voluntary separation occurs and not to the date on which payment of the incentive is made. Thus, for example, if a CIA employee were voluntarily separated in connection with the voluntary separation incentive program on September 25, 1998, but the CIA did not issue the check to pay the incentive amount to the employee until October 2, 1998, the payment would still be owed to the employee and would be a valid obligation, because the separation occurred before the September 30, 1998 deadline in subsection 2(h).

Subsection 2(i) requires the Director to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the legislation. Such regulations constitute regulations concerning a foreign affairs function of the United States and matters relating to agency management and personnel (see 5 U.S.C. 553(a)).

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SIMON, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. WOFFORD):

S. 649. A bill to ensure proper and full implementation by the Department of Health and Human Services of medicaid coverage for certain low-income medicare beneficiaries; to the Committee on Finance.

MEDICARE ENROLLMENT IMPROVEMENT AND PROTECTION ACT OF 1993

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, last Congress I introduced S. 2814, the Medicare Enrollment Improvement and Protection Act of 1992 to solve the problems that keep low-income seniors and disabled citizens from receiving financial assistance with their out-of-pocket Medicare costs through the Qualified Medicare Beneficiary [QMB] Program. Today, I am reintroducing this legislation with minor technical modifications and improvements based on comments we received on the bill. I am pleased that Senators MITCHELL, PRYOR, COHEN, KENNEDY, SIMON, LEAHY, JOHNSTON, SARBANES, and WOFFORD have joined me in cosponsoring this important legislation.

Six years ago, Congress acted to protect low-income seniors and disabled citizens from the increasing costs of deductibles, copayments, and premiums under the Medicare Program. The Qualified Medicare Beneficiary Program was to be implemented by the Department of Health and Human Services [HHS] and the States beginning in 1989. For the 2.5 million seniors who are enrolled in this program, the Medicaid Program pays for seniors' out-of-pocket expenses for Medicare coverage. These expenses include a deductible for hospitalization—$676—premiums for part B coverage—$36.60 deducted from Social Security check each month—a deductible for part B services—$100 a year—and a 20 percent copayment for most part B services. Without the QMB benefit, these seniors could face direct costs of over $1,100 a year if they are hospitalized just once, and that doesn't include copayments and deductibles for physicians' services.

Today, Families U.S.A. released a report which indicates that 1.8 million low-income beneficiaries are not receiving the QMB benefits to which they are entitled because they do know they are eligible or face other barriers that make it difficult to apply for the benefits. Furthermore, as of January 1, 1993, almost 1 million more individuals became newly eligible for limited help with their Medicare cost-sharing. Specified low-income Medicare beneficiaries [SLMB] receive financial assistance for their part B premiums, which cost $36.60 per month—$439 per year. In Michigan, over 94,000 individuals are eligible for QMB or SLMB benefits and are not receiving them today.

To illustrate the barriers people encounter in applying for this benefit, let me tell you the story of Jeanette Moyer of Constantine, MI, who tried to apply for QMB benefits for her 73-year-old mother. In October 1991, Jeanette learned of the QMB benefit from a story in the Kalamazoo Gazette. She called several Government offices to find out more about the program and to apply for her mother but most offices had not heard of the program. When she finally got through and received the application it was 27 pages long and very confusing. Jeanette started the process in October and finally her mother received coverage in January 1992. Her mother had been purchasing a private Medigap supplemental policy through AARP, even though her income was less than $6,700 a year and her assets were less than $4,000, and she clearly qualified for the program. With this new benefit she was able to cancel the policy.

I was among those who worked to preserve this benefit when the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act of 1968 was repealed. Since then, based on reports from national advocacy groups and Michigan citizens, I have initiated congressional letters to the Secretary of HHS, Dr. Louis Sullivan, pointing

out problems of implementation and urging administrative changes and more outreach. Most recently, I have corresponded with Secretary Shalala, who has indicated a willingness to work on this issue. The legislation I am introducing today outlines specific actions we need to take to solve this problem once and for all.

This legislation improves the process of enrolling people in the QMB Program by directing Secretary Shalala to develop a system to accept QMB and SLMB applications at Social Security offices and by mail. To increase awareness of the program, the legislation strengthens information and notification programs and provides grants for outreach to a variety of organizations. To remove the current hassles in the system, the legislation directs the Secretary to develop a simplified application form for QMB and SLMB benefits for use in Social Security offices and through the mail.

In Michigan, Blue Cross/Blue Shield received a grant from the Health Care Financing Administration to conduct outreach to the elderly. They are working with the Michigan Office of Services to the Aging to train providers and advocates on the QMB and SLMB benefits. These individuals will take the information back to their communities, where they can implement an outreach program to reach low-income beneficiaries. My legislation would provide funds for outreach programs like this.

Mr. President, low-income seniors and disabled individuals, especially those with serious medical problems, have a hard time meeting the basic needs, such as food and rent. Congress intended to relieve some of their financial burden by alleviating their costs under Medicare. It's time we ensure they receive this relief. I urge more of my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

I ask unanimous consent that a summary and the full text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 649

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 "Medicare Enrollment Improvement and Protection Act of 1993".

TITLE I—IMPROVING ENROLLMENT

SEC. 101. NOTIFICATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1804 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395b-2) is amended—

(1) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (2),

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting ", and",

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) a clear, simple explanation (designed to attract the reader's attention and stated plainly in English and any other language determined by the Secretary) of the eligibility requirements and application procedures for receiving payment of medicare cost-sharing (as defined in section 1905(p)(3)) by qualified medicare beneficiaries (as defined in section 1905(p)(1)), qualified disabled and working individuals (as defined in section 1905(s)), and individuals described in section 1902(a)(10)(E)(iii).", and

(4) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The portion of the notice containing the explanation described in paragraph (4) shall also be prepared in a manner suitable for posting and shall be distributed to physicians, hospital offices, other medical facilities, and entities receiving grants from the Secretary for programs designed to provide services to individuals age 65 or older.".

(b) TOLL-FREE HOTLINE.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall establish a toll-free telephone number to provide individuals with information on medicare cost-sharing (as defined in section 1905(p)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(p)(3)), including the availability of and requirements for obtaining such medicare cost-sharing, where to go for applications, and documentation needed for applying. Such information shall be offered to every caller to the hotline regardless of the specific inquiry. All notices described in section 1804(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395b-2(4)) shall include this toll-free telephone number.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 102. USE OF SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION OFFICES AND SIMPLIFIED APPLICATION PROCESSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"ALTERNATIVE LOCATIONS FOR PROCESSING APPLICATIONS FOR QUALIFIED MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES

"SEC. 1931. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, through the Social Security Administration and the Health Care Financing Administration, shall provide, as an alternative to the procedure established by State agencies under State plans under this title, a procedure (including appropriate training of personnel by the Health Care Financing Administration) to assist individuals in completing the application form described in subsection (b) at Social Security Administration offices (and any other Federal office, as determined appropriate by the Secretary), and to accept by mail or in person such application form at such offices. The Secretary shall ensure that adequate resources are available to implement the procedure developed under this subsection.

"(b) SIMPLIFIED APPLICATION FORMS.—The Secretary shall develop a short, simplified application form to determine if an individual meets the requirements for status as a qualified medicare beneficiary under section 1905(p)(1), a qualified disabled and working individual (as defined in section 1905(s)), or an individual described in section 1902(a)(10)(E)(iii). The form shall be developed with the consultation of consumer advocates and State agencies and shall be available in offices described in subsection (a).

"(c) ADDITIONAL USES OF FORMS.—The Secretary shall periodically (at such times as determined by the Secretary) mail the forms described in subsection (b) to individuals potentially eligible for the status described in such subsection, and shall provide such forms to counselors in organizations described in section 105 of the Medicare Enrollment Improvement and Protection Act of 1993 for use in determining an individual's eligibility for such status.

"(d) SUBMISSION OF FORMS.—Except as provided in subsection (e), the Secretary shall refer application forms described in subsection (b) which are received by the Secretary to the appropriate State agency designated under this title for review and decision.

"(e) CERTIFICATION OF DETERMINATION OF STATUS.—

"(1) CERTIFICATION TO STATE.—If the Secretary, based upon an application described in subsection (b), makes a determination that an individual meets the requirements for the status described in such subsection, the Secretary shall certify such determination to the State in which the individual resides.

"(2) STATE RECOGNITION OF ELIGIBILITY.—If the Secretary certifies to the State that an individual meets the requirements for such status, the individual shall be deemed to have met the requirements for such status.

"(3) CONTINUING ELIGIBILITY REQUIRED.—Nothing in paragraph (2) shall be construed to prohibit a State from requiring an individual to continue to meet the requirements of such status after the individual is deemed to have met the requirements of such status under paragraph (2).".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 103. MANDATORY DIRECT ENROLLMENT OF PART A ELIGIBLES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 1818(g) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395i-2(e)) is amended by striking "shall, at the request of a State made after 1989, enter into a modification of an agreement entered into with the State pursuant to section 1843(a)" and inserting "shall enter into an agreement with each State under terms described in section 1843".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 104. OPTIONAL PRESUMPTIVE ELIGIBILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 1920 the following new section:

"PRESUMPTIVE ELIGIBILITY FOR QUALIFIED MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES

"SEC. 1920A. (a) IN GENERAL.—A State plan approved under section 1902 may provide that during a presumptive eligibility period, medical assistance may be made available for medicare cost-sharing (as described in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of section 1902(a)(10)(E)) to qualified medicare beneficiaries (as defined in section 1905(p)(1)), qualified disabled and working individuals (as defined in section 1905(s)), and individuals described in section 1902(a)(10)(E)(iii) without regard to whether a final determination of eligibility for such assistance has been made.

"(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'presumptive eligibility period' means, with respect to an individual described in subsection (a), the period that—

"(A) begins with the date on which a qualified provider determines, on the basis of preliminary information, that the family income of the individual does not exceed the applicable income level of eligibility under the State plan, and

"(B) ends with (and includes) the earlier of—

"(i) the day on which a determination is made with respect to the eligibility of the individual for medical assistance described in subsection (a) under the State plan, or

"(ii) in the case of an individual who does not file an application by the last day of the month following the month during which the provider makes the determination referred to in subparagraph (A), such last day, and

"(2) the term 'qualified provider' means any provider that—

"(A) is eligible for payments under a State plan approved under this title, and

"(B) is determined by the State agency to be capable of making determinations of the type described in paragraph (1)(A).

"(c) DUTIES OF STATE AGENCY, QUALIFIED PROVIDERS, AND PRESUMPTIVELY ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.—

"(1) DUTIES OF STATE AGENCY.—The State agency shall provide qualified providers with—

"(A) such forms as are necessary for an individual described in subsection (a) to make application for medical assistance described in subsection (a) under the State plan, and

"(B) information on how to assist such individuals in completing and filing such forms.

"(2) DUTIES OF QUALIFIED PROVIDERS.—A qualified provider that determines under subsection (b)(1)(A) that such an individual is presumptively eligible for such medical assistance under a State plan shall—

"(A) notify the State agency of the determination within 5 working days after the date on which the determination is made, and

"(B) inform the individual at the time the determination is made that such individual is required to make application for such medical assistance under the State plan by no later than the last day of the month following the month during which the determination is made.

"(3) DUTIES OF PRESUMPTIVELY ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.—An individual who is determined by a qualified provider to be presumptively eligible for medical assistance under a State plan shall make application for such medical assistance under such plan by no later than the last day of the month following the month during which the determination is made.".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to calendar quarters beginning on or after January 1, 1994, without regard to whether or not regulations to implement such amendment are promulgated by such date.

SEC. 105. OUTREACH GRANTS.

(a) GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this section referred to as the "Secretary") shall make grants, one-half to State agencies and one-half to organizations approved under paragraph (2), that submit applications to the Secretary that meet the requirements of this section for the purpose of providing information, counseling, and assistance to older individuals who may be eligible for, but who are not receiving, benefits as qualified medicare beneficiaries (as defined in section 1905(p)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(p)(1)), qualified disabled and working individuals (as defined in section 1905(s) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(s)), and individuals described in section 1902(a)(10)(E)(iii) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(10)(E)) (in this section referred to as "eligible individuals"). The Secretary shall prescribe regulations to establish a minimum level of funding for a grant issued under this section.

(2) APPROVED ORGANIZATIONS.—For purposes of paragraph (1), an organization shall be approved by the Secretary to submit an application for grant funding (as described in subsection (b)) if, as determined by the Secretary, such organization has local entities that can assist older individuals with information and applications to determine if such individuals are eligible individuals.

(b) GRANT APPLICATIONS.—

(1) SUBMISSIONS.—In submitting an application under this section, a State agency or approved organization may consolidate and coordinate an application that consists of parts prepared by more than one department of such State agency or organization.

(2) PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—As part of an application for a grant under this section, a State agency or approved organization shall submit a plan for an information, counseling, and assistance program. Such program shall—

(A) establish or improve upon an information, counseling, and assistance program that provides counseling and assistance to eligible individuals in need of information that may assist such individuals in applying for medicare cost-sharing (as defined in section 1905(p)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(p)(3));

(B) establish a system of referrals to appropriate Federal, State, or local departments or agencies for assistance with problems related to enrollment in and full implementation of such medicare cost-sharing program, as determined by the Secretary;

(C) provide for a sufficient number of staff positions (including volunteer positions) necessary to provide the services of the information, counseling, and assistance program;

(D) provide for the collection and dissemination of timely and accurate enrollment information to staff members;

(E) provide for training programs for staff members (including volunteer staff members);

(F) provide for the coordination of the exchange of enrollment information between the staff of departments and agencies of the State government and the staff of the information, counseling, and assistance program;

(G) make recommendations concerning consumer issues and complaints related to such enrollment to agencies and departments of the State government and the Federal Government responsible for providing such medicare cost-sharing;

(H) establish an outreach program to provide the enrollment information and counseling described in subparagraph (A) and the assistance described in subparagraph (B) to eligible individuals; and

(I) demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, an ability to provide the counseling and assistance required under this section.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—The State agency or approved organization shall operate the information, counseling, and assistance program in locations other than State welfare offices, including facilities operated by any area agency on aging (as defined in section 102(a)(17) of the Older Americans Act of 1965), meals on wheels program, senior center, and other location determined by the Secretary in consultation with such agency or organization.

(d) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—Any funds appropriated for the activities under this section shall supplement, and shall not supplant, funds that are expended for similar purposes under any Federal, State, or local program.

(e) ANNUAL APPLICANT REPORT.—A State agency or approved organization that receives a grant under subsection (a) shall, not later than 180 days after receiving such grant, and annually thereafter, issue an annual report to the Secretary that includes information concerning—

(1) the number of individuals served by the information, counseling, and assistance program of such State agency or organization; and

(2) the problems that eligible individuals encounter in enrolling for medicare cost-sharing.

(f) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall issue a report to the Committee on Finance of the Senate, the Special Committee on Aging of the Senate, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, and the Select Committee on Aging of the House of Representatives that—

(1) summarizes the allocation of funds authorized for grants under this section and the expenditure of such funds;

(2) outlines the problems that eligible individuals encounter in enrolling for medicare cost-sharing;

(3) makes recommendations that the Secretary determines to be appropriate to address the problems described in paragraph (2); and

(4) in the case of the first report issued 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, evaluates the effectiveness of counseling programs established under this program, and makes recommendations regarding continued authorization of funds for these purposes.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR GRANTS.—There are authorized to be appropriated, in equal parts from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and from the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund, $30,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1994, 1995, and 1996, and $10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years beginning after fiscal year 1996, to fund the grant programs described in this section.

TITLE II—APPLICATION OF OTHER MEDICAID ELIGIBILITY RULES

SEC. 201. OTHER MEDICAID ELIGIBILITY RULES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 1905 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d) is amended by striking "or, in the case of medicare cost-sharing with respect to a qualified medicare beneficiary described in subsection (p)(1), if provided after the month in which the individual becomes such a beneficiary)" and inserting "or, in the case of medicare cost-sharing with respect to a qualified medicare beneficiary (as defined in subsection (p)(1)), a qualified disabled and working individual (as defined in subsection (s)), or an individual described in section 1902(a)(10)(E)(iii), if provided in or after the third month before the month in which the individual makes application to become such a beneficiary or individual)".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (8) of section 1902(e) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(e)) is amended to read as follows:

"(8) For purposes of payment to a State under section 1903(a), if an individual is determined to be a qualified medicare beneficiary (as defined in section 1905(p)(1)), a qualified disabled and working individual (as defined in section 1905(s)), or an individual described in subsection (a)(10)(E)(iii), such determination shall be considered to be valid for an individual for a period of 12 months from the date of application, except that a

State may provide for such determinations more frequently, but not more frequently than once every 6 months for an individual.".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to applications filed after December 31, 1993.

TITLE III—REPORT

SEC. 301. REPORT BY SECRETARY.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall report to the Congress not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act on the activities of the Department of Health and Human Services to ensure enrollment and full implementation of the benefits described in section 1902(a)(10)(E) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(10)(E)) and the effectiveness of each such activity. Such report shall also include any recommendations regarding any proposed legislation necessary to further improve such enrollment and implementation.

SUMMARY OF MEDICARE ENROLLMENT IMPROVEMENT AND PROTECTION ACT

PURPOSE

To ensure full and proper implementation of Medicaid coverage for certain low-income Medicare beneficiaries by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

SECTION I—IMPROVING ENROLLMENT

Background: Only slightly more than half of those eligible for QMB benefits are receiving them due to lack of information and other barriers to gaining access to the program. In addition, as of 1/1/93, Medicare beneficiaries with incomes between 100% and 110% of poverty may be newly-eligible for some buy-in benefits as Specified Low-Income Medicare Beneficiaries (SLMBs).

(1) Notification

Legislative Proposal: Require the Secretary of HHS to notify all new Medicare beneficiaries of the QMB/SLMB benefits at the time they apply for Medicare participation.

In addition, the Secretary shall mail information annually about the QMB and SLMB benefits to Medicare beneficiaries. In informing potential Medicare beneficiaries, the information shall include the buy-in eligibility criteria, how to get additional information, and how to apply for the benefits. The information shall be designed to attract the reader's attention and should be written in clear and simple English, as well as other languages determined by the Secretary.

The Secretary shall also supply notices for posting to provider offices and to community agencies serving the low-income elderly and persons with disabilities.

(2) Toll-free hotline

Background: Medicare beneficiaries are currently confused as to where to go to get information on the QMB/SLMB benefits and to complete applications. They are not sure if they should go to Social Security or welfare offices and get mixed information about who is ultimately responsible for the QMB/SLMB program.

Legislative proposal: Establish a toll-free phone line for information on the benefit, including where to go for applications, documentation needed when applying, and other information. The information shall be offered to every caller to the hotline regardless of the nature of their specific inquiry. All notices about the buy-in benefit are required to include this toll-free number.

(3) Use of Social Security Administration offices and development of a simplified application form

Legislative Proposal: Require Social Security offices to take QMB and SLMB applications, so beneficiaries have the option to apply for these benefits at sites other than local welfare offices. The Secretary shall develop a plan to implement the process and to ensure adequate resources are provided (e.g. for training of SSA workers). The Secretary shall develop a simplified application form, with the consultation of consumer advocates and states, for use in Social Security offices. These forms will be referred to the state agency for follow-up. The Secretary shall periodically send forms to low-income Social Security beneficiaries which, when completed, would enable HHS to determine likely eligibility. HHS would refer the forms to the appropriate State or local agency or office.

(4) Outreach

Legislative Proposal: Provide grants totaling $30 million annually to agencies to provide information, counseling, and assistance with problems related to QMB/SLMB enrollment for low-income Medicare beneficiaries. One half of the appropriated grant funds would be available for states and state agencies; the other half would be available for community-based agencies with wide community support. Funds could be used for such activities as public awareness campaigns and one-on-one counseling by these organizations.

(5) Direct enrollment of Part A eligibles

Background: HCFA can identify individuals who are not entitled to Medicare hospital coverage (Part A) due to their lack of contributions to the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund. The QMB benefit extends Medicaid coverage of the Part A premium to these individuals. Over 30 states currently automatically enroll these individuals in Part A and QMB through Part-A buy-in agreements with the Secretary. The remaining states require these individuals to first apply for QMB benefits, before their Part A premium will be paid. Since enrollment in Part A is required for QMB benefits, these beneficiaries must first pay the Part A monthly premium to qualify as QMBs. Also, HCFA limits enrollment of QMB eligibles in Medicare Part A to the first three months of a year.

Legislative Proposal: The Secretary shall be required to establish Part-A buyin agreements with all the States to enroll these individuals automatically and to bill state Medicaid plans for the premiums. The Social Security Act shall be amended to permit Part A enrollment throughout the year, rather than only in the first three months.

(6) Optional presumptive eligibility

Background: Currently, states have the option of establishing presumptive eligibility for low-income pregnant women. Providers may make a preliminary determination that a woman seeking treatment is eligible for Medicaid and the state is obligated to cover pregnancy-related services provided for a certain time period or until the state completes an eligibility review, whichever is earlier. The individual may apply for Medicaid coverage up to the end of the month following the month in which presumptive eligibility was established, and is guaranteed coverage to that date.

Legislative Proposal: Allow states to extend presumptive eligibility to potential QMB eligibles. Certain providers would be authorized to establish presumptive eligibility for Medicare cost-sharing.

SECTION II—APPLICATION OF OTHER MEDICAID ELIGIBILITY RULES

Background: For most individuals eligible for Medicaid, the date of eligibility for benefits is based on the date of application. If an individual files an application for Medicaid in a given month, but the State does not make its eligibility determination until several months later, the individual will be eligible for coverage as of the date he or she filed the application and in most instances for 3 months prior to the date of application. However, QMB beneficiaries are ineligible until the end of the month in which eligibility is determined. In the time from filing application until determination, they may incur cost-sharing expenses for hospital care or other benefits.

Legislative Proposal: Make QMBs eligible for cost-sharing for 3 months prior to the date of application for those benefits, if they met the eligibility requirements during that time.

SECTION III—REPORT TO CONGRESS

Require Secretary Shalala to report to Congress, no later than 12 months after enactment, on Administration's activities to ensure enrollment and full implementation of the QMB and SLMB benefits and on the effectiveness of each activity.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I rise today to join my distinguished colleague, Senator RIEGLE, as an original cosponsor of the Medicare Enrollment Improvement and Protection Act of 1993. This legislation is designed to solve a beneficiary access issue—to eliminate barriers which keep low-income seniors and disabled citizens from receiving financial assistance with their out-of-pocket Medicare costs. This legislation is designed to implement the Qualified Medicare Beneficiary Program.

The Medicare Enrollment Improvement and Protection Act of 1993 will fully implement the Qualified Medicare Beneficiary Program enacted by Congress over 5 years ago and the Specialized Low-Income Medicare Beneficiary Program, in effect as of this year.

It was the intent of Congress to create a program that would protect all elderly and disabled individuals whose incomes are at the poverty line from the increasing costs of Medicare deductibles, copayments and premiums. More than 5 years after enactment, however, 42 percent of low-income Medicare beneficiaries are not informed or face access barriers to receiving the benefits to which they are entitled.

Today, over 2 million beneficiaries are still unaware of the program and their eligibility status. As a result, low-income elderly and disabled persons may be paying over $1,100 a year unnecessarily if they are hospitalized only once.

Repeated efforts by Members of Congress to resolve this problem administratively have been less than successful. In June 1991, I joined with nine other members of the Finance Committee to urge that Medicare beneficiaries be allowed to apply for the Qualified Medicare Beneficiary Program at Social Security offices, rather than requiring them to make a second trip to welfare offices. These efforts and our

urgent suggestions for comprehensive outreach programs have not resulted in significant improvements.

This bill requires Social Security offices to develop a simplified application and to assist all new Medicare beneficiaries to apply without a second trip to a local welfare office.

This legislation will also require the Department of Health and Human Services to simplify and initiate more effective enrollment procedures. This act will assure more effective notification including public awareness and outreach grants to community organizations.

In my home State of Maine, the area agencies on aging successfully conducted a 1991 statewide outreach to eligible qualified Medicare beneficiaries. As a result, Maine's rate of enrollment of eligible beneficiaries is significantly better than the national average. These efforts must be continued and stepped up to ensure full awareness and overcome barriers to enrollment.

The Medicare Enrollment Improvement and Protection Act of 1993 will provide the legal means to ensure the full implementation of a program to assist low-income Medicare beneficiaries with out-of-pocket costs—just as Congress intended almost 6 years ago. This bill is supported by many organizations including the National Association of Area Agencies on Aging and the National Council of Senior Citizens.

I commend Senator RIEGLE for his dedication to this issue. He introduced this legislation three times since 1991. The implementation of this beneficiary access program is even more timely with the addition of the Specialized Low-Income Medicare Beneficiary Program.

I urge my colleagues to join us to ensure the financial protection of all low income elderly and disabled citizens.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

S. 650. A bill to amend the National Apprenticeship Act to require minimum funding for certain outreach recruitment and training programs, to restore a national information collection system, to limit the authority to conduct reductions in force within the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training of the Department of Labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

APPRENTICESHIP IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1993

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Apprenticeship Improvement Act of 1993. I am very pleased that my friend and colleague from Michigan, Senator LEVIN, is an original cosponsor of this legislation. The bill we are offering addresses one of our Nation's most critical challenges: Educating and training American workers so they can fill high-skill jobs that we must have in this country.

We face a job crisis in this country. Our manufacturing base is eroding and fewer good jobs are coming on line. This is especially true in my State of Michigan. In fact, over the past year 89 percent of the increase in jobs in Michigan were part-time jobs. These are jobs that generally pay lower wages and do not provide health and pension benefits. Consequently, young men and women entering the work force straight from high school do not have the same opportunities that existed in the past.

If we are to remain a strong Nation and rebuild our job base we need a strategy to provide meaningful job opportunities for all Americans. An important element of that strategy is ensuring that every citizen has the skills that he or she needs to be as productive as possible. Apprenticeship programs have proven to be a highly effective way of providing those practical skills they need to succeed.

Some 280,000 people are now enrolled in registered apprenticeship programs. Unfortunately, the United States, unlike many of our foreign competitors, does not provide enough support for apprenticeship opportunities. Furthermore, that support has declined; from 1980 to 1990, Federal support for apprenticeship programs declined by 70 percent.

President Clinton and Secretary of Labor Robert Reich recognize the importance of apprenticeship programs in training our work force. I am encouraged by their leadership and I look forward to working with them.

At the Federal level, apprenticeship programs are now administered by the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training [BAT]. BAT plays a vital role in promoting and maintaining our apprenticeship system. BAT encourages employers to implement apprenticeship programs and helps workers find appropriate programs.

Despite the clear need to expand apprenticeship opportunities, BAT has been decimated by staff reductions over the past 12 years. In 1981, there were 459 full-time staff members at BAT; in 1990, there were 246. The legislation I am introducing today would restore some strength to BAT by increasing the staff level to 377.

This proposal would not return BAT to the level that existed in 1981. We face an enormous budget deficit that threatens our long-term economic health. I believe that it is appropriate to encourage the Federal Government to do more and spend less. This bill is consistent with that idea.

In addition, so we can make best use of the apprenticeship programs already available, the bill would require the Secretary of Labor to establish and maintain a national information collection system for apprenticeship and apprenticeship programs.

The Apprenticeship Improvement Act would encourage BAT to make a greater effort to ensure that more people who have not traditionally been part of the apprenticeship programs in the past have greater opportunity in the future. Women now account for 45 percent of the work force, yet only about 7 percent of apprentices are women. A GAO study found that a lack of public awareness of apprenticeship programs is a major reason women are under-represented in the work force. The bill requires that at least 1 percent of the funding for the program be made available for outreach recruitment activities to increase the participation of women, minorities, handicapped individuals, displaced workers, and disadvantaged individuals.

Within 6 months of the enactment of this bill the Secretary of Labor must submit a detailed report determining whether apprenticeship programs comply with regulations governing equal opportunity. The composition of our work force is changing dramatically—we must ensure that anyone who is capable of contributing is given the chance.

Mr. President, this bill would help us rebuild our economic strength by improving the productivity of our most important resource—our people. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be included in the RECORD.

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

S. 650

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 "Apprenticeship Improvement Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF INFORMATION COLLECTION SYSTEM.

Section 2 of the Act of August 16, 1937 (50 Stat. 664; 29 U.S.C. 50), popularly known as the "National Apprenticeship Act", (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Act") is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 2."; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

(b) The Secretary shall establish and maintain a national information collection system for apprenticeships and apprenticeship programs.".

SEC. 3. OUTREACH PROGRAM.

The Act is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 4 as section 5, and

(2) by inserting after section 3 the following new section:

"SEC. 4. The Secretary shall assure that from the amounts appropriated to carry out this Act in each fiscal year, not less than 1 percent of such amounts shall be available to establish outreach recruitment activities to increase the participation of women, minorities, handicapped individuals, displaced workers, and disadvantaged individuals in the apprenticeship programs authorized by this Act.".

SEC. 4. ESTABLISHMENT OF BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP AND TRAINING; APPOINTMENT OF EMPLOYEES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Department of Labor, the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Bureau") which shall carry out the policies and functions of this Act on behalf of the Secretary of Labor (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary"). The Bureau shall be under the direction of an administrator to be known as the Administrator of the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training. The Administrator shall report directly to the Secretary.

(b) TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS.—Functions of the Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training Administration of the Department of Labor with respect to the promotion of labor standards of apprenticeship, including research, information, and publications are transferred to the Bureau. Functions related to apprenticeship, including appropriate administrative and program support services, together with personnel necessary to the administration of such functions, and unexpended balances of appropriations and other funds related thereto, are transferred to the Bureau.

(c) APPOINTMENT OF EMPLOYEES.—The Secretary is authorized to appoint such employees as may be necessary for the administration of this Act in accordance with laws applicable to the appointment and compensation of employees and advisors of the United States.

SEC. 5. INCREASE IN FORCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall increase the force within the Bureau to 377 full-time employees not later than January 1, 1994.

(b) CONSIDERATION OF EMPLOYEES WORKING LESS THAN FULL TIME.—In the administration of subsection (a)—

(1) a part-time employee shall be counted as a fraction, the numerator of which is the number corresponding to the average number of hours in such employee's regularly scheduled workweek and the denominator of which is 40; and

(2) an individual employed on a temporary or intermittent basis shall not be counted.

SEC. 6. LIMITATIONS ON REDUCTION IN FORCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A reduction in force may not be conducted within the Bureau if—

(1) the reduction in force would reduce the total number of civilian employees within such Bureau; and

(2) such total number, after the reduction in force, would be less than the equivalent of 377 employees.

(b) CONSIDERATION OF EMPLOYEES WORKING LESS THAN FULL TIME.—In the administration of subsection (a)—

(1) a part-time employee shall be counted as a fraction, the numerator of which is the number corresponding to the average number of hours in such employee's regularly scheduled workweek and the denominator of which is 40; and

(2) an individual employed on a temporary or intermittent basis shall not be counted.

SEC. 7. REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Congress, not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, a detailed report concerning whether the apprenticeship program conducted by the Department of Labor under the Act of August 16, 1937 (50 Stat. 664; 29 U.S.C. 50), complies with regulations governing equal opportunity.

(b) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—The report required by this section shall include—

(1) a detailed description of activities carried out by the Department of Labor to ensure compliance;

(2) a list of compliance reviews undertaken by the Department; and

(3) a description of any sanctions imposed as a result of the compliance reviews.

By Mr. PELL (for himself, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S.J. Res. 69. A joint resolution providing for the United States to assume a strong leadership role in implementing the decisions made at the Earth Summit by developing a national strategy to implement Agenda 21 and other Earth Summit agreements through domestic policy and foreign policy, by cooperating with all countries to identify and initiate further agreements to protect the global environment, and by supporting and participating in the high-level United Nations Sustainable Development Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EARTH SUMMIT ENVIRONMENT LEADERSHIP ACT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Earth Summit Environmental Leadership Act. Joining me in introducing this legislation are Senators CHAFEE, KERRY, and WELLSTONE. A companion measure is being introduced on the House side by Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI to whom special recognition and credit should go for her efforts in this area.

Last year in June, the leaders of over 100 nations met in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil for the U.N. Conference on Environment and Development or more simply the Earth Summit. The Conference was the largest ever meeting of heads of state. It was also vivid testimony to the importance environmental issues have assumed in international relations.

Five documents were completed at the Earth Summit: the Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Rio Declaration, Agenda 21, and a nonbinding authoritative statement on global forest management.

As my colleagues may remember, the Senate granted its advice and consent to the Convention on Climate Change, enabling the United States to become the first industrialized country and only the fourth country overall to become a party to the convention. The Bush administration declined to sign the Convention on Biological Diversity.

The centerpiece of what remains is Agenda 21, a 40 chapter, 600 plus page action plan for sustainable development into the 21st century. The resolution introduced today focuses on the steps necessary for Congress and the President to take to implement Agenda 21 effectively. With my colleagues indulgence, I will highlight just a few of those measures.

The resolution calls for the adoption of a national strategy for sustainable development. It notes that the strategy should be prepared with board input from all sectors of society, including State and local government, business, labor, and nongovernmental organizations. The President is called upon to submit an annual report to Congress on the steps taken to implement Agenda 21.

The resolution also calls for the promotion of sustainable development through the U.S. foreign assistance program and through the multilateral development banks.

Further, the resolution calls on the President to affirm the United States strong commitment to the Commission on Sustainable Development. The Commission was formally established only last month in New York at the meeting of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. Its mandate, broadly speaking is to monitor implementation of Agenda 21.

In order to ensure that the Commission has the credibility to carry out this function effectively, the resolution urges the President to appoint a high-level representatives or delegation from the United States to the Commission. In addition, resolution states that the United States should encourage the active participation of the representatives of the international financial institutions in the Commission's work.

Mr. President, alone in the Congress, I had the privilege and honor to attend both the Earth Summit and its predecessor by 20 years, the Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment. That earlier conference marked a turning point in environmental awareness around the world.

One of the Stockholm Conference's most significant accomplishments was the establishment of the United Nations Environment Programme. To my mind, UNEP has been one of the most cost effective investments in protecting the global environment that our Government has made.

The establishment of UNEP was not, however, the only product of Stockholm. In the aftermath of the Conference, numerous countries established their own versions of our Environmental Protection Agency or provided a formal mandate to protect the environment to an existing ministry.

Similar and indeed stronger action will be necessary to make the promise of UNCED a reality. The Earth Summit Environmental Leadership Act provides broad guidance for United States implementation of accords reached last June to the U.N. Conference on Environment and Development in Brazil, especially Agenda 21.

I am hopeful that broad, bipartisan consensus can be reached behind these policies, because such support will be essential for their effective implementation. I hope this resolution will enjoy that support.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 20

At the request of Mr. ROTH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 20, a bill to provide for the establishment, testing, and evaluation of strategic planning and performance measurement in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

S. 110

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] was added as a cosponsor of S. 110, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to seek advice concerning environmental risks, and for other purposes.

S. 161

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the name of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM] was added as a cosponsor of S. 161, a bill to provide for an endowment grant program to support college access programs nationwide, and for other purposes.

S. 412

At the request of Mr. EXON, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 412, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, regarding the collection of certain payments for shipments via motor common carriers of property and nonhousehold goods freight forwarders, and for other purposes.

S. 452

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 452, a bill to amend chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, to establish a program of rural health-care clinics, and for other purposes.

S. 535

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 535, a bill to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to plan and design an extension of the National Air and Space Museum at Washington Dulles International Airport, and for other purposes.

S. 557

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 557, a bill to combat telemarketing fraud.

S. 596

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the names of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES], the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] were added as cosponsors of S. 596, a bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to provide improved child welfare services, and for other purposes.

S. 600

At the request of Mr. BOREN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 600, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the targeted jobs credit.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 39

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 39, a joint resolution designating the weeks beginning May 23, 1993, and May 15, 1994, as Emergency Medical Services Week.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 50

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 50, a joint resolution to designate the weeks of September 19, 1993, through September 25, 1993, and of September 18, 1994, through September 24, 1994, as "National Rehabilitation Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 53

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DANFORTH] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 53, a joint resolution designating March 1993 and March 1994 both as "Women's History Month."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 54

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG], the Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB], the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 54, a joint resolution designating April 9, 1993, and April 9, 1994, as "National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 56

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 56, a joint resolution to designate the week beginning April 12, 1993, as "National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 62

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 62, a joint resolution to designate the week beginning April 25, 1993, as "National Crime Victims' Rights Week."

SENATE RESOLUTION 68

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 68, a resolution urging the President of the United States to seek an international oil embargo through the United Nations against Libya because of its refusal to comply with United Nations Security Council Resolutions 731 and 748 concerning the bombing of Pan Am Flight 103.

AMENDMENT NO. 222

At the request of Mr. DURENBERGER the names of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER] were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 222 proposed to Senate Concurrent Resolution 18, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998.

SENATE RESOLUTION 82 RELATING TO THE PRODUCTION OF RECORDS BY THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. MITCHELL (for himself and Mr. DOLE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 82

Whereas, the Committee on Governmental Affairs has conducted an investigation of serious management problems at the National Archives and Record Administration;

Whereas, as a result of its investigation, the Committee referred matters that it had investigated to executive branch agencies for investigation and appropriate action;

Whereas, the Department of Justice has requested access to records of the Committee's investigation as part of the inquiry resulting from the Committee's referral;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate can, by administrative or judicial process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate is needed for the promotion of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee on Governmental Affairs, acting jointly, are authorized to provide to the Department of

Justice records of testimony and exhibits received by the Committee in its investigation of management problems at the National Archives and Records Administration, except for materials for which a privilege should be asserted.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

OMNIBUS CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RESOLUTION

LAUTENBERG AMENDMENT NO. 242

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself and Mr. EXON), proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998, as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following new section.

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON SOCIAL SECURITY TAXES.

It is the sense of the Senate that the revenues set forth in this resolution assume that the Finance Committee will make every effort to find alternative sources of revenues before imposing new taxes on the benefits of Social Security beneficiaries with threshold incomes (for purposes of the taxation of Social Security benefits) of less than $32,000 for individuals and $40,000 for married couples filing joint returns.

THURMOND AMENDMENT NO. 243

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. THURMOND (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. COATS, and Mr. SMITH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), supra, as follows:

On page 10, line 4, increase the amount by $1,033,000,000.

On page 41, line 17, increase the amount by −$769,000,000.

On page 43, line 3, increase the amount by −$264,000,000.

On page 10, line 5, increase the amount by $981,000,000.

On page 41, line 18, increase the amount by −$717,000,000.

On page 43, line 4, increase the amount by −$264,000,000.

On page 10, line 11, increase the amount by $1,820,000,000.

On page 41, line 24, increase the amount by −$1,356,000,000.

On page 43, line 10, increase the amount by −$465,000,000.

On page 10, line 12, increase the amount by $1,777,000,000.

On page 41, line 25, increase the amount by −$1,312,000,000.

On page 43, line 11, increase the amount by −$465,000,000.

On page 10, line 12, increase the amount by $2,455,000,000.

On page 42, line 6, increase the amount by $1,831,000,000.

On page 43, line 17, increase the amount by −$624,000,000.

On page 10, line 19, increase the amount by $2,417,000,000.

On page 42, line 7, increase the amount by −$1,793,000,000.

On page 43, line 18, increase the amount by −$624,000,000.

On page 10, line 25, increase the amount by $3,112,000,000.

On page 42, line 13, increase the amount by −$2,318,000,000.

On page 43, line 24, increase the amount by −$794,000,000.

On page 11, line 1, increase the amount by $3,071,000,000.

On page 42, line 14, increase the amount by −$2,277,000,000.

On page 43, line 14, increase the amount by −$794,000,000.

On page 11, line 7, increase the amount by $3,343,000,000.

On page 42, line 20, increase the amount by −$2,495,000,000.

On page 44, line 6, increase the amount by −$847,000,000.

On page 11, line 8, increase the amount by $3,321,000,000.

On page 42, line 21, increase the amount by −$2,474,000,000.

On page 44, line 7, increase the amount by −$847,000,000.

KERREY AMENDMENT NO. 244

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. KERREY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), supra, as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following new section:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF SENATE REGARDING ADDITIONAL REDUCTIONS IN AGRICULTURAL SPENDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) of the top 12 mandatory spending programs of the Federal Government, the farm price support program ranks 12th in total spending and is the only program of the 12 whose spending declined between fiscal years 1985 and 1992;

(2) spending for the farm price support program will comprise less than ⅕ of the nearly $63 billion budget for the United States Department of Agriculture during fiscal year 1993;

(3) agricultural spending can be reduced by the expansion of markets for agricultural products and improved management of farm programs, as well as by cuts in farm price support levels;

(4) each 1 cent per bushel increase in the price received by corn producers decreases the cost of the corn price support program by $55–80 million annually;

(5) each 1 cent per bushel increase in the price received by wheat producers decreases the cost of the wheat price support program by $17–22 million annually;

(6) agriculture is the largest industry in the United States, employing more Americans in production, processing, and marketing activities associated with agriculture than any other single industry;

(7) consumers in the United States spend 9.8 percent of their personal income on food consumed at home, a smaller percent of income than consumers in any other country in the world;

(8) the European Community spends nearly 3 times more than the United States in support of farmers of the European Community, including more in the form of export subsidies than the entire cost of United States farm programs;

(9) the net return on assets employed in United States agriculture was −5.8 percent in 1988, −5.3 percent in 1989, −5.3 percent in 1990, −5.5 percent in 1991, −4.6 percent in 1992, and is forecast to be −5.5 percent in 1993;

(10) 22 percent of all farm households have total incomes below the poverty line, more than twice the rate for all United States households;

(11) in 1990, 85 percent of the income of farm households came from non-farm sources;

(12) in the 1980's, the number of farms and ranches decreased by 12 percent and the number of Americans living on farms and ranches decreased by 25 percent; and

(13) according to the University of Nebraska, a 97-acre Nebraska corn farm that supported a family in 1975 needed to be 1,327 acres in 1991 in order to maintain the same standard of living for the family.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that any further reductions in agricultural spending required under this resolution be accomplished by increasing the prices that producers receive for their commodities in the marketplace rather than by making additional reductions in farm price support payment rates.

GRAMM AMENDMENT NO. 245

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. GRAMM, submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), supra, as follows:

On page 19, line 19, increase the amount by $192,000,000.

On page 19, line 20, increase the amount by $192,000,000.

On page 20, line 2, increase the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 20, line 3, increase the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 20, line 10, increase the amount by $208,000,000.

On page 20, line 11, increase the amount by $208,000,000.

On page 20, line 18, increase the amount by $216,000,000.

On page 20, line 19, increase the amount by $216,000,000.

On page 21, line 2, increase the amount by $224,000,000.

On page 21, line 3, increase the amount by $224,000,000.

On page 41, line 17, decrease the amount by $255,000,000.

On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $255,000,000.

On page 41, line 24, decrease the amount by $265,000,000.

On page 41, line 25, decrease the amount by $265,000,000.

On page 42, line 6, decrease the amount by $276,000,000.

On page 42, line 7, decrease the amount by $276,000,000.

On page 42, line 13, decrease the amount by $286,000,000.

On page 42, line 14, decrease the amount by $286,000,000.

On page 42, line 20, decrease the amount by $297,000,000.

On page 42, line 21, decrease the amount by $297,000,000.

On page 2, line 18, decrease the amount by $63,000,000.

On page 2, line 19, decrease the amount by $65,000,000.

On page 3, line 2, decrease the amount by $68,000,000.

On page 3, line 4, decrease the amount by $70,000,000.

On page 3, line 6, decrease the amount by $73,000,000.

On page 3, line 10, decrease the amount by $63,000,000.
On page 3, line 11, decrease the amount by $65,000,000.
On page 3, line 12, decrease the amount by $68,000,000.
On page 3, line 13, decrease the amount by $70,000,000.
On page 3, line 14, decrease the amount by $73,000,000.
On page 4, line 6, decrease the amount by $63,000,000.
On page 4, line 7, decrease the amount by $65,000,000.
On page 4, line 8, decrease the amount by $68,000,000.
On page 4, line 9, decrease the amount by $70,000,000.
On page 4, line 11, decrease the amount by $73,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, decrease the amount by $63,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by $65,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by $68,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by $70,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by $73,000,000.
On page 5, line 1, decrease the amount by $63,000,000.
On page 5, line 2, decrease the amount by $65,000,000.
On page 5, line 3, decrease the amount by $68,000,000.
On page 5, line 4, decrease the amount by $70,000,000.
On page 5, line 5, decrease the amount by $73,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $63,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $65,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $68,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $70,000,000.
On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by $73,000,000.
On page 5, line 22, decrease the amount by $63,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, decrease the amount by $65,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, decrease the amount by $68,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, decrease the amount by $70,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, decrease the amount by $73,000,000.
On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $63,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $65,000,000.
On page 6, line 9, decrease the amount by $68,000,000.
On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $70,000,000.
On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $73,000,000.
On page 47, line 22, decrease the first amount by $63,000,000.
On page 47, line 22, decrease the last amount by $339,000,000.
On page 57, line 18, decrease the amount by $63,000,000.
On page 57, line 19, decrease the amount by $339,000,000.

GRAMM AMENDMENT NO. 246

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. GRAMM (for himself, Mr. ROTH, and Mr. PRESSLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), supra, as follows:

On page 2, line 18, decrease the amount by $12,800,000,000.
On page 2, line 19, decrease the amount by $8,500,000,000.
On page 3, line 2, decrease the amount by $9,900,000,000.
On page 3, line 4, decrease the amount by $12,000,000,000.
On page 3, line 6, decrease the amount by $12,900,000,000.
On page 3, line 10, decrease the amount by $12,800,000,000.
On page 3, line 11, decrease the amount by $8,500,000,000.
On page 3, line 12, decrease the amount by $9,900,000,000.
On page 3, line 13, decrease the amount by $12,000,000,000.
On page 3, line 14, decrease the amount by $12,900,000,000.
On page 4, line 6, decrease the amount by $12,800,000,000.
On page 4, line 7, decrease the amount by $8,500,000,000.
On page 4, line 8, decrease the amount by $9,900,000,000.
On page 4, line 9, decrease the amount by $12,000,000,000.
On page 4, line 11, decrease the amount by $12,900,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, decrease the amount by $12,800,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by $8,500,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by $9,900,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by $12,000,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by $12,900,000,000.
On page 5, line 1, decrease the amount by $12,800,000,000.
On page 5, line 2, decrease the amount by $8,500,000,000.
On page 5, line 3, decrease the amount by $9,900,000,000.
On page 5, line 4, decrease the amount by $12,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 5, decrease the amount by $12,900,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $12,800,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $8,500,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $9,900,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $12,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by $12,900,000,000.
On page 5, line 22, decrease the amount by $12,800,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, decrease the amount by $8,500,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, decrease the amount by $9,900,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, decrease the amount by $12,000,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, decrease the amount by $12,900,000,000.
On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $12,800,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $8,500,000,000.
On page 6, line 9, decrease the amount by $9,900,000,000.
On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $12,000,000,000.
On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $12,900,000,000.
On page 41, line 17, decrease the amount by $12,800,000,000.
On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $12,800,000,000.
On page 41, line 24, decrease the amount by $8,500,000,000.
On page 41, line 25, decrease the amount by $8,500,000,000.
On page 42, line 6, decrease the amount by $9,900,000,000.
On page 42, line 7, decrease the amount by $9,900,000,000.
On page 42, line 13, decrease the amount by $12,000,000,000.
On page 42, line 14, decrease the amount by $12,000,000,000.
On page 42, line 20, decrease the amount by $12,900,000,000.
On page 42, line 21, decrease the amount by $12,900,000,000.
On page 50, line 9, decrease the amount by $12,800,000,000.
On page 50, line 10, decrease the amount by $56,100,000,000.
On page 57, line 18, decrease the amount by $12,900,000,000.
On page 57, line 19, decrease the amount by $56,100,000,000.

BROWN AMENDMENT NO. 247

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), supra, as follows:

On page 2, line 19, increase the amount by $2,000,000,000.
On page 3, line 2, increase the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 3, line 4, increase the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 3, line 6, increase the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $0.
On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $2,000,000,000.
On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $0.
On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $2,000,000,000.
On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 4, line 11, increase the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $0.
On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $2,000,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 1, decrease the amount by $34,500,000,000.
On page 5, line 2, decrease the amount by $69,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 3, decrease the amount by $119,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 4, decrease the amount by $179,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 5, decrease the amount by $240,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $34,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $69,900,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $119,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $179,100,000,000.
On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by $240,100,000,000.
On page 5, line 22, decrease the amount by $30,500,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, decrease the amount by $66,400,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, decrease the amount by $115,900,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, decrease the amount by $176,000,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, decrease the amount by $237,000,000,000.
On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $30,500,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $66,400,000,000.
On page 6, line 9, decrease the amount by $115,900,000,000.
On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $176,100,000,000.
On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $237,300,000,000.
On page 6, line 17, decrease the amount by $30,500,000,000.
On page 6, line 18, decrease the amount by $64,400,000,000.
On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $112,900,000,000.
On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $173,100,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $234,300,000,000.
On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $30,500,000,000
On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $64,400,000,000.
On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by $112,900,000,000.
On page 7, line 4, decrease the amount by $173,100,000,000.
On page 7, line 5, decrease the amount by $234,300,000,000.
On page 7, line 8, decrease the amount by $30,500,000,000.
On page 7, line 9, decrease the amount by $94,900,000,000.
On page 7, line 10, decrease the amount by $207,800,000,000.
On page 7, line 11, decrease the amount by $380,900,000,000.
On page 7, line 12, decrease the amount by $615,200,000,000.
On page 8, line 7, decrease the amount by $30,500,000,000.
On page 8, line 8, decrease the amount by $64,400,000,000.
On page 8, line 9, decrease the amount by $112,900,000,000.
On page 8, line 10, decrease the amount by $173,100,000,000.
On page 8, line 11, decrease the amount by $234,300,000,000.
On page 11, line 15, decrease the amount by $800,000,000.
On page 11, line 16, decrease the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 11, line 23, decrease the amount by $1,400,000,000.
On page 11, line 24, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 12, line 7, decrease the amount by $2,000,000,000.
On page 12, line 8, decrease the amount by $1,500,000,000.
On page 12, line 15, decrease the amount by $2,600,000,000.
On page 12, line 16, decrease the amount by $2,100,000,000.
On page 12, line 23, decrease the amount by $3,100,000,000.
On page 12, line 24, decrease the amount by $2,500,000,000.
On page 13, line 9, decrease the amount by $500,000,000 .
On page 13, line 10, decrease the amount by $300,000,000.
On page 13, line 16, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 13, line 17, decrease the amount by $800,000,000.
On page 13, line 23, decrease the amount by $1,500,000,000.
On page 13, line 24, decrease the amount by $1,200,000,000.
On page 14, line 5, decrease the amount by $2,000,000,000.
On page 14, line 6, decrease the amount by $1,700,000,000.
On page 14, line 12, decrease the amount by $2,500,000,000 .
On page 14, line 13, decrease the amount by $2,200,000,000
On page 14, line 20, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.
On page 14, line 21, decrease the amount by $100,000,000.
On page 15, line 3, decrease the amount by $300,000,000.
On page 15, line 4, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.
On page 15, line 11, decrease the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 15, line 12, decrease the amount by $400,000,000.
On page 15, line 19, decrease the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 15, line 20, decrease the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 16, line 2, decrease the amount by $800,000,000.
On page 16, line 3, decrease the amount by $700,000,000.
On page 16, line 11, decrease the amount by $800,000,000.
On page 16, line 12, decrease the amount by $400,000,000.
On page 16, line 19, decrease the amount by $1,500,000,000.
On page 16, line 20, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 17, line 2, decrease the amount by $2,100,000,000.
On page 17, line 3, decrease the amount by $1,600,000,000.
On page 17, line 10, decrease the amount by $2,800,000,000.
On page 17, line 11, decrease the amount by $2,300,000,000.
On page 17, line 18, decrease the amount by $3,600,000,000.
On page 17, line 19, decrease the amount by $2,900,000,000.
On page 18, line 2, decrease the amount by $100,000,000.
On page 18, line 3, decrease the amount by $100,000,000.
On page 18, line 10, decrease the amount by $300,000,000.
On page 18, line 11, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.
On page 18, line 18, decrease the amount by $400,000,000.
On page 18, line 19, decrease the amount by $400,000,000.
On page 19, line 2, decrease the amount by $1,200,000,000.
On page 19, line 3, decrease the amount by $1,100,000,000.
On page 19, line 10, decrease the amount by $900,000,000.
On page 19, line 11, decrease the amount by $900,000,000.
On page 19, line 19, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.
On page 19, line 20, decrease the amount by $100,000,000.
On page 20, line 2, decrease the amount by $300,000,000.
On page 20, line 3, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.
On page 20, line 10, decrease the amount by $400,000,000.
On page 20, line 11, decrease the amount by $400,000,000.
On page 20, line 18, decrease the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 20, line 19, decrease the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 21, line 2, decrease the amount by $700,000,000.
On page 21, line 3, decrease the amount by $700,000,000.
On page 21, line 11, decrease the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 21, line 12, decrease the amount by $400,000,000.
On page 21, line 19, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 21, line 20, decrease the amount by $1,200,000,000.
On page 22, line 2, decrease the amount by $1,400,000,000.
On page 22, line 3, decrease the amount by $2,000,000,000.
On page 22, line 10, decrease the amount by $1,800,000,000.
On page 22, line 11, decrease the amount by $2,900,000,000.
On page 22, line 18, decrease the amount by $2,300,000,000.
On page 22, line 19, decrease the amount by $3,900,000,000.
On page 23, line 3, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.
On page 23, line 4, decrease the amount by $100,000,000.
On page 23, line 11, decrease the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 23, line 12, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.
On page 23, line 19, decrease the amount by $700,000,000.
On page 23, line 20, decrease the amount by $400,000,000.
On page 24, line 2, decrease the amount by $900,000,000.
On page 24, line 3, decrease the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 24, line 10, decrease the amount by $1,100,000,000.
On page 24, line 11, decrease the amount by $800,000,000.
On page 24, line 20, decrease the amount by $1,600,000,000.
On page 24, line 21, decrease the amount by $800,000,000.
On page 25, line 3, decrease the amount by $2,700,000,000.
On page 25, line 4, decrease the amount by $1,800,000,000.
On page 25, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,900,000,000.
On page 25, line 12, decrease the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 25, line 19, decrease the amount by $5,000,000,000.
On page 25, line 20, decrease the amount by $4,100,000,000.
On page 26, line 2, decrease the amount by $6,000,000,000.
On page 26, line 3, decrease the amount by $5,200,000,000.
On page 26, line 11, decrease the amount by $5,200,000,000.
On page 26, line 12, decrease the amount by $4,900,000,000.

On page 26, line 18, decrease the amount by $11,900,000,000.
On page 26, line 19, decrease the amount by $11,600,000,000.
On page 26, line 25, decrease the amount by $20,000,000,000.
On page 27, line 1, decrease the amount by $19,700,000,000.
On page 27, line 7, decrease the amount by $29,200,000,000.
On page 27, line 8, decrease the amount by $28,900,000,000.
On page 27, line 14, decrease the amount by $40,100,000,000.
On page 27, line 15, decrease the amount by $39,700,000,000.
On page 27, line 22, decrease the amount by $13,600,000,000.
On page 27, line 23, decrease the amount by $13,600,000,000.
On page 28, line 5, decrease the amount by $28,700,000,000.
On page 28, line 6, decrease the amount by $28,700,000,000.
On page 28, line 12, decrease the amount by $44,500,000,000.
On page 28, line 13, decrease the amount by $44,500,000,000.
On page 28, line 19, decrease the amount by $61,400,000,000.
On page 28, line 20, decrease the amount by $61,400,000,000.
On page 29, line 2, decrease the amount by $79,900,000,000.
On page 29, line 3, decrease the amount by $79,900,000,000.
On page 30, line 24, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 30, line 25, decrease the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 31, line 6, decrease the amount by $2,200,000,000.
On page 31, line 7, decrease the amount by $1,600,000,000.
On page 31, line 13, decrease the amount by $5,000,000,000.
On page 31, line 14, decrease the amount by $4,200,000,000.
On page 31, line 20, decrease the amount by $6,700,000,000.
On page 31, line 21, decrease the amount by $5,700,000,000.
On page 32, line 2, decrease the amount by $8,700,000,000.
On page 32, line 3, decrease the amount by $7,500,000,000.
On page 32, line 11, decrease the amount by $0.
On page 32, line 12, decrease the amount by $100,000,000.
On page 32, line 17, decrease the amount by $0.
On page 32, line 18, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.
On page 32, line 24, decrease the amount by $0.
On page 32, line 24, decrease the amount by $300,000,000.
On page 33, line 6, decrease the amount by $0.
On page 33, line 7, decrease the amount by $400,000,000.
On page 33, line 13, decrease the amount by $0.
On page 33, line 14, decrease the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 33, line 21, decrease the amount by $700,000,000.
On page 33, line 22, decrease the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 34, line 5, decrease the amount by $1,300,000,000.
On page 34, line 6, decrease the amount by $1,200,000,000.
On page 34, line 13, decrease the amount by $1,900,000,000.
On page 34, line 14, decrease the amount by $1,800,000,000.
On page 34, line 21, decrease the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 34, line 22, decrease the amount by $2,700,000,000.
On page 35, line 5, decrease the amount by $3,700,000,000.
On page 35, line 4, decrease the amount by $3,600,000,000.
On page 35, line 14, decrease the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 35, line 15, decrease the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 35, line 21, decrease the amount by $1,100,000,000.
On page 35, line 22, decrease the amount by $900,000,000.
On page 36, line 3, decrease the amount by $1,600,000,000.
On page 36, line 4, decrease the amount by $1,400,000,000.
On page 36, line 10, decrease the amount by $2,100,000,000.
On page 36, line 11, decrease the amount by $2,000,000,000.
On page 36, line 17, decrease the amount by $2,600,000,000.
On page 36, line 18, decrease the amount by $2,500,000,000.
On page 36, line 25, decrease the amount by $1,100,000,000.
On page 37, line 1, decrease the amount by $1,100,000,000.
On page 37, line 7, decrease the amount by $1,600,000,000.
On page 37, line 8, decrease the amount by $1,500,000,000.
On page 37, line 14, decrease the amount by $2,200,000,000.
On page 37, line 15, decrease the amount by $2,100,000,000.
On page 37, line 21, decrease the amount by $2,700,000,000.
On page 37, line 22, decrease the amount by $2,600,000,000.
On page 38, line 3, decrease the amount by $3,400,000,000.
On page 38, line 4, decrease the amount by $3,300,000,000.
On page 38, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 38, line 12, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 38, line 18, decrease the amount by $4,000,000,000.
On page 38, line 19, decrease the amount by $4,000,000,000.
On page 38, line 25, decrease the amount by $10,000,000,000.
On page 39, line 1, decrease the amount by $10,000,000,000.
On page 39, line 7, decrease the amount by $20,000,000,000.
On page 39, line 8, decrease the amount by $20,000,000,000.
On page 39, line 14, decrease the amount by $34,000,000,000.
On page 39, line 15, decrease the amount by $34,000,000,000.
On page 41, line 17, decrease the amount by $6,400,000,000.
On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $6,400,000,000.
On page 41, line 24, decrease the amount by $10,000,000,000.
On page 41, line 25, decrease the amount by $10,000,000,000.
On page 42, line 6, decrease the amount by $21,000,000,000.
On page 42, line 7, decrease the amount by $21,000,000,000.
On page 42, line 13, decrease the amount by $36,800,000,000.
On page 42, line 14, decrease the amount by $36,800,000,000.
On page 42, line 20, decrease the amount by $49,600,000,000.
On page 42, line 21, decrease the amount by $49,600,000,000.
On page 46, line 18, increase the amount by $100,000,000.
On page 46, line 19, increase the amount by $1,500,000,000.
On page 47, line 6, increase the amount by $100,000,000.
On page 47, line 7, increase the amount by $900,000,000.
On page 49, line 22, increase the amount by $13,700,000,000.
On page 49, line 23, increase the amount by $228,984,000,000.
On page 50, line 10, increase the amount by $11,000,000,000.
On page 50, line 22, increase the amount by $10,500,000,000.
On page 51, line 13, increase the amount by $200,000,000.
On page 51, line 14, increase the amount by $1,800,000,000.
On page 52, line 10, decrease the amount by $100,000,000.
On page 52, line 11, decrease the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 71, line 13, decrease the amount by $119,000,000,000.
On page 71, line 14, decrease the amount by $115,900,000,000.
On page 71, line 16, decrease the amount by $179,100,000,000.
On page 71, line 17, decrease the amount by $176,100,000,000.
On page 71, line 20, decrease the amount by $240,100,000,000.
On page 71, line 21, decrease the amount by $237,300,000,000.

D'AMATO AMENDMENT NO. 248

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. D'AMATO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), supra, as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT IMPOSING NEW FEES ON STATE-CHARTERED BANKS WILL EXACERBATE THE CREDIT CRUNCH AND STIFLE ECONOMIC RECOVERY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) No program to revitalize the economy and reduce unemployment will work unless small businesses, the real engine of economic growth and employment, can get the credit necessary to expand and to hire new workers.

(2) Small businesses employ half the country's workforce and contribute 40 percent to the nation's GNP.

(3) Between 1980 and 1987, while the Fortune 500 companies eliminated 3.1 million jobs, small businesses created 17 million new jobs.

(4) Between 1981 and 1986 small businesses with less than 20 employees created 88 percent of new jobs.

(5) Banks are the single most important source of capital to small businesses. Banks provide approximately 65 percent of all short-term funding for businesses that employee between 21 and 100 employees and nearly 70 percent of the long-term capital for small businesses with between 101 and 500 employees.

