



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 142

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 16, 1996

No. 69

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 16, 1996.

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

NEWT GINGRICH.
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

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

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. DOGGETT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

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

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 102-246, the Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader, appoints Julie Finley, of Washington, DC, as a member of the Library

of Congress Trust Fund Board, effective June 30, 1996, vice Edwin L. Cox.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

A POP QUIZ

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H5185

CONTINUING THE QUIZ

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

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

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

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

PASS THE KASICH BUDGET

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

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

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

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

DOLE LEAVES EXTREMIST CONGRESS

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I heard what my colleague from Arizona just said. The bottom line is the President is not leaving. He is not going any-

where, because he has to stay here and protect the average American from the hurt that is being inflicted by this Republican extremist Congress. What BOB DOLE knew and we all know is that he could not stick around because, after this budget was unveiled again last week, the one we are going to be voting on again, he realized that the same old song, if you will, of cutting Medicare, cutting Medicaid, trying to cut back on education and also on environmental protection was not something that the American public wanted to hear. They realize that they are being hurt severely by this Republican plan.

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

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

PROMISES KEPT

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, Bill Clinton is fooling the American people by saying that he is reforming the Government and cutting down on big Government spending.

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

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

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

DOLE LEAVING SCENE OF THE CRIME

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, BOB DOLE can run but he cannot hide. For

the last year and a half, BOB DOLE has led this Congress to cut Medicare, cut education, destroy the environment, attack a woman's right to choose, and pander to the gun lobby.

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

MEDICARE

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

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

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

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

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

CORRECT THE TRADE IMBALANCE

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

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

The truth is the White House is talking like John Wayne and performing like Barney Fife. There is only one way to get the attention of these Chinese dictators that are destroying American

jobs, and that is a 2 by 4 right between the eyes. Neither party will balance the budget as long as we compete for \$5 an hour jobs.

REPEAL GAS TAX INCREASE

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the worst thing is that this tax increase especially hurts lower income families. According to the Joint Economic Committee, the lowest 20 percent of taxpayers pay 7.1 percent of their income on gasoline while the top 20 percent pay only 1.6 percent. In other words, lower income families in America pay four times as much as others. I strongly urge the repeal of this tax.

ESCAPING A FAILED CONGRESS

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

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

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

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

□ 0930

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

REJECT BUDGET REHASH

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

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

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

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

WE MUST PROTECT MEDICARE WHILE SLOWING ITS GROWTH

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

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

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

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

LEAVING CONGRESS

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

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

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

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

ATTACK WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE IN MEDICARE

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the key to the solution is to attack waste, fraud, and abuse. We need to spend smarter. If we can just slow the growth of Medicare by spending smarter, we can save the system and give seniors in Maine and across the country a better program. But what we cannot do is make Medicare a partisan issue.

COMMITMENT TO A BALANCED BUDGET

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Well, candidate Clinton became President Clinton and that one-time champion of the middle-class soon began singing an altogether different tune. This Congress passed a middle-class tax cut; 89 percent of that tax cut would go to families earning under \$75,000 per year. President Clinton said no and vetoed it. He called it a tax cut for the rich.

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

MAKING A DIFFERENCE BY LEAVING

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

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

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

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

STOP DRUG PRODUCTION AT ITS SOURCE

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

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

If we really wanted to deal with the drug problem, we would attack it not only here in our country and at the borders but at its source. In Peru and Bolivia, 90 percent of the world's coca is produced. Ninety percent, we know exactly where it is grown. We could take U.S. airplanes and use environmentally safe herbicides and fly over the fields and drop them, and within 1 to 2 weeks knock out 90 percent of the world's coca and crack. And yet we do not do it.

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

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

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

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1997

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 435

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 178) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1997 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002. No further general debate shall be in order. The concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. No amendment shall be in order except those designated in section 2 of this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order designated, may be offered only by the Member designated or a designee (except that if no Member offers the amendment designated in paragraph (3) of section 2, then that amendment shall nevertheless be considered as pending at this point), shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against the amendments designated in section 2 are waived except that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment and a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the Committee

shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 0945

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

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

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this budget resolution is to set overall national priorities in how we spend the taxpayers' money. It is not the place to haggle over the details of Federal spending. The opportunity for

that will come later in the appropriation bills; and, of course, the reconciliation bills that will be brought up during June and July.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Since the debt limit has already been set, it will not be necessary to have a

further increase until at least October 1997. By that time the House will have adopted the third year budget of our glidepath to a balanced budget over a 7-year period. And if we have in any way veered off that glidepath, I, for one, will lead the fight and will refuse to vote for any increase in the debt limit. I have only done it once in 18 years and, hopefully, will never have to do it again.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the budget resolution itself, first I want to commend the Committee on the Budget and particularly the gentleman from Ohio, Chairman KASICH, for making the tough choices necessary to keep this Government on the glidepath to a balanced budget. In the past there have been efforts to reach a balanced budget by setting statutory deficit reduction levels, for example in the Gramm-Rudman statute, but the Democrat-controlled Congress proved unable to stick to the glidepath toward a balanced budget over that 5-year period back in 1985. The urge to spend was just too strong.

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

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

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

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

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

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

This budget also takes into consideration the debt we all owe our Nation's veterans for defending the country in

time of war. I spent 10 years on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and served as its ranking member, and this, to me, is so terribly important, particularly when we see the World War II veterans, veterans like the gentleman from Kansas, BOB DOLE, who left his job when he was a young man and went to war to save his country.

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

In this budget for the veterans it recommends \$5.1 billion more than President Clinton for Veterans' Affairs spending, which is principally for hospital, for outpatient care, medical care. It calls for improvements to the Veterans Administration mandatory programs, including things like an increase in auto allowances for certain severely disabled veterans and improved compensation payments for surviving spouses.

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

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

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

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

Federal Government, particularly that part that is inside this beltway today.

Why is a balanced budget so terribly important? I see some Members on that side of the aisle who strongly support a balanced budget, the gentleman from Utah, [Mr. ORTON] as well. It means their children and our children will not have to spend the rest of their lives under an ever-increasing crushing burden of interest payments. Today we have a \$5 trillion debt that has accumulated over the years. To pay for the interest, just the annual interest, the yearly interest on that \$5 trillion today is costing as much, almost, as we spend on our national defense budget. The real reason we need a Federal Government is to provide for a common defense for our States, and we spend almost as much on interest as we spend on the defense of our country, \$250 billion.

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

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

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

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

□ 1000

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

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

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

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

some fiscal sanity and an end to this sea of red ink which is literally bankrupting not only the Government but local governments as well, and the private sector even more so.

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

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

[As of May 15, 1996]

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

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

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

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

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

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of May 15, 1996]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350-71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255-172 (1/25/95).
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PO: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PO: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282-144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252-175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253-165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271-151 (3/2/95).
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO			A: voice vote (3/6/95).
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: 257-155 (3/7/95).
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			A: voice vote (3/8/95).
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Approps	PO: 234-191 A: 247-181 (3/9/95).
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: 242-190 (3/15/95).
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/28/95).
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: voice vote (3/21/95).
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 217-211 (3/22/95).
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: 423-1 (4/4/95).
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: voice vote (4/6/95).
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 228-204 (4/5/95).
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: 253-172 (4/6/95).
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/2/95).
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: voice vote (5/9/95).
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: 414-4 (5/10/95).
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	PO: 252-170 A: 255-168 (5/17/95).
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	A: 233-176 (5/23/95).
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1817	MilCon Appropriations FY 1996	PO: 225-191 A: 233-183 (6/13/95).
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	PO: 223-180 A: 245-155 (6/16/95).
H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)	O	H.R. 1868	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996	PO: 232-196 A: 236-191 (6/20/95).
H. Res. 171 (6/22/95)	O	H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996	PO: 221-178 A: 217-175 (6/22/95).
H. Res. 173 (6/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 79	Flag Constitutional Amendment	A: voice vote (7/12/95).
H. Res. 176 (6/28/95)	MC	H.R. 1944	Emer. Supp. Approps	PO: 258-170 A: 271-152 (6/28/95).
H. Res. 185 (7/11/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996	PO: 236-194 A: 234-192 (6/29/95).
H. Res. 187 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996 #2	PO: 235-193 D: 192-238 (7/12/95).
H. Res. 188 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1976	Agriculture Approps. FY 1996	PO: 230-194 A: 229-195 (7/13/95).
H. Res. 190 (7/17/95)	O	H.R. 2020	Treasury/Postal Approps. FY 1996	PO: 242-185 A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 193 (7/19/95)	C	H.J. Res. 96	Disapproval of MFN to China	PO: 232-192 A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 194 (7/19/95)	O	H.R. 2002	Transportation Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/20/95).
H. Res. 197 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan Crude Oil	PO: 217-202 (7/21/95).
H. Res. 198 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 2076	Commerce, State Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/24/95).
H. Res. 201 (7/25/95)	O	H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/25/95).
H. Res. 204 (7/28/95)	MC	S. 21	Terminating U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	A: voice vote (8/1/95).
H. Res. 205 (7/28/95)	O	H.R. 2126	Defense Approps. FY 1996	A: 409-1 (7/31/95).
H. Res. 207 (8/1/95)	MC	H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	A: 255-156 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 208 (8/1/95)	O	H.R. 2127	Labor, HHS Approps. FY 1996	A: 323-104 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 215 (9/7/95)	O	H.R. 1594	Economically Targeted Investments	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 216 (9/7/95)	MO	H.R. 1655	Intelligence Authorization FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 218 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1162	Deficit Reduction Lockbox	A: voice vote (9/13/95).
H. Res. 219 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1670	Federal Acquisition Reform Act	A: 414-0 (9/13/95).
H. Res. 222 (9/18/95)	O	H.R. 1617	CAREERS Act	A: 388-2 (9/19/95).
H. Res. 224 (9/19/95)	O	H.R. 2274	Natl. Highway System	PO: 241-173 A: 375-39-1 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 225 (9/19/95)	MC	H.R. 927	Cuban Liberty & Dem. Solidarity	A: 304-118 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 226 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 743	Team Act	A: 344-66-1 (9/27/95).
H. Res. 227 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1170	3-Judge Court	A: voice vote (9/28/95).
H. Res. 228 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1601	Internatl. Space Station	A: voice vote (9/27/95).
H. Res. 230 (9/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 108	Continuing Resolution FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/28/95).
H. Res. 234 (9/29/95)	O	H.R. 2405	Omnibus Science Auth	A: voice vote (10/11/95).
H. Res. 237 (10/17/95)	MC	H.R. 2259	Disapprove Sentencing Guidelines	A: voice vote (10/18/95).
H. Res. 238 (10/18/95)	MC	H.R. 2425	Medicare Preservation Act	PO: 231-194 A: 227-192 (10/19/95).

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

[As of May 15, 1996]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 239 (10/19/95)	C	H.R. 2492	Leg. Branch Approps	PQ: 235-184 A: voice vote (10/31/95).
H. Res. 245 (10/25/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 109	Social Security Earnings Reform	PQ: 228-191 A: 235-185 (10/26/95).
H. Res. 251 (10/31/95)	C	H.R. 2491	Seven-Year Balanced Budget	A: 237-190 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 252 (10/31/95)	MO	H.R. 1833	Partial Birth Abortion Ban	A: 241-181 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 257 (11/7/95)	C	H.R. 2546	D.C. Approps.	A: 216-210 (11/8/95).
H. Res. 258 (11/8/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 115	Cont. Res. FY 1996	A: 220-200 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 259 (11/9/95)	O	H.R. 2586	Debt Limit	A: voice vote (11/14/95).
H. Res. 261 (11/9/95)	C	H.R. 2539	ICC Termination Act	A: 223-182 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 262 (11/9/95)	C	H.J. Res. 115	Cont. Resolution	A: 220-185 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 269 (11/15/95)	O	H.R. 2564	Increase Debt Limit	A: voice vote (11/16/95).
H. Res. 270 (11/15/95)	C	H.J. Res. 122	Further Cont. Resolution	A: 229-176 (11/15/95).
H. Res. 273 (11/16/95)	MC	H.R. 2606	Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia	A: 239-181 (11/17/95).
H. Res. 284 (11/29/95)	O	H.R. 1788	Amtrak Reform	A: voice vote (11/30/95).
H. Res. 287 (11/30/95)	O	H.R. 1350	Maritime Security Act	A: voice vote (12/6/95).
H. Res. 293 (12/7/95)	C	H.R. 2621	Protect Federal Trust Funds	PQ: 223-183 A: 228-184 (12/14/95).
H. Res. 303 (12/13/95)	O	H.R. 1745	Utah Public Lands	PQ: 230-188 A: 229-189 (12/19/95).
H. Res. 309 (12/18/95)	C	H.Con. Res. 122	Budget Res. W/President	A: voice vote (12/20/95).
H. Res. 313 (12/19/95)	O	H.R. 558	Texas Low-Level Radioactive	Tabled (2/28/96).
H. Res. 323 (12/21/95)	C	H.R. 2677	Natl. Parks & Wildlife Refuge	PQ: 228-182 A: 244-168 (2/28/96).
H. Res. 366 (2/27/96)	MC	H.R. 2854	Farm Bill	A: voice vote (3/7/96).
H. Res. 368 (2/28/96)	O	H.R. 994	Small Business Growth	PQ: voice vote A: 235-175 (3/7/96).
H. Res. 371 (3/6/96)	C	H.R. 3021	Debt Limit Increase	A: 251-157 (3/7/96).
H. Res. 372 (3/6/96)	MC	H.R. 3019	Cont. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 233-152 A: voice vote (3/21/96).
H. Res. 380 (3/12/96)	MC	H.R. 2703	Effective Death Penalty	PQ: 234-187 A: 237-183 (3/21/96).
H. Res. 384 (3/14/96)	MC	H.R. 2202	Immigration	A: 244-166 (3/22/96).
H. Res. 386 (3/20/96)	C	H.J. Res. 165	Further Cont. Approps	PQ: 232-180 A: 232-177, (3/28/96).
H. Res. 388 (3/20/96)	C	H.R. 125	Gun Crime Enforcement	PQ: 229-186 A: Voice Vote (3/29/96).
H. Res. 391 (3/27/96)	C	H.R. 3136	Contract w/America Advancement	PQ: 232-168 A: 234-162 (4/15/96).
H. Res. 392 (3/27/96)	MC	H.R. 3103	Health Coverage Affordability	A: voice vote (4/17/96).
H. Res. 395 (3/29/96)	MC	H.J. Res. 159	Tax Limitation Const. Amdmt.	A: voice vote (4/24/96).
H. Res. 396 (3/29/96)	O	H.R. 842	Truth in Budgeting Act	A: voice vote (4/24/96).
H. Res. 409 (4/23/96)	O	H.R. 2715	Paperwork Elimination Act	A: voice vote (5/1/96).
H. Res. 410 (4/23/96)	O	H.R. 1675	Natl. Wildlife Refuge	A: 422-0 (5/1/96).
H. Res. 411 (4/23/96)	O	H.J. Res. 175	Further Cont. Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/7/96).
H. Res. 418 (4/30/96)	O	H.R. 2641	U.S. Marshals Service	A: voice vote (5/7/96).
H. Res. 419 (4/30/96)	O	H.R. 2149	Ocean Shipping Reform	A: voice vote (5/7/96).
H. Res. 421 (5/2/96)	O	H.R. 2974	Crimes Against Children & Elderly	PQ: 218-208 A: voice vote (5/8/96).
H. Res. 422 (5/2/96)	O	H.R. 3120	Witness & Jury Tampering	A: voice vote (5/9/96).
H. Res. 426 (5/7/96)	O	H.R. 2406	U.S. Housing Act of 1996	A: voice vote (5/9/96).
H. Res. 427 (5/7/96)	O	H.R. 3322	Omnibus Civilian Science Auth.	A: voice vote (5/10/96).
H. Res. 428 (5/7/96)	MC	H.R. 3286	Adoption Promotion & Stability	A: 235-149 (5/10/96).
H. Res. 430 (5/9/96)	S	H.R. 3230	DoD Auth. FY 1997	
H. Res. 435 (5/15/96)	MC	H. Con. Res. 178	Con. Res. on the Budget, 1997	

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And the Republican medical savings accounts are basically health care for the healthy and wealthy once again at the expense of the seniors who remain in traditional Medicare and people who are either sick or lower income.

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

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

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

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

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

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

The rule allows for three complete substitutes, as Chairman SOLOMON has said, all of which comply with the prerequisites of obtaining balance in the budget by the year 2002. That is wonderfully good news for Americans. We

should stop and think about that for a moment. This Congress has accomplished a truly remarkable feat in changing the focus of the discussion here in Washington from if we should balance our budget to how we will balance the budget.

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

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

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

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

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

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

While I firmly believe that we cannot use process to avoid the tough substantive decisions we must make to achieve a balanced budget, I believe just as firmly that the process that we are using today can be greatly improved to help force us to make those tough decisions and to ensure they stick. I look forward to working with Chairman SOLOMON on this effort and with my friend, the Budget Committee

chairman, Mr. KASICH, and all of our many colleagues who have expressed interest.

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

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

(Mr. ORTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in fact, let me quote to Members what the CBO said about section 205 for the Senate and 210 for the House. This is a quote from CBO:

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1015

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

When we discuss the budget situation in America today, it seems to me to be imperative to ask how did we get where we are today, how did we end up with a \$5 trillion national debt? Is it because we are spending too much on health care so that all Americans have health care? I do not think so. Is it because the Federal Government is spending too much on education so that all American families could send their kids to college? Is that the reason we have the deficit? Is it because we are spending too much on affordable housing so that we have no homelessness in

America, so that people are not paying 40, 50, 60 percent of their income in rent; is that why we have a \$5 trillion debt? I do not think so.

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

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

Does that make sense? I do not think so.

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

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

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I support a balanced budget. I voted for a balanced budget. But I rise in strong opposition to the Republican budget and the tremendous harm it would do on American families.

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

But there is another provision in this budget that would hurt America's middle-class families. This budget, like the last Republican budget, would mandate

a doubling of flood insurance premiums, costing American families around the country \$1 billion. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the average flood insurance premium of Houston's 25th Congressional District, which I represent, would double from \$400 to almost \$800 under the Republican budget. Homeowners along coastlines, rivers and bayous would see monthly mortgage payments increase in order to pay these higher premiums.

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

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

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

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

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

On the other hand, the President's budget achieves the requirement of keeping Medicare solvent in the same way as the Republican budget, but it does not make these radical changes to Medicare that will hurt the average senior citizen.

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

And finally, on the environment, again the President's budget provides

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

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

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

(Mr. BEILENSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

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

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

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

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

The Republican plan would also cut domestic discretionary spending much too deeply. Under this plan, we would spend about 25 percent less, in real terms, on domestic dis-

cretionary programs than we are spending this year—after we have already made dramatic cuts in this area. Not only are these cuts unwise; they are also unrealistic. There are growing pressures on both sides of the aisle to spend more in this area. For example, the House recently voted to take transportation programs off budget, so we could spend more on transportation; and the debate on the immigration bill showed that there is a very strong support for substantially spending more on immigration control.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

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

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

The majority's attack on the earned income tax credit raises taxes on 3.3 million low-income families, parents

with children, who have chosen work over welfare. Low-income working people pay more even after taking account of the much ballyhooed \$500 per child tax credit.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Has this growth in spending and Government programs kept America on the right track? I think the answer is, sadly, no. While we are ready to shrink government and return decisions back to our communities, the President's budget plan does just the opposite. It expands Government, shifts financial burden to future generations, and I am amazed that the same President who came to this Chamber in January and declared that the era of big government is over has sent us a budget that continues the Washington knows best approach to dealing with America's priorities.

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

□ 1030

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In addition, with regard to Medicare, what they would do is to restructure it. They will allow medical savings accounts, which the American Academy of Actuaries, no liberal group by any stretch of the imagination, says for those people who are in traditional insurance plans, they will see a 61-percent hike in their insurance premiums. They now will take those restrictions back that we have had all these years, which say that doctors and hospitals

cannot charge seniors in addition to what Medicare pays for. Do not be fooled. Do not allow this budget to go through.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Orton amendment would make any tax cuts dependent upon the Congressional Budget Office certifying that the total budget would in fact be balanced by 2002. We should not be promising tax cuts until we are sure that the budget is balanced.

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

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

The material referred to is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION AMENDMENT TEXT: H. RES. 435 FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 178, BUDGET RESOLUTION FOR FY 1997

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

"SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, at the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution

for amendment, it shall be in order to consider, without intervention of any point of order, an amendment to be offered by Representative Orton, or his designee and an amendment to be offered by Representative Meek, or her designee. The amendments are printed in section of this resolution.

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

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

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

(a) CBO CERTIFICATION OF LEGISLATIVE SUBMISSIONS.—

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

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

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

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

(b) PROCEDURE IN THE HOUSE.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In section 2(1)(A), increase the recommended level of Federal revenues by \$15,031,000,000 for fiscal year 1997, by

\$17,817,000,000 for fiscal year 1998, by \$21,488,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, by \$21,291,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, by \$21,114,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and by \$14,466,000,000 for fiscal year 2002.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and

a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first let me just say I keep hearing on that side of the aisle tax breaks for the very, very rich. Mr. Speaker, that just bothers me. Evidently, tax breaks for the rich, the Democrats think that anybody with a

job is rich, because a \$500 tax credit for middle-class Americans, they are not rich people. They may be rich because they have families, but they are not rich moneywise.

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

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

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

A gas tax repeal, is that going to help the very, very rich? I know in the Hudson Valley where I live and over in Connecticut where the Speaker pro tempore lives, people drive in my district about 100 miles a day to work. Is repealing that Clinton gas tax, is that for the very, very rich? I do not think so. We ought to stop all this rhetoric.

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

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

Should we Republicans be allowed to amend the Black Caucus budget or any of those others and water it down with what they want to do? No. They ought to have an up-or-down vote on their

proposal. That is exactly what this rule calls for. So in fairness, I want everybody to come over here. I want Members to defeat this ridiculous attempt to defeat the previous question. I want Members to vote for the previous question and then vote for this very fair rule. Let us get on with the debate on this very responsible Republican budget.

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

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

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

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

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

[Roll No. 175]

YEAS—227

Allard	Cremeans	Hastert
Archer	Cubin	Hastings (WA)
Army	Cunningham	Hayworth
Bachus	Davis	Hefley
Baker (CA)	Deal	Heineman
Baker (LA)	DeLay	Herger
Ballenger	Diaz-Balart	Hilleary
Barr	Dickey	Hobson
Barrett (NE)	Doolittle	Hoekstra
Bartlett	Dorman	Hoke
Barton	Dreier	Horn
Bass	Duncan	Hostettler
Bateman	Dunn	Houghton
Bereuter	Ehlers	Hunter
Bilirakis	Ehrlich	Hutchinson
Bliley	Emerson	Hyde
Blute	English	Inglis
Boehlert	Ensign	Istook
Boehner	Everett	Johnson (CT)
Bonilla	Ewing	Johnson, Sam
Bono	Fawell	Jones
Brownback	Fields (TX)	Kasich
Bryant (TN)	Flanagan	Kelly
Bunn	Foley	Kim
Bunning	Forbes	King
Burr	Fowler	Kingston
Burton	Fox	Klug
Buyer	Franks (CT)	Knollenberg
Callahan	Franks (NJ)	Kolbe
Calvert	Frelinghuysen	LaHood
Camp	Frisa	Largent
Campbell	Funderburk	Latham
Canady	Galleghy	LaTourette
Castle	Ganske	Laughlin
Chabot	Gekas	Lazio
Chambliss	Gilchrest	Leach
Chenoweth	Gillmor	Lewis (CA)
Christensen	Gilman	Lewis (KY)
Chrysler	Goodlatte	Lightfoot
Clinger	Goodling	Linder
Coble	Goss	Livingston
Coburn	Graham	LoBiondo
Collins (GA)	Greene (UT)	Longley
Combest	Greenwood	Lucas
Cooley	Gunderson	Manzullo
Cox	Gutknecht	Martinez
Crane	Hancock	Martini
Crapo	Hansen	McCollum

McCrery	Quinn	Solomon
McDade	Radanovich	Spence
McHugh	Ramstad	Stearns
McInnis	Regula	Stockman
McIntosh	Riggs	Stump
McKeon	Rogers	Tate
Metcalfe	Rohrabacher	Taylor (NC)
Meyers	Ros-Lehtinen	Thomas
Mica	Roth	Thornberry
Miller (FL)	Roukema	Tiahrt
Moorhead	Royce	Torkildsen
Morella	Salmon	Upton
Myers	Sanford	Vucanovich
Myrick	Saxton	Walker
Nethercutt	Scarborough	Walsh
Neumann	Schaefer	Wamp
Ney	Schiff	Watts (OK)
Norwood	Seastrand	Weldon (FL)
Nussle	Sensenbrenner	Weldon (PA)
Oxley	Shadegg	White
Packard	Shaw	Whitfield
Parker	Shays	Wicker
Petri	Shuster	Wolf
Pombo	Skeen	Young (AK)
Porter	Smith (MI)	Young (FL)
Portman	Smith (NJ)	Zeliff
Pryce	Smith (TX)	Zimmer
Quillen	Smith (WA)	

NAYS—196

Abercrombie	Gejdenson	Obey
Ackerman	Gephardt	Oliver
Andrews	Geren	Ortiz
Baessler	Gibbons	Orton
Baldacci	Gonzalez	Owens
Barcia	Gordon	Pallone
Barrett (WI)	Green (TX)	Pastor
Becerra	Gutierrez	Payne (NJ)
Beilenson	Hall (OH)	Payne (VA)
Bentsen	Hall (TX)	Pelosi
Berman	Hamilton	Peterson (MN)
Bevill	Harman	Pickett
Bilbray	Hastings (FL)	Pomeroy
Bishop	Hefner	Poshard
Bonior	Hilliard	Rahall
Borski	Hinchey	Rangel
Boucher	Holden	Reed
Brewster	Hoyer	Richardson
Browder	Jackson (IL)	Rivers
Brown (CA)	Jackson-Lee	Roemer
Brown (FL)	(TX)	Rose
Brown (OH)	Jacobs	Roybal-Allard
Bryant (TX)	Jefferson	Rush
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Sabo
Chapman	Johnson, E.B.	Sanders
Clay	Johnston	Sawyer
Clayton	Kanjorski	Schroeder
Clement	Kaptur	Schumer
Clyburn	Kennedy (MA)	Scott
Coleman	Kennelly	Serrano
Collins (IL)	Kildee	Sisisky
Collins (MI)	Kleczka	Skaggs
Condit	Klink	Skelton
Conyers	LaFalce	Slaughter
Costello	Lantos	Spratt
Coyne	Levin	Stark
Cramer	Lewis (GA)	Stenholm
Cummings	Lincoln	Stokes
Danner	Lipinski	Studds
de la Garza	Lofgren	Stupak
DeFazio	Lowe	Tanner
DeLauro	Luther	Tauzin
Dellums	Maloney	Taylor (MS)
Deutsch	Manton	Tejeda
Dicks	Markey	Thompson
Dingell	Mascara	Thornton
Dixon	Matsui	Thurman
Doggett	McCarthy	Torres
Dooley	McDermott	Torricelli
Doyle	McHale	Towns
Durbin	McKinney	Trafigant
Edwards	McNulty	Velazquez
Engel	Meehan	Vento
Eshoo	Meek	Visclosky
Evans	Menendez	Volkmer
Farr	Miller (CA)	Ward
Fattah	Minge	Waters
Fazio	Mink	Watt (NC)
Fields (LA)	Moakley	Waxman
Filner	Mollohan	Weller
Flake	Montgomery	Wilson
Foglietta	Moran	Wise
Ford	Murtha	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Nadler	Wynn
Frost	Neal	Yates
Furse	Oberstar	

NOT VOTING—10

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

□ 1100

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Paxon for, with Mr. Williams against.

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

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

□ 1101

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

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

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 178 is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 178

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

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

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

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

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

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

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

Fiscal year 1997: \$1,085,363,000,000.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

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

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$267,183,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$264,846,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$268,958,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$263,618,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$271,677,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$267,049,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$192,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$274,377,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$270,841,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$277,121,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$270,025,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$185,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$280,101,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$270,122,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$183,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,732,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,963,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,551,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,484,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,342,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$18,262,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$10,576,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,467,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,358,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$18,311,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,089,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,025,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,346,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$18,311,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$10,890,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$10,584,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,395,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$18,409,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,009,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$10,281,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,387,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$18,409,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,537,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,697,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,428,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,494,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,313,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,224,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,159,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,111,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,934,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$15,943,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,602,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$15,673,000,000.

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

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

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,380,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,729,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,033,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,441,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,078,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,039,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,034,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,327,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,045,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,697,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$815,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,036,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,782,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$740,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,430,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$231,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,031,000,000.

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

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,529,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,322,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$37,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,902,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,654,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$41,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,713,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,409,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$38,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,399,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,950,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$38,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,994,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,205,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$38,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,860,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,910,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$38,000,000.

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

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,840,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,238,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$7,794,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$5,870,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,750,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$9,855,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$9,346,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$6,637,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,367,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$9,483,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,743,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$6,586,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$10,714,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$8,843,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,736,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$6,652,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,497,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$7,730,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,595,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$6,641,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,964,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$7,181,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,570,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$6,709,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,838,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$2,319,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,856,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$197,340,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,464,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,752,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,787,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$196,750,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$10,476,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,043,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,763,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$196,253,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,448,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$7,320,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,759,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$195,883,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,268,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$7,283,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,745,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$195,375,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,598,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$7,218,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,740,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$194,875,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$41,737,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$39,007,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,541,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$37,635,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,961,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$36,111,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,103,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$35,236,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,531,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$34,526,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,045,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$34,042,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,000,000.

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

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,672,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,149,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,231,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,133,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,605,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$8,640,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,257,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,133,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,559,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$7,820,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,287,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$1,171,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,595,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$7,040,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,365,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$1,171,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,243,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,655,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,404,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,202,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,153,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,161,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,430,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,202,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,965,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$49,504,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$16,219,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$15,469,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$47,416,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$48,112,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 1999:

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

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

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

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

Fiscal year 2000:

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

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

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

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

Fiscal year 2001:

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

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

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

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

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

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

(11) Health (550):

Fiscal year 1997:

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

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

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

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

Fiscal year 1998:

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

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

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

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

Fiscal year 1999:

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

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

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

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

Fiscal year 2000:

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

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

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

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

Fiscal year 2001:

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

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

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

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

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

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

(12) Medicare (570):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$193,165,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$191,481,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$207,183,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$205,458,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$217,250,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$214,978,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$229,309,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$227,560,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$241,641,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$239,907,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$255,121,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$252,720,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

(13) Income Security (600):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$232,612,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$240,107,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$241,254,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$244,185,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$244,842,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$251,716,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$262,510,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$263,060,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$262,260,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$265,271,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$281,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$277,213,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

(14) Social Security (650):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,812,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$10,543,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,476,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,213,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,219,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,922,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,979,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,662,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$10,775,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,458,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,607,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,290,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,117,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,654,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$935,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,458,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,321,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$962,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,712,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,063,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$987,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,713,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,427,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,021,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,002,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,882,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,189,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,713,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,912,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,194,000,000.

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

(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,125,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,930,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,302,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,162,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,186,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,241,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,235,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,944,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,746,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,704,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,740,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,700,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,372,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,747,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,314,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,640,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,592,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,928,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,987,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,364,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,549,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,454,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,020,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,321,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$282,653,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$282,653,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$288,947,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$288,947,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$292,607,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$292,607,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$294,004,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$294,004,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$298,041,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$298,041,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$302,443,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$302,443,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 1997:

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

(B) Outlays, —\$1,032,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 1998:

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

(B) Outlays, —\$833,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 1999:

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

(B) Outlays, —\$183,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2000:

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

(B) Outlays, —\$271,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2001:

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

(B) Outlays, —\$1,770,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

(B) Outlays, —\$2,139,000,000.

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

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

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 1997:

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

(B) Outlays, —\$45,574,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 1998:

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

(B) Outlays, —\$35,574,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 1999:

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

(B) Outlays, —\$34,762,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2000:

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

(B) Outlays, —\$36,540,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2001:

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

(B) Outlays, —\$38,322,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

(B) Outlays, —\$40,586,000,000.

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

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

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) SUBMISSIONS.—

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

such recommendations without any substantive revision.

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

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

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

(b) INSTRUCTIONS FOR WELFARE AND MEDICAID REFORM.—

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

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

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

(4) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending for welfare reform such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$382,631,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$563,077,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and \$2,810,370,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(c) INSTRUCTIONS FOR MEDICARE PRESERVATION.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(5) COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS.—The House Committee on International Relations shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$13,025,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$10,311,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and \$67,953,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(6) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The House Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the

total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$2,784,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$4,586,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and \$24,982,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 5. SALE OF GOVERNMENT ASSETS.

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

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

(C) TREATMENT OF LOAN ASSETS.—For purposes of this section, the sale of loan assets

or the prepayment of a loan shall be governed by the terms of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.

SEC. 6. CREDIT REFORM AND DIRECT STUDENT LOANS.

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

- (1) loan disbursements;
- (2) repayments of principal;
- (3) payments of interest and other payments by or to the Government over the life of the loan after adjusting for estimated defaults, prepayments, fees, penalties, and other recoveries; and
- (4) direct expenses, including—

(A) activities related to credit extension, loan origination, loan servicing, management of contractors, and payments to contractors, other government entities, and program participants;

- (B) collection of delinquent loans; and
- (C) writeoff and closeout of loans.

SEC. 7. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON BASELINES.

(A) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that:

(1) Baselines are projections of future spending if existing policies remain unchanged.

(2) Under baseline assumptions, spending automatically rises with inflation even if such increases are not mandated under existing law.

(3) Baseline budgeting is inherently biased against policies that would reduce the projected growth in spending because such policies are depicted as spending reductions from an increasing baseline.

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

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

SEC. 8. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON EMERGENCIES.

(A) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that:

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

(2) Congress and the President have increasingly misused the emergency designation by—

(A) designating as emergencies funding requirements that are predictable and do not pose a threat to life, property, or national security,

(B) designating emergencies with the sole purpose of circumventing statutory and congressional spending limitations and

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

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

SEC. 9. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON LOAN SALES.

(A) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that:

(1) The House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees on Treasury, Postal Service,

and General Government have stated that "more consideration should be given to the sale of nonperforming loans held not only by HUD, but by all Federal agencies that provide credit programs" and directed the Office of Management and Budget to direct Federal agencies to evaluate the value of their credit programs and develop a plan for the privatization of such credit programs.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(3) reject any illusory financing schemes;

(4) continue Federal minimum standards for nursing homes;

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

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

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

(A) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) **LEGISLATIVE ACCOUNTABILITY FOR IMPACT ON CHILDREN.**—In the event legislation enacted to comply with this resolution results in an increase in the number of hungry, homeless, poor, or medically uninsured by the end of fiscal year 1997, Congress shall revisit the provisions of such legislation which caused such increase and shall, as soon as practicable thereafter, adopt legislation which would halt any continuation of such increase.