(6) The inability of small businesses to obtain credit, the so-called "credit crunch", is stifling economic recovery and employment growth. The Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System has concluded that the credit crunch is a major reason why small business has not been able to expand as much as in the past and employment growth has been so slow.

(7) Based on the current 8 percent capital requirement, banks can lend $12.50 for every dollar of capital. Thus, every dollar that the government takes out of the banking system will reduce credit available to small businesses by $12.50.

(8) The budget resolution provision that requires the federal government to impose $1,379,000,000 in new fees on state-chartered banks will reduce the availability of credit to small businesses by $17,237,500,000.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the budget resolution provision raising additional fees of $1,379,000,000 on state-chartered banks will exacerbate the credit crunch, stifle economic recovery, employment growth and, therefore, should be stricken.

GRAMM (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 249

Mr. GRAMM (for himself, Mr. LOTT, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. MACK, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, and Mr. NICKLES) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), supra, as follows:

On page 41, line 17, decrease the amount by $31,300,000,000.

On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $31,300,000,000.

On page 41, line 24, decrease the amount by $25,000,000,000.

On page 41, line 25, decrease the amount by $25,000,000,000.

On page 42, line 6, decrease the amount by $38,000,000,000.

On page 42, line 7, decrease the amount by $38,000,000,000.

On page 42, line 13, decrease the amount by $51,000,000,000.

On page 42, line 14, decrease the amount by $51,000,000,000.

On page 42, line 20, decrease the amount by $62,000,000,000.

On page 42, line 21, decrease the amount by $62,000,000,000.

On page 41, line 9, decrease the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 41, line 10, decrease the amount by $86,000,000.

On page 41, line 11, decrease the amount by $333,000,000.

On page 41, line 12, decrease the amount by $278,000,000.

On page 41, line 13, decrease the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 38, line 11, decrease the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 38, line 12, decrease the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 38, line 18, increase the amount by $86,000,000.

On page 38, line 19, increase the amount by $86,000,000.

On page 38, line 25, increase the amount by $333,000,000.

On page 39, line 1, increase the amount by $333,000,000.

On page 39, line 7, increase the amount by $278,000,000.

On page 39, line 8, increase the amount by $278,000,000.

On page 39, line 14, decrease the amount by $73,000,000.

On page 39, line 15, decrease the amount by $73,000,000.

On page 2, line 18, decrease the amount by $29,593,000,000.

On page 2, line 19, decrease the amount by $31,022,000,000.

On page 3, line 2, decrease the amount by $40,420,000,000.

On page 3, line 4, decrease the amount by $50,545,000,000.

On page 3, line 6, decrease the amount by $54,440,000,000.

On page 3, line 10, decrease the amount by $29,593,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, decrease the amount by $32,022,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, decrease the amount by $40,420,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, decrease the amount by $50,545,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, decrease the amount by $54,440,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, decrease the amount by $31,300,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, decrease the amount by $25,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, decrease the amount by $38,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, decrease the amount by $51,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, decrease the amount by $62,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $31,300,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $25,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $38,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $51,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by $62,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, decrease the amount by $31,300,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, decrease the amount by $25,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 24, decrease the amount by $38,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 25, decrease the amount by $51,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, decrease the amount by $62,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $31,300,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $25,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 9, decrease the amount by $38,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $51,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $62,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 17, decrease the amount by $1,757,000,000.

On page 6, line 18, increase the amount by $6,108,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, increase the amount by $2,753,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $177,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $7,633,000,000.

On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $1,757,000,000.

On page 7, line 2, increase the amount by $4,351,000,000.

On page 7, line 3, increase the amount by $7,104,000,000.

On page 7, line 4, increase the amount by $6,927,000,000.

On page 7, line 5, decrease the amount by $706,000,000.

On page 7, line 8, decrease the amount by $1,757,000,000.

On page 7, line 9, increase the amount by $6,108,000,000.

On page 7, line 10, increase the amount by $2,753,000,000.

On page 7, line 11, decrease the amount by $177,000,000.

On page 7, line 12, decrease the amount by $7,633,000,000.

On page 9, line 3, decrease the amount by $2,859,000,000.

On page 9, line 4, decrease the amount by $6,104,000,000.

On page 9, line 5, decrease the amount by $6,891,000,000.

On page 9, line 6, decrease the amount by $7,683,000,000.

On page 9, line 7, decrease the amount by $8,462,000,000.

On page 50, line 9, decrease the amount by $29,593,000,000.

On page 50, line 10, decrease the amount by $206,000,000,000.

On page 57, line 7, decrease the amount by $29,593,000,000.

On page 57, line 8, decrease the amount by $206,020,000,000.

On page 39, line 23, decrease the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 39, line 24, decrease the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 40, line 5, increase the amount by $86,000,000.

On page 40, line 6, increase the amount by $86,000,000.

On page 40, line 12, increase the amount by $333,000,000.

On page 40, line 13, increase the amount by $333,000,000.

On page 40, line 19, increase the amount by $278,000,000.

On page 40, line 20, increase the amount by $278,000,000.

On page 41, line 2, decrease the amount by $73,000,000.

On page 41, line 3, decrease the amount by $73,000,000.

SPECTER AMENDMENT NO. 250

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. SPECTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), supra, as follows:

At the appropriate place in the resolution, insert the following:

SEC. . It is the sense of the Congress, in setting forth the budget authority and outlay amounts in this resolution, that it is assumed that funds to reduce the availability and use of illegal drugs will be shifted over the next five years so that the allocation shall be equally distributed between the so-called "supply side" (interdiction, law enforcement, and international supply reduction efforts) and the so-called "demand side" (education, rehabilitation, treatment, and research programs).

DANFORTH (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 251

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. DANFORTH (for himself, Mr. BOREN, and Mr. BAUCUS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), supra, as follows:

At the end of the concurrent resolution, insert the following:

SEC. . It is the sense of the Senate that the Senate Committee on Finance should

give serious consideration to the adoption of a broad and progressive consumption-based tax to replace part or all of the existing tax system when fulfilling its obligation under section 7 of this resolution.

Moreover, it is the sense of the Senate that not later than December 31, 1993, the Senate Committee on Finance should hold hearings on the various issues involved in moving our tax system toward a consumption-based tax system and away from the current income-based system.

MIKULSKI (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 252

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BUMPERS, and Mr. RIEGLE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), supra, as follows:

At end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. . ASSUMPTIONS.

In setting forth the budget authority and outlay amounts in this resolution, Congress assumes that the Children's Immunization and Women's Health programs will be funded at the level requested by the President for fiscal year 1998.

BOND AMENDMENT NO. 253

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. BOND submitted an amendment to the intended to be proposed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), supra, as follows:

On page 41, decrease the amount on line 17 by $6,400,000,000.

On page 41, decrease the amount on line 18 by $3,800,000,000.

On page 41, decrease the amount on line 24 by $700,000,000.

On page 41, decrease the amount on line 25 by $2,000,000,000.

On page 42, decrease the amount on line 6 by $1,500,000,000.

On page 42, decrease the amount on line 7 by $2,000,000,000.

On page 42, decrease the amount on line 13 by $2,600,000,000.

On page 42, decrease the amount on line 14 by $2,000,000,000.

On page 71, decrease the amount on line 13 by $1,500,000,000.

On page 71, decrease the amount on line 14 by $2,000,000,000.

On page 71, decrease the amount on line 16 by $2,600,000,000.

On page 71, decrease the amount on line 17 by $2,000,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 1 by $6,500,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 2 by $1,000,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 3 by $1,900,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 4 by $3,200,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 5 by $700,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 11 by $6,500,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 12 by $1,000,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 13 by $1,900,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 14 by $3,200,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 15 by $700,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 22 by $3,900,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 23 by $2,300,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 24 by $2,400,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 25 by $2,600,000,000.

On page 6, decrease the amount on line 1 by $700,000,000.

On page 6, decrease the amount on line 7 by $3,900,000,000.

On page 6, decrease the amount on line 8 by $2,300,000,000.

On page 6, decrease the amount on line 9 by $2,400,000,000.

On page 6, decrease the amount on line 10 by $2,600,000,000.

On page 6, decrease the amount on line 11 by $700,000,000.

On page 6, decrease the amount on line 17 by $3,900,000,000.

On page 6, decrease the amount on line 18 by $2,300,000,000.

On page 6, decrease the amount on line 19 by $2,400,000,000.

On page 6, decrease the amount on line 20 by $2,600,000,000.

On page 6, decrease the amount on line 21 by $700,000,000.

On page 7, decrease the amount on line 1 by $3,900,000,000.

On page 7, decrease the amount on line 2 by $2,300,000,000.

On page 7, decrease the amount on line 3 by $2,400,000,000.

On page 7, decrease the amount on line 4 by $2,600,000,000.

On page 7, decrease the amount on line 5 by $700,000,000.

On page 7, decrease the amount on line 8 by $3,900,000,000.

On page 7, decrease the amount on line 9 by $6,200,000,000.

On page 7, decrease the amount on line 10 by $8,600,000,000.

On page 7, decrease the amount on line 11 by $11,200,000,000.

On page 7, decrease the amount on line 12 by $11,900,000,000.

On page 8, decrease the amount on line 7 by $3,900,000,000.

On page 8, decrease the amount on line 8 by $2,300,000,000.

On page 8, decrease the amount on line 9 by $2,400,000,000.

On page 8, decrease the amount on line 10 by $2,600,000,000.

On page 8, decrease the amount on line 11 by $700,000,000.

KENNEDY (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 254

Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. KERRY, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. DODD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. PELL, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. WOFFORD, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. CHAFEE) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), supra, as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

It is the sense of the Senate that revenue figures contained in this resolution assume, consistent with the position of the Administration, that the Btu tax will be imposed at the same rate on all fuels purchased by households for home heating purposes and therefore that the supplemental tax on oil will not be imposed on such fuels.

NUNN (DOMENICI) AMENDMENT NO. 255

Mr. NUNN (for himself and Mr. DOMENICI) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), supra, as follows:

At the end of the resolution, insert the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING A NEW TAX SYSTEM FOR THE UNITED STATES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) a higher level of saving and investment for sustained long-term economic growth is a national priority;

(2) the United States must have a tax system that is compatible with policies to promote savings and investment in order to promote greater productivity and more rapid economic growth while maintaining fairness and the principle of progressive taxation;

(3) All individuals at all income levels should be given a fair opportunity to save, earn additional income from their investment and raise their standard of living;

(4) economic growth requires a tax system that facilitates successful competition in the emerging global marketplace;

(5) the tax system of the United States must be simple and efficient;

(6) the Congress should not enact a VAT on top of our current income tax system; and

(7) the current tax code is irreparably flawed and should be replaced with a new progressive consumption based, savings exempt income tax.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Secretary of the Treasury shall conduct a study on the desireability and feasibility of abolishing the current income tax system and replacing it with a progressive consumption-based, savings exempt income tax system described in (c).

(2) the Secretary of the Treasury shall, not later than March 1, 1994, report the results of the study under subsection (a) to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

(3) Following and contingent upon the Treasury study, but not later than December 31, 1994, the Congress and the President should decide whether to adopt a progressive consumption-based, savings exempt income tax system and specify appropriate transition strategy that assures that revenue requirements are met through consumption-based, savings exempt income taxes for individuals and cash flow taxes for corporations.

(4) If the Congress decides to go forward with this reform, not later than December 31, 1995, the Congress and the President should abolish the current income tax system and enact a progressive consumption-based, savings exempt income tax system, which when coupled with the budget reforms and spending reductions are adequate to balance the budget in 2002. Revenue increases would take effect only upon the enactment of spending restraints called for under budget resolutions considered after January 1, 1996.

(c) IN GENERAL.—The progressive consumption-based, savings exempt income tax system described in this subsection shall—

(1) replace the current progressive-rate income tax system with a simplified progressive rate tax on gross income which provides that savings and investment made by individuals would not be taxed; and

(2) replace the current corporate income tax system with a simplified cash flow tax on business gross income (sales minus cost of goods sold) which allows a deduction for savings reinvested in plant and equipment for the business.

(d) OTHER FEATURES.—The system shall provide that—

(1) corporations and individuals would continue to pay the same proportion of the total Federal income tax revenue as is paid under current law;

(2) the rate structure would retain, or improve upon the progressivity of current law;

(3) the rate structure would recognize that every family spends a certain amount of income on necessities and would provide a threshold amount of consumption upon which families would not be taxed;

(4) anti-savings and investment incentives in the current income tax code would be replaced by a system that exempts savings from taxation;

(5) wages, if saved and interest earned from those savings would be exempt from taxation;

(6) dividends earned and saved would be exempt from taxation under the new tax system;

(7) capital gains would, after a minimum holding period, be subject to progressively lower rates the longer the gains remain unrealize;

(8) estate and gift taxes would be modified so that no income escapes taxation at least once during the lifetime of the earner;

(9) there would be no bias in favor of either debt or equity financing;

(10) the export competitiveness of the United States would be enhanced by the providing border adjustability on terms meeting the requirements of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade;

(11) expensing of capital costs would replace other cost recovery systems; and

(12) dividends would be taxed only at the corporate level if the recipient reinvests or otherwise saves the dividends.

(e) The Secretary of the Treasury shall, not later than March 1, 1993, report the results of the study to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate. Such report shall include such legislative recommendations as the Secretary determines appropriate.

SEC. . CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS.

(a) The applicable congressional committees shall, not later than December 31, 1994, conduct such hearings into the tax system described in section as the committees deem appropriate.

(b) CONTENT.—The hearings under subsection (a) should focus on the following issues:

(1) The impact of the new system on the economy, including potential changes in the growth rate of the Gross Domestic Product, changes in the cost of capital and cost of labor, increases in productivity, and increases in the national savings rate.

(2) The impact on the revenue-generating capacity, fairness, and simplification of the tax system;

(3) An appropriate level of basic income to be exempted from taxation;

(4) Evaluation of tax expenditures and other provisions in the tax code that subsidize certain activities;

(5) Evaluation of options to adjust such tax expenditures and other provisions' tax treatment to reflect the investment and consumption components;

(6) Appropriate treatment of gifts and estates to achieve generational equity;

(7) Appropriate treatment of transfer payments; and

(8) Transition problems and recommended measures to alleviate such problems;

(9) Applicable Congressional Committees.—For the purposes of this section, the term "applicable congressional committees" means the following:

(A) Committee on Finance of the Senate.

(B) Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(C) Committees on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(D) Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(E) Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(F) Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

(G) Joint Economic Committee.

KRUEGER (AND DORGAN) AMENDMENT NO. 256

Mr. KRUEGER (for himself and Mr. DORGAN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), supra, as follows:

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

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE USE OF SAVINGS FROM GOVERNMENT STREAMLINING.

It is the sense of the Senate that any amounts saved through the efforts of the National Performance Review Task Force headed by the Vice President and as a result of any other reorganization and streamlining of the Federal Government should be applied to offset the cost of any economic stimulus package enacted in fiscal year 1993. Any amounts saved in excess of those necessary to offset the cost of any such economic stimulus shall be applied to reduce the Federal budget deficit and for no other purpose.

BAUCUS AND OTHERS AMENDMENT NO. 257

Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. PRYOR, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. DORGAN, and Mr. HARKIN), proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), supra, as follows:

At the end of the resolution, insert the following new section:

SEC. . RELIEF FROM ENERGY TAX FOR THE AGRICULTURE INDUSTRY.

It is the sense of the Senate that any energy tax enacted during the 103d Congress should provide such relief to the agriculture industry as is necessary to ensure that the industry does not absorb a disproportionate impact of that tax.

DOLE (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 258

Mr. DOLE (for himself and Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. ROTH, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. GREGG, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. LOTT, Mr. BOND, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURNS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. DANFORTH, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. GORTON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HELMS, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MACK, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WALLOP, and Mr. WARNER) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), supra, as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

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

"(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1994, including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998, as required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (as amended by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990).

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

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1994.
Sec. 2. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 3. Debt increase as a measure of deficits.
Sec. 4. Social security.
Sec. 5. Major functional categories.
Sec. 6. Reconciliation.
Sec. 7. Social security fire wall point of order in the Senate.
Sec. 8. Enforcement procedures.
Sec. 9. Sense of the Congress on a Mandatory Cap.
Sec. 10. Sense of the Congress on paying for the stimulus package.
Sec. 11. Sense of the Congress on a Balanced Budget.
Sec. 12. Sense of the Congress on Budget Enforcement.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

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

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

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

Fiscal year 1994: $878,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $933,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $979,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,019,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,069,900,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $0.
Fiscal year 1995: $0.
Fiscal year 1996: $0.
Fiscal year 1997: $0.
Fiscal year 1998: $0.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $87,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $92,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $97,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $102,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $106,800,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 1994: $790,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $840,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $881,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $917,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $963,100,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $0.
Fiscal year 1995: $0.
Fiscal year 1996: $0.
Fiscal year 1997: $0.
Fiscal year 1998: $0.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—(A) For purposes of comparison with the maximum defi-

cit amount under sections 601(a)(1) and 606 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and for purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: $1,212,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,262,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,297,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,340,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,397,600,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $1,125,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,162,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,189,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,221,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,265,600,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $1,209,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,250,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,274,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,279,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,322,300,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $1,123,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,154,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,168,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,160,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,190,700,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $331,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $316,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $295,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $259,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $252,400,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $333,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $313,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $286,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $243,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $227,600,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $4,746,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $5,119,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $5,485,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $5,824,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $6,151,300,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $11,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $12,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $24,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $37,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $38,700,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $149,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $149,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $141,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $133,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $135,600,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 1994: $387,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $373,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $366,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $338,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $327,100,000,000.

SEC. 4. SOCIAL SECURITY.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $336,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $356,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $375,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $393,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $410,500,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $274,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $286,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $297,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $308,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $319,100,000,000.

SEC. 5. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, new primary loan guarantee commitments, and new secondary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1994 through 1998 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $273,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $284,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $271,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $278,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $261,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $269,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $251,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $251,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $254,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $252,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $18,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $17,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $17,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $16,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $17,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $15,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $15,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,700,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $17,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $17,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $17,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $17,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $17,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $4,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $5,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $4,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $3,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $3,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $3,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $18,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $18,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $18,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $17,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $17,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $15,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $13,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $12,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $12,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $7,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $11,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,100,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $16,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $78,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $16,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $80,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $12,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $82,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $8,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$11,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $84,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $8,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$8,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $86,300,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $39,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,0100,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $39,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $40,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $42,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $42,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $8,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $7,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $7,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $7,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $7,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,600,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $50,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $21,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $49,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $22,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $47,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $12,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $11,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $45,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $25,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $46,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $26,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $118,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $118,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $130,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $130,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $143,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $142,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $157,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $156,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $172,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $171,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $151,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $149,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $171,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $167,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $183,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $182,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $201,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $200,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $220,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $220,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(13) For purposes of section 710 of the Social Security Act, Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund:
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $51,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $58,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $63,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $71,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $71,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $79,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $80,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(14) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $206,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $209,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $212,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $216,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $222,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $220,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $234,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $229,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $239,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $237,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(15) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $6,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $6,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $7,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $7,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $8,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(16) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $35,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $23,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $34,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $34,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $34,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $34,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,400,000,000.
(17) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $14,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $14,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $14,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $14,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $14,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(18) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $12,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $12,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $12,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $12,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $12,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(19) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $240,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $240,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $261,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $261,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $281,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $281,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $299,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $299,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $315,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $315,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(20) For purposes of section 710 of the Social Security Act, Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $250,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $250,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $271,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $271,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $291,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $291,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $307,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $307,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $321,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $321,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(21) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$9,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, −$7,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$17,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, −$9,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$15,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, −$11,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$37,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$12,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$56,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(22) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, −$30,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$32,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, −$30,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$32,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, −$30,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$32,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, −$31,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$32,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$31,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$32,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(23) For purposes of section 710 of the Social Security Act, Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, −$28,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$29,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, −$28,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$29,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, −$28,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$30,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, −$28,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$29,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$29,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$30,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

SEC. 6. RECONCILIATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than May 14, 1993, the committees named in subsections (b) and (c) of this section shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of their respective Houses. After receiving those recommendations, the Committees on the Budget shall each report to their respective Houses a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(b) SENATE COMMITTEES.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY.—The Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) sufficient to reduce outlays: $88,000,000 in fiscal year 1994; and $2,976,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(2) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—(A) The Senate Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) sufficient to reduce outlays: $0 in fiscal year 1994; and $0 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(3) COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS.—The Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) sufficient to reduce outlays: $338,000,000 in fiscal year 1994; and $1,770,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(4) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION.—(A) The Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) sufficient to reduce outlays: $1,700,000,000 in fiscal year 1994; and $7,405,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(B) The Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase revenues: $0 in fiscal year 1994; and $0 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(5) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES.—(A) The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) sufficient to reduce outlays: $125,000,000 in fiscal year 1994; and $1,124,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(B) The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase revenues: $0 in fiscal year 1994; and $0 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(6) COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS.—(A) The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) sufficient to reduce outlays: $13,000,000 in fiscal year 1994; and $1,254,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(B) The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase revenues: $0 in fiscal year 1994; and $0 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(7) COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.—The Senate Committee on Finance shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) sufficient to reduce outlays: $2,453,000,000 in fiscal year 1994; and $37,956,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(8) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS.—The Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) sufficient to reduce outlays: $46,000,000 in fiscal year 1994; and $10,294,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(9) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Senate Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) sufficient

to reduce outlays: $0 in fiscal year 1994; and $345,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(10) COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES.—(A) The Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) sufficient to reduce outlays: $66,000,000 in fiscal year 1994; and $6,697,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(B) The Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase revenues: $0 in fiscal year 1994; and $0 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(11) COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS.—The Senate Committee on Small Business shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) sufficient to reduce outlays: $0 in fiscal year 1994; and $0 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(12) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) sufficient to reduce outlays: $266,000,000 in fiscal year 1994; and $2,580,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(c) HOUSE COMMITTEES.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) sufficient to reduce outlays: $88,000,000 in fiscal year 1994; and $2,976,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(2) COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS.—(A) The House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) sufficient to reduce outlays: $202,000,000 in fiscal year 1994; and $1,415,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(B) The House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase revenues: $0 in fiscal year 1994; and $0 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(3) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR.—The House Committee on Education and Labor shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) sufficient to reduce outlays: $66,000,000 in fiscal year 1994; and $6,697,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(4) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) sufficient to reduce outlays: $1,886,000,000 in fiscal year 1994; and $16,210,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(4A) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS.—The House Committee on Government Operations shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) sufficient to reduce outlays: $0 in fiscal year 1994; and $693,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(5) COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS.—The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) sufficient to reduce outlays: $110,000,000 in fiscal year 1994; and $996,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(6) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The House Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) sufficient to reduce outlays: $0 in fiscal year 1994; and $345,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(7) COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES.—The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) sufficient to reduce outlays: $0 in fiscal year 1994; and $205,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(8) COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE.—The House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) sufficient to reduce outlays: $46,000,000 in fiscal year 1994; and $9,601,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(9) COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION.—The House Committee on Public Works and Transportation shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) sufficient to reduce outlays: $31,000,000 in fiscal year 1994; and $296,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(10) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY.—The House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) sufficient to reduce outlays: $0 in fiscal year 1994; and $0 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(11) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) sufficient to reduce outlays: $266,000,000 in fiscal year 1994; and $2,580,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(12) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays: $2,391,000,000 in fiscal year 1994; and $30,166,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

SEC. 7. SOCIAL SECURITY FIRE WALL POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.

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

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

SEC. 8. ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURES.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—

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

(A) with respect to fiscal year 1996:

$475,858,000,000 in new budget authority and $513,706,000,000 in outlays;

(B) with respect to fiscal year 1997:

$465,273,000,000 in new budget authority and $490,399,000,000 in outlays; and

(C) with respect to fiscal year 1998:

$462,953,000,000 in new budget authority and $488,877,000,000 in outlays.

(2) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

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

SEC. 9. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON A MANDATORY CAP

(a) It is the Sense of the Congress that legislation should be enacted that—

(1) caps the growth of mandatory spending for all programs except Social Security at a level that allows for beneficiary and inflation growth;

(2) prohibits, through a super-majority point of order, the consideration of congressional budget resolutions or direct spending legislation that would cause the mandatory cap to be exceeded; and

(3) provides processes, including reconciliation and sequestration procedures, to provide for orderly restraint in mandatory spending growth except Social Security if such spending exceeds the cap.

(b) It is the sense of the Congress that the conference report on this concurrent resolution on the budget should—

(1) include spending limits on aggregate mandatory spending excluding Social Security, at levels that allow for inflation and beneficiary growth;

(2) include spending limits on defense and non-defense discretionary spending for fiscal years 1994 through 1998; and,

(3) include reconciliation instructions to restrain mandatory spending growth to meet the mandatory cap.

SEC. 10. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON PAYING FOR THE STIMULUS PACKAGE

It is the Sense of the Congress that the budget effects of the President's economic stimulus package should not be exempted from the Congressional budget process and that if such legislation is enacted it should abide by "pay-as-you-go" and not cause an increase in the deficit.

SEC. 11. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON A BALANCED BUDGET

It is the Sense of the Congress that the budget should be balanced and that legislation should be adopted mandating a balanced budget.

SEC. 12. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

It is the Sense of the Congress that budget enforcement procedures should be enacted including:

(a) individual statutory caps on defense and non-defense discretionary spending enforced by points of order and sequester orders;

(b) pay-as-you-go discipline for mandatory spending programs enforced by super-majority points of order and sequester orders; and,

(c) fixed statutory maximum deficit amounts that are enforced by super-majority points of order and sequester orders.

DANFORTH AMENDMENT NO. 259

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. DANFORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), supra, as follows:

At the end of the concurrent resolution, insert the following:

"An economic program that does not control the growth of entitlements cannot strengthen our economy."

KERREY AMENDMENT NO. 260

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. KERREY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), supra, as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF SENATE REGARDING ADDITIONAL REDUCTIONS IN AGRICULTURAL SPENDING.

( ) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that any further reductions in agricultural spending required under this resolution be accomplished by increasing the prices that producers receive for their commodities in the marketplace rather than by making additional reductions in farm price support payment rates.

MURKOWSKI AMENDMENT NO. 261

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), supra, as follows:

On page 2, decrease the amount on line 18, by $45,000,000.

On page 2, decrease the amount on line 19, by $90,000,000.

On page 3, decrease the amount on line 2, by $134,000,000.

On page 3, decrease the amount on line 4, by $134,000,000.

On page 3, decrease the amount on line 6, by $134,000,000.

On page 3, decrease the amount on line 10, by $45,000,000.

On page 3, decrease the amount on line 11, by $90,000,000.

On page 3, decrease the amount on line 12, by $134,000,000.

On page 3, decrease the amount on line 13, by $134,000,000.

On page 3, decrease the amount on line 14, by $134,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 6, by $45,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 7, by $90,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 8, by $134,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 9, by $134,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 11, by $134,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 15, by $45,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 16, by $90,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 17, by $134,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 18, by $134,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 19, by $134,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 1, by $45,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 2, by $90,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 3, by $134,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 4, by $134,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 5, by $134,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 11, by $45,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 12, by $90,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 13, by $134,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 14, by $134,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 15, by $134,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 22, by $45,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 23, by $90,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 24, by $134,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 25, by $134,000,000.

On page 6, decrease the amount on line 1, by $134,000,000.

On page 6, decrease the amount on line 7, by $45,000,000.

On page 6, decrease the amount on line 8, by $90,000,000.

On page 6, decrease the amount on line 9, by $134,000,000.

On page 6, decrease the amount on line 10, by $134,000,000.

On page 6, decrease the amount on line 11, by $134,000,000.

On page 41, decrease the amount on line 17, by $45,000,000.

On page 41, decrease the amount on line 18, by $45,000,000.

On page 41, decrease the amount on line 24, by $90,000,000.

On page 41, decrease the amount on line 25, by $90,000,000.

On page 42, decrease the amount on line 6, by $134,000,000.

On page 42, decrease the amount on line 7, by $134,000,000.

On page 42, decrease the amount on line 13, by $134,000,000.

On page 42, decrease the amount on line 14, by $134,000,000.

On page 42, decrease the amount on line 20, by $134,000,000.

On page 42, decrease the amount on line 21, by $134,000,000.

On page 50, decrease the amount on line 9, by $45,000,000.

On page 50, decrease the amount on line 10, by $537,000,000.

On page 57, decrease the amount on line 18, by $45,000,000.

On page 57, decrease the amount on line 19, by $537,000,000.

On page 71, decrease the amount on line 13, by $134,000,000.

On page 71, decrease the amount on line 14, by $134,000,000.

On page 71, decrease the amount on line 16, by $134,000,000.

On page 71, decrease the amount on line 17, by $134,000,000.

On page 71, decrease the amount on line 20, by $134,000,000.

On page 71, decrease the amount on line 21, by $134,000,000.

SASSER (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 262

Mr. SASSER (for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER) proposed to the concurrent resolution (S Con. Res. 18), supra, as follows:

At the end of the resolution, insert the following:

SEC. . REDUCING FEDERAL HEALTH CARE COSTS THROUGH COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH CARE REFORM.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the vast majority of rising mandatory program costs is due to increasing federal health care costs, and these costs are assumed in the levels set forth in this resolution;

(2) health care reform is essential to curb the escalating costs of health entitlement programs to reduce the deficit;

(3) the reduction in health costs in this budget resolution should be augmented by further savings in federal health outlays as a part of comprehensive health care reform which will be reflected in future budget resolutions; and

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

NUNN (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 263

Mr. NUNN (for himself, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. ROBB, Mr. DANFORTH, Mr. KERREY, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. BOND, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. COVERDELL, and Mr. THURMOND) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), supra, as follows:

Strike all that occurs beginning on page 5 line 1 and ending on page 45 line 23 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Fiscal year 1994: $1,221,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,285,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,342,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,406,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,482,800,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $1,134,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,187,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,234,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,287,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,350,100,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $1,220,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,279,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,309,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,335,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,392,500,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $1,135,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,183,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,201,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,216,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,260,200,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $306,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $299,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $266,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $240,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $248,300,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $314,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $308,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $270,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $237,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $238,400,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $4,723,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $5,082,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $5,419,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $5,739,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $6,063,900,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $11,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $12,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $24,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $37,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $38,700,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $149,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $149,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $141,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $133,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $135,600,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 1994: $363,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $358,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $336,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $320,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $324,400,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 1994: $1,056,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,171,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,293,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,418,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,541,900,000,000.

SEC. 5. SOCIAL SECURITY.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $336,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $356,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $375,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $393,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $410,500,000,000.

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

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

SEC. 6. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, new primary loan guarantee commitments, and new secondary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1994 through 1998 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, $263,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $277,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, $262,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $272,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, $253,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $264,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $248,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $249,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $254,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $252,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, $19,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $19,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $17,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $18,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $17,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $18,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $18,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,700,000,000.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $18,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $18,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $20,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $21,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $21,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $4,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $5,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $4,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $5,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $5,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $21,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $23,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $23,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $24,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $24,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $15,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $14,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $13,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $12,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $7,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $12,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,100,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $17,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $78,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $17,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $80,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $14,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $82,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $10,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$10,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $84,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $10,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$6,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $86,300,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $40,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $41,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $43,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $44,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $46,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $9,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, $8,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $8,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $9,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $9,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,600,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $54,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $21,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $56,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $22,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $60,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $12,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $11,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $62,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $25,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $68,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $26,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $118,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $117,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $131,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $130,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $146,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $145,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $163,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $161,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $181,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $179,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $151,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $149,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $171,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $167,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $184,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $183,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $201,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $201,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $221,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $221,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(13) For purposes of section 710 of the Social Security Act, Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund:
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $51,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $61,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $63,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $71,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $71,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $80,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $80,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(14) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $211,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $213,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $220,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $221,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $236,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $231,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $252,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $243,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $260,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $253,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(15) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $6,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $6,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $7,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $7,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $8,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(16) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $35,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $23,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $36,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $37,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $38,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $39,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $39,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,400,000,000.
(17) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $15,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $16,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $16,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $17,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $18,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(18) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $13,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $13,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $15,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $15,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(19) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $239,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $239,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $260,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $260,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $278,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $278,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $294,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $294,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $309,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $309,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(20) For purposes of section 710 of the Social Security Act, Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $250,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $250,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $270,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $270,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $288,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $288,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $302,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $302,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $315,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $315,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(21) The corresponding levels of gross interest on the public debt are as follows:
Fiscal year 1994: $307,458,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $326,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $345,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $361,360,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $375,968,000,000.
(22) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, −$3,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, −$6,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$6,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, −$8,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$17,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, −$10,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$40,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$10,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$62,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(23) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, −$30,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$32,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, −$30,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$32,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, −$31,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$32,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, −$31,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$32,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$32,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$33,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(24) For purposes of section 710 of the Social Security Act, Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, −$28,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$29,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, −$28,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$30,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, −$28,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$30,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, −$29,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$29,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$29,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$30,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

SEC. 6A. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON CONTROLLING MANDATORY SPENDING.

It is the sense of the Senate that the Congress should enact a cap on the growth of mandatory spending programs that—

(1) is enacted this year and takes effect beginning in fiscal year 1996;

(2) includes spending limits on mandatory spending programs, excluding Social Security, at levels that allow for increases for inflation plus increases in case load plus an additional allowance of 1 percent in fiscal year 1996, 1 percent in fiscal year 1997, an 0 percent in fiscal year 1998 and all subsequent years;

(3) prohibits, through a super-majority point of order, the consideration of concurrent budget resolutions or direct spending legislation that would cause the mandatory cap to be exceeded;

(4) provides processes, including reconciliation and sequestration procedures, to provide for the orderly enforcement of the mandatory cap if spending for a mandatory program exceeds the cap; and

(5) Provides for a period of not less than 60 days before such sequestration for committees of the House and the Senate with jurisdiction over mandatory programs which are determined to be exceeding these allowable spending levels to report legislation that reduces direct spending in their jurisdiction by an amount sufficient to eliminate the excess spending.

(6) Ensures that reductions in federal spending for mandatory programs required by such legislation is not to be achieved by shifting costs to state and local governments.

BRADLEY (AND HOLLINGS) AMENDMENT NO. 264

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. BRADLEY (for himself and Mr. HOLLINGS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), supra, as follows:

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

SEC. . Sense of the Senate regarding Line Item Veto authority including Appropriations and Tax Expenditures.

It is the Sense of the Senate that the President should be granted line-item veto authority over items of appropriation and tax expenditures. The line item authority should provide that:

(1) Each item of appropriation or each tax expenditure should be separately enrolled for presentment to the President; and

(2) The new authority would expire at the conclusion of the 103d Congress.

PRESSLER (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 265

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. PRESSLER (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), supra, as follows:

At the end of the resolution, insert the following:

SEC. . ASSUMPTIONS.

In setting forth the budget authority and outlay amounts in this resolution, Congress assumes that funding to reduce the number of defense civilian, active duty and reserve military personnel from being released into the unemployment lines, and funding for WIC, Head Start, Maternal and Child Health, and humanitarian aid will be increased by amounts made available by the elimination of cargo preference.

PRESSLER (AND GRASSLEY) AMENDMENT NO. 266

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. PRESSLER (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), supra, as follows:

At the end of the resolution, insert the following:

SEC. . ASSUMPTIONS.

In setting forth the budget authority and outlay amounts in this resolution, Congress assumes that funding to reduce the number of defense civilian, active duty and reserve military personnel from being released into the unemployment lines, and funding for WIC, Head Start, Maternal and Child Health, and humanitarian aid will be increased by amounts made available by requiring U.S.-flag companies to offer world competitive bids in order to carry preference cargoes.

CAMERON PARISH LANDS CONVEYANCE ACT

JOHNSTON AMENDMENTS NOS. 267 AND 268

Mr. MITCHELL (for Mr. JOHNSTON) proposed two amendments to the bill (S. 433) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Cameron Parish, LA, and for other purposes, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 267

On page 3, line 23, strike "141.4 acres" and insert in lieu thereof, "162.36 acres".

AMENDMENT NO. 268

On page 4, line 2, strike "February," and insert in lieu thereof, "March,".

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 24, beginning at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on taking stock: assessing environmental threats.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 24 at 10 a.m. to hold a closed briefing on Treaty Doc. 102–37, the Treaty on Open Skies.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be permitted to meet in executive session on March 24, 1993, at 9:30 a.m. to consider the nomination of Dr. Lawrence Summers to be Under Secretary of the Treasury.

I further ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be permitted to meet March 24, 1993, at 10 a.m. to hear testimony from the Honorable Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

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

COMMITEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 24 at 2 p.m. to hold a nomination hearing on Harriet Babbitt to be Ambassador to the OAS.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 24, at 11:30 a.m. to hold a nomination hearing on Joan Spero to be Under Secretary of State for Economic and Agricultural Affairs.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, 9:30 a.m., March 24, 1993, to receive testimony on S. 473, the Department of Energy National Competitiveness Technology Partnership Act of 1993.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, NATIONAL PARKS AND FORESTS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Public Lands, National Parks and Forests of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, 2:30 p.m., March 24, 1993, to receive testimony on radio and television broadcast use fees on public lands.

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

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs would like to request unanimous consent to hold a hearing on S. 616, the compensation COLA bill, and oversight of VA claims processing and adjudication at 1:30 p.m. on Wednesday, March 24, 1993. The hearing will be held in room 418 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet on Wednesday, March 24, 1993, at 9:30 a.m., in open/closed session, to receive testimony regarding the international security environment.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REV. JAMES PARIS WILSON

• Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, today I rise to honor Rev. James Paris Wilson, an outstanding spiritual and community leader who has made significant contributions to his hometown of Saginaw as well as to the State of Michigan.

Reverend Wilson began serving as pastor of Mount Olive Baptist Church in Saginaw in October 1958. As pastor of one of Saginaw's most renowned churches, he has ministered to thousands of individuals and families. Under his leadership, Mount Olive Baptist Church has seen three major renovations which improved the facility to better serve, not only the congregation, but the community as well.

As a prominent member of the religious community, Reverend Wilson has been most generous with his time, giving to causes and endeavors which mirror his strong religious beliefs. Reverend Wilson organized the Saginaw Valley Baptist District Association and has served as its moderator for over 30 years. Reverend Wilson also served as president of the Wolverine State Baptist Convention. During his 20 years of service, the convention purchased and established its first headquarters building in Saginaw.

As a citizen concerned with the well-being of others, Reverend Wilson served as the first African-American on the Saginaw County Board of Commissioners. He also served on the Saginaw City Council. During his political career he was known as a voice for the voiceless and a committed advocate for the poor, senior citizens, and the disenfranchised.

Mr. President, Reverend Wilson's commitment to his parishioners and his community should be an example to us all. He has shown remarkable courage and dedication throughout his distinguished career. I would like to join Reverend Wilson's family and friends in thanking him for his service and wishing him well in his retirement.•

ST. ROCCO PARISH 90TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, this year of 1993 marks the 90th anniversary of St. Rocco Parish in Johnston, RI. More than 8,000 parishioners will be celebrating this important landmark in a growing tradition of faith and community.

The crowning event of the anniversary will be a Solemn Mass celebrated by His Excellency Bishop Louis E. Gelineau, Bishop of Providence, on Sunday, April 25, 1993, at 4 p.m.

St. Rocco Parish was established in 1903 by the Scalabrinian Fathers, also known as the Missionary Fathers of St. Charles Borromeo, to serve the Catholic Italian immigrants living in the Thornton, Knightsville, and Silver Lake neighborhood.

The founder and first pastor of St. Rocco Parish was Father Domenico Belliotti, C.S. The original St. Rocco Church was built on Clemence Street in the Thornton section of Cranston and was dedicated in 1903.

Land for a new church was purchased on Atwood Avenue in Johnston in 1938 under the guidance of Father Bartolomeo Marenchino, C.S. The Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart began to serve the parish community in 1942.

Under the guidance of Father Angelo Susin, C.S., the new church was built and dedicated in 1951. St. Rocco School was built in 1963 and now has an enrollment of 320 children from pre-K to Grade 8, staffed by the Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart.

St. Rocco Parish Community now includes about 3,000 families. A list of some of the parish societies indicates just how much the parish has grown and how active the community has become.

Parish societies include: Holy Name Society, St. Rocco Women's Guild, St. Vincent DePaul Society, Legion of Mary, CYO Youth Group, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Cub Scouts and Brownies, Prayer Group, Altar Boy Group, and St. Rocco School PTG.

I am confident that I speak for all Rhode Islanders who have been touched by its good works, when I say we join in thanks and heartfelt wishes for the continued growth and success of St. Rocco Parish.

DEATH OF ELLEN ABRAMS

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Ellen Abrams, a wonderful person and a truly outstanding journalist from Connecticut who, tragically, was killed last week while jogging near her home.

Ellen Abrams reported for WTNH-TV for the past 7 years, and worked for WVIT-TV, the Connecticut Radio Network and WCNX radio before that. As a Senator and, before that, as attorney general of Connecticut, I got to know Ellen very well, and I can tell you that she was one of the best. She was a real professional, dedicated to her craft and to the public interest. She was also a warm and genuine human being who was a pleasure to work with, even while she was asking the tough questions.

Despite being in a profession where people often move all around the country, in the words of our former Governor, Ella Grasso, Ellen Abrams blossomed where she was planted—in Connecticut. She grew up in West Hartford and attended the Loomis-Chaffee School in Windsor. After attending George Washington University and Trinity College, she set out on a career that was always on an upward path. Ellen's talent cut through the clutter of a competitive environment and she became a success by virtue of that ability and her own hard work. At WTNH, she developed special expertise covering crime and the criminal justice system. She received several awards, including a regional Emmy nomination, for her series on the prison system in Connecticut.

My heart and prayers go out to Ellen's family, including her husband, Peter Darby, her sister, and her mother. We will all miss her very much. In her time on Earth, she really made a difference in the lives of many people, and she enriched her profession and our State by her presence.

IRRESPONSIBLE CONGRESS? HERE IS TODAY'S BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the Federal debt—run up by the U.S. Congress—stood at $4,218,250,912,999.50 as of the close of business on Monday, March 22.

Anybody remotely familiar with the U.S. Constitution is bound to know that no President can spend a dime of the taxpayer's money that has not first been authorized and appropriated by the Congress of the United States. Therefore, no Member of Congress, House or Senate, can pass the buck as to the responsibility for this long-term and shameful display of irresponsibility. The dead cat lies on the doorstep of the Congress of the United States.

During the past fiscal year, it cost the American taxpayers $286,022,000,000 merely to pay the interest on reckless Federal spending, approved by Congress—spending of the taxpayers' money over and above what the Federal Government has collected in taxes and other income. This has been what is called deficit spending—but it is really a form of thievery. Averaged out, this astounding interest paid on the Federal debt amounts to $5.5 billion every week, or $785 million every day—just to pay, I reiterate for the purpose of emphasis, the interest on the existing Federal debt.

Looking at it on a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes $16,422.44—thanks to the big-spenders in Congress for the past half century. The interest payments on this massive debt, average out to be $1,127.85 per year for each man, woman, and child in America. Or, looking at it still another way, for each family of four, the tab—to pay the interest alone, mind you—comes to $4,511.40 per year.

Does this prompt you to wonder what America's economic stability would be like today if, for the past five or six decades, there had been a Congress with the courage and the integrity to maintain a balanced Federal budget? The arithmetic speaks for itself.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE NO-FLY ZONE OVER BOSNIA

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about an issue that has been of great concern to me for the past year—that is, the turmoil in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and how the United States should, or should not, respond.

On numerous occasions I have addressed this body to express my serious reservations about the involvement of U.S. military personnel in the continuing conflict in that nation.

Now another decision is reported to be in the making by the U.N. which will involve the United States. As the U.N. Security Council is considering a resolution calling for the enforcement of the no-fly zone over Bosnia, I express now my concerns with the United States becoming involved in this enforcement action.

Mr. President, at my specific request, the chairmen of both the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence conducted hearings and briefings within the past few weeks to receive testimony from the intelligence community and the Department of Defense on the situation in the former Yugoslavia and the various military and political options available. I urge my colleagues to carefully review the transcripts from these sessions which, in my opinion, contain very valuable information and judgments which Senators should consider before deciding to support the use of U.S. military force in this conflict.

Only one of the three briefings and hearings on this subject was conducted in open session. I am now asking the chairmen of the Armed Services Committee and the Intelligence Committee to request the respective agencies, which sent witnesses, to declassify as much of the testimony as possible from the two closed sessions.

My remarks today draw from the testimony in open session conducted by the Armed Services Committee on January 29—testimony which reinforced my belief that there is very little to be gained from a military perspective for the international community to proceed with enforcing the no-fly zone. In fact, testimony from witnesses from the Joint Chiefs of Staff revealed this interesting conclusion—contrary to popular belief, most of the violations of the no-fly zone over the past several months have been by Croatian military aircraft, not Serbian. Further, from an operational viewpoint, U.N. aircraft attempting to enforce a no-fly zone would have great difficulty distinguishing between the aircraft of the various factions.

Those who argue that enforcement of the no-fly zone will deter or detract from the ability of Serbian forces to continue fighting may be in for a surprise if these current patterns of flight activity continue. An enforcement resolution could well result in the shooting down of more Croatian planes than Serbian planes.

The witnesses at that Armed Services hearing were Lt. Gen. Martin Brandtner, USMC, director for operations for the JCS; and Rear Adm. Mike Cramer, USN, the director for JCS support, DIA—the top intelligence officer for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Admiral Cramer was asked directly—"even if the coalition were to completely enforce the no-fly zone, with no planes flying, you are saying * * * it would not make an appreciable military difference?" Admiral Cramer's response was—"Yes, sir, that is correct." When asked to elaborate on his remarks later in the hearing, Admiral Cramer stated—"It (enforcement of a no-fly zone) is not a significant contributor to what really the Bosnian Serbs are able to do on the ground with artillery and other means."

Given these important opinions expressed by experts entrusted to know, why are we pushing forward in the United Nations for this military option and putting at risk our military personnel? If we go forward and participate, pursuant to a U.N. mandate, and the missions fail to achieve any measurable military objective—as predicted by the Department of Defense witnesses—what do we then say to the world by way of explanation? Also, there have been no opinions given regarding the impact of executing this option on the ground forces of other nations currently fulfilling the "peacekeeping" role in the former Yugoslavia.

I believe that we all have an obligation to the men and women in uniform to ensure that if we send them on a military mission, we have thoroughly examined the risks of that mission, the chances for success, and the steps that we will take if we do not succeed. For example, if the enforcement of the no-fly zone does not bring about an end to the fighting, what will we do next? Have we considered that next military step? Is it most likely to be a call to use these same aircraft to suppress the hostile—and most damaging—Serbian use of heavy mortars and artillery? Are we slowly being drawn into an endless military engagement in a nation where the various ethnic groups have been fighting for centuries?

When General Brandtner was asked about the enforcement of the no-fly zone and the lifting of the arms embargo as steps to send a message of international resolve he responded—"History has proven that we have seldom weakened the will of nations by the kind of action that is contemplated."

I have talked to my Senate colleagues about this impending decision for the United States to become involved in this no-fly zone military operation and can find no evidence of any substantial consultation between the Congress and the executive branch on this issue. Given the conflicting testimony, given the greater—far greater—risk to our military personnel than in the airdrop mission, I urge the administration to initiate a consultation process prior to a final decision.

VERMONT LAW SCHOOL

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise today to briefly commend the Vermont Law School. For the last 3 years, Vermont Law School has been ranked No. 1 for environmental law, according to U.S. News and World Report. Vermont, long known for its regard for the environment, is helping to promote environmental protection nationwide by providing the best training to the future environmental lawyers of this country. Three years as the best school is a tremendous accomplishment and I commend the administrators, faculty, and students for their accomplishment.

CAMERON PARISH CONVEYANCE ACT

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 32, S. 433, Cameron Parish land conveyance bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 433) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Cameron Parish, LA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 267 AND 268

Mr. MITCHELL. On behalf of Senator JOHNSTON, I send two amendments to the desk and ask for their immediate consideration en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendments en bloc.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. MITCHELL], for Mr. JOHNSTON, proposes amendments en bloc numbered 267 and 268.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

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

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 267

On page 3, line 23, strike "141.4 acres" and insert in lieu thereof, "162.36 acres".

AMENDMENT NO. 268

On page 4, line 2, strike "February," and insert in lieu thereof, "March,".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments (Nos. 267 and 268) were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 433

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

SECTION 1. CONVEYANCE OF LANDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the limitations set forth in this section, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") is directed to convey by quitclaim deed and without monetary consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands located in Cameron Parish, Louisiana, as described in section 2, to the West Cameron Port Commission for use as a public port facility or for other public purposes.

(b) RESERVATION OF MINERALS.—The United States hereby excepts and reserves from the provisions of subsection (a) all minerals underlying the lands referred to in section 2.

(c) REVERSION TO THE UNITED STATES.—If the lands conveyed by the United States pursuant to this Act cease to be operated by the West Cameron Port Authority for use as a public port facility or for other public purposes, such lands shall revert to the United States: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall not acquire any lands under this subsection if the Secretary determines that such lands, or any portion thereof, have become contaminated with hazardous substances (as defined in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. 9601)).

(d) RETENTION OF PROPERTY FOR COAST GUARD.—The Secretary, after consultation with the Coast Guard and the West Cameron Port Authority, shall except and reserve from such conveyance all right, title, and interest to approximately 3.0 acres of lands previously used by the Coast Guard, along with any improvements thereon, for the continued use and benefit of the Coast Guard.

(e) RETENTION OF OTHER ENCUMBRANCES.—(1) The Secretary shall not convey any right, title, or interest held by the United States on the date of enactment of this Act in or to the following encumbrances, as identified on the map referred to in section 2—

(A) a permit granted to the United States Army to install and maintain an automatic tide gauge for recording storm and hurricane tides; and

(B) height restrictions in relation to the radio beacon tower.

(2) The Secretary, after consultation with the Coast Guard, may include in the deed of conveyance any other restrictions the Secretary determines necessary for the benefit of the Coast Guard, including, but not limited to restrictions on height of structures, and requirements to shield seaward facing lights.

SEC. 2. LAND DESCRIPTION.

The lands to be conveyed pursuant to this Act comprise approximately 162.36 acres of Federal lands located within the irregular section 32, Township 15 south, range 10 west, Louisiana Meridian, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Cameron Parish Land Conveyance" and dated March 1993.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. DOLE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE PRODUCTION OF RECORDS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, in behalf of myself and the distinguished Republican leader, Senator DOLE, I send to the desk a resolution on authorization of the production of Senate records and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 82) to authorize the production of records by the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, the Department of Justice has requested access to documents from the Committee on Governmental Affairs relating to its review into management practices at the National Archives and Records Administration. The Committee's investigation and report documented serious management problems at the National Archives and referred the matter to appropriate executive branch agencies for review.

In connection with a review that it has initiated in response to the Committee's referral, the Department of Justice is seeking records of testimony and exhibits received by the committee in this matter. Consistent with the Senate's customary practice, this resolution would authorize the chairman and ranking minority member of the committee to provide to the Department records of the committee's investigation into management practices at the National Archives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution (S. Res. 82) and its preamble are considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 82

Whereas, the Committee on Governmental Affairs has conducted an investigation of serious management problems at the National Archives and Record Administration;

Whereas, as a result of its investigation, the Committee referred matters that it had investigated to executive branch agencies for investigation and appropriate action;

Whereas, the Department of Justice has requested access to records of the Committee's investigation as part of the inquiry resulting from the Committee's referral;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate can, by administrative or judicial process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate is needed for the promotion of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee on Governmental Affairs, acting jointly, are authorized to provide to the Department of Justice records of testimony and exhibits received by the Committee in its investigation of management problems at the National Archives and Records Administration, except for materials for which a privilege should be asserted.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ORDERS FOR TOMORROW

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 9:20 a.m., on today, Thursday, March 25; that following the prayer, the Journal of the proceedings be deemed approved to date; that at 9:25 a.m. the Senate resume consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 18, the budget resolution; that when the Senate resumes consideration of the budget resolution, the only amendments remaining in order to the resolution be the following first-degree amendments with no second-degree amendments in order thereto:

An amendment by Senator BRADLEY, No. 264; an amendment by Senator BROWN, No. 208; an amendment by Senator KEMPTHORNE, No. 195; and amendment by Senator COHEN, No. 200; an amendment by Senator GRAMM of Texas, No. 246; an amendment by Senator BOND, No. 253; an amendment by Senator SPECTER, No. 250; an amendment by Senator MURKOWSKI, No. 205; an amendment by Senator CRAIG, No. 223; an amendment by Senator DANFORTH, No. 259; an amendment by Senator D'AMATO, No. 248; an amendment by Senator BROWN, No. 247; an amendment by Senator SPECTER, No. 238; an amendment by Senator COHEN, No. 239; an amendment by Senator WALLOP, No. 241.

I further ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered in the order as listed; that any votes with respect to any of the listed amendments following the first vote be for a maximum of 15 minutes only; further, that if the listed amendments have not been disposed of prior to 12 noon on Thursday, March 25, that they no longer be in order; that at 12 noon, the Senate vote on any pending amendment, and that the previous unanimous-consent

agreement regarding the disposition of the budget resolution remain in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, let me summarize what will occur as a result of this agreement.

The Senate will resume consideration of this resolution at 9:25 a.m. this morning at which time there will be a vote on the Bradley amendment. That vote will be pursuant to our regular procedures which will be for 15 minutes plus a maximum extension of 5 minutes for a total time of up to 20 minutes on the first vote.

Thereafter, it will be in order for Senators to offer the amendments as listed, and each vote on subsequent amendments, and that would be beginning with the Brown Amendment No. 208, will be for a maximum of 15 minutes; that at 12 noon, the Senate will complete action on whatever amendment is pending and no further amendments will thereafter be in order. So if an amendment on this list has not been called up by 12 noon it will not be in order. And pursuant to the previous agreement, the Senate will then, after disposing of the last pending amendment, as of 12 noon, proceed to final passage of the budget resolution and then to consideration of the supplemental appropriations bill.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MODIFICATION OF UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I renew my previous request with the following modification, that the Senate when it completes its business today stand in recess until 9:25 a.m. on Thursday, March 25, and that at 9:30 a.m. the Senate resume consideration of the budget resolution.

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

The text of the agreement follows:

Ordered, That at 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, March 25, 1993, the Senate resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 18, the Congressional Budget Resolution, with the only amendments remaining in order to the resolution to be the following, with no second degree amendments in order thereto:

Bradley, No. 264.
Brown, No. 208.
Kempthorne, No. 195.
Cohen, No. 200.
Gramm, No. 246.
Bond, No. 253.
Specter, No. 250.
Murkowski, No. 205.
Craig, No. 223.
Danforth, No. 259.
D'Amato, No. 248.
Brown, No. 247.
Specter, No. 238.
Cohen, No. 239.
Wallop, No. 241.

Ordered further, That the amendments be considered in the order as listed and that any votes ordered with respect to the listed amendments, following the first vote, be for a maximum of 15 minutes only.

Ordered further, That if the listed amendments have not been disposed of prior to 12 noon, Thursday, March 25, 1993, that they no longer be in order.

Ordered further, That no amendments on the subject of Social Security be in order.

Ordered further, That at 12 noon on Thursday, March 25, 1993, the Senate dispose of the pending amendments and proceed to H. Con. Res. 64, without any intervening action or debate.

Ordered further, That adoption of the House Concurrent Resolution 64, after the Senate language, as amended, has been substituted in lieu thereof, be no later than 12 noon on Thursday, March 25, 1993.

Ordered further, That upon the disposition of the House Budget Resolution, the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on disagreeing votes of the two Houses, that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees, and the Senate companion be returned to the Calendar.

Ordered further, That the provisions of the three preceding paragraphs occur without any intervening action or debate.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, then if I can modify my previous statement, the first vote will begin at 9:30, and it will be in accordance with the standard voting time. All votes thereafter will be for a maximum of 15 minutes.

APPOINTMENT BY THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to Public Law 94-118, appoints the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] to the Japan-United States Friendship Commission.

RECESS UNTIL 9:25 A.M. THURSDAY

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess, as under the previous order, until 9:25 a.m.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:42 a.m., recessed until Thursday, March 25, 1993, at 9:25 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, March 24, 1993*

The House met at 12 noon.

Rabbi Seth H. Frisch, Temple Beth El, Portland, ME, offered the following prayer:

The festival of Passover proclaimed in Your Bible, Lord, is drawing near, and it is in the Passover festival meal that the question is asked by our youngest children: Why is this night different from all other nights? Why indeed, Lord?

We open our doors and we say during the festival meal: All who are hungry, let them come and eat. We say this because there are those who in every generation have been hungry, and over the times and the years we have noticed that there are many who hunger, and these times are no different than those times.

Lord, there are those who hunger for bread and those who hunger for freedom, and all too often they go hand in hand. While this does not make these times different from other times, yet we still ask for freedom from the fear of oppression and from the poverty of servitude which so many of Your children know from their own lives all too well.

During the festival of freedom, the Passover proclaimed in Your Torah, Your Bible, we see that we are commanded to eat unleavened bread. We are told that it is the bread of affliction eaten by Your ancestors, our ancestors, in slavery in Egypt. We are told also in the Bible that it is the bread of freedom which was eaten the first night out of slavery, and we ask: What has changed?

It is not the bread that is changed. It is the people who see it and feel it and eat it who have changed, and we notice, Lord, that the bread changes even today, for even our own people, we Americans in this Nation, have known and tasted of the bread of poverty and of the bread of freedom.

But what makes this night different from all other nights and these times different from all other times is that those who hunger for freedom and for bread look to us, this Nation, this leadership, this House, for your help.

So we today, Lord, look to You for Your guidance, and we ask that You answer our prayers and bestow upon our leaders the wisdom, the ability, and the means to lead us in the difficult challenges we must all face in the days and the months ahead. And so these are our prayers of blessing that You have bestowed upon us and that Your servants have always recited, thanking You for Your blessings in the past and asking for Your continued guidance all the days of our lives.

Blessed art Thou, O Lord, our God, sovereign of the universe, who has kept us in life, sustained us, and enabled us, all of us, to reach this day. Remain with us, teach us, and, dear Lord, guide us.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 252, nays 147, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 89]

YEAS—252

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Archer
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Chapman
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Hoke
Holden
Hughes
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ravenel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Snowe
Spratt
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tejeda
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NAYS—147

Allard
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dornan
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Greenwood
Hancock
Hansen
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Huffington
Hunter
Inhofe
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson, Sam
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Machtley
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella

Murphy	Saxton	Talent
Nussle	Schaefer	Taylor (MS)
Packard	Schiff	Taylor (NC)
Paxon	Schroeder	Thomas (CA)
Petri	Sensenbrenner	Thomas (WY)
Porter	Shays	Torkildsen
Pryce (OH)	Shuster	Upton
Quinn	Skeen	Vucanovich
Ramstad	Smith (MI)	Walker
Regula	Smith (OR)	Walsh
Ridge	Smith (TX)	Weldon
Roberts	Solomon	Wolf
Rogers	Spence	Young (AK)
Rohrabacher	Stearns	Young (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen	Stump	Zeliff
Roukema	Sundquist	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—31

Applegate	Hoyer	Santorum
Barcia	Johnson (CT)	Sharp
Brown (CA)	Lewis (FL)	Shaw
Carr	McDermott	Stark
Clay	Mfume	Swett
Doolittle	Owens	Tauzin
Dreier	Pickle	Tucker
Ford (TN)	Quillen	Unsoeld
Grandy	Rangel	Whitten
Henry	Royce	
Houghton	Sanders	

□ 1227

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING RABBI SETH H. FRISCH

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and honored to welcome to the House of Representatives Rabbi Seth H. Frisch, who offered this morning's opening prayer.

Rabbi Frisch was ordained by the Jewish Theological Seminary of America in New York City in 1986. He served for 3 years at the Temple Emmanuel in Newton, MA, before being installed at the Temple Beth El in Portland, ME, in 1989.

Rabbi Frisch is the youngest rabbi ever installed at the Temple Beth El, the largest Jewish congregation north of Boston.

He is also an active member of the community, a strong advocate for civil rights, and a good friend.

I am pleased and honored to welcome Rabbi Frisch to the Nation's Capitol today and thank him on behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives for offering this morning's opening prayer.

□ 1230

WE NEED SERIOUS REFORM

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Congress reminds me of the alcoholic who refused to enter a treatment facility, saying "I can reform myself."

Mr. Speaker, the Congress cannot reform itself. It spends money like the alcoholic drinks whiskey, rationalizing all the way to oblivion. We need to reform our spending habits, and we need to do it now.

Next week, the Democrat majority will pass a conference report on the budget that will include an extension of the debt limit.

The Democrats want to increase our debt limit by almost $225 billion. And yet they do not believe our debt problems warrant a radical solution like a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

They refuse to give us a vote on this important and, yes, radical reform proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we need a vote on the balanced budget amendment before we vote on raising the debt limit. The American people need to know that the Congress has no intention of seriously reforming its ways.

TIME TO ACT ON THE CLINTON ECONOMIC PLAN

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

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, last week the House shed the shackles of the status quo and rose to the occasion.

Thanks to strong Democratic support the House approved President Clinton's economic package by a comfortable margin.

This week the national spotlight is trained on the Congress. I would urge my colleagues to move the Clinton package forward.

The Clinton plan directs long-range investments in the economy, it makes $510 billion in deficit reduction, and it puts forth a short-term stimulus package to create a half million jobs.

Without action, the recovery will produce pitifully few jobs.

At this stage in the last seven recessions, the economy has typically recovered 237 percent of the jobs lost. In the current recovery, we have recovered only 29 percent of the jobs lost.

The House-passed Clinton plan will invigorate small businesses through job creation. It will invest in research and development to promote our Nation's competitiveness. Finally, the plan goes to bat for our children by vaccinating them from infectious disease and by boosting the Head Start Program.