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

It is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

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

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

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

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

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

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

Fiscal year 1997: \$1,140,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$1,216,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$1,777,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,345,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,407,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,483,500,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: \$40,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$67,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$78,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$93,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$96,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$109,700,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: \$1,338,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$1,400,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$1,448,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,508,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,548,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,618,600,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: \$1,325,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$1,391,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$1,536,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,483,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,525,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,589,200,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: \$184,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$175,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$159,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$138,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$117,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$105,700,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: \$5,417,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$5,651,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$5,864,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$6,058,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$6,212,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$6,344,300,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: \$41,432,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$39,420,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$42,470,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$43,895,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$44,292,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$46,718,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: \$267,340,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$266,819,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$266,088,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$267,079,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$267,982,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$269,051,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

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

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

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$240,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$237,300,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$233,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$235,200,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$227,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$228,300,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$223,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$220,400,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$219,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$216,400,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$219,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$216,500,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$200,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,800,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,342,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$18,251,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,500,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,417,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$18,628,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,518,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$19,030,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,600,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,618,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$19,406,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,739,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$19,858,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,891,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$20,431,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,400,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,300,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,200,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,900,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,900,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,900,000,000.

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

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

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,033,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998:

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

(B) Outlays, \$1,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,050,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,300,000,000.

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

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,078,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,109,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,141,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

(B) Outlays, \$1,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,179,000,000,000.

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

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$27,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$41,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,400,000,000.

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

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$41,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$41,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$44,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$44,000,000.

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

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$7,810,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$5,994,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,100,000,000.

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

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$9,387,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$6,765,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$10,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$8,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,808,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$6,836,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$10,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$8,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,825,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$6,909,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$7,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,708,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$6,983,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,706,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$7,060,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,910,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$198,096,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$10,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,900,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$198,218,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

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

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

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,954,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$198,427,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$7,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,015,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$198,723,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$7,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,072,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$198,876,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$8,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,134,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$199,111,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,300,000,000.

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

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$38,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$16,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$36,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$16,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$33,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$17,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$33,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$17,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$33,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$18,000,000.

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

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):

Fiscal year 1997:

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

(B) Outlays, \$11,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,230,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,187,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$11,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,257,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,229,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

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

(B) Outlays, \$12,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,287,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,315,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$12,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,365,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,369,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,404,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,448,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,430,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,496,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$62,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$61,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$16,219,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$15,469,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$64,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$63,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$69,700,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$68,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$66,400,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$70,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$68,700,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$71,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$69,700,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$73,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$71,100,000,000.

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

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

(11) Health (550):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$140,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$140,300,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$154,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$153,700,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$168,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$167,700,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2000:

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

(B) Outlays, \$182,300,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$198,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$198,000,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$215,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$214,700,000,000.

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

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

(12) Medicare (570):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$199,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$198,700,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$218,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$217,100,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$239,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$236,900,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$259,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$258,000,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$282,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$780,700,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$307,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$305,000,000,000.

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

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

(13) Income Security (600):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$236,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$244,300,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$253,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$255,700,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$261,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$267,300,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2000:

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

(B) Outlays, \$281,400,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$283,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$287,200,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$305,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$302,400,000,000.

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

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

(14) Social Security (650):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$11,100,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$11,900,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$12,700,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2000:

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

(B) Outlays, \$13,600,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,500,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,400,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,300,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$935,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$26,362,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,500,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$982,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$25,925,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,200,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$987,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$25,426,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$44,700,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,021,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$24,883,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,800,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,189,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$24,298,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$45,400,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,194,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$23,668,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,200,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,300,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,800,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,400,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,600,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

(17) General Government (800):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,600,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,600,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,500,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,600,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,500,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,100,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

(18) Net Interest (900):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$281,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$281,400,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$285,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$285,600,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$287,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$287,300,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$286,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$286,800,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$289,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$289,500,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$293,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$293,500,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

(19) Allowances (920):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$0.
 (B) Outlays, —\$0.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$0.
 (B) Outlays, —\$0.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$0.
 (B) Outlays, —\$0.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$0.
 (B) Outlays, —\$0.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$0.
 (B) Outlays, —\$0.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$0.
 (B) Outlays, —\$0.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$43,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$43,300,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$7,900,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$33,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$33,500,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$8,838,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$8,838,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$31,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$31,100,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$3,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$3,600,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$32,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$32,600,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$33,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$33,800,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) Not later than June 21, 1996, the House committee named in subsection (b) shall report its recommendations to the House.

(b) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase revenues by \$40,500,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, by \$377,000,000,000 in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and by \$486,600,000,000 in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

SEC. 5. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND FEDERAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

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

(2) domestic violence dramatically affects the victim's ability to participate in the workforce; a University of Minnesota survey

reported that one-quarter of battered women surveyed had lost a job partly because of being abused and that over half of these women had been harassed by their abuser at work;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 6. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IMPACT OF LEGISLATION ON CHILDREN.

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

(b) LEGISLATIVE ACCOUNTABILITY FOR IMPACT ON CHILDREN.—In the event legislation enacted to comply with this resolution results in an increase in the number of hungry, homeless, poor, or medically uninsured by the end of fiscal year 1997, Congress shall revisit the provisions of such legislation which caused such increase and shall, as soon as practicable thereafter, adopt legislation which would halt any continuation of such increase.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE] and a Member opposed, each will control 30 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] will be recognized for 30 minutes in opposition.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, I am proud to join my distinguished col-

league from New York, MAJOR OWENS, and our friends in the Progressive Caucus, in offering a budget plan to renew America by reordering our national priorities.

It has been the tradition of the Congressional Black Caucus each year to offer an alternative budget which embodies our vision for America. I am pleased that this year, our good friends from the Progressive Caucus have joined in this effort and I want to acknowledge the contributions of BERNIE SANDERS, chairman of the Progressive Caucus and PETER DEFAZIO, who heads the Budget Task Force.

After many months of hard work, we have produced a plan which is both fiscally sound and morally responsible. Yes, we bring about a balanced budget by the year 2002. We recognize that our Nation cannot continue to carry this heavy burden of debt. During the Reagan-Bush era, we saw an unprecedented explosion of the deficit, as it first doubled, then tripled, then quadrupled. Fortunately, under President Clinton's leadership, the budget deficit has been cut dramatically and as we all know, our economy is markedly healthier than it was in 1993 when he took office. I am proud to be among those who supported his successful deficit reduction plan.

We in the Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus want to continue to build on the President's deficit reduction success. We also want to strengthen and rebuild America by investing wisely—in education; job training; transportation and infrastructure; health care; and protection of programs on which older Americans rely—Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

We reject the path taken by our Republican colleagues over these past 2 years, a path we believe the American people have also found to be dangerous and extreme. What kind of message does Congress send when it gives the Pentagon \$13 billion more than it asked for next year, while at the same time proposing to cut Medicare for our seniors by \$168 billion, eliminating Goals 2000, direct student loans, and State incentive grants? It is our contention that funneling resources away from sound investments like education, employment training, vocational skills, and scientific research, in order to purchase costly and unnecessary weapons will make our Nation weaker, not stronger. We need our students to be the best and the brightest as they carry America's legacy forward into the next millennium, meeting all the challenges of a dramatically changing global marketplace.

During this past Congress, we were ultimately successful in saving items in the budget which make a difference in the lives of millions of Americans—programs like the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program so that older people can pay their heating bills in the coldest months of the winter, and the Summer Youth Employment

Program to give young people the chance to become productive wage earners.

Our caring majority budget continues these important domestic investments.

We also recognize America's role as a champion of democracy worldwide. In the area of international affairs, we provide support for emerging democracies in Eastern Europe and other nations in this post-cold-war-era. We maintain the current level of foreign assistance to Africa and support foreign aid grants to Egypt and Israel. We encourage efforts to reach a fair and just peace in places like Northern Ireland. In addition, in keeping with America's tradition of lending a helping hand to those in need, we provide humanitarian assistance through the Public Law 480 food programs.

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

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I have just a brief question to the leader of the opposition of this bill. The gentleman that is opposing this bill is my good friend from Connecticut, a moderate Republican. When he takes to the well, will he kindly explain to all of his friends on this side how he ended up being designated the person to lead the opposition to one of the finest budgets that I thought I remembered he used to compliment?

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I will conclude by saying I urge my colleagues in the House to support a budget plan that will truly set us on a bold new course. We know that the policies of the 1980's brought us wasteful military spending and costly tax breaks for the affluent, while saddling our Nation with massive debt. Let us reject those worn out ideas and invest in America's people.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS], chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus Budget Task Force, who worked tirelessly on this last year and this year, and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. NUSSLE].

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

Let me start by suggesting that what we have here today is a real opportunity. I think what the Black Caucus has put together is probably the only real alternative that will be on the floor today. It balances the budget. It is a real budget, with real priorities. It is just using real numbers. What you have been able to put together is a real balanced budget.

There is no quarrel on this side I am aware of with the compliment that in fact you have done fantastic work in coming forth with that priority. I think it is maybe a way of trying to answer this gentleman's question about why we are in opposition is just a matter of priorities. Certainly that is what this debate needs to be about.

Just to set the tone, and hopefully it will work this way, hopefully you are not going to come out and say Medicare cuts. We do not cut Medicare. We can talk about reductions, we can talk about reductions in growth, we can talk about saving, we can talk about lots of things like that. But please do not come out with that, because we think we can sincerely have a debate over your budget and our budget without using the kind of rhetoric.

□ 1115

So I start with a very sincere compliment that I think is shared by my side of the aisle with regard to the budget that you presented.

Let me also suggest this. It is different than the so-called Blue Dog budget, in that the Blue Dogs really just endorsed the status quo, and, basically, it is a reendorsement of the 1993 tax increase.

The Clinton budget does not use real numbers. The deficits go up in the first couple of years and it does not get to balance by 2002. What my Democrat colleagues have been able to put together, I say sincerely, is a great effort and I compliment them on it.

Now, where do we differ? Where we differ, quite honestly, is the comment I tried to talk a little bit about yesterday, and that is when the woman came up to me after my town meeting and said:

You know, you have it all wrong out there in Washington. It is not more government. It is not more government programs. We have tried that. We have tried growing the government. We have tried more government programs.

She was about 90 years old, and what she told me was when she was a little girl in her neighborhood, that is where they solved problems. Now, Norman Rockwell is not around anymore. There is no way it can work exactly like that. But unless we establish a partnership between the Federal Government, the State government, the local governments and, more importantly, families, individuals and communities to solve these problems, I do not think we are going to get there.

We spent \$5.3 trillion on the War on Poverty since the 1960's, and I do not think there is anybody here that is suggesting we won that war. We have not even made a dent in that war in many respects.

The second thing I would just say is, I met a gentleman in Waterloo, IA, who happens to be a black American, who in his neighborhood has established, we have all heard of Neighborhood Watch, well, this is the ultimate of Neighborhood Watch. He has gone into

his community, neighborhood and community, and organized neighbors to solve poverty, drugs, crime.

This guy is walking around late at night in his community with a gang of adults and parents, and what they are doing is they are saying,

We are not going to wait for the Federal Government. We are not going to wait for the State government. We are not going to wait for Congress to pass a bill or get its act together or debate the budget. We are going to clean up our community today. We are going to solve local problems today.

What the Republicans want to do is give him the resources. We do not want to just hire more bureaucrats to get that job done. We do not want to just establish more status quo programs.

I say respectfully, while my colleagues' budget proposal balances, what we are concerned about is that it really continues much of this perpetuation of big government and more programs and more bureaucracy. So we have a difference of opinion. I know that is where my colleagues are coming from. Where we are coming from is that that has been tried, and we want to get it back to the local level. That is the difference between the two plans, in my estimation.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE] and the chairman of the House Progressive Caucus, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], for their support and development of this caring majority budget that we are presenting here today.

I also want to thank all the members of the CBC and the Progressive Caucus and their staff for their help in completing this very worthwhile project. Particularly, I want to thank members of my staff, Kenya Reid and Jacqui Ellis, for the Herculean efforts they put forth to produce this budget.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Oregon, Congressman PETER DEFazio, and his staff for their valuable assistance.

The caring majority budget of the Congressional Black Caucus and the House Progressive Caucus meets the mandate that we produce a balanced budget. But this budget does not produce a murder of Medicaid. It does not reduce EITC or wipe out the summer youth employment programs. The budget is again balanced by eliminating corporate welfare and closing corporate tax loopholes.

The Republican budget, on the other hand, continues in its extremism. The Republican budget is really not about money in the overall analysis. The Republican budget is about a destructive plan to destroy the New Deal programs and the great society programs. It wants to destroy safety net programs. Why else would it want to have a \$13 billion increase for the defense budget at the same time it proposes to pare down government, streamline govern-

ment, and to bring an end to Big Government?

By continuing to insist that the Medicaid entitlement be eliminated, the Republican budget poses a clear and present threat to the health and life of millions of Americans. By abandoning health care to the States, the Republican budget opens the door to decentralized genocide. Instead of going forward into universal health care, we will be leaving the children and the elderly to die for lack of vital health care.

As an alternative to this mean and extreme Republican budget, our caring majority budget of the Congressional Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus is a budget of compassion which would promote the general welfare while ensuring fairness and justice for all.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH].

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. I am pleased to be here, and I want to congratulate the other side of the aisle for submitting a budget that really expresses concern for the care of the poor and the needy and for the less fortunate in this country. I applaud them for their compassion, their good will, and I would like to say that we share their concern and their compassion for the care of the poor and needy and also for those less fortunate.

We share their concern in wanting to provide more opportunity for more Americans in this country, but I want to point out a couple of things. One, referring to this chart right here, if this chair was America, which I believe it is, say this chair represents America, only a fool wants to sit in a chair like this, simply because Government is way too big. This is a result of the Great Society. The chair is ready to tip over.

The Government is the Great Society in the chair and it is way too large. At the same time, look at our religious institutions, look at our business institutions, look how we have decimated the family unit over the last 30 years. This is a result of the big government approach to solving problems in this country. This is the fruit of 30 to 40 years of the Great Society, where Government steps in, identifies a problem, tries to solve it with a Government solution.

Let me say, too, that we all care about how to take care and create more opportunity in this country. The question is how do we do it. No. 1, reducing the ranks of the poor and needy; No. 2, creating more opportunity for every American.

This is a tired old system. Today a child born into America has a very little chance of having a stable family, No. 1. No. 2, Government is overregulating and overtaxing so that he or she has no opportunity to go out and create. and No. 3, we have a system or a country today where religions have been devalued in this country.

And look what they have to deal with; a value-neutral Federal Government that hands out dollars and does not provide for any stability or security in this country. I am sorry, but this is the kind of budget that we are considering now that is being offered.

What the Republican budget seeks to do is this: It seeks to equalize the legs in the chair. Government is reduced. Everybody knows that the people on this side of the aisle are trying to reduce Government, but I will tell my friends why.

It is too free up the other institutions in this country. It is to free them up so that they have more influence on the individual lives of every American, so that a child born into America today is born into strong families; is also born into a business environment that provides opportunity, not only so that that person can either get a job but that they can go out and are trained to create a job; that they are born into a country that has more significance, where more value is placed on the religious institutions in this country; and that they are born into a country where there is less Government interference in their life.

Now, this is the Republican budget that we are considering, and I would request my colleagues to join the Republicans so that we can produce a budget that cares for the poor and needy, that meets the needs of the less fortunate, but also provides more opportunity for every American.

I would ask that we reject this amended budget that was brought in and support the Republican budget and the Republican efforts to make America a better country for everybody.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, did the chart of the gentleman from California include the leg that added \$13 billion on to defense? That is the chart we are looking for. That is the leg that is out of order here.

Where is the gentleman from California? He is not here.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from New York, Mr. OWENS, and the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. PAYNE, and say that it has been a pleasure for the Progressive Caucus to work with the Black Caucus in developing the real alternative budget.

Mr. Chairman, yes, we should move this country toward a balanced budget, but we should not be balancing the budget on the backs of the weakest and most vulnerable people in this country. To my mind, it makes no sense to give huge tax breaks to the rich when we are living in a time where the rich are getting much richer and everybody else is getting poorer.

One of the reasons we have a major deficit crisis today is that during the

1970's and 1980's we already gave huge breaks to the rich. The wealthiest 1 percent of the population now owns more wealth than the bottom 90 percent. They do not need more tax breaks. Corporate profits are soaring while workers' wages are in decline. We do not have to give large corporations more tax breaks.

Mr. Chairman, I would submit that the vast majority of the people in this country do not believe, as the Republican leadership does, that we should force the elderly to pay double what they are paying today in Medicare premiums in 7 years and then spend \$13 billion more on the military at a time when the cold war is over.

Why do we make elderly people earning \$8,000 a year from Social Security double their Medicare premiums so we can build B-2 bombers and star wars programs that the Pentagon does not need?

Mr. Chairman, it is immoral and it is wrong to throw millions of young people off of Medicaid. These are the children of America. We should not be throwing them off of Medicaid because of disastrous cuts in Medicaid in order to give tax breaks to the rich, in order to increase military spending.

If we are sincere about moving toward a balanced budget in a fair way, there are ways to do it, and that is what the Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus budget does. We say no more corporate welfare for large corporations and wealthy people. Let us end the tax breaks and the subsidies that the large corporations are receiving. That is the way we can move forward a balanced budget.

We say that now that the cold war is over, let us increase funding for education, let us protect the environment. We do not need to be spending tens of billions of dollars more on military spending.

And, most importantly, what we are saying is that as America becomes more and more divided, with the rich owning a larger and larger percentage of the national wealth, we do not need to give tax breaks to the rich and then cut back on so many other programs that working people and the middle class need.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to just correct a few points that were made by my colleague.

First, we have no increase in copayment in our Medicare, no increase in the deductible, and we keep the premium at 25 percent. There is no increase in premiums. We only increase the premium for the wealthiest in our country who make over \$100,000. They may pay more in Medicare part B.

Second, there are no tax cuts for the wealthy. What we have as a tax cut is a \$500 tax credit for families making less than \$100,000. Families making less than \$100,000 in our bill will get \$500 per child, regardless of wealth, under \$100,000.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

□ 1130

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding me the time.

Let me refresh the memory of my colleagues. Who said the era of big government is over? I think we all know President Clinton said that. Who also said the rising tide lifts all boats? Many Democrat Presidents have said that.

Let me give information from the Labor Department, February 20, 1996: It released its employment cost index showing the smallest gain in wages and benefits since the Government began keeping statistics in 1982. Surely we need tax cuts. We have had since 1981, 19 tax increases in this country. Surely the Republican budget can have a tax cut. Bob Michel was on the floor, the former leader of our party, and he used to say son of a buck, we need some kind of tax cut for the American people. We can do better. Middle-class families work hard. They deserve tax relief. And frankly, my friends, and I credit the folks on the other side for their budget, but there are no tax reductions there.

After 19 tax increases it is time we had these tax cuts, and I am glad to say the Republican budget has that. We also want to see changes in welfare. Now we have a different approach with welfare, but we believe again that we need to improve it. You keep the status quo.

So the Republicans' budget is not extreme. It is reliable, reasonable and, most importantly, the Republican budget is honest. It uses honest numbers. And we have tax reductions for American families. We can do better. We can help Americans earn more, keep more so they can do more, and that is why when President Clinton said the era of big government is over and many Democrat Presidents also said rising tides lift all boats, these Democrats understood that you can do that best by tax reductions for the middle class.

I have to say to my colleagues on that side of the aisle, your budget does not have any tax relief for these American families. The Labor Department statistics shows the smallest gain in wages and benefits since the Government began keeping these statistics in 1982. So surely, as Bob Michel used to say, son of a buck, we have to give some tax relief for American families.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

(Mr. CONYERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the floor manager for his generosity.

Can one of the Members on the Republican side, including the gentleman

from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], my good friend, ever get off the rhetoric and start talking about what is in this great bill? The tax breaks are for the wealthy. There is a \$13 billion increase in the military. Let us not say that Medicare or health care premiums are not going up. Let us talk specific. We have only got an hour for debate.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL].

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, one of the things that hits the poor communities most in this country is lack of access to health care. I know how sensitive my Republican colleagues are in talking about cutting the health care budget, so let me put it this way in language that they like to hear. That is that 75 percent of the savings, 75 percent of reducing the rate of increase is coming from health care. Under this particular budget that you have, any old person that goes into a hospital or goes to a doctor, they will know what Medicare charges, but no longer will they know what the doctor is going to charge.

Under this, if you push it off to the States, there is no guarantee. So it is just like having a car with full insurance, and you go in and the insurance company says, we are going to pay everything we promised, and Medicare will under the Republican bill. But what they do not pay is what the doctor can charge.

Mr. Chairman, I think it ought to be a shame on all of those that have such confidence in the Governors that will turn our older folks loose to be subjected to whatever the hospitals and whatever doctors want to charge them beyond Medicare.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to talk real specifics and the truth about our budget.

Under Medicare, our budget goes from \$196 to \$284 billion. That is a 45-percent increase in spending in our program in Medicare. We have the same kind of increase in Medicaid. It goes from \$95 to \$140 billion. Only in this city when you spend so much more do people call it a cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SANFORD].

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, Rick Towne, who runs a small auto supply and parts store in Charleston, SC, came by my office yesterday. His belief was that this budget was about creating, not destroying. In fact, he talked about how is it that we get the economy growing again so that middle class, hard-working families are not hurt the way they are today?

His belief was a fairly simple two-part formula. He said first, you got to get government out of my pocket; and, second, you got to get government out of my way. I think that this budget reflects that. There is a saying back

home farmers use, you can only squeeze so much blood out of a turnip that talks about taxes, and I think we all know the detrimental effect of taxes on economic growth.

So instead, I would like to focus on the second part of his formula, which was getting government out of his way. My mom used to say that too much of a good thing is actually a bad thing. Similarly, Ben Franklin urged moderation in all things. Well, there was a recent joint economic report that said if government spends too much money, it actually begins to hurt the economy, actually begins to be a drag on the economy. Above the point at about 17½ percent of the size of our economy, from that point forward, we are now spending about 22 percent.

From that point forward, it is a drag on the economy such that for every \$100 of spending cut, we get about \$138 of economic benefit for the Rick Townes of the world working in an auto parts store back in Charleston, SC.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

(Mr. WYNN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Black Caucus-progressive caucus budget. Someone said earlier today this debate is about priorities, and that is absolutely true. Our budget is balanced over 6 years, but we have different priorities. I think we have the priorities of the American people.

The Republicans want to talk about your future, but they do not want to spend money on education. If you look at function 500 in our budget, what you will find is that we are trying to create an opportunity society. We spend money for education infrastructure. That means repairing and building new schools. We spend money on family learning centers, so that the average citizen can get on the information highway in his public library.

We spend \$2 billion more on summer jobs so that young people will have opportunities to work for a living rather than engage in a life of crime. We spend money on Head Start so that every child, black, white, brown, or yellow, will have a chance to get a fair start in life.

We believe that this budget reflects the priorities of the American dream. It is a balanced budget. It solves the deficit problem, but it reflects true American values. I support this budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut for yielding me time. I want to begin by commending the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], our colleague, and the Committee on the Budget for

the magnificent job they have done in keeping us headed down the road toward balancing the budget over the period leading to 2002.

The budget of course is the place from which the appropriators start to allocate funds, to choose priorities. And let me emphasize that the process is a process that we have engaged in since we took control of the Congress last year of reviewing everything that every department, every agency, and every program in government does to evaluate it and to choose priorities and to choose what works well for people so that the money is properly spent.

The press, unfortunately, has focused, I believe, over the last year and a half, exclusively on what has been cut and eliminated, just the way our colleagues on the other side of the aisle do. But I think people should understand that Republicans have protected and enhanced good programs that work well for people.

In our own subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, the one that funds the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services and Education, we raised Pell grants, that is, the money that needy students need to go to college and get a higher education, to the highest level in history with the largest increase in 1 year in history.

We protected the programs like TRIO and college work study and SEOG's that help needy students, as well. We provided an increase for Job Corps, which addressed the most at-risk youth in our society to give them an opportunity to get a job and to get ahead. We provided an increase for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the public health programs of this country, where needy Americans go to receive health care, some of them their only place to receive it, where we address the problems of children, the problems of infectious diseases, all the problems of public health.

We gave a very substantial increase of 5.7 percent to the National Institutes of Health, which engage in biomedical research all across our country.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that the Speaker of the House gave his very, very strong support to that kind of increase for biomedical research funding that leads to cures for diseases and preventing of diseases throughout our society and indeed throughout the world. We protected funding for AIDS, both on the research side and the health care side, and we actually increased it in the final product.

We protected funding for the administration of the Social Security Administration so that they could do a better job of helping the American people. In a time of working to balance the budget, which is our job here, to take responsibility for the bottom line, we also have to choose priorities. I believe this Congress in the last year and a half has done that job very, very well. It has provided very strong support for

the programs that work for people, and it has only cut those that really do not do the job or waste the taxpayers money.

Mr. Chairman, I commend our budget chairman and my friend, JOHN KASICH, for his commitment to following the path we forged last year in bringing our budget into balance by the year 2002. Without question, the deficit problem has reached crisis stage, and I believe that overall, Mr. KASICH's number is a realistic one which will impose the painful but not unbearable fiscal restraint we need if we are ever to regain a measure of control over our economic destiny.

However, there are some aspects of this proposal that I don't agree with, although it is far preferable to the administration's budget.

For my part, I would prefer that we not cut taxes by \$122 million until the budget is in balance. This tax cut will make it that much more difficult to balance the budget and simply comes at the wrong time. While I agree that some carefully targeted tax relief such as reductions in capital gains are warranted, I would prefer a smaller overall impact on our deficit.

I believe that biomedical research must be one of Congress' highest priorities in allocating scarce Federal funding and I am glad that the budget committee moved away from the unwise reductions proposed in this area last year. Federally supported biomedical research creates high-skill jobs, helps retain our country's worldwide leadership in biomedical research, and supports the biotechnology industry which generates economic growth and a positive balance of trade for our country.

Research provides great hope for effectively treating, curing, and eventually preventing disease and thereby saving our country billions of dollars in annual health care costs. The development of the polio vaccine alone—one of thousands of discoveries supported by National Institutes of Health [NIH] funding—in terms of health care savings, has more than paid for our country's five decades of investment in Federal biomedical research.

Defense spending, I would also note, could share a little more in the burden of reducing our Federal deficit. While clearly the President's defense budget proposal was dangerously low, and I am glad this budget restores troop readiness, the procurement budget increase of over \$6 billion is difficult to justify.

In addition, America's ability to influence the world and provide necessary leadership is at its zenith, and further cutting foreign assistance at this stage is the wrong answer. We have already reduced foreign assistance by one-third over the last 5 years. Further reductions in this area, which is less than 1 percent of our total budget, will undermine our leadership for American values of democracy, human rights, and free market economies at the exact time when their advancement is most possible.

And I also want to note that the cuts assumed for energy efficiency initiatives are unwise and should not be adopted. These initiatives make our economy more productive and competitive overseas, while saving jobs and resources. This type of activity—which is proenvironment and proeconomic growth—is what we should be supporting, not discouraging.

Finally, I support the downsizing and eliminating of departments, agencies, and pro-

grams that will assist the Government in becoming more efficient and productive. However, we should not simply do this for the sake of symbolism. There must be real savings and efficiencies generated in this process.

While I have these differences and some others, with the resolution's details, I think that JOHN KASICH and the Budget Committee deserve credit for having the courage to keep us on track to getting our economic house in order. The President, frankly, has not put forward courageous proposals that recognize the primacy of balancing the budget. This House has, and I salute this effort.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

(Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

You know, when I look at the Republican budget and then at the budget that the Congressional Black Caucus and the Congressional Progressive Caucus have done, I feel that this country is fortunate to have a really caring majority vision for America that is presented by this budget by these two groups. Under this Congressional Black Caucus/Progressive Caucus proposal the budget would be balanced in 6 years. There would be reductions in military spending and cuts in corporate welfare, Medicare and Medicaid recipients would be protected and, yes, the middle class will get a tax cut after deficit reduction was achieved.

Now, the majority of Americans believe that the power and bulk of our great country should be shared among all the people. That is one of the foundations of the principles on which our country was built. It has already been said that corporate CEO's earn 200 times what their workers make. The stock market continues to soar, profits are unbelievably high. Almost all of the new economic growth in our country is already going to the wealthy and the Republican budget wants to give them more.

You know, what I find as a hypocrisy is that the Republicans are always talking about family friendly, and yet when it comes to families, they want to cut education. They want to cut housing. They want to cut medical care for senior citizens. What kind of family friendly is that? I mean, this is beyond all kinds of belief. The radical budget prepared by the Gingrich-Armey Republicans demonstrates only one thing to America—that they don't care about the poor, about educating children, about providing medical care for homeless families.

Last year, that same troupe gave us the balance the budget on the backs of the neediest Americans and Working Families Act, that I said on this floor then was an absolutely wrongheaded and unconscionable approach and one that the overwhelming majority of American people, including my constituents, found fault with. That mean-

spirited budget of the Republicans and their use of the bully pulpit left us with multiple shutdowns of the Federal Government and proved my words. They said play with my budget or I'll leave the playing field. They stopped the game. They didn't care.

This year, all over again, the Republicans are doing it again to the American people. They don't care about what the American people want, they just want their way. But I urge them to take a good look at this alternative proposal because it has great merit and to put aside partisan politics and to vote for it. In fact, I urge all of my colleagues to vote for the Congressional Black Caucus/Progressive Caucus budget proposal.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding me the time.

This is an exciting time to be debating the budget. This is my fourth year on the Committee on the Budget. I remember back in 1993, where we first had the budget, where the President had the largest tax increase in history, we talked about budget deficits of \$200 billion a year as far as we knew. Now the debate has changed. Even last year the President's budget, when he presented it last February, had \$200 billion deficits as far as we could see. But today the debate is about balancing the budget. It is not whether we are going to balance it. It is how to balance it. So at least the debate has shifted.

Now the problem is we have two major differences with our colleagues from the other side. One is using real numbers, and the other is shifting power and money and influence out of Washington. Because we believe we need to have real numbers that we begin on a glide path to a balanced budget over 6 years and we also believe we need to shift power and influence out of Washington.

Now, I have to give credit to the Black Caucus budget because it has real numbers. It has a big tax increase and big cuts in defense spending. It is unrealistic in today's environment. So that is not a realistic option, and it does keep power and influence in Washington. That is what we need to get out of.

When I go home to my district in Florida, people are frustrated by all the power in Washington. Whether there it is the fact that health care, Medicare is a great program, we need Medicare, but there is one size fits all.

Why should not people have some choices? Welfare, what works in Sarasota, FL, is not the same that will work in New York City or in San Francisco. Let us have some choices. That is the fundamental difference between the two proposals on the Democratic side. Keep power and influence in Washington. We want to shift it back to the State and local counties and to individuals.

□ 1145

Another important thing is we have to remember why are we balancing the budget. We are balancing the budget for our children's future. It is obscene, it is obscene, these deficits we are running every year on this debt. To think that we have over a \$19,000 debt for every man, woman and child in the United States is wrong, and what we are doing is helping for the jobs and the economy and growth in this country.

That is why we are fighting for this budget, to shift power and influence out of Washington and to protect our children's future.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA].

(Mr. FOGLIETTA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the budget proposed by the Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus.

Over the past 14 months, our Nation has been involved in a significant debate over the role of government. What should government do? I go by the principle that government must do for people what people cannot do for themselves. Not only to the point of subsistence, but to the point of human dignity. They are the teachings of Pope John XXIII in *mater majeste*.

I support the Black Caucus budget because it does the best job of meeting the mandate of that principle. As the founding chairman of the Congressional Urban Caucus, I say to you that it also would do the best job of keeping our cities alive—while the majority budget would do so many things to hurt urban America.

First, and perhaps most importantly, the Black Caucus budget makes the proper investment to help people do the most for themselves. It increases spending on education and training, so that our Nation will be able to compete in the next century and so that people will be able to get good jobs at good wages.

It increases investments in job creation and urban empowerment through community development block grants and the Economic Development Administration. It would maintain our commitment to mass transit—while the majority budget would drive us toward gridlock in the year 2000. These are the kind of tools which we need to get to genuine welfare reform.

Second, it maintains the safety net. Health care for the poor and the elderly would be maintained and indeed strengthened by credible spending and sending savings back into the system—instead of sending this money on a big, fat tax cut for the wealthiest people in America.

Third, it would make a strong investment in one of the best examples of the role of government—protection against crime and providing for a common defense. It would spend \$21 billion more

to put more police on our streets and prevent crime.

Further, our caucus budget would pay for these important investments by supporting defense spending at safe and reliable levels—instead of taking us on the buying spree that the majority proposes—spending much more than the experts in the Pentagon have requested.

The Black Caucus budget proves that we can get to a balanced budget—as does the President's budget—without cutting the safety net to shreds and without sacrificing the principle our Government must do for people what they cannot do for themselves, alone.

I urge my colleagues to support the Black Caucus budget, as an effort toward rational, responsible, and compassionate budget cutting.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, May 8 was a high day. I do not know how many people recognized it. It was tax freedom day. It was the last day that Americans, the average American, worked to pay their taxes. Ever since January 1, all Americans worked through May 8 to pay their taxes. But one could not breathe a sigh of relief on May 9 thinking that they could then work for themselves to buy a car or pay for their home or put their children through school because they still had about 9 weeks to go to pay for the cost of unfunded Federal mandates.

Government-free day last year was on July 9. We will see what it is this year.

Clearly, clearly, with Americans spending 52 percent of their time working to pay for the cost of government, we have got to reverse that trend and turn it around. The budget under discussion here moves us in the wrong direction. People will be working more than 52 percent of their time to pay for the cost of government. Americans are demanding that we turn that trend around and move back toward sanity where they work inconspicuously less than 52 percent of their time to support government.

Please reject this Black Caucus budget and vote for a budget that moves us in the right direction.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO], from the Progressive Caucus Task Force.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time to me. I thank those speakers earlier in the well who said that this was an honest alternative and they said it was about the difference in priorities. Indeed it is.

Let us talk about something that neither the Republicans on that side of the aisle, nor the sponsors of the other alternatives that will be offered today, want to discuss. Today in America, 73 percent of the foreign corporations doing business in our country pay no Federal income tax, none, zero; profit-

able, huge, multinational corporations. The U.S. Tax Code is full of credits and giveaways that actually encourage our firms to move overseas and move their jobs overseas. And guess what? The Republicans are saying that the middle-income taxpayers should carry the burden; they should subsidize the foreign mining corporations for removing billions of dollars of gold from our public lands in the West without paying 1 cent in royalties to the Federal Treasury. I am talking about the billions of dollars that the Federal Government gives to profitable corporations in the forms of subsidies, tax loopholes, outright gifts. And none of the other budgets on the floor today touch those giveaways.

Darn right, we increase taxes. We are going to ask these corporate free-loaders to pay their fair share. Why do the other budgets not address this issue? Because both political parties are addicted to the corporate cash that fuels their campaigns. It is like the emperor's new clothes. Nobody will admit that the king is stark naked, and nobody around here will tell the truth to the American people about how thoroughly our political system has been bought and sold.