The Congress stands on the brink of approving the most comprehensive economic plan we have ever seen. But we must all do our job.

The American people called on the House to back the President's plan. The House has responded to the people's challenge.

Mr. Speaker, this week the Congress should approve the Clinton plan to get the economy rolling and to create jobs.

INCREASING THE DEBT LIMIT

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

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I urge the American people to look closely at President Clinton's budget conference report that we will probably take up next week.

Inside that document is a little gem which will increase our debt limit by hundreds of billions of dollars.

Yes; as the President drones out about his plan to decrease the deficit, his allies on the Hill will be making plans to increase the debt limit.

Mr. Speaker, this is ridiculous. Are we going to increase the debt or decrease the debt?

The only way to know for sure is to pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

I urge the Democratic leadership to allow us to vote on the balanced budget amendment before we even think of increasing the debt limit.

ENCOURAGING THE SENATE TO ACT ON THE STIMULUS PACKAGE

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

Ms. DANNER. Mr. Speaker, last fall the American people cast their ballots for change.

The people elected a leader who had a vision about what America could be, if the determination and resources could be found to initiate change. President Clinton has demonstrated the determination and the resourcefulness to carry out such change and has not disappointed those who called for renewal.

The renewal has begun with our passage of the President's stimulus package. The stimulus legislation will provide 500,000 jobs, without delay, to those unfortunate individuals not currently employed. Renewal continued with our passage of the budget resolution.

The President has kept his promise to the American people and has submitted to Congress his proposals for transforming Government. Last week we, in this body, took action on those proposals and overwhelmingly endorsed his economic stimulus plan and budget.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is pleased to have acted, in con-

cert with the President, to move our Nation forward—to be the positive force for change that Americans asked for last November.

THE DEBT LIMIT AND THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, when we passed that empty shell known as the Clinton budget last week, it did not include an item that should worry the American people.

But under the rules of the House, when we consider the conference report next week, we will also be considering a Democrat proposal to extend the debt limit. The majority party wants to increase the debt limit by hundreds of billions of dollars.

After seeing the pork in the President's spending package, I can see why they want the additional room to maneuver. But, Mr. Speaker, we must ask ourselves if extending the debt limit is in the best interests of the Nation.

We must come to grips with our debt. We shouldn't try to quietly expand it without considering serious options to reduce it. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to give us a vote on one serious option, the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, before we increase our debt limit.

The American people need to know that we are serious about reducing our debt. The Clinton administration has shown only a serious need to increase it so far.

CLINTON ADMINISTRATION RESPONDS POSITIVELY TO RUSSIAN CRISIS

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

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration has handled the crisis in Russia with great professionalism, finesse, and credibility. The President's strong support for Boris Yeltsin, and his support for the forces of democracy and reform, and his leadership in encouraging the rest of the world to adopt a similar response has clearly contributed to an international response dedicated to continue the principles of civil liberties and free market economies.

The President clearly knows that America has big stakes in preserving democracy in Russia. A failure of democracy would produce a renewed nuclear threat, a strong and a legitimate push to restore the defense budget to significantly higher levels, thereby increasing our deficit and perhaps hurting economic recovery, and a reduction in American business and economic opportunities in Central and Eastern Europe.

What happens in Russia, Bill Clinton knows, will directly affect the lives of all Americans. There are some politicians in Washington, including a few in the other body, who seem to constantly want to publicly second-guess the President's policies, offering gratuitous advice without the benefit of the intelligence and advice only the President gets every day.

Public gratuitous advice during such tenuous times can sometimes be destructive. The President is handling the foreign crisis just fine. I am thankful that his team is in charge.

SPENDAHOLICS IN DENIAL

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

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has denied that there is any pork in his spending package.

The Democrats in the House have protested that this package is not pork, but investment.

Mr. Speaker, this is a classic example of spendaholics in denial.

Next week, when we take up the budget resolution conference report, the Democrats will seek to increase the Federal debt limit by hundreds of billions of dollars.

What do the Democrats want to pay for with this debt limit increase? More pork barrel projects: Things like swimming pool renovations, white water canoeing facilities, and rest room repairs.

I urge the Democrats to check themselves into a Spendaholics Anonymous clinic, and pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

URGING CONGRESS NOT TO LET THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC PROGRAM UNRAVEL

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, a sweater retains its shape and form and its effectiveness to ward off the cold only if we leave the threads intact. If we start pulling at the threads, the sweater unravels and becomes a shapeless and formless mass of material.

The same, I think, analogy applies to the President's economic program. It is composed of a series of threads woven together. They make a form and a shape, and that form and shape will be lower inflation rates, it will be higher rates of employment, it will be a greater and a more abundant and healthier economy.

If the threads are pulled and the economic program unravels, as it will, then it becomes shapeless, formless, and totally ineffective to see us through to the next century.

As the President's program goes through the tortuous legislative process, and there will be people tugging at all of its threads, I hope those threads stay intact and I hope the garment stays together. In keeping the garment together, we can make America stronger.

□ 1240

RAISING THE DEBT CEILING AND THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, anxiety among constituents is rising over ever-increasing Federal spending and the $4.15 trillion national debt. And next week the Democrats will try to raise the debt ceiling again. Secretary Bentsen wants Congress to raise it by $225 billion.

There is also a hue and cry throughout the districts we represent for a balanced budget amendment. This issue received a lot of attention in the last election and we now have the opportunity and responsibility to make good on promises made, keep the public trust—and at the same time reduce the national debt.

Yet there are some Members who argue that such an amendment is unnecessary. Such a position is almost comical in the light of President Clinton's recent proposals to increase domestic spending by $180 billion, and to increase taxes by $300 billion and increase the debt by $1 trillion. Mr. Perot recently said that submitting such a spending program to Congress is like getting a friend who's trying to stop drinking a liquor store. The point is they will spend it. They will not use it to pay down the debt. If it takes an amendment to the Constitution to change the spending habits of Congress for the better, I say let's do it.

Mr. Speaker, I propose, that we break with our miserable tradition—that we change—and try balancing the budget just once. Who knows we might like it. If a balanced budget amendment is passed we might just foster the environment necessary for continued economic growth, begin to reduce the national debt, and effectively represent the people who sent us here.

SUPPORT FOR BORIS YELTSIN

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

Mr. SARPALIUS. Mr. Speaker, I first saw him standing tall in a room along with several of my colleagues where he stood there in support of Dr. Landsbergis and the movement in Lith-

uania, Estonia, and Latvia for their push toward democracy. We all watched him stand tall on top of a tank while the whole world watched him stand up for changes in Russia, for democracy and freedom.

He was the first elected president in over a thousand years in their country, and we heard him stand right here at this podium behind us and address this institution and talk about freedom and democracy and reducing nuclear weapons and working together for world peace.

He now stands again fighting for a new constitution for their country, for a balance of powers.

I can recall when we went to President Bush and begged him to recognize the Baltic States and the movements of Boris Yeltsin. We were the second-to-last country in the world to recognize them. It is encouraging to now have a President who stands tall along the side of President Boris Yeltsin.

TERM LIMITS

(Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of reform proposals that are floating around this House and many of those are very good proposals, and I salute them. But there is one reform proposal that guarantees the most sweeping change in true organizational change to this body, and that is term limits, limiting the number of years that Members of Congress can serve here.

Mr. Speaker, this last year we accomplished significant change in this House with 110 new Members of Congress. That is great. But we need to see even greater change in this House, particularly at the chairman and leadership position level.

It is very important, Mr. Speaker, that this bipartisan effort continue, that we have term limits in this House, and that we do that on bipartisan basis. This is not the Democrats' Congress; this is not the Republicans' Congress. This is America's Congress and America's Congress needs fixing with term limits.

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S ECONOMIC PLAN

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

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to encourage full support of President Clinton's economic stimulus package. The President's plan is about putting people back to work. Opponents of the plan have charged that it is more unnecessary spending. Some have even claimed that much of this spending is for nonemergency purposes.

Let me make it plain, in my community, much of the proposed spending constitutes emergency relief. The exhaustion of unemployment benefits, Head Start, WIC, the Emergency Food Assistance Programs, AIDS research, and Pell grants all constitute an emergency in my district. We've been in a Reagan-Bush economic drought for 12 years and it's time for some rain to fall. It is an emergency when nearly 9 million people are unemployed; when every 104 seconds a black teenage girl becomes pregnant; when every 7 minutes a black baby is born to a mother who had late or nonexistent prenatal care; when less than 1 in 2 black children had private health insurance in 1990; and when black infants are more than five times as likely as white infants to die of AIDS. The African-American community has waited 12 long years for these programs to be funded. Twelve years of deprivation and denial, in my book, constitutes an emergency that must be met with all deliberate speed.

For those who are concerned about the level of proposed spending, President Clinton's plan includes 150 specific cuts in domestic programs. Every investments is paid for, dollar for dollar, by spending cuts in existing programs. Investment means putting more policemen on our streets; investing in the Nation's infrastructure; rebuilding roads and bridges and creating information networks. The President's investment package will create 500,000 jobs by the end of 1994.

Opponents to the President's plan argue that the recession is over and the economy is recovering. But the most important indicator—job growth—is stagnant. There are still mass layoffs—companies like Sears, United Airlines, Campbell Soup, and in my own district, Commonwealth Edison.

Do not let the opponents of this plan fool you. This economic recovery is still far behind those of previous recessionary recoveries when it comes to total jobs lost. The suffering that the American people have experienced must be addressed. I urge total support of President Clinton's investment package and start putting America back to work.

DEBT CEILING-BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, the idea to which the American people responded in this past election was the idea of change. The freshman class was elected on the promise that we would work for genuine, substantive change. Nothing could be more symptomatic of the business-as-usual thinking than the proposal on which we will vote to once again raise the debt ceiling—this time for another $225 billion.

This type of free-spirited spending is like the fellow who slovenly exceeds his credit card limit. Only there is a significant difference. Instead of Congress changing its irresponsible spending habits, it just raises its credit limit.

Instead of raising the debt ceiling, what we really need to do is pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution and restore fiscal responsibility to the institution of Congress.

QUICK APPROVAL OF CLINTON ECONOMIC PLAN URGED

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

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. Speaker, the American people have spoken. They want a strong economy that answers the needs of real people. They want an end to gridlock and the status quo. They want real change.

It is a clear message. It deserves a clear and decisive response.

President Clinton responded clearly when he proposed his comprehensive economic plan to reduce the Federal deficit, cut Government spending, and make the crucial long-term investments that are needed to inspire and uplift the American people. Last week, the House responded with swift and decisive approval of the President's plan.

As President Clinton's plan enters the next stage of debate, the American people are waiting for a response. Will we move forward into a new era of fiscal responsibility and economic growth, or remain stuck in the rationalizations of the past? America is waiting for the answer.

I urge the Congress to take the next step and quickly approve the President's economic plan.

THE BUDDY CHECK TWELVE PROGRAM—AN INNOVATIVE APPROACH TO EARLY DETECTION OF CANCER

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

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, the buddy check twelve program of Jacksonville has received national recognition for its innovative approach to dealing with breast cancer awareness.

This joint program between Jacksonville's Baptist Medical Center, WTLV Television 12, and AT&T American Transtech, has impacted 124,000 people since its inception 1 year ago.

The program teaches self-examination for breast cancer. This approach has been used to make early detection a useful tool in saving lives.

Early detection can also be credited with reducing health care costs.

Studies have shown that breast cancer treatment, when detected early, costs approximately $9,000. For advanced stage breast cancer, the costs can reach $32,000.

I am proud of the commitment that has been shown in Jacksonville, and urge my colleagues to use the buddy check twelve program as a model in their own communities.

Getting back to the basics—people joining together to help each other—is what this country needs. The buddy check twelve program is one example—it should be copied throughout the Nation.

□ 1250

THE CLINTON ECONOMIC PLAN

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

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the investment package proposed by President Clinton. This is an important program that should be passed into law.

The citizens of this country are demanding that their leaders keep their campaign promises to break the gridlock that has crippled our Government for far too long.

The passage of the President's economic plan by this House has shown the American public that we are serious about getting our country moving again. This economic plan must reach the President's desk without any revisions that exclude funding for such vital programs as Head Start, WIC, and children's immunizations.

Not one benefit is gained by preventing a single mother from getting help during her most difficult times. Not one benefit is gained by uneducated and unhealthy children. No one profits from this, most certainly not our economy.

All of us must do our part to see that the President's economic package is passed in its entirety.

INVEST IN AMERICAN CITIES AND STATES, NOT RUSSIA

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, democracy in Russia is great, but not all the Russkies are buying it. And America should not have to buy it by paying for it either. After all, if dollars produced democracy, the Mideast would be our 51st State.

America should push but not shove. In fact, America's cash may become America's curse for both Boris Yeltsin and democracy in Russia.

It is time for Russia to do it the old-fashioned way, for the Russian people to nurture, defend, and support democracy, not the American taxpayer. If we have any money laying around, we had better start investing in the cities and the States of America while our democracy is still pretty solid.

HUNTINGTON'S GENE DISCOVERY

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the historic discovery made by an international team of renowned scientists who have uncovered what some have called the most coveted treasure in molecular biology—the gene behind the insidious killer—Huntington's disease.

Mr. Speaker, Huntington's disease is a little-known, but very cruel, neurodegenerative illness that usually strikes a person in their 30's or 40's. This disease is progressive as it gradually, and most certainly, destroys both the mind and body. Those diagnosed with Huntington's disease have come to know that they can expect to live out a 10- or 20-year death sentence striking them down in the prime of life.

Mr. Speaker, folksinger Woody Guthrie is one of the best known victims of this illness that is passed from generation to generation.

But today, Mr. Speaker, the 30,000 Americans suffering from Huntington's disease and the 150,000 Americans at risk of contracting this genetic killer are one giant step closer to knowing that someday Huntington's disease will be a thing of the past, as a team of scientists have unmasked the renegade Huntington's gene after 10 years of searching.

Mr. Speaker, all Americans owe a debt of gratitude to the outstanding scientists of the human genome project. They are the dream team of genetic research and they include: Dr. James Gusella of Massachusetts General Hospital; Dr. Hans Lehrash of the Imperial Cancer Research Fund; Dr. David Housman of MIT; Dr. John Wasmuth of the University of California-Irvine; Dr. Peter Harper of the University of Wales; Dr. Nancy Wexler of Hereditary Disease Foundation of Santa Monica, CA; and Dr. Frances Collins of the University of Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, many others were involved in this important and historic research and we salute each of them.

THE NAFTA FORUM

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my commitment to ensuring that the North American Free-Trade Agreement does not compromise the livelihood of millions of American people, the health and safety of workers in all countries, and the health of our environment. President Clinton has articulated a commitment to ensuring that side agreements to the NAFTA adequately address these crucial concerns.

Tomorrow a very important forum will take place which will aid us in further deliberations as to the future of the North American Free-Trade Agreement. Leading experts from the United States, Mexico, and Canada and my colleagues, the gentleman from Missouri and the gentlewoman from Ohio, will come together to discuss the various aspects of this important issue. This forum will no doubt help us to consider more carefully the North American Free-Trade Agreement as it develops in the next coming months. I thank my colleagues for affording us this valuable opportunity.

INCREASED TAXES AND THE AILING AIRLINE INDUSTRY

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, yesterday this body gave final approval to a commission to study the problems of the ailing airline industry. I am hopeful that that commission will come back with some positive results. But I am reminded of the Aviation Subcommittee hearings that we just recently held where we listened to people who were involved in the airline industry as they voiced their concerns about needed changes in the tax codes, about concerns of the current bankruptcy laws, about allowing foreign carriers to invest in our domestic carriers, and their concern about additional taxation including the energy tax, a tax that supposedly will cost $140 million for every penny of increase in fuel to the ailing aviation industry.

As I watched those proceedings, I became concerned and frustrated that some of the Members of this body who are promoting that commission are some of the same Members who just last week voted for a budget resolution that was predicated on the largest tax increase in the history of this Nation including the energy tax, the very measure that will be devastating to the airline industry.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot have it both ways. I hope there will be some revisions in thoughts of Members of this body.

INTRODUCTION OF THE FOREIGN AID REPORTING AND REFORM ACT

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

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I introduced legislation which will help this Congress and our new President bring another measure of accountability to Government. This bill is being called the Foreign Aid Reporting and Reform Act of 1993.

Last week, we approved a budget which calls on the American people to sacrifice in order to solve our Nation's budget crisis. We are, rightly, beginning to focus our priorities on investment instead of consumption. We cannot justifiably ask for sacrifice unless we are also willing to show some responsibility in our spending proposals.

One budget category which deserves close scrutiny is foreign aid spending. If we were to live and die by public opinion, foreign assistance would no longer be an issue in our budget negotiations. It would long ago have been dispensed with in favor of our domestic priorities.

As popular as that view might be back home, there is an argument for some foreign aid as long as it is in the best interests of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, our world is changing at an astounding pace. Today's maps are vastly different from those of a decade ago. But, our foreign assistance priorities have not keep pace. The Foreign Aid Reporting Reform Act is designed to help us keep in step with domestic and international priorities.

The current crisis in Russia is a perfect example of the need for this type of comprehensive study. Our ability to come to the rescue in an international crisis is limited both by politics and lack of money. By fully researching the current status of foreign assistance programs, including that of the former Soviet Union, we will be better prepared to make the tough choices necessary to avoid the chaos. We will be able to make intelligent choices—to respond, rather than simply react, to an international crisis.

My bill calls on the administration to report to Congress each year on the status of all foreign aid spending. This report would include information on where our foreign aid dollars are going and what goals we are trying to achieve. For the first time, my bill would require the administration to project a termination date when each foreign aid program would end. As with domestic spending, programs which still serve a legitimate purpose can be saved. Those which have served their purpose or which are not achieving their goals can be ended, in favor of more pressing needs and deficit reduction.

Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Aid Reporting Reform Act does not, of its own merit, increase or reduce our foreign aid spending. It will, however, streamline our current information so that we can make informed decisions about how and where our foreign aid dollars are spent. We owe the American people this additional measure of accountability.

I urge my colleagues to join me and over 30 original cosponsors in supporting the Foreign Aid Reporting Reform Act.

THE NEW SLICKTIONARY

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton continues to give so many new meanings to old words that perhaps we should consider replacing Webster's dictionary with Clinton's slicktionary.

It could contain these words and phrases: "Contributions," once known as "taxes," still means forcibly extracting from taxpayers their hard-earned dollars. "Deficit," normally considered the result of excessive Government spending, is now a justification for massive new taxes and more spending. "Investment" means a four-legged, rotund animal with curly tail, previously known as "pork." Or "spending."

□ 1300

"Patriotism," formerly used to describe loyalty to one's country, now means an obligation to pay the Government more taxes without complaint. "Tax fairness" is now frequently used to justify increased taxes, particularly on the top half of all wage-earners, who are already paying 94 percent of all taxes.

"Spending cuts" now defines not an actual decrease in spending, but rather a smaller increase than threatened.

Despite what President Clinton says, the American people know what these words really mean; they mean tax and spend, again and again and again.

LET US PULL TOGETHER AS A COUNTRY

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

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I think we have heard a litany of voices this morning that are simply trying to gain time to complain. What we need to do is to pull together as a country. We have had 12 years of gridlock and deadlock and whining. What we need to do is look toward the future and see what we can accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, I have worked with the White House over the last week, I have talked to the President's representatives about the energy tax. I am pleased to learn that yesterday the President decided that ethanol, a renewable fuel, clean burning, good for the environment, will not be subject to the energy tax.

I think this is the type of work that we need to engage in. We have a President who has been more receptive to working with Congress than any President in my memory.

We have an opportunity to work together effectively and to put to an end the deadlock and gridlock that have plagued this city for so many years.

AMENDED HOUSE RULE WOULD REQUIRE THREE-FIFTHS VOTE TO RESTRICT GERMANE AMENDMENTS

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

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation that will bring fair and open debate to the floor of the House of Representatives. This legislation is fairly simple. It would amend the rules of the House to require a three-fifths or 60 percent majority vote in order to adopt a rule which restricts consideration of any germane amendment. All amendments would have to be filed with the Rules Committee at least 3 days prior to consideration of the bill.

The intent of this legislation is to require that the majority consult with the minority to bring a rule to the floor. Rules could easily restrict amendments if the leadership of both parties were consulted.

Citizens around the country are calling for congressional reform and accountability of Members to their constituents back home. What better way to represent our constituents than by considering, through open debate on the floor, every aspect of the legislation we pass.

Some limits are necessary in order to keep debate moving on an issue so that we do not become so embroiled in debate that we are unable to move on to other important issues. However, germane amendments are obviously offered for a reason—because the Member is knowledgeable on the issue and feels that what he or she is offering should be considered by the Whole House. Rules, as they are now, have the effect of gagging these Members from offering amendments that are relevant to the legislation being debated.

All Members deserve to be heard and their constituents also have the right to hear their Representative's position on any given issue. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation and show that they support free and open debate on the House floor.

A NEW DIRECTION?

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

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, when President Bill Clinton spoke

of a new direction in his State of the Union Address, I assumed he was talking about bringing the deficit down. I was wrong.

Unfortunately, he meant the deficit was going straight up, under his administration.

We saw signs of this last week when we voted for his massive spending package. Next week we will see more signs of Clinton's new direction when the Democrats vote to raise the debt limit by $225 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I think our deficit should go in a different direction: down.

We must reduce our public debt. That is why we must pass the balanced budget amendment and do it before we raise the debt limit.

The American people need to know where the Congress stands on actual debt reduction. Only a vote on the balanced budget amendment next week will give them that necessary knowledge.

TERM LIMITS' TIME HAS COME

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, a front-page article in the New York Times last week ridiculed those of us seeking to initiate some reforms in Washington. They labeled us goody-goody chic.

It printed wise sayings by veteran Members, quoted beltway insider comments about "nerds" and "reform wonks."

I suggest this article is out of step with America. People demand change. That means some reform here in this House.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I joined with my colleague, BOB INGLIS, the gentleman from South Carolina, and several grassroots organizations in launching a coordinated national effort to implement Federal term limits, which in many ways is the mother of all reform.

More than 22 million Americans have overwhelmingly voted to limit the terms of Congress. A full 36 percent of this body is already bound by term limits.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the leadership of this Congress to stop throwing roadblocks in the way of those of us who believe in a citizen Congress and who respect the wishes of the American people for change.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the majority leadership to help us move Mr. INGLIS' legislation.

NO PORK IN THE STIMULUS PACKAGE? WRONG

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, yesterday President Clinton, in his concluding remarks during his news conference, said there was not any pork in his economic stimulus package, that there were no swimming pools, no movie theaters, no beachfront parking garages, et cetera, et cetera.

I want to tell you, Mr. Clinton, that is a lot of baloney because they are in there. As a matter of fact, on Tuesday, February 23, Hon. Henry G. Cisneros, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, appeared before the Subcommittee on Veterans' Administration, HUD, and Independent Agencies, and he brought with him a list of all the projects that were going to be funded.

If you will look, Mr. President, if you are paying attention, on page 983 you will find Mr. Cisneros' remarks about these projects and about how they were going to create jobs.

Mr. President, don't try to mislead the American people. That bill is laden with pork, waste, fraud. That is not what the American people want; they want that deficit cut and they don't want more taxes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

The Chair would like to remind the Member to address the Chair and not anyone else.

BIG SPENDING—BUSINESS AS USUAL

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, today the House will consider a $508.5 million reauthorization of the family planning amendments.

This is a $96.5 million increase and requests a 55.5 percent increase for fiscal year 1993 spending over the current appropriation for the title X program.

I cannot believe that we are continuing to ask the American taxpayer to pay for such huge increases in these programs, day after day, month after month, year after year. This is just ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker, it is business-as-usual around here. It is the same old lip-service that has frustrated the American taxpayer, and gotten us where we are today, over $4 trillion in the hole.

No matter how one feels on the divisive issue of abortion, this bill should be defeated on fiscal grounds alone.

I am sure this legislation will pass and once again we will prove that all this talk about spending cuts is a charade, a hoax, a cruel joke on the American people.

□ 1310

PRESIDENT CLINTON IS DISARMING AMERICA

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton is disarming America. The world is still a very dangerous place. In the former Soviet Union, in Bosnia, in the Middle East, in North Korea, we see signs of danger, and President Clinton with his $127 billion in defense cuts is responding with weakness.

Will Rogers once said, "You can always tell when a war is about to come. It is when America starts disarming."

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton is disarming America.

THE TRUE STORY

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

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, last year Congress acted positively in supporting the American automobile industry by affirming a 25-percent tariff on minivans and sports utility vehicles. Now the President has supported that congressional action by questioning why the Federal Government gave a $300 million a year freebie to Japan by reducing the tariffs.

The Japanese Government threatened to take this minivan dispute to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT] if the United States Government persisted in labeling the MPV as a truck for tariff purposes, and the van, also. We originally got into this situation of renaming trucks as cars because the Treasury Department overruled Customs on the classification of MPV's and vans. The chart on MPV's shows just what the inconsistencies are. It is a truck with 2 doors, a car if it has 4 doors—and a truck for CAFE purposes. If it is built like a truck—taxed like a truck—exhausts like a truck—then it is a truck. The freebies should stop. The President is right. Buy American.

HOW ABOUT BEFORE THE LAST 12 YEARS?

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, what I wanted to talk about is we have heard so much in the last couple days about the horrible atrocities of the last 12 years, so I went back and I said, "Well, what about before the last 12?"

And because there are so many people who are interested in saying the last 12 were so horrible, here is what we had for the 4 years before the

Reagan Presidency: 1979–80, the worst inflation in the country in 60 years, 3 to 4 percent under Ronald Reagan.

Interest rates, 21 percent, the highest in 120 years, cut in half under Ronald Reagan.

The weekly wage of American earners, down 9 percent on an average. The median family income down 5½ percent, the highest single tax increase in the history of the United States, auto loans 17 percent, fuel costs doubled.

The Misery Index, which the Democrats used to decry President Ford at that time, of course, that is unemployment plus the inflation rate, under President Ford was 13.2 percent. Under Jimmy Carter, the great humanitarian, 21 percent. Under Ronald Reagan, down to 9.2 percent.

Twelve years of misery? I think not. Look at the statistics, 18½ million new jobs created during that period of time.

I regret there is not more time to talk about these years, but I will do so in the future.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 670, FAMILY PLANNING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1993

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 138 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 138

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 670) to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to ensure that pregnant women receiving assistance under title X of the Public Health Service Act are provided with information and counseling regarding their pregnancies, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered as read for amendment under the five-minute rule. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed, may be offered only by the named proponent or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except as specified in the report, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The amendment in the form of a motion to strike specified in the report to be offered by Representative Bartlett of Maryland shall not be in order if the text proposed to be stricken has been rewritten in its entirety by earlier amendment. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. House Resolution 81 is hereby laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). The gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes of debate time to my New York colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WALKER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, do I understand correctly that during the debate on the rule that we are about to take up there was a discussion in the Rules Committee with regard to this rule and future rules that would come up in which the gentlewoman from New York and her colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina, said fairly clearly in the Rules Committee that they did not believe that the House should ever again be allowed to have an open rule and that we should resolve all these things in committee and that the House floor should be a place that only ratifies action taken by the committees.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid the gentleman from Pennsylvania is wrong again. No; that was not the discussion.

Mr. WALKER. That discussion did not take place and we will not find any committee transcript indicating that kind of discussion?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. There was no discussion in the Rules Committee as to what kind of rules should be put forward in the future.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] may be referring to a comment that I had made at one point that what had happened in the past when the Department of Education was being discussed here on the floor is that the debate went on for a solid month. That is the only remark that was made.

I do not recall the gentleman from South Carolina saying anything about that at all.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I am a little disturbed by the answer that my good friend, and she is my good friend, the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER], has just given, because I just sent upstairs to try to get the transcript of what took place.

I have to tell my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that I was outraged and I said that some of those remarks were absolutely absurd that took place up there, because I was alarmed at what seems to be a pattern now that is taking place.

As a matter of fact, I am pointing out in my remarks here a little bit later that back in 1977 and 1978, about the time that the gentleman and I came here, that we had under Speaker O'Neill a fairly fair system of free and open debate with open rules on this floor.

Eighty-five percent of all the rules that came to the floor came here in an open rule process in which any Member from 435 areas of this country could stand up and offer legitimate, reasonable, germane amendments to any party of the bill.

In the course of the years since 1977 and 1978, this Rules Committee, governed by the King—I call him a King instead of a Speaker—has shut down these rules, so that in the last term of Congress two-thirds of every rule that came on this floor was shut down, was gagged, and Members of this House could not offer amendments on the floor.

I think what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is talking about is a colloquy that I believe the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER DERRICK] had with some of the Members who were testifying in which it was inferred—and I have to say that my good friend, the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER], later engaged in another colloquy which to me inferred that in the future we are not going to have Members have the right to come on this floor under the 5-minute rule and offer germane amendments to any piece of legislation, that in the future it was going to have to go through the normal committee process.

In other words, if you have got 25 Members serving on the Labor committee, only those 25 Members are going to have the right to have amendments considered on this floor or in the Foreign Affairs Committee or in the Ways and Means Committee.

□ 1320

That to me is the most undemocratic statement I have heard since I have been in this Congress, and that is the issue I said was so absurd up there the other day, and that is what we are going to put a stop to in this House because we are not going to let this continue.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object——

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, could we have regular order, please?

Mr. SOLOMON. What did you say? You are trying to shut me off?

Mr. WALKER. Reserving the right to object——

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). The gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] withdraws her unanimous-consent request.

The gentlewoman is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, we will continue this later.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

Can the gentlewoman withdraw her unanimous-consent request without getting unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes, she can, since it has not yet been granted.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. That is what the Parliamentarian just said?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is the ruling of the Chair.

The Chair now recognizes the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER]

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 138 is the rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 670, the Family Planning Amendments of 1993.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

No amendment to the bill is to be in order except those amendments printed in the report to accompany the rule. The amendments are to be considered in the order and manner specified in the report. Except as specified in the report, the amendments are not subject to amendment, nor to a demand for a division of the question.

The Bartlett amendment to strike language in the text of the bill shall not be in order if that language has been rewritten in its entirety by the adoption of an earlier amendment.

The rule makes in order all the germane amendments submitted to the Rules Committee except for two; in both cases, those amendments had not been offered at the Energy and Commerce Committee, nor had the issues they raised been discussed there despite their potentially far-reaching effects on title X Programs.

The rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Finally, the rule provides that House Resolution 81, the earlier rule to provide for consideration of H.R. 670, be laid on the table.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in strongly supporting H.R. 670, the Family Planning Amendments Act of 1993, the bill for which the Rules Committee has recommended this rule. While title X of the Public Health Service Act was first enacted in 1970, its programs have not been reauthorized since 1985. This overdue legislation will ensure the continued availability of a variety of essential family planning programs and activities.

Let me share with you why this legislation is fundamental. Title X provides a diverse array of health care services to 4 million beneficiaries in over 4,000 clinics across the country every year. Its prime focus is family planning services and education. Under the provisions of this bill, clinics will be able to provide accurate and complete information and counseling on a patient's full range of contraception and pregnancy options.

Women who receive these vital services under title X are just as entitled to complete and accurate information about their health care options as are beneficiaries in private health plans. Passage of this bill will guarantee the end of the previous administration's attempts to impose censorship on poor women's medical care options, threatening the health of low-income women and their families.

In addition to reproductive health services and family planning counseling, title X clinics also often provide access for many women to preventive health care services such as screening for breast and cervical cancer, diabetes, and high blood pressure. These comprehensive medical services are cost-effective investments to preserve our Nation's health.

Finally, title X also supports training, education, and research related to family planning, including the training of 14,000 health care providers to provide family planning services at title X clinics.

One thing title X cannot fund is abortion. Let me repeat that. Despite the opponents' attempts to muddy the issue, no funds under this bill can be used for abortion. What this bill allows is that when a patient makes a request, she can receive complete and objective counseling on all pregnancy management options. Furthermore, H.R. 670 mandates that grant recipients which provide abortion services with nonfederal funds must comply with State parental notification or consent laws.

The text of the reported bill is exactly the same as the House-passed version of this authorization in the 102d Congress. Regrettably, President Bush chose to veto that bill. Fortunately for the women of our Nation, the current administration supports enactment of this bill and notes that "the provisions in the bill requiring projects to provide complete information regarding pregnancy management are consistent with the President's recent directive to suspend and revoke the gag rule."

I commend Chairman WAXMAN for again bringing to the floor this vital legislation to ensure American women have access to all relevant medical information when making reproductive choices.

I ask my colleagues to support the rule so that we may proceed with consideration of this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield, for the purpose of debate only, to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think by now most of our new Members are aware that there are actually two kinds of House rules around here. There are the standing rules that we adopted on opening day, presumably to guide our committee and floor deliberations for the next 2 years. Then there are these special rules which are resolutions reported by the Rules Committee to permit important bills to be considered out of order, and to establish the procedures for their debate and amendment.

Mr. Speaker, in the not-too-distant past, most of these special rules allowed for an open amendment process. Back in the 95th Congress, when Tip O'Neill was the Speaker, in 1977 and 1978, for instance, 85 percent of all of these rules allowed any and all Members to offer germane amendments—any one of the 435 Members. But, I say to my colleagues, all that has gradually changed over the years until in the last Congress, fully two-thirds of any rules that came on this floor limited the amendment process on important bills, and so far in this new Congress, eight out of eight rules have been limited, in other words, all of them, 100 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come to rename these special rules King's Rules, because they seem to conform to the rules laid down by the King of Hearts at the trial of the knave in "Alice in Wonderland."

Do any of the Members have grandchildren? I just read this story to my grandchild the other day. I suggest you go back and reread it.

My colleagues will recall that when Alice was called as a witness, the King suddenly pronounced, "Rule Forty-two: All persons more than a mile high to leave the court."

Well, Alice protested that she was not a mile high, and she added, "That's not a regular rule; you invented it just now."

To which the King replied, "It's the oldest rule in the book."

Well, Mr. Speaker, things have gotten curiouser and curiouser in this House, and today we are operating under the King's Rules, right out of "Alice in Wonderland." We ought to be ashamed of ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, as much as we might protest that this is not a regular rule,

and that the majority has just invented it, we are told that this is the oldest rule in the book: The King makes the rules around here, and they are subject to change at any time. And boy, are they ever.

Today is an example of just how absurd all this has become. Back on February 16, our Rules Committee reported a rule that allowed just one amendment to the family planning bill—an amendment by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY], who is sitting right behind me, requiring parental notification on abortions for minors.

The following day, February 17, the Democrat leadership pulled that rule, just as it was about to be brought up here on the floor, and nothing further was heard of it for more than a month. Yet we did not have anything on the floor for action. We had, I believe, one bill a week.

Then last week the chairman of the Rules Committee announced that he was reopening consideration for a new rule and Members could again file amendments they wished to offer.

□ 1330

Mr. Speaker, even though the Committee on Rules had rejected seven out of eight amendments submitted on the first go around, the Democrat chairman was now inviting Members to offer even more amendments. To me that was a hopeful sign that we would now have an open rule, or at least a modified open rule, making in order all of the amendments that were submitted up there.

But as it turns out, the Democrat majority had not been overcome by a sudden fit of guilt, fairness, or generosity. In point of fact, the Democrat leadership feared that the one amendment that had been made in order might just pass. So to counteract that possibility, they had to reopen the entire amendment process in order to neutralize that one amendment, and that is what this new rule is all about, neutralizing the opposition.

Talk about democracy. Oh, it is true that the Committee on Rules has made in order four other amendments submitted by Republicans. But, just as with the Bliley amendment, in two of those instances they allow a Democrat to trump the Republican amendments with a watered-down second-degree amendment so there will not be a legitimate vote on any Republican amendment. And in one instance they even allow a Democrat to totally preempt a Republican amendment that they made in order with another amendment, so that if that is adopted, it would preclude the Republican from offering it at all.

Mr. Speaker, you talk about cuteness. These are supposed to be representatives of the people of this Nation, not Members being cute.

69-059 O—97 Vol. 139 (Pt. 5) 12

Mr. Speaker, this new two-step rule process has been a complete sham and a shell game, allowing the Democrat majority to reopen the amendment process so that Democrat-trumped amendments can be offered. We might as well rename this Committee on Rules the trump shuttle. We show our hand first, then the Democrats shuttle back to the Committee on Rules to produce some kind of a trump card that knocks our hand out.

Mr. Speaker, just as when the king said to Alice that rule XLII requires that all persons over a mile high must leave the court, the Democrat leadership is saying that according to their king's rules, anyone with an amendment with a chance of passing will not win, and they will guarantee it.

It is a little like the Queen of Hearts put it at the same trial: First you get the sentence, then you get the verdict.

Here in the king's House you are sentenced to death by the Committee on Rules before the jury of your peers, the full House, can pronounce itself on the merits of your amendment at all.

I will put it another way, Mr. Speaker, and I hope Members back in their offices are listening. Free thinking and free voting Representatives can forget about participating in the legislative process. The rules are automatically rigged against them, unless they are doing the bidding of the Democrat leadership or the Democrat administration.

Well, welcome to the Committee on Rules. Instead of a kangaroo court, we have got a king of the rule court, right out of Malice in Wonderland. No, I am not tonguetied; Malice in Wonderland.

Mr. Speaker, I was amazed to read in last Sunday's Washington Post that one freshman Democrat was quoted as saying, "First and foremost, we are here to enact a substantive agenda." He goes on to say, "Whether or not we have open or closed rules will not affect the day-to-day lives of ordinary citizens."

Change? Mr. Speaker, I think there is a serious disconnect here on the part of some of the Members, too many of them, perhaps on the relationship between process and policy.

Let me put it bluntly: If you do not fight to be a part of this process, you are not going to have a dime's worth of influence on the policy. It is just that simple.

I did not come here for that, and I hope you did not. If you do not realize that every time you agree to one of these restrictive rules you are not only disenfranchising yourself, but you are disempowering your constituents as well, then you sure have a lot to learn about both procedure and policy.

Mr. Speaker, maybe to some Members that does not make any difference. Maybe they are more comfortable letting their Democrat leadership and Democrat administration make their decision for them. Maybe they prefer to be spared the pain and the work involved in being a real player around here. But let me caution Members right now: This kind of automatic pilot mentality will not land them safely back in their districts come election time. Mr. Speaker, Members will be held accountable for the decisions made by this Government, regardless of whether they are actually involved in it or not, and it just will not do for them to claim they were just following orders.

Mr. Speaker, if those policies turn out to be wrong and they fail, Members are going to learn real fast about term limits. There are 63 new Democrats over there. Just continue to be yes men. They should continue ignoring why their constituents that sent them here—it was for change. Remember that word? On the day after the election, just 19 months from now, it is right around the corner, they are going to wake up and find their term has been limited to one.

Mr. Speaker, that is right. Half of them will be gone. I have seen it happen year after year for 15 years. And they wonder, "What did I do wrong? I followed my Democrat leadership."

Mr. Speaker, I would appeal to Members on both sides of the aisle, do not stand blindly and idly by while your basic rights and those of your constituents are being stripped away. This is not a partisan matter. This is about a role of the people's branch, and your place in it. If you do not fight for it now, you will soon be out of it. You had better think about that.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I include extraneous material, including the rollcall votes in the Committee on Rules, including the rollcall vote where every Democrat voted party line against my amendment, the Solomon amendment, banning HIV-AIDS infected immigrants from coming into this country.

ROLLCALL VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE ON RULES ON MOTIONS OFFERED TO THE PROPOSED RULE ON THE FAMILY PLANNING AMENDMENTS (H.R. 670)

1. Solomon motion.—For an open rule plus Solomon amendment #9 (see attached summary of amendments) barring aliens with AIDS from permanent immigration. Rejected: 2–7. Yeas: Solomon and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Hall, Wheat and Slaughter.

2. Goss motion.—For an open rule. Rejected: 2–7. Yeas: Solomon and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Hall, Wheat and Slaughter.

3. Solomon motion.—To make in order Dornan amendment #6. Rejected: 2–7. Yeas: Solomon and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Hall, Wheat and Slaughter.

4. Goss motion.—To make in order Smith (NJ) amendment #8. Rejected: 4–5. Yeas: Moakley, Hall, Solomon and Goss. Nays: Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Wheat and Slaughter.

5. Solomon motion.—To make in order Solomon amendment #9. Rejected: 2–8. Yeas: Solomon and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick,

Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Hall, Wheat and Slaughter.

6. Solomon motion.—To make in order Bartlett amendment #1 even if Waxman amendment #20 is adopted (note: the pending rule precludes Bartlett from being offered if Waxman is adopted). Rejected: 2-8. Yeas: Solomon and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Hall, Wheat and Slaughter.

7. Derrick motion.—To report rule as moved. Adopted: 8-2. Yeas: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Hall, Wheat and Slaughter. Nays: Solomon and Goss.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED TO THE RULES COMMITTEE ON H.R. 670, THE FAMILY PLANNING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1993

1. Bartlett.—Strikes language in the bill clarifying that the conscience clause exemption applies to either an individual or a project and, in the case of a provider, that the patient must be referred to a provider that will provide information.

2. Bliley.—Prohibits the provision of Title X grants to a provider unless that provider agrees that it will notify a parent or legal guardian of a minor seeking abortion services, and at least 48 hours have elapsed. Provides the following exceptions: (1) a doctor certifies that the abortion was necessary to prevent the death of the minor and there is insufficient time to provide the notice; (2) the pregnancy results from incest with a parent or the minor has been at risk of sexual abuse, child abuse or child neglect, provided that the physician notifies state authorities of the known or suspected abuse; (3) in cases where the provider complies with a state or local law which requires parental notification or consent and provides for no waivers or a waiver only for one or more of six stated circumstances.

3. DeLay.—Requires that information on pregnancy management options be given only by a counselor who has a professional degree in medicine or osteopathic medicine, nursing, clinical psychology, an allied health profession, or social work.

4. DeLay.—Requires that Title X grants be given to State health and human services agencies rather than directly to the public or nonprofit private entities.

5. Solomon.—Requires the Secretary, in carrying out duties under the Immigration and Nationality Act, to consider infection with AIDS to be a communicable disease of public health significance.

6. Dornan.—Requires a specific means test to establish "low-income family" under Section 1006 of the Public Health Service Act. This would include counseling services on contraception as well as pregnancy management options. Also specifies that, for minors, the determination of income will be made without maintaining confidentiality between the minor and the minor's family.

7. Burton.—Prohibits the provision of Title X grants to providers unless the provider agreed to distribute condoms which meet minimum FDA standards and provides counseling in the use of the condoms.

8. Smith of New Jersey.—Codifies that a Title X project must be kept separate and distinct, financially and physically, from any abortion-related activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO SECOND DEADLINE: MARCH 22, 1993

9. Solomon.—Prohibits the permanent admission into the U.S. of immigrants who are infected with the HIV virus (identical to Senate-passed language on NIH Authorization).

10. Johnson of Texas.—Withdrawn.

11. Baesler.—Withdrawn.

12. Baesler.—Withdrawn.

13. Kolbe.—Withdrawn.

14. Johnson of Texas.—Withdrawn.

15. Waxman.—Second degree amendment to the DeLay amendment. Adds to list of those allowed to provide pregnancy counseling, persons who meet criteria established by the Secretary and persons who are allowed to provide such counseling under State law.

16. Waxman.—Second degree amendment to the Smith (NJ) amendment. Requires that grantees maintain sufficient records to demonstrate that no Federal funds were used to provide abortion services.

17. Waxman.—Second degree amendment to the Bliley amendment. Restates the bill's provisions requiring that grantees abide by State law regarding parental notification for minors seeking abortion services with private funds and clarifies that State law is to be used to define the term "minor."

18. Waxman.—Second degree amendment to the Burton amendment. Clarifies that family planning clinics may only give out condoms that meet applicable existing FDA requirements regarding labeling and quality control, and any subsequently developed requirement on prevention of pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases.

19. Waxman.—Second degree amendment to the Dornan amendment. Defines the target population of the family planning program to be individuals at 185% of the official poverty line and those whose economic status might otherwise prevent their participation.

20. Waxman.—Clarifies that referral for pregnancy management options is not required of an individual provider with objections of conscience but that the project receiving funds must make arrangements for such referral.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 95TH–103D CONG.

Congress (years)	Total rules granted [1]	Open rules		Restrictive rules	
		Number	Percent [2]	Number	Percent [3]
95th (1977–78)	211	179	85	32	15
96th (1979–80)	214	161	75	53	25
97th (1981–82)	120	90	75	30	25
98th (1983–84)	155	105	68	50	32
99th (1985–86)	115	65	57	50	43
100th (1987–88)	123	66	54	57	46
101st (1989–90)	104	47	45	57	55
102d (1991–92)	109	37	34	72	66
103d (1993–94)	8	0	0	8	100

[1] Total rules counted are all order of business resolutions reported from the Rules Committee which provide for the initial consideration of legislation, except rules on appropriations bills which only waive points of order. Original jurisdiction measures reported as privileged are also not counted.

[2] Open rules are those which permit any Member to offer any germane amendment to a measure so long as it is otherwise in compliance with the rules of the House. The parenthetical percentages are open rules as a percent of total rules granted.

[3] Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules, as well as completely closed rules, and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. The parenthetical percentages are restrictive rules as a percent of total rules granted.

Sources: "Rules Committee Calendars & Surveys of Activities," 95th–102d Cong.; "Notices of Action Taken," Committee on Rules, 103d Congress, through Mar. 17, 1993.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 103D CONG.

Rule number date reported	Rule type	Bill number and subject	Amendments submitted	Amendments allowed	Disposition of rule and date
H. Res. 58, Feb. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 1: Family and medical leave	30 (D–5; R–25)	3 (D–0 R–3)	PQ: (264–176. A: 259–164. Feb. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 59, Feb. 3, 1993	MC	H.R. 2: Motor voter	9 (D–1; R–8)	1 (D–0; R–1)	PQ: (248–171. A: 249–170. Feb. 4, 1993).
H. Res. 81, Feb. 16, 1993	MC	H.R. 6: Family planning	8 (D–0; R–8)	1 (D–0; R–1)	
H. Res. 103, Feb. 23, 1993	C	H.R. 920: Unemployment compensation	7 (D–2; R–5)	0	PQ: (243–172. A: 237–178. Feb. 24, 1993).
H. Res. 106, Mar. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 20: Hatch Act amendments	9 (D–1; R–8)	3 (D–0; R–3)	PQ: (248–166. A: 249–163. Mar. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 119, Mar. 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 4: NIH Revitalization Act of 1993	13 (D–4; R–9)	8 (D–3; R–5)	PQ: (247–170. A: 248–170. Mar. 10, 1993).
H. Res. 132, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 1335: Emergency supplemental appropriations	37 (D–8; R–29)	1 (not submitted) (D–1; R–0).	
H. Res. 133, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H. Con. Res. 64: Budget resolution	14 (D–2; R–12)	4 (1–D not submitted) (D–2; R–2).	

Note.—Code: C-Closed; MC-Modified closed; MO-Modified open; O-Open; D-Democrat; R-Republican; PQ: Previous question; A-Adopted; F-Failed.

H. RES. 138—PROVIDING FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 670, THE FAMILY PLANNING AMENDMENTS ACT

(An amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. Solomon)

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 670) to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to ensure that pregnant women receiving assistant under title X of the Public Health Service Act are provided with information and counseling regarding their pregnancies, and for other purposes, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. After general debate which shall be confined to the bill and which shall not exceed one hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.".

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to strike a blow for democracy by voting no on the previous question. Get some guts over there. I used to do it against my own party. Vote down this gag rule and vote yes on my amendment to keep those immigrants that are infected with HIV virus out of this country. Your constituents will appreciate that.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I presently have no requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], a new

and very viable member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I find it hard to say more articulately or more passionately what the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has just enunciated.

I think our task here is to try and acquaint all the Members and all the audience and the leadership with the problems that we have got with the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, the President invited Republicans to participate in the legislative process and policymaking. But the Democratic leadership on the Hill has contrary ideas. It is using the Rules Committee to block substantive Republican contributions. The Democrat-controlled Rules Committee has implemented a systematic and wholesale denial of Republican amendments—to date in this Congress we have had eight closed or restrictive rules and no open rules. A few Republican amendments actually were allowed today, but they have been thoroughly gutted by a special process involving so-called second-degree amendments to cancel them out.

The President has invited us in but the Democrat majority on the Rules Committee has slammed the door in our face and pulled away the welcome mat. The majority here has apparently determined the best way to end gridlock is to terminate the democratic system. The surviving descendant of gridlock is a growing monster we could call step-lock. The Democrats are not taking any chances. They march in unison—in lock step—to close off sensitive debate, despite their overwhelming majority. It was not enough that the majority leadership strong-armed the Rules Committee to grant a mostly closed rule for this bill 1 month ago, allowing only 1 of 8 amendments filed, allowing for an amendment to ensure that parents are notified when their children seek abortions. The Democrats pulled that bill and directed the Rules Committee to create a series of perfecting amendments that deflect votes on relevant and substantive proposals offered by several Members.

Do not be fooled by the word "perfecting" used to describe the amendments offered by Mr. WAXMAN. Those so-called perfecting amendments do little more than gut the minority amendments. It is a process that pretends to give us a bigger picture—but yanks the magnifying glass away when the time comes to vote. Some legitimate Republican amendments were closed out entirely—like those offered by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Mr. SOLOMON of New York—to address serious concerns about the proper use of public funds and public health. This bill seeks to boost title X funding by 56 percent over current levels in the next 2 years. Just days after approving the single largest tax hike in history when all Americans are being asked to sacrifice—is it appropriate to implement a 56-percent increase in this program at this time? And how does this issue—which Mr. WAXMAN has described as one of great public health significance—impact the First Lady's Health Care Task Force, known by some as Hillary Health which will not be revealed until early May?

And what about the public health matter of opening our national borders to immigrants known to be infected with the AIDS virus? By refusing to allow clean votes on these very crucial public health questions, the majority is gagging this House. We are talking about explosive medical cost questions that affect each American in a very personal way. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic leadership may have concluded that Republicans do not matter. But Republicans represent Americans, too. This is the people's House and the people have a right to be represented by each of the 435 Members they sent here. Please defeat the previous question and vote down this rule.

□ 1340

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

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

I rise in strong support of the bill, and in opposition to the Bliley recommittal motion and the other proposed first amendments.

Title X is an important source of low cost, primary health care services for many poor women. It is part of our Nation's health care solution, not part of the problem. The program is also part of the solution to the abortion problem. I support title X as a legitimate part of a comprehensive effort to prevent unintended pregnancies and thus prevent abortions. It is instructive that those most strongly opposed to choice are also those most strongly opposed to effective voluntary family planning.

The gag rule—which the new President lifted recently—is offensive to American values and contrary to sound medical practice. The American people understand that a system of regulatory controls on factual information, controls on medical professionals, and abrogation of the rights of poor women does great damage to the fabric of our democracy. It is good that the gag rule will be permanently reversed by this legislation.

Mr. Bliley's proposal relating to the issue of parental involvement in abortion decisions should not be supported. H.R. 670 has already been drafted to ensure that it does not interfere with State laws on notice and consent. A provision was put in the bill to protect State parental notice and consent laws and should be left undisturbed.

It is also important to note that the Bliley motion does not contain appropriate provisions for a judicial bypass. The Supreme Court has required such a judicial bypass mechanism in past decisions and the Bliley motion, if adopted, would be an intentional invitation to litigation, and could well be found to violate constitutional standards.

Several other amendments may be offered today. They are all aimed at undermining title X and should be rejected. Mr. DELAY's amendments would have the effect of raising program costs and cutting back services. He would also effectively terminate many of the grantees who are currently doing excellent work under difficult conditions. And Mr. BARTLETT is proposing an amendment that would effectively reimpose the gag rule by allowing facilities that do not counsel or refer on all options to be funded under the program.

These amendments should be rejected and the underlying bill passed.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY], the distinguished ranking subcommittee member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule. It was approximately 1 month ago that the Rules Committee reported out House Resolution 81, which made my amendment on parental notification in order. Under this rule, all Members of the House would have been given the opportunity to vote on parental notification regarding abortions involving minors.

However, the Democratic leadership pulled the title X reauthorization from the floor when it became clear that the leadership was uncertain whether it had the votes to defeat my amendment.

The Democratic leadership sent the bill back to the Rules Committee in order to assure a rule that would give them the outcome they desired. This new rule attempts to provide a flimsy fig leaf of democracy by providing for some additional amendments. However, we all know that the primary goal of this new rule is to allow the Health Subcommittee chairman to offer a second degree amendment that completely guts my amendment.

Members should realize that Congressman WAXMAN's substitute is clearly a sham substitute which barely adds several new meaningless words to the underlying text of H.R. 670. Clearly, its only intention is to prevent a clean vote on my parental notification amendment.

Mr. Speaker, this body is supposed to represent democracy at its finest. Unfortunately, that has been far from the truth in recent days. I urge my colleagues to restore credibility and integrity to more debate process in this Chamber and to reject this bogus rule.

Mr. Speaker, I was at the Committee on Rules and I was present when the discussion took place between the gentlewoman from New York and the gentleman from South Carolina as to whether amendments were considered in committee and whether they should all be considered in committee or not. Indeed, the gentleman from South Carolina asked me if my amendment had been considered in the committee, and I assured him that it had. Whereupon, he remarked that "Then you are clean," and I said, "Well, I hope I am always that way."

So there was a discussion, and I would invite Members to look at the transcript that was taken at the Committee on Rules and to see for themselves what occurred or what did not occur.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. COPPERSMITH].

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of this rule and in favor of H.R. 670, the reauthorization of the Title X Family Planning Program. I have served as a volunteer with a family planning organization that has used title X funds to provide family planning services to low-income families. I also received the old office of a former Member of this House, George Bush, and before he underwent an ultimately unsuccessful political transformation, he was an original cosponsor of the Title X Program.

Mr. Speaker, the Title X Program is cost-effective. In addition to grants to State and local governments, the program uses low-cost nonprofit providers. Every $1 spent on family planning services saves $8 to $10 or more in future costs. The Title X Program improves maternal and child health. The Title X Program strengthens families. From personal experience, I know the program works, and works well, and so does every other Member of this body.

However, for the past decade, reauthorization of this program has been held hostage to politics. Two prior administrations thought it more important to score points than to serve people. The other side last time complained bitterly that the rule allowed too few amendments; now, the minority complains equally bitterly that the rule allows too many amendments. Once again, men on the other side of the aisle are trying to make innocent women and families bear the cost of their political posturing, by linking this program to some totally unrelated and nongermane issues. Prior and identical versions of this bill were thoroughly debated by this House. It's time to stop playing games with peoples' lives, to adopt this rule, and to reauthorize title X.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], one of the real leaders of this House.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I testified and asked the Rules Committee to report an open rule for the consideration of H.R. 670 because the Family Planning Amendments Act of 1993 is an authorization bill and by definition, establishes the basic parameters of the program.

An open rule, it seemed to me, would be more likely to permit the House to work its will.

The Rules Committee instead opted for business as usual—allowing only a few amendments to be in order and has so crafted the rule that it is highly unlikely some important pro-life amendments permitted under the rule will even get a vote.

The rule before us is unfair, belittles the legislative process, and in a word, is a sham.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to offer an amendment designed to mitigate and perhaps even end the occurrence of a blatant conflict of interest—both ethically and financially.

That conflict of interest exists when title X projects also operate as abortion mills. My amendment would simply have required that a title X clinic be kept separate and distinct, financially and physically from the performance of abortions. It was and is a rather modest proposal.

HHS has compiled a list of at least 39 nonhospital title X clinics that are colocated with abortion mills. The fundamental difference between the provision of birth control and the chemical poisoning or dismemberment of babies by abortion should not be blurred, especially when a fee is collected for each baby aborted. Additionally, now that Mr. Clinton has, by Executive order, mandated referrals for abortion as a method of family planning, title X clinics are free to refer mothers for abortion at their own abortion mills. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to understand the consequence of this—more abortions and an obvious conflict of interest.

When you consider that one major title X recipient—Planned Parenthood—performs or refers for over 200,000 abortions per year which means that Planned Parenthood kills 1 million kids every 5 years. The need for physical and financial separation to avoid a conflict of interest is compelling and obvious.

In their September 24, 1982, report, the General Accounting Office [GAO] said that "HHS needs to set forth clear guidance on the scope of abortion restrictions in its title X program regulations and guidelines." The GAO report further addressed the issue of "organizationally separating the title X family program" from abortion-related activities.

The GAO report cited a Brooklyn, NY, clinic that operated a family planning clinic and an abortion clinic at the same location. They conducted abortion clinic hours from 8:30 a.m. to 10 a.m. 4 days a week and then shifted to family planning and abortion postoperative hours from 10:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. "Both the family planning and abortion clinics are staffed by the same personnel, and the medical director for the family planning program generally performs the abortions for the clinic as well," the GAO reported. Obviously, this type of activity violates the letter and spirit of the title X statute.

My amendment that was not made in order carefully tracked the final rule which HHS published on February 2, 1988. It would have provided for a case-by-case review by the Department of Health and Human Services. It would have exempted large, metropolitan hospitals due to their unique circumstances and broader public purposes. The final rule also provided a great deal of latitude in the Department's dealings with rural health centers.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. WAXMAN proposed a second-degree amendment which was designed to completely gut my language while putting in its place seemingly innocuous language that says the administration and title X recipients are required to follow the law as it relates to abortion by doing some bookkeeping. Big deal.

I argued that Mr. WAXMAN ought to be offering his amendment in addition to, but not in place of, my amendment.

But that's not the little game being played here.

Each of Mr. WAXMAN's second-degree amendments are diversionary in nature and constitute a cynical attempt to preclude consideration of Mr. BLILEY's amendment, mine and others.

Question: Why, Mr. Speaker, why. Why are the pro-abortionists so afraid to let our language proceed to the floor unfettered by tricky substitute language. When you think about it, it is really an insult to the character and intelligence of conscientious Members in this body because the pro-abortion lobby seems to think you are unable to understand the shell game being played out here, or they think that you do not care.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed—but after 13 years here, not surprised anymore. Rather than getting discouraged, though, these cheap tricks only make me and others more determined. The bottom line is that the process here is not on the up and up and that goes double on this rule and bill.

Finally, if we all wonder sometimes why so many people in and out of government have lost faith in Congress it is precisely because of these kinds of deceitful tactics.

The time for reform in this duplicitous process has come.

With the power vested in this House, especially in the majority, goes the moral responsibility to be ethical and fair. This rule flunks any standard of fairness by a wide margin. This rule—this process—is an outrage.

□ 1350

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and I want to make several points. I think it is time for common sense, too. I think it is time for common sense in letting women be able to make decisions with a minimum of hubbub about them which Congress has imposed on them, which the Federal Government has imposed on them, which this debate imposes upon them.

Indeed, ultimately it is a decision that each woman is going to have to make. We ought not to make that process more difficult in the family planning authorization language. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the Bliley amendment, and I oppose it for a number of reasons.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, it is my reading of the Bliley amendment that there is an excellent chance that it will wipe out part, if not all, but definitely part of the West Virginia parental notification statute. That is the statute that in our State was fought over and agonized over for a long period of time. It is a statute, for instance, which was one reason that I withheld support from the early Freedom of Choice Act last year, because it did not have adequate protection for a statute such as the West Virginia parental notification statute.

Yet when I read the Bliley amendment, I read that it probably imposes restrictions that our State legislature, in a rural State, has deemed not worthy of imposing.

I am concerned when I see a waiting period of the magnitude of this one, since many women in our State drive 5 or 6 hours to one of the few clinics that performs abortions and can provide that assistance. So I would say that this seems to suggest one of those undue burdens that the Supreme Court spoke about in one of its recent decisions.

I am also concerned with the incest provision, which says yes, that a minor can waive the parental notification provisions if there is incest by the parent or legal guardian. However, what about by an uncle? What about by a brother? What about by someone of that status of relationship, and not just a parent or guardian, equally as destructive in the family setting? I think that the incest provision definitely falls short here.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I oppose the Bliley amendment. I think it does harm. I also believe that these issues are going to be addressed in subsequent legislation, as well.

I also walked on the floor and heard the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] talking very eloquently about his concern about the HIV situation. I think my colleagues ought to know that the situation he is talking about, banning those with HIV, testing HIV positive, from coming into this country, that is not germane to this provision of the bill. This is Title X: Family Planning Reauthorization. It does not deal with HIV and immigration provisions.

Second, if the Members remember, those on the House floor voted only 2 weeks ago to instruct conferees on another bill that this House stood overwhelmingly in opposition to allowing those with the HIV virus to enter this country. I voted for that language, to ban those from entering this country. That is presently being worked out in conference. That is not germane to this bill. It has been acted upon by this House, it will be acted upon in the future, and that should not be used as a smoke screen to diffuse support for this rule.

I urge support of this rule and support of this legislation. Let us get on with it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the deputy whip.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to once again use the chart to demonstrate how much we have gone in the last several Congresses toward adopting Mussolini rules in the House of Representatives. Mussolini rules are those that follow the handbook of Benito Mussolini, who wanted to make the trains run on time but resorted to fascism to do that. Mussolini rules in the House are those that want to make the House run on time but destroy democracy in order to do it.

Let us see here. During the 95th Congress, just a few short years ago, about 85 percent of all the rules were open rules, in other words allowed free and open debate, allowed middle-class America to have their views heard on the House floor.

□ 1400

Guess what? As middle-class America has become more and more disgusted with the Congress, and has found what Congress is doing, undermining everything they believe in, open rules have declined to the point that in this Congress they have plunged to nothing.

Today we have another Mussolini rule on the floor that gives us no chance for open debate whatsoever.

What has happened about closed rules, as middle America has found that Congress is not doing what they wish, Congress has more and more resorted to closed rules, until we get to this Congress, when every rule brought to the floor is a closed rule.