There are two distinct paths to the balanced budget. On the one side we have the Republican budget and its pale shadows, the President's budget and its pale shadows, the President's budget and the Coalition budget. All of those budgets operate from the premise that military spending and corporate welfare are sacred cows that cannot be touched. The arithmetic is simple. If my colleagues will not cut the cold war military budget and they do not want to upset their corporate campaign contributors, they have no choice. So they have to cut Medicare, and they have to cut other vital social programs.

The Republicans actually want to make the matter far worse because they want to increase military spending and give their wealthy friends a hefty tax cut. As a result, they make deep cuts in Medicare, education, the environment, and other programs the American people strongly support.

We in the Progressive and Black Caucuses are offering the only genuine alternative to business as usual. We demand that foreign corporations doing business here get out of the wagon, as a famous gentleman on the other side of the aisle likes to say, and start pulling with the rest of us. We close loopholes and encourage job exports to the Far East and Mexico. We make foreign mining companies pay their fair share for valuable minerals they mine on our public lands.

We have the guts to take on the biggest pork barrel in the Federal budget, the bloated spending at the Pentagon across the river. We protect Medicare without forcing hospitals out of business or making seniors pay more for their care. We increase Federal investment in education.

Mr. Chairman, let's talk about something that none of the sponsors of any of the other

budgets on the floor of this House want to discuss.

Today in America 73 percent of the foreign corporations doing business on our shores pay no Federal income tax. None.

The U.S. Tax Code is full of credits and giveaways that actually encourage U.S. firms to move jobs overseas.

Middle-income taxpayers are being asked to subsidize foreign mining corporations who are removing billions of dollars worth of gold from our public lands without paying one cent in royalties to the U.S. Treasury.

I am talking about the billions and billions of dollars that the Federal Government gives to profitable corporations in the form of subsidies, tax loopholes and outright gifts and none of the other budgets on the floor today touch those giveaways.

Why? Because both political parties are addicted to the corporate cash that fuels their campaigns. It is like the emperor's new clothes: Nobody will admit the king is stark naked, and nobody around here will tell the truth to the American people about how thoroughly our political system has been bought and sold.

There are two distinct paths to a balanced budget.

On one side we have the Republican budget and its pale shadows, the President's budget, and the coalition budget.

All of those budgets operate from the premise that military spending and corporate welfare are sacred cows that cannot be touched.

The arithmetic is very simple. If they will not cut the cold war military budget and do not want to upset corporate campaign contributors, there is no choice but to make deep cuts in Medicare and other vital social programs.

The Republicans actually make the matter far worse because they want to increase military spending and give their wealthy friends a hefty tax cut. As a result, they make deep cuts in Medicare, education, the environment, and other programs that the American people strongly support.

We in the Progressive and Black Caucuses are offering the only genuine alternative to business-as-usual. We demand that foreign corporations doing business here get out of the wagon and start pulling with the rest of us. We close loopholes that encourage job exports to the Far East and Mexico. We made foreign mining companies pay their share for the valuable minerals they mine on our public lands. And we have the guts to take on the biggest pork barrel in the Federal budget, the Pentagon's bloated bank account.

We protect Medicare without forcing hospitals out of business or making seniors pay more for their care. We increase Federal investment in education and job training to make American workers more competitive. We take care of veterans and we fully fund the war on crime.

We can afford to do these things because we're willing to challenge the powers-that-be, the new class of corporate robber barons whose campaign contributions and private favors have so badly corrupted this nation's political system.

This budget is a collaboration between the Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus. Though I disagree with my colleagues in the

Black Caucus who seek small increases in foreign aid, I believe we need to cut overseas assistance. This budget illustrates our priorities as well as any collaboration can.

Our budget is the only proposal on the floor today that challenges the conventional wisdom in Washington, DC, and puts the interests of American working people first. I urge the House to adopt it.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to just point out to my colleague that on Medicare we increase it from 196 today, in billions, to \$284 billion. That is Medicare. That is a 45-percent increase in the spending on Medicare. And on Medicaid we increase it from \$95 billion to \$140 billion. At the same time, we give seniors choice without increasing their copayment, their deductible or their premium.

Mr. Chairman, we also have a tax cut in our budget only for those who make less than \$100,000; a \$500 tax credit for children. That is the only tax cut we have in our budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER].

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, in 1993 President Clinton took money and power away from the American people and our children and gave it to the Washington bureaucracy. President Clinton gave us our highest tax increase in our Nation's history, raising taxes on the American family to its highest level in history.

Mr. Chairman, the Clinton tax bill included increased taxes on gasoline, increased taxes on family incomes, increased taxes on married couples, increased taxes on Social Security benefits, increased taxes on small business owners and increased taxes on property that parents leave their children. Today the average family pays more in taxes than it pays on food, clothing, and housing combined.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget, on the other hand, lowers taxes by a net \$121 billion and cuts Government in Washington so that the citizens of this great Nation can earn more and can keep more of what they earn and, therefore, be able to take better care of their families.

Mr. Chairman, America needs the Republican budget before us today, a budget that shifts money and power and influence out of Washington and gives it back to the people. This is a historic debate about the role and the scope of Government in our lives, a debate of whether Washington will continue to tax more, spend more and regulate more or whether we will finally begin to reduce the size and scope and power of Washington.

Support the Republican budget.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN].

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the budget presented by the Congressional Black and Progressive Caucuses.

Unlike the Republican budget, which steals from the needy in order to pad the pockets of the wealthy, this budget is fair. It achieves a balance in 6 years through shared sacrifices. And it does so without bankrupting the poor and the working people of this country.

This budget also retains two of the most important aspects of the Federal Government. They are Medicare and Housing, perhaps the most essential services our Government can offer its citizens.

By protecting our Medicare and Medicaid recipients we can do our best to assure health care for the poor, the old, the veterans and children of this country.

In my State alone there are more than 3 million senior citizens. They make up more than 20 percent of the population. The least we can do for these people is guarantee them a bed in a nursing home, and medical attention when they need it.

Another area that the caucuses' budget protects is housing. Public housing is often the last safety net that poor people have before becoming homeless.

Mr. Chairman, this is a responsible budget that champions the values of this country.

"To whom God has given much, much is expected."

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] who risked his life in Vietnam for our defense through 300 missions and was shot down on the 300th mission.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the Black Caucus for at least producing a balanced budget unlike the President's budget. But I think that Colin Powell would enlighten the Congressional Black Caucus on what the needs for national security are within this country. Our committee, Republicans and Democrats, by a vote 49 to 2, 49 to 2 Republicans and Democrats, came together and said that after the cold war these are the needs of our Nation, and it was supported by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Shalikashvili in a memo to the Presidents. When the Democrats' task is studied, the Bottom-Up Review of what we would need after the military drawdown to fight two conflicts at the same time, a level was stationed. A \$50 billion cut according to Colin Powell, Dick Cheney, and then-candidate Clinton would put us into a hollow force. The President cut defense \$177 billion, and then with what was left put in nondefense spending. We spend billions of dollars in Haiti, which is military operations. There is another \$2 billion just in administrative costs, as the one in Haiti. Take a look at Somalia and all the other expansions. Operation Tempo has increased 150 percent over Vietnam. The Air Force has not bought a single airplane in 3 years, gentleman. The AV-8's; we are losing

them, almost a third of them, the new ones with the upgrades.

We safety our pilots by over 50 percent. We pay for those safety fixes; the F-14's, the fixes because we are crashing F-14's.

The COLA. The President said that he was going to have a middle-class tax cut in 1993 and increase middle-class tax, and then he cut COLA of the military, some of these kids on food stamps. We recognized an increase for the families, the COLA.

We provide for national security in this country, well trained, well equipped, and allow our families in the military to have a fairly good life above at least a food stamp level. So I would challenge my colleagues in the Black Caucus to listen to what the real national security needs are of this country.

□ 1200

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY].

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to rise today in support of the CBC/Progressive Caucus budget. Finally, Mr. Chairman, we have a budget on the floor that is courageous enough to say: It is time for America's corporate welfare kings and bloated military to share in the burdens of balancing the budget. Going after such sacred cows makes sense not only because it is fair, but because it was President Reagan's corporate tax giveaways and military spending that put us in this deficit hole in the first place.

Mr. Chairman, our budget is the only budget that tackles the issue of corporate tax entitlement spending. Our budget is the only budget that says, it's time for the Pentagon and military contractors to go on a diet, too.

Just like everyone else.

The CBC/Progressive Caucus budget reaches balance by the year 2002 without cutting Medicare, Medicaid, education and the environment in order to pay for tax breaks. Our tax breaks come after the budget is balanced. That is the responsible thing to do.

As this chart here demonstrates, the share of the national tax burden paid by corporations has declined steadily since the 1950's, while average Americans have continued to carry about the same share of the national tax burden. If Wall Street paid in taxes what corporations used to pay the budget would be balanced in 1 year, not 6.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when corporate profits are going through the roof, the stock Market is breaking new records and CEO salaries are making sports heroes blush, it is time that corporate America paid its fair share to balance the budget—just like everyone else.

Moreover, instead of giving the Pentagon \$270 billion a year, let's ask them to make due with \$220 billion a year. And why not, especially when we spend more than all of our potential enemies combined.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to demonstrate this fact with this chart. Here are all our potential enemies and what they spend on the military. And this is what we spend and then some.

Mr. Chairman, Ronald Reagan and George Bush gave us this deficit with their tax cuts for the wealthy and pork for the Pentagon. It is time to say: No longer are we going to pay McDonald's and M&M's to advertise overseas. No longer should we pay to build golf courses at military bases.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this budget which protects middle class families in this changing economy. Our seniors, students, and poor should not be asked to carry the entire burden of balancing the budget. Everyone must pull the wagon, including Wall Street and defense contractors.

Support the American middle class and support the CBC/Progressive Caucus budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, our objective in our budget is to get our financial house in order and balance our Federal budget to save our trust funds for future generations, and to transform our caretaking social and corporate welfare state into what I would call a caring opportunity society.

That really gets at the thrust of why I am here today. As a moderate Republican, I have seen what we have done for the last 30 years. We have been caretakers instead of being caring. We are able to go back to our districts and say I did this for you and I did that for you, but the bottom line is we have been a caretaker instead of caring.

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FATTAH].

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of a budget for the United States of America, for it is not the Congressional Black Caucus' budget, it is a budget offered by the Congressional Black Caucus on behalf of those constituents that we represent, who know all too well that the biggest deficit that we have in this country is not the trade deficit or the budget deficit, but the human capital deficit; the fact that we want to see future Colin Powells have an opportunity to get an education, to be able to grow up in decent neighborhoods and have affordable housing.

This is a budget that we would recommend to our colleagues to truly consider in light of the need to not only have a budget that is fiscally balanced, but that is morally correct and that is focused on this Nation's needs to develop future generations.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the leadership of the Congressional Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus for offering this alternative here on the floor. I would hope that my colleagues would be able to see

past their partisan and perhaps parochial concerns and see the needs of an entire Nation, striving to create a more perfect union.

Mr. Chairman, this is an opportunity for us to put behind us generations of neglect for many families in our country. I hope that we support this bill.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate the gentleman from New York allowing me to participate.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Republican budget and in support of the strong point that we need a balanced budget. Any of the three substitutes offered by the Democrats indeed is better, including the bipartisan coalition budget. But the Black Caucus budget is, indeed, about our priorities of human beings. I am pleased to be an advocate for a balanced budget that balances our priorities as a nation, and we respect people and respect the honor of having an opportunity to serve people.

As we balance the budget, we should not prefer one group over another. I ask the Republicans, do they really want to be known as the party whose policies support the wealthy at the expense of working Americans or those who are less fortunate? All three of the substitute budgets make clear that these programs and policies are more important to the average American citizen than the Republican budget. All three substitutes do a better job of protecting education, protecting the environment, protecting Medicare and Medicaid, and making sure those priorities that make America strong indeed are provided for.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH], to talk positively about our budget.

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

Mr. Chairman, again today we have a graphic example of two differing philosophies: one philosophy which places its trust in an ever-expanding, ever more powerful Federal bureaucracy, a philosophy that somehow confuses the notion of compassion and commitment.

On the other hand, our new majority offers a budget that offers true compassion, for it faces up to the fact that if we do nothing to change our ways, and if by some miracle, the legislative equivalent of chewing gum and baling wire, this Republic endures and somehow averts the fiscal crisis that awaits it, children born today will pay in excess of \$185,000 in interest on the national debt. Nothing could be more immoral. Nothing could be more egregious.

So as we move to solve the problems, let us have the courage to acknowledge that in contrast to the budget offered here, all answers do not emanate from Washington, DC. All answers do not confuse compassion and commitment.

The most compassionate thing we can do for this generation of seniors, for generations yet unborn, is to adopt a sensible, rational budget that at long last has Washington live within its limits and the American people truly compassionately live within their means.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, with all respect to my friend, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH], I think he is still giving his campaign speech from 2 years ago. Every budget that is coming to this floor will balance the Federal budget, so this is not about whether we balance the Federal budget or not. We have already passed that point.

The question is what kind of priorities we set while we balance the Federal budget. Do we continue to build up a military that is already spending 100 times, 100 times more than any other country in the world? And do we do that at the expense of ordinary, average working people who need health care, who need education, who need the environment protected, who need the services that we provide to the elderly?

Mr. Chairman, anybody ought to understand that this is not about whether we balance the budget or not. It is about the priorities we set while we engage in that process. Mr. Chairman, I hope my friend will understand that that debate is over.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GANSKE].

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill and against the amendment. Basically the amendment or the substitute calls for very steep cuts in defense.

Mr. Chairman, I am one of the GOP freshmen that voted against the defense authorization. I have voted against our defense bills, because I thought that some of the funding was misdirected and could be a little lower. However, I think that the substitute here goes way too far in cutting defense. I am very concerned about what I think could happen in Russia in the elections that are coming up.

I would refer my colleagues to an article that is in a journal that some may or may not read: *The American Spectator*. It is called, "Zyuganov, the Terrible." It is about the Russian who is leading in the polls now. He is the head of the Communist Party. Statements from his writings are very, very worrisome in terms of a very anti-West program, and very anti-Zionist remarks by this person who is leading the Russian polls now for their elections which are coming up.

I am very fearful that we may end up facing some significant increased defense expenditures. For that reason, I think that the priorities are misdirected in the substitute, and I would urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I need to say to this country that the Congressional Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus' budget is the best budget for all the people of America. If we watch that budget, we will see that they are going to have the older people of this country sustaining and keeping the Medicare Program where it is now, without cutting it and making it a regressive kind of cut. They are also protecting the Medicaid recipients in this country.

They also look to help the lower working class people of all this country. It does not mean only black people or minorities, it means everybody. When we work to help the lower people who are at the lower-paying jobs, then we are helping this country.

So what the Republicans have done, on one side they want to help the rich, but they want to keep the poor down. The Black Caucus' budget and the Progressive Caucus' budget combined help that segment of America. I ask Members to please vote yes on this resolution by the Black Caucus.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

(Mr. KOLBE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Mr. Chairman, yesterday in my remarks on the floor, I talked about the budget proposals that were before us. I said that I thought there was a difference in the direction of these proposals. I said the budget debate ought to be about the direction of this country, it ought to be about our different philosophies. In the various proposals we see here today we can see those differences clearly delineated.

The President, in his State of the Union Address, told us three times that the era of big government was over. Yet, the budget proposal that he has made and the other alternatives that we have before us from the Democratic side of the aisle do not reflect that the era of big government is over.

□ 1215

I want to focus on the issue of entitlement changes, because this is where we know we have to make changes if we are ever really going to balance the budget, if we are ever really going to change the direction of government. Many of our entitlement programs are not working the way they should. They are not delivering health care, they are not delivering services to people in poverty the way they should. We need to make changes to that and we think we can make those changes by giving their management back to the States, back to local governments.

Yet the alternative budget provisions and the Clinton budget make none of these changes. No fundamental changes are being made to entitlement programs. That is why we need to adopt the Republican budget proposal.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, do I have the right to close?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] has the right to close.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, we come to the last moments of this debate. I have stated on numerous occasions that the most significant thing that any of us do is to adopt a national budget for this country, because our budget speaks to our values, our principles, and our priorities.

Are there specific individual items in this budget or any other budget that some of us may disagree with? If we applied that test, we would vote against all the budgets, because there is no perfect budget out here.

But what is important, Mr. Chairman, is that we rise above the minutia, because those matters can be worked out. This is a starting point. What each of us in these Chambers must do is embrace that budget that in a general way speaks to our vision about the hopes and the dreams, the aspirations and the needs of the American people and vote for whichever budget we believe best does that.

Which budget in its military budget speaks to the realities of the post-cold-war world and attempts to reverse the extraordinary expenditures that characterized the cold war? I believe the budget before us does that and reverses that trend.

Which budget embraces a vision that reverses the trend toward big tax breaks and corporate giveaways? I believe this budget does that.

Which budget, Mr. Chairman, speaks to the realities of the pain and human misery and tragedy that is the reality of urban and suburban and rural America throughout this country, with young children dying in the streets of America, impoverished people, frightened senior citizens, unemployed human beings, undereducated people, and an environment that often is being raped and plundered rather than preserved in a fragile way for our children and our children's children?

Each of us must look at each one of these budgets to ascertain which one of them, not some specific item, "I can't vote for your budget because it has this." Those matters can be worked out.

We must lift ourselves to a larger vision, a larger vision about where this country ought to go as we travel to the 21st century. I believe the budget before us does that. It reverses the wrong trends and with compassion and dignity and vision and forthright thought speaks to the reality of the pain and the human misery and the needs of our

people, whether they are senior citizens, whether they are middle-class human beings, whether they are farmers in rural America or whether they are young children trapped in the mire of the violence of urban America. This budget, it seems to me, does that.

I ask all of my colleagues, who can find many specific details that would allow them to bail out of any one of these budgets, to move beyond minutia, to grab hold of a much larger vision and a larger idea. I am proud to stand in support of the budget that is before us. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

As a moderate Republican who has voted for a number of budgets that have taken care of people, I have seen the result of our work. The result of our work in some cases is 12-year-olds having babies, it is 14-year-olds selling drugs, it is 15-year-olds who cannot read their own diplomas, it is 24-year-olds who have never had a job, it is 30-year-old grandparents. We have a caretaking society, and it has become a caretaking society because of what we have done in the Federal Government.

When I was elected from the State government to the Federal government, I thought the Federal Government could do it better. It cannot do it better because what it does is, it adds up all the people in a room, adds up their entire shoe size, divides the number of people by the shoe size, and say, "Here is 8½, wear it. If your shoe size is 10, I'm sorry. Here is 8½, wear it." We have a society that is going in the wrong direction.

Our budget changes that. We increase the student loans, we increase Medicare, we increase Medicaid, we increase welfare payments. But ultimately what we are trying to do, as a columnist said, in the final analysis, it is not what we do for our children but what we have taught them to do for themselves that will make them successful human beings.

We are looking to transform our caretaking social and corporate welfare state into a caring opportunity society, a caring opportunity society where we teach people how to grow the seeds so they can do it for themselves. So I compliment my colleagues on the other side. There is compassion in that budget, but it is headed in the wrong direction.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Sabo substitute to the budget resolution. Although it is much more appealing than the Republican proposal, it certainly isn't the best substitute we had the opportunity to consider today.

The Congressional Black Caucus-Progressive Caucus budget offered a 6-year balanced budget that proposed to increase investments in education, job training, infrastructure and at the same time protected Medicare and Medicaid. To pay for these investments the substitute proposed to modestly reduce the defense budget and closed tax loopholes that create corporate welfare. It made investing in

the working class, the middle class, the poor, our children a priority. The CBC-Progressive Caucus budget proved that we can invest in education, job training, infrastructure, while protecting health security and still achieve a balanced budget.

The CBC-Progressive Caucus budget also provided sufficient military funding to keep national defense strong while eliminating large amounts of waste through a thorough analysis and projection for future world security and peacekeeping needs. But the Sabo substitute still spends \$251 billion more than CBC-Progressive budget over 6 years. In fact, the Sabo military provision is virtually indistinguishable from the Republican defense budget. The \$251 billion the CBC saves allows us to invest more in education, job training, transportation, and health care. Without the savings, we will not have the resources to make the necessary human investments, even as we move toward a balanced budget.

In the CBC-Progressive budget substitute, we proposed to invest more than \$80 billion over 6 years in education and job training—to assure that we have the most advanced and competitive work force in the 21st century. We protected large job-creating programs like transportation and public works—investments that not only create work but also improve our Nation's standard of living by improving our infrastructure. We protected Medicare and Medicaid, assuring its effectiveness for our Nation's elderly population. Until we get real health care reform, spending on Medicare and Medicaid cannot be compromised. We just can't afford the cuts that the Republican budget leaders are prescribing.

Mr. Chairman, this budget debate is about priorities. I believe the CBC-Progressive Caucus defense budget fairly reflects our Nation's security needs, while offering this country the peace dividend it has earned. Without the savings realized by a more efficient Defense Department, we are not able to make the kinds of investments that will truly help working people in America.

Americans have rejected the extreme ideas of the Republican majority. Democrats have the responsibility to represent the middle class, the working class, the poor, the elderly, and our children. The CBC-Progressive Caucus budget emphasized a commitment to these priorities and deserves our support.

But yet how do we account for the fact that the CBC-Progressive budget garnered only 63 votes and the Blue-Dog Democrats were able to manage twice as many votes? I urged my Democratic colleagues to vote for the CBC-Progressive budget so we could in turn vote for the President's budget—but they refused. What kind of message does this send to 40 million people who are represented by members of the Black and Hispanic caucuses, that endorsed the CBC-Progressive budget? I ask our esteemed leader, Mr. GEPHARDT, to share with me the serious dichotomy that honestly reveals at bottom that most of the Democrats have very little vision of how we would discharge the most important responsibility as legislators, if we were in power. We're run over now, and unless things change, we will be run over when we win on November 5, 1996. I have asked Mr. GEPHARDT to meet with me on this subject at his earliest convenience.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Congress-

sional Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus alternative budget.

When President Reagan, in 1981, challenged anyone who did not accept his program to come up with an alternative that offered a greater chance of balancing the budget, the Congressional Black Caucus sent him their answer in a month.

With that first budget they set the tone for fiscally sound, economically fair, and realistically feasible budgetary options for this country in its attempts to recover from serious economic deficits and high inflation.

The Congressional Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus have joined to offer an alternative budget for fiscal year 1997 that does not engage in the economic cannibalism of our Nation's poor, elderly, or children.

This budget opposes all attempts by the "elite conservative minority" of the Republican Party to reduce the value of Social Security. This budget would ensure that current coverage for Medicaid and Medicare is not cut or further compromised.

This budget would maintain current services, where the Republican budget would have \$240 billion in Medicaid cuts.

To encourage commerce through the creation of small and women and minority owned businesses this budget would add another \$300 million for each fiscal year. They would freeze Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation moneys at fiscal year 1996 levels rather than allow it to decrease in funding.

This budget would oppose any attempts to erode the value of Social Security, including any extension of the age for eligibility.

They would balance the budget with a fair application of revenue increases through the elimination of loopholes for multinational and foreign controlled corporations, reform taxation of income of multinational corporations and capital gains reform just to mention a few. Their recommended changes would result in a total of additional revenue of \$486.7 billion.

The American people need and want a reasoned and balanced plan for addressing this country's serious deficit problems, and this budget is that plan.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 63, noes 362, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 176]

AYES—63

Becerra	Engel	Jackson-Lee
Bishop	Evans	(TX)
Bonior	Fattah	Jefferson
Brown (FL)	Fields (LA)	Johnson, E.B.
Clay	Filner	Johnston
Clayton	Flake	Lewis (GA)
Clyburn	Foglietta	Markey
Collins (IL)	Ford	Martinez
Collins (MI)	Frank (MA)	McDermott
Conyers	Gibbons	McKinney
Coyne	Gutierrez	Meek
Cummings	Hastings (FL)	Millender-
DeFazio	Hilliard	McDonald
Dellums	Hinchey	Moakley
Dixon	Jackson (IL)	Nadler

Oberstar
Owens
Payne (NJ)
Rangel
Rush
Sanders
Schroeder

Scott
Serrano
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Thompson
Torres

Velazquez
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wynn
Yates

Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Sabo
Salmon
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schumer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner

Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skeltan
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Stupak
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton

Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Traficant
Upton
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,330,292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,392,543,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: \$7,157,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$17,170,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$16,303,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: \$17,838,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: \$19,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$18,645,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: \$1,316,223,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$1,364,054,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$1,405,593,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: \$1,448,718,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: \$1,480,821,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,529,237,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: \$1,313,391,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$1,352,476,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$1,388,058,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: \$1,428,498,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: \$1,453,221,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,501,530,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: \$205,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$186,756,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$173,397,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: \$158,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: \$122,929,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$108,987,000,000.

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

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

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

Fiscal year 1997: \$41,432,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$39,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$42,470,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: \$43,895,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: \$45,292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$46,718,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: \$267,340,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$266,819,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$266,088,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: \$267,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: \$267,982,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$269,051,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

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

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, \$259,235,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$262,484,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, \$263,733,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$259,351,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:

NOES—362

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Billbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Christensen
Chrysler
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Creameans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle

Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Ingalls
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim

King
Kingston
Klecicka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowe
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalfe
Meyers
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce

NOT VOTING—8

Bevill
Burton
Chenoweth

Hayes
Molinari
Paxon

Talent
Towns

□ 1241

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Towns for, with Mr. Paxon against.

Messrs. EWING, CHRYSLER, and RADANOVICH, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute designated in paragraph 2 of section 2 of House Resolution 435.

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

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

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

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

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. ORTON.

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

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

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

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

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

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

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

Fiscal year 1997: \$1,107,513,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$1,165,720,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$1,214,661,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: \$1,269,637,000,000.

(A) New budget authority, \$267,996,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$261,560,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$273,082,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$267,858,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$272,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$265,703,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$272,372,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$269,364,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$200,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,178,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,008,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,342,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$18,251,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,682,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,566,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,417,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$18,628,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,838,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,552,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,518,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$19,030,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,749,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,461,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,618,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$19,406,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,879,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,669,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,739,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$19,858,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,124,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,727,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,891,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$20,431,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,840,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,894,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,841,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,852,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,843,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,776,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,844,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,822,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,845,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,844,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,846,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,845,000,000.

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

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

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,728,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,080,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,033,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,654,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,695,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,050,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,220,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,180,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,078,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,167,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,035,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,109,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,337,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,179,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,141,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,065,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,816,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,174,000,000.

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

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,359,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,969,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$37,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,131,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,846,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$41,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,277,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,921,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$41,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,150,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,630,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$41,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,032,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,253,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$44,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,019,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,089,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$44,000,000.

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

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,617,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,778,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$7,810,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$5,994,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,663,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,677,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$9,387,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$6,765,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,481,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,529,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,808,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$6,836,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,933,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,026,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,825,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$6,909,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$10,889,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$9,081,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,708,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$6,983,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$10,646,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$8,816,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,706,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$7,060,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,928,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$826,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,910,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$198,096,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,878,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,381,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,900,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$198,218,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$10,622,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,713,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,954,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$198,427,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,421,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,686,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,015,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$198,723,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,984,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$7,198,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,072,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$198,876,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,325,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,837,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,134,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$199,111,000,000.
 (8) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,944,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,307,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,651,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,616,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$16,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,544,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,014,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$16,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,240,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,526,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$17,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,854,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,788,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$17,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,582,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,440,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$18,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,733,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$10,409,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,231,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,181,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,268,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$10,024,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,257,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,229,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,556,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,464,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,287,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,315,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,621,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,163,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,365,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,369,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,610,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,671,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,404,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,448,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,498,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,149,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,430,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,496,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,099,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$51,302,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$16,219,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$15,469,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$54,914,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$53,764,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$19,040,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$14,760,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$56,631,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$55,520,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$21,781,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$13,854,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,968,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$56,675,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$22,884,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$14,589,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$59,496,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,975,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$23,978,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$15,319,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,089,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$59,302,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$25,127,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$16,085,000,000.
 (11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$130,271,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$129,859,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$187,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$137,102,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$136,870,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$94,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$146,449,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$146,486,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$155,462,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$155,232,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$163,952,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$163,535,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$174,717,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$174,167,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
 (12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$191,735,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$190,051,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$205,671,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$203,946,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$219,739,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$217,467,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$233,083,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$231,334,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$249,351,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$247,617,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$266,091,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$263,690,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
 (13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$231,135,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$238,848,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$243,312,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$247,097,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$252,613,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$256,017,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$266,923,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$268,708,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$273,393,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$273,190,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$288,716,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$286,757,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
 (14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,813,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,001,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,477,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,664,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,220,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,369,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,980,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,129,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,776,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,925,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,608,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,757,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,074,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,570,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$935,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$26,362,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,910,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,387,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$962,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$25,925,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,420,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,603,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$987,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$25,426,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,548,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,235,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,021,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$24,883,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,803,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,655,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,189,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$24,298,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,005,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,268,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,194,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$23,668,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,127,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,930,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,302,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,162,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,186,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,241,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,235,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,944,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,119,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,461,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,143,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,085,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

(17) General Government (800):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,655,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,362,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,661,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,522,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,311,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,299,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,149,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,346,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,086,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,046,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,147,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,104,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

(18) Net Interest (900):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$282,011,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$281,971,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$287,083,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$286,933,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$289,332,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$289,032,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$289,637,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$289,162,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$292,873,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$292,190,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$297,178,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$296,252,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

(19) Allowances (920):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$0.
 (B) Outlays, —\$0.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$6,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$6,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$7,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$7,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$8,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$8,500,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$9,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$9,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$9,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$9,500,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$43,258,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$43,258,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$7,900,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$34,878,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$34,878,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,350,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$33,685,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$33,685,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$35,974,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$35,974,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$37,759,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$37,759,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$39,435,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$39,435,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) Not later than June 21, 1996, the House committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(b)(1) The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$2,082,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$15,117,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997

through 2001, and \$18,852,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(2) The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$367,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$2,428,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$3,026,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(3) The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$10,717,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$158,844,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$226,598,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(4) The House Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$220,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$2,454,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$3,198,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(5) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$2,600,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$40,278,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$50,900,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(6) The House Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$0 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$357,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$476,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(7) The House Committee on National Security shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$84,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$493,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$649,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(8) The House Committee on Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$74,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$308,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$332,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(9) The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$19,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$810,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$885,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(10) The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$117,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$2,378,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$3,232,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(11) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit, as follows: by \$14,766,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, by \$172,990,000,000 in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and by \$231,595,000,000 in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

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

SEC. 5. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND FEDERAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 6. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IMPACT OF LEGISLATION ON CHILDREN.

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

(b) LEGISLATIVE ACCOUNTABILITY FOR IMPACT ON CHILDREN.—In the event legislation enacted to comply with this resolution results in an increase in the number of hungry, homeless, poor, or medically uninsured by the end of fiscal year 1997, Congress shall revisit the provisions of such legislation which caused such increase and shall, as soon as practicable thereafter, adopt legislation which would halt any continuation of such increase.

SEC. 7. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING TAX CUTS.

It is the sense of Congress that changes in tax laws which promote job creation, economic growth, and increased savings and investment should be enacted and be offset by changes which close tax loopholes and eliminate corporate welfare.

SEC. 8. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE DEBT.

It is the sense of Congress that eliminating the deficit by producing a balanced budget is

only the first step toward the ultimate goal of reducing and eventually eliminating the public debt.

SEC. 9. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING TRUST FUND SURPLUSES.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(2) all recent-year Federal budgets, as well as both fiscal year 1996 budget resolutions reported out by the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate, have masked the magnitude of annual deficits by counting various trust fund surpluses; and

(2) upon reaching a balance in the Federal budget, the Government should move toward balance without consideration of trust fund surpluses.

SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING BALANCED BUDGET ENFORCEMENT.

It is the sense of Congress that, in order to ensure that a balanced budget is achieved by fiscal year 2002 and that the budget remains in balance thereafter, title XIV of H.R. 2530 establishing strict budget enforcement mechanisms should be enacted. Such language would—

(1) require the Federal Government to reach a balanced Federal budget by fiscal year 2002 and remain in balance thereafter;

(2) establish procedures for developing honest, accurate, and accepted budget estimates;

(3) require that the President propose annual budgets that would achieve a balanced Federal budget by fiscal year 2002 and for each year thereafter, using accurate assumptions;

(4) require the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate to report budget resolutions that achieve a balanced Federal budget by fiscal year 2002 and for each year thereafter, using accurate assumptions; and

(5) require Congress and the President to take action if the deficit targets in this resolution are not met.

SEC. 11. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING MEDICARE REFORM.

It is the sense of Congress that any legislation reforming medicare should reflect the policies and distribution of savings contained in H.R. 2530. Specifically, that legislation should—

(1) reform policies for medicare risk contracting to expand the choice of private options available to all medicare beneficiaries, including individuals in rural areas;

(2) contain regulatory reforms to facilitate the creation of provider-sponsored networks;

(3) contain reasonable reductions in the growth of payments to providers that do not threaten the availability or quality of care;

(4) require higher income medicare beneficiaries to pay a greater portion of medicare premiums without establishing a new bureaucracy for the collection of premiums;

(5) expand coverage of preventive benefits under medicare;

(6) provide a demonstration project for Medical Savings Accounts for medicare beneficiaries; and

(7) prohibit managed care plans from charging medicare beneficiaries additional premiums beyond the part B premium.

SEC. 12. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING MEDICAID REFORM.

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

(1) continue guaranteed coverage for low-income children, pregnant women, the elderly, and the disabled;

(2) continue the guarantee of an adequate benefits package for all medicaid beneficiaries;

(3) provide States with greater flexibility in the delivery of services and administration of the program;

(4) contain a financing mechanism in which the Federal Government fully shares in changes in program costs resulting from changes in caseload;

(5) require States to maintain current levels of financial effort to preserve the current joint Federal-State partnership in meeting the costs of this program;

(6) continue current restrictions on the use of provider taxes and donations and other illusory State financing schemes;

(7) continue Federal minimum standards for nursing homes;

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

(9) continue coverage of medicaid premiums and cost sharing for low-income seniors.

SEC. 13. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING WELFARE REFORM.

It is the sense of Congress that any legislation reforming welfare programs pursuant to this resolution should—

(1) impose tough work requirements on able-bodied recipients;

(2) provide sufficient resources for job training, child care, and other programs necessary to help welfare recipients make the transition from welfare to work;

(3) require States to maintain levels of financial support sufficient to operate an effective program;

(4) contain effective counter-cyclical mechanisms to assist States facing economic downturns or increases in population;

(5) include provisions holding States accountable for the use of Federal funds and the effectiveness of State programs;

(6) contain strong child support provisions; and

(7) maintain the integrity of the food stamp program as a national safety net.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be coming shortly, and he will be opposed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, last night after general debate on the budget, I was talking with one of my constituents who after watching several hours of debate was totally confused over what the argument was all about. While the budget and alternatives may be clear to those of us here in this Chamber, the people have a hard time following us.