What does that tell us? It tells us that the American people are being shut out of this body. It tells us that the Democrats' majority can no longer allow the American people to have their say.

I suggested that this was going to become a part of a pattern here in a colloquy a few minutes ago, and I was told that no such thing was said in the Rules Committee about this becoming a pattern. Now I am not allowed to quote from the transcript of the Rules Committee, but I can paraphrase it, and everything that I said was absolutely true in that colloquy between the gentlewoman from New York and the gentleman from South Carolina in which they talked about the fact that the only amendments that should be allowed on the floor under anything other than emergency conditions should be those that come up in the committee.

Well, what does that mean? It means that we are not going to have a chance for Members of Congress representing 565,000 of their constituents to have their opportunity to offer amendments on the floor. That means that middle class America is being shut out of the House floor, and it is being done purposely, and the Rules Committee has every intention of continuing the pattern.

The gentlewoman from New York referred to the fact that there was a long debate over the Department of Education some years ago, and it went on for some days. And what they do not tell you about that debate—what they do not tell you about that debate that she refers to—is the fact that they checked with their former Republican colleague, Mr. Horton, about this, and Mr. Horton was a proponent of the Department of Education. He did not like that long debate, and I will tell Members why. Because when they went into that debate they had a 100-vote margin and they were going to win the thing by 100 votes. After the debate, and after that bill was defined for the American people, they only won by four votes, because the debate did change minds.

The fact is that that is what often takes place. When you allow free debate on the House floor, when middle-class America has their opportunity to be heard on the House floor, every once in a while minds are changed. Every once in a while we move ahead.

The Democrats know that if we are able to expose their legislation and their programs to the light of day that middle-class America will not agree with them, and they will have a chance, we will have a chance of reversing some of that legislation on the floor.

They do not want that to happen, and so the trend is clear. Mussolini rules are winning. More and more of the open rules are being declined and Mussolini rules are going up, so in this Congress Mussolini wins. We have gone from having "Jefferson's Manual" to having "Mussolini's Manual" governing the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say to my Democrat friends that last week on the floor I called probably 12 or 13 votes, and I received criticism not from Democrats but from Republicans as well because it took so much time, and people wanted to go home.

What is happening is that the Rules Committee is gagging, literally gagging the Republicans to such a degree that we have no alternative but to use what rules are left to fight for our constituents. If you close off debate in the Rules Committee so we cannot propose our amendments, then you are strangling 550,000 to 600,000 people, and that is just not right.

So I want to tell my Democrat friends that regardless of the pressure I get from Republicans or Democrats, I am going to be calling vote after vote after vote after vote. And when you want to go home to see your families on the weekends, when you have an airplane to catch, and when we are calling a vote, just remember, it is not because we want to do it, it is because you are gagging the Republican minority, because you will not allow us to bring our amendments to the floor which our constituents want fully debated.

So remember what we are telling you today, not only the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], and myself, but many others are going to be calling for lots of votes that are going to cause a lot of discomfort for you, and if you want this discomfort to end, then you are going to have to start being fair with the Republican minority.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD], the ranking Republican on the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule.

The Rules Committee met last month and made the Bliley amendment on parental notification in order. Floor debate on H.R. 670 was scheduled for February 16 and 17. Because of the fear that the amendment might actually succceed, the bill was pulled from floor consideration.

To preclude any possibility that the amendment might prevail, the Rules Committee reconvened to develop a new rule to make in order a second degree amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the minority is continually seeking open rules so that any Member can offer amendments, even second degree amendments. Now we are being advised that when the majority crafts a closed rule and subsequently discovers that it does not have the votes, we are just going to go back to Rules and remedy the situation.

I urge my colleagues to send a message that this is not acceptable. Vote "no" on this rule.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I did not personally offer any amendments on this bill to the Rules Committee; nor did I testify. I have offered amendments in the past, however, and I do support several of the amendments which were offered and either rejected, or accepted in a watered-down form. I know all too well the frustration that comes from being effectively silenced by the heavy hand of the Rules Committee.

Having been there, Mr. Speaker, I can say honestly that I am sick and tired of minority efforts to obtain fairness not being taken seriously in this body. The majority seems to think that every time the minority tries to amend a bill, it is being obstructionist.

Does it ever occur to the suspicious majority that perhaps the minority believes—in good faith—that certain amendments are simply better public policy? That some amendments are offered in an attempt to actually improve the legislation? That reasonable minds can and do legitimately disagree on important issues, and that these voices should be heard? Things like keeping abortion separate from family planning, or ensuring that moneys intended for low-income families actually go to low-income families, or a conscience clause?

These are legitimate concerns, and I believe that at least some of them represent the beliefs of a majority, regardless of how Members feel about abortion itself. These are not obstructionist ploys.

Before the majority simply closes its ears and dismisses my complaints and those of my colleagues as whining, why not listen to an objective voice? Last month, Dr. Thomas Mann of the Brookings Institution told the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress that the current practice of the Rules Committee has deteriorated to a "sharp partisan conflict that has brought great disrepute to the House." Great disrepute to the House. Our rules are no longer about moving legislation forward, as they once were. Our rules are about silencing voices of dissent. And yes, this type of rule has, indeed, brought great disrepute to this great House.

In the spirit of discussion, dissent, and tolerance, I will oppose the rule. I urge Members who have a sense of fair play to do the same.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of our time.

Mr. Speaker, President Lincoln in his first Inaugural said, "If by the mere force of numbers a majority should deprive a minority of any clearly written constitutional right, it might, in a moral point of view, justify revolution." And he went on to say, "And certainly would if such a right were a vital one."

Mr. Speaker, during the last election campaign we witnessed the opening round in a political revolution that is taking place in this land, perhaps most evident, I guess, in the adoption of term-limit initiatives in 14 out of 14 States where it appeared on the ballot—14 out of 14. And notwithstanding all of the winds of change rhetoric that is swirling around this Capitol right now, the people still feel that they are not a part of this Government, that they are being shut out. And you need look no further than these gag rules for evidence that they are indeed being denied full representation, a right guaranteed them under the Constitution.

This is not a partisan matter or a mere procedural squabble. We are talking about the denial of basic constitutional rights of Members of Congress. And believe me, the people are becoming more and more aware of just how important these special rules are.

People are listening. People are watching on C-SPAN, and they know what you are doing. They know what you are doing to the minority.

So I would urge my colleagues to reverse this dangerous trend by putting the people back in the people's House, and by putting this House back in the sunshine of freedom and deliberation.

Members, term limitations. Your constituents are watching, and you had better pay attention to that.

I ask Members to vote down the previous question so that I can offer an open rule that will allow us to again offer the amendment which would ban immigrants from coming into this country with the infectious disease of AIDS.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself just a few minutes to close debate.

I think it is very apt that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], opened his debate talking about Alice in Wonderland, because that is exactly what we all feel, that we have fallen down the rabbit hole after we have listened to one of these debates. The truth of the matter is in the Rules Committee, that is being put at fault here, it is not that we do not allow Republican amendments, it is that we do not allow every one of them. The one the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] refers to is obviously not germane to this bill, and as the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] so eloquently pointed out, it is being debated as we speak in another bill that has already passed this House.

The fact is in the last bill that I carried on this floor, the NIH bill, there were eight amendments allowed, five of them Republican.

Mr. SOLOMON. Would my friend yield at that point?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. No; I will not yield. If I may, I would like to close debate.

What we have here today is invective and threats, and shouting about what the American people are wanting.

I will tell Members what they are wanting in my district. They are wanting this Congress to get busy and to do something about the direction of this country, to make sure that their children are educated, their health care is taken care of, that their job is somewhat secure.

But we spend the time here, and as I have said many times, I think what we are doing, the fact is that the veto is lost from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, and this is the next way to create gridlock so that the House will not be able to do any of its work.

We have deliberated long and hard. Every Member who comes to the Rules Committee gets heard. And I will submit that what we do is what we are trying to do which is best for the Rules Committee, for our colleagues, and for the country.

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

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

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

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

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

Pursuant to clause 5(b) of rule XV, the Chair will reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for any recorded vote that may be ordered on adoption of the resolution, without intervening business.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 252, nays 164, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 90]

YEAS—252

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thornton
Thurman
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NAYS—164

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

NOT VOTING—14

Doolittle
Dreier
Ford (TN)
Hansen
Henry
Lewis (FL)
McDermott
Pickle
Quillen
Sharp
Shaw
Swett
Torres
Zeliff

□ 1429

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 247, nays 169, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 91]

YEAS—247

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)

Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Snowe
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tejeda
Thornton
Thurman
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NAYS—169

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dornan
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Mollohan
Moorhead
Murphy
Myers
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—14

Doolittle
Dreier
English (AZ)
Ford (TN)
Henry
Johnson, E.B.
Lewis (FL)
Pickle
Quillen
Sharp
Shaw
Swett
Torres
Zeliff

□ 1439

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Pickle for, with Mr. Doolittle against.
Mr. Torres for, with Mr. Lewis against.
Ms. English for, with Mr. Quillen against.

Mr. TAUZIN changed his voté from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

Mr. WALKER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker——

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the House passed House Resolution 138.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I have not objected. I am reserving the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has a privileged motion which she can offer at this point.

□ 1440

MOTION OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the House agreed to House Resolution 138.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). For what purpose does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] rise?

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MOAKLEY

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 252, noes 165, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 92]

AYES—252

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Snowe
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tejeda
Thornton
Thurman
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOES—165

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dornan
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Myers
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—13

Barrett (WI)
Doolittle
Dreier
Ford (TN)
Henry
Lewis (FL)
Pickle
Quillen
Sharp
Skaggs
Swett
Torres
Zeliff

□ 1457

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana moves that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 32, nays 374, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 93]

YEAS—32

Allard
Armey
Baker (CA)
Bartlett
Burton
Castle
Cox
Crane
DeLay
Dornan
Duncan
Emerson
Fields (TX)
Franks (CT)
Hancock
Hefley
Hoke
Hunter
Kingston
Livingston
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Moorhead
Paxon
Rohrabacher
Santorum
Schaefer
Smith (NJ)
Stump
Sundquist
Taylor (NC)

NAYS—374

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Dooley
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—24

Berman
Brown (CA)
de la Garza
Dellums
Dingell
Doolittle
Dreier
Edwards (CA)
Ford (TN)
Henry
Johnson, Sam
LaFalce
Lewis (FL)
Martinez
Meyers
Pickle
Quillen
Rangel
Sharp
Swett
Tejeda
Washington
Williams
Zeliff

□ 1517

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

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for rollcall votes numbered 90 through 93. Had I been present for these rollcalls I would have voted "No" in each instance.

During these votes I was meeting with officials at the Environmental Protection Agency to discuss the findings of my citizens task force on Superfund reform.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TEJEDA. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 93 on motion to ad-

journ I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "No."

FAMILY PLANNING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS). Pursuant to House Resolution 138 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 670.

□ 1517

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 670) to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to ensure that pregnant women receiving assistance under title X of the Public Health Service Act are provided with information and counseling regarding their pregnancies, and for other purposes, with Ms. SLAUGHTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

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

Madam Chairman, H.R. 670 is a bill to reauthorize the Federal family planning program, to overturn the gag rule on health professionals in family planning clinics, and to require that these clinics comply with State law that is in force regarding parental notification or consent for minors seeking an abortion.

ON REAUTHORIZATION

The Federal family planning program is a key element in the Nation's effort to improve maternal and child health, lower infant mortality, and lower the rates of unwanted pregnancy and abortion in the United States. Over the years, expert review and medical research have always arrived at the same common sense conclusion: The best solution to unwanted pregnancy is to prevent the pregnancy.

Unfortunately, this program has been held hostage in the abortion debate for too long. The program has been proposed for repeals, block grants, freezes, and restrictions. It has not been reauthorized since 1985 and has not had significant funding increases since its last authorization.

The tragic result is that routine contraception services have been limited over the last decade, and that has meant unwanted pregnancy and, in turn, unnecessarily high rates of both low-birth-weight babies and abortions.

With this legislation, I hope that we can expand these services and move beyond the abortion debate to the health debate. The continued use of the family planning program as a pawn in this debate is self-defeating, leaving poor women with fewer and fewer ways to prevent pregnancy.

ON THE GAG RULE

We should also move to ensure that poor women are able to get the best medical advice of the health professionals that provide them services. The Bush administration proposed regulations to limit the ability of doctors and nurses to counsel and refer patients or even to answer point-blank questions with truthful answers. This regulation—which is known as the gag rule—is bad medicine, bad law, and bad precedent. And although President Clinton has now suspended the implementation of this regulation, it is important that we move forward with legislation to guarantee the provision of accurate and truthful information to all title X patients.

H.R. 670 would permanently reverse the gag rule and replace it with a codification of the guidelines that were issued by the Reagan administration on how a family planning clinic should deal with a pregnant woman. This is a simple approach: If a patient requests information on pregnancy options, she should be given that information. It should be nondirective, it should be complete, and it should be true.

This has been the practice of the program since its inception. It was formalized by the Reagan administration. It is supported by all health provider groups, including the American Medical Association and the American Nurses Association. It should continue to be the policy of the program.

ON PARENTAL NOTIFICATION

Finally, this bill contains an amendment to require that clinics receiving funds under this program comply with any State law in force that provides for parental notification or consent for minors seeking abortions.

The first thing that I want to make explicit is that title X funds cannot be used to perform abortions. Nothing in this bill changes that policy. This amendment affects only title X clinics that provide abortions with totally separate, non-Federal funds.

The amendment requires that these clinics comply with State law that is in force on parental notification and consent. The committee took this approach because of the widely varying provisions of State parental involvement law. Some States require it, some States do not. Some States make exceptions for medical emergencies. Some States allow notification to grandparents. Some States allow counseling by clergy instead.

Rather than superceding this variety of laws, the committee chose to recognize these laws in a States' rights manner. It would be inappropriate to override State laws in this extremely complex area through a small grants program.

CONCLUSION

In closing, I would simply reemphasize that the Federal family planning program is our best hope to achieve many maternal and child health goals. To reduce unwanted pregnancy we should make family planning widely available. To lower abortion rates we should give women the ability to prevent pregnancy. Finally planning is not the problem. It is the solution. I urge Members to support H.R. 670.

□ 1520

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Chairman, I am unable to support H.R. 670. I simply cannot reconcile the provisions of H.R. 670 with my view that the purpose of the family planning program is to provide low-income women with the health care services necessary to plan their families.

It must be remembered that the authorizing statute for the family planning program includes a prohibition on the use of title X funds in programs where abortion is a method of family planning. H.R. 670 conflicts with the underlying intent of this provision. It does not make sense that a program originally intended to reduce abortion should provide counseling and refer women for abortions. I do not believe that abortion counseling and referrals have any place in this program.

Since the very beginning of the program it has been HHS policy to treat abortion differently from other services. Referral is a very important and integral part of title X because it is a limited prepregnancy program.

Under H.R. 670, however, title X projects will be required to treat abortion referrals on an equal basis with all other types of referrals. In no way does the bill merely maintain the status quo in regards to counseling and referral.

H.R. 670 should also be opposed because it is a budget buster of the first magnitude.

The total authorization for fiscal year 1994 is a 37.7-percent increase over the fiscal year 1993 appropriation and is 16.7 percent higher than what came out of conference just last year for 1994. As one of the first programs to be reauthorized this year, it is the wrong message to send to the American people. What happened to our commitment to control spending and reduce the deficit? Does this reflect the type of spending requests we are going to grant in this new Congress? If you give title X a 37 percent increase, how are you going

to say no to all the advocates of all the other programs?

In sum, Madam Chairman, I am unable to support this bill and I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing it.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAMBURG].

Mr. HAMBURG. Madam Chairman, I rise to speak in strong support of reauthorization of title X of the Public Health Service Act as set forth in H.R. 670 without amendment.

President Clinton has ordered lifting of the gag rule. For the first time in nearly 5 years, this body can, without the threat of veto, authorize and appropriate resources to provide a full range of information to women about pregnancy options. For the first time in nearly 5 years, we can ensure that women who seek medical assistance through federally funded family planning clinics will have complete information on which to base the difficult and critical choices associated with pregnancy.

Free choice is possible only with complete information. Every woman who must make choices about pregnancy, benefits from complete information. Our society as a whole benefits from the decisions made by fully informed women.

I urge my colleagues not to allow any amendment to H.R. 670.

The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Virginia intrudes unnecessarily and inappropriately in an area that Federal regulation need not and should not enter.

H.R. 670 already includes adequate provision to ensure that parents are notified before abortion in States which have required such notification by State law.

This is not an area in which government should intrude. Many young women are fortunate enough to be members of supportive families whom they consult in the course of making decisions about their pregnancy.

It is the young women who do not enjoy the support and confidence of their families who alone will be affected by the proposed amendment. Federal regulation cannot create family support where it does not exist. Such requirements are far more likely to limit access to health care than to create support.

I am alarmed that more than 1½ million abortions are performed in this country every year. I am deeply concerned that so many of our teenaged young women become pregnant.

Let us direct our attention and energies to addressing the societal problems so often associated with early pregnancy.

Let us strengthen our educational system. It must speak to and stimulate all the young people of our country.

Let us strengthen our economy. People of all ages must be able to work in meaningful jobs.

Let us implement fundamental health care reform. All people must have access to quality medical care.

Authorizing title X is a good place to start. It funds a broad range of medical services to many who otherwise would receive none at all. Title X is also critical for providing information. Studies indicate that an additional 1.2 million unintended pregnancies would occur without title X funding.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the amendment and pass H.R. 670.

□ 1530

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD], the ranking member of the full committee.

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

Madam Chairman, I believe the family planning program can and has served a very useful purpose in our society—to help low-income women plan their families. The key term regarding the program is planning.

Unfortunately, though, as a result of President Clinton's decision to overturn the regulations prohibiting counseling or referral for abortion, and as a result of the mandate in H.R. 670 that such counseling be provided, the program now validates abortion related activities as a means of dealing with an unwanted pregnancy. Consequently, I am unable to support H.R. 670.

I supported the regulations issued by the previous administration prohibiting title X grantees from engaging in counseling, referral for, and activities advocating abortion as a method of family planning. In my opinion, these regulations restored the integrity of the family planning program to what the Congress originally intended it to be—a pre-pregnancy program to either help women get pregnant or prevent pregnancy. I regret that both President Clinton's executive order and this bill reverse these regulations. Reversal of these regulations undeniably links abortion with family planning and as a result I must oppose passage of this legislation.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Chairman, in the past few years, we have seen a basic freedom—a woman's right to consult freely with her doctor—seriously threatened—not by outsiders, but by the Government itself.

I am speaking about the gag rule—a Federal regulation which would have affected every pregnant woman seeking treatment at a federally run family health clinic.

Supporters of the gag rule wanted to limit what doctors and nurses at these clinics could tell pregnant women about options available to them, including abortion.

This is a case of big government being too much government.

Their Big Brother message to women was simple: We know what's best. The less you know, the better.

Madam Chairman, those days are over. The gag rule is dead. With his Executive order last January, President Clinton killed it. And this week, with the Family Planning Reauthorization Act, we stand ready to bury it.

No one in this country—least of all pregnant women—should be limited by their Government in the kind of information they can receive from their doctor.

I am proud to support this bill and I am proud that we have a President who will sign it.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman a couple of years ago, I met a remarkable young woman whose story underscores why, at a minimum, the Bliley amendment must be part of the title X program.

But first let me note with sadness, that as a direct result of President Clinton's recent order, title X is back in the business of abortion counseling and referral. Also, notwithstanding an obvious conflict of interest, abortion mills under the Clinton decree can, once again, be situated under the same roof and same ownership as a federally subsidized family planning project.

As a direct result of this linkage of abortion mills with family planning providers, more babies will suffer the cruelty of being dismembered by suction machines or being poisoned with various lethal chemicals. Only the most naive would believe otherwise.

As a direct result, more teenage moms will get abortions and suffer trauma, in some cases lifelong.

By now, Americans are beginning to recognize that with every abortion, one person is dead, the other wounded.

The Bliley amendment simply requires that at least one parent of a minor be notified that their daughter is scheduled for irreversible surgery—a type of procedure that destroys an unborn child.

A parent or legal guardian has a right to know if their daughter is seeking an abortion. Which brings me to the story of Erin Rettig, a courageous young woman I've met who, like millions of other teenagers, procured a secret abortion. And now desperately wishes she hadn't and desperately wishes her mom had been notified.

Erin Rettig relates her story,

In March of 1985, exactly six years ago, we were having sex education in my P.E. class. The class was taught by a nurse from the Oroville Family Health Center, a Title X program. I had been afraid that I was preg-

nant, and the discussions so upset me that I ran from the room crying. Both my teacher and the Health Center nurse followed me outside to talk with me.

They made arrangements for me to go to the Health Center for a pregnancy test. They asked me if I was going to tell my mother. I did not want to disappoint my mom, so I told them I did not want her to know. They said my mother would never have to know. They asked me what I was going to do if I was pregnant. I said, "I guess I'll have an abortion." They said they could help, that it would be quick and easy, and they reassured me that my mother would never have to know.

After school the next day, my teacher took me to the Health Center. * * * I cried when I found out I was pregnant. The same nurse talked to me for about twenty minutes. She never encouraged me to talk with my mother, and she never explained to me that if I wanted to keep the baby, I could get financial help, medical help, and could even stay in school. Instead, she told me that if I was going to have an abortion, it would have to be done quickly. The nurse made an appointment for me to have an abortion at a clinic in the next town.

The nurse then talked with my teacher and told her all of the steps that would have to be taken to sign me up for welfare to pay for the abortion.

Each time I was out of school my teacher had to forge my daily reports to keep my mom from finding out I was pregnant.

My teacher took me. She sent a note home to my mom asking if I could babysit all day and spend the night.

At the abortion clinic, no one encouraged me to talk with my mother. I did not meet my doctor until I was already on the operating table.

Some of what I had been told was true. The abortion was quick. But it was not easy. And my mother did have to know, because at school next week, I began bleeding, and the school had to call my mother to get permission to take me to the hospital.

While I was recovering from the emergency surgery, and from the trauma of the abortion, I learned just how much my mother loved me and how much she cared about my best interests.

All of this happened six years ago. When I think back, I wish I could do it all over again. I wish my mother had known. I wish she had been there with me to help me decide what to do.

I know that if I had been told the truth, that I would have had that baby—I would not have had the abortion. My mother and my family would have helped me during my difficult time. I know that now—I wish I had been given the chance to find that out then.

Mr. Chairman, our compassion and concern for young girls, for minors like Erin Rettig—minors—should inspire us to support the Bliley amendment no matter what the extremists in the pro-abortion lobby say.

Finally, let me say that I strongly believe that parents are usually well aware of their children's medical history and can anticipate possible complications that may accompany a surgical procedure. Parents can also provide guidance and support to a minor child who might be frightened or confused. Parental consultation is usually required for a teenager to have a tooth drilled, get an eye exam, go on a school trip or get ears pierced. Certainly, parents have a right to be involved, at least notified in life-and-death decisions such as abortion.

Dr. James Rogers, author of a study on parental notification which was published in the March 1991 issue of the American Journal of Public Health, shows scientifically that abortion rates and pregnancy rates for minor girls declined dramatically after Minnesota's parental notification law went into effect. The average abortion rate among 15- to 17-year-old minors declined by 28.3 percent, Dr. Rogers reported.

The Missouri Department of Health reported a decline of 12.5 percent in "the percentage of aborted pregnancies to minors" between 1985 and 1988. This development coincided with the enforcement of a parental consent statute that had previously been tied up in the courts.

The Bliley amendment is the least we can do to help women and young girls of our country.

Finally because H.R. 670 facilitates abortions alternative via counseling and approval, because title X family planning clinics can be colocated with abortion mills, and because substantive reform amendments were blocked from being considered—I urge a "no" vote on H.R. 670.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to respond very briefly to the comment by the gentleman from New Jersey. He told a story about a young woman who had an abortion who regretted it and wished her mother had known.

I want to tell a story of a young woman by the name of Becky Bell who feared, because of the State law on parental notification, that her mother and father would disapprove, so she left the State, had an abortion, and, unfortunately, died.

□ 1540

Her mother said she wished there had not been that parental notification law.

Second, notwithstanding whatever the views are and how abortion ought to be handled, this bill is not about abortion. This bill is about family planning, contraception. And the story that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] told us, as I recall, had nothing to do with a clinic that got title X funds. So if he wanted the Bliley amendment, it would not have even applied to that clinic that provided abortion services.

The issue of abortion and parental notification should not be decided on this bill. It should be decided on some bill dealing with abortion. It ought to be decided at the State level, not the Federal level.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a very important member of our committee, a leader on this whole question of reproductive rights, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support for H.R. 670. This legislation allows us to take a big step forward to try to catch up for the many years of backward movement we have experienced in our attempts to provide complete information to women and families about family planning.

The past two administrations have acted as if the world was a crisp and clean television sitcom in which everything always worked out perfectly. Well, it just isn't that simple. In the real world women get pregnant and sometimes find it necessary for various, myriad reasons to select pregnancy management options. This is not something revolutionary—it is an inescapable fact.

Often the women who come to family planning clinics face the most difficult decisions of their lives without full knowledge of pregnancy management options including prenatal care and delivery, adoption, birth control pills, and devices, and so on. The least we can do is provide them with access to the complete range of information and services available.

The recent violence at clinics and medical offices across the country has heightened the volatile nature of the debate about pregnancy termination. We in the Congress must keep cool heads and send a clear signal that we are supportive of the efforts of the front-line professionals who are providing the counseling and services.

H.R. 670 would require the title X clinics to offer basic, nondirective information on prenatal care, infant care, foster care, adoption and so on. Without this information it would be impossible for these clinics to fulfill their role of adequately and totally informing their clients about family planning.

The epidemic growth in teenage pregnancy is of major concern to all of us. So too, is the growth in unplanned pregnancies by adults. Both can lead to health and social problems such as low birth weight babies, unloved children and recurring generations of poverty, to name a few.

Family planning clinics provide a significant portion of the information that reaches our poorest citizens on issues that will have a lasting impact on their lives. What we do here today matters. It matters to the woman who is facing the most traumatic decision of her life. It matters to the young family trying to plan for its future. It matters in the most basic and personal way.

As this debate progresses in the House and in the other body you will hear from a variety of speakers who will offer amendments under the guise of improving the bill. I urge my colleagues to carefully evaluate these attempts to weaken this legislation. Many would try to decrease the effectiveness of this program with Trojan horse-like measures which appear to be

tiveness of this program with Trojan horse-like measures which appear to be reasonable, but all too often make the work of these clinics less accessible to women.

Mr. Chairman, I heartily endorse H.R. 670 and urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEVY].

Mr. LEVY. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely regret that so much of the debate on this bill has centered on the issue of women's rights and abortion.

In fact, this bill does little to advance women's rights because it does little to change national policy: What it does with respect to those issues is merely to codify policies that already exist by virtue of President Clinton's Executive order dated January 22.

The bill does do one thing, however, that the President cannot do without congressional help. It spends money.

The legislation that is before us today proposes to increase family planning spending by almost $162 million—or more than 50 percent over the next 2 years.

Let us not be fooled. A vote for this bill is not a pro-choice vote; it is a vote to dig deeper into the pockets of middle-class Americans who are already paying too much in taxes and whose economic well-being is, I think, increasingly threatened by what we do here.

It is absolutely irresponsible, as we promise to cut the deficit, for us to be considering legislation which increases spending as H.R. 670 does.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON].

Mr. EMERSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill—not because I oppose family planning, but because I oppose abortion. I strongly support family planning, and I truly wish that we could pass a family planning bill that everyone could support and then hash out the abortion issues separately. Why do they have to be linked? The plain fact of the matter is quite simple: Abortion is not family planning. Planning is something you do before pregnancy; abortion is something that comes after pregnancy. Abortion and family planning should not be in the same bill, but the majority here seems to treat the two as indistinguishable.

This bill does several things to promote abortion. It places abortion on a par with prenatal care, delivery, and adoption with regard to counseling and referrals; according to this bill, abortion is just another pregnancy management option—a rather cold and clinical way to describe a procedure that ends the life of a human being. The requirement for abortion counseling and referral extends even to those who conscientiously object to abortion and would rather not participate in abortion in any way—this bill tells them that if they want to continue to work toward the prevention of pregnancy, they must also refer for abortions. What will be next—will we require family planners to give women bus fare to abortion clinics?

This bill also requires that family planners give any individual information about abortion counseling and referral upon request. Not pregnant women, not title X clients—any individual. I think that the hard-earned tax dollars funding title X would be better used if they actually went toward preventing pregnancy in the first place than toward providing abortion information to anyone who happens to ask for it.

This bill moves title X—originally a worthy program—away from its original intent of preventing unwanted pregnancies and toward a goal of encouraging and advocating abortion—all with taxpayer dollars. I urge Members to oppose H.R. 670.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 670, the Family Planning Amendments of 1993, and I commend the chairman for bringing this crucial legislation to the floor.

The title X program has been one of the most highly respected an successful Federal health programs, but the program has been held hostage to politics over the last decade. As a result, the title X program has gone unauthorized, and funding has not been able to respond to the critical need for services.

Today, in passing this bill without crippling amendments, we can renew our commitment to critical family planning programs that improve women's health and prevent unintended pregnancies. Surely we can all agree on these goals.

Studies show that 3.1 million unintended pregnancies are averted each year because of publicly funded contraceptive services. Additionally, over $4 in health and welfare costs are saved for each public dollar invested in family planning. But today the United States leads all Western countries in teen pregnancy and childbearing rates. That reality has led to a growing national consensus on the importance of supporting family planning programs. H.R. 670 will act on that consensus and give new substance to these essential programs.

And, as we embark on the task of reforming our health care system, I want to remind my colleagues that the title X program goes far beyond family planning services. For some 85 percent of those who utilize title X clinics, it is their only source of medical care. In the process, millions of Americans have gained access to cost-effective preventive health care services thanks to title X.

I urge my colleagues to join me in advancing an agenda that will reduce unintended pregnancies and improve public health.

Vote "yes" on H.R. 670.

□ 1550

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, this bill puts some of us in a very difficult position. I believe that many unwanted pregnancies can be avoided through open counseling and complete information on reproductive health care, and to reduce the number of unwanted pregnancies and abortions, which I oppose.

I rise in strong support of the title X Federal Family Planning Program. In Wyoming, these facilities play an important role in helping families plan for children. For me, education is the best way this Nation can reduce unwanted pregnancies before they happen. It is my opinion, as well, that by preventing unwanted pregnancies through open counseling and complete information on reproductive health care, we can lessen abortions, which I oppose.

But I intend to vote against the bill because I have to tell you, I am absolutely disturbed by the 56 percent increase in spending for this bill during a time when the people of this country and the Congress are clamoring for cuts. In this act, even if we held it to last year's funding level, that would be something I could support. But a 56-percent increase over previous levels is not at all in line with what should be this body's commitment to balancing the budget. I resent being put in this position to vote against a program I support because of irresponsible spending increases.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, this bill will give an opportunity to those who have limited funds and limited access to medical facilities to enjoy the benefits that are available to all others, and for that reason I rise in strong support of H.R. 670.

I have had the privilege on a number of occasions to visit family planning clinics and to talk to the people who were there. I will tell you that the benefits from those clinics when observed first-hand are clear, not only to the families, not only to the individuals involved, but to society as a whole.

I am deeply troubled when I hear comments from the other side of the

aisle from those who say it will cost us. Rather than costing us, this bill will be beneficial and in the long run will save money for society.

By avoiding unwanted pregnancies, we are going to avoid the problem of children who are born and who become a burden on society. We are going to avoid the problem of young teenage mothers who have unwanted pregnancies and have their education curtailed.

For all these reasons, as well as the beneficial health aspects of it as well, I rise in strong support of H.R. 670 and I urge all Members of the House to join in an affirmative vote on this legislation.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY].

Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZINSKY. Mr. Chairman. I raise today to voice my opposition to the Bliley amendment to House Resolution 690, the family planning reauthorization bill.

The Bliley amendment would require any woman visiting a title X clinic to notify one parent about her private decision. In addition, this restrictive amendment does not allow for judicial bypass.

All responsible parents hope that their child will come to them to discuss this kind of important decision. But I have seen the other side. As a reporter, I have been in a clinic with a young girl whose parents, I was told, regularly took part in operation rescue activities outside this clinic. This girl told me that she would rather kill herself than tell her parents. For this young woman, parental notification did not mean open communication. It meant an illegal abortion or worse.

The net result of this amendment is that all title 10 clinics will refuse this Federal funding, and will not be able to serve the many women who desperately need these services and counseling.

The Bliley amendment may force some women into dangerous decisions, and I urge my colleagues to defeat it and to stand up for the reproductive rights of American women.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SCHENK].

Ms. SCHENK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong and unqualified support of H.R. 670, and I urge my colleagues to support its passage without amendment.

I am pleased and gratified that the House is considering this landmark legislation, which will finally bring American family planning policy back into modern times and modern reality. This is a matter of utmost importance to American women and one which is a focal point for women in my district.

Family planning decisions are the most important health care decisions American women will make in their lifetimes—and yet, many women of child-bearing age cannot afford private counseling and treatment. Congress established the network of federally funded clinics so that all women, regardless of income, might receive sincere, objective, and professional counseling.

Unfortunately, 12 long years of archaic, reactionary administration policy have crippled the ability of clinics to meet the overwhelming demand for family planning services. Congress has failed to reauthorize title X in nearly a decade. As a result, funding for title X services has been frozen—limiting both the quality and availability of family planning services.

Even worse, the past two administrations have denied women the most basic information about their family planning options. Five years ago, the Reagan administration issued the infamous gag rule, preventing federally funded clinics from even discussing the full range of options—including the option of terminating one's pregnancy.

H.R. 670 ends this regressive chapter in the history of American health care. It authorizes appropriate increases in funding for title X services so that clinics can expand their staffs to meet the overwhelming demand for counseling services.

Best of all, H.R. 670 lifts the gag rule, and restores the fundamental right of all American women to make informed decisions about their reproductive health.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 670 restores common sense to our family planning system. I urge my colleagues to vote for this landmark legislation.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to briefly discuss in a couple minutes the Dornan amendment that was not allowed under this restricted rule as well as two other amendments that are coming up in which each side will have 30 minutes to discuss.

Unfortunately, my amendment was not found in order, and I think it is ridiculous. My amendment would establish a means test for receiving services at title X family planning clinics. The Dornan amendment would have prevented the daughters of millionaires, billionaires, Congressmen, and other wealthy Americans from going to a clinic and saying, "My parents have been stiffing me on my allowance. I am poor. I want these taxpayer funded services."

The Dornan proposal would merely have redefined the term low-income family—the target group that was originally intended to be the benefactors of title X family planning services. In doing so, it would have simply ensured that those receiving these services are truly in financial need, falling at or below 150 percent of the official poverty line.

It would also have required that an unemancipated minor's total family income be considered prior to determining that minor's ability to pay. This would effect only those minors still dependent on their parents or other legal guardians. Current law asks middle class families to pay for title X services received by the children of millionaires or the children of persons at the congressional pay level. This is wrong. But perhaps more important the Dornan amendment would have resulted in more parental notification. But that was not allowed on the floor.

I also want to take this opportunity to speak on the DeLay amendment which is trying to address the serious problem of the lack of maturity or experience among people who provide important counsel in planned parenthood centers.

The gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN], my good friend and esteemed colleague, has tried to inject more reason into the process, I guess. He wants to add to the list of those allowed to provide pregnancy counseling, persons who meet criteria established by the Secretary of HHS and persons allowed to provide such counseling under State law. Leaving it up to the Secretary of Health and Human Services is fine, I could accept that under the DeLay amendment; but any State law that is silent on who may or may not provide counseling on pregnancy management options, that makes it appear that anyone trained or untrained, could be allowed to provide such counseling in title X clinics. That is what we have now if we consider the preliminary reports from Planned Parenthood which profiled 500 of their individual counselors and found that they are largely young, totally inexperienced, unpaid and probably, obviously, using the job for training experience and preparation for other jobs in the future.

□ 1600

And although the so-called gag rule is still nefariously, mentioned as some terrible chapter in medical history, it was just this type of situation it was meant to address.

Remember, President Bush made it perfectly clear that doctors could do whatever they wanted. What we were trying to get at was the young teenaged, unpaid volunteered, so-called counselors telling other frightened, young teenagers, "This is the way to go. If you don't want your child, kill your child, and you're saving your country an economic burden."

And by the way, Mr. Chairman, one of the four major suppressed stories last year: We will sell the placenta, and maybe something else, to European cosmetic firms where they will work it into face creams, and bring it back to America and sell it to American women. Fact.

Read "Operation Spike" by a bipartisan panel of journalists about that spiked story.

The third amendment that is allowed, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT] I will discuss during the time for that amendment.

Mrs. MORELLA. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Family Planning Amendments Act, H.R. 670.

Title X has been the focus of our national family planning effort since 1970, providing funding to more than 4,000 family planning clinics for medical and educational services to over 5.3 million low-income women and teenagers. While title X supported clinics focus primarily on contraceptive services, they also provide preventive health care. In fact, they are the only source of health care for over 50 percent of their patients. These clinics offer health screening, treatment, or referrals for cervical and breast cancer, anemia, sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV, hypertension, kidney dysfunction, and diabetes.

Each year, federally funded family planning programs prevent 1.2 million unintended pregnancies. And there has always been a prohibition on the use of title X funds for abortions. Clearly, this program is one of the most effective preventive public health care programs, and yet, it has gone unauthorized for 7 years and has suffered severe funding cuts.

H.R. 670 also overturns the outrageous restrictions of the gag rule. While President Clinton has already issued an Executive order suspending the gag rule, Congress must also overturn it to ensure that it is not reinstated in the future. The gag rule was a clear violation of the first amendment, would have resulted in defensive medicine, and would have created a class system for women's health. It was patronizing to women and it must be permanently overturned.

I also urge my colleagues to defeat all weakening amendments to the bill, particularly the Bliley amendment. I strongly believe that minors should have parental consent for an abortion whenever possible. However, laws mandating parental involvement can actually harm the teens and families they are intended to protect, by increasing illegal and self-induced abortions, family violence, suicide, and later abortions. H.R. 670 requires that title X grantees comply with applicable State law regarding minors' access to abortions.

The Bliley amendment would supersede the State laws for title X clinics in all but three States. It would establish very strict requirements for parental notification, making exceptions only if a mother's life is in immediate danger—thereby excluding serious medical conditions, such as AIDS or diabetes.

The amendment's exception for rape or incest would only apply if the incest was committed by the father or legal guardian; no exception is provided for other family members. No judicial bypass would be allowed, unless the State already has such a mechanism established.

States that failed to comply with these requirements would lose their Federal family planning funding, even though Federal funds are never used to pay for abortions.

Our focus should be on preventing unintended pregnancies and the need for abortions. Title X is a key part of this effort and it must be reauthorized so that low-income women can continue to receive these critical health services. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 670 and to oppose all weakening amendments.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support or H.R. 670, the reauthorization of the Title X Family Planning Program. Since the mid-1980's this legislation has been the source of bitter debate between the past two Republican administrations and the Congress. By renewing our commitment to the Title X Program, Congress will show the American public that common sense can prevail over Washington gridlock.

Funding for family planning services enables low-income women to take responsibility for their reproductive health, as well as assisting women in determining the number and timing of their pregnancies. By overturning the gag rule, Congress sends a strong massage to this Nation that American women have a right to uncensored information about pregnancy options, regardless of income.

Not only does this program provide much needed family planning services but also offers other vital health services such as screening for breast and cervical cancer, diabetes, and HIV, as well as providing community education and outreach. Family planning clinics play an essential role in providing health services to their clients. For over 85 percent of the patients who visit title X clinics, these clinics are their only source of health care.

One of the populations most in need of family planning services is American teenagers. Each year, 1 in every 11 American females between the ages of 15 and 19 has a birth or an abortion, figures which are significantly greater than many European countries. Federally funded family planning services are essential in reducing our Nation's astounding teen pregnancy rate, as well as relieving the many negative impacts of teen pregnancy on educational advancement and employment opportunities.

Finally, I wish to emphasize that funding the Title X Family Planning Program is money well spent. Every $1 spent on contraceptive services saves the taxpayer $4.40 in short-term mandated services to support unintended pregnancy and birth.

In light of the essential role family planning clinics play in the lives of millions of women of reproductive age, I strongly support the reauthorization of the Title X Family Planning Program and urge its swift passage.

Mr. KLECZKA. Madam Chairman, today I rise to express my strong support for passage of H.R. 670, a bill to reauthorize funding for the Title X Family Planning Program, and urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in voting for this bill.

It is unfortunate the politics of abortion in general, and the gag rule in particular, have prevented Congress from enacting a title X authorization bill for nearly a decade. Counseling and referrals for pregnancy management options are only a few of the numerous services provided by title X clinics.

More importantly, the program also underwrites basic and reproductive health services for more than 4 million women, with priority given to low-income adults and teens. In the Fourth Congressional District of Wisconsin, which I represent, the Title X Program finances these important services for more than 13,000 women. Moreover, title X birth control services prevent at least 1.2 million unintended pregnancies nationwide each year, thereby precluding an estimated 516,000 abortions. In addition, it should be noted that for every $1 invested in family planning services, the Federal Government saves $4.40 in mandatory social services. By voting today to authorize title X funds for fiscal years 1994 and 1995, we would save money in the long term while ensuring that women in my district and yours continue receiving vital health services over the next 2 years.

Turning to the gag rule issue, it is reasonable and wise to restore in law the Title X Program's counseling and referral policy on pregnancy management options. This policy was replaced in 1992 by the gag rule, that bars clinic professionals from discussing abortion with a patient under nearly all circumstances. Before the gag rule took effect, clinic personnel were required to offer comprehensive and nondirective counseling on the legal options available to a woman faced with an unplanned pregnancy, included information on pre-natal care and delivery; child care; foster care and adoption; and abortion. Referrals to providers of the service chosen by the woman were also offered by clinic personnel. The gag rule clearly eliminated a sensible policy that from 1970 to 1992 limited the demand for abortions while enabling women to receive the information needed to make fully informed decisions about their care. Accordingly, I am pleased that H.R. 670 would place into law the nondirective counseling and referral policy once used by title X clinics.

In addition, this bill allows individual title X projects or personnel that are morally opposed to abortion to refuse to supply counseling or referrals for it, as long as they direct the patient toward another provider that is willing and qualified to provide such counseling and referrals.

Finally, H.R. 670 deserves our support because it does not weaken current Federal law that bars title X clinics from using taxpayer funds to perform abortions. I oppose Government financing of abortion except in cases of rape, incest, or if by continuing a pregnancy a woman's life would be endangered or her health impaired.

It is time to set aside politics as usual and authorize funding for the beneficial Title X Program. Let me emphasize again that the program's goal is the prevention of unwanted pregnancies and abortions; there has always been a prohibition on the use of funds for abortions. Thousands of unintended pregnancies and abortions have been prevented each year, thanks to title X. Millions of dollars have been saved in other medical and social services. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to vote for passage of H.R. 670.

Mr. PENNY. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 670, the Family Planning Amendments of 1993. I am extremely pleased that, after years of inaction, we are finally able to reauthorize the Title X Family Planning Program for an additional 2 years.

Family planning—and the program authorized under this act—is good policy. Without the availability of title X family planning services, it is estimated that there would be at

least 1.2 million additional unwanted pregnancies each year, leading to perhaps as many as 500,000 additional abortions. It is the prevention of these unwanted pregnancies where those like me who hold pro-life views and those like President Clinton who hold pro-choice views can find agreement. We can and must support American families through making sure that Federal dollars are available to keep family planning services and basic health care readily accessible to women throughout the country in all areas—rural and urban.

This legislation also contains sufficient safeguards separating the issues of family planning and abortion. Title X prohibits the use of family planning funds for abortion services. The bill specifically requires that any counseling provided is nondirective. Information on all pregnancy options, including prenatal care and delivery, infant care, foster care and adoption, and pregnancy termination will not be presented to a patient unless that patient requests the information.

Additionally, the bill includes a provision that individual title X providers as well as individual counselors are exempted from discussing specific pregnancy options, such as abortion, if they object to that option on religious or moral grounds.

Finally, while I strongly support this legislation, I do intend to support the amendment offered by Mr. BLILEY. I believe that adoption of a Federal standard regarding parental notification is a positive step.

Most important, however, is the hundreds of thousands of abortions that will be prevented through the availability of effective family planning services.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of the Family Planning Amendment Act of 1993. For years, family planning clinics have provided counseling and health services to primarily low-income women, offering them an opportunity to make informed decisions on family planning. I have been a strong supporter of programs offered through title X and believe that we must ensure that both men and women receive high-quality care.

Family planning is especially crucial in my State where teen pregnancy ranks the second highest in the country. A majority of the clients who visit family planning clinics live at or below the poverty line, yet are not eligible for Medicaid. As a result, family planning clinics are often the first, and sometimes the only, contact these women have with health care professionals.

Family planning also makes economical sense. Citing my State as an example again, it is estimated that every $1 spent on family planning in California saves $11.20 in public costs associated with unintended pregnancy. These costs include Medicaid delivery, maternity and infant care, Medicaid abortions, AFDC, food stamps, and other social services.

Madam Chairman, I would like to add that I strongly support codifying the revision of the gag rule. In funding title X, we have a responsibility to ensure that clients visiting publicly funded clinics receive quality medical care and are fully informed regarding available options, including information on their reproductive lives. I believe one of the most effective ways to prevent unwanted pregnancies, and thus the number of abortions, is to throw our complete support behind family planning programs. This requires providing sufficient funding as well as enacting appropriate policies.

By appropriate policies I mean that doctors must be given the freedom to answer patients' inquiries and to provide accurate and complete information on family planning. Government has no place in telling doctors which legal medical procedures they are allowed to discuss with their patients. Accordingly, Government has no place in denying patients the right to receive nondirective counseling on pregnancy management options.

If we allow the controversy that the so-called gag rule inspires to obstruct the funding of title X programs, we will be undermining the proven successes of family planning programs. For the sake of the many people who depend on clinics funded under title X, we simply cannot let this happen. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. SNOWE. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Family Planning Amendments Act of 1993.

With the passage of this legislation, over 4 million low-income women across America will have improved access to family planning services and preventative health care. This is particularly important because, for 83 percent of title X clients, family planning clinics are their only source of primary health care.

The passage of the legislation before us today is significant for two major reasons. First, the bill strengthens the title X program by increasing its authorization to a more appropriate level. As many of you know, this program has not been reauthorized since 1984, and as a result, its funding suffered greatly over the last decade.

This is particularly regretful because significant savings in public dollars can be realized through effective family planning—every $1 spent on family planning saves $4.40 in public health and welfare costs.

The second important component of this legislation is the requirement that title X clinics provide their clients with complete pregnancy counseling. As a result of this provision, there will never again be a Government-enforced gag rule on the information doctors can provide to their patients. Never again will a woman's economic status determine the medical information she is allowed to receive.

This legislation sends a clear message to American women that the Federal Government trusts them to make responsible decisions regarding their health care.

Members of the House, everyday, thanks to the guidance and resources of family planning clinics, thousands of low-income women are protected against sexually transmitted diseases and unwanted pregnancy. Therefore, there is no better investment that both sides of the abortion debate can make than strongly supporting family planning programs.

Madam Chairman, those who support both antiabortion and anticontraception policies leave women with no realistic alternative to unwanted pregnancy. This position only exacerbates the current crisis of unwanted pregnancy and abortion and does nothing to solve these problems.

The entire thrust of the title X bill is solving this crisis through prevention. Family planning is one of the most effective tools in reducing the incidence of abortion and should be recognized as such.

For all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Family Planning Amendments Act of 1993.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Madam Chairman, I find it fascinating that opponents of the Bliley parental notification amendment are attempting to frame this debate as a States' rights issue. Moreover, I object to the fact that we are asking the American taxpayer to pay for title X funds, yet are hearing arguments that the Federal Government should not be involved in the process. It cannot be argued logically that the Government must sponsor and subsidize—through tax dollars—this family planning program and not have any involvement in how and to whom those funds should be dispersed.

I am an ardent supporter of States rights and object to the Federal Government interfering with those rights when it is indeed an issue of States rights. However, contrary to how the opposition would paint the picture, the Bliley amendment is consistent with these rights. Title X is entirely a Federal program. That is, public and private nonprofit organizations apply on a voluntary basis and no matching of funds is required by the States or organizations choosing to participate. The Bliley amendment is not telling States what to do or invalidating their laws. It merely provides that those organizations which receive Federal funds through title X and perform abortions follow a true, not a loophole-ridden, parental notification requirement.

Madam Chairman, polls have consistently shown that 80 percent and more of the American people—whether they support abortion or not—strongly support parental notification laws. This amendment would merely bring this legislation, which calls upon the American taxpayer for funding, in line with the wishes of the majority of Americans.

Now I know that there are certain tragic situations in which a child would not be able to discuss the issue of abortion with her parents. The Bliley amendment has provided an exception for such extreme cases. The amendment allows for exceptions to the parental notification law to save a minor's life; if incest was involved in the pregnancy; or if the child is at risk of sexual abuse, child abuse, or neglect. In addition, it offers exception if the State is already in compliance with a State or local parental notification or consent law that allows only specific waivers.

Madam Chairman, this well-thought-out amendment should be included in the language of this bill to allow parents to be involved in such a life-threatening decision.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I had further requests for time, but none of those who have requested time are here at the moment. Therefore, if the minority is prepared to yield back its time, we are prepared to yield back the balance of our time.

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of our time as well.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO). Pursuant to the rule, the

bill is considered as read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of the bill, H.R. 670, is as follows:

H.R. 670

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 "Family Planning Amendments Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. PROJECT GRANTS AND CONTRACTS FOR FAMILY PLANNING SERVICES.

(a) REQUIRING CERTAIN NONDIRECTIVE COUNSELING AND REFERRAL SERVICES.—Section 1001 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) through (d) as subsections (c) through (e), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following subsection:

"(b)(1) The Secretary may not make an award of a grant or contract under this section unless the applicant for the award agrees that the family planning project involved will provide to individuals information regarding pregnancy management options upon request of the individuals.

"(2) With respect to compliance with the agreement made under paragraph (1), the family planning project involved, and any provider of services in the project, may not be required to provide information regarding a pregnancy management option if—

"(A) the project or provider (as the case may be) objects to doing so in grounds of religious beliefs or moral convictions; and

"(B) the project or provider refers the individual seeking services to another provider in the project, or to another project in the geographic area involved, as the case may be, that will provide such information.

"(3) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'information regarding pregnancy management options' means nondirective counseling and referrals regarding—

"(A) prenatal care and delivery;

"(B) infant care, foster care, and adoption; and

"(C) termination of pregnancy.".

(b) COMPLIANCE WITH STATE LAWS ON PARENTAL NOTIFICATION AND CONSENT.—Section 1008 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300a-6) is amended by inserting "(a)" before "None" and by adding at the end the following:

"(b)(1) No public or nonprofit entity that performs abortions may receive an award of a grant or contract under section 1001 unless the entity has certified to the Secretary that the entity is in compliance with State law regarding parental notification of or consent for the performance of an abortion on a minor which is enforced in the State in which the entity is located.

"(2) Paragraph (1) shall not be construed to require or prohibit a State's abortion of parental notification or parental consent laws regarding the performance of an abortion on a minor, or to require or prohibit the enforcement by a State of such laws.".

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1001(e) of the Public Health Service Act, as redesignated by subsection (a) of this section, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) For the purpose of grants and contracts under this section, there are authorized to be appropriated $220,000,000 for fiscal year 1994, and $250,000,000 for fiscal year 1995.".

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAINING GRANTS AND CONTRACTS.

Section 1003(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300a-1(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) For the purpose of grants and contracts under subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated $6,250,000 for fiscal year 1994, and $7,000,000 for fiscal year 1995.".

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR INFORMATIONAL AND EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS.

Section 1005(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300a-3(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) For the purpose of grants and contracts under subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated $12,000,000 for fiscal year 1994, and $13,500,000 for fiscal year 1995.".

SEC. 5. SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized in title X of the Public Health Service Act to be purchased with an award of a grant or contract under such title, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such an award should in expending the award purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF AWARDS.—In making awards of grants and contracts under title X of the Public Health Service Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall provide to each recipient of such an award a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act take effect upon the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. No amendments to the bill are in order except the amendments printed in House Report 103-41, which may be offered only in the order printed and by the named proponent or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment, except as specified in House Report 103-41, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. Debate on each amendment will be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment.

The amendment in the form of a motion to strike specified in House Report 103-41 to be offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT] will not be in order if the text proposed to be stricken has been rewritten in its entirety by earlier amendment.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 103-41.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] rise?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELAY

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DELAY: Page 2, line 18, insert before the period the following; ", and that such information will be provided only through individuals holding professional degrees in medicine or osteopathic medicine, nursing, clinical psychology, the allied health professions, or social work".

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] will be recognized for 7½ minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] will be recognized for 7½ minutes.

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, in rising to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] I offer an amendment to his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] offering his amendment now?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELAY

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment to the amendment.

The text of the amendment to the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WAXMAN to the amendment offered by Mr. DELAY: In the matter proposed by the amendment to be inserted on page 2, line 18, of the bill, insert before the ending quotations the following: ", through individuals meeting such other criteria as the Secretary determines to be appropriate for providing such information, or through individuals allowed under State law to provide such information".

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DELAY. Could the Chairman explain how we are going to proceed?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] now will have 15 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] will have 15 minutes to debate both amendments.

Mr. DELAY. So we will be debating both amendments.

Mr. Chairman, the first vote will be on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] when offered?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. DELAY. And we will just trade back and forth and use the 30 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. As usual, yes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I really find it very surprising that my amendment is controversial. I think it is self-explanatory. It would require that counselors in title X clinics who are providing information on what H.R. 670 terms "pregnancy management options," that is, prenatal care, adoption and abortion, among others, have a profes-

sional degree in medicine, nursing, clinical psychology, the allied health professions, or social work. My reason for offering this is quite simple. If part of the purpose of the Title X Program is to provide quality care and advice to pregnant women, then I believe it is only reasonable to require that the advice be given by a qualified professional.

During all the debate on the so-called gag rule and this title X policy over the years, Mr. Chairman, we have heard from the proponents of the Title X Program that counseling is being done by professionals and that the Bush administration and those of us that oppose the process are gagging professional medical service providers and professional counselors. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I feel it is extremely important to emphasize that professionalism so that women, particularly underaged women that find themselves pregnant and come to a family planning clinic for advice, be protected from receiving uninformed or inexperienced advice.

It bothers me when I read from a Planned Parenthood preliminary report on the counseling function in their affiliates throughout the Nation that, and I quote:

> Data from the nearly 500 individual counselor profiles give a clear picture of a counseling staff which is largely young and inexperienced, much of it working unpaid and probably using PPFA employment for training, experience and preparation for other jobs in the future. * * * Counselors' formal training is relatively modest * * *.

A lawsuit involving the Planned Parenthood Association of San Mateo County in California further illustrates my point. In this case, a Planned Parenthood employee, with the job title "Reproductive Health Specialist" stated in a deposition that she had had no prior experience or education in medical care, nor had she even had a biology course, before being hired for that position. Rather, the prior job experience of this so-called reproductive health specialist was as an architectural drafter for various corporations. She was given 2 months', on-the-job training by the center manager, who also had no prior medical training.

This reproductive health specialist was responsible not only for performing medical exams on clients, she was also charged with providing information on human reproduction and counseling pregnant women on their reproductive choices. There is something very wrong with this situation—if I were a woman who expected to receive professional care and advice when going to a federally funded clinic, I would find this very upsetting.

Even as recently as last month I noticed a help wanted ad in the Washington Post in which a northern Virginia Planned Parenthood clinic was advertising for a full-time educator-counselor. The ad reads as follows:

> The clinic provides family planning, HIV & pregnancy options counseling and medical services. * * * College education desirable, bicultural and bilingual Spanish. Driver's license/car.

Isn't it sad, and even frightening, that for this pregnancy counseling position one must have a driver's license, but not a college degree? While I cannot comment as to the professionalism of this particular clinic or whether it receives title X funds, this ad serves as an obvious example of what my amendment attempts to correct. I do not think it is right for the Federal Government to fund clinics that hire individuals without even a college degree to counsel pregnant women on one of the most important decisions they are going to make in their lives.

It is my understanding after speaking with officials from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services that State law does not address the issue of educational standards for counselors in a meaningful way, if at all. Rather, private organizations attempt to establish such standards for their own members. For example, the Council on Accreditation of Services for Families and Children, which is sponsored by the Child Welfare League of America, the National Association of Homes and Services for Children, and the Lutheran Social Ministry System, among others, requires its agencies' personnel who provide counseling to an expectant parent on the decision to parent the child, to transfer custody of the child, or to terminate the pregnancy to have a master's degree from an accredited program of social work education, or have a bachelor's or master's degree in an allied field and are supervised by a person with a master's degree in social work.

□ 1610

Furthermore, in a November 1991 letter signed by 21 organizations, including the American Medical Association, the American College of Physicians, and the National Association of Community Health Centers, the words "health care professionals" appear seven times on one page in reference to those who would be affected by the counseling restrictions known as the gag rule. It is obvious that much of the health care community recognizes the need to require counselors to be qualified. Why is it then that situations such as the ones I described earlier continue to exist? It is vital that we address this problem now.

I am not asserting that all family planning clinics receiving title X funds are employing inexperienced counselors. However, even if only a few clinics are doing so, then we are not taking women's health care seriously enough. I believe requiring pregnancy counselors to have a professional degree can only enhance the title X Program. I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment, and a "no" vote on the Waxman second-degree amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, the DeLay amendment specifies the types of professionals that can provide counseling: doctors, nurses, allied health professionals, social workers, and clinical psychologists. These are all well-educated people and simply we would feel comfortable with them providing counseling.

But I do not think we ought to be so limiting as the DeLay amendment would have us do if it were adopted. It would make across-the-board determination of the question who would be permitted to counsel. Even though there are some rural and underserved urban areas where some counselors may be specially trained health care workers and some poverty health clinicians, the health professionals with degrees are already fully occupied giving actual health care services and the delegation of counseling is made to people working under their supervision who may not have the same degrees. We should allow, and my amendment would permit, the States to decide the competence of people who would do counseling. We should allow the Secretary to determine this issue as well.

So my amendment to the DeLay amendment would allow for counseling by those people authorized under State law to do this work, and would also authorize the Secretary of HHS to continue to establish criteria in this area.

This amendment is a most flexible approach to high quality health care. Family planning clinics have been short funded and shortstaffed for years now. If the DeLay amendment is adopted without this amendment to it, no matter how hard some of us may try to have more money provided for these clinics, if they do not get more funds they just will not be able to hire the counselors to give the needed counseling to people who come in.

These counselors must be directly supervised by licensed professionals. They must be trained and they must meet the standards set by the Secretary or by State law.

So we are offering the amendment to the DeLay amendment. I would oppose the DeLay amendment if it were not amended, because it would in fact prevent many women from getting any counseling by anyone. Nurse practitioners, psychologists, social workers, will not be available to them. If they are available at all, they will be working in other clinics and providing other services.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we should give the clinics, the States, and the Secretary the flexibility to use their money in the most efficient way possible, and my amendment does that. I urge an "aye" vote for the Waxman amendment to the DeLay amendment.

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, a few years ago, Planned Parenthood really slipped up by allowing us a small peek into their usually secret, hidden, and Byzantine world of abortion and the typical profile of those counselors who counsel mothers to get them.

When you remember that Planned Parenthood alone performs, counsels, and refers for well over 200,000 abortions each year—in 5-year time periods they kill more than 1 million kids—and when you recall that Planned Parenthood runs the largest chain of abortion mills in the land, insights concerning the caliber, experience, and suitability of their so-called counselors should be a great interest to the Congress.

Especially when we're paying for it.

A Planned Parenthood report stated the fact:

> Data from nearly 500 individual counselor profiles gives a clear picture of a counseling staff which is largely young and inexperienced, much of it working unpaid and probably using PPFA employment for training, experience and preparation for other jobs in the future. Counselors' formal training is relatively modest. Only 20 percent are certified in counseling.

A counseling staff that is young, inexperienced, with modest formal training, using the experience as a stepping stone for other employment—raises serious questions concerning the quality of counseling.

Mr. Chairman, a recent ad in the help wanted section of the Washington Post, Planned Parenthood advertises for counselors with a text that said, "College education desirable." In other words, health education credentials are not necessary. There are no health credential prerequisites.

Now if nonfederally funded abortion counseling projects want to employ inexperienced abortion counselors, there is perhaps, little we can do about it.

But if federally subsidized groups like Planned Parenthood—which, by the way, get tens of millions each year from Uncle Sam—want to use noncredentialed abortion counselors, it better be our business.

I believe we have a serious obligation to women, especially teenagers, who use the clinics to insist on a high level of professionalism, training, expertise, and education for counselors.

Mr. DELAY's amendment raises those standards, to protect women from hack counselors. DELAY requires that individuals have a professional degree in medicine or osteopathic medicine, nursing, clinical psychology, and allied health profession, or social work.

Mr. WAXMAN's substitute approach, however, is not only weak and ineffective but is designed to establish a lower standard of competency for counselors than that envisioned by Mr. DELAY. And I hope no one will be fooled by the charade occurring here. Mr. WAXMAN's second-degree amendment again is offered as a killer amendment. By offering his amendments in the second degree, Mr. WAXMAN hopes to deprive this House of the opportunity to vote on Mr. DELAY's amendment. So much for openness and fairness.