Therefore, as simply as I can, I will now outline the principal differences between the various budgets we are considering.

All of the budgets offered would achieved balance in 2002. The differences are in the details of how much is cut each year, how much is spent or cut from each program, and how the programs are changed to achieve these savings.

Last year, at the beginning of the budget debate, the President's budget

and the Republican's budget were \$600 billion different between now and 2002. The coalition budget was a centrist budget, with numbers between the President's and Republican's, designed to bridge the gap between the two and facilitate an agreement which the President could sign into law.

Since that time, in an effort to resolve their differences, both the President and the Republicans have changed their proposals significantly toward one another. In fact, their numbers on spending have collapsed to virtually mirror the coalition budget. Today, the difference between the President and the coalition is only 0.6 percent and between the Republicans and the coalition is only 0.9 percent in an \$11 trillion budget over the next six years.

Being so close, then why isn't there agreement? The answer is found in the policy decisions—how you change each program to achieve the savings. Here again, the coalition budget has set forth proposed policy changes designed to bridge the gap with real common-sense solutions. In a moment, my colleagues will outline those solutions in welfare, Medicaid, Medicare, and other areas.

There is another major difference between the coalition budget and the others under consideration. That is how quickly the deficit is reduced and how much additional Government borrowing is necessary.

The coalition budget borrows \$137 billion less than the Republicans and \$200 billion less than the President over the next six years.

How is that done? The coalition budget cuts spending first. Both the Republicans and the President backload their spending cuts. What is backloading? That means that most of the spending cuts come in the last years of the budget. In fact 80 percent in the last 3 years. And they don't bring the deficit down below \$100 billion until the next century—when some future Congress and President will have to make the tough choices of spending cuts. According to CBO the Republican deficits will go up \$4 billion next year and then drop to only \$1 billion below today's level in 2 years. That is a net increase in the deficit of \$3 billion 2 years from now, leaving almost all of the tough decisions to the next Congress.

We have also heard a lot about tax cuts. The coalition budget does not include tax cuts, not because we oppose tax cuts, but rather we believe we should cut spending and achieve a balanced budget first. Next we should reform our tax system for fairness and simplicity. To try to combine both balancing the budget and tax cuts will guarantee neither and probably prevent either. In an effort to guarantee both, last year the budget contained the provision "Tax Reduction Contingent on Balanced Budget", but this year they refuse to include even those guarantees. Why? Because they promise tax cuts which the Joint Tax Com-

mittee says will cost \$216 billion, but only provide numbers in the budget for \$122 billion. That is not "truth in budgeting". The Republican plan is apparently to being a tax cut package first, an obvious benefit in an election year, and then separately try to change entitlements. This is the same approach used in the 1980's when deficits quadrupled the debt to over \$4 trillion.

I urge my colleagues to support the coalition budget.

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

□ 1245

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend from Connecticut, and I listened with interest to my colleague from Utah. I share the lament of one of his constituents, who, if I understand my friend correctly, said the argument seemed to be escaping the American people, by and large. We get caught up in too many arcane terms with reference to the budget.

So we will attempt to both respond to my colleague from Utah and to his constituent; and, indeed, Mr. Chairman, to the American people. I think there is simply this fundamental difference. It may be a matter of degrees on the liberal side of the aisle, but essentially what our friends in the coalition are saying is this: "We can change the way we spend money, but let us maintain control here in Washington, and let us maintain control," they say, "with the vast Federal bureaucracy."

Indeed, they use the same mechanisms of the past. Even in trying to have numbers meet in the middle, they have a philosophy which is more of the same: more taxing, more spending.

The budget offered by my friends who call themselves Blue Dog would raise taxes \$211 billion. The budget offered by the coalition would raise spending \$74 billion. And of great concern to the seniors in the Sixth District of Arizona and nationwide, the coalition budget would give seniors \$51 billion less over 6 years.

The remedy is the same. It is regrettable. Our colleagues who call themselves the Blue Dogs seek more of the green stuff from home. They want more of our money in taxes; they want more spending; and they want control here in Washington.

Our budget saves our children's future, empowers people to be self-reliant, and shifts the money, power, and influence out of the hands of the Washington bureaucrats and back home to Main Street, to local government, to solve problems.

With that in mind, I urge my colleagues to reject the budget of the Blue Dogs and stay with the new vision for the future.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Utah for yielding me the time.

I want to quickly respond to my colleague from Arizona and say there are no tax increases in the coalition budget, and that we save or we have \$140 billion more in deficit reduction than the Republican budget.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to that Republican budget and in strong support of the coalition substitute. The coalition substitute balances the budget in 6 years in an honest, straightforward manner, no detours, no gimmicks, and without any unnecessary tax cuts.

The coalition's budget balances our fiscal responsibility with our social responsibility, and the balance is perhaps best illustrated by our Medicare policy. The coalition budget ensures Medicare solvency for the same number of years as the Republican plan, yet without harsh Republican policies. Our Medicare plan is fair to seniors, does not allow managed care companies or doctors to extra bill them, and it only increases premiums for those with the highest incomes. It provides over \$2 billion for preventive benefits for cancer screening and diabetes testing, an investment that will make sense and will save both lives and money.

Our Medicare plan is also fair to providers. It is supported by numerous health care providers as the most equitable and reasonable way to save the trust fund. Let me read from a letter I received this morning from the American Hospital Association:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PAYNE: The American Hospital Association, representing 5,000 hospitals, health systems and other providers, believes the Coalition's budget alternative is the best choice available to Congress for balancing the Federal budget. We applaud your efforts and urge the Congress to adopt your fiscal year 1997 budget plan.

The Coalition alternative is compatible with the Medicare and Medicaid budget principles that the American Hospital Association has consistently supported.

We appreciate the thoughtful approach the Coalition has taken to deficit reduction, particularly as it pertains to Medicare and Medicaid.

Signed, Rick Pollack, executive vice president.

Mr. Chairman, seniors and providers of health care support our budget as the most equitable and most responsible, and I urge my colleagues to support the coalition Medicare plan and the coalition substitute budget.

Mr. Chairman, I include the letter from the American Hospital Association for the RECORD:

AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, May 15, 1996.

Hon. L.F. PAYNE,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PAYNE: The American Hospital Association (AHA), representing 5,000 hospitals, health systems, and other providers of care, believes the Coalition's budget alternative is the best choice available to the Congress for balancing the federal budget. We applaud your efforts and urge the Congress to adopt your fiscal year 1997 budget plan.

The Coalition alternative is compatible with the Medicare and Medicaid budget prin-

ciples that the American Hospital Association has consistently supported, including:

Assuring access to care for vulnerable populations—the Coalition preserves the Medicaid program as an entitlement and guarantees reasonable payment to providers for the care they deliver to Medicaid patients.

Giving hospitals the tools they need to compete in the future health care system—the Coalition alternative contains provider-sponsored organization (PSO) language that creates real options for Medicare patients.

Providing for shared responsibility among all stakeholders in the Medicare program.

Creating an independent citizens' commission to help Congress make the tough choices for Medicare's next 30 years.

Not cutting Medicare and Medicaid too fast or too deep—the Coalition's reductions to these two critical programs, while still deeper than we might prefer, are more balanced than those in the Republican or Administration plans.

We appreciate the thoughtful approach the Coalition has taken to deficit reduction, particularly as it applies to Medicare and Medicaid.

Sincerely,

RICK POLLACK,
Executive Vice President.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

(Mr. NEUMANN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, this issue of whether or not we should pass the blue dog budget is really a very, very simple matter. When put into perspective, under the blue dog budget the American people would pay \$211 billion more in taxes as compared to the Republican plan that we are going to be voting on later on today.

Second, the people in Washington, DC, will spend \$74 billion more over the next 6 years than under the Republican plan that we will be voting on later on today.

So it both taxes the American people more and it spends more, and our people in Wisconsin do not want to pay more taxes and they do not think the people in Washington, DC, need to spend more.

But that is not the biggest problem with the blue dog budget. The biggest problem is its impact on the Social Security benefits paid to our senior citizens. And to all of the senior citizens listening here today, I would like to caution them about some Washington jargon that should be a red flag. It is called the CPI adjustment.

Whenever anyone hears this Washington language, they need to know that what they are really talking about is reducing the amount of money that is available to be paid to our senior citizens in the future.

Let me make this very, very simple. If the blue dog budget passes today, and the CPI, that is the cost of living adjustment, would be 3 percent, under the blue dog plan it would be reduced to 2.5 percent. So instead of going up by 3 percent, an individual's Social Security payments would only go up by 2.5 percent instead.

Folks, this needs to be very, very clear; that under the blue dog budget

Social Security benefits are impacted. To me, this is a very simple matter. The blue dog budget taxes more, it spends more, and it reduces the amount of money compared to current law that would be paid to our senior citizens from where we are today.

Clearly, this is a budget we should be voting against for those three reasons: It taxes more, spends more, and reduces the benefits to our senior citizens.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arkansas [Mrs. BLANCH LAMBERT LINCOLN].

(Mrs. LINCOLN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Chairman, today, I come and rise in strong support of the blue dog coalition budget, and I oppose the other budgets being offered. I do that as a mother expecting two youngsters soon, and I am especially proud of the coalition's work on a fair balanced budget proposal.

One of the biggest selling points, and it is very clear to everyone, is that the coalition budget has less debt burden placed on our children, my children, everyone's children, in the future. The Republican budget will run up \$137 billion more in debt, which our children will have to pay; or the \$200 billion in the President's budget.

Regardless of what this extra debt is used for, tax cuts, spending, whatever, it will mean higher interest payments and, therefore, less money for our children. Anyone knows that less money down on a house means a larger payment; more interest that is not even deductible.

The coalition alternative balances the budget while being more responsible. The prime example is Medicaid. We maintain guaranteed coverage for those who need it, including disabled children. We allow Medicaid dollars to follow demand, keeping costs down by focusing our dollars on individuals and their needs. We guarantee adequate benefit packages to recipients.

Our guarantees of coverage and benefits will be enforceable through the Federal Government. The Republican proposal contains enforcement loopholes. We still give the States the flexibility that they need to create the savings. We retain Federal nursing home standards to protect our elderly citizens, which the Republican plan does not. We do all of this while still slowing the rate of growth in Medicaid, creating a total savings of \$70 billion over 6 years in Medicaid.

That is what the coalition budget is all about, balancing budget using common sense and fair approaches while doing all that we can to ease the burden on future Americans by taking responsibility for spending now.

If we are concerned about the future for our children, which my colleagues over here claim they are, no one can argue that ours is the only budget that leaves the least amount of debt to our children, all of our children.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO], the chairman of the committee that is reforming housing.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment but also to congratulate my colleagues who have put forward this amendment in an effort to try to find a constructive solution.

Let me say, ladies and gentleman, that we do not go the whole route with this alternative. In 1950, ladies and gentlemen, a family of four making an inflation-adjusted \$50,000 in current dollars paid about 4 percent of their income in Federal taxes. Guess what it is now: 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 18? If Members guessed any of those, they would be wrong. Twenty-six percent in the last 40 years; a 6-fold increase in the Federal tax burden.

Is there any wonder why moms cannot spend more time with their children after school to go over homework or dads have to work overtime just to meet that Federal burden?

The Republican budget meets this challenge. It begins to say that Americans who earn more will be able to keep more so they can do more. They can make their own decisions. They can help their families. They can have more time to spend going over homework and going to clubs and organizations with their children.

In 1993 this body passed the largest tax increase in the history of our Nation. Now we are going down another path, a path where Americans can keep more of what they earn and help their families.

Alan Greenspan, the chairman of the Federal Reserve board, said in testimony before us that families can look forward to their children doing better than they, and that is the American dream.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], the ranking member and former chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

(Mr. SABO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I congratulate the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], and other Members of the coalition for the budget that they present. If our goal is to balance the budget by 2002, this is the alternative that might actually do it.

Mr. Chairman, we need a little humility when we project 6 years into the future. Many things can change. But if there is any plan that can actually work, it is the Orton proposal. It is tough, it is realistic, but it is also fair to people.

It means less interest costs for the Federal Government. It is the one plan that might actually result in happening what we talk about; that a young

family buying a new home might actually have lower mortgage payments because of lower interest rate costs.

It is a good proposal, it is fair, it is workable, it is the one that can achieve our goals. I, in the strongest way I can, urge people to vote for this good alternative, and I congratulate the gentleman from Utah.

□ 1300

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN].

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my friends, the blue dogs on this side of the aisle, for bringing forth this budget today. I think it is a great improvement over the budget we are going to see next, which is the President's budget. I think the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] is going to bring it to the floor.

I say that because the President's budget does not even balance over the 6-year period based on CBO numbers, unless you add some late year gimmicks the last 2 years on some contingencies. So I commend them for having a product that does get to balance. I have a few problems with it as I look at it.

No. 1, in the entitlement area, which is where most of our spending increases are now, they do not get at the real problems, in my view, in Medicaid. I think there could be an unfunded mandate in Medicaid because there is a lack of flexibility, as compared with the Republican approach.

With regard to Medicare, you cannot tell how long the part A trust fund remains solvent based on this approach. It looks like we have a shift from the part A trust fund to the taxpayer-paid part B trust fund.

Finally, and this is the fundamental point, it has higher taxes and higher spending than the Republican plan which gets to balance in the same time period. So why vote for something that does not have the attributes of the Republican plan in terms of entitlement reform, fundamental reforms and has higher taxes and higher spending and gets there at the same time?

I guess my view is, why not the best? We have a plan that has lower taxes and less spending that gets us to balance. That is what we need to do.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

(Mr. CARDIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge my colleagues in the House to vote for the coalition budget. Let me suggest three reasons why they should.

First, there is no question that the coalition budget reduces the Federal deficit greater than any of the other proposals before us. Just compare the facts. After 3 years under the Republican budget, the deficit will be reduced by just \$35 billion, from \$150 billion to \$115 billion. Then they would have us

believe that Congress is going to jump off a cliff in the next 3 years and eliminate that \$115 billion deficit.

Compare that to the coalition budget which reduces the deficit during the first 3 years by almost one half, down from \$150 billion to \$80 billion.

The true measure as to whether we are serious about deficit reduction is what we do up front. The coalition budget does the best job of keeping us on a glide path to really get the budget deficit over with. Over the next 6 years the Republican committee budget will increase the national debt by \$140 billion more than the coalition budget. The American people want us to end the flood of red ink. The coalition budget is the serious proposal to get that done.

The CBO, OMB, and outside interest groups all agree that this is the best approach, if reducing the deficit is our top domestic priority.

The second reason I urge my colleagues to support this approach is that this approach protects the priorities that are important to the American people. It protects priorities in education, environment, and health care. It protects student loans and provides \$45 billion more for education and training programs to help prepare American children and workers for the economic challenges of the future.

The third reason is that the coalition budget can pass. Democrats and Republicans can come together on the coalition budget and we can really get the job done. If we want to accomplish a balanced budget by the year 2002, this is the way to go. We can come together as Democrats and Republicans, and I urge my colleagues to support the coalition budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. Very briefly, if the Democrats or the coalition or the blue dogs had presented this budget 2 years ago, I suspect most everybody on this side of the aisle would have voted for it.

The reason I suggest we should not vote for this blue dog budget is because it would replace an even better budget passed by the Budget Committee. Here is why I think the Republican budget is better. The Democrat proposal has higher taxes. It has increased spending and that means returning to a tax and spending philosophy.

We had a tax increase in 1993. All of this side of the aisle voted for the tax increase. That tax increase, according to the Heritage Foundation, cost Americans 1.2 million additional private sector jobs and \$208 billion in economic output. The Democrat coalition budget continues all of the 1993 tax increases.

We have such huge budget problems. I compliment the coalition Members for looking at Social Security. That could be the next catastrophe to hit

this country. We need to start dealing with it. I say we have got to have a tax change policy that encourages job expansion for more and better jobs to assist our effort to solve these budget problems.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TANNER].

(Mr. TANNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time to me. I thank the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] for his leadership on the coalition on putting this budget together.

We in the coalition have struggled for this entire Congress and we had the luxury, quite frankly, of being called sometimes a minority within a minority, to put forth a public policy document free of as much partisan politics as is possible in this city of Washington, DC.

You will hear a lot of rhetoric. I will not get into it. The Republicans say this raises taxes, this does not, welfare is better or worse in our plan or yours. But my colleagues, there is one good reason why about 40 major newspapers and the Concord Coalition, which is a bipartisan group dedicated to the balancing of this Nation's budget, has endorsed the coalition plan. They have no ax to grind. They take it seriously. I really know of nobody who has credibility on this issue more in our country than the Concord Coalition. They say the blue dog budget is the way to go.

Why? No. 1, we stop borrowing money quicker. We do not keep going into debt as both the Republican and the White House budgets do. That is uncontroverted.

No. 2, we have in our plan an enforcement mechanism, the only one on the floor today.

Mr. Chairman, I was here for part of Gramm-Rudman 2. We had Gramm-Rudman 1. We had the budget summit of 1990, all well-intentioned by good-meaning people to try to get something done, and what happened? We had a big announcement that things were going to get better and because of lack of enforcement, it did not happen.

We put an enforcement mechanism in our budget. We are not interested in going out here and having a press conference and making an announcement that the budget is going to be balanced in 6 years unless it actually happens. We try to do it.

Please support our plan.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], my colleague on the Committee on the Budget.

(Mr. KOLBE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to restore a comment that was made earlier by my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH]. I think if this were the budget that were

proposed 2 years ago, we would all be up here enthusiastically endorsing it. But that was 2 years ago today, we think there is a better alternative that is available.

The chief difference between this alternative budget proposed by the conservative Democrat coalition and the Republican budget comes in the area of tax relief for American citizens. The coalition talks about how we are going to achieve greater deficit reduction. They say their deficit reduction numbers are bigger. The Concord Coalition endorses it. That is true. It does make a faster reduction in the deficit at least initially.

Mr. Chairman, what the coalition budget does not do is give necessary relief to American taxpayers. American taxpayers are paying too much in taxes today. Whereas a few years ago, a generation ago, Americans were sending 4, 5 percent of their income to Washington, today they are sending over 20 percent. When you add in local and State taxes, for a one-income family, 36 percent of their income goes to taxes, 39 percent for a two-income family. It is too much.

We need to stimulate the economy. We need to stimulate growth by putting some money back in people's pockets. That is the difference between these two budget proposals.

We believe we can achieve a balanced budget. We get to a balanced budget at the same time as the coalition budget. We believe we can achieve a balanced budget. We can do it while giving at the same time some tax relief to American citizens.

Mr. Chairman, there is another difference. If you look at this proposal over the very long run, even longer than our budget horizon goes, you do not get the fundamental changes that you must make to entitlement programs in order to have longstanding, long lasting, budget deficit reduction.

That is one of the big differences here. We have got to change programs. We have got to make changes to entitlements if we are ever going to really see a balanced budget. For those two reasons, tax relief for American citizens and fundamental changes to entitlement programs, the Republican budget proposal should be supported.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

(Mr. MONTGOMERY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the coalition budget.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, a number of Members have used this chart. Our plan will help Americans earn more,

keep more, so they can do more. That has been the rhetoric. Let me suggest to my friends that this rhetoric was copyrighted in 1981. It was called supply-side economics. It was copyrighted at a time when we had \$945 billion in debt that confronted the American public. Twelve years later, when not a nickel was spent in America that Ronald Reagan and George Bush did not approve, not a nickel, we had an additional \$4 trillion in debt.

I suggest that the Republican budget is an easy budget to vote for. You get the candy without a promise of medicine later on. Politicians and people like to do that. Do it easy. It is tough to say we are going to constrain entitlements. I understand that. There has been some demagoguery, very frankly, on this side of the aisle where Social Security is being cut, although Medicare, we are slowing the growth, give me a break. How dumb do we think the American public is?

Mr. Chairman, we need to have courage. We need to be honest. We need to trust the people. I am not going to vote for the President's budget because I think, like the Republican budget, it makes early promises and early ease for long-term greater pain. That is what we did in 1981. And we did it together. Let us together be honest with the American public. The coalition budget is not perfect. No budget will be perfect because it is a consensus. We work together.

But the coalition budget is honest in that it says we have a problem. We have a deficit that is too high, that is slowing growth, undermining America's ability to grow and to earn more. Let us confront the tough questions first and then reap the benefits later. Vote for the coalition budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to correct my colleague.

On Medicaid, we are increasing spending from \$95 billion to \$140 billion. My colleague may call that a cut but it is not. It is an increase in spending. We increased Medicare from \$196 billion to \$284 billion. We are increasing Medicare.

My colleague took a chart and then proceeded to mislead, in my judgment, the facts. Medicare is growing from \$196 to \$284 billion. That is not a cut. It is a 45-percent increase in spending. Medicaid is going from \$95 billion to \$104 billion. The student loan program is going from \$24 billion to \$36 billion. We do have a cut, \$500 tax cut for children for families making under \$100,000. We pay for that tax cut. It is not like 1981, like my colleague would try to imply. We pay for it. We set aside the money by making further reductions in the budget.

Mr. Chairman, this coalition budget spends more, It raises more money in revenue. It goes after senior citizens by going and paying them less in their Social Security benefits.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. PARKER].

(Mr. PARKER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1315

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], for yielding this time to me, and I want to join my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], in saying that if 2 years ago the Blue Dog Coalition budget had been offered, it would have passed in a tremendous vote of confidence with the Democrats in charge, and I will tell my colleagues the Democrats could very well still be in charge of this House if they had followed the advice of the Blue Dog Coalition.

But I will also tell my colleagues that there is a lot of rhetoric on both sides. People are made up of 99-percent water, so I think it is kind of a natural phenomenon that people, they act like water, they follow the course of least resistance, and that is what we are doing in a lot of ways around this place.

I am really struck though by the fact that everybody says we have got a choice between the President's budget, the Blue Dog budget, the Black Coalition budget and the Republican budget as though one of those plans is going to be all and end all.

Now, my personal belief is the Republican plan takes the first big step, but anyone in this Chamber, anyone in this country, who believes that the Republican plan, as draconian as all the Democrats are saying that it is, if my colleagues think that that is going to be the panacea, they are wrong. The Republican plan is just the first step.

If we are going to get this budget in balance, if we are going to control the spending of our Government and create an economy where our children and grandchildren can prosper, the only way it can be done is to take very severe steps. The Republican plan is not a severe measure in any way, shape or form. Everybody in this Chamber had better start looking at this from an adult perspective and quit playing politics. We are talking about the future of our Nation.

The Republican plan takes just the first steps. There are more drastic steps that are going to have to be taken, and I am more than willing to take those steps because I think that the payoff that we will have as a Nation, it will be more than worth it.

We need to quit playing politics. We need to vote for the Republican plan.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the conservative coalition budget alternative. Of all the budget alternatives the House will consider this year, this is by far the most favorable in its

treatment of research and development.

I make this point not just because I happen to be an advocate of science and technology. The more important issue is that this budget alternative directly and clearly recognizes that investing in R&D will stimulate economic growth. That is, it treats R&D as an integral part of their overall plan to eliminate the deficit, create jobs, and increase productivity.

I will take a moment to contrast this with the Republican view and the Republican treatment of R&D in House Concurrent Resolution 178. That view is pervasive throughout the report accompanying that resolution. R&D, they say, is just another form of corporate welfare, it is just another expenditure that needs to be cut, the Federal Government no longer needs to spend as much money on R&D, they say. For that reason, the Republican budget resolution cuts civilian R&D by 25 percent over the next 6 years.

The coalition budget restores this funding and targets it on some very critical needs:

It maintains a healthy and stable space program and provides NASA the funding it will need to carry out its critical programs.

It increases funding for basic research in agencies such as NSF, real increases, not some distorted arithmetic such as in the Republican resolution.

It provides funding for critical energy programs in solar and renewable research, fossil energy research, and energy conservation. The coalition budget recognizes that these are critical to our energy security and a sustainable future and are not just product improvements, as the Republican budget calls them.

Finally, it provides much needed funding for various environmental research programs that will be critical in basing any future regulations on actual risk data.

Mr. Chairman, the conservative coalition budget makes many good decisions. It holds defense spending to what is actually needed, it avoids a misguided tax cut, and it puts us on the road to a healthier and more productive economic future. Investments in research and development are a major part of this equation.

I do have concerns with the CPI cuts. I will work to see that a final budget package finds another way to reach balance and to promote a healthy, growing economy without the kind of CPI cuts contained in the coalition budget.

But, overall, the coalition budget does make many wise choices. I will vote for it today and ask my colleagues to join me.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to apologize to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER]. He was right on one and wrong on another. We are paying for our taxes; I disagreed with him there. But he did make the point that we were allowing

Medicare and Medicaid to grow, and I misunderstood his comments, and I apologize to the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the coalition budget in one decent respect in which we must all agree at one point or another, and that is the increased funding for the health component of Government spending.

As a stalwart supporter of the National Institutes of Health, I consider the work that they do in trying to prevent disease and to cure disease alone merits the full attention of the Congress of the United States because everything that they do is for the individual betterment of the American citizen, and so I commend the coalition on that score, and I hope to be able to convince the Republican Members when we get farther down the budget process that the balancing act that we eventually have to do will take some cognizance of the coalition health funding than is now the case in the budget resolution preferred by the Republicans.

On the other hand, I want to say, in summary, of the gentleman from Maryland, I promise now that I will never say that the Democrats are interested in cutting Social Security if they will consider promising from this floor that they will never say the Republicans are interested in cutting Medicare. If we can make that kind of deal, we have gone a long way in trying to be commonsensical to the American people who, as the gentleman from Maryland says, are not stupid.

We are not cutting Medicare, they are not cutting Social Security. I wish from the President down that the Democratic side of the government will acknowledge that the Republicans at long last are not cutting Medicare.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, in Indiana we are known for our hard work and our common sense. This coalition budget represents hard work because it is not a pie-in-the-sky budget, it cuts spending in Washington first, and it also is known for its common sense because we do not cut a dime from student loans, we do not cut a nickel from hot lunches for poor children in Indiana or Tennessee, and we do not cut a penny from Head Start programs, one of the best investments we make.

Now, if the Republican budget stays with a \$13 billion increase in defense, as that bill passed yesterday, we are going to see B-2 bombers and a host of other things that are going to require cuts in education that are not going to reflect common sense.

People in Indiana and across the country want and deserve a balanced budget. This coalition budget does it fairly and with common sense, not a

pie-in-the-sky budget, but reflects the grass roots, hard work of the Midwest and other States in the Union.

I strongly support a vote for this budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Kolbe].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I want to respond to what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] said about the Republican budget cutting school lunches and student loans. That just simply is not true.

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

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman for a few seconds here. Go ahead.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I would just say to the gentleman, first of all we have just been working for the last 1½ years, and the gentleman from Arizona will not deny that Head Start was cut under their first budget, student loans were cut under their first budget—

Mr. KOLBE. No, Mr. Chairman, that is simply not true.

Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, student loans are not being cut. First of all, Pell grant will go up, the total dollar volume of student loans will go up under the Republican budget. The only thing that we are talking about cutting is cutting the very wasteful, bureaucratic direct student loan program. We are going to reduce some of the money that goes in subsidies to bankers. But we are not cutting the number of student loans or the amount of student loans. Let us make that very clear.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from the State of New Jersey [Mr. FRANKS].

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I had the opportunity to open this discussion yesterday, and I reflected on the fact that budget proposals are indeed a reflection of our values and our priorities, and in one important respect there is something fundamentally dangerous about the budget resolution that is before us today. It seeks to impose legislatively an arbitrary so-called correction of the Consumer Price Index.

Now there is a body of economists who believe that the CPI currently overstates the impact of inflation, and I think most of us would agree that something should be done about it.

But what the blue dog budget seeks to do would not only, if adopted, reduce Social Security checks next year, but it would set the movement to try to responsibly reform the CPI back for years. We should only be tinkering with this measure of inflation after a technically competent group can arrive at some scientific measures of the most popular recognition of how we can more accurately assess the impact of inflation. To rely on a budget fix, not of a hundred million or a billion or \$10 billion, but in excess of \$50 billion with the CPI plug when we do not have

the final analysis having been completed by either BLS or by the Senate Finance Committee's commission.

We can wait and know that we have got the scientific efficacy, the legitimacy, to make this change. To arbitrarily make it in the form of legislation will, in my judgment, set back the cause of responsibly reforming the CPI.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds just to respond with regard to the CPI.

Senate Majority Leader BOB DOLE last September, in talking about the CPI, endorsing the reduction in the CPI, said, quote, "It can only happen if we join hands. I think we ought to do it in a bipartisan way without taking political shots." Now that is a quote from the Washington Times, September 27.

Also I would remind my colleagues that 11 Republican Senators have also proposed a CPI increase twice as high as that proposed in the blue dog budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] for yielding this time to me.

I am pleased once again to join in supporting the bipartisan coalition balanced budget proposal. In contrast to both the Gingrich and the President's budget proposals, cuts in this budget are balanced in each year and achieve a zero deficit without resorting to unsustainable program cuts in the out-years and an ill-timed tax cut paid for with borrowed money.

The coalition proposal is a honest compromise between the other two major proposals, and it contains policy recommendations that strengthen and preserve Medicare and Medicaid as well as critical investments in education, technology, and the environment.

I support tax cuts including a capital gains tax cut, but they should be enacted and paid for in the context of overall tax reform when we can also simplify the tax system.

If we are serious about deficit reduction, let us put spending cuts first. Let us put a plan on the table that asks the 104th Congress to make the same kind of hard decisions that we will ask of the 105th and 106th Congresses.

Vote for the coalition budget.

□ 1330

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the State of Louisiana [Mr. MCCRERY], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. MCCRERY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to commend the authors of the coalition

budget. It is an excellent budget. It is not the best budget on the floor today, but it is an excellent budget. If anyone doubts the positive impact on the budget process that the new Republican majority has had, they need only look at the offerings on the floor of the House of Representatives today and compare them with the offerings of just 3 years ago. There is a marked distinction, a marked distinction in favor of future generations of Americans; in favor of dealing honestly with our Nation's fiscal problems.

I want to commend those who have brought honest budgets to the floor today. I also know, however, that some of these same authors of the coalition budget just 3 years ago voted against a tax increase. They voted against President Clinton's tax increase. Yet, they stand on the floor today, just 3 years later, and say, "Oh, well, we were against them then, but today we think they are okay." That is essentially what they are saying when they refuse to give back to the American people any portion of President Clinton's tax increase of 1993.

The Republican budget gets back for the people less than half of the tax increase that was passed by one vote in this House 3 years ago. I do not think that is too much. I would like to do more. I would like to give more of that money that we took from the American people in 1993 back to them, but at least we get a good start in the Republican budget.

The coalition budget, as good as it is, taxes more and spends more. That is the key difference between their budget and the Republican budget. Please vote no on this coalition budget. Support the Republican budget.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

(Mr. BENTSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the coalition budget, the fairest, most realistic, most achievable, and most responsible of the balanced budget plans before us.

This plan meets the goals of both the President and the Republican leadership by balancing the budget within 6 years using the conservative economic assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office. But most importantly, this is a plan that is good for our economy and good for the American people because it preserves vital investments such as health care, medical and scientific research, education, and environmental protection.

The coalition budget is superior to the other plans before us in many ways.

First, it includes \$137 billion more in deficit reduction than the Republican plan, leaving less debt to burden our economy and future generations. And it achieves more deficit reduction faster than the backloaded Republican plan, making it more likely that future

Congresses will stick to this plan and actually balance the budget.

Second, the coalition budget extends the solvency of the Medicare trust fund without taking away senior citizens' choice of doctors, as the Republican plan would do. The coalition budget ensures adequate funding for medical education by providing dedicated funding from managed health care plans for this important purpose.

Third, the coalition budget continues the guarantee of health care coverage for all current Medicaid beneficiaries and protects families from the devastating cost of long-term care.

The coalition budget also sets the right investment priorities. It provides \$45 billion more for education programs such as student loans, elementary and secondary education, Head Start, and job training. It provides \$8.7 billion more for medical research at the National Institutes of Health and other agencies. Finally, Mr. Chairman, the coalition budget is the only budget proposal which achieves a balanced budget without shifting the tax burden. The Republican budget would increase taxes for families earning \$28,000 or less and double flood insurance premiums for homeowners.

Mr. Chairman, the coalition budget offers the best opportunity to put aside partisan politics and pass a common-sense balanced budget that is fair to the American people and good for our economy. I urge my colleagues to pass this budget, and I urge the President and the Republican leadership to come to agreement on a plan such as this.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE].

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, the reason we are fighting for a balanced budget is that it will allow young working families to save more of the money that they earn. It will boost the economy. It will increase their wages. The problem with the Clinton budget is that it taxes more and it spends more. And the problem with the Clinton budget is that it simply does not balance. It increases the deficit next year, and even more the year after that. That means more money out of the taxpayers' pockets.

Our GOP budget ends three decades of reckless deficit spending and stops forcing our children to pay our bills. Currently, the Federal Government taxes and spends on programs that in many cases simply are not effective, and that is why we provide tax relief. That is why we reform welfare. That is why we are shifting power and money and influence out of Washington and giving it back to the people whose taxes it was paid with.

For example, in this budget we terminate the Department of Energy and the Department of Commerce, chronically mismanaged agencies. We eliminate or privatize 130 wasteful or unnecessary Federal programs, saving more than \$34 billion over 6 years. The Republican budget cuts corporate welfare,

it implements the FAIR Act, taking us away from a command-control Federal farm program, and leading us back toward a more purely based market-based farm system.

Last, Mr. Chairman, President Clinton's budget plan avoids making the hard choices. Of all the spending cuts he recommends, 64 percent take place in the last 2 years, after he is out of office. As has been pointed out, that is like trying to lose 50 pounds over 50 weeks and waiting until the last week to lose 49 pounds. It simply will not happen.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, we are in the strange position of all agreeing that we wish to balance the budget in 7 years, but then quibbling over some of the details, and also over the design. I think it is important to put in bold relief the difference between the coalition plan and the Republican plan and the President's plan.

I think that perhaps nothing speaks more eloquently to this than the comments of the last speaker. That is, how much are we actually making in terms of sacrifices and cuts in these early years, when we are serving in Congress and we are answerable for our actions?

I submit that both under the President's plan and under the Republican plan, we are being asked to postpone the tough decisions until later, when we are perhaps not even in office. It is not responsible, I submit, to take this attitude, but instead, we should ask that realistic cuts and sacrifices be made now, in 1996, 1997, 1998. Under the Republican plan, approximately \$90 billion of deficit reduction has to occur in the last 2 years.

It is unrealistic to think this will happen. We all agree that we ought to be cutting taxes, but tragically, when we attempt to cut taxes, we borrow money to finance that cut. The Republican plan has \$137 billion less deficit reduction than the coalition plan, as a result. I urge support for the coalition plan.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute and 30 seconds, just to point out to the gentleman that, of course, the administration and most of the Members of the majority were supporting a President's budget that would have spent \$7 billion in 1996 more than what the Democrats spent in 1995.