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

Mr. Chairman, I cannot see how the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] could characterize a perfecting amendment to the DeLay amendment as a killer amendment. The DeLay amendment spells out certain professionals who would be eligible to give counseling, counseling only, at family planning clinics. My amendment would broaden that to say that a State could decide beyond those who are licensed health care professionals to serve in that capacity, provided, of course, they are trained appropriately and working under the supervision of someone who is a health professional.

This is an amendment that I think makes a lot of sense. Under any regular order of business in this institution, such an amendment would be appropriate to be considered.

Not only is it appropriate to be considered, it should be adopted. We live in a society where many people do not speak English. Why should not someone be able to counsel women about contraception in their own language? Why should they be precluded, if they are not a doctor, a nurse, psychologist licensed after years of training, a social worker licensed after years of training, but instead are women who have gone through instruction with these health professionals, working under the direction of health professionals and giving information, and only information, not medical services. So I think it is very appropriate to expand the list.

Now, one has to wonder why they want to be so restrictive in, who in fact, can give this counseling.

□ 1620

I would suspect that if the gentleman wanted to deny women counseling, he would say, "Well, the best thing to say is only a doctor could provide that counseling." After all, that is what the Bush administration proposed in their rule.

They were going to say no one could even tell the truth to a woman if she wanted to know about abortion. No one else but a doctor could tell her that information; knowing full well that in most family planning clinics, they could not afford to have a doctor. They had nurse practitioners. Instead, they said a nurse practitioner did not have sufficient competence.

Now some of these Members who are opposed to family planning and counseling are saying it should only be a doctor or nurse practitioner but not anyone else. So I think we ought to look behind what may be at stake in this issue insofar as this amendment is dealing with the real problem that we want competent personnel.

I think the States are competent to decide who ought to be giving counseling. They, after all, license professionals. We do not do that at the Federal level. Let the States make that decision.

I think the Secretary can adopt guidelines so that we have qualified personnel to give counseling and this counseling is about contraception. It is about where else to go for services, if the services are not provided at that family planning clinic.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

The fact that this report from Planned Parenthood is a few years old and that nothing has been done in a number of States, there is no real regulation insuring that these title X and other types of family planning providers, including abortion counselers, do not have the kinds of credentials. There is no standards in many States.

We have an opportunity today to help establish a standard so that competent medical or degreed or credentialed people, people who have a degree perhaps in counseling and, as I pointed out, this report said that only 20 percent of the counselers had a background where they received formal training in counseling.

That means that 80 percent do not have it. I would suggest to the gentleman that there are a number of people out there, and I have met many women who have been counseled improperly in their view, were not given all the options as a result. And they were by people who were either part-time or they were people who were just working at the clinic but did not have those kinds of credentials.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, it seems to me that if there is a problem in any institution where someone working in a capacity under someone else is not doing the job adequately, then the supervisors ought to be informed. But there are supervisors in every one of these clinics.

I think the States should be able to make the decisions for themselves in terms of who they think ought to be able to counsel. And I do not think all the answers come from Washington. I do not think they come particularly from those Members who do not want to give all the real information, who do not want to tell women about their rights and then do not want to let a women decide for herself if she wants to use contraception and avoid pregnancy or even decide for herself if she wants to terminate a pregnancy.

I think that we ought to allow the States and the Secretary to establish the qualifications. And if we hear about people acting inappropriately, we report them to their supervisors or the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the matter is straighened out, rather than adopt an amendment that would be a straitjacket to keep counselers from being available.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO). The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I know the Chairman does not want to mislead the House about what my amendment says.

My amendment specifically lays out that social workers are included.

Members must understand that these health providers do more than just counseling. In some cases, they offer medical exams.

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

Mr. DELAY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say to the gentleman that I rise in support of his amendment, that the amendment provides that the individuals who provide counseling to women in title X clinics have a degree in medicine, nursing, clinical psychology, the allied health profession or, at least, social work, that they have one of these degrees.

I think it is a good amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Texas. The amendment provides that the individuals who provide counseling to the women at title X clinics have a degree in medicine, nursing, clinical psychology, the allied health profession, or social work.

The amendment is necessary because currently most of the counselors at these clinics have little to no professional training or education. A report prepared for the Planned Parenthood Federation of America describes the situation at many clinics. On page 1 of the introduction, the report states, "The fact that many affiliates rely to a large extent on unpaid part-time counselors is documented."

On page nine of the report there is a section entitled, characteristics of individual counselors, data from the counselor profiles. Let me quote from this section.

Data from the nearly 500 individual counselor profiles give a clear picture of a counseling staff which is largely young and inexperienced, much of it working unpaid, and probably using PPFA, Planned Parenthood Federation of America employment for training, experience and preparation for other jobs in the future.

Counselors' formal training is relatively modest, which is presumably related to the training efforts made by the affiliates.

Mr. Chairman, we recently considered the National Institutes of Health reauthorization on the floor. During the debate on that bill, we heard over and over again that finally something was being done about women's health. It is interesting that the same Members who are so concerned about women's health are willing to let individuals with no professional training in medicine or mental health counsel poor women about very important decisions regarding their reproductive health.

I urge my colleagues to vote "Yes" on the DeLay amendment.

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

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that the gentleman has not read his amendment. His amendment talks about counselors only and not about people giving medical services. Medical services would have to be provided by people who are licensed to give those services.

The amendment speaks only to those who sit and advise people as to where to go for services or to talk about the kinds of things in a counseling session that would be counseling exclusive.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, that is not entirely correct. My amendment applies to those who provide information on pregnancy management options, which includes persons with the title "reproductive health specialist."

We all know, and I have evidence of this, that often these people do more than just counsel.

Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to accept the portion of the gentleman's amendment which adds to my list of those allowed to provide pregnancy counseling, persons who meet criteria established by the Secretary of HHS. However, I have some serious concerns with the second part of the amendment, which adds to the list those persons who are allowed to provide such counseling under State law.

In the first place, I am concerned about the impact Mr. WAXMAN's amendment would have should State law be absent of any provisions regarding educational standards for counseling, and it is my understanding that, for the most part, State law is not specific in this regard. Since the gentleman's amendment appears to give State law a weight equal to criteria established by the HHS Secretary and my list of professional degrees that would become Federal law, if passed, it seems this would mean anyone could provide counseling, even a 17-year-old high school volunteer, if State law did not set specific educational requirements.

Furthermore, and this brings me to my second concern, suppose a State's laws did identify certain educational prerequisites to counsel for pregnancy, but they were less stringent than the Federal standards, such as requiring only a high school degree, or even a college degree but not in a social science or medical field. Under the Waxman amendment, it seems the standards set by State law would be sufficient for receiving title X funds, and we would find ourselves in the curious situation of having set Federal minimum standards for receiving Federal funding, and having these standards violated by recipients who are complying with State law. Since when has State law superseded Federal law when it comes to Federal funding? In essence, it seems this amendment would be making it legal for States to disobey Federal law. Interesting, but ridiculous.

I believe Mr. WAXMAN is concerned about States rights being infringed upon by Federal regulation, a concern which I certainly share. However, this is not an issue of States' rights. My amendment does not require a professional degree for pregnancy counselors across the board. It simply sets such standards at family planning clinics receiving title X funds. If a clinic does not wish to meet these standards, then it is under no obligation to participate in the Title X Program, and can continue to provide family planning services independently. Furthermore, States are free to establish any standards they wish for counseling, whether more or less stringent than the federal standards—it is up to each clinic individually to determine whether it meets or wishes to meet the Federal standards and receive title X funding.

It has always been, and continues to be, perfectly legitimate for the Federal Government to establish minimum criteria that must be met to be eligible to receive Federal funds. In fact, it is expected that the Federal Government set standards with regard to its allocation of money. It would be absurd to argue that States have the right to twist and turn Federal programs to implement them in whatever way they may desire.

By allowing State law to supersede Federal law, it is obvious that the Waxman amendment would completely undermine the intent of my amendment, which is to set high standards for Federal health care providers. As I stated earlier, pregnancy counselors advise women on one of the most important decisions they'll ever make in their lives—if the Federal Government is funding such counseling, then I strongly believe it has a responsibility to ensure that such counseling is provided by qualified professionals.

Don't settle for less.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on the Waxman amendment and a "yes" vote on the DeLay amendment.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time we have remaining.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The language of this DeLay amendment says that such information will be provided only through individuals holding professional degrees in medicine or osteopathic medicine, nursing, clinical psychology, allied health professions, or social work. The key thing is "such information."

We are talking about who can give information in a family planning clinic. I think all those professionals ought to be able to give information, but I do not think they are the only ones that should be permitted to give information. I think that if a State wants to enable others to give information, they should not be precluded from it. I do not think that the Secretary seeing that this program is administered the way Congress intends should preclude others from giving information. And if in a community where English is not the first language for most of the community, then I think that a person working in that clinic who speaks the language of the community, working under the direction of a health professional, ought to be able to give information, give counseling.

□ 1630

In rural areas where they will not have, sometimes, available to them doctors, social workers, osteopathic medics, or licensed health professionals, I think they ought to be able to have paraprofessionals to give information. We are not talking about medical services, but information.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the amendment we are offering to the DeLay amendment is a reasonable one. This clarifies the situation, and I would urge its adoption.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO). The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] has no time remaining.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I really salute the gentleman for his amendment, because I think it makes an incredible amount of sense. I used to be the attorney for Rocky Mountain Planned Parenthood, and the gentleman is pointing out some excellent points. No. 1, when we went onto the reservations where native Americans were, it was important often to have interpreters. The gentleman's amendment over here would make things very, very confused as to how this could be done with interpreters, what we can do.

Second, it is very clear that every State has been very, very strong in regulating the medical clinics and everything that is under their domain. They license people, they determine what is going on. No one is down here naming States, saying all this awful stuff is going on in States. We have just got this scenario factory out here unwinding where people are saying, "This is the scenario where it is possible it could happen," but no one is giving us any indication of how it could possibly happen.

I think we all know about medical malpractice, and States and clinics and everybody are terribly careful about the control they have and about what kind of information they are putting out. I think that the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] has the right approach to this. It should be in the States that oversee the clinics and oversee the licensing and oversee what is going on. They are the ones that are monitoring it. To have one level being monitored by the States and then the Feds coming in for another part of it makes no sense.

Second, if we cannot use paraprofessionals for any area where we need bilingual interpretation, we could have all sorts of problems in how we would implement the law if we were to change it from what the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] is trying to do.

I really encourage people to move forward on this, to finally get this issue behind us, and to strongly vote for the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I yielded to him.

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, to establish the intent of this House on the gentleman's amendment, could the gentleman explain to me what would happen on his intent if the State law does not speak to the qualifications of these health care providers?

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman, if the DeLay amendment is adopted with the Waxman amendment to it, all those professionals spelled out in the amendment of the gentleman from Texas would be eligible to give counseling at a title X clinic.

If a State did not allow others to participate as counselors, then that State would not have addressed the matter. The Secretary would be required further to spell out through regulations additional individuals who could give information at these title X clinics, and that would be the full extent of the law in terms of how it would operate in title X clinics for counseling purposes.

Mr. DELAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WAXMAN. If the gentleman understands that, perhaps he would be agreeable to it. I cannot see what objection he would have to either States deciding on their own to add qualified people to give counseling or the Secretary to make that determination.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I still think it is rather confusing. If the gentleman would rewrite it, I might even accept it. I appreciate the gentleman establishing the intent, but I am not sure the courts will see it that way.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, if I can reclaim my time, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] is not on our committee. This issue has never come up on the subcommittee or the full committee. We have not had any contact from him to try to work out an amendment.

The gentleman has offered an amendment which he did not understand, from his own explanation, because he did not understand it was limited to counselors alone. He may not even realize that it excludes a lot of paraprofessionals and others who are quite competent to do this job. I think we ought to adopt this perfecting amendment, or otherwise to defeat the DeLay amendment, because I do not think it has been thought through what he is trying to accomplish, unless, unless it is to try to keep rural areas and inner city areas and short-funded family planning clinics from having people available to give counseling.

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

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I thought this was a civil discussion, but the gentleman impugns my ability to read amendments and write amendments. This is absolutely untrue. We know what these specialists do. They do not just counsel, they even give medical exams. I understand that.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman, he is absolutely incorrect. The amendment does not address anybody but those giving counseling.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, they do other functions besides just giving counseling. We all understand that. We know how Planned Parenthood works.

Mr. WAXMAN. I would say to the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, the amendment addresses only counseling.

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman will yield further, the issue is we, even in this country, require Federal inspection of meat, but we do not care what the qualifications are of people that counsel teenage women on their reproductive options.

Mr. WAXMAN. What the gentleman is saying is that a State should not be able to determine that qualification, and I think a State should be able to. I think the Secretary ought to be able to deal with this as well.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of reauthorization of the Title X Program. Reauthorization of this bill is imperative as we are confronted with an increase in teen pregnancy, the AIDS epidemic, and an ongoing battle with sexually transmitted

diseases. Although this program has been funded through continuing appropriations. I believe this is a half-hearted approach to dealing with the devastating reality of these problems. Today we can change this. Mr. Chairman, we have a program before us designed to promote family planning and health care, especially among low-income women. This program must be authorized and legitimized to insure these services remain available, accessible, and affordable to women.

Title X funds over 4,000 clinics providing services to 4 million women. In addition to contraceptive services, family planning clinics provide health services and counseling to women who have nowhere else to go. In many cases these clinics are the only places low-income women can go to receive primary health care. Unfortunately, the issues surrounding reauthorization of the Title X Program have been constantly focused on the abortion debate. But there is much more to title X than this debate. How many people talk about how well-designed the program is to target low-income women and teenagers, the two groups at highest risk for poor pregnancy outcomes? How many people talk about the information these clinics put together to educate people about family planning? How many people talk about the preventive health services available to women at these clinics? What about screenings for cervical cancer and sexually transmitted diseases? Title X clinics should be applauded for their efforts to address all aspects of a women's health care needs. On a visit to a planned parenthood clinic in my hometown of Waterbury, CT, I was able to see the care and effort these professionals put into making their clinic accessible and supportive for women.

I do feel strongly, however, that parental involvement in the health decisions of minors who use these clinics is crucial to the effectiveness of these programs. These decisions are serious ones, ones that teenagers are often not able to deal with on their own. While the input of professionals is certainly quite valuable, nothing can equal the support and guidance that a parent can offer. The Government should be encouraging, rather than discouraging strong parental involvement in our children's lives and this is the best way of doing so. It is not our function to keep important information from parents regarding their children's health and well-being. The development of strong family units, with open communication will help in many cases to alleviate the problems these teenagers face.

Mr. Chairman, I feel we need to encourage and support family planning clinics, with an emphasis on the family, not obstruct and deter what is known to be a successful program of family planning and health care. It is time to reauthorize this program, the only major Federal program we have that goes directly to the need of family planning and avoiding unwanted pregnancies. Mr. Chairman, I support this bill, but more importantly I support the clinics and the women who will benefit from passage of this bill.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 670 which reauthorizes title X, the Nation's family planning program. I urge my colleagues to pass this important bill without any weakening amendments.

Approximately 4 million women are served by title X clinics in the United States each year, an average of over 10,000 women a day. For many of these women, the federally funded clinics are the only access they have to health care—including treatment, prevention, and education. This legislation would provide funding levels of $238 million for fiscal year 1994 and $270 million for fiscal year 1995.

This bill, which provides essential funding for title X clinics through 1995, also clarifies the language regarding abortion counseling and referrals. It specifies that federally funded clinics must provide nondirective advice on all pregnancy options. On his first day in office, President Clinton suspended the gag rule regulations which the Reagan and Bush administrations attempted to impose on the clinics. He also directed Secretary Shalala to rewrite the regulations to clarify the law. I applaud his efforts to swiftly revoke this harmful regulation. We must now clarify in statute the language regarding abortion counseling and referrals, so that this may never be an issue for the women of this country again.

As we vote to permanently revoke the gag rule, we must also oppose the Bliley amendment which requires parental notification and a 48-hour waiting period for minors. There is no judicial bypass and it includes only two minor exceptions. One, if the minors' life is in imminent danger. Serious health problems would not be considered. And second, if the pregnancy is due to incest with the father or legal guardian, incest by an uncle, brother, or grandfather is not included.

The issue here is a fundamental one of fairness. The Bliley amendment restricts only poor teenaged girls' access to health care options because it applies solely to minors who receive their health care in federally funded clinics. Health care options must not be determined by economics and age. Oppose Bliley and let individual States decide their own laws on minors.

Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, oppose the Bliley amendment, and protect all women's right to choice including the rights of teenaged girls.

Mr. MFUME. Madam Chairman, Mr. Speaker, today we vote on legislation that has ramifications for millions of poor women across the country. Not only do we have the opportunity to reauthorize the Title X Family Planning Program, we also have the opportunity to rectify a policy that has, for almost 5 years, effectively denied low-income women access to critical medical advice.

The prohibition on Federal funds to title X clinics offering complete pregnancy management counseling has resulted in dangerous restrictions on dissemination of medical information. Formerly, such counseling may only have been made if the mother's life was in imminent danger. But if the woman's health was threatened—that is, if she has medical conditions that could be aggravated by a pregnancy—she was still denied access to information that was vital to her health and well-being.

Already the Clinton administration has demonstrated its commitment to improved family planning services by suspending the "gag rule" regulations and instructing title X clinics to resume counseling on all options for dealing with a pregnancy. Let us follow President Clinton's example and bring down the barriers that now exist for equal access to the counseling that women who can afford private health care take for granted.

Access to complete medical advice and threats to a mother's life are not the only issues at stake today. The United States has one of the industrial world's highest teenage pregnancy and childbearing rates. Teenagers are most likely to use the services of federally funded family planning clinics and are most at risk for problem pregnancies. Yet we have chosen to deny the clinics they use from providing abortion counseling or referrals.

Another political battle that has arisen to dilute this bill surrounds the issue of parental notification and States' rights. States should reserve the right to enact reasonable parental notification or consent requirements. Many already have laws in place—laws that would be undermined by a Federal standard.

By imposing a Federal standard on parental notification, Congress would be dictating to States stricter regulations than any now in force.

We cannot shirk from our responsibilities to this population and let politics interfere with the policies surrounding reproductive health care. The right to make individual decisions should not be impeded by antiabortion politics. Let us enable our doctors to provide the critical medical advice the "gag rule" has prohibited them from offering their indigent patients.

We must establish greater equality in the realm of public health and in the medical information made available to low-income citizens. It is imperative that we not exclude counseling for those who rely on public clinics because they can afford no other source of medical care. Today we have the opportunity to remedy the misdirected policies that "gagged" our physicians and have denied many their right to complete information with regard to pregnancy management.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

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

Mr. DELAY. 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. 94]

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Dornan
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Faleomavaega (AS)
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

□ 1657

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO). Four hundred sixteen Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(c) of rule XXIII, the Chair announces that any recorded vote on the DeLay amendment, as amended, will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 256, noes 165, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

AYES—256

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonior
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
Eshoo
Evans
Faleomavaega (AS)
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kleczka
Klein
Klug
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKinney
McMillan
Meehan
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sawyer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Snowe
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Zimmer

NOES—165

Allard
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Borski
Bunning
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dornan
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
English (OK)
Everett
Ewing
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Gallegly
Gillmor
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hoekstra
Holden
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kildee
Kim

King
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kyl
LaFalce
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Manton
Manzullo
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McKeon
McNulty
Mica
Michel
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Myers
Nussle
Oberstar
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Poshard
Quinn
Rahall
Ravenel
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schaefer
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Whitten
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—14

Carr
Doolittle
Dreier
Ford (TN)
Geren
Henry
Lewis (FL)
Meek
Pickle
Quillen
Romero-Barceló (PR)
Sharp
Swett
Underwood (GU)

□ 1707

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO). This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 408, noes 16, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 96]

AYES—408

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Archer
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Dornan
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Faleomavaega (AS)
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walker
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—16

Allard
Applegate
Armey
Ballenger
Bunning
Costello
Michel
Myers
Nussle
Roberts
Shuster
Smith (OR)
Solomon
Tejeda
Vucanovich
Watt

NOT VOTING—11

Doolittle
Dreier
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Henry
Lewis (FL)
Meek
Pickle
Quillen
Romero-Barceló (PR)
Sharp

□ 1716

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. CRANE, Ms. DUNN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 103–41.

For what purpose does the gentleman from California rise?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WAXMAN: Page 3, strike lines 1 through 5 and insert the following:

"(B) the project refers the individual seeking services to another provider in the project, or to another project in the geographic area involved, as the case may be, that will provide such information.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chairman, H.R. 670 contains language regarding the issues that are commonly called the conscience clause. This provision was offered last year as an amendment by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], and was adopted overwhelmingly at that time.

The provision allows an individual doctor or nurse to decline to provide information about pregnancy management options—including abortion—if to do so would violate the doctor or nurse's moral convictions. It also allows a project receiving grant support to decline to provide such information.

The provision also requires that the project receiving the grant support refer a woman to another project that will answer her questions.

My amendment clarifies the provisions in the bill.

The current bill language could be interpreted to require individual doctors and nurses personally to refer patients to other sources of information.

My amendment makes it clear that this is a responsibility of the project receiving grant support—not each individual in that project—and that the project must make a referral.

This is the right balance.

No one is asking individuals to provide counseling—even nondirective, informational counseling—if it violates their principles to do so.

But we are saying that when a pregnant women asks for information, she can get the information she needs.

Madam Chairman, I urge an "aye" vote for the amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, I am very pleased that the original bill recognized the need for a conscience clause, but regrettably, the language of the original bill does not provide a conscience clause which is acceptable.

The language of the original bill required that someone offering counseling would have to refer the individual to someone who would talk to them about abortion. There are many people in the country who cannot do this.

□ 1720

The language of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] corrects the problem somewhat in that it now removes the obligation from the person who counseled, but it still places an obligation on the institution, on the organization, to refer to another institution, or organization, or clinic that will provide the counseling. This will disenfranchise many organizations, many clinics, across the country where everyone in the clinic is opposed to abortion and yet, from a compassionate viewpoint, they genuinely want to help these women.

Madam Chairman, I would submit that there is not probably a single woman in the United States who does not know that abortion is an option. Someone does not need to tell them that an abortion is an option. I object to language that would require the individual or the organization to refer this woman or this young woman to another organization where this kind of counseling for abortion would be provided.

Whether I were pro-life or whether I were pro-choice, Madam Chairman, as a matter of compassion and as a matter of fairness I would support removing the language from the bill, and we would do no violation to the intent of this bill. It is a very simple bill, and I say to my colleagues, "If you remove this language from it, we do not need to substitute language of the Waxman amendment. My amendment, which can be voted on if we vote this amendment down simply removes the offending language from page 3, the first five lines of page 3."

Madam Chairman, this is a very simple procedure. It now brings the conscience clause into what most people would feel was a true conscience clause. That was the intent of the bill. All that I ask my colleagues to do is please vote down this amendment and then vote yes for my amendment which would make this a true conscience clause.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chairman, I wish to respond to the gentleman's statement, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, first of all I am pleased that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT] recognizes that this amendment does clarify the conscience of individuals who do not want to personally give information that they feel is inconsistent with their beliefs, but this clarification, I think, is all that is needed. If we go further, Madam Chairman, what we would be saying is that a woman who wanted to get counseling would not be able to go anywhere. She would not be told where to go. Even though an individual may not want to give that information and counseling, that individual should refer to someone else in the program who does not have this disability in terms of giving this counseling that she is requesting, or refusal, and if there is no one in the plan there, she ought to be referred somewhere else to get the information. If they are going to get Federal funds, individuals who get the Federal funds, individuals who work in the plans who get Federal funds, should not have to violate their consciences, and that is what the purpose of this amendment is all about, and I think this clarification is very much needed.

Madam Chairman, I would urge an aye vote.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, an extremely dangerous precedent will be set if the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] is enacted forcing all title X family planning projects to refer for abortions. Under the chairman's amendment, federally funded family planning projects, comprised of doctors, nurses and counselors of conscience, who collectively oppose facilitating the demise of infant children, will either lose their Federal funds or if they buckle under the pressure will acquiesce to financial coercion and refer for abortions.

Mr. WAXMAN argues that his amendment is a conscience clause but it utterly fails to protect family planning projects which are nothing more than groups of people in complicity in abortion.

To illustrate: If a woman works at a title X clinic and she and her colleagues refuse to refer for abortions because they recognize the fact that these procedures kill baby girls and boys by dismembering their fragile bodies or because they are repelled by poisons routinely employed by the abortionist that chemically burn and disfigure the baby, under the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN], if they conscientiously object to abortion, they are no longer eligible for Federal aid. Forcing their title X clinic to have an abortion counselor or counselors makes them an accessory to the killing of babies, and no neat, little, tidy rationalization that they only referred to someone else who then made the referral does in no way lessen their involvement.

Madam Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] is not a conscience clause for groups of people. It compels, it forces title X projects to refer for abortions, so let us not kid ourselves on that score.

Madam Chairman, I urge its defeat. I urge it so that we can then get to the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT] which gets on to this floor for consideration by this body, a genuine, authentic conscience clause.

Mr. BARLETT of Maryland. Madam Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Madam Chairman, this is another one of those parliamentary moves where a reasonable person coming on this floor, believing in the individual rights of conscience, would say about the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN]: "Well, this looks pretty reasonable. How can I possibly vote against this?"

Yet, Madam Chairman, it precludes a vote of the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT] which is a true conscience amendment vote.

I say to my colleagues, "If you don't think we have a conscience problem with abortion, may I announce to this Chamber that for the first time a doctor cannot be found in the U.S. military, in all the branches, anywhere in the world, willing to do abortions, except one, and at the base his anesthesiologist said, 'Not me, Jocko. Count

me out. Find yourself somebody else to administer the anesthesia.'"

So, right now, until we recruit abortion doctors for the Navy, the Air Force, or Army, we have a real conscience problem under our brand-new, first ever in two centuries and 16-some years, a full-on, abortion-for-all-9-months-for-any-reason President. We have got our first abortion President, and as a result, my colleagues, we are going to have conscience problems all over this country.

Now we cannot force a crisis pregnancy center counselor who believes that there is a human life in the womb to tell a pregnant woman, "Go down to the far cubicle, because I have," what the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] called, "a disability in counselling on killing." He inadvertently, and I know he did not mean to do it, but the gentleman from California called it a disability. "If I don't gag, I have to say 'kill your baby.' We have just listened to the sonogram. We heard that sound that sounds like 'Wow' under the water; 'Wow, Wow, Wow, Wow, Wow, Wow, Wow,' 120 beats a minute. Let us kill that baby."

"I cannot bring myself to say that, so because of my 'disability,' go to cubicle 3-C, where we've got this volunteer honcho out there, a teenager, and she'll tell you how to do it."

Madam Chairman, we have got to have a substantive amendment here that allows for conscience which I think every man and woman of conscience in this great deliberative body would like to give to people who truly believe this is killing.

When I got here 17 years ago, Madam Chairman, it had been 15 years since my wife had had life inside of her, our youngest. That youngest, Kathleen, is now 7 months pregnant. I have gone through nine pregnancies, with my daughter-in-law and three daughters, during this last 15 years. I put my hand on those pregnant bellies and listened with the help of sonograms.

We are dealing with human life here. Respect the consciences of those who will not kill.

□ 1730

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, this is an extremely difficult issue for many people, but one thing ought to be easy, and that is respecting somebody's conscience. I do not think your conscience is mortgaged to anybody. It ought to remain inviolable. People who have moral scruples about abortion, about being an accessory to abortion, about advancing or furthering the cause of exterminating unborn children, the sensitivity, indeed, the sanctity of their conscience, ought to be respected.

The gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] does indirectly what the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT] wishes and seeks to prevent indirectly. It is a distinction without a difference. It is accomplishing the same purpose, namely, a referral for abortion, and it does contravene the conscience of someone who is opposed to this sort of action.

Madam Chairman, I plead with Members as they march forward into this new abortion era that we seem to be entering, respect the consciences of those who feel deeply and morally about this question, defeat the Waxman amendment, and permit the Bartlett amendment to be presented and hopefully adopted.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Madam Chairman, I do not think that there is a single person in the United States but what would hope that we could resolve the problems of unfortunate women who have a pregnancy they do not want by some means other than abortion. There are many, many clinics across the country that would seek to counsel women to this end. If we do not vote down this amendment and vote mine in, these clinics will not be able to function.

Madam Chairman, I ask Members to please vote down the Waxman amendment. Make it possible to vote a true conscience clause. The one thing that distinguishes our society and our country from every other society essentially and every other country in the world is the fairness and compassion that marks our society. Please recognize that in this vote. Vote down the Waxman amendment and then vote up the Bartlett amendment.

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

Madam Chairman, I want to clarify what this amendment is all about. This amendment states clearly that if someone finds it objectionable to his or her conscience to advise or counsel on abortion, that that individual not be required to participate in that counseling. That is a way to deal with those who have a definite conscientious objection to abortion and not to require them to do something that is inconsistent with their moral values.

This amendment also says that a woman can still get the information. If the Bartlett amendment were adopted, we would have the gag rule reincarnated, because a clinic would then be able to say, "Well, no one here wants to tell a woman where she could get that information, and therefore she will not even be referred to those who can give her the information she wants, the actual true full facts that she is entitled to," because a clinic is receiving Federal dollars and they ought to be able to give her at least a referral to someone who can give her the information she wants and the truth. So we would through this amendment permit those who have conscientious objections to participating, to opt out and not participate in counseling, and I urge that this conscience amendment be adopted. I ask for an aye vote for the amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 260, noes 163, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]

AYES—260

Abercrombie	Durbin	Johnson, E.B.
Ackerman	Edwards (CA)	Kaptur
Andrews (ME)	Edwards (TX)	Kennedy
Andrews (NJ)	Engel	Kennelly
Andrews (TX)	English (AZ)	Kleczka
Bacchus (FL)	Eshoo	Klein
Baesler	Evans	Klug
Barlow	Faleomavaega (AS)	Kolbe
Barrett (WI)	Fawell	Kopetski
Becerra	Fazio	Kreidler
Beilenson	Fields (LA)	Lambert
Berman	Filner	Lancaster
Bevill	Fingerhut	Lantos
Bilbray	Flake	LaRocco
Bishop	Foglietta	Laughlin
Blackwell	Ford (MI)	Lazio
Boehlert	Fowler	Leach
Bonilla	Frank (MA)	Lehman
Bonior	Franks (CT)	Levin
Boucher	Franks (NJ)	Levy
Brewster	Frost	Lewis (CA)
Brooks	Furse	Lewis (GA)
Browder	Gallo	Lloyd
Brown (CA)	Gejdenson	Long
Brown (FL)	Gekas	Lowey
Brown (OH)	Gephardt	Machtley
Bryant	Geren	Maloney
Byrne	Gibbons	Mann
Calvert	Gilchrest	Margolies-Mezvinsky
Cantwell	Gilman	Markey
Cardin	Glickman	Martinez
Carr	Gonzalez	Matsui
Castle	Gordon	McCloskey
Chapman	Grandy	McCurdy
Clay	Green	McDermott
Clayton	Greenwood	McHale
Clement	Gunderson	McHugh
Clinger	Gutierrez	McInnis
Clyburn	Hamburg	McKinney
Coleman	Hamilton	McMillan
Collins (IL)	Harman	Meehan
Collins (MI)	Hastings	Meek
Condit	Hefner	Menendez
Cooper	Hilliard	Meyers
Coppersmith	Hinchey	Mfume
Coyne	Hoagland	Miller (CA)
Cramer	Hobson	Miller (FL)
Danner	Hochbrueckner	Mineta
Darden	Hoke	Minge
de Lugo (VI)	Horn	Mink
Deal	Houghton	Moakley
DeFazio	Hoyer	Molinari
DeLauro	Huffington	Moran
Dellums	Hughes	Morella
Derrick	Inslee	Nadler
Deutsch	Jacobs	Natcher
Dicks	Jefferson	Neal (MA)
Dingell	Johnson (CT)	Neal (NC)
Dixon	Johnson (GA)	Norton (DC)
Dooley	Johnson (SD)	Obey
Dunn		

Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Snowe
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Swett
Swift
Synar
Thomas (CA)
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—163

Allard
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Borski
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Canady
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
de la Garza
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dornan
Duncan
Emerson
English (OK)
Everett
Ewing
Fields (TX)
Fish
Gallegly
Gillmor
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hoekstra
Holden
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kyl
LaFalce
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Manton
Manzullo
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McKeon
McNulty
Mica
Michel
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nussle
Oberstar
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Poshard
Quinn
Rahall
Ravenel
Regula
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Royce
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schaefer
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (WY)
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Whitten
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Conyers
Doolittle
Dreier
Ford (TN)
Henry
Johnston
Lewis (FL)
Pickle
Quillen
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Sharp
Visclosky

□ 1756

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion to rise offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 287, noes 119, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 98]

AYES—287

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Ewing
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Hoke
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Hyde
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Mica
Mineta
Minge
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Volkmer
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Zeliff

NOES—119

Allard
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Camp
Canady
Coble
Collins (GA)
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dornan
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrich
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hancock
Hastert
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Inglis
Inhofe
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Manzullo
McCandless
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Myers
Nussle
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Regula
Roberts
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Schaefer
Sensenbrenner
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—29

Armey
Berman
Chapman
Combest
Cox
Doolittle
Dreier
Faleomavaega (AS)
Ford (TN)
Hefner
Henry
Kasich
Lambert
Lewis (FL)
Manton
Miller (CA)
Mink
Murphy
Pickle
Quillen
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Sharp
Stark
Tucker
Visclosky
Whitten
Williams
Yates
Young (FL)

□ 1817

Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mrs. ROUKEMA changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

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

So the motion to rise was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. HOYER]

having assumed the chair, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 670) to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to ensure that pregnant women receiving assistance under title X of the Public Health Service Act are provided with information and counseling regarding their pregnancies, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ME-TOO DRUGS OFFER SAVINGS

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

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw this Chamber's attention to the sad, and very nearly tragic, mistreatment of a Democratic former Member of the House of Representatives.

A long time ago, someone counted up how much the chemicals and other substances that make up the human body were worth. The total came to 98 cents. Well, it may be time to update that figure. Based on the medical treatment Defense Secretary Aspin received from military doctors, we now know that a Defense Secretary is not even worth a buck fifty-five.

Now, I mean no disrespect to the Secretary. A buck fifty-five is what the military health system saved by giving the Secretary a typhoid vaccine injection rather than a more expensive oral vaccine. The injection Secretary Aspin received resulted in a fever, which caused dehydration, which, in turn aggravated the Secretary's preexisting heart condition.

The costlier oral vaccine, which, I understand, was developed with military funds, has fewer side effects, and is routinely administered to U.S. soldiers sent to developing countries. I applaud this practice. Our fighting men and women are worth the additional cost. In fact, I wish the doctors treating the Secretary had come to me before giving him the shot; I would have gladly paid the buck fifty-five out of my own pocket to spare him the hospital stay.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you may be wondering why I am rising to the defense of a leader of the other party. You should, instead, be wondering why the Members of his own party have not noted and deplored this grave injustice. The reason may be that they fear being politically incorrect.

In recent years, it has become common practice for some Members of this body to inveigh against the way the pharmaceutical industry does business.

It has been alleged that drug prices are too high. Never mind that a recent study by the respected National Bureau of Economic Research pointed out serious flaws in the data on which this allegation is based.

It has been alleged that drug company profits are too high. Never mind that a study by our own Office of Technology Assessment, while far from favorable to the industry, found that drug company profits are not far out of line with those in comparable industries.

It has also been alleged that drug companies spend too much time and money developing what are called me-too drugs. Now, for those of my colleagues who may not spend too much time following the pharmaceutical debate, let me make it clear what a me-too drug is. This is a drug that takes an existing formula and improves on it, perhaps by eliminating adverse side effects, by increasing the speed of action, or by making the active ingredient available in a form that is easier to use. The oral vaccine that probably would have saved Secretary Aspin in his stay in the hospital was just such a drug.

Those who deplore the money spent on me-too drugs would have drug companies spend all their time on developing break-through products. Would that they could. I do not know a single drug company CEO who would say, "Well, we could develop a cure for cancer or AIDS, but why not enter the crowded cold remedy market instead."

Many critics of the drug industry seem not to understand that scientific progress is incremental. I have spent some time with a number of scientists and university professors. I never saw any light bulbs go off over anyone's head as they got hit by a breakthrough idea. What I saw was lots of very smart people, making progress in small steps, picking problems they hoped they could solve, or make a contribution to solving. Scientific breakthroughs are really the culmination of many small steps, some of which may, originally, have been heading in an entirely different direction.

And breakthroughs are no good at all to the people who cannot benefit from them. Me-too drugs make these breakthroughs available to a broader range of people by eliminating certain side effects and, most importantly, by giving patients and their physicians a choice. That's what upsets me the most about the way the Secretary's doctors treated him—they had a choice, and they made the wrong one.

What could be even worse, however, is eliminating the choice entirely. Suppose scientists discover a cure for AIDS, or cancer, but it is not suitable to the needs of 20 to 30 percent of those who need it. This is the proportion of people who have adverse side effects from the injection from the Secretary was given. And suppose you are an AIDS or cancer patient in that 20 or 30 percent. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, I would be shouting, "Me, too! I want to be helped!"

Mr. Speaker, I have here in my hand a buck fifty-five. I would like to donate it to the Defense Department to make sure that the next time the Secretary's doctors need to give him a typhoid shot, that they stop and give him the safer oral vaccine. At least in this case, there is a choice. Let us not be so eager to reform the drug industry that we eliminate choice for the rest of us.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to include extraneous matter, I include the following article from the New York Times of February 24, 1993, for reprinting in the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 24, 1993]

MILITARY GAVE ASPIN A RISKIER VACCINE

(By Eric Schmitt)

WASHINGTON, February 23.—Military doctors gave Defense Secretary Les Aspin a typhoid shot known to cause nausea and fever, aggravating a congenital heart condition, instead of a more expensive oral vaccine with fewer side effects, a senior Pentagon official said today.

"It's my understanding that the injection vaccine was used because it's cheaper than the oral one," said Mr. Aspin's spokesman, Vernon A. Guidry Jr. "That policy is now being reconsidered."

The cost to the Pentagon of a typhoid vaccine injection is 35 cents, and the immunization is effective for three years. The oral vaccine, which the Army helped develop, costs $1.90 and is effective for five years. The costlier oral vaccine is routinely administered to soldiers bound for developing countries. Mr. Aspin was inoculated in preparation for a trip this weekend to Somalia; the trip has now been postponed.

Doctors said today that Mr. Aspin had "significantly improved" since Sunday, when he was placed in intensive care at Georgetown University Hospital after suffering breathing difficulties related to a mild heart condition. Pentagon officials said Mr. Aspin, who is 54, would probably remain hospitalized one more night for further tests and evaluation.

FULL RECOVERY EXPECTED

Pentagon doctors issued their first detailed statement on Mr. Aspin tonight. According to The Associated Press, the statement said that Mr. Aspin was not suffering from chest pains but that the thickness of his heart muscle had increased since he suffered heart problems in 1991.

The statement said that Mr. Aspin had occasionally skipped heartbeats but that they were not dangerous. The doctors said they expected a full recovery.

Mr. Aspin had been suffering from bronchitis, but his breathing problems resulted mainly from a typhoid inoculation that induced a fever and aggravated his heart problem, Pentagon officials said.

The cost of Mr. Aspin's hospitalization following use of the less expensive vaccine is unknown. The Secretary chose to go to Georgetown Hospital instead of a military hospital in the Washington area because his personal doctor practices there, the Pentagon said.

FEVER A COMMON SIDE EFFECT

Infectious-disease specialists today raised questions about the quality of Mr. Aspin's medical treatment, particularly since a fever often follows the typhoid injection. Fevers

often cause dehydration, which is known to aggravate Mr. Aspin's heart condition, hypertrophic cardiomyopathy, a thickening of the heart muscle that can impair the heart's ability to pump blood.

"The oral vaccine's great virtue is that you get the same level of protection without the side effects," said Dr. Pierce Gardner, acting chief of infectious disease division at University Hospital in Stony Brook, L.I.

Military doctors gave Mr. Aspin several inoculations in his third-floor Pentagon office last Saturday, said Mr. Guidry, who declined to identify the doctors. Mr. Guidry said the doctors were aware of Mr. Aspin's heart condition but apparently did not anticipate his reactions to the typhoid shot.

"The bronchitis was not diagnosed," Mr. Guidry said. "The reaction to the typhoid shot was not anticipated, and therefore the cumulative effect of the two problems with the chronic, underlying heart condition was not predicted."

But doctors interviewed today said that the typhoid injection causes side effects like fever, nausea, flu-like symptoms and a sore arm in 20 percent to 30 percent of the people inoculated.

As a result, the military worked for years to help develop an oral vaccine with fewer side effects. In the mid-1980's, the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research in Washington awarded a $782,000 grant to conduct field trials for an oral vaccine developed by the University of Maryland's Center for Vaccine Development and the Berna Products Corporation of Coral Gables, Fla., a subsidiary of the Swiss Serum and Vaccine Institute in Berne, Switzerland.

The United States Food and Drug Administration approved the oral typhoid vaccine in 1990. The Armed Forces Epidemiological Board, the Defense Department's medical advisory panel, recommended in May 1991 that military doctors give troops going overseas the oral vaccine instead of the injection.

"The Ty21a oral vaccine has been shown effective by extensive testing to be a safe and effective vaccine without eliciting the undesirable side reactions of the parenteral typhoid vaccines," according to the board's memorandum to the senior military medical officials.

In August 1991, the Army Surgeon General advised all Army medical commands to phase in the oral vaccine as existing stocks of the injection vaccine were depleted.

The oral vaccine is given in four capsules taken every other day, doctors said. The injection is a one-time shot, except for the initial immunization, which requires a booster 30 days after the first inoculation.

A Pentagon spokeswoman, Susan Hansen, said both types of typhoid vaccine were available to military commanders.

HOSPITAL ROOM AS OFFICE

Officials at the Defense personnel Support Center in Philadelphia, which buys medical supplies for military depots, said the center had 2,060 packages of vaccine shots, with 50 doses per packages, in stock and another 15,780 packages on order. The center last week ordered 6,000 packages of the oral vaccine, which have four capsules per package. Individual military bases have been ordering the oral vaccine for months, said Andreas Murai, the president of Berna Products.

A Pentagon spokesman, Bob Hall, said Mr. Aspin was expected to be released from the hospital's cardiac-care unit in "a day or so."

With secure communications equipment set up in his hospital room, Mr. Aspin took care of some pressing Pentagon business from his bed, Mr. Guidry said, meeting with Gen. Colin L. Powell, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the designated Deputy Defense Secretary, William Perry.

While Mr. Aspin seemed in good spirits, Mr. Guidry said his voice was "gravelly" by the end of the day.

TOWARD A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

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

Mr. BARLOW. Mr. Speaker, it is deeply gratifying that the Republicans are joining with Democratic leadership in the historic march toward a balanced budget. It is very understandable that people in our country are looking to a balanced budget amendment, because after 12 years of Republican mismanagement of our economy we are in deep trouble and we need to move quickly.

Let me just point out the deficits proposed in the last 2 years of the Bush administration: The budget sent down from the White House to Capitol Hill in 1992, $280 billion deficit proposed by President Bush. In 1993, $349 billion deficit proposed by President Bush.

We want to remedy the mistakes of the past.

Mr. Speaker, in the Community Development Block Grant Program, in 1981 it was the Republicans who threw out the bookkeeper, who prevented oversight by the appropriations process for the moneys sent to the States under the Community Development Block Grant Program.

Why did this happen? Why did the Republicans propose this?

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget sent to Hill by Reagan/Bush	First budget resolution reported by Senate/House conference
1981	2.2	[1] 0.2
1982	61.7	37.6
1983	107.2	103.9
1984	202.8	171.6
1985	195.2	181.2
1986	180.0	171.9
1987	143.6	142.6
1988	107.8	108.0
1989	129.5	135.3
1990	91.1	99.7
1991	63.1	64.0
1992	280.9	278.8
1993	349.9	326.6

[1] $200 M surplus.

Note.—Budget numbers compiled by the Congressional Budget Office and the Congressional Research Service.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 265, nays 134, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

YEAS—265

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Archer
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Glickman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Grandy
Green
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Inglis
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Mann
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Mica
Mineta
Minge
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman

Wheat	Wise	Wyden
Wilson	Woolsey	Wynn

NAYS—134

Bachus (AL)	Gilman	Myers
Baker (CA)	Gingrich	Nussle
Baker (LA)	Gonzalez	Ortiz
Ballenger	Goss	Oxley
Barrett (NE)	Grams	Packard
Bartlett	Greenwood	Paxon
Barton	Hancock	Petri
Bereuter	Hansen	Pombo
Bilirakis	Hastert	Porter
Blute	Hefley	Quinn
Boehlert	Herger	Ramstad
Boehner	Hobson	Regula
Bonilla	Horn	Rogers
Bonior	Houghton	Rohrabacher
Bunning	Huffington	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton	Hunter	Roth
Buyer	Hutchinson	Roukema
Callahan	Hyde	Royce
Calvert	Inhofe	Santorum
Camp	Istook	Schaefer
Canady	Johnson (CT)	Schiff
Coble	Johnson, Sam	Sensenbrenner
Collins (GA)	Kim	Shaw
Cox	King	Skeen
Crane	Kingston	Slattery
Crapo	Klug	Smith (MI)
Cunningham	Knollenberg	Smith (TX)
DeLay	Kyl	Snowe
Diaz-Balart	Lazio	Solomon
Dickey	Leach	Stearns
Dornan	Levy	Stump
Duncan	Lewis (CA)	Sundquist
Dunn	Lightfoot	Thomas (CA)
Emerson	Linder	Thomas (WY)
Everett	Livingston	Torkildsen
Ewing	McCollum	Upton
Fields (TX)	McCrery	Vucanovich
Fish	McHugh	Walker
Fowler	McInnis	Walsh
Franks (CT)	Meyers	Weldon
Gallegly	Michel	Wolf
Gallo	Miller (FL)	Young (AK)
Gekas	Molinari	Zeliff
Gilchrest	Moorhead	Zimmer
Gillmor	Morella	

NOT VOTING—31

Applegate	Hefner	Quillen
Armey	Henry	Sharp
Bateman	Hutto	Taylor (NC)
Berman	Lewis (FL)	Tucker
Brown (CA)	Maloney	Visclosky
Combest	Manton	Whitten
DeFazio	McDade	Williams
Doolittle	Miller (CA)	Yates
Dreier	Mink	Young (FL)
Ford (TN)	Murphy	
Gibbons	Pickle	

□ 1836

So the motion to adjourn was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 25, 1993, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

948. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the 15th annual report on the administration of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1692m; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

949. A letter from the Chair, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

950. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

951. A letter from the Acting Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to section 108 of Public Law 102-229; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

952. A letter from the Acting Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to section 108 of Public Law 102-229; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

SUBSEQUENT ACTION ON A REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

The Committee on Agriculture discharged from further consideration of H.R. 720; H.R. 720 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

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. GILMAN (for himself, Ms. MOLINARI, and Mr. SOLOMON):

H.R. 1438. A bill to strengthen United States and international antiterrorism efforts; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Texas (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FROST, Mrs. MINK, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 1439. A bill to create "Healthy American Schools," where children will learn the lifelong health and fitness skills vital to developing a smart body and smart mind and to empower every school with the ability to become a healthy school, built on a firm foundation of "healthy mind and healthy body" curricula; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma (for himself, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. PENNY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. MINGE, and Mr. BARLOW):

H.R. 1440. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to provide for comprehensive site-specific resource management plans on land used for the production of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERMAN:

H.R. 1441. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a cooperative agreement with the William O. Douglas Outdoor Classroom, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 1442. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish outpatient medical services for any disability of a former prisoner of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOUCHER (for himself, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. PICKETT, Mrs. BYRNE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GILLMOR, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 1443. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit to businesses which mine metallurgical coal and are required to make contributions to the UMWA Combined Benefit Fund created by the Energy Policy Act of 1992; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEMENT:

H.R. 1444. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for payment of a benefit for the month of the recipient's death; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of California (for himself, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WOOLSEY, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. BLACKWELL, and Mr. LAFALCE):

H.R. 1445. A bill to provide for the trilateral negotiation of North American environmental, labor, and agricultural standards, to implement as U.S. negotiating objectives in the North American free trade area negotiations certain threshold protections regarding worker rights, agricultural standards, and environmental quality, and to implement a corresponding, comprehensive trinational dispute resolution mechanism to investigate, adjudicate, and render binding, enforceable judgments against any unfair trade practices arising within the North American free trade area, including those involving the systematic denial or practical negation of certain threshold protections of worker rights, agricultural standards, and environmental quality; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of California (for himself, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. WALSH, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. BLACKWELL, and Mr. LAFALCE):

H.R. 1446. A bill to provide for the multilateral negotiation of Western Hemisphere environmental, labor, and agricultural standards, to implement as U.S. negotiating objectives in any free trade area negotiations pursuant to the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative certain threshold protections regarding worker rights, agricultural standards, and environmental quality, and to implement a corresponding, comprehensive multilateral dispute resolution mechanism to investigate, adjudicate, and render binding, enforceable judgment against any unfair trade practices arising within the Western Hemisphere free trade area, including those involving the systematic denial or practical negation of certain threshold protections of worker rights, agricultural standards, and environmental quality; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEMENT:

H.R. 1447. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for an improved benefit computation formula for workers who attain age 65 in or after 1982 and to whom applies the 15-year period of transition to the changes in benefit computation rules enacted in the Social Security Amendments of 1977 (and related beneficiaries) and to provide prospectively for increases in their benefits accordingly; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 1448. A bill to establish a limit on the fee which certain persons may charge for cashing checks and other instruments, to require depository institutions to cash checks issued by the United States or a State, and to provide that checks drawn by the Federal

Government may be mailed only to the personal residence or primary place of business of the payee, to a Federal post office box, or to a federally insured depository institution at which the payee holds an account; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Government Operations.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1449. A bill to prohibit any State or local government from requiring any disabled veteran to reside for a minimum period within the jurisdiction of such government as a condition of receiving benefits under any real property tax relief program of such government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALKER (for himself, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DELAY, Mr. HYDE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. PAXON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HENRY, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HOKE, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. LINDER, Mr. BLUTE, Ms. DUNN, Mr. BAKER of California, and Mr. BARTLETT):

H.R. 1450. A bill to promote the competitiveness of American businesses by reducing the national debt to lower the cost of capital, providing tax incentives to further enhance private capital formation, modernizing antitrust law to remove barriers to cooperative enterprise, instituting civil justice reform to reduce litigious burdens, and reviewing new Federal regulations to prevent unintended effects, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Energy and Commerce, Science, Space, and Technology, Education and Labor, and Government Operations.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself and Mr. BOUCHER):

H.R. 1451. A bill to amend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 to include Montgomery, Roanoke, and Rockbridge Counties, VA, as part of the Appalachian region; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. GOODLING (for himself and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 1452. A bill to allow States, local educational agencies, and schools the flexibility to use and combine Federal, State, and local funds to improve the educational achievement of all elementary and secondary school students; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GENE GREEN (for himself, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WILSON, Mr. PETE GEREN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. BROOKS, Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. PICKLE):

H.R. 1453. A bill to provide equity in education funding for the States received under chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GUNDERSON (for himself, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. PETRI, Ms. MOLINARI, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. BEREUTER):

H.R. 1454. A bill to provide for the development of workplace readiness competencies and voluntary national industry-recognized skill standards, to promote school-to-work transition and youth apprenticeship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JACOBS (for himself and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 1455. A bill to provide protection for veal calves; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 1456. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that income of spouses will not be aggregated for purposes of the limitations of sections 401(a)(17) and 404(2) of such Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. OWENS, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MFUME, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. SLATTERY, and Mr. GONZALEZ):

H.R. 1457. A bill to protect the voting rights of homeless citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAZZOLI:

H.R. 1458. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit for the cost of installing automatic fire sprinkler systems in certain buildings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM (for himself, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mrs. ROUKEMA):

H.R. 1459. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to expand the definition of "aggravated felony," to eliminate the administrative deportation hearing and review process for aliens convicted of aggravated felonies who are not permanent residents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 1460. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of associations resulting from mergers of certain farm credit associations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MFUME:

H.R. 1461. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for stalking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1462. A bill to amend section 203 of the National Housing Act to reduce the minimum downpayment required for a mortgage on a 1- to 4-family residence located in Alaska, Guam, Hawaii, or the Virgin Islands to be eligible for mortgage insurance under such act; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (by request):

H.R. 1463. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to implement recommendations made by the Commission on the Future Structure of Veterans Health Care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mrs. MINK, and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 1464. A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of certain factors with respect to any aspect of a surety bond transaction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ORTON:

H.R. 1465. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the treatment of certain real estate activities under the limitations on losses from passive activities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1466. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to improve the procedure for appointing members to the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey:

H.R. 1467. A bill to provide grants to community-based organizations to provide employment and job training services, to provide grants to those organizations to provide attitudinal, motivational, and skills training to certain disadvantaged youths and adults, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. PELOSI:

H.R. 1468. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to convey for scrapping by the National Maritime Museum Association not more than two vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet that are scheduled to be scrapped; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Ms. PELOSI (for herself and Mr. MILLER of California):

H.R. 1469. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to use the facilities of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area to develop and implement a program to use drought-resistant species of plants in the landscaping of public lands; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 1470. A bill to reauthorize the Mining and Mineral Resources Research Institute Act of 1984; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 1471. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating a segment of the Rio Grande in New Mexico as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. SYNAR):

H.R. 1472. A bill to make unlawful the transfer or possession of assault weapons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 1473. A bill to correct the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States as it applies to electric toothbrushes and parts thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas::

H.R. 1474. A bill to increase the irrigable acreage for the San Angelo Federal reclamation project, TX, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SUNDQUIST:

H.R. 1475. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the unified estate and gift tax credits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VALENTINE (for himself, Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. TANNER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BATEMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. MINGE, Mr. HASTERT, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. SCHAEFER, and Mr. LEHMAN):

H.R. 1476. A bill to require the President to submit to the Congress each year an integrated jus-

tification for U.S. foreign assistance programs, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Agriculture, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and Rules.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 1477. A bill to provide for the management of lands and recreational resources at Canyon Ferry Recreation Area, MT, and other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself and Mr. ROWLAND):

H.J. Res. 162. Joint resolution to designate July 5, 1993, through July 12, 1993, as "National Awareness Week for Life-Saving Techniques"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HEFNER:

H.J. Res. 163. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States restoring the right of Americans to pray in public institutions, including public school graduation ceremonies and athletic events; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SHEPHERD:

H.J. Res. 164. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide a limitation on the terms of U.S. Senators and Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. PETE GEREN, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. WILSON, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FROST, and Mr. HAYES of Louisiana):

H. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to certain international aviation agreements and certain agreements between commercial air carriers of the United States and the United Kingdom; to the Committee on foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol grounds for the 12th annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. GILCHREST (for himself, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. CRANE, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. EWING, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. HERGER, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. WELDON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. KLUG, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. KASICH, Mr. REGULA, Mr. KYL, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. SAXTON, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CANADY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. DORNAN, and Mr. GALLEGLY):

H. Res. 139. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require a three-fifths vote to adopt any rule reported from the Committee on Rules disallowing germane amendments to a bill or resolution; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

60. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to a bipartisan Pacific Northwest forest summit; to the Committee on Agriculture.

61. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Utah, relative to Federal grazing fees; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

62. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Utah, relative to a balanced Federal budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

63. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of New Mexico, relative to veterans benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

64. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Utah, relative to a medical care savings account; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

65. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Iowa, relative to small issue private activity bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina introduced a bill (H.R. 1478) for the relief of Chi Hsii Tsui, Jim Mie Tsui, Yim Whee Tsui, Yin Tan Tsui, and Yin Chao Tsui; which was referred 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. 18: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. MANTON, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 25: Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LAROCCO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. TORRES, Mr. REED, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 28: Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 59: Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. DEAL, and Mr. KNOLLENBERG.

H.R. 65: Mr. HUTTO, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 67: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 71: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.

H.R. 94: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 112: Mr. DOOLITTLE and Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 159: Mr. ISTOOK.

H.R. 162: Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. BATEMAN, Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, Mr. FISH, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. MCDADE, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 163: Mr. ALLARD.

H.R. 171: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 174: Mr. VENTO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 214: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ZIMMER, and Mr. BARCIA.

H.R. 303: Mr. DICKS and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 322: Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 335: Mr. BLUTE, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 349: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, and Mr. BAKER of California.

H.R. 406: Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 454: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 455 Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 465: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia.

H.R. 485: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. TALENT, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. CLAY, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 535: Mr. BROOKS, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. REED, Mr. REGULA, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. WISE, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. KOLBE, Ms. FURSE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. ORTON.

H.R. 624: Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BUYER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. LAZIO, Ms. DANNER, Ms. FURSE, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. LEVY, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. HOKE, and Mr. ROEMER.

H.R. 653: Mr. KINGSTON, and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 656: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 672: Mr. CLAY, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 697: Ms. BYRNE, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana.

H.R. 723: Mr. PORTER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BOEHNER, and Mr. LEVY.

H.R. 749: Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, and Mr. TEJEDA.

H.R. 767: Mr. CRAPO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. LAROCCO, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming.

H.R. 776: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 786: Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 792: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 830: Mr. BAKER of California, Ms. FOWLER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. TALENT, Ms. LAMBERT, Mr. CRANE, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SUNDQUIST, and Mr. COX.

H.R. 852: Mr. MCKEON, Mr. KIM, and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 882: Mr. HEFLEY and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 886: Mr. LEVY, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. LAZIO.

H.R. 915: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. MCINNIS.

H.R. 916: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SABO, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. HASTINGS, and Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 930: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. HYDE, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 942: Mr. COBLE, Mr. WILSON, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. COYNE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. WALSH, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. COLEMAN, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. PORTER, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 943: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. LEVY, and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 960: Mr. BARLOW, Mr. ROGERS, and Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 962: Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. FISH, Ms. FOWLER, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. DEAL, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 985: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Ms. DANNER, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. BAKER of California, and Mr. KASICH.

H.R. 986: Miss COLLINS of Michigan.

H.R. 999: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GOSS, Mr. HILLIARD, and Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 1036: Mr. REED, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. PENNY.

H.R. 1048: Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 1055: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. KING, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. FROST, and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 1067: Mr. GINGRICH and Mr. COX.

H.R. 1079: Mr. SAM JOHNSON OF TEXAS.

H.R. 1086: Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 1088: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. EWING, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. ARMEY, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 1090: Mr. EWING and Mr. SANGMEISTER.

H.R. 1133: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BRYANT, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. VENTO, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. COYNE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BEILENSON, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MFUME, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. SARPALIUS, and Mrs. LLOYD.

H.R. 1141: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. KLUG, and Mr. KYL.

H.R. 1149: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1164: Mr. SCHUMER.

H.R. 1200: Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 1210: Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.R. 1247: Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BAKER of California, and Mr. HOKE.

H.R. 1280: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, and Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 1285: Mr. PENNY, Mr. BAKER of California, Mrs. LLOYD, and Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.

H.R. 1309: Mr. FAWELL, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. PENNY.

H.R. 1322: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. HOKE.

H.R. 1327: Mrs. MEEK, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MONTGOMERY, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1332: Mr. BOEHNER, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DIXON, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GOSS, Mr. HEFNER, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MCDADE, Mrs. MINK, Mr. OXLEY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 1360: Mr. FLAKE, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1368: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 1404: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. KING, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. FISH, and Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 1405: Mr. RUSH, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 1415: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, and Mr. TUCKER.

H.R. 1424: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.J. Res. 1: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. KREIDLER.

H.J. Res. 9: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.J. Res. 22: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia and Mr. EVERETT.

H.J. Res. 30: Mr. GOODLATTE.

69-059 O—97 Vol. 139 (Pt. 5) 13

H.J. Res. 79: Ms. DANNER, Mr. FROST, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. WALSH.

H.J. Res. 80: Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BREWSTER, Ms. DANNER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SHARP, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.J. Res. 83: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.J. Res. 86: Mr. PETRI, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.J. Res. 88: Ms. FURSE.

H.J. Res. 94: Mr. PARKER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SWIFT, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. INHOFE, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Mrs. COLLINS of Illionis.

H.J. Res. 108: Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. FISH, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. THOMAS of California, Ms. DUNN, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.J. Res. 111: Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. QUILLEN, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. SABO, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. RAVENEL.

H.J. Res. 126: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FROST, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. LEVY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SWETT, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. WOLF.

H.J. Res. 127: Mr. WOLF, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. FROST, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SHARP, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.J. Res. 133: Mr. HAMILTON, Ms. DANNER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. BARCIA.

H.J. Res. 147: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. KASICH, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. FROST, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. ROSE, Mr. MOORHEAD, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. HUTCHINSON.

H. Con. Res. 2: Mr. STUMP.

H. Con. Res. 6: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. TALENT, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, and Mr. BARCIA.

H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.

H. Con. Res. 29: Mr. UPTON.

H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. PARKER, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, and Mr. BROWDER.

H. Con. Res. 56: Mr. WATT, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. TORRES, Mr. RICHARDSON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. DE LA GARZA, and Mr. DE LUGO.

H. Res. 38: Ms. SNOWE, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. ANDREWS of Texas.

H. Res. 53: Mr. NUSSLE.

H. Res. 86: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. GALLO, Mr. KIM, Mr. KING, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. TORKILDSEN, and Mr. TUCKER.

H. Res. 118: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. MANZULLO.

H. Res. 122: Mr. LEVY, Ms. MOLINARI, Ms. DANNER, Mr. QUINN, Mr. TALENT, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. BLUTE, and Mr. TOWNS.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1430

By Mr. SOLOMON:

—At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE II.—LEGISLATIVE LINE-ITEM VETO ACT OF 1993

SECTION 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "The Legislative Line-Item Veto Act of 1993".