So in other words, the Democrats in the House essentially supported, not all but the greatest number of them, supported the President's proposal to increase Washington spending by \$7 billion, discretionary spending by \$7 billion over 1995 and 1996. We advocated making a reduction of somewhere over \$23 billion, from 1995 and 1996. We ended up with \$23 billion worth of savings in Washington spending, the single greatest amount of savings in at least the last 50 years.

So to argue that our budget is backloaded is kind or absurd, because

we have been able to force the greatest amount of savings in over 50 years. We accomplished that just the opposite of what the administration wanted to do. We did not backload. We got in there in the very first year, I would say to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY], and we made the most significant downsizing of Washington spending and Washington bureaucracy since World War II.

So let us not argue about who is doing the backloading. We are not doing any backloading. We are doing a lot of heavy lifting, and I want to compliment the House. There were only 32 votes against it, so we are in the midst of a real change in this city.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me thank my colleague, the gentleman from Utah, for yielding time to me, and for the good work he has done on the coalition budget.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to point out that the Republican budget that we are dealing with today is the same one that was tried as blackmail to force this President to sign priorities he disagreed with, and the American people disagreed with. It took two shutdowns of this Government to bring the Republican Members of Congress to their senses, so we could proceed with last year's budget.

This budget, again, is a repeat. The poor, the sick, the elderly, our students, the environment, all, once again, face drastic cuts. The elderly and the disabled will no longer be guaranteed a minimum of medical care should they be unable to afford it because Medicaid would be block granted. Rural hospitals and rural medicine would suffer because of the Office of Rural Health is eliminated, on top of many new reductions in the Department of Agriculture's programs, that go well beyond the most recently passed farm bill.

There is no question that the coalition budget is a much better way of balancing the budget. There are no cuts in education or student loans. Medicare and Medicaid growth is controlled, as it must be, but not ruthlessly slashed. The coalition budget not only balances by the year 2002, it creates a surplus. It starts doling out whatever medicine we must take now, gradually reducing the deficit over the 7-year period, rather than plusing up spending, as the Republican budget does, in a way that makes it questionable as to whether we will ever get to the other end of this road we must travel.

There is no question that the honest and up front approach has been taken by the coalition. It should serve as a basis for agreement, not only in this Congress, before we end our deliberations, but I would hope in the next Congress, when a new majority takes control. Again, I want to thank those

who have worked so hard and showed courage in breaking new ground, particularly on the issue of cost-of-living adjustments.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding time to me, and I also want to commend him on his work. I rise not as a member of the Blue Dogs, but I rise as a Member who thinks that the proposal that is authorized by the coalition indeed is a strong proposal, and in fact is the strongest one we have.

I also rise as one who thinks all three alternatives really are better than the Republican party's, because they, indeed, balance the priorities of this Nation. So I am pleased to say I am an advocate and supporter of a balanced budget, but I am even more pleased to say I am supporting a balanced budget that makes tough choices and shared sacrifices across the board, and it does it not at the expense of the poor or the expense of the working American.

Again, all three substitute budgets make clear the programs and policies do support the average American citizen. The coalition budget protects and preserves these fundamental values that make America strong. At the same time, it does not increase the tax burden, as, indeed, the Republican party does, and it does it at the expense of the poor, and the working Americans, when they say cuts, which, indeed, has been the motto for the Republican Party.

I think the coalition budget also has taken a strong position in saying all of us must make sacrifices, those who are senior citizens as well as the rest of America, but it does it in the most appropriate way. There are those who would like to demagog those taking this courageous step. I think they need to be complimented.

Yes; I would emphasize, all three substitutes are better than the Republican party's. I urge my colleague to reject the Republican party's alternative and vote strongly for the resolution that the coalition has put before us.

□ 1345

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN].

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk about welfare spending. Welfare spending is so huge it is tough to comprehend. One way to put it, though, is this.

On average the cost of the welfare system amounted to \$3,300 for each household that paid Federal income tax in the year 1993. That means the first \$3,300 of taxes from that household went into the welfare system black hole. I am sorry, but that is a lot of money for a Federal bureaucracy that has simply failed every American.

Mr. Chairman, some studies show that for every dollar that is spent in the current welfare system, 70 cents of

that dollar is wasted on the Federal Government bureaucracy. That is not compassion, I would argue. The money in our Federal welfare system needs to go to those folks who really need it, not a bureaucrat inside the beltway.

Let us talk a moment about compassion, because many of the liberal Members seem to have a distorted sense of what that term means when it comes to our Nation's failed welfare policies. More taxes do not equal more compassion.

Is it compassionate to continue with the status quo that for the last three generations has only served to strip women and children of their dignity? I do not think so. Is it compassionate to prolong a system that encourages destructive behavior and greater illegitimacy plus little incentive to go to work? I do not think so. Is it compassionate to maintain a system that traps so many children in such a poor environment that it exposes them to higher rates of domestic abuse, higher rates of violent crime, and inadequate educational opportunities, so that some children never during the course of their lifetime have within their family a role model who holds a job? I do not think so.

Republicans say no. In fact, our current welfare system is anything but compassionate in reality. It is destructive. Most Americans on welfare want to go to work, but as long as the Government offers them a better deal to stay dependent and makes it tougher to move off welfare, many of them will stay on welfare. That is not compassionate.

Our proposal will bypass this outdated bureaucracy at the Federal level and it will funnel money more directly to the people who so desperately need it. Our proposal will shift the Government's current destructive incentives to incentives that promote marriage and work. And our proposal will remove the Federal Government as a surrogate parent and enable people to take personal responsibility for their lives.

Republicans want to help people break the cycle of poverty that holds down families and children of America. That is compassion. I encourage my colleagues to vote down the blue dog budget and to vote for the Republican budget that funds \$6 million in child care, that goes after deadbeat parents, and that sends our welfare tax dollars back to the States and to the people who need it.

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

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT].

(Mr. CONDIT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the coalition budget, I ask all my colleagues to vote for it, and I commend the gentleman from Utah

[Mr. ORTON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] for the work they have done.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, let me just thank my friend from Utah for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, could the gentlewoman from Washington tell us what she means about the liberals, the so-called liberals having a distorted sense of compassion? Maybe being from Georgia, I do not quite really understand what "distortion" means.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 1/4 minutes to simply say that to try to combine both balancing the budget and tax cuts will guarantee neither and probably prevent either. In an effort to guarantee both, last year the budget contained the provision called "Tax Reduction Contingent on Balanced Budget," but this year they even refuse to include those guarantees. Why? Because they promise tax cuts which the Joint Committee says will cost almost \$216 billion but only provide numbers in the budget for \$122 billion. That is not truth-in-budgeting. The Republican plan is apparently to bring a tax cut package first, an obvious benefit in an election year, and then separately try to change entitlements. This is the same approach used in the 1980's when deficits quadrupled the debt to over \$4 trillion.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the coalition plan which is the only plan which does not borrow money. I would just point out that the \$122 billion of tax cuts is borrowed money. We are going to borrow money from future generations to pay it back to today's generation in a tax cut that people say they would rather use the money to balance the budget.

I urge my colleagues to support the coalition budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 3 minutes.

(Mr. STENHOLM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the coalition budget, and think it would be helpful if all of us lowered the tones of our voices and stuck a little bit more to the facts before us.

The coalition budget differs from the majority budget in that we do not borrow \$137 billion in order to grant all of us who need it a tax cut. The chart to my right shows the difference. The orange and the yellow lines are the difference between the majority's views of what the deficit ought to look like in 2002, the White House opinion of what it ought to be, and what the coalition believes that it ought to be.

I for one accept, and I believe I speak for every single Member that supports the coalition budget on both sides of

the aisle, with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] that said we should stop talking about cutting, in this case the accusation from a few of the extremists on this side of the aisle that said we are cutting Social Security. We ought not to be saying that because that is not true, and we know it, and the two freshman Members that made that statement know better.

Now the end of that. I commend my colleagues on this side for saying that and helping set the record straight. No one is proposing cutting Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security. But what we are talking about doing, and there are differences of opinion, and members of the coalition, myself in particular, have major differences with the majority and how they choose to adjust Medicare and Medicaid. But we are getting very close on welfare reform, and the beautiful speech we heard a moment ago, we are there, folks, we are there. Why we keep talking about that, I do not know.

But I have to say, and I will be happy to yield at any time to anyone on this side that challenges anything that I am saying in the few seconds I have got remaining, because representing a rural area, I object strenuously to cutting 56 percent of the remaining discretionary spending for agriculture in rural America. That is not the farm program. We took care of that. Fifty-six percent.

The gentleman and the party now that suggest that we ought to eliminate 100 percent of the research on fossil fuels, at a time we are complaining about the price of gasoline, I say makes no sense whatsoever. So I differ with your policies in that regard, and let us debate those policies on the floor. But let us quit making accusations. There is bipartisan support for education, there is bipartisan support for meaningful health care.

What we suggest in the coalition budget is that we ought to be honest going into it and say if we are going to be for it, speak for it, we ought to budget for it, not come on the floor of the House and make some of the speeches that we have heard here today. That is not helpful.

But I want to say, in fairness and in closing, I appreciate the tenor of most of the debate that has come from this side today. It is helpful. And I appreciate my colleagues on our side for supporting this budget, and I urge its passage. It could be the most positive step forward for this Congress in dealing with the very real problems that both sides say that we need to address.

Ms. FURSE. I rise today during consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 178 to support of the coalition balanced budget plan. As someone who strongly supports balancing the budget, there are aspects to each proposal with which I disagree. After evaluating each approach, I support the coalition budget because it is fiscally conservative and socially responsible. It is a common sense approach that both Democrats and Republicans can support.

We need a balanced budget plan that emphasizes security in our communities and families. I believe the Republican balanced budget plan of last year was rightly rejected by the public and deserved the President's veto. Simply put, it is wrong to ask seniors and students to pay more while giving the Pentagon a \$70 billion boost.

I believe the Black Caucus budget has the best priorities, because it cuts wasteful Pentagon spending by over \$250 billion. Moreover, the Black Caucus budget makes education and our communities a priority. Unfortunately, it goes beyond simply cutting corporate welfare and dramatically increases taxes.

The coalition balanced budget is a common sense budget. It balances the budget through tough spending cuts, without raising taxes, but maintains our priorities. There are no education cuts in the coalition plan. It reforms Medicaid, but does not eliminate health care guarantees for children and pregnant women. It makes important changes in the welfare system, but does not punish children for the actions of their parents. It also emphasizes community health and other protections.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it is plain wrong to make seniors and students pay more to hand out tax cuts for the rich. We should make balancing the budget our number one priority—that is what the coalition budget does. This is the second year in a row that I have supported the coalition balanced budget plan, and hope we can pass it before the end of the year.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, no matter how you address the issue, the coalition budget is far and away, more beneficial and less extreme than the bombastic Republican budget. This Republican budget continues the policies of wanton destruction of this Nation's environment, human capital, and technological infrastructure.

May I remind my colleagues that absolutely none of the deficit reduction attempts being attempted would have been possible without the previous efforts of both Presidents Bush and Clinton. Regardless of what my Republican colleagues will tell you, getting toward a balanced budget is neither a new or distinctly Republican idea—it is an American idea. However, it is an idea which must be achieved through thoughtful and careful policies designed to make the taxpayers' money work harder without destroying the social and technological progress that this Nation has built, and the coalition budget does this.

As an example, the members of the Science Committee soundly rejected last year, the privatization of the Department of Energy's National Laboratories. We did so because Republicans and Democrats alike understood how important these precious national resources are. Mr. KASICH and his Republican colleagues obviously do not, since they would carelessly sell off these irreplaceable technological jewels to the highest bidder. It is clear that they were thinking no farther ahead than November 2, and their desire for a political trophy.

Mr. Chairman, I would venture to say that those proposing the coalition budget are even more serious about deficit reduction than the Republican proposal. The coalition budget cuts the deficit without tax cuts. The coalition budget cuts the deficit while spending more on education, economic development, and scientific research. They can do this because this

budget postpones tax cuts until after the budget has been balanced.

The world is not the simplistic place that Republicans in this House would have us believe. It is a pool of economic sharks. In the globally competitive environment that American businesses and their employees are in today, the only way to survive and prosper is through investing in the things which drive the engine of economic growth: education, research and development, training and economic development. In our collective haste toward a zero deficit, let us not eat our children's seed-corn. Let us not leave them with a deficiency of educated workers, a paucity of new technology and an abundance of sick elderly and low-income citizens.

Cutting the deficit is not painless, but the coalition budget is far more reasonable and far more careful about how it applies this pain. The coalition budget is far more concerned about changing, but keeping viable, this country's safety net of Medicare, Medicaid and welfare.

Those supporting the Republican budget speak frequently of saving the future for our children and our children's children, but what future will they have living in a polluted environment? Throughout their tenure as the majority, the Republicans have fought an unyielding war against the environment. A leopard cannot change its spots and regardless of how many zoos the Speaker visits and how many nature walks Republican freshmen take, their record and their budget speak for themselves. It is only due to the cries and raised voices of anger against the Republican anti-environment agenda that they seemed to have changed their colors, but we know that the special interests are giving heavily in this campaign season and eventually we will see those environment-destroying policies surface yet again.

I ask my colleagues to vote for this coalition budget and keep intact our children's true future, the one of continued technological advancement, economic leadership, environmental stewardship and a balanced Federal budget.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the budget resolution introduced by the coalition to balance the budget by the year 2002, and salute my coalition colleagues for presenting a responsible, viable plan that meets the needs of our Nation today and our collective future.

I oppose provisions of the Republican budget that assume dramatic and detrimental changes in Medicare, Medicaid, welfare, and the earned income tax credit—all in the name of increased defense spending and tax breaks which we cannot afford. Block grants, medical savings accounts, higher Medicare premiums, increasing taxes on the working poor, eliminating guaranteed healthcare for children, women, and seniors, and denying benefits to legal immigrants are not solutions to our country's financial crisis.

This proposal maintains basic human services at adequate levels. The coalition budget does not eliminate bilingual education programs or the direct lending program for student loans. Nor does it privatize the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. I believe the Republican cuts to these programs would harm children, our future, and I oppose them.

Further, the Republican budget does not adequately protect our natural resources and

the environment, reducing funding for these programs by 10 percent. The Department of Energy and its key research programs on alternative fuels, clean coal technology, and renewable energy would be eliminated. The coalition proposal freezes funding for natural resources and the environment at levels that are adequate to maintain the progress we have made in cleaning up our air, water, and land.

Under the Republican budget, the important work of the National Institutes of Health would be endangered. Just recently, scientists have found the gene that causes breast cancer, and they are hopeful that this information will help them develop a cure for the disease. Now is not the time to decrease funds for this type of research. The coalition budget includes an additional \$8.7 billion for this and other health research functions.

Budgets always lack something. Neither includes a targeted capital gains tax cut, which I believe is critical to sustaining and increasing the level of economic growth we have enjoyed in this country. The Republican budget pays lipservice to capital gains by indicating that such a tax cut may be possible, but only if offsets can be found in the Tax Code. However, their budget resolution does not assume a capital gains tax cut. And it is clear that under the Republican proposal, there is not enough left over from savings over the 6 years to pay for such a tax cut.

There is a need to permanently extend the research and development tax credit. Our country's leadership in high technology will wither if we do not reward our companies for investment in research and development of new products. These provisions, coupled with the Republicans proposal to eliminate the Department of Commerce, will sound a death-knell for our country's preeminence in the high technology arena.

The coalition's budget is the most viable approach to deficit reduction, toward a balanced budget by 2002, with some tough medicine, and a recognition that we can retain investments in our people, and not abandon our principles to do so.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the coalition budget.

The coalition budget is a fair and steady approach toward a balanced budget in 2002.

It adds \$137 billion less than the Republican plan to the debt because it does not delay the majority of the spending cuts to the last 2 years.

The resolutions before us today are just numbers, but attached to these numbers are fundamental policy assumptions.

While it is encouraging to see the Republicans abandon some of the extreme cuts in last year's budget and bring their numbers closer to the coalition's budget, they retain many of the same dangerous and radical policy assumptions.

The Republicans offer \$168 billion in Medicare savings, while the coalition plan offers \$146 billion in savings.

The differences, however, are more than the \$21 billion would suggest.

The coalition budget achieves greater savings from means-testing the Medicare part B premium for upper income beneficiaries by using existing methods to collect the premiums. The Republican proposal assumes essentially the same provider cuts that were contained in the reconciliation bill that was vetoed last year.

Both proposals provide Medicare beneficiaries with increased choice of private options. The coalition budget, however, protects seniors in rural and other under-served areas and protects seniors from managed care plans charging beneficiaries additional amounts beyond the part B premium.

It also appropriately limits the radical medical savings account proposal to a demonstration program.

The \$2 billion difference between the Republican \$72 billion cut and the coalition's \$70 billion cut from Medicaid masks the fact that the Republican plan permits States to cut their Medicaid funding by an additional \$178 billion, seriously undermining our commitment to the poor, the disabled, and the elderly.

We can cut Medicaid growth without eliminating the guaranteed coverage to the poor, the disabled, and the elderly, and the coalition budget does.

We can balance the budget without eliminating the Departments of Commerce and Energy; and the coalition budget does so.

We can save \$42 billion from welfare programs while at the same time meet the Governors' request for providing adequate funding child care so that the parents can return to work.

We can reduce fraud in the earned income tax credit without imposing a tax increase of \$20 billion on the working poor.

Mr. Speaker for the those and a host of other reasons I urge my colleagues to reject the Republican budget and support the coalition budget.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A record vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 130, noes 295, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 177]

AYES—130

Andrews	Doggett	Johnson, E. B.
Baessler	Dooley	Johnston
Baldacci	Doyle	Kennelly
Barcia	Duncan	Klug
Barrett (NE)	Eshoo	LaFalce
Barrett (WI)	Farr	LaHood
Barton	Fattah	Lantos
Beilenson	Fazio	Leach
Bentsen	Fields (LA)	Lincoln
Bereuter	Filner	Lofgren
Bevill	Flake	Luther
Bishop	Foglietta	Martinez
Blute	Furse	Matsui
Brewster	Geren	McCarthy
Browder	Gibbons	McDade
Brown (CA)	Gordon	McDermott
Brown (FL)	Gunderson	McHale
Campbell	Hall (OH)	McKinney
Cardin	Hall (TX)	Meehan
Chapman	Hamilton	Meek
Clay	Harman	Metcalf
Clayton	Hastings (FL)	Millender-
Clement	Hefner	McDonald
Clyburn	Hilliard	Minge
Collins (MI)	Holden	Montgomery
Condit	Hoyer	Moran
Cramer	Jackson (IL)	Morella
Davis	Jackson-Lee	Murtha
de la Garza	(TX)	Oberstar
Dicks	Jefferson	Olver
Dingell	Johnson (CT)	Ortiz

Orton
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roukema

Sabo
Sawyer
Schroeder
Scott
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Spratt
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Tanner
Tauzin

Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Towns
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Wamp
Ward
Watt (NC)
Wilson
Wise
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOES—295

Abercrombie	Everett	Lipinski
Ackerman	Ewing	Livingston
Allard	Fawell	LoBiondo
Archer	Fields (TX)	Longley
Armey	Flanagan	Lowe
Bachus	Foley	Lucas
Baker (CA)	Forbes	Maloney
Baker (LA)	Fowler	Manton
Ballenger	Fox	Manzullo
Barr	Frank (MA)	Markey
Bartlett	Franks (CT)	Martini
Bass	Franks (NJ)	Mascara
Bateman	Frelinghuysen	McCormack
Becerra	Frist	McCrery
Berman	Frost	McHugh
Bilbray	Funderburk	McInnis
Billakis	Gallegly	McIntosh
Bliley	Ganske	McKeon
Boehlert	Gejdenson	McNulty
Boehner	Gekas	Menendez
Bonilla	Gephardt	Meyers
Bonior	Gilchrest	Mica
Bono	Gillmor	Mink
Borski	Gilman	Moakley
Boucher	Gonzalez	Mollohan
Brown (OH)	Goodlatte	Moorhead
Brownback	Goodling	Myers
Bryant (TN)	Goss	Myrick
Bryant (TX)	Graham	Nadler
Bunn	Green (TX)	Neal
Bunning	Greene (UT)	Nethercutt
Burr	Greenwood	Neumann
Burton	Gutierrez	Ney
Buyer	Gutknecht	Norwood
Callahan	Hancock	Nussle
Calvert	Hansen	Obey
Camp	Hastert	Owens
Canady	Hastings (WA)	Oxley
Castle	Hayworth	Packard
Chabot	Hefley	Pallone
Chambliss	Heineman	Parker
Chenoweth	Herger	Pastor
Christensen	Hilleary	Pelosi
Chrysler	Hinchey	Petri
Clinger	Hobson	Pickett
Coble	Hoekstra	Pombo
Coburn	Hoke	Portman
Coleman	Horn	Pryce
Collins (GA)	Hostettler	Quillen
Collins (IL)	Houghton	Quinn
Combest	Hunter	Radanovich
Conyers	Hutchinson	Rahall
Cooley	Hyde	Ramstad
Costello	Inglis	Rangel
Cox	Istook	Reed
Coyne	Jacobs	Regula
Crane	Johnson (SD)	Riggs
Crapo	Johnson, Sam	Roberts
Cremins	Jones	Rogers
Cubin	Kanjorski	Rohrabacher
Cummings	Kaptur	Ros-Lehtinen
Cunningham	Kasich	Roth
Danner	Kelly	Roybal-Allard
Deal	Kennedy (MA)	Royce
DeFazio	Kennedy (RI)	Rush
DeLauro	Kildee	Salmon
DeLay	Kim	Sanders
Dellums	King	Sanford
Deutsch	Kingston	Saxton
Diaz-Balart	Klecza	Scarborough
Dickey	Klink	Schaefer
Dixon	Knollenberg	Schiff
Doolittle	Kolbe	Schumer
Dornan	Largent	Seastrand
Dreier	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Dunn	LaTourette	Serrano
Durbin	Laughlin	Shadegg
Edwards	Lazio	Shaw
Ehrlich	Levin	Shays
Emerson	Lewis (CA)	Shuster
Engel	Lewis (GA)	Skeen
English	Lewis (KY)	Slaughter
Ensign	Lightfoot	Smith (MI)
Evans	Linder	Smith (NJ)

Smith (TX)	Thornton	Weldon (FL)
Smith (WA)	Thurman	Weldon (PA)
Solomon	Tiahrt	Weller
Souder	Torkildsen	White
Spence	Torres	Whitfield
Stark	Torricelli	Wicker
Stearns	Trafficant	Williams
Stockman	Upton	Wolf
Stump	Velazquez	Woolsey
Stupak	Vucanovich	Yates
Tate	Walker	Young (FL)
Taylor (NC)	Walsh	Zeliff
Tejeda	Waters	Zimmer
Thomas	Watts (OK)	
Thornberry	Waxman	

NOT VOTING—8

Ehlers	Miller (CA)	Paxon
Ford	Miller (FL)	Talent
Hayes	Molinari	

□ 1415

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Paxon against.

Messrs. EVERETT, MOAKLEY, HORN, and SERRANO, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

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

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1415

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider the amendment designated in paragraph 3 of section 2 of House Resolution 435.

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

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

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

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

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. SABO:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

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

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

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

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

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

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

Fiscal year 1997: \$1,092,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$1,146,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$1,195,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: \$1,244,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: \$1,309,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,389,900,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: —\$7,929,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: —\$2,150,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: —\$2,741,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: —\$7,219,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: —\$1,721,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$16,024,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: \$1,325,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$1,374,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$1,413,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,454,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,496,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,528,300,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: \$1,321,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$1,375,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$1,408,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,447,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,466,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,498,400,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: \$228,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$229,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$212,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$202,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$156,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$108,500,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: \$5,441,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$5,713,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$5,964,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$6,204,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$6,395,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$6,542,900,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: \$45,451,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: \$172,005,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

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

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$254,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$260,800,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$229,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$258,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$256,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$263,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$257,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$270,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$263,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$279,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$266,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$287,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$278,200,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$15,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,067,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$18,624,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,900,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,900,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,300,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$15,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$15,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,600,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,620,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

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

(B) Outlays, \$2,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,100,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$36,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

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

(B) Outlays, \$22,600,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 1997:

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

(B) Outlays, \$11,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$7,605,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$8,150,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$9,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$10,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$8,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$10,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$8,900,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$5,536,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$97,707,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$10,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$8,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$8,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$8,500,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$39,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$415,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$571,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$38,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$36,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$34,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$33,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$35,300,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,952,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,885,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$9,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$9,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$8,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$8,300,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$53,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$51,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$21,770,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$19,114,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$54,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$53,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$56,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$55,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$58,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$56,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$60,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$58,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$63,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$61,400,000,000.

(11) Health (550):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$136,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$136,300,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$140,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$144,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$144,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$151,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$151,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$158,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$159,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$164,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$163,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$176,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$174,600,000,000.

(12) Medicare (570):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$193,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$191,400,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$209,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$207,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$222,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$220,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$236,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$234,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$252,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$250,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$272,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$269,900,000,000.

(13) Income Security (600):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$231,600,000,000.

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

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$37,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$244,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$247,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$255,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$256,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$271,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$270,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

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

(B) Outlays, \$277,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$296,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$292,900,000,000.

(14) Social Security (650):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,900,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$11,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$12,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

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

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$10,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,800,000,000.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

Fiscal year 1997:

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

(B) Outlays, \$39,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,344,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$24,548,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$38,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$37,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$37,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,300,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$39,800,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,200,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$24,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$24,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,000,000,000.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,800,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$15,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,000,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, \$282,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$282,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, \$289,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$289,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, \$293,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$293,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, \$296,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$296,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, \$301,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$301,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, \$307,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$307,500,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, —\$500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$106,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, —\$0.
(B) Outlays, —\$0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, —\$0.
(B) Outlays, —\$0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, —\$0.
(B) Outlays, —\$0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, —\$12,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$16,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, —\$36,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$36,800,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, —\$43,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$43,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, —\$35,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$35,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, —\$35,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$35,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, —\$38,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$38,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, —\$41,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$41,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, —\$62,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$62,200,000,000.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) Not later than June 21, 1996, the House committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(b)(1) The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$2,062,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$14,816,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997

through 2001, and \$18,457,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(2) The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$3,346,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$2,755,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$3,143,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(3) The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$5,717,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$128,862,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$207,698,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(4) The House Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$633,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$4,923,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$6,040,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(5) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$840,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$7,236,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$9,086,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(6) The House Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to increase outlays, as follows: \$51,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, and reduce outlays by \$84,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$147,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(7) The House Committee on National Security shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$79,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$472,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$1,753,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(8) The House Committee on Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$112,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$372,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$391,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(9) The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$42,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$255,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$363,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(10) The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$148,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$3,870,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$5,284,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(11) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase the deficit, as follows: by \$1,024,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and decrease the deficit by \$64,619,000,000 in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and by \$117,820,000,000 in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] and the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS] will each control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

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

Mr. Chairman, one is always faced with choice, and alternatives are never as perfect as one would like them. I was a strong supporter of the coalition budget, which was just, I think unfortunately, defeated on the House floor. That was my preference as the best way to achieve a balanced budget. Now I offer another alternative, the budget as presented by the President of the United States.

As an alternative to the Republican proposal, it is clearly far superior for a number of reasons. It does balance in 6 years, as scored by CBO; but, more important, it makes very fundamental reforms in how we run numerous governmental programs but is still fair to beneficiaries.

It does make fundamental changes in Medicare but does it in a fashion that does not do long-term damage to the program like those proposed by the Republican majority. It makes fundamental change in reform of Medicaid in a way to save money for both the Federal and State and local governments, but it still continues to assure adequate health care for the vulnerable, elderly, disabled, and children in our society.

It has fiscal restraints as it relates to discretionary spending, but still provides the opportunity to invest in education and training, research and development, and investing in the basic infrastructure of this country.

It reforms welfare in a fashion that is tough on work, not tough on kids.

So, Mr. Chairman, at this point, I strongly urge a "yes" vote for the President's budget as an alternative that is clearly superior for the American public and for the future of our economy to the proposal of the Republican majority.

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

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

I would hope that Members would look very carefully at what they have in the budget that is before them now; that is the President's budget. Because the fact is that this is, indeed, a UFO budget.

Our friend, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, has said on a number of occasions that when they took a poll some time back they found that among young people more of them believed in UFO's than believed they would ever collect Social Security and Medicare because they thought the whole process was breaking down.

Obviously, the administration took that poll to heart and designed a budget around the UFO philosophy, because

what they have here is a budget that has unidentified spending cuts in it, that has a family tax increase in it, and it has ominously higher deficits in 1997 and 1998.

Now, think about this for a moment. They come to us today with a budget that, first of all, suggests that it is in balance while at the end of the process, in the year 2002, they have huge, tens of billions of dollars of money they do not identify in terms of spending cuts.

The gentleman from Minnesota just told us that they will protect education and research and training. How do we know? There are massive spending cuts that are not identified in this budget. It is not real.

There is a tax increase in here. If we take the CBO estimates and we take them out to the year 2002, what we find is it takes \$16 billion of unspecified taxes in order to balance the budget. That is \$16 billion of a middle class tax increase.

So the American families are now being treated to the specter of people saying they are going to cut spending but, in the meantime, what are they doing? They are raising taxes.

And, finally, Mr. Chairman, if we believe they are going to balance the budget, how do we get along with this idea that in the President's budget the deficits go up in 1997 and 1998? That is true. Now, he claims what he is doing is having us on a downward slope toward a balanced budget. But, instead, in 1997 and 1998, where do the deficits go? The deficits go up, not down.

If we were the American people sitting out there, would we believe that the deficits can go up and still balance the budget? I do not think so.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, the President says he wants a balanced budget, but in reality he has not produced one. He says he wants to lower the deficit year after year, and as we just heard, he does not do that either. And the President has said that he wants to save Medicare, at least on occasion, and end welfare as we know it, and that does not happen.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that the President's budget is a budget of assumptions, it is a budget of hunches, it is a budget of nonspecifics, it is a budget based on if's; what if this happens, what if that happens.

The Republican budget is a concrete budget that returns power, influence and money back to the people of this country. It is a budget that gives a reasonable tax cut to working Americans, and this is in contrast to the President's budget that does none of this.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG].

(Mr. SHADEGG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, there is a stark contrast between the Republican budget and the President's budget on one issue. On the issue of tax cuts there is a clear and flagrant difference.

The Republicans give real, meaningful tax cuts. The President gives essentially no tax cuts and, indeed, in the last year of his budget he raises taxes by \$14 billion just to bring, by smoke and mirrors, his budget into balance at the last minute.

Mr. Chairman, I make no apology for arguing for tax cuts. We Republicans trust Americans to spend their money more wisely than we do. But let us talk about that issue. We are here concerned about the deficit and the debt.

The truth is we have an anemic economy growing at 2 percent a year. Historically our economy has grown over the last 30 years at 3.6 percent. Now it is growing at only 2 percent. If we could enact the tax cuts that President Clinton vetoed, we could unleash this economy.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting a budget that stops the situation where Americans pay more in food and clothing than they do in taxes.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not vote for the President's budget, but I will tell my colleagues one thing: This President has brought the budget deficit down. This President, contrary to Mr. Bush, contrary to Mr. Reagan, who in 1981 said, "If you will only adopt my tax cut, things are going to be rosy." They were rosy, all right, all red. All red. All deficits.

I voted for the coalition budget because I thought it was real. The Republican budget is not real. The President, this President, has already brought the budget deficit down 3 years in the running, the first time that has been done since Harry Truman. It will be a 4th year by my Republican colleagues' figures and our figures, which will be the first time in this century that the budget deficit has come down 4 years running.

President Clinton did it because he had the courage to put forth an economic program in 1993 that was real. It was not easy, but it was real, and none on the Republican side voted for it, so they cannot take credit for bringing the deficit down. All they can take credit for is putting it up \$4 trillion.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, in 1981 we had similar supply-side economics as the majority is projecting today. In 1981 we were told that by 1984 the budget would be in balance. Instead, we had a deficit of \$175 billion.

When we were told we should cut taxes and something good would happen to the deficit, instead it exploded. Spending exploded under the Reagan program and the deficit went to \$175 billion, under the same theory that the majority leadership has today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

(Mr. HEFNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I have heard many times here today and on television in the last few days that the President raised taxes, the biggest taxes raised in history. That is not true, but we will not debate that at this time.

Every Member in this body had more people getting a tax cut under the President's 1993 package than had an increase. In the 8th District of North Carolina, 1,100 people had a tax increase and 54,000 people had a tax cut because of the EITC, the Earned Income Tax Credit, which the majority is going to do away with in this budget. They are going to practically do away with that. If a taxpayer makes \$20,000 a year and does not have any children, they will not get any tax relief. So much for the middle income folks.

Let me tell Members this. Here is what we have done, and I am speaking about "we" because we are all Americans. Since President Clinton has been President, we have created 8 million new jobs. People say the President created those jobs, but they were created in the United States of America. We have lowered interest rates and produced the lowest combined rate of unemployment since 1968.

I was at a reception last night for a group of people that are not Democratic supporters, and one of the gentlemen was in the furniture business. I said, "How has business been in the past 3½ years?" He said, "It has been the best it has ever been since I have been in business." And this is a family business. "I have made more money in the last 3½ years than I have ever made in business."

Now, the same people that are coming here today to tell us how great this Republican package is and how bad the 1993 package was, let me just read some of the statements that were being made when we were considering the President's package back in 1993.

□ 1430

In 1993, the Speaker of the House said: The tax increase will kill jobs and lead to a recession, and the recession will force people off of work and on to unemployment and will actually increase the deficit.

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

Mr. HEFNER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. What, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. HEFNER. That was the Speaker of the House, distinguished Representative NEWT GINGRICH. The President, the chairman of the Budget Committee in the other body, said April fool, America. This Clinton budget plan will not create jobs, will not grow the economy, and will not reduce the deficit. These are not my words. It was said in the Dallas Morning News.

Our distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget, who is a

very dear friend of mine, made these statements: We are going to find out whether we have higher deficits. We are going to find out whether we have a slower economy. We are going to find out what is going to happen to interest rates, and it is our opinion that this budget is a killer.

He goes on to say the Democrats have a job-killer program. It is like a snake bite. The venom is going to be injected into the body of this economy in our judgment, and it is going to spread throughout the body and is going to begin to kill the jobs that Americans now have.

And it goes on and on. I could give other names: DICK ARMEY, CONNIE MACK, Congressman DORNAN, WALLY HERGER, JOEL HEFLEY, CHARLES GRASSLEY, JIM BUNNING, JOHN CHAFEE, JOSEPH KNOLLENBERG, JIM RAMSTAD, and it goes on and on and on.

Mr. SABO. If the gentleman would continue to yield, has the deficit not gone down?

Mr. HEFNER. Yes.

We have created 8 million new jobs. The deficit is down. They have continued to go down for 3 years, on the 4th year of a downward trend on the deficit. It will go down even more this year than it would if we pass this Republican so-called family friendly budget that is going to help the middle class.

This budget was a sham when it was projected a few months ago. It is a sham today and I do not blame BOB DOLE from disengaging from this process that the Republicans are putting forward.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 seconds only to say that the reason the deficit went down is that the President of the United States and the Democrats in Congress enacted the largest tax increase in American history.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to respond to two of the points made by the previous speaker. First of all, he said that not only was the earned income tax credit being cut. We have heard that one before. He said it was practically being dismantled.

Now, I know the gentleman from North Carolina has been around Washington a lot longer than I have. Maybe that is part of the problem here. This is how much has been spent in the last 6 years on the earned income tax credit. This is how much, \$109 billion; \$155 billion would be spent in the next 6 years.

Mr. Chairman, that is dismantling the EITC? I do not think so. But only in Washington-speak, only those people that have been around here all the time and only think of everything when it doubles every year think that we are actually cutting or dismantling the earned income tax credit.

On the second point, as far as the deficit is concerned, I would point out

that President Bush, the Congressional Budget Office under a Democratic Congress, a Democratic administration, proposed in a Republican administration, said that the deficit was going to go down each of the succeeding years after 1992. The President's budget starting in 1993 showed deficits that stretched into infinity.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. MYRICK].

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Chairman, our budget shows our trust in the American people to make their own decisions. We want to let them control their money and design programs that will solve the problems at home. I know firsthand that the local people can be trusted to do this. You know, when I was Mayor, we did not hold our hand out to the Federal Government. We simply went ahead, worked together to move people off of the Federal dependency and into self-sufficiency.

We got a lot of ideas for others to follow, like a public housing venture that literally moves people out of public housing and into home ownership. We have a housing partnership that last year built 119 homes, sold those homes, and 65 of those homes were sold to people who had previously been in public housing.

We started a homeless shelter with private community support that in the last 2 years has put over 500 men back into the workplace. We have coordinated job training program that actually does help young people, not only with training but puts them into their first job. We are turning lives around one at a time and it works. It works because we work together to help people achieve self-sufficiency and because we can tailor the program to fit the need.

Our budget allows communities all over America to use their ingenuity and help to do their own programs to solve their own problems, and it works so much better than a bureaucrat in Washington, DC, trying to tell them how to do it.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

(Mr. VOLKMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I have been here for 20 years, and I have seen a lot of budgets. Each year that I vote on budgets, I have not found one yet that I can agree with 100 percent. But this time, and basically that is why I voted for the coalition budget, because there was only one item in there that I disagreed with. Now I am faced, like every Member of this House is faced, with a prospect that if we do not pass the President's budget, which I do not agree with on certain things, all I have got left is this monstrosity that the majority has presented to us that will ruin rural America.

I have no choice. I do not think anybody in this House has any choice. The

only alternative I have is the President's budget, and it is a whole lot better than what I see coming from them. What does it do? Well, it protects and provides funds for education, which is big for my district and the United States of America. It provides for medicare. It does not make those reductions that they make in medicare and medicaid, which will devastate my rural hospitals.

I am from a rural district. yes, this is going to mean closings. My hospital association says it means closing within 5 years of some of my rural hospitals. What does that do? I guess they can go out and find the money and provide for the hospitals. Sorry, folks, it is not going to work that way. The President's budget provides for environment, rural development, and it is balanced. yes, in the same period of time, it is a balanced budget.

Although I do not believe we should do tax cuts until we have a balanced budget, and I firmly believe that, that is one of the areas I disagree with the President's budget, but I can vote on that as a later issue.

So I am asking the Members of this House, if they do not want to take the radical approach, you know, I heard two Members of that opposite party last month when I was talking federalism with them, said the Federal Government should do two things: Defend our shores and deliver the mail. They were not so sure about delivering the mail. Think about that. That is radical, just defend our shores and do nothing else.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM].

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

If there is a young person who, for whatever reason, missed school today and is sitting, listening to this debate, let me tell them why I think their country is in such debt and why I think the President's budget does not help a whole lot. The deficit is about \$150 billion. There is a thing called the national debt that, as I speak, is \$5,098,866,418,898. It is worth \$19,250 for every man, woman, child in America.

The reason that we got a \$5 trillion debt is because entitlement spending in this country has gone through the roof, and both parties are sitting here yelling at each other about who caused the problem. In my opinion, both parties have let the entitlements grow to the point that they are 50 percent of the budget. When we add the interest element to the equation, 67 percent of the Federal budget is on auto pilot. If you want us to balance the budget, please make us change the reason Medicare has grown 2,200 percent since 1980. If you want to free America up, balance the budget and help people, please change welfare so the average person does not stay on it 10 years. If you want us to do something about education in your State, please make us

change Medicaid so it does not grow at 19 percent a year and takes money away from the State to run its education program just to get health care dollars.

President Clinton's budget has no entitlement reforms. It does not address why we are in debt. It does not change any of the reasons that led to every man, woman, and child owing \$19,000 today. If you want us to change America, let us give choices and get government back home.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We are still talking here today about the need to balance the budget, to reduce the burden on future generations. That is important, and I certainly concur with that belief. But I think it is very important too that we protect future generations and ensure that a good quality of life is going to be available to our grandchildren as was available to us.

The Republican budget resolution does not adhere to this principle. The amendment before us now, which incorporates President Clinton's 6-year balanced budget plan, will continue to invest in our children. It will provide quality, affordable health care to our senior citizens and the disabled, provide tax incentives targeted to the middle class and stimulate further economic growth and development.

The choice before us is simple: We either invest now in critical programs aimed at improving the quality and standard of living in the United States, programs like education, community development, biomedical research, national assistance, public safety, small business development, trade promotion, clean air and clean water, and so forth. Or we can refuse to meet the basic responsibilities of the Federal Government and turn our backs on the most vulnerable, the senior citizen, the children, the disabled, and the poor.

I support investing in the future, and I will support the Sabo amendment. I urge my colleagues too, as well. I hope you would carefully review this proposal because many of the policy assumptions that were included in the budget have always enjoyed bipartisan support. The budget, as I stated before, it balanced. It includes real middle-class tax cuts without adding to the deficit or without using Medicare cuts to pay for tax cuts for the rich.

It includes a proposal to give premium subsidies to individuals who lose their health insurance when they lose their jobs. It also assumes real increases in biomedical research, maintains a strong commitment to civilian research and development, increases our investment again in our children in education. It also calls for the restora-

tion of tax fairness by targeting tax relief to the real middle class, and the amendment assumes the deduction for qualifying. This is most important. The deduction of \$5,000 a year to educate and training expenses in 1996, 1997, and 1998 and in 1999 raises it to \$10,000.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

(Mr. STENHOLM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

At times I am asked, "What's the hardest part of being a Congressman?" I could easily talk about the grueling schedule or the complexity of legislation or the fact that we live in glass houses—or maybe the answer for many of us has to do with how hard it is to be missing in action from our families so much of the time.

But one of the toughest things I grapple with on days like today is determining when something is good enough to support as "moving the mark forward" and when it just doesn't quite pass muster.

I refuse to be part of the mentality so prevalent these days that claims compromise is a dirty word. Working things out, finding a middle ground—that's part of the life blood of a Democratic legislative body.

But I also know the danger of wink-and-nod acquiescence to inferior agreements crafted too much for political expediency and not enough in honest confrontation of difficult problems—problems like the deficit.

I sincerely praise both the President and the Republicans for promoting specific and legitimate balanced budgets this year. I am proud as a Democrat to note that, with one exception, this is the first time since the last Democratic President that, the House has voted on a Presidential budget scored as being in balance by the Congressional Budget Office.

Just as the majority has moved toward the coalition budget by moderating many of their savings, the President has moved toward the coalition budget by tackling some of the tough choices necessary to reach balance. While more movement from both sides is necessary, the fact that each has come toward the coalition's numbers in the center gives me some hope we still can seal a balanced budget agreement.

But in the final analysis today, I think both the President's and the majority's budgets have done too much winking and nodding when it comes to deficit reduction. Republicans want too much to raid my grandson's pockets to pay for today's tax cuts. Having lived through the failed promises of the 1980's tax cuts, I won't walk down that path again.

Likewise, the President wants to dip into my grandson's pockets to pay for grandpa's Social Security and Medicare. Having watched the uncontrolled ballooning of those programs in the early 1990's, I won't follow that path either.

President Clinton, and Chairman KASICH both deserve recognition for heightening the debate on balancing the budget. But both proposals fall short when measured on the deficit reduction yardstick. I will oppose both, having just supported the only obvious compromise and the plan most dedicated to deficit reduction, the coalition budget. Our substitute post-

poned tax cuts until the budget is balanced, provided a steady deficit reduction glide path, and has less total debt than any of the other options before us. It also avoided unlikely off-triggers on taxes and other questionable budget devices found in both of the other budgets.

Americans are asking for bipartisanship, for honesty, integrity, and responsibility, and for constructive solutions. It's time to respond to those demands.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. STEARNS. I thank my colleague. Let me give an analogy on this debate. Let us say you are overweight by 100 pounds. You are trying to lose weight over a 7-year period. Would you take a plan where in the first 2 years you gain 100 pounds and then in the next 2 years you try to lose it, then in the final year you really make an effort to reduce that 100 pounds? Of course not, it will not work.

This same principle is applying to the Clinton budget. The President's budget is such that the largest spending reductions are in the 7th year. Also under the President's budget, deficits go up in the early years. We certainly do not need that, either.

How many of this floor remember what the President said in 1993 about his tax increase? He said, "You might think I raised your taxes too much. Well, it might surprise you to know that I think I raised your taxes too much too." And in fact his tax increase was the largest of the 19 increases we have had on this floor since 1981.

□ 1445

Mr. Chairman, I ask, "Isn't it time that after 15 years we should have one single tax cut?" We should not have to wait another 17 years.

Also, my colleagues, Prof. Thomas Hopkins of the University of Rochester indicated that the annual cost of Federal regulation has risen since 1981 over the equivalent of \$6,000 for every single American while the party of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] has been in control for the last 40 years.

Come on, Mr. President. It is time for a new direction. Even the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. HOYER, came on this House floor and said he is not going to vote for the Clinton budget, so why should Mr. SABO?

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds. I say to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS], because it is so much better than the Republican alternative.

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

Mr. SABO. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, why does not the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] and many of the gentleman's other colleagues come on the House floor and say they do not support the Clinton budget?

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I cannot respond for other people. I can only say

the President's record on deficit reduction, on rational discipline of the Government is so much superior to previous Republican administrations. His proposal today is so far superior to the majority proposal that it is a simple and easy vote for me to vote "yes" despite the fact I would have preferred some other alternative.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North California [Mr. HEFNER].

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I might have an answer.

Might be the reason the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is not going to vote for it might be the reason that 20-some of the Republicans voted for the coalition budget because they think it is so much better than the Republican budget.

I say about the Republican budget it is like the one we had many years ago. This budget is like an ugly child. We have to tie a pork chop around its neck to get the dogs to play with it.

So this is a terrible budget.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 seconds only to say that the members of their party will flee from their budget like scalded dogs.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP].

(Mr. STUMP asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Clinton budget and in support of the House Republican budget proposal.

I also want to express my appreciation to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, JOHN KASICH, the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee.

He and his staff worked closely with the committee on Veterans' Affairs on the Republican budget, and it shows in the favorable provisions for veterans.

The President's plan would balance the budget on the backs of our Nation's veterans, drastically cutting VA medical care spending.

The House Republican budget plan provides \$100 million more next year and \$5 billion more over the next 6 years than the Clinton plan for veterans' medical care spending.

The President's plan takes more cuts out of veterans programs for deficit reduction but still falls short of balancing the budget, denying all veterans the economic advantages of a balanced Federal budget.

Our plan balances the budget while providing nearly \$230 million for increases to veterans' earned benefit programs, which are not in the President's budget.

In the words of President Clinton's Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Jesse Brown, and I quote, "The President's budget would devastate VA."

In a letter dated May 14, 1996, to Secretary Brown, the national command-

ers of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, AMVETS, and the Paralyzed Veterans of America stated and I quote:

Our Nation's sick and disabled veterans deserve a viable health care system devoted to them and their special health care needs. . . . President Clinton's seven year balanced budget proposal does not provide the funding necessary to meet these needs.

I urge my colleagues to join the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs and the major veterans service organizations in denouncing the Clinton budget proposals for veterans by voting "no" and defeating the Presidents' plan.

For over a year, Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Jesse Brown has bashed Republicans in Congress with a barrage of fraudulent and deceptive attacks about the Republican budget's impact on veterans' programs.

Secretary Brown has misled veterans to believe that the Republican budget would impose a means test on service-connected benefits, tax veterans' benefits, remove disabled veterans from compensation rolls, and cut compensation for other disabled veterans. The Balanced Budget Act contained none of those proposals, and Secretary Brown knows it did not. He has also widely claimed that he would be forced to close numerous VA hospitals because of the budget.

With the apparent approval of the President and clear knowledge of the facts, Secretary Brown continues spreading misinformation. He goes so far as to suggest in battlefield metaphor that "veterans are under attack by hostile forces within this nation. Those forces are Members of Congress. * * * We must stay alert because we have hypocrites in the land."

Yes, there are hypocrites in Washington. They are creating a pattern of deception, purposely telling half-truths to scare veterans for political advantage. But, they are not the Republican Members of Congress.

Let's take a look at the pattern of deception. In the 1994 budget, President Clinton's Office of Management and Budget planned to cut 27,000 VA employees as part of the Clinton administration's heralded reinventing Government effort to reduce the Federal work force by 252,000 positions by the year 2000. Congress, at that time controlled by the Democrats, blocked the proposal and worked out a compromise limiting the VA cuts to 10,051 employees. In the 1995 budget, President Clinton proposed the first installment of these VA personnel reductions. Secretary Brown presented it to Congress and defended the President's budget, which included cutting VA medical care staffing by 3,400. Congress refused to accept the budget, allocating \$100 million more than Secretary Brown had requested for VA medical care. Despite this increase, VA eliminated 3,436 medical care positions and closed 2,300 hospital beds. Clearly, these medical staff reductions and bed closures were not budget driven. They were part of an overall plan to move VA's health care system in line with private sector models, emphasizing outpatient and primary care.

For 1996, after prolonged budget debates, Congress increased VA medical care spending by \$400 million above the prior year. Secretary Brown shrieked for months that veterans would suffer due to lost hospital beds and medical staff cuts. He forecast catastrophe and called Congress mean spirited wherever

he traveled. Throughout the year, Republican leaders assured veterans that medical care funding would remain sufficient to provide well managed, quality care.

In recent testimony before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Secretary Brown stated that his dire predictions did not happen because of increased efficiencies and consolidations of service. He did not explain why his predictions failed to reflect VA's already planned efficiencies and consolidations. This raises the question of whether he was out of the loop or just scaring veterans for political purposes.

Testimony of the Under Secretary of Health, Dr. Kenneth Kizer, confirmed the previous reductions of work force and hospital beds did not result from budget cuts but were part of VA's initial efforts to reform the way it provides care. Dr. Kizer said, "We are fundamentally reengineering and reinventing the health care system so that it goes from a hospital based system to an ambulatory care-based system that is rooted in primary care." He added, that VA would "continue to emphasize improved and increased accessibility and quality of VA health care."

Having admitted that his dire predictions did not come true, one might expect Secretary Brown to cool his rhetoric, correct the record, and reassure veterans that quality health care delivery is being maintained.

But on a recent trip to Colorado, Secretary Brown blamed Congress again for cuts, implying that staffing reductions are purely budget driven and are having a negative impact on the delivery of care.

The Secretary has a responsibility to tell veterans the truth about what is really going on within VA health care and the President's budget.

Secretary Brown should tell veterans that the President's budget requests a further medical care work force reduction of 5,000 in 1997. He should also tell veterans that he has sought and received authority from the President to reduce VA's medical work force by 10,000 persons over the next 2 years. And, he should tell veterans that these additional proposed reductions are a continuation of VA's reorganization efforts, can be achieved without negatively impacting health care delivery, and are not simply budget driven reductions.

When on the road, at taxpayer expense, the Secretary says nothing about President Clinton's budget for VA health care in future years. He should be honest with veterans and tell them that the President's budget takes VA medical care from a high of \$17 billion in fiscal year 1997 down to a low of \$13 billion in fiscal year 2000 without one word of explanation about how this would be accomplished. When asked about this at a hearing, Secretary Brown told the obvious truth saying, "The President's outyear numbers would devastate VA."

As a self-proclaimed advocate for veterans, Secretary Brown should have the courage to tell the truth—to tell veterans and their families that the House Republican budget is better for veterans than the President's budget. The House budget proposes to spend nearly \$100 million more on VA health care in 1997 than President Clinton, and \$5.1 billion more on VA health care than the President over the next 6 years. Additionally, the House budget requires less in savings from veterans' programs to balance the budget and provides for nearly

\$230 million in benefit improvements that are not contained in the Clinton budget plan. Those are the facts.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER].

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I also rise in opposition to the President's budget. I agree with the Secretary of the VA that the President's budget will, in fact, be devastating to the VA. The President slashes VA medical care spending by \$4 billion while at the same time raiding \$18 million from the National Cemetery Service at the same time as more veterans, in fact, are dying. It bothers me tremendously.

One point I would like to make is, I have to ask where is the President's commitment? I ask that because the President, first he said he would balance the budget in 5 years, then he said we can do it in 7 years, then he said I think we can do it in 9 years, then he said I think we will balance the budget in 10 years, then he said I think we can reach it in 8 years, then he said somewhere between 7 and 9, and today he sent to the floor a budget for 6 years.

Where is the commitment? This is a President that opposed the balanced budget amendment. Bill Clinton has the commitment of a Kamikaze pilot on his 37th mission.

Where is your commitment, Mr. President?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would caution Members their remarks should be addressed to the Chair.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I want to only say it is the President's program that reduced the Federal deficit by more than 50 percent over all the "no" votes of the Republican, now majority, when they were in the minority. It is the President's program that has brought record growth of over 8½ million new jobs since 1993. The President does not have to listen to lectures from people who voted "no" on real deficit reduction in 1993. He has not just talked about it, he has done it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, the President's budget is not perfect, but the President's budget does prove that we can balance the budget in 6 years without extreme cuts in health care and education and housing and law enforcement and environmental protection. But while those extreme proposals get most of the attention, I would like to point out to other areas of the extremist Republican budget that have at least as many bad implications for our future, and those areas are scientific research and development and our public transportation.

The Committee on the Budget plan cuts civilian science by \$15 billion over 6 years. It phases research and solar and renewable energy way down and wipes out energy conservation and research in fossil energy efficiencies. It

eliminates technology partnerships with businesses, including advanced technology development and manufacturing extension.

Now, these are the very investments that create high-paying jobs to grow our economy while protecting our environment and quality of life.

Now, public transportation gets people to jobs and to their medical appointments while conserving energy and protecting the environment. Completely missing the interconnection between public transportation and our energy and environmental security needs, the Republican budget slashes support for transportation systems that are used in every urban community, large and small, all over America.

What kind of future will those policies leave us? Well, a bleak future at best.

So we should reject the Committee on the Budget's renewal of extremist proposals and adopt instead the President's budget as a far better investment in our future, and I urge all my colleagues to support the President's sensible priorities.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I find the use of the term "extremist" in reference to the Republican budget rather ironic when looking at the section dealing with veterans' health care spending. The veterans in this country want a balanced budget. They know what it is to sacrifice for our country, and they want a balanced budget, but they want a balanced budget that is fair, in which we do not attempt to balance the budget of this country on the backs of our Nation's veterans. The President's budget seeks to balance the budget on their backs at their expense.

That is why the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs rightly said that the President's budget would be devastating to the veterans' health care spending in this country, and that is why the national commanders of four of our major veteran service organizations wrote the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs this week saying that in fact there was not adequate funding for a viable health care system in the President's budget and urging that it not be supported and saying that they would oppose it and all other budgets that fail to provide for our veterans.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] earlier called the President's budget the UFO budget. I rather like that and think that is rather accurate. But if we look at the veteran section, we can call it the big dipper budget because in the next 4 years in the area of VA medical spending there is a 20-percent cut in veteran spending for health care in the President's budget. That is devastating. It would reduce from \$17 to \$13 billion over the next 4 years. It is over a 20-percent cut in medical care. We cannot tolerate that.

The President's budget would spend \$5 billion less on veterans' medical care

over the next 6 years than the Republican House budget. The House budget even next year spends \$100 million more on VA health care than does the President.

There is nothing extreme about that, but there is fairness to our Nation's veterans.

Again I say, Mr. Chairman the veterans of this country want a balanced budget, but they want a balanced budget that is fair. They do not want, as this chart indicates, a 20-percent cut in medical care spending with no explanation of how those cuts will be achieved, simply putting them at the expense of our Nation's veterans. That is not right, it is not fair. The President's budget fails the fairness test for our Nation's veterans.

Mr. Chairman, that is why we need to oppose this Clinton budget.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Veterans funding is the gentleman's top priority. He should have voted for the coalition budget because that budget had less cuts in veterans' care than the majority proposal. But, in reality, what will govern the funds available for VA funding in the next several years is a total level of discretionary funding. That is what is going to give appropriations the flexibility for funding VA. Cuts in discretionary funding are much deeper, much more severe, than those projected in the President's budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE) assumed the chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1997

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] is recognized for 2 minutes.

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the President's 6-year balanced budget.

This debate is about much more than dollars and cents—it is about our Nation's fundamental priorities and values. The differences between the Gingrich budget and the President's budget are very clear. These plans offer competing visions for America's future,

and they present all Americans with a stark choice.

The President's plan balances the budget and provides tax relief for the middle class while protecting key priorities like Medicare, Medicaid, education and the environment.

President Clinton's budget will guarantee Medicare's solvency through 2005, while giving our seniors greater choice and flexibility. It cuts down on fraud and abuse in Medicaid, shakes up the welfare system, and provides hard working families with tax credits to pay for college or to start a business.

The Gingrich budget hits the elderly and our children the hardest. New York alone will lose \$14 billion in Medicare funding and \$10 billion from Medicaid under NEWT GINGRICH's budget. Seniors will lose long-term care and children will be denied health care. Financially strapped school systems—like the one in Yonkers, NY, will lose millions in Federal aid.

The choice is clear—the President's balanced budget provides tax relief for hard working Americans while protecting the priorities of the American people. NEWT GINGRICH's budget increases spending at the Pentagon while slashing Medicare, Medicaid, education and the environment.

Let's listen to what a very senior Republican from my State of New York recently had to say about the Gingrich revolution:

Americans did not vote to cut funding for education and cut funding for the environment and cut funding for programs they care about it.

Those were AL D'AMATO's words—let's take his advice, reject the Gingrich budget and support the President's plan.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would caution that Members should avoid references to individual Senators.

□ 1500

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the latest round of Republican Medicare cuts. The American people rejected this extreme agenda last year, and I call on my colleagues to reject it today. The Medicare cuts contained in the Republican budget are designed to create a second-class health care system for America's seniors. Their drastic cuts are compounded by dangerous policy proposals which will truly force Medicare to "wither on the vine," as the Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia, NEWT GINGRICH, called for last year. Under the Gingrich budget seniors will pay more and they will get less health care.

The medical savings accounts in the Republican plan will skim off the healthiest and the wealthiest individuals and threaten to leave the remaining millions of seniors vulnerable to a weakened Medicare system, while in-

creasing their costs. The Republican plan to cut \$168 billion from Medicare and \$72 billion from Medicaid is far more than is necessary to ensure the solvency of the trust fund.

The President's budget proves that. The President's budget makes Medicare solvent for the same number of years as the Republican budget, but does so without making such deep cuts. So why would the Republicans cut so deeply? The answer is \$176 billion in tax breaks for the wealthiest in our country.

Mr. Chairman, the American people rejected, out of hand, the extreme agenda of the Republican resolution when Speaker GINGRICH tried to take the country hostage by shutting down the Government and then going home for the Christmas vacation. Congress should not slash Medicare and Medicaid for millions of America's seniors in order to pay for tax breaks for the wealthiest few. It was wrong last year, and it is wrong today. I call on my colleagues to reject the Republicans' failed agenda.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

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

Mr. Chairman, listening again to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut, I think back again to the Washington Post editorial that talked about Mediscare. Here they go again. Mr. Chairman, the fact is this: that spending per patient will increase from \$5,200 to \$7,000 under our plan. That is no cut. There is no increase in deductibles, copayments, or premiums. And the gentlewoman neglected to admit that the Medicare trust fund is \$4 billion in arrears. That is unconscionable. That is why we must have this budget.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arizona can continue to try to fool the American public, when in fact if you add more seniors to the program, if you allow for inflation, the Republican budget in fact does cut Medicare for seniors. It allows them to have to pay increased deductibles and increases their medical bills, and no matter how they want to tell us that they are slowing the rate of growth, they really, truly want to see this program changed and it wither on the vine, as their leader, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], has talked about.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] to respond.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House, and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I would simply remind my friend, the gentlewoman from Connecticut, that again she misquotes people, not only an interesting use of numbers, but with reference to withering on the vine. The full record indicates, as the gentlewoman from Connecticut knows, the Speaker was referring to the Health Care Financing Administration and some of the problems with socialized medicine that existed in the former Soviet Union. That quote has been culled incorrectly.

The gentlewoman from Connecticut knows this, as she also knows the fact that we are increasing expenditures per beneficiary. There is no dispute with that, nor is there a dispute, Mr. Chairman, with this cold, hard fact of reality: The Medicare trust fund is already \$4 billion in arrears.

I ask my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, at long last, have they no sense of decency left? Let us save Medicare for seniors, quit worrying about the next election, enact this budget, and save the program.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the very decent gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, talk about decency; BOB DOLE: "I was there fighting the fight, voting against Medicare in 1965 because we knew it would not work."

"Now, we didn't get rid of it in round 1, because we didn't think that was politically smart, and we don't think that is the right way to go through a transition. But we believe it is going to wither on the vine." The gentleman from Georgia, Mr. NEWT GINGRICH, speaking to the Blue Cross-Blue Shield conference on October 24, 1995.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend and member of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

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

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Arizona is going to take exception to quotes, let us talk facts. In fact, the Republican budget proposes the deepest cuts in Medicare, future Medicare spending; once again, \$161 billion over 6 years, compared to \$117 billion in the President's budget before us.

Let us look behind these numbers, however, so we understand exactly where those cuts fall. One hundred and twenty three billion dollars comes from part A, the reimbursements to hospitals and home nursing care. There is no way we can take these cuts out of future spending and hospitals without devastating the network of essential care provided by hospitals all across this country. This cut is deeper than their cut last year.

As regards hospital reimbursement, home health care services so vital to seniors, they cut more than they cut last year. I think the American people know full well that their budget last

year on Medicare cuts was reckless, was dangerous, and threatened the care of our elderly.

As regards the part B premium, for those who might elect the managed care option under their Medicare revisions, the GOP budget would leave unlimited exposure to physician charges. Medicare would cover a portion of the physician charges, but whatever the physician wanted to bill in addition to that, the senior would be responsible for.

The bottom line on their budget: Closed hospitals in many parts of the country, and higher doctor bills payable out of the pockets of the senior citizens of this country.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POMEROY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman voting for the budget?

Mr. POMEROY. I am going to vote for the President's budget. I will oppose the GOP budget, for the reasons that I am saying.

Mr. Chairman, another area of important contrast involves the Medicaid Program. The Medicaid Program is a major source of reimbursement, as members know, for those senior citizens in nursing homes without resources. They will, combined with the reductions in State funding, devastate reimbursement in the Medicaid Program, and the President's budget compares very favorably in this area as well.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the minority on their tactics, because we have been studying them and learning from them. It is interesting that in the hour that they came to the floor to support the President's budget, they do not have anything good to say about it. So what they do is come to the floor and try to attack our budget.

Every one of them are smart, good, decent people who know that Medicare is going bankrupt. They furthermore know that we are increasing the number of dollars behind the senior citizen from \$4,800 per senior citizen to \$7,000 for each senior citizen.

But what is curious about this debate is that the plan basically has all its savings at the end. Take a typical American diet, I would say to the gentleman from Illinois, HENRY HYDE; that you are going to lose 50 pounds this year; you are going to lose 1 pound in the first week and 49 in the last week.

So first of all, it is backloaded. In other words, we put all the heavy lifting off for the children of the next century. We have children that visit this Capitol every day, and we are asking them to do all the heavy lifting, while we kind of get away scot-free. We do not want to do that.

Second, we do not believe in tax increases.

Third, if the economy has improved so much, why is it the President keeps running around talking about wage stagnation and job insecurity? It is because it is real. It is because they have not been able to grow this economy, to provide job security, permanent jobs, high-paying jobs, because the American people do not have the money to save and invest and risk-take, and give our workers the tools they need to compete and win.

Finally, everyone on this floor knows that at the end of the day, we are going to have to come to grips with entitlement programs. Our philosophy is we can manage them better by designing local solutions to local problems for less cost.

But I wish we could spend this hour having you defend or support the President's budget, rather than attacking ours. It is a curious way to operate, but I think I understand it, when you have so much difficulty finding the good reasons to support the President in his very feeble efforts.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I have no problem defending the President's budget versus that of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH]. The gentleman from Ohio worked hard, but the President's is much better, much better for education and training, much better potentially for reforming Medicare in a fashion that will work.

The reality is your changes, you add some money up early, your provider Medicare cuts are going to have to be deeper in the final year, 2002, than they were in your original plan. Why? to accommodate your tax cuts. You talk about front end and back end loading. Somehow, there is enough money for your tax cut in 1997, for you show a deficit increase then, too. Miraculously, your tax cut costs less in 2002 than it does in 2001. There is some end loading in the President's, but you have the same problem. If you did not want that, if you wanted a nice, steady flow, you would have voted for the coalition budget.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, let me just say that it is really dubious to make the claim that the President is spending more on any program that is in the discretionary accounts, because you have \$67 billion in unspecified cuts. If we wanted to do a really good job, an effort at this in the style of the gentleman from Massachusetts, ED MARKEY, we would take the \$67 billion in cuts and we would hold charts up of the children who we think you will hurt, or we will hold up charts of any number of discretionary programs and say you are going to cut those.

The simple fact of the matter is that we have done the most, we have been

able to accomplish the most amount of change, and you all endorsed it. About 2 weeks ago the President of the United States had a budget that said we would have spent \$7 billion more in 1996 than we spent in 1995. We said, no, no, we want \$23 billion less. And guess what, the revolution has come, and guess what, it is winning. And do you know why? You all voted for it. You voted for the most massive amount of downsizing of Washington spending since World War II. I think it is fantastic that you did it.

Now, for the period of the next 6 years, there is not fundamentally that much difference between you and us on Washington spending, because you have already endorsed our program. Now what we are asking you to do is to endorse the rest of our program that takes entitlement programs that are going through the roof, that are threatening to sink the young people's future, that are destroying job security and creating wage stagnation, and we are saying, look, take the program out of Washington, send it home, design a local solution for a local problem. And we do not want to have higher taxes on the American people. People pay too much in taxes.

Mr. Chairman, the choices are pretty clear between these two alternatives, but I am glad that the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. SABO, is now defending or supporting the President's budget rather than focusing on the shortfalls in ours, because we believe strongly in ours and we are glad that the gentleman at least believes in his.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, let me just say that we impose discipline on discretionary spending. We did it in 1993. I just have to say to my friend, the chairman of the committee, I am curious that if it was his program that finally passed, why he had to shut the Government for Christmas.

There were some issues at odds: Funding for education, for environmental protection, for inspection of safety, very important priorities. That is the difference. Frankly, there are very important differences over the future: Over educational funding, training, research and development; significant differences between the President's budget and its potential for doing good things for the future of our economy, things that are left out of your budget.

□ 1515

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make the point that the President was asking and many of you were asking to spend \$7 billion more in 1996 than in 1995. We were saying, No, no, we don't want to do that. We want to downsize Washington programs and spend less. At the end of the day, we ended up spending \$23 billion less. You

wanted \$7 billion more, we spent \$23 billion less. That is a \$30 billion difference.

The thing that is so amazing is that we frankly have already won that debate, because you all voted for this. There were only 32 votes against this appropriation bill that lowers the whole base of spending in Washington. It is a terrific accomplishment by this Congress. I want to congratulate you for being part of it.

But when you start this big argument about the difference in Washington spending, frankly, folks, that debate is done. You already conceded our point. We are going to have the most massive amount of downsizing of Washington and the most amount of hope for the American people we have had in terms of controlling this Government in 50 years. I think it is reason to celebrate, not fight. We appreciate your support of that.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

(Mr. CONYERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the Budget chairman, on his disingenuousness.

All the budgets have agreed that we would balance in 7 years. All the budgets have agreed that we would downsize. So what else is new? The question is, inside of that, what is going to be cut?

What is not going to be cut inside of yours, ladies and gentlemen, is Star Wars, a \$13 billion increase in the Pentagon, and all the taxes for the wealthy, and in the meantime the people on Medicare pay higher doctor bills, more seniors will be in the system, there will be more inflation. You have got a lot of backloading. Then Mr. DOLE has already said, "I tried to get Medicare once but it was not politically timely, but I think we can do better this time."

But what is disturbing is how come I cannot get more votes for the Congressional Black Caucus budget because we are Democrats, too, with one of the better programs that have been on the floor. I ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] to consider that.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the reason that I think in our Committee on the Budget there was not much talk about the positive notes on the President's budget is because the President's budget is full of tricks. It takes taxes and says we are going to have tax cuts, but then it restores all those tax cuts and ends up actually with a tax increase of \$16 billion after the year 2002.

It does not have many spending cuts so nobody is particularly offended. Technically it balances because of a gimmick. The President says, "Look, if

we're not on track by the year 2000, then I want you to take another \$67 billion out of discretionary spending." That is more discretionary cuts than even the Republicans have suggested in that length of time. It is going to be impossible. It is pretending that it balances when it does not. I bet there are a lot of Democrats that are going to be unwilling to vote for the President's budget.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that our Federal budget should be a statement of our national values. President Clinton's budget is. It protects and invests in the health, education, and well-being of the American people, protects the environment, as well as protecting Medicare and Medicaid.

I have many problems with the Republican budget. However, the most extreme and shortsighted part of the GOP budget plan is the severe cuts to education and job training. Essentially these vital programs to prepare the American people for the challenge of a new global economy are cut by 25 percent from this year's funding and then frozen for 6 years. Many scholarship and student loan programs are eliminated. This renewed attack on education places the Republican budget on a collision course with the Clinton administration, which has proposed \$61 billion more in investments for education and job training.

For health programs, the Republican plan calls for drastic cuts in programs like community health centers, family planning and biomedical research. Is this a statement of our national values? The plan to cut purchasing power for the National Institutes of Health by 16 percent is extreme and is lacking in an understanding of the importance of investment in biomedical research.

Over and over again the Republican budget makes cuts where we should be making investments. I do not believe it is a statement of our national values. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the GOP plan and be proud to vote "aye" on the Clinton proposal.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the 1997 Republican budget resolution. Like last year's budget, the plan is out-of-touch with the American people and should be rejected by the House.