SEC. 202. LEGISLATIVE LINE-ITEM VETO RESCISSION AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the provisions of part B of title X of The Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, and subject to the provisions of this section, the President may rescind all or part of any discretionary budget authority for fiscal years 1994 and 1995 which is subject to the terms of this Act if the President—

(1) determines that—

(A) such rescission would help balance the Federal budget, reduce the Federal budget deficit, or reduce the public debt;

(B) such rescission will not impair any essential Government functions;

(C) such rescission will not harm the national interest; and

(D) such rescission will directly contribute to the purpose of this Act of limiting discretionary spending in fiscal years 1994 or 1995, as the case may be; and

(2) notifies the Congress of such rescission by a special message not later than 20 calendar days (not including Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays) after the date of enactment of a regular or supplemental appropriations act for fiscal year 1994 or 1995 or a joint resolution making continuing appropriations providing such budget authority for fiscal year 1994 or 1995, as the case may be.

The President shall submit a separate rescission message for each appropriations bill under this paragraph.

SEC. 203. RESCISSION EFFECTIVE UNLESS DISAPPROVED.

(a) Any amount of budget authority rescinded under this Act as set forth in a special message by the President shall be deemed canceled unless during the period described in subsection (b), a rescission dis-

bill making available all of the amount rescinded is enacted into law.

(b) The period referred to in subsection (a) is—

(1) a congressional review period of 20 calendar days of session during which Congress must complete action on the rescission disapproval bill and present such bill to the President for approval or disapproval;

(2) after the period provided in paragraph (1), an additional 10 days (not including Sundays) during which the President may exercise his authority to sign or veto the rescission disapproval bill; and

(3) if the President vetoes the rescission disapproval bill during the period provided in paragraph (2), an additional 5 calendar days of session after the date of the veto.

(c) If a special message is transmitted by the President under this Act and the last session of the Congress adjourns sine die before the expiration of the period described in subsection (b), the rescission shall not take effect. The message shall be deemed to have been retransmitted on the first day of the succeeding Congress and the review period referred to in subsection (b) (with respect to such message) shall run beginning after such first day.

SEC. 204 DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act—

(a) the term "rescission disapproval bill" means a bill or joint resolution which only disapproves a rescission of discretionary budget authority for fiscal year 1994 or 1995, in whole, rescinded in a special message transmitted by the President under this Act; and

(b) the term "calendar days of session" shall mean only those days on which both Houses of Congress are in session.

SEC. 205. CONGRESSIONAL CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATIVE LINE ITEM VETO RESCISSIONS.

(a) PRESIDENTIAL SPECIAL MESSAGE.—Whenever the President rescinds any budget authority as provided in this Act, the President shall transmit to both Houses of Congress a special message specifying—

(1) the amount of budget authority rescinded;

(2) any account, department, or establishment of the Government to which such budget authority is available for obligation, and the specific project or governmental functions involved;

(3) the reasons and justifications for the determination to rescind budget authority pursuant to this Act;

(4) to the maximum extent practicable, the estimated fiscal, economic, and budgetary effect of the rescission; and

(5) all actions, circumstances, and considerations relating to or bearing upon the rescission and the decision to effect the rescission, and to the maximum extent practicable, the estimated effect of the rescission upon the objects, purposes, and programs for which the budget authority is provided.

(b) TRANSMISSION OF MESSAGES OF HOUSE AND SENATE.—

(1) Each special message transmitted under this Act shall be transmitted to the House of Representative and the Senate on the same day, and shall be delivered to the Clerk of the House of Representatives if the House is not in session, and to the Secretary of the Senate if the Senate is not in session. Each special message so transmitted shall be referred to the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate. Each such message shall be printed as a document of each House.

(2) Any special message transmitted under this Act shall be printed in the first issue of the Federal Register published after such transmittal.

(c) REFERRAL OF RESCISSION DISAPPROVAL BILLS.—Any rescission disapproval bill introduced with respect to a special message shall be referred to the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives or the Senate, as the case may be.

(d) CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

(1) Any rescission disapproval bill received in the Senate from the House shall be considered in the Senate pursuant to the provisions of this Act.

(2) Debate in the Senate on any rescission disapproval bill and debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours. The time shall be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader of their designees.

(3) Debate in the Senate on any debatable motions or appeal in connection with such bill shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by the mover and the manager of the bill, except that in the event the manager of the bill is in favor of any such motion or appeal, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or his designee. Such leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any debatable motion or appeal.

(4) A motion to further limit debate is not debatable. A motion to recommit (except a motion to recommit with instructions to report back within a specified number of days not to exceed 1, not counting any day on which the Senate is not in session) is not in order.

(e) POINTS OF ORDER.—

(1) It shall not be in order in the Senate or the House of Representatives to consider any rescission disapproval bill that relates to any matter other than the rescission budget authority transmitted by the President under this Act.

(1) It shall not be in order in the Senate or the House of Representatives to consider any amendment to a rescission disapproval bill.

(3) Paragraphs (1) and (2) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by a vote of three-fifths of the members duly chosen and sworn.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

OPENING THE DOOR TO CITIZENSHIP

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today I am proudly introducing a bill to help a man who has proven his love for and loyalty to the United States obtain his greatest wish: the ability to become a citizen of our country.

Mr. Speaker, you and many of our colleagues may have read the article on Charlie Tsui which appeared in Parade magazine on January 24, 1993. Within days of the story's publication, my office began receiving hundreds of letters from people all across the Nation who said that Charlie's story touched their hearts. A copy of this article follows my remarks, and I urge those who have not to take the time to read it.

Mr. Speaker, while various legal actions have permitted Charlie and his family to live and work in the United States without the threat of being deported, these same actions also prevent Charlie and his family from becoming lawful permanent residents [LPR's], the first step in realizing their dream of becoming full citizens of the United States. Charlie is essentially a man without a country. Without private legislation, the only means currently available to Charlie for securing LPR status is to go before an immigration judge and request a suspension of deportation. To do this, however, he would have to declare himself deportable and rely on the mercy of the judge to rule in his favor. If the judge were to rule against him, Charlie would face immediate deportation to one of the most repressive countries in the world as well as possible separation from his family. To require Charlie—a man who spent 7 years in a Chinese prison because he would not denounce his former Marine friends—to make this impossible choice seems unfair and unreasonable.

During the 102d Congress, the Senate voted unanimously in favor of a bill granting Charlie and his family the ability to apply for LPR status. Likewise, the International Law, Immigration and Refugee Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee unanimously endorsed the bill. Unfortunately, as this approval came during the waning hours of the 102d Congress, the full Judiciary Committee did not have time to meet on this bill—although every indication pointed to its approval. I am resuming this effort in the 103d Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the response I have received from people who have read the Parade magazine article on Charlie is simply amazing. I have heard from many of Charlie's former Marine buddies as well as former Marines who had heard of Charlie while serving in China but who have never met him. I have heard from sixth-grade students from Liberty Middle School in Liberty, GA, and seventh grade students from East Cobb Middle School in Marietta, GA. I have heard from people from almost every State, including New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Florida, Texas, Kentucky, Ohio, Utah, California, and Alaska, not to mention from my own State of North Carolina. These people agree that Charlie has proven his love for and loyalty to the United States, and that it is entirely appropriate for our Nation to acknowledge his loyalty and faith and grant him and his family the right to begin the process of becoming U.S. citizens.

HIS GREATEST WISH—TO BE A CITIZEN

(By David Perlmutt)

In the coming weeks, a private bill will be introduced in Congress to grant citizenship to one remarkable Chinese man and his family. This is his story:

The Chinese boy was pressed and spit-shined, like a good Marine should be. On this bitterly cold day in February 1948, he followed a group of U.S. Marines to an airstrip outside Tsingtao. For more than three years, they had treated the boy like a brother: feeding him, sending him to school—in short, making him one of them, a Marine. Now they were leaving.

"Bullard!" the boy shouted to PFC William Bullard as the two hugged. "You send for me, won't you? You bring me stateside, won't you?"

"Oh, yes, Charlie—someday we'll come back for you," Bullard told his young friend. As their plane roared down the runway, the Marines looked from the windows at the 13-year-old boy who stood at attention, saluting. He was crying.

So were the Marines.

It would be 35 years before William Bullard and his fellow Marines, could keep their promise. By then, the boy had paid a high price for his loyalty.

Today, he is 58 and calls himself Charlie Tsui (pronounced "tway"). The Marines called him Charlie Two Shoes. Even now, they are awed by his devotion to them and to the United States. Because he refused to denounce the U.S., he endured seven years in prison and 10 years under house arrest before finally entering this country in 1983.

All Tsui wanted in exchange for his loyalty was to be a U.S. citizen. Dozens of his former Marine buddies, most now in their 60s and 70s, pushed for passage of a bill that would have granted citizenship to him and his family. In October, the bill failed to get to the floor of the U.S. House, effectively killing it.

Tsui and his wife, Jin Mie, 54, now run a Chinese restaurant in Chapel Hill, N.C., with their three children. They own a five-room house and are not in jeopardy of being sent back to China. By all appearances, his family is living the American Dream. Still, Tsui says, without citizenship, he feels rootless.

"A lot of people tell me, 'A citizen doesn't make any more money than anybody else,'" he says. "It's not the money. It has to do with the honor, the integrity of being a citizen. I feel that I should have been a citizen 47 years ago. Because, when I first became a Marine, I felt: "I'm a Marine, and a Marine is from the United States. So I'm a part of the U.S. too.' I don't understand why Congress turned its back on me after all I went through."

That is the real story—all that Tsui endured to become a U.S. citizen. It began in 1949, after the last Marines left China.

They had come to China in October 1945. World War II had been over for two months, but word of the Japanese surrender had yet to reach the mud-hut villages surrounding the city of Tsingtao. The Marines' mission: to disarm the Japanese and send them home.

As the Chinese had fought the Japanese, they were destined to fight among themselves—peasants under the Communist leader Mao Tse-tung rising up to overthrow the Nationalist government of Chiang Kai-shek.

In a village near an air base 15 miles from Tsingtao lived a frail 10-year-old. When the Marines asked his name, he said, "Tsui Chi Hsii." "Sounds like 'Charlie Two Shoes,'" said one Marine, and the name stuck. Charlie stoked their fires and brought eggs from his parents' farm. He took home K-rations—Spam, tuna, beans.

"All he was doing was trying to help his family," says Don Sexton of Greensboro, N.C., a former Marine corporal. "He wanted food, not money. The Japanese had deprived his village of what little it had."

The unit received permission from Charlie's parents to take him in. Soon he was one of them. He slept in their tents and, later, in the barracks at the Marine compound. He wore uniforms cut to his size—wool greens in winter, khakis in summer. He hiked and paraded with the Marines. They sent him to a school run by nuns, who led him to Christianity.

As Marines left, their replacements welcomed Charlie. Then suddenly, in January 1949, just after he turned 14, the Marines' mission was over. By February, they were gone. The Communists took control of China. Charlie was sent home.

Charlie's parents were frightened to see him. "Being with the Marines for four years, I could barely speak my language," he explains. "My parents know the Communists may kill me, and they are scared for themselves." His mother hid him in a hole in the backyard, covered with hay. After two weeks, Communist soldiers came to his house to see the boy. They assured his mother they meant no harm. Charlie appeared, still wearing his Marine greens. The soldiers told the boy the Americans were his enemies.

After they left, Charlie's mother began burning his Marine possessions: first, books and papers; then, piece by piece, his uniforms. "This is evidence they will use against you," she said. Finally, she came to his fatigue trousers. "You are not going to destroy these," he said. Instead, she dyed them black.

For 13 years, the Communists didn't bother Charlie. He went to school and to church, until the Communists boarded them up. After that, he prayed to himself—always in English, for practice. In 1960, he married Zhu Jin Mie. He found a job as a silk researcher. Then, in 1962, after refusing to sign a statement that the Marines had mistreated the Chinese, he was arrested, found guilty of "suspicion of espionage" and refusing to cooperate with the government, and sentenced to seven years in prison and 10 years under house arrest.

Tsui's son, Jeff, was 2 months old when he left for prison. Jin Mie, a teacher, was fired

for refusing to divorce her husband and forced to work in the fields.

"Those seven years were easy," Tsui reflects about prison. "In my country, there wasn't much freedom anyway."

When Tsui was released, his son was 7. Still under house arrest, Tsui could work only at the dirtiest jobs—carrying manure to the fields and digging wells. Another son, David, and a daughter, Susan, were born. By 1979, the year Tsui regained his freedom, the United States and China had established diplomatic relations.

Tsui decided to write the Marines, but it took months to get permission. Relying on faith, he prayed: "Lord, thank you for keeping me alive. But you've got to help one more time. Help me remember addresses." Before long, he sent letters to three he'd committed to memory some 30 years earlier. One made it through: On a bright day in April 1980 in Autreyville, N.C., William Bullard reached into his mailbox and fished out a battered letter:

Dear Bullard,

How are you and your family? Do you remember your old buddy in China? . . . I hope you will be willing to help me as you did before to create success.—Charlie

Bullard cried. He'd long wondered if Charlie was alive. Bullard phoned his old Marine friends. All flooded Congress with letters.

On May 10, 1983, Charlie Two Shoes flew into Cleveland. "Semper Fi," he told Bullard and four other weeping ex-Marines—short for "*semper fidelis*" (Latin for "always faithful"), the Corps' motto. For 2½ years, Tsui lived in Tallmadge, Ohio, with former Marine PFC Roy Sibit, who, with Bullard, had led the effort to bring him to the U.S.

Tsui came on a six-month visa, which his Marine friends managed to have extended twice. The third time—in 1985, with Tsui just days from deportation—U.S. Attorney General Edwin Meese stepped in, arranging for him to stay indefinitely. Charlie sent for his family.

Not long after, says Tsui, his friendship with Sibit soured. So his family moved to North Carolina—first to Greensboro, where Charlie and Jeff installed carpet; then, in late 1986, to Chapel Hill, where they opened Tsing Tao Restaurant, decorating it with photos and mementos of Charlie and the Marines.

Though permitted to remain here, Charlie had not been given residency status—necessary to apply for citizenship. Last September, a bill to grant citizenship to Tsui was introduced by then U.S. Sen. Terry Sanford (D., N.C.). Many Marines wrote to Congress in support. But Roy Sibit has a different view. "Charlie already has the privilege of coming and staying in the U.S.," he says. "I don't feel he is deserving of getting citizenship by going through a special process."

It sailed through the Senate but, even after a background check confirmed Tsui's story, the bill died in the House. In the coming weeks, Rep. David Price (D., N.C.) will reintroduce it. "We hope to get the bill passed quickly," he says.

The men who fought to make their old friend from China a citizen hope so: "What you have in your midst," says former Marine Cpl. Jack Hutchins of Hazel Green, Ky., "is a true American hero."

HONORING RUSSELL AND ELIZABETH SIMMONS

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, all of us are blessed with special constituents who take a serious and concerted effort at trying to improve the quality of life for all of our people back home. One such couple who has made a tremendous contribution to the citizens of New Mexico is Russell and Elizabeth Simmons of Raton.

Russell and Elizabeth moved to New Mexico in 1975, and have been writing to our State's political leaders ever since. In 1988, they founded a local chapter of the American Association of Retired People. They are a fixture at my town meetings and are a constant source of information for me.

I urge my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to this wonderful couple who were recently profiled in the Raton Range. The article follows:

STILL ACTIVE—RUSSELL AND ELIZABETH SIMMONS DIDN'T SLOW DOWN WHEN THEY RETIRED TO RATON

(By Todd Wildermuth)

For Russell and Elizabeth Simmons, retirement isn't for sitting home quietly. Not that it has taken retirement to get them involved in community activities or to express an opinion on a national topic of concern. They've been doing that for a long time now.

"We've been brought up and worked in things that mattered to the community," explains Elizabeth. "I think if you don't do it, democracy's going to go down the drain."

Elizabeth spent 20 years on the county commission in St. Paul, Minn., and was a member of the League of Women Voters. While a librarian there, she was involved in fighting censorship in the 1970s.

Russell has done a bit of everything—the ministry, the army, the law field—on his way to Raton, where he and Elizabeth have lived since 1975. At their house just outside the city limits, Russell sifts through books and all sorts of information he has requested from government agencies and other sources. If he comes across a news item or another piece of interesting information, he'll file it away as a possibility to be referred to in one of his frequent letters to the editor or perhaps in his weekly "Leisure Hour" introduction. Russell has been opening the Wednesday morning senior citizen get-together at the library for years. His remarks on issues ranging from local to worldwide have become such a crowd-pleaser that it has become almost impossible for Russell to even think about ever discontinuing his weekly opening. A couple years ago, Russell tried to announce his "resignation."

"A new year started and I kept my word and didn't do it, and all hell broke loose down there," he remembers.

So Russell remains a Leisure Hour fixture. And his letters remain a fixture in The Raton Range, as well as occasionally in the state's larger metropolitan papers.

But those are just the letters most of us see. Even more letters have been shipped off to whomever Russell thinks may have an answer for him. Or may need an answer from him. Be it the governor, a congressman or anybody else with the authority to take some action on an issue.

"I should get a federal grant to cover my postage," jokes Russell, whose pet subject is social security.

"When (State Representative) Bill Richardson was here a couple of town meetings ago, somebody asked a question about social security," Elizabeth says, "and Bill turned and said, 'Ask Russell Simmons. He knows more about social security than I do.' Because he does."

Elizabeth focuses her attention these days on the local AARP chapter she and Russell organized in 1988. They added AARP—a national organization for retired people—to the list of 92 formally organized groups and clubs already existing in Raton. They wanted to provide a group "just for fun" that wouldn't "obligate" its members to doing too much.

About 45 or so people are now involved in AARP, which holds its regular meeting the second Monday of each month at the Sweet Shop. All the other Mondays, about 20 folks will show up at the restaurant of the week to meet in Koffeeklatch. And those who like to do needlework while chatting come to the Stitch, Knit and Chatter club. The Koffeeklatch varies in numbers depending on the restaurant it's being held at each week, but it has become a much looked-forward-to feature for many AARP members.

"We have a really nice group," Elizabeth says. "One lady told me, 'I wouldn't miss it for anything. I get up in the morning and start the week right.'"

"We're supposed to have dues," says Russell, "so we have the minimum we could think of, we have a dollar a year. And I've always told them if it's too hard you can pay it quarterly. They manage to dig up a dollar."

And Russell and Elizabeth have managed to dig up a few retirees who thought they wanted no part of any more groups, causes, clubs, or other activities.

"People have done things through their church and they've done things through the Kiwanis Club and they've done things even through the business women (organizations)," Elizabeth says. "And by the time they get retirement age, into your 70s or 80s, they're pretty well burned out. One man told us, 'I'm retired. I'm not going to do another thing.' Well, he has come around in the last few years."

The Simmons came around to Raton in 1975 when Russell retired. A few years earlier, he had written to the secretaries of state in Arizona and New Mexico, inquiring about their state with the thought of moving from his home state of Minnesota. Arizona did not respond, but Russell's letter apparently got passed around to New Mexico communities. Numerous chambers and retirement groups sent him material.

In 1973, a trip home from Mexico doubled as a fact-finding mission through all the towns that had sent information. It wasn't an encouraging first look at the state.

"We were very discouraged because we could buy 1,500 acres or 500 acres, but you never could buy five," Elizabeth explains. "And we though we just wanted to be on the outside of a city on just about five acres."

Raton was the final New Mexico stop before pointing the car back to Minnesota, where they already had 40 acres to retire on.

"Russell was very discouraged," Elizabeth says. "He didn't even want to stop."

"This was our last chance," Russell says.

The best had been saved for last. They looked at some land and purchased it when they got back to Minnesota. Two years later, they were back in Raton as residents.

And as active ones. They have no intentions of becoming couch potatoes as retirees.

"You find them all over, not just before the television set," Russell says. "There's couch potatoes all over, they sit and just absorb and don't do anything."

"Put your money where your mouth is," Elizabeth says in no uncertain terms. "Get involved or don't criticize. If you don't like something, don't just tell yourself and all your friends. Tell the guy who has some power to something about it."

NATIONAL SCHOOL-TO-WORK AND YOUTH APPRENTICESHIP ACT OF 1993

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining with my good friend and colleague from Wisconsin, Mr. GUNDERSON, in introducing legislation we feel will go a long way toward addressing a critical need in the U.S. educational system. Our bill, the National School-to-Work Transition and Youth Apprenticeship Act of 1993, will encourage the development of State and local programs to provide education and employment opportunities for our Nation's youth who do not intend to go on to college after graduating from high school—often known as the forgotten half.

It has become a well-known statistic in recent years, that only about 50 percent, or approximately 1.4 million of this Nation's youth enter some form of postsecondary education the fall after they graduate from high school. Of these, only about half successfully complete a B.A. or B.S. degree. For the other half, representing 3 out of every 4 youth, a rough and often painful transition to a career begins.

Our legislation is designed to provide positive career-related options for these noncollege-bound youth—helping them to make successful transitions from high school either into the work force, or into further education or training which is directly related to an occupation. The bill builds on positive initiatives begun under the Bush administration in the areas of skill standards development and youth apprenticeship. The bill is also written as but one part of a comprehensive national work force policy which we are in the process of developing, that will benefit American youth, workers, businesses, and will make the United States truly competitive in the years to come.

There are many models of successful school-to-work transition programs in the United States, such as tech prep, high school career academies, and cooperative education that our bill indirectly encourages through grants to States for school-to-work transition systems. While no one approach is the answer, the youth apprenticeship approach to learning provides key elements leading to successful transitions for noncollege-bound youth. Therefore title IV of our bill focuses specifically on the development of a U.S. youth apprenticeship system, building on successful models of youth apprenticeship in the States—such as the technical prepyouth apprenticeship program that is currently underway in my district in York, PA.

The York program, which this year is limited to metalworking, but is expanding in the 1993–94 school year to Allied health, business office management, mechanical engineering technology, and metal trades technology, is operated out of the York County Area Vocational Technical School, and Pennsylvania's Department of Commerce. Students who might otherwise take what is normally known as the general track, are enrolled in a program that will provide them with a coordinated 4-year technical preparatory curriculum—with an emphasis on applied instruction and intensive worksite training.

Upon completion of the program, the students in the York Youth Apprenticeship program will have earned a high school diploma, valuable experience, and up to 2 years of college credits toward an associate degree. As a vital part of the program, business stakeholders are integrally involved in the entire program—even to the point of having business personnel review students' report cards with them. Teachers, who teach in terms—stressing the relevance of academic subjects to the technical portion of the program—are energized. Students are energized.

It is this type of innovative program that we are trying, through this legislation, to replicate nationwide. We believe the Federal Government has a proper role in assisting States and local areas to develop school to work transition and youth apprenticeship systems that meet their local economic, demographic, and labor market needs.

Specifically, title I of our bill requires the U.S. Departments of Labor and Education to form a compact to develop and implement U.S. work force preparation policy in the areas of skill standards development, broad-based school-to-work transition, and development of a U.S. youth apprenticeship system.

Title II of our legislation builds on current efforts undertaken by the Departments of Education and Labor—begun under the Bush administration that facilitate the development of voluntary, national industry-recognized skill standards. These skill standards are to be voluntarily developed through partnerships of business and industry, labor, and experts in the fields of education and training tied to work force development. Once developed, these partnerships are to recommend methods by which to assess such standards, recommend curricula for achieving the standards, and ensure that skill standards can be utilized by employees, employers, and the education and training community.

Title III of the bill provides grants to States for systemwide education reform and building of infrastructure that will result in programs and services that provide youth with the education, competencies, and skills necessary to make a successful transition from school to work or into further education and training which are directly related to an occupation.

Title IV of the bill provides grants to States and local consortia of business and education providers for the development of local youth apprenticeship programs. These grants will expand the range of skill training options for young people through immediate entry into a skilled occupation upon graduating from high school, entry into technical postsecondary education programs, entry into technologically oriented programs at colleges and universities, or entry into registered apprenticeships.

There is growing consensus in this country that U.S. competitiveness is directly dependent on the skills levels of our work force. This legislation goes a long way toward moving our Nation into the 21st century in the area of work force development. I encourage my colleagues to join us in cosponsorship of this important legislation.

ARTICLE EXPOSES TAX-AND-SPEND NATURE OF CLINTON BUDGET

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the American people are starting to get wise to the Clinton budget, and many of them don't like what they see.

That includes reporters, commentators, and other shapers of public opinion who finally have had the time to scrutinize the budget.

One of those commentators is J. Craig Crawford of the Orlando Sentinel, whose excellent analysis of the Clinton budget I gladly place in today's RECORD. The article speaks for itself and I urge all members to read it.

WAITING FOR THE NITTY-GRITTY

(By J. Craig Crawford)

WASHINGTON.—Imagine that on the first Tuesday after the first Monday of November in a year divisible by four the citizens of the richest nation on Earth give you the power to spend their money.

If you can imagine that, then you might grasp what faces President Clinton after his 1992 election.

By April 5 the new president will tell the nation how he would spend its money next year.

You might say he won the world's richest lottery: $1.5 trillion for the 1994 budget year, which starts Oct. 1.

That's enough money to buy a swimming pool for every U.S. homeowner and have enough left over to send every American to the Caribbean for a week.

In one year the U.S. government spends more than twice as much as the estimated cost of rebuilding the former Communist East Germany during the next decade.

As Clinton sits in the Oval Office, pondering the magnitude of spending so much money (it equals a 70-mile-high stack of thousand-dollar bills), he might be forgiven a moment of wonder. He might even recall the words of one of the nation's first politicians to discover such joy.

"It's that most delicious of all privileges—spending other people's money," Virginia congressman John Randolph said in 1799.

But wait. Hasn't Clinton already announced his economic plan? Didn't the House approve his budget last week?

Not exactly. So far, Clinton has offered only an outline. And last week the House approved its broad spending and tax targets as part of a five-year plan to reduce the deficit, but not the details on what will happen next year. It will take months for Congress to work out the nitty-gritty once Clinton submits his complete 1994 budget.

The president's five-year "Vision of Change for America"—unveiled to the nation in his Feb. 17 speech to Congress and approved Thursday in the House—was not a budget. Not even close.

Only when Clinton submits his detailed budget will the nation find out exactly how he would spend its money next year. We're talking numbers, statistics, concrete stuff. Visions and rhetoric won't do.

But there are enough hints in Clinton's 145-page vision of the next five years for economists to get the hint about his 1994 plans.

If you think the kind of change that Clinton seeks involves less government, or tough cutbacks in federal overspending, you might be surprised by his 1994 budget.

"The rhetoric and the numbers in the president's proposals move in very different directions," Brookings Institution scholar Allen Schick said. "His rhetoric promises revolutionary change, but the reality is much closer to business as usual."

In Washington, business as usual means higher taxes and more spending every year.

And so far, Clinton's 1994 plans appear to be no different.

To see how, you'll need a budget microscope for your mind's eye.

First, set your imaginary microscope on the broadest level of resolution. Our first laboratory dish contains the overall tax and spending changes in Clinton's 1994 plans.

Taxes go up more than $100 billion. And spending increases nearly $40 billion.

That doesn't jibe with the rhetoric about sacrifice in the growth of government.

Let's tighten the focus on that mental microscope and see what's going on.

Next year the president would have the Internal Revenue Service collect another $107.3 billion in taxes, nearly a 10 percent increase over this year's $1.1 trillion in revenues. The increase is a combination of higher taxes on the wealthiest Americans, the proposed energy tax and a projected increase in overall tax revenues as the economy bounces back.

And his 1994 blueprint shows that federal spending would increase $38 billion, a 3 percent increase over this year's spending. Not a large percentage increase, perhaps, but far from the fiscal discipline that Clinton championed in his speech to Congress.

"Cuts, not gimmicks, in government spending," Clinton promised.

But twist your microscope knobs another notch and we find something else.

Clinton's 1994 plan claims to cut $20 billion in spending next year, but nearly one-fifth of his so called cuts actually are tax and fee increases—such as raising the taxability of Social Security benefits for retired couples earning more than $25,000 a year.

Let's give the president a bit of rhetorical running room on that one. What about his real spending-cut proposals? How far do they go?

Set your microscopes on superfine resolution. The largest budget-cutting specimen is $16.5 billion taken out of the Pentagon's $300-billion-a-year budget. That accounts for 80 percent of Clinton's claimed spending cuts.

What's left? The next-largest chunk of cuts is labeled "non-defense discretionary." That is spending on domestic programs that Congress adjusts every year, such as community aid grants or NASA's Space Station Freedom.

Tighten the focus on these cuts and two telling pictures emerge.

First, there is little substance to most of Clinton's domestic spending cuts. Second, all of the cuts are wiped out by spending increases—sometimes in the same programs that were cut.

Floating in our laboratory's budget dish are two items called "administrative cuts" and "streamlining government." Clinton's proposed cuts in these broad categories comprise 30 percent of all domestic savings in his 1994 plan.

Yet those cuts mostly are undefined. Perhaps the president's complete 1994 budget will provide the details.

Even so, his proposed cuts are overwhelmed by specific spending increases. He would trim $4 billion from domestic programs while adding $27 billion in what Clinton calls economic "stimulus" and "investment."

Here we see a contradiction that illuminates the gap between Clinton's budget rhetoric and reality.

Some programs receive cuts and increases in the same year.

Wastewater treatment projects, for instance, are listed under "program savings" in Clinton's 1994 plan. He would cut $104 million next year from the Environmental Protection Agency's spending on those projects.

But turn a few pages to "stimulus proposals" for 1994, and wastewater spending get a $179 million increase, a net gain of $75 million.

An EPA spokesman explained this budget maneuver as merely a switch in programs but acknowledged that Clinton was not cutting overall wastewater spending.

You might call this budget trick robbing Peter to pay Peter, with interest. And it's replayed throughout Clinton's economic plan in several categories, from highway projects to federal hiring.

All in all, over the next few years Clinton would cut $150 billion in programs that also receive that much, or more, in proposed increases.

The simultaneous cut-and-add strategy allows Clinton to impress those who want less government, while touting increases in those favoring more government.

So, the nation's new president gets more to spend, while taking credit for spending less. How's that for winning the world's richest political lottery?

"It's ingenious," economist Schick said. "By inflating cutbacks and increases he is playing to contradictory constituencies. Both are satisfied that things are changing, even though the course remains the same: Government grows."

UNDERSTANDING EVENTS IN THE NEW COUNTRIES OF CENTRAL ASIA

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the current turmoil in Russia. But that is not the only region of the former Soviet Union to be experiencing unrest and even chaos. As Co-Chair of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues to the situation in the newly independent countries of Central Asia. There were great hopes when these new countries, former republics of the Soviet Union, became independent in January 1992, and join the CSCE, at last able to emerge from under the oppressive cover of first Russian, then Soviet colonization. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, events in a number of the Central Asian countries since that time have shown that some of the regimes there not only have not moved toward democratic and economic reform, but have set the clock back to the pre-glasnost days of Soviet-style repression.

In Uzbekistan, the most populous Central Asian country, the government of President Islam Karimov last year instituted a harsh crackdown against all opposition activists, even moving to shut down the only registered opposition party in the country. Reports of beatings, unlawful searches, arbitrary arrests and interrogations, and even abductions of members of opposition movements have become depressingly frequent. That there are fewer such reports from Turkmenistan is due primarily to the fact that Turkmen President Saparmurad Niyazov so tightly controls political, economic and social life in Turkmenistan, that those inclined to opposition activity are barely able even to become operational. During the past year in Tajikistan, the world scarcely noticed a civil war that has proved to be one of the most brutal and bloody clashes in the former Soviet Union. Decades of regional-based resentment, repressed under the lid of Soviet ideology, rose to the surface and exploded after the collapse of the Soviet regime, and thousands have died, and hundreds of thousands made refugees, as a result.

The situation is not so discouraging in the other two countries of the region, however. Though President Nursultan Nazarbayev maintains fairly tight controls over political developments in Kazakhstan, many opposition groups are active, and some are able to publish their own newspapers. Many problems remain, though, and at this point in time it is impossible to determine whether President Nazarbayev will continue down the path of slow, limited, democratization, or whether he, too, like the presidents of Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan, will assert the need for stability as justification for political repression. Democratic reform has advanced furthest in the small country of Kyrgyzstan, where many opposition groups are registered, and they and numerous opposition newspapers are not prevented from operating. As with Kazakhstan, however, there continue to be concerns that the former Communist Party apparatchiks who remain entrenched in the Kyrgyz government will one day make concerted efforts to roll back the political and economic reforms that threaten their narrow interests.

Mr. Speaker, I offer here only the briefest overview of the situation in the Central Asian countries. It is tragic that so little is known about this part of the world, hidden from view until recently, and I believe that it will be impossible for us in the United States to respond to these complex developments in this relatively unknown region of Central Asia without more information on what is happening there. Recently, a February 28 Baltimore Sun article by William Englund highlighted the human rights difficulties being experienced by Uzbekistan which I would like to share with my colleagues.

THE WORST HUMAN RIGHTS RECORD

(By Will Englund)

TASHKENT, UZBEKISTAN.—The mindless pop music thumps away at the "Istanbul" cellar restaurant here; the prostitutes conscientiously ply their trade at the hard-currency hotel; the markets groan with melons, carrots, spices and pistachios—all in all, it doesn't really look like a police state.

But the government is cracking down on its scattered opposition here with a vengeance.

Jailings, beatings and rigged trials are giving Uzbekistan—the largest and most important of the new countries of Central Asia—the worst human rights record of any former Soviet republic not now engulfed in a shooting war.

Uzbekistan's internal crackdown has sharply intensified this month, driving even the moderate opposition nearly to desperation.

"We are pressed to the wall. And we have only one way to carry on," Mukhammad Salikh, leader of the only legal opposition party, said in a recent interview.

"Now is the time of confrontation. The time of dialogue is over.

"We kept silent for a year and a half because we feared bloodshed. But now, even if our blood is spilled, we will go the streets. It's our only course. We have no weapons, we have no regiments, no squadrons, but we will come out with our bare hands."

The day after making that declaration in his office, Mr. Salikh was hauled in for a series of police interrogations, during which, he later said, he was told he would be beaten or killed if he didn't keep quiet.

Since then he has gone into hiding.

Uzbekistan could hold the key to all of Central Asia's future. With 22 million people, fertile farmland and a smattering of natural resources, as well as its central location, it is the natural kingpin of the region.

Clearly the government of President Islam Karimov sees itself as playing a leading role. Uzbekistan has provided the communist forces in Tajikistan with moral and material support throughout the fighting there. The government portrays the Tajik rebels as dangerous Islamic fanatics—and has now taken to describing its own opposition the same way.

Uzbekistan's government casts itself as a bulwark against religious extremism, prepared to use whatever means are necessary to preserve a secular state. Incessantly, it uses the example of war-torn Tajikistan as a hammer with which to pound its opponents.

Leaders of the opposition—most of whom are now in jail or on the run—say they want a democratic state, not a religious one. They portray the struggle in Uzbekistan as one that pits a repressive, holdover regime against the inexorable rise of democracy and freedom that is sweeping across the world.

The government dismisses that argument out of hand.

This month, the government shut down the only remaining independent newspaper. It drove the leadership of the democratically oriented Erk ("Will") Party—the only legal opposition party—underground. A member of parliament was expelled from the legislature and put on trial on charges of "hooliganism" and resisting arrest. Another, also expelled from parliament, was beaten and forcibly evicted from his apartment, along with his wife and three children, even though they own it.

Four leaders of the Birlik ("Unity") movement, are languishing in jail, awaiting trial on charges of anti-government activity. Birlik itself was suspended for three months in January.

And, Thursday, the government began the trial of Vasilya Inoyatova, a Birlik office worker who is accused of "defaming" the president in a poem she wrote last June. If convicted, she could face six years in prison.

"Let them give me six years in jail," she said defiantly. "I will never regret it. I know very well that I am right. I'm proud of it. I thank God I had the chance to do it."

In fact, though, opposition leaders are floored by the crackdown. Theirs has never been a strong movement. They are, for the most part, intellectuals—many of whom studied in Russia. They concede that among ordinary Uzbeks the government remains relatively popular.

Why, they ask, are they being hounded so relentlessly?

A foreign ministry official, Akhmadzhan Lukmanov, said that the government was forced to take strict measures against its opponents because their "uncivilized" protests and "lust for power."

And, inevitably, he raised the specter of Tajikstan. Uzbekistan, he said, must not allow itself to slide into civil war. Only a strong hand can prevent it.

"This Tajik lesson teaches Uzbekistan a great deal," said Mr. Lukmanov. "If there are [human rights] violations, you say they are harsh measures, but really they are normal."

Mr. Salikh has promised that the battered Erk Party would not give up. Despite its reputation for cautious moderation, he said, it would be taking to the streets with protests in the next several weeks.

But it's an open question how many will answer the call.

"Politics? We have no politics," said Munira Uldashova, a vendor at Tashkent's open market. Her counter was piled with yellow carrots, a specialty, and her quick broad smile revealed a mouth full of gold teeth.

"God gives good health, We work."

"Life's good here," insisted her friend, Delbar Israilova. "It's because of Karimov, of course. Our leader. If the father is good, the family is good. And he's good in all respects."

"Yes, in all respects," agreed Ms. Uldashova. "And he's working to create order, not only here but in Tajikistan as well. And that's good."

What these women and countless others worry about is not democracy or human rights, but the slipping of the economy and threats to order.

Inflation is as bad here as in any of the neighboring republics, and that hits the agricultural workers with their small private plots the hardest. Cash earned from last year's crop was almost worthless when it came time to prepare for this year's.

As prices went up, Uzbekistan's overall economy fell. Total production declined no more than the average of former Soviet republics last year, but that still meant a 20 percent drop in economic activity, with more to come.

The leaders of Erk and Birlik believe their greatest ally will prove to be the bad economy.

"Karimov had a chance to arrange reforms," said Mr. Salikh. "He had the most stable situation in the Commonwealth of Independent States. But he didn't follow the reforms. He tried consolidate the old regime. But the old regime is gone. Its time has passed. It's a dead-end.

But so far the government has not taken the blame.

In Samarkand, close by the Tajik border, a farmer named Sattar Shamuradov came in from the countryside to sell a load of juicy green melons.

"Yes, things are very bad here," he said. Things went bad with perestroika. Who's to blame?

"Maybe it's Gorbachev. Maybe it's Yeltsin," he said, naming two leaders, Mikhail S. Gorbachev and Boris N. Yeltsin, of what is now a very distant Moscow.

We can't blame the government here. It's because Russia and Ukraine don't send us things, the way they used to."

Samarkand, the fabled 14th century capital of the Mongol conqueror Tamerlane, gave rise three years ago to a movement of ethnic Tajiks, who predominate in the city. It was crushed just as thoroughly as Birlik has been.

In a recent interview with the Russian press, President Karimov himself said, "Any country needs strong executive power when it gains its own statehood. Strong executive power is necessary to prevent bloodshed and confrontation and to preserve ethnic and civil concord, peace and stability in our region. It is necessary for democracy's progress."

Sometimes the exercise of that power has been blatant.

Two weeks ago a Dutch reporter, Hubert Smeets, was detained in his hotel room in Tashkent by security agents after he had interviewed opposition leaders. The next day they escorted him to the airport where he was placed on a plane for Moscow.

In December, Uzbek agents kidnapped three dissidents on a street in Bishkek, the capital of neighboring Kyrgyzstan.

Two were later released. The third, Abdumannob Pulatov, was tried in January on a charge of impugning the president's honor, because of a poster he allegedly drew.

The case gained widespread attention, from the U.S. embassy here as well as from human rights groups around the world. That may be why Mr. Pulatov, after being convicted and sentenced to three years in prison, was immediately granted amnesty.

In Moscow later, he said, "International rights organizations saved my life. I could have been killed."

One group that supported him was an American organization called the Union of Councils for Soviet Jews, which hired a Russian lawyer to defend Mr. Pulatov, who is not Jewish.

The group's interest in Uzbekistan stems in part from a long-standing Jewish community in the city of Bukhara, which they fear could also face persecution.

At the moment, President Karimov's government is courting Israel, in part to bolster its image as a rampart against Muslim extremism. The Israelis have established several links with Uzbekistan, providing help, for instance, in the construction of an irrigation system.

At the same time, the government is seeking aid as well from both Turkey and Iran. But those two countries, which were expected to be the great Muslim competitors for Central Asian influence, have proved to have relatively shallow pockets as far as investment is concerned.

These past few weeks, though, the government's main focus has been on its scattered domestic opponents.

And it has been resolutely unapologetic about its human rights record.

"First of all," Sadik Safaev, the foreign minister, said in a recent interview, "comes the right to live."

A major accomplishment of the government had been to avoid the bloodshed of neighboring Tajikistan, he said.

"We shouldn't be under the pressure of political feelings or religious, or of ideological beliefs," he said. "And the Uzbeks have a right to some time to develop their society.

"I guess democracy's too serious a thing to be developed in just one year."

H.R. 1438, THE ANTITERRORISM ACT OF 1993

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to draw the attention of my colleagues to a bill I have introduced today, H.R. 1438, the Antiterrorism Act of 1993.

Following the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the cold war, I believe our Nation has an extraordinary opportunity to strengthen our policies against terrorism.

Over the years, due to the extraordinary efforts of our Nation's law enforcement officials, Customs Service, and intelligence agencies, our Nation has been virtually free of terrorist incidents. However, as the World Trade Center bombing tragically demonstrates, we are certainly not free of this criminal scourge. Clearly, those responsible must be brought to justice. Additionally, while the world was granted a reprieve from terrorism following the gulf war, terrorism has not ceased, it has temporarily gone into remission. Many of the states that previously supported terrorism have only shelved their terrorist infrastructures for temporary storage.

I believe that there are several significant steps that can be taken to strengthen our Nation's fight against terrorism. While democracies must preserve the ideals upon which they are founded, I believe that democracies can and should have a strong response to terrorism. Our Nation, working with other nations, can severely curtail the freedoms under which terrorists have operated during the past decade.

My legislation seeks to impose a complete embargo on imports from nations which continue to support international terrorism. Without the support of the Soviet Union, several of these states are increasingly dependent upon the United States, or our allies. By imposing an embargo on these states, and by encouraging our allies to join us, we will be sending a strong message that support for international terrorism is no longer acceptable. Additionally, the bill contains provisions to prevent the use of nuclear terrorism, and creates a government-business antiterrorism council to seek out additional measures our government and businesses can take to counter terrorist activities. Lastly, the bill calls for the death penalty for terrorists who murder Americans, whether at home or abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I request that the full text of H.R. 1438 be inserted at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I invite my colleagues to cosponsor this vital measure.

H.R. 1438

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 "Antiterrorism Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. GENERAL POLICY STATEMENT.

The Congress finds and declares the following:

(1) The continued use of terrorism is to be deplored.

(2) With the dramatic changes that have occurred in the world in the late 1980s and early 1990s, the world community has an extraordinary opportunity to further curtail, and possibly eliminate, terrorist activity.

SEC. 3. EMBARGO ON TRADE WITH COUNTRIES SUPPORTING INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM.

(a) TRADE EMBARGO.—

(1) PROHIBITION ON IMPORTS.—Goods or services from a country described in subsection (b) may not be imported into the United States.

(2) PROHIBITION ON EXPORTS.—(A) Goods and technology that are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, or that are exported by any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, may not be exported to any country described in subsection (b).

(B) As used in this paragraph, the term "goods and technology" includes—

(i) any goods or technology (as those terms are defined in paragraphs (3) and (4) of section 16 of the Export Administration Act of 1979); and

(ii) any materials or technology that are subject to export controls under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

(C) Sections 11, 12, and 13 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (relating to violations, enforcement, and administrative procedure and judicial review) apply with respect to violations and enforcement of this paragraph, without regard to the termination date specified in section 20 of that Act.

(3) REGULATIONS.—The President may issue such regulations as are necessary to carry out this subsection.

(b) COUNTRIES SUBJECT TO EMBARGO.—

(1) DETERMINATION BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.—Subsection (a) applies with respect to a country if the Secretary of State determines that the government of that country has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism. For purposes of this section, support for acts of international terrorism includes a situation in which the government of a country knowingly allows an international terrorist organization to operate or maintain facilities within the country without taking measures to prevent such organization from operating freely.

(2) PUBLICATION OF DETERMINATIONS.—Each determination of the Secretary of State under paragraph (1) shall be published in the Federal Register.

(3) RESCISSION OF DETERMINATION.—A determination made by the Secretary of State under paragraph (1) may not be rescinded unless the President submits to the Congress—

(A) before the proposed rescission would take effect, a report certifying that—

(i) there has been a fundamental change in the leadership and policies of the government of the country concerned;

(ii) that government is not supporting acts of international terrorism; and

(iii) that government has provided assurances that it will not support acts of international terrorism in the future; or

(B) at least 45 days before the proposed rescission would take effect, a report justifying the rescission and certifying that—

(i) the government concerned has not provided any support for international terrorism during the preceding 6-month period; and

(ii) the government concerned has provided assurances that it will not support acts of international terrorism in the future.

(c) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The President may waive, in whole or in part, the application of subsection (a)(1) or (a)(2)(A) with respect to a country if—

(1) the President determines that national security interests or humanitarian reasons justify such waiver; and

(2) at least 15 days before the waiver takes effect, the President consults with the Congress regarding the proposed waiver and submits to the Congress a report—

(A) identifying the country concerned;

(B) describing the national security interests or humanitarian reasons which justify the waiver;

(C) specifying the imports and exports that will be allowed by the waiver if the waiver is less than a complete lifting of the embargo required by subsection (a); and

(D) specifying the period of time during which such waiver will be effective.

(d) REPEALS.—

(1) AUTHORITY TO BAN IMPORTS.—Section 505 of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985 (relating to the authorization to ban the importation of goods and services from countries supporting terrorism) is repealed.

(2) LICENSING REQUIREMENT FOR EXPORTS.—(A) Section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (relating to the requirement for validated licenses and notice to Congress for certain exports to countries supporting international terrorism) is repealed.

(B) Any reference in any law to a determination made under section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 shall be deemed to be a reference to a determination made under subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 4. OTHER PROVISIONS RELATING TO STATE SPONSORED TERRORISM.

(a) REPORT.—Concurrent with the publication in the Federal Register pursuant to section 3(b)(2) of this Act, section 620A(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, or section 40(e) of the Arms Export Control Act of a determination by the Secretary of State that the government of a country has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report describing the measures the United States is taking, unilaterally and in concert with other countries, to pressure, both economically and politically, that government to terminate such support.

(b) EXAMPLES OF SUPPORT FOR ACTS OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM.—

(1) FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT.—Section 620A(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end the following: "For purposes of this section, support for acts of international terrorism includes a situation in which the government of a country knowingly allows an international terrorist organization to operate or maintain facilities within the country without taking measures to prevent such organization from operating freely.".

(2) ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT.—Section 40(d) of the Arms Export Control Act is amended by adding at the end the following: "For purposes of this section, support for acts of international terrorism includes a situation in which the government of a country knowingly allows an international terrorist organization to operate or maintain facilities within the country without taking measures to prevent such organization from operating freely.".

SEC. 5. INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM CONTROL TREATY.

The Congress reaffirms the policy expressed in section 507 of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, which expressed the sense of the Congress that the President should establish a

process by which democratic and open societies of the world negotiate a viable treaty to effectively prevent and respond to terrorist attacks.

SEC. 6. INTERNATIONAL EMBARGO ON IMPORTS FROM LIBYA.

The Congress urges the President to seek the participation of other nations in an embargo on imports from Libya.

SEC. 7. REPORT REGARDING INCREASED INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION TO COMBAT TERRORISM.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the Congress a report on the implementation of section 201 of the 1984 Act to Combat International Terrorism, which urges the President to seek more effective international cooperation in combatting international terrorism and identifies certain cooperative steps that could be taken.

SEC. 8. NUCLEAR TERRORISM.

(a) REAFFIRMATION OF 1986 PROVISIONS.—The Congress reaffirms the necessity of the President taking the actions to combat international nuclear terrorism specified in section 601(a) of the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986, in particular paragraph (4) of that section which directs the President to seek an agreement in the United Nations Security Council to establish—

(1) an effective regime of international sanctions against any nation or subnational group which conducts or sponsors acts of international nuclear terrorism; and

(2) measures for coordinating responses to all acts of international nuclear terrorism, including measures for the recovery of stolen nuclear material and the clean-up of nuclear releases.

(b) ADDITIONAL MEASURES.—The Congress urges the President to seek within the United Nations Security Council whatever additional measures may be necessary to discourage the use of nuclear terrorism.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Each report submitted pursuant to section 601 of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 shall include a description of the measures the United States is taking unilaterally, bilaterally, or multilaterally—

(1) to curtail the spread of nuclear material and technology to countries whose governments support international terrorism; and

(2) to develop a prompt response to nuclear terrorist threats.

SEC. 9. IMPROVING THE ABILITY OF UNITED STATES BUSINESSES TO COUNTER THE THREAT OF KIDNAPPING AND OTHER ACTS OF TERRORISM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall establish a Government-Business Antiterrorism Council to study and make recommendations on—

(1) additional steps the United States Government could take to assist United States businesses counter the threat posed by international terrorism; and

(2) measures that could be taken by United States businesses to counter the threat posed by international terrorism.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The membership of the council established pursuant to this section shall include representatives of the airline industry, the tourism industry, and multinational corporations.

(c) SPECIAL FOCUS ON KIDNAPPING FOR RANSOM.—The study conducted pursuant to this section should focus on ways to improve the ability of United States businesses to avoid the kidnapping of business executives abroad by terrorist groups seeking to obtain, through ransom payments, funds for terrorist activities.

SEC. 10. STATE DEPARTMENT COORDINATOR FOR COUNTER-TERRORISM.

In any reorganization of the Department of State, the position of Coordinator for Counter-Terrorism, with the rank of Ambassador at Large, shall be retained.

SEC. 11. TERMINATION OF IMET PROGRAM FOR MALTA.

Funds made available for fiscal year 1993 or 1994 to carry out chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (relating to the international military education and training program) may not be obligated for Malta.

SEC. 12. STEPS TO ENCOURAGE EXTENDED TOURS OF DUTY FOR GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL INVOLVED IN COUNTER-TERRORISM ACTIVITIES.

In recognition of the long start-up time required for sensitive counter-terrorism work, it is the sense of the Congress that United States Government personnel, both civilian and military, who are assigned counter-terrorism duties and who voluntarily accept extended tours of duty in order to continue to perform counter-terrorism duties should be accorded beneficial consideration for advancement after completion of such extended tours of duty.

SEC. 13. DESIGNATION OF FBI AS LEAD AGENCY FOR DOMESTIC COUNTER-TERRORISM.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation shall be the lead agency for coordinating the domestic counter-terrorism activities of the United States Government.

SEC. 14. DEATH PENALTY FOR TERRORIST ACTS ABROAD AGAINST UNITED STATES NATIONALS.

Section 2332(a)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting ", and shall be subject to the penalty of death in accordance with the procedures applicable to the imposition of that penalty under section 903(c) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. Appendix 1473(c)) relating to procedures in respect of aircraft piracy penalties" after "so imprisoned".

SEC. 15. DEATH PENALTY FOR TERRORIST ACTS IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 113A of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 2339. Domestic terrorism

"(a) Whoever commits a terrorist act in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce shall be subject to the death penalty, in accordance with the procedures applicable to the imposition of that penalty under section 903(c) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. Appendix 1473(c)) if death results, and in any other case shall be fined under this title or imprisoned any term of years or for life.

"(b) As used in this section, the term 'terrorist act' means any crime of violence that appears to be intended—

"(1) to influence or to be in retaliation for the policy or conduct of a government;

"(2) to intimidate or coerce a civilian population; or

"(3) to affect the conduct of a government by assassination or kidnapping.".

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 113A of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"2339. Domestic terrorism.".

TRIBUTE TO PAT RODDY, JR.

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the leading businessmen in Knoxville, Pat Roddy, Jr., passed away last Saturday at the age of 90. Mr. Roddy had one of the most successful careers possible through his operation of the Coca-Cola distributing company for east Tennessee. Under his leadership, he saw the company grow from a small business into one of the largest companies in our area.

Over the years, Mr. Roddy helped thousands of people in countless ways. His children carry on his community service throughout east Tennessee and other parts of the South even today.

In this country today, unfortunately we sometimes imply, through our words and actions, that only Government helps people. Actually, our Government causes about as many problems as it solves, while businesses like Roddy Coca-Cola Bottling Co. provide jobs and strengthen the economy and supply the tax base that allows the government to do what it does.

This Nation became great because of people like Pat Roddy, Jr., and we should never forget the contributions like he made.

I want to insert the editorial about Mr. Roddy that ran in the Knoxville News Sentinel on March 23, and want to call it to the attention of my colleagues and readers of the RECORD.

A LOSS FOR KNOXVILLE

With the death of J.P. "Pat" Roddy, Jr., Knoxville has lost one of its most prominent businessmen and benefactors.

Roddy, 90, died Saturday at Fort Sanders Regional Medical Center after a fall he suffered last week.

At his death, Roddy was chairman of the board of Roddy Coca-Cola Bottling Co., the family-owned franchise that has bottled soft-drink products in East Tennessee since 1902, the year of his birth.

He started work for the firm when he was 12 and later held a full range of leadership positions, including board member, vice president and secretary, and president. He also served on the boards of the Commercial National Bank and the Hamilton National Bank.

His career with the family firm was interrupted by World War II service in the Navy, which he entered as a lieutenant in 1942.

While a student at the University of Tennessee in the 1920s, Roddy ran track; and his close involvement with UT athletics continued throughout his life. He is believed to be the first person to broadcast a UT football game on the radio.

Roddy's children by his wife of 55 years, the late Mary Lois Wright Roddy, remain active in the business and are civic and community leaders in their own right. In 1991, the Knoxville Roundtable of the National Conference of Christians and Jews recognized the impact of the whole family on humanitarian causes with its annual Brotherhood/Sisterhood Award.

Pat Roddy, Jr.'s life spanned most of the 20th century, and he was witness to and an active participant in the growth and progress of his hometown. The impact of his

abilities and interests will be felt in the region for decades to come.

We join the community in mourning his death, and we offer our sympathies to his family and friends.

THE LONG BEACH NAVAL SHIPYARD

HON. STEPHEN HORN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, on March 12, Secretary of Defense Les Aspin released his list of military bases recommended for closure. I was pleased to see that the Long Beach Naval Shipyard was not on Secretary Aspin's list—nor was it on the original Navy list.

I salute the Navy and the Secretary for their wisdom and sense of judgment. Yet I also know that this process is not complete. The Base Closure and Realignment Commission has the authority to add any base it may choose to its own list in the months ahead. In fact, this ability to consider additional bases resulted in the Commission's consideration, to the protest of the Defense Department, of the Long Beach Naval Shipyard in the 1991 base closure round. The Commission subsequently voted to retain the shipyard. What I want to lay out today is why the Long Beach Naval Shipyard was not on the 1993 recommended closure list and why it should not be on the Base Closure Commission's list either.

The Base Closure Commission is required by law to consider bases primarily on the basis of military value. Congress explicitly mandated this requirement so that we do not conclude the process with a base infrastructure which is of little use to our military. Second, the Commission is to consider the return on investment stemming from the closure of individual bases. Not only do we mean to draw down our base infrastructure in the most militarily rational manner, but we mean to save money as we do so. Last in priority, Congress stipulated that the Base Closure Commission would consider the economic impact of a particular base's closure.

There are efforts in Congress to place greater emphasis on this last priority of economic impact. As a Member from southern California, from Los Angeles County, I am particularly sensitive to these efforts. While the rest of the Nation is slowly emerging from the recession, southern California is not. My district has been economically devastated by defense cuts, even as traditional economic engines such as the construction industry remain dormant and manufacturing industries flee the State in search of a lower cost climate. Unfortunately, because we face ever deeper cuts in our military forces, the economic pain on my community associated with these cuts will continue for several years to come. Long Beach and the surrounding communities are staggering under an unemployment rate of more than 10 percent, with not a great deal of hope for the immediate future.

Though Los Angeles County could ill-afford the loss of the Long Beach Naval Shipyard and its 4,200 jobs, coming as the closure might on top of the 1991 mandated closure of the Long Beach Naval Station, I do not believe that we should change the closure priority criteria at this time. I will certainly point out to the Commission the special pain that southern California is experiencing, but I will base my presentation to the Commission for the retention of the shipyard first and foremost on its strong military value. We cannot on one hand argue for deep defense cuts, and an associated peace dividend, and then, on the other hand, become supplicants for protection when the budget knife strikes too close to home.

In this 1993 base closure round, the Navy has finally been forthcoming with deep cuts in its shore infrastructure. The dream of a dispersed homeport structure has disappeared. On the Pacific coast, California has been hit particularly hard. The Long Beach Naval Station is already slated for closure in 1996 and it is clearly the Navy's intention to remove itself from the San Francisco Bay area. What will remain is one Pacific megaport in San Diego, one homeport at Everett, Washington—supported by the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard with its ability to do all types of nuclear work—and a homeport and naval shipyard at Pearl Harbor.

In 1991, San Diego and Long Beach were home to 31 percent of the entire Navy's surface fleet. While I do not have comparable percentages for 1993 or for years into the future, I think that this 31 percent will very likely remain constant. With realignment, the number of ships homeported at San Diego may even remain constant, though overall Navy ship numbers will fall. Certainly, San Diego will remain the center of Pacific surface fleet activity.

Because San Diego has neither a dedicated naval shipyard to support this fleet, nor the drydock infrastructure to repair its largest ships, the Long Beach Naval Shipyard is in a unique position to serve the Navy's most pressing needs well into the future.

As the Navy will shrink to well below 400 ships and submarines, two critical points need to be understood. First, it is clearly the Navy's intent to cut back the nuclear navy to a greater degree than the rest of its fleet. Fast attack submarines will likely fall from over 80 to around 40. That cutback will result in a massive reduction in the workload for shipyards that primarily do nuclear work. While the Navy had been anticipating a spike in nuclear refuelings of submarines late in this decade, those refuelings clearly will no longer be done.

It is also the Navy's intention to increasingly move away from nuclear propulsion systems in its surface fleet and toward gas turbine systems that are easier, cheaper, and faster to maintain. This trend also means the loss of nuclear shipyard work. Second, the Navy means to become a force less focused on a sea control mission and one aimed more at force projection. This is why the Navy has stated its intention to cut its attack submarine force by 50 percent while maintaining a fleet of 12 aircraft carriers. The Navy of the future will be more surface-oriented, more nonnuclear propelled, and made up of larger ships—primarily carriers and amphibious platforms, which can project power, as opposed to smaller ships tasked to an anti-submarine mission.

The trends outlined above will create an environment which logically argues for the retention of the Long Beach Naval Shipyard.

Long Beach is strategically located near the major concentration of the Navy's surface fleet. The shipyard specializes in work—complex and otherwise—on surface ships. In fact, while Long Beach is certified to do nuclear work, it does not do work on nuclear systems.

Long Beach is home to drydock No. 1, the only drydock south of Washington State able to drydock aircraft carriers, large amphibious ships, and the largest class of fleet oilers. Navy policy dictates the availability of two carrier-capable drydocks on the west coast. While the number of ships in the Navy will decline, the Navy anticipated in 1991 that large drydock utilization will fall very little. Without Long Beach, the Navy would be left with a megaport in San Diego, but without the necessary infrastructure to repair and overhaul those ships in the most efficient and timely manner.

Long Beach has a highly qualified and dedicated, strike-free work force. The shipyard embodies a mix of skills and an industrial overhead that private shipyards simply cannot duplicate. As Admiral Horne stated in testimony before the Department of Defense's 1988 Base Closure Commission, "There is no comparable skill base in the private sector on the Pacific coast to support ships with complex combat systems." Long Beach carries the capacity to do emergent repair work which yards in San Diego cannot do. When it comes to shore infrastructure, the Navy and the Commission are compelled to think in the very long term. If the Long Beach Naval Shipyard closes, this piece of land will never be available again to the Navy for reuse.

Long Beach is also the most efficient, cost-effective shipyard in the Navy. While some may claim otherwise, the most obvious indicator of shipyard performance, accumulated operating results, clearly shows Long Beach is the only shipyard which has returned shipwork savings to the Navy over any stretch of time.

Long Beach serves as an important yardstick by which to measure the cost of ship repair work in both private and public yards. The Long Beach Naval Shipyard is an honest broker by which the documented overruns at other Pacific coast yards can be kept in check and millions of taxpayer/Navy dollars can be saved. My colleague DANA ROHRABACHER has passed on to me a letter he received from a constituent in Seal Beach, who recalls that it was routine practice in the Navy to get estimates from Long Beach on ship repair work that was being bid out exclusively to private shipyards in San Diego—all in an effort to keep the San Diego yards from inflating their bids.

If the aim of the Navy is to reduce its shore infrastructure in the most militarily logical manner while generating the possible greatest cost savings, closure of the Long Beach Naval Shipyard does not make sense. The Navy needs two carrier-capable drydocks on the west coast. The construction of another large drydock the size of No. 1 at Long Beach would cost at least $250 million—the same amount associated with the entire closing costs at Mare Island. In 1991, the Navy's Base Evaluation Committee found the cost to

close Long Beach, less drydock replacement, was $750 million. Annual cost avoidance was a mere $9.4 million, while payback of closure would be 79 years. In comparison, the longest payback on the entire 1993 base closure list is 12 years. Clearly, the closure of the Long Beach Naval Shipyard is not a good return on investment.

Ironically, the anticipated closure of the Long Beach Naval Station has strengthened the case for the Long Beach Naval Shipyard. The 1991 base structure committee gave Long Beach Naval Shipyard a lower yellow ranking—as opposed to green—in the land/facilities category because of supposed encroachment from the city. The closure of the Long Beach Naval Station will free up both land and housing for use by the shipyard. Importantly, the city of Long Beach is absolutely committed to a land reuse strategy of shipyard first.