In 1993, President Clinton working with Congress began a process of deficit reduction that has produced Federal deficits which have gone down for 4 years in a row. In fact, the Federal budget deficit has been cut in half since the beginning of the Clinton Presidency. We need a continuation of the moderate proposals which have been working. We do not need another extreme budget plan to foster bitter confrontation between the Republican Congress and the administration. The American people reject this tactic; they want bipartisan cooperation in solving problems.

The Republican plan proposes to cut Medicare by \$168 billion over the next 6 years.

Even worse, the plan proposes to end 30 years of universal coverage for senior citizens and allow the healthy and wealthy to opt out of the program causing disruption and placing the entire Medicare Program at risk.

The Republican plan for Medicaid is even more extreme. A cut of \$72 billion over 6 years and allowing the States to cut even more in State payments would be severely destructive to the program. The plan also would eliminate the current guarantees of health coverage for low-income children, pregnant women, disabled people, and senior citizens. Thankfully, the President has already rejected the drastic approach and proposed a reasonable plan to cap individual benefits resulting in comparable savings without millions of Americans losing health coverage.

Likewise, the Republican budget includes much of the Republican welfare plan which was vetoed by the President because it was too extreme and did little to move people from welfare to work. There appears to be little to recommend proceeding with the same plan encouraging a race to the bottom for State welfare programs.

With regard to discretionary spending, the Republican plan is once again extreme. Funding for defense programs is increased greatly over the Pentagon's request. On the other hand, nondefense spending falls dramatically; a 25-percent reduction in purchasing power for domestic programs.

For health programs, the Republican plan calls for drastic cuts to programs like community health centers, family planning and biomedical research. The plan to cut purchasing power for the National Institutes of Health [NIH] by 16 percent is extreme and lacking in an understanding of the importance of investment in biomedical research.

Again this year, the Republican budget plan proposes to cut important worker protection programs, including the Occupational Health and Safety Administration [OSHA] by more than 20 percent while terminating important research on workplace safety. The budget plan also calls for the repeal of the Davis-Bacon Act and the Service Contract Act thus threatening other important worker income security protections.

Nonetheless, the most extreme and short-sighted part of the GOP budget plan is the severe cuts to education and job training programs. Essentially, these vital programs to prepare the American people for the challenges of a new global economy are cut by 25 percent from this year's funding and then frozen for 6 years. Important education reforms are terminated and funding for bilingual education is eliminated. Many scholarship and student loan programs are eliminated. The successful direct Student Loan Program is also eliminated. This renewed attack on education places the Republican budget on a collision course with the Clinton administration which has proposed \$61 billion more in investments for education and job training.

Meanwhile, this plan would phase-out funding for the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities as well as

eliminate Federal funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Again, these proposals are short-sighted and extreme.

Again, the Republican plan fails to adequately protect the environment. The plan would cut purchasing power for natural resources and environmental protection by 26 percent. It also focuses cuts at the Environmental Protection Agency based on flawed risk-based regulation reforms. The American people want the environment protected. They want clean water, clean air, and access to well-kept national parks.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget resolution is *deja vu* from last year's Gingrich budget. This budget sets in motion the same failed tactic of confrontation that resulted in the longest and most destructive Government shutdowns in our Nation's history. I fear that not enough was learned by the Republican leadership from last year's failures.

I urge my colleagues to reject this fundamentally flawed Republican budget and insist that a bipartisan budget proposal be adopted to move us on an orderly course to complete the important budget work of this Congress.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank my good friend and ranking member from Minnesota, Mr. SABO, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to acknowledge that I think the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] is right. We do need to be discussing the Clinton budget, and we do need to be doing it in contrast to the Republican budget so the American people can fully understand. I do think that we have a sense of responsibility here and we are right, or he is right, we did collectively come together to vote on that last bill, appropriations bill, to ensure that the Government remained open, which is what the Democrats were trying to do all year long.

But one thing we did stand up and say is that we did not like those priorities because it did not ensure the protection of Medicare, it relinquished the responsibility for young children to have good health by cutting Medicaid so drastically, and then it gave short shrift to research and development. And here we are again now, looking at this new budget with the same kinds of poison-pen activities.

I support the Clinton budget because it recognizes that we as Americans must be embracing of all of us. It supports research and development, it includes a very vital program that I have heard my colleagues make jokes about, and that is the Summer Youth Jobs Program that puts young people back to work, and then I think we should refresh our memories about what happens when we recklessly cut taxes.

I believe in cutting taxes, and I think we need to be fair to the American people. If we cut taxes, we need to ensure the least of those who are working and not engaged in receiving welfare and respecting the earned income tax credit. But with this new budget, we are seeing the Republicans cutting \$200 billion of revenue. Where does it go? It does not go to the average working American. It goes to those who are already well-endowed.

We realize that under a Republican President when that same philosophy and budgeting process was implemented, we for the first time in this Nation began to define the deficit in one word, trillions.

Now we are coming to this Congress and asking for a fair budgeting process, one that emphasizes the environment, one that emphasizes education, one that emphasizes working America, and one that recognizes that this country would not be where it is today if we had not supported research and development. We would not be where we are today in terms of health care nor would we be where we are today in terms of the kinds of technology and jobs that are created. I think research and development is the work of the 21st century. That creates the work opportunities for the 21st century. It would be shameful to cut so drastically, what we have done in this Republican budget.

So I would simply say that we are talking about a budget that has priorities, priorities of balance and a priority that balances what this budget should be about and, yes, does not take away \$200 billion of revenue that American people will need to ensure a better quality of life.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], the distinguished majority whip.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I really appreciate this very vigorous debate. It has been very encouraging and very stimulating. I hope the American people are watching, because there are two very clear differences held here on the floor as to where this country ought to be going.

My good friend from Houston, TX, my neighbor who just spoke, was very clear about where the Democrats are, where the liberals are. They want priorities and they want to maintain the Washington spending that they have been so proud of for all these 40 years. They want to continue these programs. They do not want to change them, and they are hanging on by their fingernails every chance that they can to continue taking money from the American families and paying for their priorities. That is what this is all about. That is why I rise in opposition to the President's budget substitute and I urge my colleagues to support the Dole budget.

Mr. Chairman, today's debate mirrors the greater debate going on in this country. On the one hand we have the President's budget which is much like the present administration. Rhetorically the President's budget looks great. It seemingly balances the budget. It seemingly gives tax relief to American families. It seemingly urges welfare reform. But if we look at the numbing details, a very different picture emerges. It is the picture of a President who promised a middle-class tax cut and then socked a gas tax on middle-class families and a Social Security tax on America's seniors.

It is the picture of a President who promised to end welfare as we know it and then vetoed commonsense welfare reform twice.

It is the picture of a President who promised to balance the budget in 5 years, then in 10 years, and then every year in between.

And it is the picture of a President that says one thing and does another.

Mr. Chairman, it is easy to see why this President is so strongly supported by Hollywood. His budget is kind of like a Hollywood set. It is a sturdy-looking facade backed by nothing more than a vivid imagination.

The contrast with the Dole budget is very striking. The Dole budget is the real thing, much like the man himself. It cuts taxes for American families, not as much as I would like, but certainly more than the President even pretends to cut; it saves Medicare for the next generation, and it balances in 6 years using real numbers, real assumptions, and real cuts in wasteful Washington spending.

So, Mr. Chairman, the American people yearn for the real thing. They do not want any more empty promises. They do not want any more phony numbers, and they do not want bigger government cloaked in Clinton rhetoric. They want a smaller, more effective Federal Government. They want lower taxes. They want real welfare reform. And they want a balanced budget.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject the Clinton budget and vote for the real thing, the Dole budget.

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Chairman, a few short weeks ago the Congressional Budget Office [CBO] estimated the budget deficit for the current fiscal year, 1996, to be \$145 billion. At that time CBO also estimated that the deficit, without some intervening action by the Congress, will top \$200 billion in fiscal 1999, reach \$311 billion in 2003, and explode to \$403 billion in 2006.

And the national debt continues its climb too and today is hovering near \$5.1 trillion. Without significant deficit reduction, the national debt of the United States will exceed \$7 trillion in 2006, a level of future debt the nation clearly cannot afford.

As a member of the coalition, I am proud of the work our group has done this year in developing and presenting an alternative resolution that balances the Federal budget, with significant deficit reduction and program reforms that stem the hemorrhaging national

debt. The coalition budget alternative is comprehensive and fair, and I am pleased to vote to support it today. In doing so, I applaud the work of BILL ORTON and CHARLIE STENHOLM and the other coalition members for their hard work.

Let me also congratulate Chairman JOHN KASICH, Ranking Member MARTIN SABO, and all the members of the Budget Committee for the work they have done this year. Chairman KASICH and Mr. SABO are both dedicated to balancing the budget, and one of my regrets is that we are not here today with a budget resolution that both of our Budget Committee leaders can support.

Mr. Chairman, I am also supporting President Clinton's budget proposal presented by the gentleman from Minnesota, [Mr. SABO], as well as the Republican resolution presented by Chairman KASICH because both of these budget resolutions are comprehensive and will set in motion the needed policy and spending changes necessary to reach a balanced budget.

Balancing the budget should be the top priority of the Congress; there can be no other. As we in the Congress proceed to implement the fiscal year 1997 Budget Resolution, let us keep the goal of reducing spending and balancing the budget central to all of our efforts.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Sabo substitute, the President's balanced budget. This plan brings the budget into balance by the year 2002 by providing \$523.4 billion in total deficit reduction over the next 6 years, including cuts of \$265 billion from entitlement spending alone.

The President's plan—like the Republican budget—brings us to balance by 2002, but unlike the GOP plan, it does not require that our seniors, education, and environmental protection bear a disproportionate share of the burden for deficit reduction.

For instance, while the President's plan would maintain direct student loans, as used by 2.5 million students in 1,400 schools nationwide, the Republican plan would eliminate them altogether. The Republican plan also eliminates the AmeriCorps national and community service program. Overall, the GOP plan would provide \$60.6 billion less for elementary, secondary, and higher education and training than the President's plan. Likewise, the President's plan demonstrates a commitment to clean air and water while the Republican plan provides \$13 billion less on protection and cleanup of our environment. And, the Republican Medicare reductions mirror those proposed in last year's budget while the President proposes real reform that protects seniors and the solvency of the Medicare trust fund.

However, I want to express my serious reservations over the fact that this budget resolution, as well as the Republican plan, assumes a reduction in the Consumer Price Index [CPI], the standard used to calculate the cost-of-living adjustments for various programs including Social Security.

The alternatives before us today assume that the Bureau of Labor Statistics [BLS] will reduce the CPI by 0.2 percent in 1998 and 0.4 percent in 2000. There is no requirement that Congress review or approve this change. Although last year I successfully amended legislation to require that Congress must review and vote on such changes, my amendment to the Labor appropriations bill was dropped in the final product.

Additionally, I want to express my reservations about the tax cuts contained in the President's budget. With our Nation facing a debt of over \$5 trillion, I do not support tax cuts at this time. Any savings should be applied to deficit reduction.

Despite these concerns, which will be addressed in more detail in later bills, the President's budget plan is sound deficit reduction. It brings our budget into balance while maintaining our commitment to education, environmental protection, seniors, and our communities.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Sabo amendment, which forwards President Clinton's budget proposal. The President's budget is balanced in 6 years as scored by the CBO. It continues the fundamental reforms begun by this administration while not doing long-term damage to programs as does the budget presented by the Republicans. It funds education in a way that continues progress toward our children's futures. It funds health care for the poor, the young, the disabled and the old. It funds programs to train the underemployed so that we can reduce dependence on welfare programs for the able bodies. It's family- and taxpayer-friendly.

This body has rejected two alternative budgets today. The American public rejects the Republican budget, because it is almost the same as the one we saw last year. I urge my colleagues to act with reason and not drag the country through the same mess we went through last year when there was no rhyme nor reason to the fiscal crisis that the Republican majority brought to us by trying to pressure the American people to accept less than they want and deserve.

The President's budget saves money for local and state government and still reserves funds for valuable programs to support the children, families and vulnerable among our population. It reforms our welfare programs in a fashion that is not tough on kids.

I appeal to my colleagues, especially those on the other side of the aisle. Don't callously harm the well-being of our seniors, our children, our working poor, and our homeless. Vote for the Sabo amendment so that we can move forward to develop a reasonable Federal budget that will work for all the American people.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of President Clinton's proposal to balance the budget. While it is not the budget that I would write, this budget does eliminate the deficit by the year 2002 while protecting the elderly from higher Medicare premiums, preserving Medicaid for the poor and those in nursing homes, protecting the environment, and providing adequate funds for education.

If I were drafting this budget, I would have cut an additional \$25 billion from defense and added that back to the Medicare trust fund for hospital and physician reimbursements. In my view, these Medicare cuts are too large for our hospitals, particularly teaching hospitals and those which treat many poor patients.

We can lessen the impact of the Medicare reductions if we treat the defense budget under the same standard as every other part of the budget. Instead defense cuts are left off the table. That is not right.

The reality is that every Member of Congress could come up with their own plan to balance the budget. There are other changes that I would make as well, but the Clinton

budget is the closest to my values. That is why it has my support. It is not perfect, but it gets the job done.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 117, yeas 304, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 178]

AYES—117

Abercrombie	Gejdenson	Millender-
Ackerman	Gephardt	McDonald
Andrews	Geren	Miller (CA)
Baldacci	Gordon	Mink
Barcia	Green (TX)	Moakley
Barrett (WI)	Hall (OH)	Murtha
Becerra	Hall (TX)	Neal
Beilenson	Hastings (FL)	Oberstar
Berman	Hefner	Obey
Bevill	Hilliard	Olver
Bonior	Hinchey	Owens
Borski	Jackson (IL)	Pallone
Brown (CA)	Jackson-Lee	Pastor
Brown (FL)	(TX)	Payne (NJ)
Bryant (TX)	Jefferson	Pelosi
Bunn	Johnson (SD)	Pomeroy
Clayton	Johnson, E. B.	Richardson
Clement	Johnston	Rose
Clyburn	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Collins (IL)	Kaptur	Sabo
Collins (MI)	Kennedy (MA)	Sawyer
Condit	Kennelly	Schroeder
Coyne	Klecza	Schumer
de la Garza	LaFalce	Slaughter
DeLauro	Lantos	Spratt
Deutsch	Levin	Studds
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Thompson
Dingell	Lofgren	Thornton
Dixon	Lowey	Torres
Durbin	Maloney	Torricelli
Eshoo	Manton	Vento
Farr	Markey	Volkmer
Fattah	Martinez	Watt (NC)
Fazio	Mascara	Waxman
Fields (LA)	Matsui	Williams
Filner	McDermott	Wilson
Flake	McKinney	Wise
Foglietta	McNulty	Woolsey
Ford	Meek	Yates
Frost	Menendez	

NOES—304

Allard	Burr	Cunningham
Archer	Burton	Danner
Armey	Buyer	Davis
Bachus	Callahan	Deal
Baessler	Calvert	DeFazio
Baker (CA)	Camp	DeLay
Baker (LA)	Campbell	Dellums
Ballenger	Canady	Diaz-Balart
Barr	Cardin	Dickey
Barrett (NE)	Castle	Doggett
Bartlett	Chabot	Dooley
Barton	Chambliss	Doolittle
Bass	Chapman	Dornan
Bateman	Chenoweth	Doyle
Bentsen	Christensen	Dreier
Bereuter	Chrysler	Duncan
Bilbray	Clay	Dunn
Bilirakis	Clinger	Edwards
Bishop	Coble	Ehrlich
Bliley	Coburn	Emerson
Blute	Collins (GA)	Engel
Boehlert	Combest	English
Boehner	Conyers	Ensign
Bonilla	Cooley	Evans
Bono	Costello	Everett
Boucher	Cox	Ewing
Brewster	Cramer	Fawell
Browder	Crane	Fields (TX)
Brown (OH)	Crapo	Flanagan
Brownback	Cremeans	Foley
Bryant (TN)	Cubin	Forbes
Bunning	Cummings	Fowler

Fox	Lightfoot	Salmon
Frank (MA)	Lincoln	Sanders
Franks (CT)	Linder	Sanford
Franks (NJ)	Lipinski	Saxton
Frelinghuysen	Livingston	Scarborough
Frisa	LoBiondo	Schaefer
Funderburk	Longley	Schiff
Furse	Lucas	Scott
Galleghy	Luther	Seastrand
Ganske	Martini	Sensenbrenner
Gekas	McCarthy	Serrano
Gilchrest	McCollum	Shadegg
Gillmor	McCrery	Shaw
Gilman	McDade	Shays
Gonzalez	McHale	Shuster
Goodlatte	McHugh	Sisisky
Goodling	McInnis	Skaggs
Goss	McIntosh	Skeen
Graham	McKeon	Skelton
Greene (UT)	Meehan	Smith (MI)
Greenwood	Metcalf	Smith (NJ)
Gunderson	Meyers	Smith (TX)
Gutierrez	Mica	Smith (WA)
Gutknecht	Minge	Solomon
Hamilton	Mollohan	Souder
Hancock	Montgomery	Spence
Hansen	Moorhead	Stark
Harman	Moran	Stearns
Hastert	Morella	Stenholm
Hastings (WA)	Myers	Stockman
Hayworth	Myrick	Stokes
Hefley	Nadler	Stump
Heineman	Nethercutt	Stupak
Henger	Neumann	Tanner
Hilleary	Ney	Tate
Hobson	Norwood	Tauzin
Hoekstra	Nussle	Taylor (MS)
Hoke	Ortiz	Taylor (NC)
Holden	Orton	Tejeda
Horn	Oxley	Thomas
Hostettler	Packard	Thornberry
Houghton	Parker	Thurman
Hoyer	Payne (VA)	Tiahrt
Hunter	Peterson (FL)	Torkildsen
Hutchinson	Peterson (MN)	Towns
Hyde	Petri	Trafficant
Inglis	Pickett	Upton
Istook	Pombo	Velazquez
Johnson (CT)	Porter	Visclosky
Johnson, Sam	Portman	Vucanovich
Jones	Poshard	Walker
Kasich	Pryce	Walsh
Kelly	Quinn	Wamp
Kennedy (RI)	Radanovich	Ward
Kildee	Rahall	Waters
Kim	Ramstad	Watts (OK)
King	Rangel	Weldon (FL)
Kingston	Reed	Weldon (PA)
Klink	Regula	Weller
Klug	Riggs	White
Knollenberg	Rivers	Whitfield
Kolbe	Roberts	Wicker
LaHood	Roemer	Wolf
Largent	Rogers	Wynn
Latham	Rohrabacher	Young (AK)
LaTourette	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (FL)
Laughlin	Roth	Zeliff
Lazio	Roukema	Zimmer
Leach	Royce	
Lewis (KY)	Rush	

NOT VOTING—12

Coleman	Jacobs	Molinari
Ehlers	Lewis (CA)	Paxon
Gibbons	Manzullo	Quillen
Hayes	Miller (FL)	Talent

□ 1549

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Gibbons for, with Mr. Paxon against.

Mr. Coleman for, with Mr. Miller against.

Messrs. HYDE, HORN, POSHARD, NETHERCUTT, and SERRANO changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

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

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, before we begin, I ask that my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUR-

THA] be permitted to speak out of order on a matter unrelated to the budget that should come to the attention of the House.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MURTHA was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENT PRAYER FOR CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, ADM. JEREMY M. BOORDA

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the House to rise and join me in a moment of silent prayer for Admiral Boorda, who apparently either shot himself accidentally or intentionally.

Admiral Boorda was one of the finest naval officers that I have ever known; a person who came up through the ranks, and all of us had so much admiration for, and who has done so much for this great country over the years. The Navy and the country is a better place because of his fine service, and I would ask that we would bow our heads for a moment of prayer.

Amen.

The CHAIRMAN. A final period of general debate is now in order. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON].

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING].

(Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of budget resolution House Concurrent Resolution 178.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the budget resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 178. It keeps us going in the right direction to make sure that we do indeed balance the budget by the year 2002.

It is truly gratifying to see the change that has taken place in Washington since the Republican majority was elected. The entire debate has shifted from one of simply not letting the deficit get any bigger to really balancing the budget. That is a fundamental change in the culture of the Federal Government.

It is good to take stock of these things from time to time because people forget very quickly how things used to be. They forget that under the previous leadership of the other party, spending spiraled out of control and it was common to refer to spending as being "uncontrollable."

We have proved that it was a lack of will to control spending that lay at the heart of our deficits. And, it was the Orwellian use of language in which spending increases were called cuts that aided the ballooning of Federal spending. The deficits ballooned because Congress could not control itself, not because spending could not be controlled.

Under Republican leadership, domestic discretionary spending actually decreased for the first time in more than two decades. While we did not reduce it as much as many of us would have liked, it was a major accomplishment to completely change the direction of government from growing ever larger to actually shrinking it.

Those of us who promised to work for a smaller, less intrusive government can be very

proud of what we have been able to do in such a short time.

The budget before us today keeps us on track to getting our financial house in order. Again, it does not go nearly as far as I would like; but, it maintains our momentum toward the goal of a balanced budget and the economic rewards that go with it.

The budget should be balanced as a matter of principle, but, just as important as the principle is the economic benefits that go with it. A 2-percent drop in interest rates, which nearly all economists agree would result from a balanced budget, means lower costs for buying a home, a car, or a college education.

Because of that kind of economic change, individuals will be able to do the things that they need to do to improve their lives and take care of their families.

Our budget will make sure that the Government programs that we depend upon will be there when we need them. Medicare is going bankrupt even faster than we originally thought and we absolutely cannot allow that to happen.

Our budget will allow Medicare to continue to grow; in fact, it will be one of the fastest growing programs in the budget. But the rate of growth will be slowed through sound policy changes that ultimately give senior citizens greater choice and control over their own health care.

I suppose that budgets reflect the priorities that we place on things and they say a great deal about who you trust. Our budget says that we have heard the call of the American people for a smaller and more responsive Government.

This budget reflects our belief that individuals can and will make the best choices about how to run their own lives. It is a far cry from the Washington-knows-best, one-size-fits-all, bigger-is-better, "spending can't be controlled" budgets of years past.

I encourage my colleagues to support the budget resolution and keep America on the path to a balanced budget, more freedom and individual responsibility.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS].

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, recently I was in Dallas, TX, and I bought a little plaque for my office that talked about priorities. I know it is very difficult to see this plague because I tried to photocopy it and it is pretty difficult to see it, but here is the message. It says: "One hundred years from now it will not matter what my bank account was, the sort of house I lived in, or the kind of car I drove, but the world may be different because I was important in the life of a child."

I bought that plaque because it reminds me of why I am here in Congress. We all need to be reminded to keep our priorities in line. Today's vote is about priorities. It is about the priority of our Nation to live the way we expect every citizen to live, within his or her means. This debate today is about truth, it is about honesty, it is about our children and our grandchildren. It is about getting rid of a \$200-plus billion deficit and a \$5 trillion national debt.

Over the last 30 years this city has had one heck of a party, and we continue sending the bill to our kids and

our grandkids. Mr. Chairman, every night I pray that the Lord will bless and keep my children, and I have a picture of my family here, and every time we have this budget debate I am reminded of my responsibility in that prayer. I have five personal reasons why I want to balance the budget. They are Kesha, Jerrell, Jennifer, Julie and Trey Watts.

I urge Members all to look around next Sunday when they go to their church or they go to their synagogue or parish, and I challenge them to go to the nursery and take a look at those nursery kids, those 2 years old and 3 years old, and understand this as they look at them: Each of them, each one of them, they are responsible for \$18,000 of the national debt, each of them, and they never held a job.

I urge Members to do that, and if they vote no today they have to tell every one of those precious children they just saddled them with an ever-deepening debt. Their life will never be as good as ours, and in essence we have lost our priorities. I urge a "yes" vote for this budget. I urge a vote for the right priorities I urge my colleagues to remember their own reasons, their own children, and continue our country on the path to a balanced budget.

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

Let me just make a couple of comments and then I will yield to others. I will try to be shorter than I was planning on.

I hear all this discussion about children. I happen to have a new grandchild. I am a grandfather for the first time, a little over a month ago.

□ 1600

It is a new experience. It is nice. But I look outside today, and I hope for the sake of my granddaughter the future is not as dreary and bleak as the weather outside today. I tell my friends on the Republican side that I see their budget, and I worry about it. I hope she grows up in a world where she knows she has to pay her bills, but I also hope she grows up with a sense of obligation and a sense of community that is larger than simply herself or her community or her State, but it also includes a view of the country as a whole in the world.

We have important obligations as we move forward to balance the budget, which we should do. But we made important commitments to our seniors in Medicare, and as we reform it and change it, as we must, we must make certain that we do it in a rational way that is sustainable and continues quality health care for all in this country. I fear the Republican proposal, as in so many cases, goes too far. In Medicaid where we deal with health care for the most vulnerable in our society, the numbers are not that far off, but the policy is. My colleagues let the States put billions of dollars out of the program.

I could go on in program after program where that is the case. We are

going to pass it today. I hope that we only recognize that somehow it is a bargaining position for your side of the aisle. Ultimately I still hope that we can come to some agreement in this session between the Congress and the President and find a solution that is pragmatic rather than ideologically driven so that we can move this whole country forward. Your proposal today is not that solution.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], who served as a very distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means and, unfortunately, is leaving us at the end of this session of Congress.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, this issue today is not about balancing the budget. In fact, this issue that we are talking about really is a wish list. It is not a law. It never will become law. It is just a wish list that we put together to say that we are fulfilling our responsibilities. But there is something wrong with this wish list. Seventy-five percent of all the savings in this wish list come out of children, aged, sick people's benefits. Seventy-five percent of all the money that is saved in this wish list comes out of Medicare and Medicaid.

In addition to that in this wish list, a horrible damage is done to the programs that have worked successfully. All of the seniors will be herded into managed care where they do not choose to go, have not chosen to go, and do not need to go. Who will profit by all that? The insurance companies, the medical doctors, and all the people who are making such a killing out of managed care.

Second, the States will not be required to continue their efforts for their children and their old people under Medicaid. Another horrible cut from the welfare of those who are dependent upon us who are healthy and well off. Then, Mr. Chairman, there is a tax cut in here, just like there was last year, and it is here for the wealthy friends of our Republicans.

America does not need a tax cut. The United States of America has today the lowest tax burden of any of the 25 industrialized nations on earth. We do need to balance our budget, but we do not need to balance our budget at the expense of the dependent people in this society. And we do not need to balance it for the benefit of those who can more than pay their own way.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

(Mr. CASTLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 178, the House budget resolution, but want to comment on the President's budget and the other budget alternatives.

While I am pleased that the President has finally agreed on the need to balance the

budget, his plan falls short on a number of the critical reforms that are necessary to achieve this goal. It promises a lot, but delivers little.

In 1994, I had the opportunity to serve on the President's bipartisan Commission on Entitlement Reform, the Kerry-Danforth Commission. For a year the Commission heard testimony from a parade of experts on the need to reform Medicare and Medicaid and other entitlements or they would ultimately either become insolvent or eat up virtually all our tax dollars.

What troubles me most about the President's budget is that it does not face up to the pressing need to address the entitlement issue. Instead, the administration has played politics by portraying the sound reforms to Medicare contained in the Republican budget as a threat to seniors.

Reforms to Medicare, Medicaid and welfare are not needed simply to balance the budget, they are needed to protect these programs for those they serve.

I am one Member who believes that we can still achieve some major progress toward balancing the budget this year.

While the President's budget falls short in key areas, I believe that the coalition budget presented earlier shows that Republicans and Democrats do not have far to go to achieve fair compromises on the most important budget issues.

The coalition budget plan and the Republican budget are the two most credible plans for achieving a balanced budget in 6 years. The President's plan does not meet the critical tests necessary to achieve a balanced budget. The President's plan is based on overly optimistic economic assumptions and avoids most of the tough choices necessary to balance the budget.

Mr. Chairman, today we should pass this budget resolution and then get down to the task to producing welfare, Medicaid, and Medicare reforms that will save these programs and save tax dollars.

These are the areas we must concentrate on in the next few months to really make a difference in the lives of our constituents.

Members of the Blue Dog Coalition and a number of Republicans have already demonstrated that we can work together to reform programs which will help people and balance the budget.

Congressman JOHN TANNER and I have introduced a bipartisan welfare reform bill which would save \$50 billion over 7 years and contains all the key reforms necessary to move people from welfare to work.

This compromise is based on H.R. 4 conference report and the bipartisan Governor's proposal.

It contains all the essential elements of the conference report—work requirements; family cap; time limits; limits on benefits to teenage mothers; paternity establishment; illegitimacy reduction; and child support enforcement.

It builds on the Governor's plan by providing additional funding for child care and the contingency fund to protect States from economic downturns, but requires more State accountability.

This is the type of bipartisan effort that will lead to a balanced budget. We need to pursue similar agreements to reform Medicaid, Medicare and hopefully provide tax relief to the American people.

I support passage of the budget resolution and then immediate action to pass legislation

to reform the key programs that will balance the budget.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Chairman, I have to rise in opposition today to the final budget resolution before us. Setting budget priorities is one of the most challenging things that we have as Members of Congress to come before us. In agreeing to a budget resolution, we are making a series of choices, choices about the goals that Government makes, choices about the services that citizens receive, choice about commitments that are kept.

The good thing about today is we come to this floor together, and we are all looking at balanced budgets. But the whole point is, how do we get there? There is no single right way to get there. There is no one answer. What we are talking about today are choices. I would argue that some of the choices in the majority's budget resolution are very much the wrong ones.

Quickly, let me just mention the choices on Medicare. We all fully agree that we have to keep the Medicare program solvent. We have done it before. We will do it again. But there are several policies in the majority's budget resolution today that would, it really would make it more difficult for seniors and at the same time does not improve the Medicare solvency situation. Two examples: Medical savings accounts. We could debate medical savings accounts for younger, healthier people and probably have a very healthy good debate. We have one universal health system in this country. Those over 65 get Medicare. If you give them a medical savings account to choose, who is going to choose it? Of course if you are younger, if you were healthier, you will choose it. And in some choosing, we lose \$4.6 billion in that whole choice.

More damaging still is those that are frailer and sicker stay in our traditional Medicare which has worked, is there for over 65 and as a result of the healthier, stronger ones going out of it, the premiums go up for the sicker. It is what we call adverse selection. In plain English, what it means is the premiums are going to go up.

Also, something that some of us on both sides of the aisles have worked for for years, and that is to see that when you have Medicare and you go to the doctor, you have a protection against increased costs over and above Medicare. For years we fought that. I can remember going to meetings when I was on the city council; assignment: Let us have assignment for doctors who work their way through it so it was fair for those on Medicare and fair for the doctors.

What is happening in the new budget resolution that we are about to vote on? Balanced billing, they call it. It is not balanced, let me tell you. It means the doctor can add on and you will not have a choice.

My final thing, let me say why in heaven's name when we are all talking about welfare reform that we are going and attacking the earned income tax credit? Make work pay. Do not take money out of people's pockets.

These things make it impossible to vote for this majority budget. We really should not do what we are doing today.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON].

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the House resolution, as a grandfather, and urge passage.

My third grandchild—and second grandson—will be born soon, and as I think of welcoming this new Hobson into the world, I can't help but wonder what kind of future he will face. How much will prices rise during his lifetime? Will the country still be a place of opportunity? Will there still be a thriving economy to support his generation? When I think about the answers to these questions, it becomes increasingly clear to me that the best thing I can do for my new grandson is to vote "yes" for this budget package.

When they look back on this Congress, our own children and grandchildren will judge us harshly if we pass up this chance, and we continue to rob them because we do not have the backbone to control our spending in this Chamber. Every time we deficit spend we are refusing to take responsibility for our actions.

Many constituents I've talked to have had concerns about specific programs they benefit from, but without fail, they also remind me to follow through with the promise to balance the budget. People are willing to accept the changes necessary to preserve our country's fiscal security, but they want us to make sure that what we do is fair, and that we follow through on our commitment to balance the budget.

We're a year into the balanced budget mission, and the sky has not fallen like some said it would. In fact, we all know that the sky will continue to brighten the closer we get to 2002 and to balance.

I know there are many here today whose parochial interests lead them to declare this plan unfair. To those people I ask them to consider this: is it fair to take the money and future and opportunity from generations of Americans who aren't even born yet? That's what we do when we deficit spend and run up the debt. Someone pays and it isn't those of us in this room, it is our children and grandchildren who trust us to look out for them.

Protect our children's and grandchildren's future and shift power, money and influence out of Washington and back to Americans: pass the 1997 budget resolution.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL].

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, as I ask for opposition to the majority budget proposal, it is with the understanding and the true belief that all of us in this House are really looking for a better America, a more prosperous America, an improvement in the quality of life for all of our citizens.

Not too long ago when President Clinton spoke to both Houses, there were a lot of people that reported that he sounded so Republican, that he had stolen every idea that only the genius of the party labeled The Grand Old Party could have. I rather thought that that was a message in saying that we all have the same objectives.

We truly would like to have a smaller Government, that we would want to reduce taxes on our constituents and even our own, for that matter; that we are concerned with being able to say that during the time that we were in the Congress, we indeed improved the quality of life. That happened whether we were Republican or whether we were Democrats.

I think that next to feeling good about being American, the next good feeling that we have in our country is the dignity and the pride of having a job. You have had to know unemployment, you have had to know the pain of looking at your family in the face, looking at your kids and somehow explaining why that American dream is not yours to share in. You have to understand, even if you had a good job and for some reason you lost a job, they downsized, they merged, how do you explain to your kids and to your family that America is doing much better, trade is expanding, but somehow you got caught in the cracks?

I suggest when Members look at this budget, instead of the rhetoric about wiping out the Department of Education and wiping out the Department of Commerce, we should say we are going to increase education. If they are not doing the job, we have got to restructure it. Instead of talking about wiping out the Department of Commerce, we are going to say we are going to expand world trade, we have exhausted European and domestic markets.

While we are talking about this and while we are willing to make available moneys for research and development, when do we start talking about training people, giving them access to education, not cutting student loans, not cutting back on education and job training? Saying everybody in this country is going to be able to work, is going to be able to stand up and say that they are going to take care of their family and they will never allow welfare to compete for the hearts of their children and the mother of those children because they have the dignity to work.

That is what the earned income tax credit was all about. It was saying if you are working every day, black or white, Jew or gentile, and at the end of the year you end up below the poverty level, that we are not going to advocate that you make the salary of a Member of Congress, but we will give you something to bring you to the dignity of working and being above poverty.

So we cut out education, we cut out the job training, and we have the audacity to cut out giving a hand to people who refuse to be on welfare but want to work each and every day with just a little help. When we start thinking about what we are not doing to put people to work in terms of education and job training, when last have we ever heard on this floor that we are spending too much money on our jails? When have we ever heard that mandatory sentences mean more taxpayers' money spent?