Unfortunately, the base closure process can degenerate into a fight among various communities trying to preserve military facilities. I do not want to enter this fray. The Navy's analysis, the Commission's analysis, and the analysis of those who fervently hope to save their facility should remain objective.

I do feel compelled to make several observations in an effort to deter any finger pointing. First, the Long Beach Naval Shipyard was ranked third among all naval shipyards in terms of military value in 1991. Again in 1993, it ranks behind only Puget Sound and Norfolk in the list of best shipyards. Thus its retention is clearly warranted under this important criterion.

The base closing list is a reflection of the Navy's belated recognition that it cannot refuse to look at eliminating nuclear shipyards in the face of a declining nuclear fleet. In my discussion with Mr. Charles Nemfakos, the civilian head of the Navy's base structure analysis team, he admitted that the nuclear yards had gotten a King's X solely on the basis of their nuclear status. In fact, the 1991 Base Structure Committee [BSC] within the Navy stated that "all nuclear yards provided a unique ability and strategic asset to the Nation. They were then excused under Step 5 of the BSC procedure." The Navy was severely reprimanded for its unsystematic evaluation system in 1991. In this year's round, the Navy has acknowledged that Long Beach plays an invaluable strategic and operational role in the Navy ship repair of the future.

I also argue that the Long Beach Naval Shipyard is an important yardstick by which to keep the good shipyards in San Diego from engaging in a General Accounting Office-documented practice of low balling, with the attendant cost overruns, which makes the cost of repairs to the Navy more expensive. The naval shipyard in Long Beach and the private shipyards in San Diego can coexist. I will point out to the Commission that neither is a good substitute for the other and that their capabilities are different. These yards should not be seen as mutually exclusive. Rather, they are mutually reinforcing. Healthy competition will always benefit the customer, in this case the Navy, in the long run.

I believe that the Base Closure Commission should also take a look at overseas bases. As the Commission is precluded from doing so under current law, I have introduced legislation to include our overseas base structure in the regular order of the closure process. My particular concern results from the amount of workload which is diverted from our naval repair facilities on the west coast to Yokosuka, Japan. The General Accounting Office has documented that repairs worth approximately $1.5 billion have been done in Yokosuka. A large percentage of these repairs could very well have been done in the United States by U.S. workers.

While I do not believe we should completely abandon our forward deployed military presence, the long-term trends of U.S. budget constraints and foreign political realities mean we will increasingly need to rely on U.S.-based facilities. In the case of Yokosuka, it is very likely that the long-term will eventually bring the Socialists to power in Japan. With their ascendancy will come a reduced willingness to house foreign bases on their territory. The Navy may save money in the short term by having repairs done at Japanese-subsidized Yokosuka, but if the long term brings our loss of the Yokosuka facility while the Navy has meanwhile allowed its United States-based shopyard infrastructure to whither, then these short-term savings will have placed our strategic capability and overall security posture in jeopardy.

I would point out that being asked to vacate long-held bases in other countries is not as unlikely as many might think. By the end of this decade, we will have left Panama. Spain essentially ordered the closure of the United States airbase in Torrejon. We might remember that we once had a major United States air base in Libya and key facilities in Iran. And most recently, the Philippines renounced our long-held security arrangement by expelling us from Clark Air Force Base and the Subic Bay naval facilities.

Finally, I would remind the Commission and other interested observers of the last minute pleas made in 1991 by the Deputy Secretary of Defense Donald Atwood and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Colin Powell. Both men stated,

> Closure of the [Long Beach Naval] Shipyard would seriously degrade drydock capability for all large ships in the Southern California area. Alternatives in Hawaii and Washington simply could not provide the services found at Long Beach.

We have a long road before us. The Secretary of Defense testified before the Commission that his list of base closures was frankly a conservative one, based primarily on a force structure plan issued by the previous Republican administration. It is my firm belief that when all is said and done, the overall weight of the evidence on Long Beach's side will convince the Commission to find the Navy's decision not to recommend closure a justified one. The strong argument of General Powell 2 years ago on behalf of the shipyard's high military value, and in particular, its essential large drydock, is no less compelling today.

HELENE C. MOMBERG, JOURNALIST AND PHILANTHROPIST

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this moment to salute veteran Colorado journalist Helene Momberg, who has just established a scholarship fund for students attending college in her home State. Helene is well-known as the long-time, as in 28 years long, editor of the Western Resources Round-Up.

Her philanthropic endeavors are equally famous. Back in the early 1970's, she founded the Achievement Scholarship Program, which provides college and trade school support for Washington-area youths on parole or probation. Most recently, Helene organized the Luther and Helene Denzler Momberg Scholarship Fund, which will support financially needy students attending Colorado schools.

The statement that follows provides more information about this most remarkable woman.

NEW SCHOLARSHIP FUND ANNOUNCED AT AWRA "ROAST" BY VETERAN NEWS WOMAN

WASHINGTON.—Helene C. Momberg, a veteran news woman here, announced on Jan. 28 at a reception given in her honor here by the American Water Resources Association that she is establishing a scholarship fund for students attending college in her home state of Colorado.

The Association "roasted" Ms. Momberg for her long career in writing about natural resource problems, programs and issues that affect the 17 Western reclamation states. She is the editor of Western Resources Wrap-up, which she has published for the past 28 years.

Ms. Momberg stated, "I am setting up a scholarship fund in my will in honor and in memory of my parents, Luther and Helene Denzler Momberg, longtime residents of my hometown of Leadville, Colo. Initially annually there will be six starter scholarships of $5,000 each, two to go to financially needy students attending the University of Colorado at Boulder; two to go to financially needy students attending the University of Southern Colorado at Pueblo; and two to go to two graduating seniors from Lake County High School at Leadville who need financial aid to attend college. All must be highly motivated students with good grades."

Ms. Momberg was the Washington correspondent here for the Pueblo Chieftain and Star-Journal from 1947-84, while she operated a news bureau here. She is a graduate of the University of Colorado at Boulder and of Leadville High School. She is a native of Leadville, Colo.

The reception raised about $300 for the Achievement Scholarship Program (ASP), which Ms. Momberg founded in 1973 and operated thru 1989 to provide scholarships for Washington-area youths on parole and probation to attend college and trade school. To assure ASP's future, Ms. Momberg turned the program over to the ARCH Training Center of Washington, DC, to operate.

CRIMINAL ALIENS DEPORTATION ACT OF 1993

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to expedite the deportation of criminal aliens who have been convicted of aggravated felonies. As a result of this bill, the only aggravated felon aliens who could avoid deportation would be those who have been permanent resident aliens for at least 7 years and who were sentenced to less than 5 years imprisonment.

Our Federal, State, and local prisons are crowded with large numbers of criminal aliens. About one-quarter of the Federal prison inmate population is foreign-born and in some border States more than 40 percent are aliens. State and local jails have similarly large percentages of criminal aliens, many of whom are in the United States illegally.

The burden on the criminal justice system, especially in high-impact States like Florida, New York, California, and Texas, is straining already overstretched budgets. For example, the State of Florida has 2,590 aliens in its prisons. The cost of incarcerating these inmates is $39.7 million annually.

Deportable criminal aliens who are released from prison may or may not be turned over to INS, which may or may not have the capacity to detain them pending deportation proceedings. If INS does not detain these aliens upon their release from prison, the Government loses control over them and locating and deporting them becomes very difficult.

Even when criminal aliens are turned over to INS and detained, the administrative process for deportation is time-consuming. Criminal aliens can delay the process by raising defenses to deportation, regardless of whether they are eligible for them. This process and repeated appeals can consume several years, further exacerbating the problem of limited detention capacity.

We can help reduce the cost of incarcerating criminal aliens, reduce prison overcrowding, and protect the general public from the danger of repeated offenses by aliens who commit serious crimes by expediting the deportation of criminal aliens.

The bill I introduced today will help address this problem by expediting the deportation of criminal aliens who commit aggravated felonies.

Aggravated felony is defined in the Immigration and Nationality Act as felonies involving murder, drug trafficking, trafficking in firearms or destructive devices, money laundering, or any crime of violence for which the term of imprisonment imposed is at least 5 years. My bill will expand this definition to include three additional classes of alien felons:

First, those who have committed serious immigration-related crimes, such as alien smuggling and trafficking in fraudulent documents.

Second, those who have participated in serious criminal activities and enterprises, but who have not themselves committed murder, trafficked in drugs, trafficked in firearms, or committed a crime of violence, and

Third, those who have committed serious white collar crimes.

Under my bill, criminal aliens who are not permanent resident aliens and who have been convicted in either State or Federal court of an aggravated felony would be deportable upon their release without further administrative processing. Federal court review of such cases would be limited to the question of whether the person in question is in fact an alien and has been convicted of an aggravated felony.

This will streamline the process, eliminating administrative hearings and frequently used delaying tactics, including petitions for relief from deportation and time-consuming administrative hearings and appeals.

My bill also provides for judicial deportation of any alien, including a permanent resident alien, who is convicted in a Federal trial court of an aggravated felony. In such a case, the U.S. attorney can request a Federal judge to issue an order of deportation during the sentencing phase of the trial. In cases where judicial deportation is sought, it would replace the current administrative procedure used for determining deportability. Aliens found deportable under this process would continue to have the right to appeal to the appropriate Federal Circuit Court of Appeals.

This bill also increases penalties for failing to depart and for reentering after a final order of deportation has been issued. Failure of criminal aliens to depart should be less of a problem under the new deportation procedures because the Government will be able to execute a final order of deportation while it still has control over the alien. However, illegal reentry will continue to be a major problem. Increased penalties are justified and necessary.

Finally, my proposed bill expands forfeiture for smuggling and harboring illegal aliens. INS currently has the authority to seize and subject to forfeiture conveyances used in or facilitating the smuggling or harboring of illegal aliens. This bill would allow the seizure and forfeiture of all property used in or acquired with the proceeds from such activities.

This bill would increase receipts and meets the pay-as-you-go requirement of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act. The following section-by-section analysis provides additional details. I strongly encourage my colleagues to cosponsor and support passage of this legislation.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE CRIMINAL ALIENS DEPORTATION ACT OF 1993

Section 1. Short title: "Criminal Aliens Deportation Act of 1993".

Section 2. Expands definition of "aggravated felony" for purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Under this definition, aggravated felonies include the current offenses (murder, drug trafficking, trafficking in firearms or explosives, money laundering, and any crime of violence for which the sentence is 5 or more years) plus the following: firearms violations, failure to appear before a court to answer a felony charge, demanding or receiving ransom money, unlawful conduct relating to RICO, immigration-related offenses including alien smuggling and sale of fraudulent documents, child pornography, owning or operating a prostitution business, treason, and tax evasion exceeding $200,000.

Section 3. Provides for prompt deportation of any alien who is not a permanent resident alien and whom the Attorney General determines is deportable and has been convicted of an aggravated felony. Section 242(h) of the Immigration and Nationality Act provides that an alien sentenced to imprisonment shall not be deported until such alien's release. This new section does not alter this requirement—the alien would still serve his or her prison term. However, a final order of deportation could be issued during such alien's imprisonment and executed upon the alien's release.

This section eliminates the following procedures for non-permanent resident criminal aliens: (1) administrative hearing before an immigration judge, (2) administrative review by the Board of Immigration Appeals of the immigration judge's determination, (3) availability of current grounds of relief from deportation, and (4) federal court review of the Attorney General's determination on any grounds other than whether the person sought to be deported is an alien and whether the alien has in fact been convicted of an aggravated felony. The AG may not execute a final order of deportation until 14 days after it has been issued in order to allow the alien an opportunity seek federal court review.

The expedited deportation proceedings currently included in section 242A and applicable to all aliens would be limited to permanent resident aliens. Current section 242A language allows for the institution of deportation proceedings while the alien is incarcerated, with the intent of completing the process so that the alien can be deported upon his or her release.

Section 4. Allows *federal* trial courts to issue an order of deportation during the sentencing phase of the criminal trial of an alien convicted of an aggravated felony. This section applies to all criminal aliens, including permanent residents.

Such an order must have been requested by the U.S. Attorney with concurrence of the INS Commissioner. Notice of intent to seek a judicial order of deportation must be given promptly after an adjudication of guilt or guilty plea. The government would still be responsible for showing that the defendant is an alien subject to deportation and that the crime the alien has been convicted of meets the definition of an "aggravated felony;" a charge containing factual allegations on these two matters must be filed at least 20 days prior to the sentencing date.

Judicial deportation would replace current administrative deportation procedures in those cases where it is sought. Aliens found deportable under this process would continue to have the right to appeal their deportation to the appropriate federal circuit court of appeals.

Judicial deportation would not be required in every criminal trial of an aggravated felon alien, and the Attorney General would retain his or her right to seek an administrative determination of deportability if the federal court denies a motion for judicial deportation.

Section 5. Restricts defenses to deportation for criminal aliens convicted of aggravated felonies. As a result of amendments made by this section, the only defense to deportation for aggravated felon aliens would be for permanent resident aliens who have lived in the U.S. in such status for at least seven years and who have been sentenced to less than five years imprisonment for such felony.

Currently, a permanent resident alien is ineligible for relief under section 212(c) (for permanent resident aliens who have lived in

the U.S. for seven consecutive years) if he or she has served five or more years for one or more aggravated felonies. This section would amend the language to make aliens who have been sentenced to five or more years ineligible for section 212(c) relief.

This standard is more relevant to judging the seriousness of an offense since dangerous criminals are at times released prematurely due to prison overcrowding or other reasons unrelated to the seriousness of his/her crime. Moreover, the current standard presents a serious logistical obstacle to the speedy commencement of deportation proceedings since it may be unknown until five years have been served whether the alien would be able to seek relief under section 212(c).

Section 5 also makes it clear that aggravated felons may not request or be granted withholding of deportation under section 243(h). The Immigration Act of 1990 unambiguously denied aggravated felon aliens from applying for or being granted political asylum; however, the question of an aggravated felon's ability to request a hearing on eligibility for withholding of deportation was not addressed. Although the Executive Office for Immigration Review has determined that no hearing is possible in such cases, litigation on this issue is likely.

This section does not affect the Attorney General's authority to designate a country other than that of the alien's nationality for deportation. It is consistent with the intent of the UN Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees to permit denial of withholding of deportation in cases of persons convicted of a "particularly serious crime."

Section 6. Enhances penalties for failing to depart or for reentering after a final order of deportation has been issued.

Currently, an alien who is deportable for criminal offenses, document fraud, or security risk is subject to criminal penalties of up to 10 years imprisonment for failure to depart. However, there are no penalties for aliens deportable for other reasons who fail to depart. Subsection (a) retains the current 10 year penalty and provides for criminal penalties of up to 2 years imprisonment for aliens who are issued deportation orders on other grounds and who fail to depart.

Subsection (b) increases the penalties for criminal aliens who reenter the U.S. after being formally deported. Currently, an alien convicted of a felony other than an aggravated felony who re-enters is subject to 5 years in prison and a criminal fine; this subsection extends the penalties to aliens convicted of three or more misdemeanors and increases the maximum prison sentence to 10 years. Aggravated felons who re-enter the U.S. currently are subject to criminal fines and up to 15 years in prison; this subsection increases the maximum prison sentence to 20 years. Language also is added to make it clear that any alien who stipulates to deportation during a criminal trial shall be considered to have been formally deported.

Subsection (c) would allow a court in a criminal proceeding against a deported alien who re-enters the U.S. to re-examine the underlying deportation order only if the alien demonstrates (1) that he/she exhausted available administrative remedies that may have been available against the deportation order, (2) that the deportation proceedings improperly deprived the alien of the opportunity for judicial review, and (3) that the entry of the order of deportation was "fundamentally unfair." This language, taken from *United States* v *Mendoza-Lopez*, 481 U.S. 828 (1987), is intended to ensure that minimum due process was followed in the original deportation proceeding while preventing wholesale, time-consuming attacks on underlying deportation orders.

Section 7. Expands current INS authority to seize and subject to forfeiture conveyances used in or facilitating the smuggling or harboring of illegal aliens to allow seizure and forfeiture of all property in such cases.

Section 8. Responds to two holdings of the 9th Circuit. Subsection (a) makes it clear that deportation proceedings may be conducted by electronic or telephonic media or, where waived or agreed to by the parties, in the absence of the alien.

Subsection (b) makes it clear that nothing in this Act or in section 242(i) (directing the AG to begin deportation proceedings as quickly as possible after a conviction) shall be construed to create a legally enforceable right or benefit.

RACISM PERSISTS AT THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, too often, too many people act as if this country has successfully resolved the issue of race and now affords all Americans an equal opportunity to succeed based upon their abilities. Sadly, such views do not reflect the reality faced daily by black, Hispanic, Asian, Native, and other nonwhite Americans. The fact that the Congress of the United States has yet to provide equal opportunity even for those it employs reflects the extent to which racism and bigotry continue to blight our country.

On August 14, 1992, the U.S. district court for the District of Columbia found in favor of a class of black plaintiffs alleging discrimination on the part of the Library of Congress. In view of that decision, the Subcommittee on Libraries and Memorials of the Committee on House Administration and the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service have recently conducted joint hearings on the Library's employment practices. In order that both my colleagues and the American people may better understand the extent to which black Americans have been denied equal or fair employment opportunities to obtain professional and administrative positions within the Library of Congress, I wish to insert the following statement into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This statement was presented before the subcommittees by Joyce Thorpe, a member of the class of black employees that sued the Library. A graduate of the George Washington University School of Law, Ms. Thorpe has been employed by the Congressional Research Service since 1977. Notwithstanding her long tenure at the Library and her law degree, Ms. Thorpe is not employed as an attorney, but as a paralegal specialist.

TESTIMONY OF JOYCE THORPE

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I wish to express my appreciation for being able to appear before this committee.

I am Joyce Thorpe. I have a law degree from George Washington University, I am a Paralegal Specialist in the American Law Division of the Congressional Research Service, and I am a plaintiff in the Howard Cook Class Action lawsuit. I am testifying not as a Library official but as a member of that lawsuit.

My testimony revolves around issues which Mr. Cook—who, unfortunately, will not be able to testify—has already raised and submitted to this committee. My involvement will be simply to summarize Mr. Cook's testimony and then to make myself available for any questions the committee members might have.

Mr. Cook raised twelve issues in his testimony. I am prepared to summarize and discuss, to the best of my ability, those issues relating to the Class Action History, Affirmative Action, Training, Parity in Minority Representation in the Workforce, the Congressional Research Service, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Complaint Office. Dr. Tommy Shaw, a court-designated class action representative, an industrial psychologist, and a Library of Congress employee, will address the issue of employment selection procedure development.

CLASS ACTION HISTORY

The Howard Cook Class Action was filed in November 1975, more than 17 years ago. It took the Library more that 6 years to process the administrative phase of this compliant, finally concluding that discrimination did not exist, resulting in a lawsuit being filed in Federal court in 1982. In April 1987, the Library conceded liability in the 4A Subclass of the Howard Cook class action; and on August 14, 1992, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia issued a decision which concluded that the Library had intentionally discriminated Black employees to an enormous degree in the use of its employment selection procedures.

The Library of Congress has responded to this decision in at least three ways: (1) It has continued to use the procedures that the court found to be discriminatory, (2) It has developed a scheme called "Actions to Ensure Equity in the Competitive Selection Process" to suggest that the selection procedures are being changed, and (3) It has refused to negotiate in good faith toward a settlement.

The Class does not, contrary to the Library's testimony to this committee, foresee an early settlement of this case. In fact, the Class believes that the only way in which this case can reach a conclusion is through the court.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

In spite of the Library's long history of affirmative action, gross underrepresentation of minorities in professional and administrative position remains the order of the day. One of the major weaknesses of the Library's affirmative action program is the placement of emphasis on education, which, in the Library of Congress, means to recycle African Americans through the education mill when they really should be getting relevant training; for they already have enough education. I would like to cite an example of what could happen as a result of this obsession with education. An article which appeared in the Library of Congress February 19, 1993, issue of the Gazette entitled "Library Olympian Recalls Victories," features Mr. James Bradford, who has more then 40 years of employment in the Library; two master degrees, one of which is a Master of Library Science and one of which is a Master of Business Administration; and a technical position as GS-9; that's right! A GS-9.

There are two other dimensions of particular affirmative action relevance for African

Americans. These relate to contractors and promotions based on reclassification. African Americans rarely, if ever, are paid $300.00 per day as contractors and then subsequently hired as permanent employees at senior level grades. Nor are they assigned to positions with the idea of senior level promotions based on reclassification. These events are common occurrences for whites.

TRAINING

Training for African Americans and other minorities in the Library of Congress is little more than instructions on how to use a word processor or differences among different brands of computer systems. The Library abolished the Training Office in 1990 and reestablished it, with inadequate resources and staff, only two weeks ago.

PARITY IN MINORITY REPRESENTATION IN THE WORKFORCE

A goal of reaching parity of representation of minorities in all grade levels should be established and completed within the next five years. Minorities should constitute whatever their percentages are in the workforce, by grade and occupation.

THE CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

The Congressional Research Service deserves special attention by this committee because it is, in a real sense, the progeny of Congress. However, it is also grossly underrepresented by minorities in professional and administrative positions. Four of the original seven plaintiffs in the 4A Subclass of the Howard Cook class action were employed in the Congressional Research Service.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMPLAINTS OFFICE

The Employment Opportunity Complaints Office concluded in 1981, in the Howard Cook class action administrative complaint, after a six-year investigation, that the "investigative file does not support the allegations of discrimination." However, the court found in 1992 that discrimination had occurred.

This office refuses to process complaints of discrimination within the 180 days required by law. Cases linger in that office without being processed for two, three, five, or seven years and longer without being completed.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Cook respectfully requests that a copy of a letter he prepared on behalf of the Black Employees Library of Congress, dated July 1, 1974, to the Chairman, Joint Committee on the Library, be included as part of the record of these proceedings, a letter that will serve to illustrate a long history of inappropriate behavior by the Library in general and by the Equal Employment Opportunity Complaints Office in particular.

EDUCATIONAL FLEXIBILITY AND EDUCATION REFORM

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, today Congressman DEFAZIO and I are introducing a bipartisan bill to provide States, schools, and school districts with the freedom to create innovative educational reform programs to help our Nation's students meet the National Education Goals.

For too many years we have focused our attention on whether or not schools and school districts receiving Federal education dollars have complied with every aspect of Federal regulations and not on what is most important: whether or not these Federal programs are achieving their stated goals.

While none of us wants to see the misuse of Federal funds, we also don't want to tie the hands of local educators, those who know best how to provide effective education to school children throughout the United States. Unfortunately, that appears to be what we have done.

Over and over again, I have heard superintendents, principals, and teachers complain that they spend more time filling out forms and justifying how dollars are spent then spending time educating children. Although some of the regulations about which they complain are added at the State and local level, we at the Federal level are responsible for our fair share of this burden.

Pulling children out of their regular class during prime instruction periods in order to remediate existing problems does not help them raise their overall achievement. It can actually put them further behind when they miss important classwork. But this is a common practice and, in most instances, is done to comply with Federal regulations.

The Freedom To Improve Educational Achievement Act will allow States, schools, and school districts to receive waivers from burdensome regulations in return for increased achievement and progress toward goals developed at the State and local level.

It is time we look to raising the educational achievement of all children through the systemic reform of our current system of education. Flexibility is one essential element of this process. We need to trust our local educators to use flexibility wisely. They are on the front lines and have the best interest of their students at heart.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join Congressman DEFAZIO and myself as cosponsors of this important legislation. As a former educator, I assure you it will go a long way towards helping our students meet the national educational goals.

THE BAD BTU TAX

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member encourages his colleagues to read the following important critique of the Clinton administration's proposed Btu tax or, as this Member calls it, the anticompetitiveness tax. The March 24 Journal of Commerce article correctly points out that the Btu tax will hurt the competitiveness of U.S. industries and agriculture by driving up the cost of their production and increasing prices of U.S. exports.

Mr. Speaker, U.S. exporters currently face tax inequities when competing with countries that impose value added taxes. The proposed Btu tax only adds to these inequities by unilaterally and unwisely raising the price of U.S. produced goods without imposing any additional costs on imported goods. Therefore, this Member believes the Btu tax will, among many other negative impacts, increase U.S. trade deficits and drive domestic manufacturing and production facilities overseas. Clearly, the Btu tax is a bad idea.

THE BTU TAX

The Clinton economic bandwagon, having rolled through the House, now is lumbering through the Senate, squeaky wheels and all. As a deficit reduction plan, it will do far less than advertised. But Democrats, trying hard to preserve party unity and convinced Mr. Clinton's plan is the only deficit-cutting vehicle around, are moving it along.

In the process, some bad ideas are coming closer to enactment. Last week, for example, the Senate narrowly approved one of the plan's biggest clunkers: the president's proposal to tax energy based on its heat content as measured in British Thermal Units, or Btu's.

The administration advertises this tax as a two-fer: a way to raise taxes for deficit reduction while promoting energy conservation. It proposes to levy a tax of 25.7 cents per million Btu's on natural gas, coal and nuclear energy, and 59.9 cents per million Btu's on oil. Hydroelectric power would be taxed at a rate yet to be determined and wind and solar energy would be exempt.

The tax is, indeed, a two-fer, but not in the way the administration says. It allows politicians to soothe both business and consumer groups by telling each the tax will fall mainly on the other. Families, they say, will pay only slightly more because business will absorb higher costs of producing goods. But companies are told a different story: They can pass higher costs along to consumers.

The truth, of course, is somewhere in between. The Heritage Foundation estimates companies will pass along between 60% and 80% of their higher costs. The average family of four will, therefore, pay more of the tax than the administration says. In the Heritage estimate, the average family will pay a tax of $450 a year, not $204 as originally claimed.

Not all families will be affected the same. The direct energy tax—higher prices for oil, gasoline and electricity—will fall most heavily on low-income consumers, who spend more of their income on energy. Higher prices for consumer goods would be similarly regressive. Families in the Midwest, South and West, who travel longer distances, would pay more than those in other regions.

And what of the impact on companies? The Btu tax is a tax on production: It encourages businesses to change the way they make goods and services, perhaps substituting other resources for energy or using more energy-efficient machines. Some companies may respond by shifting some production offshore. Others may stay put but make costly changes in their manufacturing processes, spending money they might otherwise invest in expanding capacity.

In either case, higher energy costs will make their U.S.-produced goods more expensive, giving an edge to foreign competitors. It's foolish to argue, as the administration does, that these tax-induced changes will not affect workers. Whatever they decide, companies will reduce output—and employment—in the United States.

Overall, the American Enterprise Institute estimates the Clinton economic plan, including the Btu tax, will subtract more than 1 percentage point from the economy's growth over the next 4 years. That much reduction in output will add $240 billion to the budget deficit, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

The drawbacks of the Btu tax were not lost even on Democrats who voted for it. Several of the 53 Senators who sided with the administration hinted they will try to whittle away at the tax when it comes up again in the Senate Finance Committee.

One of them, Alabama Sen. Howell Heflin, admitted the energy tax is a loser. Yet, he voted against the amendment to delete the tax because "it was a killer amendment; it would have killed the President's program."

All in all, that's a pretty weak reason for congressional Democrats to put their better judgment on automatic pilot and go along with Mr. Clinton's onerous tax.

THE MEDIA'S SHAME

HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to a recent editorial in the Philadelphia Inquirer. This editorial condemns the lack of sensitivity in the coverage of Italian-Americans by some members of the media. It criticizes the stereotyping of Italian-American culture and history. This has long caused me great distress, as I am proud of what people of my heritage have accomplished for this country. I wish to enter this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that others can be made aware of this subtle yet terrible discrimination.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, March 15, 1993]

ITALIAN AMERICANS JUST WANT RESPECT

(By Arthur J. Gajarsa)

To be sensitive is defined as being "susceptible to the attitudes, feelings or circumstances of others," To be sensitive also means to be "quick to take offense; touchy."

Today, all across this country we find the issue of sensitivity at the heart of a growing dispute between Italian Americans and the media. Italian Americans contend that the media are not sensitive in their coverage, treatment and portrayal of Italian Americans. The media counter that the Italian American community is too sensitive. There may be a little bit of truth on both sides.

Is there a happy medium that can be reached? The Media Institute of The National Italian American Foundation (NIAF) believes so. The Federal Communications Commission has banned at least seven words on radio and television for the obvious offense they cause to the general public. We at the NIAF proposed another group of words that should not be seen, heard or printed by the media: "wop," "guinea," "dago." These derogatory words have no place in the modern Americans' vocabulary and no argument can justify their use, whether for humor or historical veracity.

Then we move to certain other overused words applied to Italian Americans. The most common of these is "mafia."

We reject and resent the guilt-by-association principle that the media applies when using this term. It is not because the Italian American community does not recognize the existence of the mafia. We do, and we deplore it. However, we argue that there is absolutely no need for the media to link the mafia with Italian Americans solely. Not even the FBI does that.

In fact, the U.S. Justice Department estimates that less than one-tenth of one percent of the nation's 20 million Italian Americans have anything to do with organized crime.

Other words used in other contexts can and do offend Italian Americans. They are words like "goombah," especially when applied to people of stature such as state Sen. Vincent J. Fumo and State Supreme Court Justice Stephen A. Zappala. Certain images also offend: the gangster character, the loud mother, the so-called neighborhood "guido." They offend because they are all designed to promote negative stereotypes of Italian Americans.

As Italian Americans, we urge the media to think before publishing a story or producing a program. Is it essential that certain terms or images be used when referring to Italian Americans? Does the potential harmful impact it might have on sectors of the Italian American community ever come into play? Aren't the media aware that this constant reinforcement of a negative stereotype has already impacted generations of Italian Americans, some of whom have suffered actual discrimination as a result of this perception?

Isn't this principle of "think before you speak or write" an exercise in sensitivity that is already applied by the media to portrayals of many ethnic and racial groups? Most certainly it is and should be.

But when it isn't, the outcry is usually quick and effective.

Therefore, we call for a new policy of ethnic neutrality by the media. Cover the facts, make your point but do it without resorting to terms, expressions or images that promote unflattering stereotypes and undue ridicule to millions of Americans of Italian descent.

This policy of ethnic neutrality makes undisputable sense. It would reduce tensions between ethnic groups and the media. This approach would demonstrate the media's sensitivity to the concerns of Italian Americans and could lead to a lessening of sensitivity by Italian Americans toward the media. We stress it is sensitivity, not censorship, we advocate. We do not want to restrict the media; all we seek is the kind of respect that comes only when all ethnic, racial and religious groups are treated equally by the media. The era of the double standard when applied to Italian Americans must end.

PRESIDENT CLINTON KNOWS FOREIGN POLICY

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, President Bill Clinton has shown Presidential leadership on the Soviet crisis by backing Boris Yeltsin early and not sending the wrong signal by changing the date of the upcoming summit.

He is right—Boris Yeltsin has been courageous in sticking up for democracy and civil liberties and market reforms, in Russia. Yeltsin is the first elected president in 1,000 years of Russian government * * * and I think most Americans support the President's plan to present an extensive, aggressive, and specific plan for American-Russian partnership at his summit with Yeltsin.

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton inherited an unstable and unpredictable world when he took office. I think his action regarding Russia and other international issues shows clearly—this President knows foreign policy; this President has great instincts on international affairs, and, most important, this President knows how and when to act.

STD AWARENESS MONTH

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a proclamation by the Governor of my State, North Carolina, declaring April as Sexually Transmitted Disease [STD] Awareness Month.

Governor Jim Hunt's proclamation is part of a national public awareness campaign which is being launched in April by the American Social Health Association [ASHA] to educate Americans about STD's.

I commend Governor Hunt and ASHA for taking the lead in this critical public health initiative, and I am submitting Governor Hunt's proclamation for the RECORD.

STD AWARENESS MONTH, 1993

(By the Governor of North Carolina)

A PROCLAMATION

Unfortunately, sexually transmitted diseases [STD's] afflict many North Carolinians, and across the country, more than twelve million people contract STDs each year.

In an effort to educate the public and control the spread of STDs, organizations in many states, including North Carolina, are implementing comprehensive public awareness programs.

The American Social Health Association has developed a public education campaign that will begin in April emphasizing the prevention, identification, and treatment of STDs.

Now, therefore, I, James B. Hunt, Jr., Governor of the State of North Carolina, do hereby proclaim April, 1993, as "STD Awareness Month" in North Carolina, and call upon all the residents of our Great State to observe this period by supporting the aims and goals of this noteworthy campaign to diminish the incidence of STDs.

JAMES B. HUNT, Jr.

CHILDHOOD IMMUNIZATION

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, March 24, 1993, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CHILDHOOD IMMUNIZATION

The United States once pioneered the use of vaccines to fight childhood diseases. It now faces an immunization crisis. Preventable diseases that were once thought to be largely eradicated in this country—such as whooping cough and measles—have returned. In 1990, nearly 27,000 cases of measles were reported, 17 times the all-time low number in

1983, resulting in 90 deaths; almost half of the cases reported were among pre-school-age children.

Steps must be taken now to reverse this dangerous and costly trend. No one disputes that immunization is a solid investment. Vaccines are safe and effective for most children, keep children healthy, and reduce health care spending in the long run. Every $1 spent on immunization saves $10 in later health care costs. The U.S. Government has in the past helped fund successful immunization drives here and abroad, and should now make the same commitment to curb childhood diseases in this country.

Reason for Outbreaks: More children are becoming ill because many of them are not getting their vaccines in a timely manner or are not fully vaccinated. Many parents wrongly assume that children do not need to be vaccinated until they start school, when in fact children need to be immunized beginning at birth, and should complete most of their vaccinations by the time they reach 2 years of age. Epidemics spread quickly among young children, and diseases like whooping cough and measles can kill the very young.

Only about half or less of 2-year-olds are fully vaccinated, and in some inner-city areas, the rate is as low as 10%. In Indiana, 53% of two-year-olds are fully immunized. The U.S. is the only industrialized nation that does not ensure that every child is immunized.

Barriers to Immunization: There are many factors contributing to the decline in immunization rates. First, vaccines have become very expensive. About half of immunizations in the U.S. are delivered through the public sector, including health care clinics; the other half through private physicians. In 1992, fully immunizing a child in a public health clinic cost $113.20 compared with the 1982 cost of $6.69. The 1992 estimated cost in the private sector is now $464.39, including physician office visits. Federal and state governments buy about half of all vaccines, and can therefore bid down the price of vaccines for public clinics. Drug companies claim that the price increases were caused by a spate of lawsuits in the 1980s brought by families claiming damages for alleged vaccine-related injuries. Others say that many drug companies face little or no competition in manufacturing vaccines and can raise prices at will. They note that concerns about lawsuits were addressed by changes in federal law which created a no-fault compensation program for injured children, and yet prices have still not come down.

Second, insurance coverage for vaccinations is inadequate. Only half of private insurance plans cover the cost of immunization services. Consequently, many parents have to pay for the vaccinations out-of-pocket, or try to get vaccinations for their children at public clinics, which often will charge little or nothing, or choose not to vaccinate their children.

Third, public clinics cannot handle the added caseload. Public clinics primarily serve low-income families, but do not have the resources to keep pace with the rising number of poor and uninsured children, let alone middle-income families seeking vaccinations for their children. A recent government survey found that most public clinics required appointments for immunizations, and about half required complete physical exams and physician referrals. Most were understaffed, and many charged patients an administration fee. Furthermore, in most states, Medicaid (the state-federal health care program for low-income families) reimburses physicians for only a fraction of the usual fee for immunization services.

Fourth, many parents are not adequately informed about the vaccinations their children should receive and then they should receive them. Guidelines have changed in recent years. In 1973 children were supposed to receive 8 doses of 3 vaccines—DTP (a diphtheria, tetanus, and whooping cough combination), polio, and MMR (a measles, mumps, and rubella combination). The current vaccination schedule calls for every child to receive 14 or 15 doses of various vaccines, given at birth, 2 months, 4 months, 6 months, and 15 to 18 months of age.

Possible Reforms: President Clinton has made childhood immunization a priority in his health care program. The U.S. Public Health Service has called for increasing the childhood immunization rate to 90% by the year 2000, and President Clinton has made several proposals to achieve that objective. First, he has included an additional $300 million in his economic stimulus package for childhood immunizations at public and nonprofit clinics, for a total of $641 million. The House passed the measure on March 18, 1993. Second, the President wants to work with drug manufacturers to ensure that any state can purchase necessary vaccines at reasonable prices. Third, he will seek to guarantee vaccination coverage for all children, regardless of whether they use public, nonprofit, or private health providers, and establish an information and tracking system to follow children's vaccination rates and monitor disease outbreaks.

State and local health officials are seeking ways to improve vaccination programs in local communities. Many states, including Indiana, are establishing "Immunization Action Plans" aimed at placing immunization clinics in non-traditional sites, including rural communities. In 1990, Washington state started buying vaccines from the Centers for Disease Control at the federal contract price and distributing them free to private and public clinics. Ten other states have adopted some form of bulk purchase of vaccines, and still others are considering doing so.

Conclusion: The keys to increasing immunization rates are access and education. Some obvious reforms come to mind. Health care insurers could be required to include immunizations in their basic benefits package. Medicaid could increase reimbursement rates for immunizations. The number, staff and type of facilities through which government-supplied vaccines are made available could be increased. In addition, the government could help launch a national education campaign on the importance of immunization for infants. Immunizations reduce the nation's health care bill and allow healthier people to be more productive, and must be encouraged.

THE EQUAL SURETY BOND OPPORTUNITY ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce the Equal Surety Bond Opportunity Act [ESBOA]. The ESBOA is directed against barriers many qualified small and emerging construction firms encounter in obtaining surety bonding.

Surety bonding is mandatory for bidding on all Federal construction work in excess of $25,000, all federally assisted construction projects in excess of $100,000, and most State and local public construction. Surety bonding requirements, however, are not restricted to Government contracting. Increasingly, private construction contracts also require surety bonding. As surety bonding has become a widespread requirement for competition, the inability to obtain surety bonding can cripple a construction firm, especially a small or nascent one.

In 1968, Congress passed the Equal Credit Opportunity Act to prohibit discrimination in credit practices. Modeled after this legislation, the ESBOA will prohibit sureties from discriminating on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, marital status, sexual orientation, disability, or age—if the applicant is not a minor. In cases where discrimination is proved, the ESBOA provides for civil liability, including actual damages, equitable relief, and attorney's fees to compensate the bond applicant.

Significantly, the ESBOA requires notification of a contractor of the action taken on his or her application within 20 days of receipt of a completed bond application. If the applicant is denied bonding, the surety would also be required, upon request, to provide a written statement of specific reasons for such denial. The need for this provision has been amply demonstrated. According to the National Association of Minority Contractors [NAMC], many minority contractors report being turned down for a bond without an explanation. When explanations are not proffered, a perception of discrimination in the surety industry is created. This perception drives minority contractors to obtain sureties outside the mainstream, often at significant additional expense and fewer protections, placing themselves, their subcontractors, and the Government at greater risk.

During my research on the subject of surety bonding, I learned that many small businesses—particularly those owned by women and minorities—have consistently and expressly raised concerns about access to surety bonding. The principal source of surety bonding is private, for-profit corporate surety firms. The purpose of a surety bond is to reduce business risks by guaranteeing a contractor's ability to perform a contract, but it is clear that some surety companies use criteria that have nothing to do with performance. Both the NAMC and the Women Construction Owners and Executives [WCOE] report discriminatory practices by individual surety agents. Although the reasons agents give for denial, if any are provided at all, are generally more subtle forms of discrimination, WCOE has reported instances in which reasons given for denial of bonding included divorce or death of a spouse who was never a partner in the business, not being married, being a woman, or being an African-American woman. These reasons are undeniably discriminatory, and the ESBOA is focusing on halting this practice.

The ESBOA will help qualified women- and minority-owned businesses to compete in the contracting business by helping them obtain adequate surety bonding. The ESBOA simply requires that surety companies comply with

the same nondiscrimination laws that bind banks and other lending institutions. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and help abolish the artificial impediments to the development and survival of emerging small businesses.

THE FAMILY BUSINESS PENSION RELIEF ACT OF 1993

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, for 20 years, Jim and Susan Richards have operated a small turbine manufacturing business in Connecticut. Like millions of small business owners across the Nation, they have struggled to keep up with changes in technology and the economy, while at the same time offering the best benefits possible in order to maintain a high-quality work force. Among other benefits, their employees enjoy being able to participate in a retirement plan, a Simplified Employee Pension [SEP], designed to encourage small business participation while minimizing paperwork.

Jim and Susan each play a key role in the operation of their business, yet the family aggregation law regarding pensions penalizes them by treating them as one, not two people. They are treated as if they receive one wage and are limited to the amount a single wage earner could contribute to secure their retirements. In other words, if Jim or Susan worked as hard for someone else, they could be twice as secure in their retirement. Is this fair? Supportive of family enterprise? Absolutely not. And furthermore, should any of their children work in the business, they too would be included in the single employee contribution limit, thus prevented from saving for their personal retirement.

The intent of current law is to prevent a business owner from circumventing the limit on tax-deferred pension contributions by putting family members on the payroll who, in reality, do not actively participate in the work of the company. To prevent abuse, however, we impose a great injustice on adults who work together to make a business succeed—and happen to be married or family members.

Therefore, today I am introducing legislation to modify family aggregation requirements and permit spouses and adult children to fully contribute to their own pension plans independently of one another, provided that they are fully contributing as employees of the firm. Thus, their retirement benefits would be the same as if they worked for someone else in similarly paying jobs.

I hope that my colleagues who share my commitment to encouraging small business development will join me in support of the Family Business Pension Relief Act of 1993.

BRETT GAILEY OF LARGO, FL, AWARDED EAGLE SCOUT HONORS

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest pleasures I have as a Member of Congress is to visit with our Nation's youth because they inspire me with their spirit and enthusiasm and their eagerness to be our Nation's next generation of leaders.

Every once in a while, though, I am struck by an especially outstanding student who has taken the calling of community service to new heights. Brett Gailey of Largo, FL and a student at St. Petersburg Catholic High School, is a remarkable young man who has excelled in his studies, athletics, and in his service to our community. The latest honor accorded him was the presentation of his rank of Eagle Scout last week during the ceremonies of Boy Scout Troop 468 in Largo.

The community service project Brett took on as required by the Boy Scouts, was the designing and landscaping of the grounds at St. Petersburg Catholic. After 6 months of work, and 256 hours of volunteer service, he completed the project on his way to earning his Eagle Scout honors.

This was just one of many ways in which Brett has made an important contribution to our community. At age 12 he began his volunteer service at the Largo Medical Center, and since then has devoted more than 800 hours to assisting the patients and staff there in so many different ways. In addition, Brett works with patients at nearby Sabal Palms nursing home.

He also is an outstanding student and through the completion of a number of honors classes has earned a 4.15 grade point average on a scale of 4.0. He is as active in his school as he is in his community, serving as a class officer, treasurer of the Mu Alpha Theta math honor society, a member of the Interact and St. Vincent de Paul service clubs, a cheerleader, and as a top rated middle linebacker on the football team.

Although Brett says that community service is its own best award, he recently was honored with the receipt of the Ricky Bell Community Service Award Scholarship. This is an annual recognition given in memory of the former Tampa Bay Buccaneer running back who died of a rare blood disorder in 1984 after a short but great National Football League career. Ricky Bell touched so many people in the Tampa Bay area that this annual award is given in memory of that spirit of community service.

Mr. Speaker, following my remarks I will include for the benefit of my colleagues a story about Brett Gailey by Bob Chick of the Tampa Tribune. It offers great hope to our Nation as Brett's generation prepares to assume a leadership role at our local, State, and Federal levels.

My best wishes and congratulations go out to Brett Gailey, his parents, and their 8 children, all of whom share the same conviction that through community service they seek to make important contributions to their neighbors in need. For Brett, the next stop after high school is a college education at Princeton, Harvard, or Notre Dame where he hopes to play football. There is no doubt in my mind that Brett will excel in his studies and that we have not heard the last of this newly honored Eagle Scout.

A SALUTE TO BILL MAYHUGH AND THE WMAL LEUKEMIA RADIOTHON

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, history was made this past weekend in the Washington metropolitan area. Local radio personality Bill Mayhugh hosted the annual WMAL–AM 630 Leukemia Radiothon starting Saturday afternoon, March 20, and when the fundraising event ended Sunday afternoon, the tote board read: $1,635,508—a recordbreaking amount.

That incredible total for the 21–hour radiothon was reached through the generosity of not only Nation's Capital area residents, but also from the outstanding contribution of the United Food and Commercial Workers union. UFCW members, nationwide and in Canada, this year, donated $1,419,000 to the radiothon to assist the Leukemia Society of America in its fight against the tragic disease.

Bill Mayhugh, in his famous mellow voice, has been encouraging generous WMAL listeners, local businesses, and employee groups for over two decades to call in their pledges to help find a cure for leukemia. His poignant stories of children stricken with leukemia, and their plight, have literally opened the pocketbooks of area residents, and others across the Nation, who have donated close to $10 million for leukemia research over the 21 years of the WMAL radiothon.

WMAL's nonstop weekend radiothon, held again this year at the Pentagon City Fashion Center in Arlington, VA, annually draws local radio and television personalities and elected officials who stop by to talk on air with Bill, share an anecdote, and urge listeners to phone in their pledges. Satirist Mark Russell, ABC News reporter Cokie Roberts, and, by phone, NBC's Willard Scott were among those who visited with Bill during the radio event.

Mr. Speaker, we salute Bill Mayhugh, WMAL, the United Food and Commercial Workers union and the many, many residents of the Washington metropolitan area whose public spirit and generosity made a difference this past weekend in the effort to find a cure for leukemia.

NISEI ACHIEVED INTELLIGENCE COUPS

HON. NEIL ABERCROMBIE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, 1993 marks the mid-point of a 4-year period in which we are marking the 50th anniversaries of significant events in World War II.

Many of those events made headlines at the time. Some, due to the requirements of military secrecy, went unnoticed by the American public. But all of them contributed to America's victory in the Second World War.

I want to take this opportunity to note the achievements of one group of Americans who, because they were the right soldiers at the right place at the right time, were enormously important to the war effort. The accomplishments of the Japanese-American soldiers of the Military Intelligence Service were among the most valuable contributions of any Allied troops during World War II. Their record is summarized in an article by Mr. Bill Wagner entitled "Nisei Achieved Intelligence Coups," which appeared in the January 1993 issue of the VFW magazine. I would like to share that article with my colleagues:

NISEI ACHIEVED INTELLIGENCE COUPS

(By Bill Wagner)

Americans of Japanese ancestry played a vital but little-known role in the Pacific Theater of WWII.

The 6,000 mostly Japanese-American (Nisei) graduates of the Military Intelligence Service Language School (MISLS) of Fort Snelling, Minn., could well be the last unsung heroes of World War II.

They served from the icy tundra of Kiska and Attu in Alaska's Aleutians to the boiling jungles of Burma and India, and on still classified missions with the OSS—Office of Strategic Services, a CIA forerunner. Nisei agents also went on forays into the caves of Yenan to rendezvous with two then obscure Chinese partisans named Mao Tse Tung and Chou En Lai. Nisei MISLS grads played a major, if unheralded, role in nearly every battle in the Pacific during WWII.

Although their contributions have rated little more than a heroic and gallant footnote to the chronicles of the war, Gen. Douglas MacArthur underscored their part when he said: "Never in military history did an army know so much about the enemy prior to an actual engagement."

Despite this accolade, mention of the Japanese-American part in WWII conjures up for most memories of the famed Nisei "Go For Broke" 442nd Regimental Combat Team which fought with distinction in Italy.

SHROUDED IN SECRECY

But the exploits of the other Japanese-Americans, the MISLS grads, so far have been told only in bits and pieces. For one thing, their work was shrouded in secrecy. Some of it was still classified in 1971.

Perhaps the Nisei's biggest intelligence coup was the capture and translation of the Z Plan, Imperial Japan's strategy for defending the Marianas Islands (Guam and Saipan).

Armed with that translation, Adm. Raymond Spruance's pilots destroyed Jananese airbases and scores of aircraft before the landings. American subs sent two Japanese carriers to the bottom. Homefront newspapers dubbed it "the great Marianas turkey shoot." Tokyo was now within range of American bombers.

Another coup was the Imperial Japanese army's ordnance inventory. It listed amounts, types and manufacturers' names and locations on the home islands, providing new targets for B-29s.

Immediately before the American landings in the Philippines in October 1944, Nisei translators learned of Japan's master plan for the defense of the islands.

If many of these disasters could be laid at the door of Japanese commanders' carelessness with codes, it's hard to fault them. When war broke out, U.S. intelligence officials estimated that only 100 Americans had mastered the complexities of the Japanese language.

SEARCH FOR TRANSLATORS

Gen. John Weckerling, an army intelligence officer, said Japanese could easily be the world's most difficult language. Weckerling and another intelligence officer, Col. Kai Rasmussen, hit upon the idea of using the 4,000 Nisei already in the service before Pearl Harbor. But they found less than 10% could read or speak more than a few words of Japanese.

Even though a lot more than refresher courses would be needed, Weckerling and Rasmussen obtained a budget outlay of only $2,000 just before Pearl Harbor for the first MISLS school in San Francisco's Presidio. The school was relocated in Minnesota when an executive order required Japanese-Americans evacuate the West Coast.

Once graduated, the Nisei scattered across the Pacific. For some, there was even more training. Charles Tatsuda, originally from Alaska, who returned to the Minneapolis-St. Paul area after the war to study and practice law, was among a handful sent to paratrooper school. Although they never jumped in combat, Tatsuda points out, "We all won Bronze Stars."

Serving as an intelligence sleuth in the Philippines, he said in a letter home: "The fighting has been tough—close combat, picking off a great deal of the enemy with rifles and not with big guns."

Another Nisei who returned to Minnesota after the war, California native Kiyoshi Ishibashi, was a member of the MISLS team in Calcutta, India. The unit broke codes by listening for "one word" signals carefully concealed in routine messages. Later, in Burma, Ishibashi's group "monitored and translated all Japanese aircraft broadcasts. We had to be careful in combat zones of our own soldiers mistaking us for the enemy."

GETTING ON WITH BEING AMERICANS

Whether in Europe or the Pacific, Nisei heroism was displayed while over 100,000 Japanese-Americans were held in detention centers. Many were the parents, brothers and sisters of Nisei GIs.

"It was the Nisei way," says Bud Nakasone, a Hawaii native who also returned to Minnesota to teach, collect and continue his army intelligence work in the Reserves.

"Americans got a better view of us through this kind of bravery," Nakasone says today. After the war, Nakasone says Nisei were primarily interested in putting their wartime glory—and the degradation of the camps— behind them "and get on with being Americans. And we did."

STOP DISCRIMINATION AGAINST OUR SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, last week I, along with some of my colleagues in the House and Senate held a press conference to draw attention to the need to repeal the Social Security earnings penalty.

On February 4, 1993, we sent a letter to President Clinton reminding him of his promise in "Putting People First" to "* * * lift Social Security earnings test limitation so that older Americans are able to help rebuild our economy and create a better future for all." In that letter, we asked him to include language to remove this burdensone and discriminatory limitation in his economic growth package. I am concerned that when his economic growth package surfaced there was no mention of the earnings test.

The purpose of the press conference was to direct the attention of Members of Congress and the President to legislation we have introduced to correct this depression era fossil. This rule was fostered during the depression to take older Americans out of the workplace to make room for the masses of unemployed. Those conditions changed long ago. In fact, the U.S. Department of Labor has warned of pending shortages in the labor market.

At present a senior citizen age 62 to 64, loses $1 in Social Security benefits for every $2 he or she earns over the limit of $7,680. Seniors aged 65 to 69 lose $1 in benefits for every $3 over the limit of $10,560. However, if you reach 70 and still want to work, there is no penalty. Our legislation would eliminate the Social Security earnings limit for people who reach normal retirement age, which is currently age 65.

Mr. Speaker, is a mind a terrible thing to waste only if it is in the body of a 20-year-old? President Kennedy once said, "It is not enough for a great nation merely to have added new years to life—our objective must also be to add new life to those years." The Social Security earnings limitation subtracts from those years. I submit to the Congress and to the President of the United States that through this rule, we have thrown away a generation who mastered fine skills, fought a world war, turned initiative into successful business practices, and invented solutions to problems with the younger generation.

No person should be penalized for being willing to work. I hope that other Members of Congress and the President will see the need to end this unfair discrimination against one of our Nation's most valued resources—our senior citizens.

THE NATIONAL SCHOOL-TO-WORK TRANSITION AND YOUTH APPRENTICESHIP ACT OF 1993

HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, today, I am joining with my good friend and the ranking minority member on the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. GOODLING, and others, in introducing a bill designed to meet the needs of the over 50 percent of U.S. youth who do not plan to seek a 4-year college degree after graduating from high school. Specifically, this legislation, the National School-to-Work Transition and Youth Apprenticeship Act of 1993, is designed to establish high quality work-based learning programs throughout the United States, that train youth for skilled, high wage careers which do not re-

quire a 4-year education. Establishment of such a system in this country, would address a serious inadequacy in this Nation's educational system, as well as significantly improve the quality of the U.S. work force, enabling the United States to better compete in the global marketplace.

At a time when only 50 percent of U.S. youth go on to college after high school, with only 20 to 25 percent of all youth completing 4-year degrees, our U.S. educational system continues to be disproportionately geared to meet the needs of the college bound. There is no question that the United States has an extremely well developed, and well funded infrastructure in place to guide young Americans from high school to college—in fact arguably the best in the world. Federal programs to assist college-bound youth provide combined public and private subsidies of $5,000 per year, for 4 years, per student. However, according to a 1990 GAO report, while postsecondary students are subsidized with Federal support, those who never enter or who drop out of the higher education system lose out on over $10,000 of public investment in their future.

In this country, 4-year college is often seen as the route to successful careers, with high school curriculum disproportionately geared to the college-bound. Counselors in high school typically advise about colleges, not careers—with a 1991 survey by ETS finding that almost one-half of all high school students never talked to a counselor about occupations. Job search assistance is almost nonexistent in U.S. high schools. And very few U.S. employers recruit from high school, with even fewer making use of high school academic records or teacher recommendations.

For many young Americans, the years between high school and entrance into the adult work force are wasted years. In large because of the difficulties which noncollege bound youth have in making the transition from school to work, high school graduates are falling further and further behind their college cohorts. Males with only a high school diploma saw wages fall 30 percent since 1973—from $9.75 to $6.90. The gap is wages between college graduates and high school graduates has increased from $3.64 to $5.03 an hour over the same period.

Moreover, American businesses are confronting an imminent shortage of skilled workers, of crisis proportion in certain high skilled industries, which is directly affecting U.S. competitiveness. Demographic trends, technological change, increased international competition, and to a degree, inadequacy of U.S. education and training systems have resulted in shortages of skilled workers, and an excess of unskilled, hard-to-employ individuals. A significant proportion of youth graduate from high school with inadequate basic skills and lacking in work readiness competencies. An estimated 17 million workers need remedial education each year. Employers are so concerned, they are spending nearly a billion dollars a year, according to some accounts, in basic skills education for their workers. And all of this is occurring at a time when higher skill occupations are growing at 2½ times the rate of lower skill jobs. Yet the United States is the only major industrial nation lacking a formal system for helping youth make the transition from school to work.

In recent years, numerous commissions have called for schools to improve achievement with longer days, after increased standards for curriculums, graduation, and teachers. However, few have focused on motivation problems that cause poor achievement. This somewhat changed in the late 1980s, with reports: "Workforce 2000" (1987); "Forgotton Half" (1988) and "America's Choice: High Skills or Low Wages" (1990) stressing high academic standards for all youth, tied to skills that workers need for successful careers in workplaces of future. However, a big problem remains. Many students still don't see the relevance of school. They cannot connect the hours of assignments, lectures, drills, tests and books with the real world and its tie to careers.

These realizations have forced States and local areas to undertake reform efforts to meet the challenge in our U.S. educational system as it pertains to the U.S. workplace. Such reforms have resulted in the establishment of State and local youth apprenticeship and other school-to-work transition programs peppered throughout the country.

In Wisconsin, under the leadership of Gov. Tommy Thompson, State Superintendent of Schools Bert Grover, and other key players, tech prep, and youth apprenticeship programs for students interested in technical careers have been developed, and now serve as models for other States and for national legislative efforts in establishing such programs nationwide. Wisconsin's Youth Apprenticeship Program, based in part on successful program designs in European countries, integrates school-based and work-based learning to provide youth with academic and occupational skills leading to both a high school diploma and a certificate of occupational proficiency in a specific industry. Our bill similarly develops a national model for youth apprenticeship, as well as establishing a national system for skill standards development.

Specifically, title I of our bill requires the U.S. Departments of Education and Labor to establish an interagency compact on work force preparation, to be administered according to an interagency agreement between the Secretaries of Education and Labor, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce. The compact is directed to utilize existing staff and resources of the Departments of Education and Labor, and to develop U.S. work force preparation policy and oversee program administration specifically in areas of: skill standards development; broadbased school-to-work transition; and development of a U.S. Youth Apprenticeship System.

Title II of the bill requires the compact to facilitate the development and subsequent endorsement of a national system of voluntary, industry-recognized skill standards, including recommendations for the assessment and application of such standards to education and training programs leading to certificates of mastery for broadly based occupations within major industries or clusters of industries. Under our legislation, industry-recognized skill standards are to be developed through partnerships of business and industry, labor, and education, and training experts in related fields of work force development—brought together through grants provided by the compact. Our bill also provides for the establishment of an advisory group on workforce skills, composed of experienced individuals from business and industry, labor, education, and training, who are known for their expertise in the area of work force development, a majority of whom are to be representatives of the private sector. The advisory group is to identify workplace readiness competencies which employers agree all students should possess upon completion of high school in order to be effective participants in the work force, and make subsequent recommendations on the incorporation of such competencies into the academic and work-based curriculum in grades K–12, as well as other appropriate education and training programs, taking into account the previous work of the SCANS Commission. The advisory group is also intended to provide expert advice to the compact on the identification of industries and industry clusters for which voluntary industry-recognized skill standards might be successfully developed and utilized. The advisory group is also intended to advise the compact on the subsequent endorsement of such standards.

Title III of our bill, provides competitive grants to States for the development of State plans in States where no such plan exists, and for systemwide education reform, infrastructure building, and implementation of State and local programs and services that will result in the development of broad-based school-to-work transition programs in States with approved plans in place. Under this title, State plans must be cooperatively developed, and grants cooperatively administered by the State's lead agencies for education, including secondary, vocational, and higher education, labor, employment and training, and where appropriate, youth apprenticeship. Grant moneys are intended to result in a reform of school structures, curricula, and instructional methods resulting in: experiential learning; integration of academic and vocational instruction; the availability of career awareness and exploration programs and opportunities in middle school and early high school years; improved and expanded career and academic counseling; the development and expansion of supportive services and a supportive environment for alternative learning opportunities; mastery learning; and expanded the innovative teacher and counselor training opportunities in the area of school-to-work transition, including opportunities outside of the classroom.

Last, title IV of our bill provides competitive grants to States, and States in turn provide grants to local consortia for the development and implementation of youth apprenticeship programs. This title is based in large part on legislation introduced last year by President Bush, the National Youth Apprenticeship Act of 1992.

The youth apprenticeship title of this bill has the goal of expanding the range of skill training and career options for youth through immediate entry into a skilled occupation upon high school graduation, entry into certified apprenticeship programs, entry into technical postsecondary education programs, or technologically oriented programs at colleges and universities. Under this program, State plans

must also be cooperatively developed, and grants cooperatively administered by the State's lead agencies for education, and labor, employment and training, and where appropriate, youth apprenticeship. Local consortia who will actually run youth apprenticeship programs under this act, must include at least one education and one business entity in a partnership. As provided for under the bill, eligible local consortia must be composed of at least one of each of the following: First, local educational agencies, an individual school within an LEA, an area vocational school, or any of these agencies or schools in partnership with institutions of higher education as defined under section 481 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, which includes 2-year public technical or community colleges, and proprietary institutions eligible under the Higher Education Act; and second, local employers or business associations, including private industry councils.

Youth Apprenticeship Programs funded under this title must: Be based on an agreement developed by the school, the employer, the student, and the student's parent; include as a prerequisite, career exploration prior to entry into an apprenticeship; include structured, sequenced classroom instruction linking academic and work-based learning, that complies with state graduation requirements; include integrated classroom instruction and work-based learning that is competency-based, and developed through cooperative efforts of educators and participating employers; include work-based learning, either job-specific or in clusters within an industry, in a skilled occupational area, and provided by a skilled mentor; include guidance and counseling, by staff that are trained and dedicated to counseling youth in youth apprenticeship programs, as well as educators who are trained and dedicated to the teaching of students in apprenticeships; and result in the receipt of a high school diploma, and either the receipt of an approved certificate of mastery, where appropriate, entry into a postsecondary program, or entry into a registered apprenticeship program.

Finally, while funding is of course an important element in the development of comprehensive school-to-work transition and youth apprenticeship legislation, we purposely stayed away from the funding debate, recommending funding in fiscal years 1994 through 1998 at such sums for all of programs established under this bill. This decision was made based on the premise that we wished to focus on policy direction as opposed to battles over the budget at this stage in the development of this legislative package. We feel that through reform of our education system to provide comprehensive school-to-work programs in grades K–12, and more focused programs such as youth apprenticeship for upper level high school students, we will go far to build the necessary bridge between school and the workplace. We feel that this legislation establishes the proper role of the Federal Government in helping States and local areas to develop and expand innovative service delivery programs that meet the needs of local areas, while providing Federal guidance on the establishment of national skill standards, a national school-to-work policy, and a national youth apprenticeship system in the United States. We encourage others to join us in cosponsorship of this important legislation.

IN MEMORIAM OF PROFESSOR EMERITUS ALLAN BURNS COWART

HON. EARL HUTTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Speaker, the Small Business Development Centers, I believe, have done some excellent work for the small businesses of our Nation. One of the outstanding citizens of my district, Allan Cowart, was a pioneer of these centers. Mr. Cowart recently passed away and I insert the following statement, delivered by Don Clause, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

IN MEMORIAM: PROFESSOR EMERITUS ALLAN BURNS COWART

Professor Emeritus Allan Burns Cowart died on March 6, 1993. Born in Pensacola, Florida on October 21, 1921, his first commitment was service with the U.S. Army Air Corps where he became an Air Traffic Control Officer with the first U.S. Fighter wing established in England in 1943—medical limitations having denied him becoming a pilot. Upon returning to the U.S. in 1946, Allan became Director of Music for Butler County High Schools, Alabama, started a music store and was a founder of the Auburn Knights Band Group of his vintage. The next four years were spent in Argentina and Ecuador as Superintendent of Pan American Grace Airways for that area; however, the Korean War forced him back into active duty which only terminated with retirement as a Lieutenant Colonel in 1970. His specializations were in the development of real time air traffic and defense control systems including heading research projects for the FAA. War and peacetime service took him through the Far East, Southeast Asia, India, Polynesia, the Middle East and Caribbean.

A passion for knowledge and pure academic learning was fulfilled through Bachelors Degrees with majors in Psychology (Hawaii) and Social Sciences (George Washington) then a Masters in Government Administration—again at George Washington University. In 1970 he was accepted into the Georgia PhD program, but this coincided with appointment as an Assistant Professor of Management at the UWF Eglin Center.

His strongest sense of mission from the beginning of his time at UWF was to extend University resources to assist small business. On July 1, 1972, President Harold Crosby authorized the start of a UWF Resource Center for Small Business Management funded by UWF resources and a grant of $43,000 from the MDIA. In October of that year UWF was appointed as one of the 36 original Small Business Institute Schools thereby giving senior and graduate students opportunities to assist small businesses while doing for-credit curriculum courses. In May 1976, the Small Business Administration selected UWF as one of six University Business Development Centers to cooperate in developing a national program to aid small business, and in March 1977, provided $40,000 towards delivering services. In April of 1977, Allan Cowart testified before the U.S. Senate Small Business Committee to gain support for such programs of management assistance. Later in 1977 the State began to fund the UW Center and in February 1978, Governor Askew, Senator Childers and Chancellor York formally dedicated the UWF SBDC facility. In October 1978, the Board of Regents approved the SBDC concept as a Statewide program with UWF being appointed as the Florida Host Institution and Allan as State Coordinator.

Allan Cowart's work at the 1980 White House Conference on Small Business contributed to Public Law 96–302 which authorized the nationwide application of the SBDC programs to assist small business. Today, there are some 750 SBDC subcenters across the nation.

As a fully tenured professor, Allan Cowart retired in August 1985 and was appointed Professor Emeritus the following year. In April 1984, he had been back in Washington testifying to the House of Representatives Committee on Small Business. As a material mark of his impact, his encouragement to develop Procurement Assistance for Small businesses in Florida ensured that by the end of 1992 over $1 billion of contracts had been obtained through FSBDC help.

The characteristics of this former faculty member were of a person with vision, with singleness of purpose, of determination leavened with charm, humanity and understanding. A person of many intellectual attributes—one who spanned both the humanities and the sciences, a musician and a businessman, a teacher and an inspirer—a person who was fully active in community affairs until the last few days of his life.

His legacy is firmly written into the history of this University and through gratitude from thousands of small business owners whose needs he saw and ensured that they could be alleviated through University assistance to the benefit of both teaching and private enterprise.

He was a true pioneer and a major contributor to the development of the University of West Florida and as such he will be ever remembered.

TRIBUTE TO THE REVEREND AND MRS. EDDIE McDONALD

HON. BOB CARR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to celebrate a milestone in Michigan. On Saturday, March 27, friends, family, and the congregation of the Friendship Missionary Baptist Church in Pontiac, MI, will gather to celebrate the 25th pastoral anniversary of the Reverend and Mrs. Eddie McDonald. I urge my colleagues to join me in saluting this remarkable couple and in congratulating them on this momentous occasion.

I am proud to stand here today and say that no one has better and more true values than my friends, the Reverend and Mrs. McDonald. They exemplify all the finest attributes of Christian service and devoted leadership. They have dedicated their lives to spreading the word of God, and have faithfully ministered to the needs of their church and the people of our community. I am truly thankful that our community has been represented strongly through their Christian service, dedication, and hard work.

The McDonald's have spent virtually a lifetime together, forging a true union of partner-

ship in their 42 years of marriage and in their 25 years of service to the Friendship Missionary Baptist Church. Success and devotion are qualities they both possess, and these qualities shine through in their marriage, in their eight loving children, and in their contributions to their church.

On a more personal note, I am deeply grateful to have good friends like the Reverend and Mrs. McDonald. Our friendship extends over more than a decade, and words cannot describe how dear they are to me and how grateful I am to have them as friends.

I am confident that the Friendship Missionary Baptist Church will continue to thrive through their spiritual leadership and through God's abundant blessings. Again, I urge you to join me in saluting this remarkable couple, and in wishing them the best of luck and much happiness and success.

MICHAEL N. COPPOLA: MAN OF THE YEAR

HON. JACK QUINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise today on the floor of this House in recognition of Michael N. Coppola from Buffalo, NY in my district, and to congratulate him for being named Boys' Town of Italy's 1993 Man of the Year.

Mike was trained well by the Jesuits of Canisius High School and Canisius College, where he earned his B.S. degree in marketing.

Today, Mike is corporate vice president of Tops markets. But 29 years ago, in 1964, he began his career with Tops as a part-time stock clerk, and has since risen through the ranks of the organization to the position he now holds. He served his industry as a past president of the Frozen Foods Association of Western New York.

Mike's commitment extends to our entire community. Last year, he served Boys' Town as chairman of the ball of the year. Recently, as chairman of the United Way's Food Division, Mike was awarded the Jacobs Cup for achieving the greatest increase in contributions over the past year. Mike works closely with his staff at Tops to help provide leadership and important fundraising for a number of other western New York community organizations.

That commitment must come from home, for Mike is a true family man. He is the eldest of 10 children, a loving husband, and devoted father. He and his wife, Kathy, who is also very involved in service to our community through a number of organizations, are both lifelong residents of western New York. Here, they have raised their four children: Jennifer, Jill, Michelle, and Jeffrey.

Another inspiration for Mike must have been his great aunt, Eve Nelson, who was named Boys' Town Woman of the Year in 1970 in New York City. She is justifiably proud of her nephew's involvement in this fine cause today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in extending congratulations to the Boys Town of Italy Man of the Year—Mike Coppola.

VCU SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK CELEBRATES 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to a momentous day in the annals of the school of social work at Virginia Commonwealth University [VCU]. They are celebrating their 75th anniversary.

The school of social work was established in 1917, as the Richmond School of Social Economy. The name was soon changed to the Richmond School of Social Work and Public Health. One of the major reasons the school was established was to help returning veterans from World War I to be reintegrated back into society as the war concluded.

After being affiliated with the College of William and Mary, the school was one of several components of the Richmond Professional institute [RPI], which became an independent State University in 1962. RPI and the Medical College of Virginia merged and became VCU in 1968.

The school is the fifth largest school of social work in the country, and is the oldest school of its kind in the South. It is 1 of only 26 schools of social work offering a bachelors and masters degree along with a doctorate. The school's master of social work program is the largest graduate program at VCU. It has 4,666 living alumni who practice social work throughout Virginia, North America, and internationally.

The school has provided both academic and professional leadership and training, and its faculty is considered to be one of the finest in the Nation. Four hundred sixty-two field instructors supervise students doing practical field work throughout the Commonwealth and the District of Columbia, and the faculty is actively engaged in research, writing, and in the development of social work theory.

For the past 75 years, the school has provided leadership and guidance in social policy and social welfare. Its graduates serve on the front lines of both private and public social service organizations as well as in senior administrative positions in Government agencies and the nonprofit sector.

I enthusiastically commend the school of social work for its commitment to our Nation and the betterment of her people. I sincerely hope that their tremendous accomplishments will continue in the future.

TRIBUTE TO MIKE CAMPBELL

HON. JERRY F. COSTELLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Mike Campbell who is stepping down as president of the Madison County Farm Bureau. This Friday's 74th annual meeting in Edwardsville, IL, will be the last meeting Mike will chair. Mike has been involved in Madison County Farm Bureau since 1974. He was first elected to the board of directors in 1978 and has served as president since 1984.

However, Mike's involvement in farm bureau activities has not been limited to the Madison County chapter. He is known throughout Illinois for his involvement in bringing issues affecting farmers to the attention of State and national legislators and working with legislators to find logical solutions to these issues. Mike is a founding member of the Illinois Farm Bureau's activator committee and has served as vice chairman of the committee since 1986. He is also chairman of my agriculture advisory board for the 12th Congressional District.

Though he is giving up his presidency of the Madison County Farm Bureau, Mike will continue to serve on the board of directors. I am thankful for his contributions to agriculture in Madison County and throughout Illinois and wish him well as he pursues new opportunities with the farm bureau. I thank my colleagues for joining me in recognition of Mike Campbell.

FIRE PROTECTION IN HIGHRISE BUILDINGS

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, communities across the country, including mine in Louisville, KY, are taking steps to prevent the tragedy of fires in highrise buildings. In Louisville, Mayor Jerry Abramson, the Louisville Board of Aldermen, and Louisville Fire Division Chief Russell Sanders are working to enact a city ordinance which will require highrise buildings to be retrofitted with automatic sprinklers.

To advance and complement these local initiatives, I am today introducing legislation which will allow for a 15-percent tax credit for the cost of installing automatic fire sprinkler systems in existing highrise buildings which were erected before State or local building codes required sprinklers.

Building owners who retrofit structures to meet National Fire Protection Association standards would qualify for the credit for work done between December 31, 1992, and January 1, 1999.

Fighting fires in highrise buildings is extremely dangerous, and often it is impossible to extinguish highrise fires using conventional firefighting equipment, techniques, and personnel. As a consequence, lives are lost and millions of dollars of property damage is done. Examples are the recent highrise fires at the MGM Grand in Las Vegas which claimed 85 lives; at the San Juan DuPont Plaza, 96 lives, and at the Peachtree 25th Building in Atlanta, 6 lives.

Technology exists to safely, efficiently, and effectively control and extinguish fires. That technology is the automatic fire sprinkler system. National Fire Protection Association statistics show that the success rate of sprinkler systems in extinguishing fires is more than 96 percent.

The value of an automatic sprinkler system can best be illustrated by the February 1991, Meridian Plaza highrise fire in Philadelphia. In that disastrous instance, eight unsprinkled

floors were completely destroyed before the fire was extinguished at the 30th floor by nine sprinkler heads.

Louisville Fire Division Chief Russell Sanders further describes the importance of automatic sprinklers in the Louisville Courier-Journal article which follows this statement.

Providing an incentive for installing these life-saving sprinkler systems makes economic sense and saves precious lives. I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this important measure.

SPRINKLERS AND LIVES

(By Russell E. Sanders)

In November of 1980, a fire at the MGM Grand Hotel in Las Vegas left 85 people dead, over 600 injured and more than $30 million of property loss. Less than three months later, Las Vegas experienced another disastrous high-rise fire. This time, fire at the 30-story Hilton Hotel involved 22 floors and caused eight deaths, 302 civilian injuries and 48 firefighter injuries.

Then, in December 1986, a fire burned out of control at the Dupont Plaza high-rise hotel in San Juan, Puerto Rico, killing 97 occupants and injuring 140 others.

High-rise office buildings have also been ravaged by fire. In May 1988, a fire at the Interstate Bank Building in Los Angeles destroyed the 12th through 16th floors and killed one security guard, before 383 firefighters gained control. More recently, in February 1991, a fire at One Meridian Plaza in Philadelphia burned out of control for 19 hours, destroyed eight floors without sprinklers, killed three firefighters and caused property damage that is now estimated at over $1 billion.

Because the Interstate Bank fire occurred after business hours and the One Meridian fire on a Saturday, only a few people were in these buildings at the time. The loss of life would have been much greater had the fires occurred during business hours.

These are only a small sample of the tragic fires that have occurred in unsprinklered high-rise buildings in this country and abroad.

The long list of needlessly destroyed lives and property will continue to grow if we fail to act. I emphasize "needlessly" because the technology to prevent these disasters is available and affordable in the form of retrofitted automatic sprinkler systems.

In fact, the effectiveness of sprinklers was clearly demonstrated in two of the tragic fires described above. At the MGM Grand the fire moved in two directions. In one direction where no sprinkler protection existed, the fire grew uncontrolled; in the other, sprinklers stopped it cold. At One Meridian Plaza fire completely destroyed the unsprinklered 22nd through 29th floors before being extinguished at the 30th floor by nine sprinkler heads.

National Fire Protection Association statistics indicate that the success rate of sprinkler systems is better than 96 percent. In instances when sprinkler systems have failed, the failure with few exceptions was due to burn intervention—the system was shut down either prior to the fire or before complete extinguishment. Further, a multiple fatality fire has never occurred in a high-rise that was protected by a properly installed working sprinkler system.

Computer modeling of the Interstate Bank fire revealed that temperatures on the initial floor of the fire reached 1,100 degrees Fahrenheit within 11 minutes of the fire's start. Then flashover occurred—the smoke reached a temperature that radiated sufficient energy to raise exposed combustible surfaces to their ignition temperatures.

Major metropolitan fire departments all over the world have proven time and again that once flashover occurs in unsprinklered high-rise buildings, the problems of fire and smoke control become unmanageable. When firefighters are unable to control the spread of fire and smoke protecting the lives of occupants and firefighters becomes difficult, at best, and in many cases impossible.

The Kentucky Building Code defines a high-rise as having floors used for human occupancy more than 75 feet above the lowest level of access for fire department vehicles. Measurement is from grade level to the floor level of the top floor used for human occupancy.

In the City of Louisville we have counted 46 unsprinklered properties that fit this definition; five others are in Jefferson County outside the city limits. There is an approximately equal distribution between office-commercial and residential properties. Five of these properties are apartments for the elderly, managed by the Housing Authority of Louisville (HAL).

Every U.S. city that has experienced one of these tragic high-rise fires has at least one thing in common. Each reacted after the disaster by passing legislation requiring the installation of sprinkler systems in all (or selected occupancy classes of) existing high-rise buildings.

We are a progressive community; let's not wait for a tragedy and then react.

The housing authority recently received approval for a federal grant to retrofit its five high-rises with automatic sprinkler systems. Tenants and residents in the remaining 46 unsprinklered properties need this same protection and your firefighters need this help

THE VETERANS HEALTH CARE REFORM ACT OF 1993

HON. G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Veterans Health-Care Reform Act of 1993, a bill that would implement the legislative recommendations of the Commission on the Future Structure of Veterans Health Care, the so-called Mission Commission. The bill would restructure eligibility for VA health care benefits by completely revising chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code. The act contains the following major provisions:

Revises eligibility rules to provide that any veteran deemed eligible for VA care would be eligible to receive all needed care and services. Under the existing system, the rules of eligibility differ depending on the type of care the veteran needs. Currently, a veteran may be eligible for one type of service; for example, hospital care, and be ineligible for another type; for example, outpatient care.

Broadens the number of veterans with so-called mandatory eligibility for VA health-care and health-related services. It would state that VA shall furnish needed care and services to any service-connected veteran and to any nonservice-connected veteran with income below the current "means test" level. In 1993, the "means test" income level is $19,408 for a single veteran and $23,290 for a married veteran, plus $1,296 for each additional dependent. Under current law, many such veterans are not entitled to all types of care, outpatient care for example.

Broadens the types of health-related services VA shall furnish to eligible veterans to include social support, such as personal care and homemaker services. It would also clarify that VA shall furnish all eligible veterans with needed preventive health care services, respite care, hospice care, medical and prosthetic equipment and devices, and home improvements and structural alterations when appropriate.

Provides that VA shall contact for all needed care and services for eligible veterans if the department is not capable of furnishing the care or services in its facilities, or if VA facilities are geographically inaccessible.

Authorizes VA to establish a system under which veterans ineligible for cost-free VA care, as described above, could still obtain care from VA at a cost determined by the Department. It would provide for VA to be reimbursed by other Federal or State programs for care furnished to veterans with dual eligibility.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of several bills that has been introduced to change eligibility for VA health care. These bills will provide a point of reference as the committee continues to work with the administration on National Health Care reform and the continued role of the VA in such reforms.

CRS REPORT ON MEDICAL INDUSTRY PROFITS SHOWS THAT DRUG FIRMS ARE UNUSUALLY PROFITABLE

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to a recent Congressional Research Service report, which analyzed the profitability of medical industries. The report shows that between 1987 and 1991, the drug industry's profits were higher than any other medical industries and they more than doubled the profit "benchmark" of the all-manufacturing average as a percent of both equity and sales.

CRS noted that the pharmaceutical industry's ability to remain extremely profitable over the past 30 years is quite rare. The report identified some of the causes for high profitability to be market structure [oligopoly], patent protection, barriers to entry, large staffs of detailmen, and third party payers who were "less than diligent in resisting high prices."

The report hypothesizes that because drug profits are so high, there exists the possibility of "reducing prices without compromising quantity and quality of supply." I strongly agree.

This CRS report further strengthens recent congressional arguments about the practices of the drug industry and the marketplace within which they thrive.

I would like to caution you, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues about promises currently

being made by the pharmaceutical industry to voluntarily contain prices without any Government oversight. As a headline, it may sound nice. However, we need to know a great deal more.

There is no means to ensure that new drugs are priced reasonably upon their introduction. Chances are, if drug executives know that they will have to contain price increases, they will jack-up the introduction price to increase revenues.

My bill, H.R. 916, entitled the Prescription Drug Prices Review Board Act of 1993, will save money for prescription drug consumers, large and small. By increasing the availability of pricing information, allowing for drug price review and negotiation, and serving penalties on those who excessively price prescription drugs, the board will make sure the American consumer is protected from price gouging. At the same time, it will see that the U.S. pharmaceutical industry remains strong and profitable.

The drug industry continues to resist legislation which will affect their pricing decisions. Consumers and Members of Congress are tired of drug business as usual. That's where we stand today. Roy Vagelos, who has been Merck's chairman and chief executive officer, stated in the Washington Post that "in the long run, the business view must reflect the customers. If the customers start to resent you, you've got a problem." I agree.

Following is a table from the CRS study that makes clear why pricing reform is overdue.

TABLE 1.—PROFITABILITY OF DRUG INDUSTRY VS. ALL-MANUFACTURING BENCHMARKS, 1987–1991

	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	5 yr. avg.
As percent of equity						
Drugs	17.56	30.44	29.43	27.12	26.07	26.12
Benchmark—all manufacturing	12.83	16.18	13.85	10.69	6.41	11.99
As percent of sales						
Drugs	10.4	16.0	15.4	15.7	15.2	14.54
Benchmark—all manufacturing	4.9	6.0	5.0	4.0	2.5	4.47

Source.—Commerce Department Quarterly Financial Report for Manufacturing, Mining and Trade Corporations.

H.R. 1430, A BILL TO INCREASE TEMPORARILY THE STATUTORY LIMIT ON THE PUBLIC DEBT

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H.R. 1430, a bill to increase temporarily the statutory limit on the public debt.

Mr. Speaker, we have just about run out of room under the current limit. Last Thursday, March 18, I received a letter from Secretary Bentsen informing me that the Treasury Department expects to run out of cash and borrowing authority on April 7. In that letter, Secretary Bentsen requests that the Congress act quickly to enact legislation to increase the debt limit to $4,370 billion through September 30, 1993. This increase would be temporary. Therefore, after September 30, the debt limit would revert to the current level.

Secretary Bentsen emphasized in his letter the importance of enacting a debt limit increase before Congress departs for the Easter district work period, so that Social Security beneficiaries who try to cash the checks they receive at the beginning of the month will not be left high and dry. In order to comply with Secretary Bentsen's request and to accommodate the need for timely action, the Committee on Ways and Means will report H.R. 1430 to the House as quickly as possible. This will facilitate floor action and final enactment before the Congress leaves for the Easter work period. This will also allow for the smooth functioning of Government without interruption.

TRIBUTE TO THE HEBREW FREE LOAN SOCIETY

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Hebrew Free Loan Society, which is celebrating its 100th anniversary.

For the past century, the Hebrew Free Loan Society, which is located in my congressional district, has followed the age-old guiding principle of helping others to help themselves. Following this credo, the Society offers aid in the form of interest free-loans to immigrants from all over the world, and to descendants of immigrants so that they can continue to contribute to the vitality and vibrancy of the United States.

Over 1 million loans totalling more than $117 million have been granted, no strings attached, since the society was founded in 1892. With these loans, the Hebrew Free Loan Society has contributed to the financial stability and dignity of the people of the New York metropolitan area.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the commendable work of this outstanding organization and congratulate the members on its growth and success. I also wish to recognize the hard work of the Hebrew Free Loan Society under the leadership of Society president David M. Durst, vice presidents David Botwinik, Donald Flamm and Stanford Warshawsky, treasurer William Golden, secretary Judah Gribetz, executive director Arnold Teitelbaum and assistant director Michael Novick.

I call upon all my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in paying tribute to these dedicated individuals, and in wishing the Hebrew Free Loan Society another 100 years of service.

HEALTH CARE REFORM SHOULD START WITH CHILDREN AND PREGNANT WOMEN

HON. RICHARD J. DURBIN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has demonstrated how serious he is about health care reform by asking his wife, Hillary Clinton, to head the effort to develop a comprehensive health care proposal. Mrs. Clinton knows how important this issue is, especially to vulnerable populations such as our Nation's children and pregnant women.

Our Nation's health care problems are apparent. Medical prices are rising far faster than the rate of inflation. American families are being priced out of the U.S. health care system because they can't afford their health insurance premiums or the out-of-pocket costs of adequate medical care.

Millions of Americans who do have insurance are only a pink slip away from being locked out of the health insurance market because of preexisting health conditions that would limit their ability to obtain a new policy.

The number of Americans who are uninsured is growing, and children are especially likely to lack health insurance coverage and adequate health care. As many as 12 million children have no health insurance coverage, and two-thirds of them live in families above the poverty level.

Although prenatal care is one of the most critical steps to a healthy start in life, one-fourth of all pregnant women do not get adequate prenatal care. And less than half of American children receive the immunizations they should have by the age of 2.

Health care reform is essential to the well-being of every American citizen and to our Nation as a whole.

We must enact a reform package that ensures that every American has affordable health care coverage as soon as possible, starting with the population where the investment in health care coverage has the most immediate and obvious return—our children.

If we fail to provide health insurance to pregnant women and children as soon as possible, we are being penny-wise and pound-foolish. What little we save by not covering those who are our most vulnerable citizens comes back to haunt us later in preventable childhood illnesses, learning disabilities, and eventually juvenile delinquency, social services, and crime.

Mr. Speaker, we need to put an end to the patchwork health care system we have today, which leaves so many children so vulnerable. We need to enact a health care reform plan that provides coverage to everyone at a price they can afford, starting with the children. I look forward to working with President and Mrs. Clinton to make this goal a reality.

TRIBUTE TO DR. ROBERT J. STEIN ON HIS RETIREMENT AS CHIEF MEDICAL EXAMINER OF COOK COUNTY, IL

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. Robert J. Stein, on the occasion of his retirement after 17 years of distinguished service as the chief medical examiner of Cook County, IL. I ask my colleagues to join me as we recognize his many achievements.

The list of Dr. Stein's accomplishments is long and impressive. He received his medical degree from the University of Innsbruck, Austria in 1932 and his M.Sc. in pathology from Northwestern University in 1952. Since then, he has shared his wide knowledge as a member of the faculties of many distinguished institutions, including the U.S. Army Graduate Medical School and the University of Iowa Medical School. He is currently professor of clinical pathology, Stritch School of Medicine, Loyola University; adjunct professor of pathology, University of Illinois Medical Center; and professor emeritus, Northwestern University.

Dr. Stein is the author of many articles and the recipient of many awards reflecting his landmark research in forensic science and pathology. Yet he is best known to the people of Cook County as a tireless public servant who has never faltered in his commitment to improve and protect the health and well being of people. He has raised public awareness about the social costs of gun and drug related violence. He has been vigilant in his efforts to protect the public from dangerous products and environments.

We honor Dr. Stein the most for his concern for the children. He has been a crusader against child abuse. He has exposed the dangers of lead contamination to children, and he has fought to protect our most vulnerable citizens from dangerous household products. He has saved countless young lives through his efforts.

I am pleased today to honor Dr. Robert J. Stein: scientist, public servant, and humanitarian.

TRIBUTE TO DOROTHY L. DOBSON

HON. JAMES V. HANSEN

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, being an educator is one of our country's most important professions. If you name anything that is vital to our Nation's well being—a prosperous economy, personal opportunity, a sound defense—you will realize that none of these things can be achieved without educators that are effective in teaching the future leaders of our country.

I rise today in honor of Ms. Dorothy L. Dobson, an outstanding educator at the Edith Bowen Laboratory School in Logan, UT. Ms. Dobson received the National Council for the Social Studies [NCSS] teacher of the year award because of her caring attitude and exceptional teaching ability. She is a model for her colleagues and an asset for the students who have the privilege of being in her class.

Motivating and properly preparing our youth is a great responsibility and one that can be very rewarding. With the ever-increasing budget constraints on our current educational system, teachers are rising to the challenge of doing more with less. The youth of today will be better able to contribute to society through the dedicated efforts of Ms. Dobson and the many other fine teachers in our educational system. I commend Ms. Dobson on this well-deserved achievement and am honored to have such an excellent teacher in the First District of Utah.

HONORING GEORGE ROWE

HON. DAVID MANN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to thank George Rowe, the city of Cincinnati director of public works, for his 42 years of service to the citizens of Cincinnati. George is retiring on April 1, 1993.

George worked his way up from the position of draftsman to hold such positions as superintendent of convention center, Riverfront stadium manager, the director of purchasing, and finally serving 13 years as director of public works. During his tenure as director of public works, George was responsible for implementing the lion's share of the city's infrastructure restoration program, the creation of the stormwater management utility division for correcting the longstanding stormwater drainage problems in the city and the solid waste management division, and implementation of the city's curbside recycling program.

George has been a people-oriented manager who has always encouraged his employees to perform at their best. One motivational method he has championed has been to use a team building program through in-house seminars, cross-departmental training, and regular communications bulletins. George Rowe also implemented the Public Works Employee of the Year Program for recognizing outstanding job performance.

George Rowe has also been heavily involved in professional and community organizations. George is currently the regional director of the American Public Works Association and is president-elect of the association. His service to the citizens of the city has not stopped with his professional duties. He has played a very active role at Gaines Methodist Church, the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts of America, the American Red Cross, the Fine Arts Fund, and the United Negro College Fund, to name but a few groups that have benefited from his talents.

I am proud to have had the opportunity to work with George and wish him all the best as he retires from city service.

A TRIBUTE TO MORRIS HERSHMAN

HON. GEORGE E. SANGMEISTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. SANGMEISTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and respect that I rise today to pay tribute to a close friend and an outstanding resident of my district, Rabbi Morris Hershman. On March 30, Rabbi Hershman's congregation, family, and countless friends will celebrate his 50 years as the spiritual leader of the Joliet Jewish congregation, and, of no less importance, his 50 years of dedicated service to his community.

In 1943, Rabbi Hershman, a recent graduate of the Hebrew Theological College in Chicago, arrived in Joliet. Since then, he has been a leader in his own profession, as he has served on the executive committee of the Chicago Board of Rabbis, the Synagogue Council of America, and the national board of the United Jewish Appeal. He led his congregation in establishing a local memorial to the victims of the Holocaust so that ours and future generations will never forget that terrible period in world history.

Rabbi Hershman saw his role in Joliet as more than that of spiritual leader of the community's Jewish population. He felt that it was his civic obligation to reach across religious lines and work with people of all faiths to better the community that everyone shared.

He has been a teacher, role model, and activist for all children and a champion of educational causes. For years, he has served as a keynote speaker for the United Way Campaign. He has also served on the board of the Joliet Junior College Adult Education Program Advisory Council and the Boy Scouts of America. In recognition of his accomplishments, Lewis University in Romeoville and the College of St. Francis in Joliet have awarded him honorary dectorate degrees.

A champion of health causes, Rabbi Hershman served as president of the Will County Health Planning Council, the Midwest Community Health Service, and on the board of the American Red Cross. He presently chairs the board of trustees of Silver Cross Hospital in Joliet.

A gifted orator, Rabbi Hershman has been at the forefront of making local government work for all the people. He was a founding member of the Joliet Mayor's Commission of Human Relations and was a driving force in the campaign to bring the city manager form of government to Joliet.

The Rabbi has been tireless in his leadership role in civic, charitable, and professional organizations over the years. He is a past president of the Joliet Rotary Club and the Joliet Region Chamber of Commerce.

Rabbi Hershman's partner in life and in his passionate drive to better our community is his wife, Goldie. He and Goldie, a former special education teacher, raised two children who have evidently inherited their parents sense of idealism. Naomi teaches visually impaired children and Josh is an attorney. Perhaps two of Rabbi Hershman's greatest blessings are his grandchildren, Jenny and Ben.

Rabbi Hershman's extraordinary dedication to helping others mirrors the teachings of the Hebrew scholar, Maimonides. According to the teachings of Maimonides, the highest level of charity is to enable another human being to help himself. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my constituents in the 11th District of Illinois, and myself, I am proud to recognize Rabbi Morris Hershman, who has helped not merely one man to improve his circumstances, but has enabled an entire community to become stronger.

LEGISLATION TO INCLUDE THE COUNTIES OF MONTGOMERY, ROANOKE, AND ROCKBRIDGE INTO THE ARC

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support a bill that Representative RICK BOUCHER and I are introducing which would amend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 to include the Virginia counties of Montgomery, Roanoke, and Rockbridge and the contiguous, independent cities of Roanoke, Salem, Radford, Lexington, and Buena Vista as part of the Appalachian Regional Commission. I believe this legislation is vital to the Appalachian region of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

The Appalachian Regional Commission [ARC] was established in 1965 as a Federal-State partnership in economic and social development. ARC's goals have been to encourage the economic development and growth of the Appalachian region.

ARC has the mission to develop an infrastructure that will help Appalachia become economically viable and competitive. It has done so by constructing some 2,100 miles of highways, implementing recycling programs, creating vocational education facilities, and building reliable waste disposal facilities, water and sewer systems.

The three counties which we propose to add are all vital to the ultimate success of the ARC. One of them, Montgomery County, along with the indpendent city of Radford, is in Mr. BOUCHER's district to the south of Roanoke County which is the southernmost part of my district.

Montgomery County, which has a total population of 74,000 people, is geographically part of the Appalachian Region. Although it is blessed with an abundance of natural resources and creative people, it is plagued with cyclical unemployment. Despite being home to Virginia Tech and possessing the fourth highest concentration of Ph.D's per capita in the Nation, 26 percent of all Montgomery County residents aged 25 and over do not have a high school education. In some areas of the county, that figure exceeds 50 percent.

Rockbridge County, and the independent cities of Lexington and Buena Vista, which occupy the central portion of my congressional district, are bordered on the west by the counties of Allegheny, Bath, and Highland, and the cities of Clifton Forge and Covington. Lexington is home to the Virginia Military Institute and Washington and Lee University. Despite benefiting from these universities and an impressive tourism industry, the area has been plagued by many recent layoffs and plant closings. Just this past summer a bus manufacturer in Buena Vista, which was a major employer, announced that it would close its gates. The area has been crippled as a result.

Rockbridge is bordered by counties that are members of ARC and has been cooperating with its neighbors on a number of projects including a regional landfill. Rockbridge continues to explore the concept of regionalism and would like to become involved in the Appalachian Regional Recycling Consortium [ARRC]—an ARC project.

However, Rockbridge has been denied involvement in ARRC because it is not a member of ARC. As a result, the recycling effort has suffered because the participating counties are unable to supply a large enough volume of recyclable material to make the program cost-effective. The addition of Rockbridge County to the ARC could help the recycling effort become a reality.

Roanoke County and the independent cities of Roanoke and Salem could well be the linchpin between success of the ARC and its failure. With a population of approximately 200,000, the Roanoke Valley has a history of cooperative agreements and joint ventures with surrounding counties. Some of the joint opportunities the Roanoke area governments have pursued include, the further development of tourism and industrial sites along the I–81 and I–581 corridors, educational/vocational training projects, and the enhancement of water and sewer infrastructure. If admitted to the ARC, Roanoke County could combine its resources and economic vitality with its less urban neighbors to help facilitate much-needed ARC regional projects.

Clearly, if Montgomery, Roanoke, and Rockbridge Counties and the contiguous independent cities are designated as part of the ARC region there will be an enhanced opportunity to pursue these types of joint programs. The potential for combined efforts in tourism, infrastructure projects and strengthening competitiveness in attracting new businesses would be tremendous.

In addition, for the ARC to ultimately succeed in its mission to provide Appalachia with the infrastructure it needs to develop into an economically viable region, it only makes sense that these three important counties be added to its membership. Their addition will provide an essential sense of regionalism with the counties already within ARC, allowing them to work together to solve the many problems of the area. It's time to realize that city, county and even State lines are becoming less and less a barrier to cooperation.

Finally, by designating the Roanoke Valley and Montgomery County as a part of ARC, Congress will be strengthening the partnership between Western and South Western Virginia.

I urge my colleagues to support this urgently needed legislation.

FEDERAL AND POSTAL SERVICE EMPLOYEES OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ACT OF 1993

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of the 103d Congress, I introduced H.R. 115, the Federal and Postal Service Employees Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1993. This bill will extend to the millions of Federal and postal workers the same protection against unsafe and unhealthy working conditions that now applies to private sector workers.

It is a privilege for me to have introduced H.R. 115. Nothing is more important to me than the welfare and rights of the nation's working men and women. This commitment is demonstrated by my longtime sponsorship of the Family and Medical Leave Act, the Striker Replacement Act and the Hatch Act Reform bill. H.R. 115 deals with the physical welfare of workers. In this day and age there is simply no excuse for the amount of death, injury, pain, and suffering in this country from occupational injuries. When is happens in the private sector, it is inexcusable and unproductive. When it happens in the Federal workplace, it borders on criminal. As a matter of public policy, there is no place for secondhand safety standards and slipshod enforcement in the offices and facilities of the U.S. Government.

For too, too long Federal and postal workers have been not received the same level of protection as workers do in the private sector under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970. Neither all of the protection nor any of the enforcement mechanisms of the original act apply in the Federal workplace.

The bill has two major thrusts:

First, my bill—like the one that former Representative Sikorski introduced last Congress covering Federal workers—proposes that each agency establish safety and health programs and safety and health committees in each worksite. Federal workers and managers should make workplace safety an important part of their jobs. I hope to accomplish this by requiring every agency to establish and carry out a comprehensive safety and health program to eliminate hazards and reduce occupational illnesses and injuries in each worksite. My bill also requires Federal agencies and the Postal Service to create worksite safety and health committees. With representatives from both the agency and nonmanagement employees, the committees will be the forum for solving workplace safety problems and for identifying and correcting hazards on an ongoing basis.

Second, the bill extend OSHA health and safety standards to Federal agencies and the postal service and authorizes OSHA to enforce them in Federal and postal workplace. This is a major step forward. In essence, the same kind of tools currently available to the Secretary of Labor to enforce safety and health standards in the private sector will be available to the Secretary for enforcement in the Federal sector. While fines and penalties will be an important part of the Secretary's enforcement tools, I am mindful of the effect that fines may have on jobs. Therefore, H.R. 115 contains language expressing the sense of the Congress that agencies should not pay finds out of funds appropriated for salaries. The bill also creates the Federal Occupational Safety and Health training fund. Any fines paid by an agency to the Secretary will be deposited in the fund and used to pay for agency safety and health education programs.

In closing, I look forward to working with the Clinton administration, employee organizations, and other interested parties on this issue. I am confident that working together Federal and Postal Service employee occupational safety and health will get the attention it deserves this Congress.

TRIBUTE TO THE CLINTON TOWNSHIP POLICE DEPARTMENT

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the dedicated men and women who honorably serve in the Clinton Township Police Department. The Clinton Township Police Department has served the community well in protecting the health, safety, and welfare of the citizens.

Four Clinton Township Constables were organized into a police department in May 1964. The constables patrolled Clinton Township on weekends in an attempt to reduce traffic accidents. In July 1965, a volunteer police department was approved by the Clinton Township Board. The volunteer police department consisted of 20 auxiliary officers.

The community voiced its approval of the police department and its distinguished members on April 1, 1968, by approving a tax increase to form a full-time police department. The police department started operations with one chief of police, 19 police officers, and 22 reserve officers. Their duty was to patrol approximately 30 square miles and protect 40,000 residents. Current Chief of Police Robert Smith was promoted to his position in 1972. In 1975, the police department moved from its original location to its present location.

After starting with four dedicated Constables, the Clinton Township Police Department today consists of 89 sworn officers whose mission is to serve, defend, and protect the approximately 90,000 residents of Clinton Township.

I commend the officers of the Clinton Township Police Department for their years of dedicated service to our community. And I ask that my colleagues join me in saluting the accomplishments of the Clinton Township Police Department. We can all feel safer knowing that the valiant officers of the Clinton Township Police Department are always close, always prepared, and always ready to help.

A TRIBUTE TO DOUG BUFFONE

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday night, the Greater Chicago UNICO Chapter will honor a great Chicagoan, Doug Buffone, a father, a businessman, a sportscaster, and of course, a 14-year linebacker for the Chicago Bears.

Doug grew up in Pennsylvania, acquiring an early zest for sports, including baseball, football, and basketball. Upon graduating from high school in 1962, Doug was scouted by Tommy Lasorda to play for the Los Angeles Dodgers. He passed up the opportunity in order to attend the University of Louisville where he earned a degree in marketing. It was at Louisville that Doug's skill on the football field led to a berth on the All America team of 1966. His college career included appearances in the Senior Bowl, the Blue-Gray Bowl, and the college All-Star game.

In 1966, George Halas, the legendary owner and manager of the Chicago Bears, drafted Doug to play for the team. Little did anyone know that Doug's career with the Bears would last a record 14 seasons. As a linebacker he holds the record for the most interceptions, 24. His teammates include a Who's Who of Hall of Famers including Gale Sayers, Dick Butkus, Alan Page, Mike Ditka, Doug Atkins, Dan Hampton, and Walter Payton.

Since his retirement from football in 1980, Doug has proven to be just as successful in business as he was in football. He is a regular sports analyst and the host of his own weekly sports show. From 1986 to 1989, he was director of development for arena football. He is a member of the Chicago Sports Hall of Fame, and the National Italian Sports Hall of Fame.

Doug is the father of four children and has been married to his wife, Dana, for 7 years.

Doug, let me join you and you many friends in extending my congratulations and warmest wishes for a great career and a brilliant future.

NORTH AMERICAN ENVIRONMENTAL, LABOR, AND AGRICULTURAL STANDARDS ACT OF 1993 AND THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE ENVIRONMENTAL, LABOR, AND AGRICULTURAL STANDARDS ACT OF 1993

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, in May 1991, the House had a heated debate on whether to grant then-President Bush's request for fast-track authority to negotiate a North American Free-Trade Agreement with Mexico and Canada. By a narrow margin that authority was extended until June 1, 1993. A shift of 20 votes would have resulted in a different outcome on that comparatively narrow process question. But it was crystal clear during that debate that many House Members, fast-track supporters as well as fast-track opponents, have profound concerns about the unfair trade and investment implications and the economic dislocations certain to result from vastly different environmental, labor, agricultural, safety, and other trade-related standards and their enforcement among the three countries.

In a nutshell, the currently negotiated agreement is quite inadequate for meeting these concerns. Yes, former President Bush's negotiators were very willing to conduct general briefings on Capitol Hill and that readiness was appreciated as far as it went. But the key point is that President Bush's negotiators did not take seriously the advice offered by many Members of Congress for tackling our legitimate concerns about this unprecedented trade agreement among countries at dramatically different levels of economic development.

To his credit, President Clinton has committed to negotiating and securing supplementary NAFTA-related agreements on trade-related labor and environmental standards and on import surges as well as a more open and representative dispute resolution mechanism.

Toward these ends, I am introducing today two companion bills that provide a roadmap for attaining such provisions. The underlying rationale for these two bills, The North American Environmental, Labor, and Agricultural Standards Act of 1993 and the Western Hemisphere Environmental, Labor, and Agricultural Standards Act of 1993, is explained more fully in an article that I authored in the spring, 1992 edition of the World Policy Journal, a copy of which I'd be glad to provide to you upon request.

My bills amend U.S. trade law to provide a framework for intrinsically linking trade-related standards to any NAFTA or future free-trade agreements. They will provide a statutory yardstick by which to substantively measure what progress our trade negotiators are making to secure effective provisions in relation to the impending NAFTA and future trade agreements on the legitimate trade-related labor, environmental, agricultural, and other concerns shared by us and so many of our constituents.

The highlights of the NAFTA bill, and its Western Hemisphere counterpart, are the following:

Proposes enforceable, fundamental worker rights and labor, environmental, and agricultural standards, for example, freedom of association and full public disclosure of toxic chemical and hazardous substance discharges, to be organically linked to any NAFTA;

Proposes that the systematic denial or violation of those rights and standards in any of the three NAFTA countries, as a means of gaining a competitive advantage in trade, be treated as an actionable unfair trade practice;

Provides for the establishment of a trinational dispute resolution mechanism to enforce the terms of any NAFTA and related agreements and to adjudicate trade disputes arising from those agreements, including unfair trade practice petitions filed by governments or informed nongovernmental parties in any of the three countries, including those involving systematic violation of agreed-upon continental labor, environmental, and agricultural standards; and

Authorizes technical assistance to bring scientific and technological expertise to bear in resolving NAFTA trade disputes and facilitating continental solutions to trade-related environmental and workplace safety and health problems across national borders.

Fundamentally, this legislation seeks to move the NAFTA-related negotiations and the corresponding trade debate within the Congress to a more specific, results-oriented footing that tackles the basic labor, environmental, and agricultural concerns shared by so many of our constituents as well as Mexicans, Canadians, and others throughout the hemisphere. In developing this legislation, I have been in direct communication with knowledgeable people inside and outside of the Mexican and Canadian Governments and elsewhere. It will allow Members of Congress for the first time to chart a specific, positive course of action to take in organically weaving labor rights and environmental, agricultural, and other trade-related standards into any NAFTA or other trade agreement.

THE NAVAL RESERVE'S "CAMPAIGN DRUG FREE"

HON. G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues a letter I received from Rear Adm. Tom Hall, Chief of the Naval Reserve, concerning their national antidrug efforts. The letter reads in part as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington, DC, March 15, 1993.

Hon. G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MONTGOMERY: I am writing to provide you with some additional information on the Naval Reserve's National Anti-Drug efforts that I briefly presented to you and your colleagues at the Congressional Breakfast on March 9, 1993. On behalf of the Naval Reserve, your interest in this area of major national concern is deeply appreciated. Naval Reservists have stepped forward to defend America since the War for Independence. I am proud to say that they are stepping forward again to help fight another desperate enemy—illegal drugs.

Naval Reserve ships and aircraft have been conducting intensive drug interdiction operations, which attack the "supply" side of the drug problem, for several years. This effort involves the detection and monitoring of the illegal international drug trade on the high seas and in international airspace, as well as the transportation of law enforcement detachments necessary for the boarding of ships, seizure of illegal drugs and arrest of international drug smugglers. More recently, we have begun attacking the "demand" side.

Campaign Drug Free, the Naval Reserve's Anti-Drug Information Program, is completely manned by Reservist volunteers who carry a simple message to a school-aged audience: you don't need drugs to be happy and successful! Perhaps even more than their active duty counterparts, Reservists are extraordinarily well-suited for this grassroots, community program—in addition to being members of the Navy, with its zero tolerance for drug abuse, they are recognized, motivated community members with a personal interest in seeing that their communities are free of illegal drugs.

The Naval Reserve is joined by the Marine Corps and Coast Guard Reserves in this effort, and is also getting a boost from '60's teen idol Frankie Avalon, who has completed a Campaign Drug Free Public Service announcement for television. Another celebrity supporter is Lieutenant Commander Drew Brown, a Naval Reservist whose "stay in school—stay free of drugs" motivational message is known to many thousands of school children around the country. Plans are underway to utilize Lieutenant David Robinson, USNR, Naval Academy graduate and NBA star of the San Antonio Spurs to assist in this effort.

My Campaign Drug Free National Coordinator is Captain Bob Erbetta, telephone (703) 694-8378/695-5588. Thank you for your continued interest in and strong support of our nation's Naval Reserve.

Sincerely,

T.F. HALL,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy, Director of Naval Reserve.

THE VOTING RIGHTS OF HOMELESS CITIZENS ACT OF 1993

HON. JOHN LEWIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Voting Rights of Homeless Citizens Act of 1993. This bill will protect the voting rights of homeless citizens.

No one should be excluded from registering to vote just because they don't have a home. But in many States they are.

Before the civil rights movement, African Americans were denied the right to vote. There were areas in the South where 50 to 80 percent of the population was black. Yet, there was not a single registered black voter.

On January 4, 1965, President Lyndon Johnson said, "I propose that we eliminate every remaining obstacle to the right and opportunity to vote." Eight months later—after Bloody Sunday—President Johnson signed into law the Voting Rights Act of 1965. As a result, millions of citizens are now able to vote.

The results have been impressive. But, we still have a long way to go to make sure that every citizens is properly represented on Capital Hill, in the State house, on the city council, and on the country commission.

I commend those of you who are working to make sure that everyone has the right to vote. I urge my colleagues in the House to join me in cosponsoring the Voting Rights for Homeless Citizens Act of 1993.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK NAPIER

HON. HERB KLEIN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay special tribute to Frank Napier, Jr., one of New Jersey's finest leaders in education. Mr. Napier has retired from the Paterson Public School System after 35 years of dedicated service.

"I became involved in education because I could not understand why schools should be boring, unexciting, nonmotivating places where young people are sent to spend their growing years," is a statement by Mr. Napier that eloquently illustrates his commitment of creating a positive learning environment for the children of Paterson.

Born and raised in Paterson, NJ, Mr. Napier became it's first African-American superintendent. Being superintendent to New Jersey's third largest school system, with a multicultural student body of more than 25,000 that collectively speaks 30 different languages was a tremendous job that Mr. Napier excelled at.

Mr. Napier was also a teacher. He was an adjunct professor at William Paterson College and an elementary school teacher earlier in his career. As Henry Adams once said, "a teacher effects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops."

I know for a fact that Mr. Napier has contributed countless hours to preparing individuals for productive and successful futures. His influence has reached far beyond the borders of Paterson, NJ. I am just one voice of many that is reaching out to say thanks to a man who has given so much of his time and energy to our community.

I wish Mr. Napier the very best in his retirement years. His leadership throughout the community and his commitment to excellence in education shall not be forgotten. I thank my colleagues for joining me in saluting Frank Napier, Jr.

MINERAL INSTITUTES REAUTHORIZATION

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to reauthorize the Mining and Mineral Resources Research Institute Act of 1984.

Under this act, 30 universities and colleges throughout the Nation receive allotment grants through the U.S. Bureau of Mines to support basic research and education in the mining and minerals sciences and engineering fields.

In addition, six generic mineral technology centers comprised of university consortiums receive research grants under the act to promote the advancement of technology in the areas of mine systems design and ground control, comminution, pyrometallurgy, mineral industry waste treatment and recovery, marine mineral technology, and respirable dust. Meanwhile, a seventh generic center, for strategic resources mineral technology, while authorized by Public Law 101–498, has yet to be established.

The authorization for the Mineral Institutes program expires at the end of fiscal year 1994. Under the Mining and Mineral Resources Research Institute Amendments of 1993 the program would be reauthorized for an additional 5 fiscal years at existing levels of budget authority. The legislation also calls for a review of the eligibility and activities of the institutes and generic centers. Finally, the bill would authorize the establishment of two new generic centers in the fields of mine health and safety and metallic/non-metallic mining reclamation.

DISTINGUISHED TEAM RECOGNIZED

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing and congratulating the Rhinelander High School mock trial team for winning their fifth State championship in the last 6 years. The State tournament was held in Madison on March 14 and 15. Rhinelander successfully argued their side of the case in several rounds of competition including the championship round before six

State supreme court justices. Winning the State tournament means that Rhinelander was judged to be the best out of over 150 teams competing statewide. In the 10 years that mock trial has been a high school activity in Wisconsin, Rhinelander has won the State tournament 5 years.

The Hodags will now travel to Atlanta, GA, and represent the State of Wisconsin in the national tournament, where they will try to become the only team in history to win two national titles. Rhinelander won the national tournament in 1989 at Louisville, KY.

Kathy Vick-Martini, a social studies teacher and the coach of this fine group of young men and women, has demonstrated how hard work and dedication can give a small town team the edge over big city, rich suburban powerhouses. Hopefully, they will continue this success in Atlanta.

Congratulations and good luck to the team members and coaches:

Members: Pat Adams, Jason Carriere, Kevin Crumley, George DeMet, Kelly Drayton, Vanessa Newburn, Dane Rasmussen, and Sheila Vanney.

Attorney coaches: Ann Munninghoff, Mike Roe, Jim Jacobi, and Melissa Hilken.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY JAGUARS BASKETBALL TEAM

HON. CLEO FIELDS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and pride that I take this opportunity to congratulate an outstanding group of young men from Southern University in Baton Rouge, LA.

The Southern University Jaguars won their first NCAA tournament game in six tries. Last Friday, they beat fourth-seeded Georgia Tech 93 to 78.

It is a great example of hard work and determination. The Jaguars were not expected to get that far. After a season of ups and downs, they were not the favorite going into the Southwestern Athletic Conference tournament.

But they ended up beating Jackson State. As SWAC champions, they headed to Tuscon, AZ, for the NCAA tournament. Many expected them to return home immediately following the game against Atlantic Coast Conference champions Georgia Tech. That did not happen.

In a stunning game, they eliminated that team. Although they did not advance any further, our community is extremely proud and honored to call these young men our own. That was evident by the hundreds who turned out to greet the team at the Baton Rouge Airport.

Once again, I want to congratulate head coach Ben Jobe and everyone associated with the entire basketball program for a fine season.

THE CANYON FERRY RECREATION, TOURISM, AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT

HON. PAT WILLIAMS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to implement the agreement between my State and the Federal Government on the future management of the Canyon Ferry Reservoir in Montana. Canyon Ferry is one of Montana's most important recreation attractions, and this legislation will set into motion plans to both upgrade the facilities at Canyon Ferry, and to assure the continuance of recreation opportunities over the long term.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, is that the State has simply not had the resources to properly maintain and improve the recreation sites at Canyon Ferry Reservoir. Reliance on State funds alone to manage this 48,000 acre recreation area is simply not doing the job, and the State has formally notified the Bureau of Reclamation that it will abandon its role at Canyon Ferry unless additional Federal funds and management expertise are brought in. This bill reflects the outcome of negotiations between the State, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Bureau of Reclamation to solve this problem and to allow BLM to bring its considerable expertise in recreation management to Canyon Ferry. It also provides an avenue for Federal funds to be applied to the maintenance of the recreation sites at the area.

Under this legislation the Bureau of Land Management will become the lead agency at Canyon Ferry, overseeing management of the public lands and the recreation facilities, with the cooperation and assistance of the State of Montana. The Bureau of Reclamation will continue its historic role in managing water flows through the reservoir.

This agreement, and this bill, enjoys strong, broad based support in Montana. This bill is supported by the Lewis and Clark and Broadwater County Commissions, the Helena and Townsend Chambers of Commerce, the Canyon Ferry Recreation Association, Trout Unlimited, Ducks Unlimited, and Good Sam Club, the Prickly Pear Sportsmen's Association, and the Broadwater Lake and Stream Improvement Commission.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation could provide real economic benefits for Montana as well. About one-fourth of the 200,000 visitors to Canyon Ferry were from out of State, and these visitors are believed to have spent $5 million on Montana goods and services. Canyon Ferry is the State's most heavily fished reservoir; with the improvements that could accrue with this bill, the reservoir could be one of the best water recreation sites in the Northwest. But we need to maintain roads, put in water wells, upgrade toilet facilities, build docks, boat launches, and parking lots, and much more. This legislation makes the Federal Government an appropriate partner in the management of this important resource, and so I urge its passage.

IN HONOR OF LOUIS JOHNSON, JR.

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a selfless community leader and constituent, Mr. Louis Johnson, Jr., who has provided 50 years of service to the commercial, social, civic, and religious community of Orland.

A retired shoe merchant, Mr. Johnson began his career in 1945 at Johnson's Family Shoes, a business started in 1914 by his father as a shoe repair shop on Walker Street in Orland. The business, moved in the early 1940's to its present location on Fourth Street in Orland, is one of the few firms with over 50 years of activity in Orland.

There are now 22 Johnson's Family Shoes stores in California, as well as stores in Oregon, Nevada, Iowa, and Nebraska. However, Orland remains the home base for the entire operation—a testment to Mr. Johnson's community loyalty.

Presently, the business is under a third generation of family leadership in Mr. Johnson's sons: Don, Marty, and Scott. In daughter Barbara and his eight grandchildren, Mr. Johnson is assured that the business has a large cast of support.

Mr. Johnson joined his father in the shoe business after returning from Army Air Force service. It was while on company business in Chicago 46 years ago that Mr. Johnson met his bride-to-be, Ann, who remains loyally at his side today. At the time they met, shoes were selling for as much as $5.95 and there was talk that they would be as much as $10 by 1950. Today, as an example of change, tennis shoes sell for as much as $200.

Outside of his business, Mr. Johnson was and continues to be involved in the Orland community. He is a charter member, foundation benefactor, Paul Harris fellow and past president of the Orland Rotary Club; past chairman of the local chapter of the American Red Cross; a board member for the area Salvation Army; and he served for 10 years on the Orland City Council. Mr. Johnson also holds membership in the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Currently, he is chairman pastor of the parish relations committee for the Orland Federated Church, and is vice chairman of the board of directors for Glenn General Hospital.

Mr. Johnson has a life-long relationship with the Boy Scouts of America [BSA], having been a Cub Scout and Master, chairman of membership enrollment for the Hamilton City/Orland Area and Mt. Lassen Area BSA, and was the recipient of the Scout's Silver Beaver Award, which is the highest-ranking award presented by the Scouting organization in the north State area. He is presently chairman of a fundraising campaign to benefit scouting.

I join my colleagues today in honoring Mr. Johnson for his many years of service to the Orland community and I wish him much happiness and continued success in all his future endeavors.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CITY OF LACONIA, NH

HON. WILLIAM H. ZELIFF, JR.

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, today is a special day in the city of Laconia, NH, for it was on this day, 100 years ago, on March 23, 1893, that Laconia was granted a charter by the New Hampshire State Legislature to become a city.

Laconia, the "City on the Lakes," was first settled by native Americans who recognized the value of the area surrounding Lake Winnipesaukee as a source of abundant food, good shelter, and ease of mobility. Weirs Beach in Laconia received its name from the ingenuity of the Indians in constructing the weirs—fences set in a waterway for catching fish—to provide food for their settlement.

While a colonial exploring party visited the Weirs in 1652—leaving its initials on Endicott Rock at Weirs Beach—the French and Indian War prevented a permanent settlement by European settlers until well into the 1700's. Gilmanton, on the east side of the Winnipesaukee River, was incorporated in 1727, and Meredith Bridge, now downtown Laconia, was established in 1761. In 1855, the present Laconia was incorporated when Meredith Bridge and the surrounding communities of Lakeport, Weirs, and a portion of Gilmanton were all combined into the existing township.

In 1893, industry and the town had grown to such an extent that the citizens petitioned the Legislature and the settlement became the city of Laconia.

Laconia grew steadily through the turbulent years of the Spanish-American War, World War I, the Depression, and World War II. Agriculture and timber formed the basis of the economy early on, but were gradually replaced by manufacturing, tourism, and service industries. Heavy industry has declined since World War II, with light manufacturing and high-technology industries taking its place. The tourism industry has maintained a solid foothold in the region, and has been supplemented by financial, professional, and service segments of the economy.

Laconia continues to successfully promote her recreational opportunities and tourist attractions. In the summer, boating, swimming, fishing, waterskiing, picnicking, hiking, camping, golf, and other family activities are a few of the reasons why so many come to Laconia. Of course, Laconia's attractions in the winter are well known to the region's skiers, as are other opportunities to participate in wintertime sports, such as ice fishing, snowmobiling, skating, and sled-dog racing. The World Championship Sled Dog Derby, run by the Lakes Region Sled Dog Club, occurs every February and attracts world-class teams from the across the United States, Canada, and abroad.

Belknap Mill, which is listed in the National Register of Historic Landmarks, represents the major historical point of interest in Laconia. Built in 1832, it is the oldest, most unaltered brick textile mill in the United States. The bell at the mill was cast by George Holbrook, an apprentice of Paul Revere. The mill's early 1900's wheelhouse, whose water-powered wheels supplied electricity to the city, is the last of its kind in America. The mill was restored and is run by the Belknap Mill Society as a nonprofit civic, educational, and cultural center.

Laconia also takes pride in the many other cultural opportunities supported by the community, including the Laconia Putnam Fund Lecture Series, the New Hampshire Music Festival, and many local theater and musical organizations.

Mr. Speaker, Mayor Fitzgerald and the people of Laconia have good reason to take pride in the rich heritage of their city, and I join with them in paying tribute to the spirit, hard work, and vision of the city's ancestors. And I am confident that when Laconia celebrates its bicentennial 100 years from now—and another Member of Congress stands here in the well to pay tribute to the city—our grandchildren and great-grandchildren will look back upon another 100 years filled with optimism and prosperity.

THE SYRACUSE BLITZ NAMED NATIONAL INDOOR SOCCER CHAMPIONS

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1993

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of outstanding individual team performance.

The under-12 boys soccer team, the Syracuse Blitz, has triumphed at the national championships held in Atlanta, GA, March 12–14, 1993. They have truly earned the title "National Indoor Soccer Champions."

These young men have earned the recognition of my colleagues. The team consists of Anthony Habayeb, Michael Spadaro, Gregory Tait, Laurence Franks, Robert Hammer, Darek Popovich, Brian Pilger, Brian Tuttle, Brian Bome, Colby Sill, Ashtian Holmes, Jasin Lord, Matthew Loucy, Brenden Causgrove, and David Keegan.

Their victory is shared by the Syracuse community. I am especially grateful to the adults whose efforts have made this championship possible: Camille A. Habayeb, president of the Syracuse Blitz; Patrick Franks, coach; Vincent Spadaro, assistant coach; and Rick Tait, team manager. They are to be commended for their efforts. The parents of these children are also to be commended for supporting the youth of our community by providing activities which develop teamwork and cooperation, skills which will last a lifetime.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, March 25, 1993, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 26

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings on the nominations of Terrence R. Duvernay Sr., of Georgia, to be Deputy Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Jean Nolan, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and Lawrence H. Summers, of Washington, D.C., to be an Under Secretary of the Treasury.

SD–538

Governmental Affairs

Federal Services, Post Office, and Civil Service Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine firearms import licensing and policies.

SD–342

MARCH 29

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1994 for energy and water development programs.

SD–192

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1994 for energy and water development programs.

SD–192

MARCH 30

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1994 for energy and water development programs.

SD–192

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on the science of global climate change.

SD–366

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1994 for foreign assistance.

SD–G50

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1994 for energy and water development programs.
SD–192

MARCH 31

9:30 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings to examine Federal and State relations in implementing United States environmental laws.
SD–406

Veterans' Affairs
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of AMVETS, the Veterans of World War I, the Vietnam Veterans of America, the American Ex-Prisoners of War, the Non Commissioned Officers Association, and the National Association of Uniformed Services.
345 Cannon Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1994 for the Department of Commerce.
SR–253

1:30 p.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the cost and other factors affecting the health care choices of veterans.
SR–418

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1994 for energy and water development programs.
SD–192

APRIL 1

9:30 a.m.
Armed Services
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1994 for the Department of Defense, and to review the future years defense plan.
SH–216

Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the impact of the North American Free Trade Agreement on the American work force.
SD–342

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1994 for the Federal Highway Administration, focusing on implementation of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act.
SD–116

Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings to examine proposals to abolish the Council on Environmental Quality.
SD–406

2:00 p.m.
Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To resume hearings to examine corruption in the professional boxing industry.
SD–342

APRIL 20

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1994 for foreign assistance, focusing on sustainable development goals and strategies.
SD–138

APRIL 21

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1994 for the Department of Transportation.
SD–192

APRIL 22

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Renewable Energy, Energy Efficiency, and Competitiveness Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on opportunities and barriers to commercialization of renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies.
SD–366

APRIL 27

9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine environmental problems in the Federal Government.
SD–342

MAY 4

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine foreign assistance and U.S. international economic and commercial interests.
SD–138

MAY 6

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1994 for the Federal Aviation Administration, focusing on procurement reform.
SD–138

MAY 11

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine foreign assistance and U.S. foreign policy and security interests.
SD–138

MAY 13

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1994 for the U.S. Coast Guard, focusing on marine safety.
SD–138

MAY 18

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine foreign assistance and transnational issues, focusing on population, environment, health, narcotics, and anti-terrorism issues.
SD–138

MAY 25

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on foreign assistance and the transition to democracy in the former Soviet Union and eastern Europe.
SD–138

MAY 27

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1994 for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, focusing on drunk driving.
SD–138

JUNE 8

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1994 for foreign assistance.
SD–138

POSTPONEMENTS

MARCH 30

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on S. 447, to facilitate the development of Federal policies with respect to those territories under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior.
SD–366