Why in the city of New York, we have a detention center that costs \$60,000 a year to keep a bum kid in, and that is before he is convicted. Yet the fight is between the mayor and the Governor and this Congress as to whether \$6,000 a year is enough. So you kick them out of school, you put them in the streets and we end up with drugs, with violence, and with jail.

A greater America is a working America, a stronger educated America, and we just made the wrong cuts for this great Republic.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, this Republican budget reminds me of a movie I saw a few years ago called "Groundhog Day." In the movie, Bill Murray, who is the star, keeps reliving the same day over and over again. Everything happens to him the same way.

This budget, which has been advertised as a real change, when you examine it, when you open the package that has been repackaged, is really the same thing. It is said to be a moderate budget. It is not a moderate budget. It is warmed over tax cuts for the wealthy, reshaped cuts in Medicare, in Medicaid, reconstituted cuts in education and the environment.

For 17 months, the President, the Democrats have been waiting for the Republicans to come to the sensible center so that we could get a budget done. The Republicans have been offered a balanced budget plan made up entirely of cuts that the Republicans support, but it is never good enough. We cannot seem to get the compromise, the consensus that we need to get this done.

□ 1615

This budget still raises taxes.

Now listen to this. I said it in the last budget debate:

This budget raises taxes on working people who are at the bottom, trying to get in the middle class, while it cuts dramatically taxes on capital gains, most of which goes to the wealthiest Americans. How can anyone argue that this is fair, that this is sensible, that this is pragmatic, that this is what we ought to be doing in this country?

It still cuts Medicare and Medicaid way too much. That would not have to

be done if we simply gave up the tax break for the wealthiest Americans, if we just focus the tax break on middle-income people and people trying to get in the middle class. We would not need as deep a cut in Medicare and Medicaid and in education.

And then if we look at the list that comes out of discretionary spending, it is too long for me to read this afternoon. Job training in vocational education, cut by more than \$1 billion; national direct student loans, eliminated entirely; libraries across the country cut by one-fifth; 24 education programs eliminated entirely; Institutes for Occupational Safety and Health, gone; rural housing eliminated; rural health, gone; agricultural extension and research, gone.

The list goes on. I could read it all afternoon.

These are efforts that everybody could agree are good for the future of this country that only, only the government will perform if this country is to move forward.

Now let me end with this:

This budget for the second year in a row is not going to happen. The President will veto the implementation of this budget, and what I cannot understand, my friends in the Republican Party, we now have 2 years of no progress.

I know my colleagues did not like the President's budget in 1993, but it cut the deficit in half, and most importantly, it got done.

This country is not a parliamentary system. Our colleagues cannot do it their way alone. They have to come to the middle, and we have to find a compromise to move this country forward. If our colleagues continue being obstinate and resolute in wanting to do it their way or no way, we get nothing done for the American people.

Let us vote this budget down, let us get a budget back on this floor that is somewhere out here in the middle that everybody in this body can support, and let us get this deficit down and balance this budget as we should have done a long time ago.

This budget will not live. Let us find a budget that will.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me just say that we have had enormous progress. The simple fact of the matter is that in the area of Washington spending the spending that we are responsible for year to year, that if we do not even come to work, of course, entitlements keep going up, but on that spending that the President was forced to deal with, we had the most massive amount of change in 50 years. We saved a net amount of dollars of 30 billion, the most amount of savings, the most amount of shrinking of Government in 50 years.

As George Will told me, "Historians were wrong, JOHN. Historians were wrong. They said government never shrunk. You proved that it can, in fact,

shrink." And the savings of that \$23 billion came, it came because we had principle. We did not cave. We stood up for what we believed in. We are standing up for this country. We are standing up for the power of the individual and a smaller Federal Government into the next century.

But let me tell you about the three reasons why we do this budget. One is the children. Everyone in this Chamber cares about the kids. That is why we all talk about them. We are about preserving America's greatest legacy. It is simple: "Your children will be better off than you were." It is the legacy that we got from our parents.

I look across this Chamber, and I look at a great man, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], a hero of the Korean war. Never in his wildest dreams did he ever think that he would get to be a very senior and respected spokesman on the Committee of Ways and Means. And I look across the aisle here. We got a professional football player who struggled his way up and made the big time and then came to Congress because he had a vision.

I mean, all we are saying is that every child, and everybody agrees with this, every child deserves a legacy and an opportunity for them to be able to live their dreams, and we cannot give them that if we keep spending money we do not have. We know it. We do not want to send them to work where the message is that they are going to work longer and harder for somebody else to pay somebody else's bills. We do not want to strangle them with a big government that can choke them off in overregulation and things that do not make common sense.

So, No. 1, our principles are driven by children, the next generation. As my colleagues know, it is right out of the Bible. One of the most important principles is the other person is more important than we are. Well, we think that this country is more important than us; and, second, we believe our children and the next generation, frankly, are more important than we are. So we do it for the children.

But as Eunice Kennedy said to me one night, she said, "You know I understand your love for the children. That's about what you're going to do tomorrow. What about today?" She said, "You have to explain what you're going to do today," and she made a fair point, and I want to say to my friend from New York, when we talk about jobs, when we talk about job insecurity, when we talk about wages, let us just look at the facts. We got a candidate in our party, we had an independent candidate, and we are going to hear about job insecurity and wage stagnation until we solve it, and we should, because mothers and fathers are working longer and harder and they are getting stuck. Too many families are stuck. They are not getting ahead.

I understand it. I come from a family where we had to work like crazy to get ahead. I understand the problem.

Where does it come from? The simple fact of the matter is, if a country does not save, it cannot invest. If a family does not save, it cannot invest, it cannot invest in its children, it cannot invest in its home, it cannot invest in transportation. If a nation does not save, it cannot invest, and America has the lowest savings rate of any modern industrialized nation on the face of the Earth. We punish people for saving, and not only do we punish them for saving, but we make it difficult for them to have anything left after they get their wages because government at all levels has taken too much from them. So, first of all, they do not have anything left, and the few crumbs they have left, they cannot save because if they save, they get penalized on their income tax statement because they saved. It is crazy.

This Nation needs to save. We need to provide reasons to save for our future because, if we save, we can invest, and if we can invest, we can improve productivity. That is an economic term. But what does it really mean? It means putting tools in the hands of American workers that allow them to compete and win with workers all around the world.

Intel in New Mexico, I believe, is the highest-paying job one can get in New Mexico. I say to my colleagues you do not work for Intel; you know why? Because the whole world wants the magic of the computer. And so their workers are paid a premium wage, their jobs are secure.

America needs to pursue a policy that saves and invests and takes risks and rewards risks and helps our people win. That is what our budget does by rewarding risk-taking and savings and investment and opportunity.

And third, the point maybe on which we most disagree because I am not so sure we disagree on the first two, how do we make this transformation? My colleagues, what we are about over here is we are about the power of the individual and we are not about the power of Washington bureaucracy. We are for systematically taking power, money and influence from this city and sending it home, and that does not mean that what we have done for the last 30 years or 40 years had not been good. It has been good. Thank God we created Medicare, thank God the Federal Government got involved in many of the issues they got involved with. But, frankly, we are not getting the results from here any more. We will not solve the problems on crime on the streets of Los Angeles from Washington. The only people that can solve the problems of crime in Los Angeles are people who live in the neighborhoods of Los Angeles. They need to be empowered.

Children are not going to learn because we are calling a bureaucrat in Washington to figure out whether our kids are getting educated. Mothers and fathers across this great country of ours, they are the ones that can make

the assessment, they are the ones that have to work with the teachers in the school houses to determine whether their children are winning or not. We do not believe that the answer lies here.

Job training; oh, come on, 120 Federal job training programs. I do not advise anybody to leave their job and think that Washington is going to retrain them. How are we going to do it? We are going to put an incentive in the hands of a business. The business is going to call somebody who does not have a skill. The business is going to train that person for an incentive, and then they are going to hire them for a real, permanent, high-paying job. That is how we do job training.

So I say our vision is get the pendulum, move the pendulum back, get the power and the money and the influence out of this city, back home where we can have local solutions for local problems at less cost because I will just suggest to my colleagues, in closing, the 21st century is about the century of the power of the individual, not the century of the power of government. It is about giving individuals the tools that we have created in this economy that can make us the most powerful people in the history of the world, and we mean to take the first big step toward guaranteeing a bright and beautiful and opportunistic, an opportunity society, for everyone into the 21st century.

Pass the resolution. It is a giant first step toward saving our children, toward providing for better jobs and empowering individuals as we fly into the 21st century.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, while I am in support of the budget resolution before the House today I do want to alert Members to a serious issue. I believe that this is no time to back away from aggressive trade policies. We need all the tools available in a post-NAFTA and post-GATT world to ensure that our farmers can fairly compete in world agriculture trade. There are programs that help American farmers and one of them is Public Law 480. This program helps countries become our trading partners of the future.

We need to strengthen Public Law 480 and integrate it into an aggressive trade strategy to make us more competitive. The 1996 farm bill made significant changes to Public Law 480 to improve the program.

For example, South Korea was a former Public Law 480 recipient. Now South Korea is the fifth largest market for United States agriculture goods. We sell over \$2 billion in agriculture products to South Korea each year.

Countries now receiving title I assistance include Lithuania and Ukraine, countries that will be our future cash trading partners.

I do not believe we should turn our backs on the farmers and ranchers of America. We need all the trading partners we can get—or the European union will take over all agriculture exports in the world.

Title I, the concessional agriculture sales program and title III, food grants to promote economic development, of Public Law 480 are important programs and it is my intention during the appropriations process to work to

make sure funding is provided for the Food for Peace Program.

The Subcommittee on Department Operations, Nutrition, and Foreign Agriculture, of which I am the chairman, worked very hard to improve this program and will continue its work to ensure adequate funding for the Food for Peace Program.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, the budget resolution for the fiscal year 1997, brought to the floor under the leadership of Chairman KASICH and the Budget Committee, continues our payments on a balanced budget by the year 2002. It is an important step forward for the Congress and for the American people, and one I wholeheartedly support.

In the report to accompany the budget resolution, the Budget Committee makes a number of specific suggestions on cuts in both discretionary and mandatory spending. Their suggestions look both at the fundamental purpose of American Government, and to areas where—when there is a legitimate governmental function—we can eliminate waste, bureaucracy, and duplication.

While I generally agree with most of the suggestions made by the Budget Committee in its report, as the chairman of the subcommittee with jurisdiction over the Federal Trade Commission, I was disappointed to see that they targeted this agency for elimination. My subcommittee will be taking up reauthorizing legislation for the agency within the next month or two, and while the subcommittee will continue to review the FTC's operations with a critical eye, I believe that this is an important agency and one which should continue to be funded.

The FTC has often demonstrated its commitment and competence in protecting American consumers. Both in its recent rejection of the Rite-Aid/Revco merger and the "Senior Sentinel" sweep designed to root out telemarketing fraud, the agency has acquitted itself admirably in meeting its mission. While we realize that this agency had a number of problems in the 1970's and early 1980's, it has put many of those problems behind it and manages to accomplish its goals with a minimum of public resources.

Further, the FTC provides a good return on the public's investment. The agency is nearly 70 percent funded by fees generated from corporate mergers. It regularly reviews old rules and discards those that are obsolete or no longer necessary to prevent fraud or unfair trade practices. When I look at the FTC, I believe that it is the model of what a regulatory agency should be, efficient, fair, and flexible.

My subcommittee will be looking closely at the FTC over the next few months and we will look for areas where the agency can be even more efficient and meet its statutory duties at a lower cost. However, eliminating the FTC would, in the end, wind up costing Americans far more in increased commercial fraud and bureaucratic waste than would be saved. I believe that this agency should continue to perform its mission and I will support efforts to see that it is able to do so.

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, once again, the House will pass a balanced budget resolution and will continue to keep its promises to all Americans. I am proud to say my colleagues on the Budget Committee and I have been able to continue our commitment to saving our children's future and providing for our seniors. This budget plan—the only plan to

balance the Federal budget while providing much needed tax relief, promotes growth, strengthens the Nation's defense, and ends the practice of runaway spending.

But above all, the Republican budget shifts money and power from Washington bureaucrats and back into the hands of people. Under our plan, Americans will earn more and keep more of their money, as we release our Nation's children from the burden of our debt.

This budget addresses Medicare's impending bankruptcy by strengthening and improving the program. It expands benefits for senior citizens by extending the Hospital Insurance Program through the year 2008, 3 years beyond the President's plan. We also recommend increasing Medicare spending for each beneficiary from an average of \$5,200 in 1996 to \$7,000 in 2002. And, contrary to the demagoguery by many willing to accept the status quo and stand idly by while Medicare burns its last flames, overall spending increases by 59 percent between now and 2002.

With this budget, my colleagues and I have ended the old Washington formula that measures compassion by the number of bureaucrats on the government payroll. We maintain the current level of funding for LIHEAP, Education for the Disadvantaged, the Drug Free Schools Program. In addition, student loan volume will increase from \$26.6 to \$37.4 billion.

While the President talked about reforming welfare, and indeed campaigned on this very pledge, the only thing he has done on the issue is veto real reform, reform which he once championed. So once again, we help the President keep his promise to the American people by reforming the ineffective aspects, while maintaining the safety net for underprivileged Americans. Over the next 6 years, welfare spending will increase from \$83.2 billion in 1996 to \$105.5 billion in 2002.

And we do all this while rolling back the Clinton tax increase of 1993. We balance the budget, insure our national defense and protect our children's future. It's what the American people asked for in 1994, it's what Republicans said they would do and it's the right way to restore prosperity for all Americans.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 178, the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution, clearly the best and most responsible of the proposals we consider here today.

First and foremost, it draws a philosophical difference that fundamentally sets it apart from any of the alternatives—the Black Caucus and coalition budgets as well as the President's proposal: It seeks to shift power, money and influence out of Washington and back into the hands of the American people where it belongs. None of the other proposals can say that—each of them raises more revenue and keeps more of it at the Federal level.

It also includes responsible tax cuts, and I emphasize the word "responsible." I categorically reject the claim that this budget resolution cuts taxes at the expense of the poor and elderly. First, the tax cuts are needed to balance the budget. Let me say that again—the tax cuts are needed to balance the budget. Why is this? Because whenever we have decreased tax rates in the past, receipts have gone up. Cutting rates means less tax sheltering and this means more revenue. By also controlling spending—and this legislation includes 130 Federal program terminations—we can live within our means.

Furthermore, the social safety net programs in the Federal budget will be increased under this budget resolution. Medicare, Medicaid, education spending—all go up. These programs are not being cut to provide tax cuts for the wealthy—it just isn't true. Reforms that are included are necessary to save the programs.

The President's own advisors have told the Congress that some of these programs are in very real danger of going bankrupt unless reforms are made now. We simply must face this very real problem now, or very quickly it will grow beyond our ability to control it.

We can debate the size and shape of these reforms—I myself have questions about this—and as chairman of the Health Subcommittee, I will be active in this debate, but this budget resolution is simply a blueprint. It is a general guideline to set the tone for the budget debate to come. It is the beginning of the process, not the end.

This guideline sets a responsible tone, it provides tax relief for America's families without endangering support programs for our Nation's elderly and veterans, it puts more money into the hands of the people and cuts the size of the Federal Government.

I urge support for the resolution.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 178 and to express my particular support for the veterans provisions in the bill. As chairman of the Veterans Subcommittee on Compensation, Pension, Insurance and Memorial Affairs, I am very pleased that the Budget Committee has been able to craft a bill that will allow us to make improvements in several areas of veterans' benefits, while at the same time moving us further toward a balanced budget.

During a recent hearing, several veterans groups expressed their support for using the savings from legislation overturning the Court of Veterans Appeals decision, Davenport versus Brown to improve veterans' benefits. The benefits improvements contained in House Concurrent Resolution 178 do just that, and I thank the committee for their foresight and patriotism.

This is a good bill for veterans. First it will increase total VA outlays from \$37.8 billion in fiscal year 1996 to \$39.9 billion in fiscal year 2002. Over the next 6 years, VA spending would total \$233.3 billion which is \$18.7 billion more than over the previous 6 years. This year, our budget provides \$100 million more for VA medical care than requested by the President, and \$5 billion more than the President over the next 6 years.

For our older veterans, it strengthens the solvency of the Medicare Program and provides a 45-percent increase in spending for Medicare. Our middle-aged veterans will benefit through lower taxes and increased buying power. Their families will see increased education and entrepreneurial opportunities, and less government. Younger veterans will see a permanent \$500 per child tax credit, an adoption tax credit, a repeal of the 1993 gasoline tax and improvements in health insurance and medical savings accounts.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to note that in testimony before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, VA Secretary Jesse Brown stated, "the President's budget would be devastating for the VA." The Secretary also said that the President's budget would close the equivalent of 41 hospitals, fire 60,000 employees, and deny care to as many as 1 million veterans.

Further, when confronted with the facts regarding the President's budget for the VA, the Secretary likes to make a point that the President has agreed to negotiate the VA budget every year. Well, that's not good enough for me. If the President is such a strong supporter of veterans, let him put the money up front. Veterans benefits should not be negotiated.

As I mentioned earlier, our bill improves several areas of veterans' benefits. First, to help our severely disabled veterans, we are proposing to raise the one time automobile allowance from the current \$5,500 to \$10,000. That will make it easier for veterans who have lost the use of their limbs or sight to more easily afford transportation.

Second, we have included legislation to extend compensation benefits to the day of death of a veteran. This may seem a small matter, but it is significant to bereaved spouses of veterans.

Third, we are going to extend the period for which a surviving spouse can receive back benefits from the current 1 to a maximum of 2 years. This will partly make up for increased adjudication time at the VA which is now running about 3 years for a claim to be decided at the Board of Veterans' Appeals.

We want to reward our veteran college students with an increase in their GI bill benefits by giving those who have a "B" average going into their senior year a scholarship. We also intend to provide an opportunity for those still on active duty to transfer from the less generous Post Vietnam Education Assistance Program [VEAP] to the current Montgomery GI bill. We'll also make it easier for veterans to become teachers by making permanent the ability to use their GI bill education benefits to pay for teaching certification.

Finally, we are going to continue funding for the veterans pro bono legal representation program at the Court of Veterans Appeals. This program ensures that needy veterans with good cases are represented before the court. The program also assists the court by reducing the number of pro se cases before the court thereby reducing the time it takes the court to process claims.

Mr. Chairman, it is important for veterans to compare the budgets before us today and decide for themselves whose budget is best for veterans and the Nation. I urge them to contact their elected officials and express their support for the bill.

To my colleagues I say support House Concurrent Resolution 178 because by doing so, you support America's veterans and ensure the economic security of the Nation.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Republican budget resolution for fiscal year 1997. The new Republican budget is nothing more than a rehash of the same extremist priorities from last year—including large tax breaks for the wealthy paid for by deep cuts in Medicare and Medicaid. House Concurrent Resolution 178 also includes misguided cuts in education funding, unneeded boosts in defense spending and tax increases on 6 million hard working American families. There is no doubt that spending in certain areas can be reduced and programs can be reformed, particularly in the area of health care, but this budget goes too far.

Mr. Speaker, the majority refuses to abandon the most outrageous part of their budget—unnecessary cuts in Medicare to finance tax breaks for the wealthy. This budget cuts

\$168 billion from the Medicare Program—\$124 billion from part A and \$44 billion from part B. This plan sacrifices the quality and availability of senior's health care for a tax giveaway, which primarily benefits people making over \$100,000 a year. The impact on senior citizens and hospitals is even more devastating than the cuts proposed last year.

House Concurrent Resolution 178 puts the squeeze on hospitals, through deep cuts in the part of Medicare that pays hospital bills. These cuts could force many hospitals to close or reduce the services they now offer to their communities. Regardless of inflation, hospitals would get less than they do today in nominal dollars under this budget. In Philadelphia, our health care system and entire economy will be endangered by these insidious cuts. Many hospitals in my district, whose beneficiaries are predominantly Medicare and Medicaid patients, may have no alternative but to shut their doors.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 178 contains the same damaging structural changes to Medicare and Medicaid the President vetoed last year. It continues to rely on the untested and dangerous medical savings accounts as its centerpiece. The majority proposal would segment the Medicare population, leaving the traditional program with fewer dollars and a sicker pool of beneficiaries. It would drive up premiums and causing Medicare to wither on the vine. This proposal is of extreme significance to my district, the 20th oldest in the Nation. More than 100,000 senior citizens in my district rely on Medicare and they live on fixed incomes. This proposal could truly end universal health coverage for elderly, effectively reversing 30 years of progress.

Mr. Speaker, the majority tries to hide its true intentions behind lofty rhetoric about saving Medicare for the future. House Concurrent Resolution 178 extends Medicare's solvency for the same number of years as the President's plan—yet the GOP plan takes \$44 billion more from Medicare. It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the majority is using funds cut from Medicare to pay for their crown jewel—a \$176 billion tax cut for wealthy Americans.

In addition, the majority is still insisting on ending the Medicaid guarantee for 36 million Americans, including millions of senior citizens and children. Mr. Speaker, approximately 400,000 people in Philadelphia rely on Medicaid as their only source of health care. Without that guarantee, families will be forced to sell their homes to pay for nursing homes for their elderly parents. This budget cuts Federal medical spending by \$72 billion, but the total cuts could still reach \$250 billion over 7 years if States spend only the minimum required to receive their full block grant allocation. This potential \$250 billion cut reduces spending growth per person below the general rate of inflation. Deep total cuts in Medicaid could place older Americans and people with disabilities at risk of losing optional Medicaid benefits. These cuts would place an additional financial burden on families caring for their parents and others with long-term care needs. In addition, the majority still insist on repealing Federal enforcement of nursing home quality standards that have dramatically improved the quality of nursing home care.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 178 also would raise taxes on between 6 and 10 million hard working American families by cutting the earned income tax credit program.

The earned income tax credit benefited 40 million Americans in working families and has been proven to help people move off welfare. In addition, this budget continues the assault on educational opportunities for our Nation's young people by cutting more than \$4.5 billion in educational assistance over the next 6 years. The Republican majority has proposed to eliminate the direct student lending program, which provides educational assistance to over 2.5 million students nationwide, as well as the Goals 2000 Program, and the State Incentive Grants Program.

We cannot afford to slam the door of educational assistance on our young people nor rob our senior citizens of their right to adequate health care. Instead, Mr. Speaker, we should continue on the path to balance with a bipartisan budget that rejects the radical policies contained in this budget and moves forward with a plan that truly reflects the values of mainstream America.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 178, the fiscal year 1997 House budget resolution. Like the Republican Majority's budget proposals of last year, this measure sets the course for a balanced Federal budget for the first time in a generation. For nearly three decades, the Federal Government has recklessly overspent, accumulating a national debt of \$5 trillion. This year, the interest on that debt will reach \$344 billion. A child born today inherits a tax bill of \$187,746 just to pay for their share of that interest. At this point, it does not matter who is to blame. What does matter is that we reverse this dangerous course before it is too late.

House Concurrent Resolution 178 is a budget plan which will give our children a future that promises economic opportunity and prosperity. This 6-year budget plan envisions a smaller, less intrusive Federal Government. Downsizing will be accomplished by eliminating wasteful or duplicative programs, sharing more power with States and local communities, and lessening the burden of taxation and regulation which has a stranglehold on our Nation's families and businesses. While House Concurrent Resolution 178 would reduce Federal spending by approximately \$700 billion over the next 6 years, overall Federal spending would still increase 3 percent annually during this period, rather than near 5 percent annual spending growth under current law.

House Concurrent Resolution 178 is not a perfect resolution. The House Budget Committee has presented recommendations of programmatic changes which can be implemented to achieve a balanced budget. The Budget Committee's illustrative cuts and reforms, however, include some suggestions which I find objectionable. Specifically, these include the elimination of the Department of Energy [DOE] and the corporatization of its national laboratories. I have written the chairman of the Budget Committee regarding these provisions, where savings yielded are questionable at best. Furthermore, I plan to be very active in the debate should the House consider related legislation.

Mr. Chairman, although I have these concerns about the budget plan's energy-related provisions, House Concurrent Resolution 178 has many more positives than negatives. I would also note that the recommendations in this plan are nonbinding; to be implemented, each recommendation must be considered

through the Committee process, adopted by both Houses of Congress, and signed into law by the President.

Time and time again, the President and the Democrats in Congress have disregarded the call from around the country for fiscal responsibility; instead, they seem intent on being dragged kicking and screaming into the 21st century. The Republican budget plan is a credible approach toward eliminating the budget deficit and revitalizing our economic and budget outlook today and in years to come. Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support this most important measure and its underlying goal of a balanced Federal budget.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Republican budget proposal we have before us today. This is a proposal which shows that the Republicans have not learned from last year's budget debate. Last year, when the Republican proposals came to light, the American people overwhelmingly voiced opposition to the extreme policies of cutting health care for the elderly, gutting environmental protection, and cutting such crucial investments as education, in order to provide massive tax breaks and increase defense spending. It was not just the dollars cut from the programs, the Gingrich/Dole budget also fundamentally changed these programs, reneging on the basic assurances of health care, education and work opportunities, and devastating the environment.

I support responsible spending reductions and statistics show that the budget downpayment accomplished during 1993 and 1994 by Congress and the President has paid off in terms of really reducing the deficit. That downpayment has led to the lowest deficit level since the Carter administration. The Congressional Budget Office [CBO] reports that the deficit for fiscal year 1996, when measured against the size of the economy, will be 1.9 percent of the GDP, the lowest level since 1979! The numbers also show that it is the first time the deficit will have dropped 4 years in a row since President Truman was in office.

The deficit is too high, but we have made progress. Now the congressional Republicans want to waste that hard work with tax breaks for short term political gain and platitudes of spending cuts way down the road. It is largely because of improved economic figures and the fact that their budget window is now 6 years instead of 7, that the Republicans come to us today with cuts which they claim are more moderate than last year's budget proposal. But although their numbers appear more moderate, the GOP/Gingrich core policy proposals are still drastic, with skewed priorities for our Nation's future.

The Gingrich budget plan once again relies on massive cuts in Medicare and Medicaid programs which help over 70 million Americans gain access to health insurance. It is clear that there are serious problems with our current health care system. Congress should be acting to expand health care coverage and rein in escalating health care costs, but instead, Republicans are focused on tearing our Nation's health safety net, potentially adding millions more to the ranks of the uninsured. The plan puts Federal health care on a defined contribution basis, not the existing assurance of health care to those who need it.

The Republican Medicare plan continues to include the same policy proposals as last

year's plan, drastically cutting payments to providers, restructuring the current program and heavily relying on untested medical savings accounts. Once again, although changes are needed in the Medicare Part A Program to extend solvency, the Republican plan goes too far, changing Medicare from reliable health insurance for our seniors to a second-class health care system. The claim of solvency is only a pretext for the out-of-context policy the GOP pursues.

Perhaps even more damaging than the Medicare cuts are the cuts and program changes planned for Medicaid. Medicaid provides health benefits to 36 million Americans, including 443,000 Minnesotans. Under the Republican plan, the seniors, people with disabilities, and low-income families who receive help from Medicaid, will be at risk of losing their coverage. In addition, States will be allowed to reduce their own share of funding for Medicaid, making the actual cuts much more severe than they appear in the resolution. Again, it is important to note that Federal defined contribution plans will not provide the defined benefits that many rely upon each and every day.

As we head into the 21st century, one of the most important investments our Nation should make is in education. Republicans once again want to make the same extreme cuts as in last year's resolution. The budget hits students who need help with higher education costs by eliminating the Direct Loan Program, and eliminating new funding for Perkins loans and State student incentive grants. The budget makes a host of other education cuts, such as eliminating Goals 2000, bilingual education, and immigrant education programs. Further, the proposal slashes funding for job training, such as the programs consolidated in the CAREERS bill. This budget resolution goes too far by cutting these programs 28 percent below the levels in the CAREERS bill, which already cut the programs by 20 percent. Alas, it becomes clear that the goal of consolidation is the justification to shrink the block grant programs. Pretending that efficiency will make up 45-percent cuts in programs doesn't hold up to commonsense evaluation.

On the environmental front, the budget resolution calls for a 26-percent cut in natural resources programs by 2002. Even as we see more and more visitors to national parks and more public interest in protecting and enjoying our national heritage, the Republicans want to slash Federal protection of these resources. We all know that effectively protecting resources is expensive and that if we want to truly protect our environment, we have to allocate sufficient funding. The funding level in this budget resolution simply will not adequately protect our environment for future generations. In addition, the Republican budget blueprint once again advocates destroying forever the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge [ANWR] by permitting oil and gas exploration and drilling. ANWR is the last great piece of American wilderness, and opening the refuge area to drilling will assure destruction of this priceless and irreplaceable treasure.

The budget blueprint contains negative policies which harm long-standing labor laws that protect American men and women, such as repealing the Davis-Bacon Act and the Service Contract Act, and gutting OSHA. Under Republican policies, fair treatment for working families would be jettisoned and corporate

management would set the rules without adequate safeguards or monitoring.

Another area which merits concern are the cuts in housing and community and regional development. Continuing to cut housing when it has already been targeted for cuts in the past is pouring salt on the wounds of those most in need. In addition, the community development programs of CDBG and CDFI have their administration merged with the HOME program and transferred to States and local governments, accompanied by severe budget cuts. Again the block grants are given short shrift. How can this majority Republican Congress advance more block grants when it reneges on the basic tenet?

In fact, the treatment of community development in this budget resolution shows the danger of turning programs into block grants—underfunding. Block grants and ceding control of programs to the States have been the mantra of this new Republican majority. However, as the budget belt tightens, Republicans seek cuts to the block grants, leaving State and local governments with all the flexibility, but with no funding to administer the programs or provide the services. This should serve as a warning to all those who advocate block grants as the answer for every problem.

This GOP budget recommends a 50-percent cut in the Federal Flood Insurance Program. Areas that are cut from funding no doubt will not find affordable insurance and when the damage occurs the Congress will reply with 100 percent Federal assistance. This is the final analysis: It will not save money, it will cost Federal taxpayers, and create political gamesmanship and more uncertainty. The GOP budget calls for \$312 billion in unspecified domestic discretionary spending in the next 6 years, meaning that the cuts already illustrated would be eclipsed by yet more savage slashes in future years. However, some sacrosanct pet programs are spared. Even while funding cuts and negative policy changes are proposed for health care, education, infrastructure, the environment, and community development, the Republican's plan proposes an increase in 1997 defense spending of \$12 billion over the Pentagon's budget request. Most of this new spending goes to unrequested weapons systems, including a host of new planes, helicopters, submarines, and ships, above what is necessary for our national defense. The irony of these budget priorities is that the United States will enter the next century with more smart weapons systems, but fewer smart soldiers to operate these sophisticated weapons systems.

We can continue to responsibly reduce the deficit, and proposals have been put forth to show that we can do it in a fair manner. The Republicans make the task of deficit reduction a political sham by insisting on including tax breaks of \$124 to \$175 billion in their budget plans. The amount that the Republicans project for the cost of the one tax item is \$124 billion and is not sufficient to pay for their additional proposed tax break policies, meaning that the cost of the tax changes will be much higher when the entire policies are in place.

The tax policies in the resolution do not reflect fairness, as the measure greatly reduces the earned income tax credit for the working poor while making low-income families ineligible for the new children's tax credit. The children's tax credit will not benefit 34 percent of the Nation's children because their parents' in-

come is so low that the nonreimbursement tax credit policy denies the child credit for low income families. In addition, the Gingrich/GOP plan leaves the option open for a capital gains tax break, a proven budget buster. Instead of including these unfair tax policies in their plan, Republicans should use these funds to moderate the cuts in other programs.

During the past year, the Republican majority has consistently shown that they do not value programs or protections for American working families and seniors, ranging from affordable health care and a clean environment, to quality education and a livable wage. Unfortunately, as this fiscal year 1997 budget proposal shows, they have not been listening to the consistent and concerned response of the American people, which has been opposition to the Republicans' extreme actions. The American people understand that in pursuit of fiscal and deficit balance, we should not accept human deficit and social imbalance. The people expect shared sacrifice, not the Gingrich cuts for people programs and tax breaks for the rich, the policy that the GOP is intent on advancing. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Republican budget resolution.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Chairman, here we are again. It was just about a year ago that we stood here on the House floor, debating the Republican plan to balance the Federal budget.

By now, we are all familiar with what happened in that debate. In response to our attempt to balance the budget, Republicans were confronted with one of the most savage political attacks in the history of this country.

We were called "mean-spirited", "uncaring", and "extremist". The American people were told that we didn't care about old people and that we wanted to starve innocent children. All of this despite the fact that our budget actually increased spending on Medicaid, Medicare, school lunches, student loans, and other programs that help the most vulnerable in our society.

Fortunately, the Republican Congress weathered these desperate attacks and fulfilled its promise to pass a balanced budget bill. Unfortunately, President Clinton's veto made all of our efforts go for naught.

But, as they say, "if you don't succeed, try, try again"—and that is exactly what we are doing. Today, we are considering another bill that lays out a concrete plan to balance the Federal budget by 2002.

Before I talk about some of the specifics of our proposal, I would like to say a few words about why we will not give up on our efforts to balance the Federal budget.

The reason we are back on the floor today, trying to balance the budget, is simple. If we do not get Federal spending under control, we risk leaving our children and grandchildren with a mountain of Federal debt that will never be able to be repaid.

If we do nothing, our children will face a country with higher interest rates, lower economic growth, and fewer jobs than there would be under a balanced budget.

If we do nothing, the safety net that supports the poor, the elderly, and the disadvantaged will collapse under the sheer weight of Government debt.

My Democratic colleagues accuse us of lacking compassion, but I say to them: How compassionate is it to borrow from our children and leave them to pay the bills?

How compassionate is it to allow the Federal safety net to collapse because of our unwillingness to do what needs to be done?

How compassionate is it to duck the hard choices, just to make things more difficult for those who come after us?

The answer is obvious: It is not compassionate at all. It is time for us to take responsibility for ourselves and put our Nation's finances in order. And that is exactly what the Republican budget does.

The bottom line of our budget proposal is simple. Under our bill, the Federal Government would experience steadily declining deficits between now and 2002—when we would actually have a \$3.2 billion surplus. For the record, that would be the first time in nearly 30 years that the Federal Government runs a surplus—truly a historic accomplishment.

But deficit numbers alone don't tell the whole story of the Republican balanced budget. Our budget proposes much more. A comprehensive overhaul of how our Government does business.

The bill starts by proposing fundamental reform of entitlements. It would probably surprise most folks to learn that the largest portion of the Federal budget, by far, is entitlement spending. In fact, spending on entitlement programs such as Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security currently consumes about two-thirds of the Federal budget. And, if we do nothing, spending on these programs will eventually consume the entire Federal budget, leaving nothing for education, defense, or any other Federal program.

Accordingly, one of the top priorities in the Republican budget is to get entitlement spending under control. Our budget starts by reforming Medicare.

As most of my colleagues are aware, the Medicare trustees warned last year that the Medicare trust fund would be bankrupt by 2002 if Congress did not act. Since then, things have only gotten worse. Medicare was \$4.2 billion in the red this year and is now projected to go broke even sooner than expected, possibly as soon as the year 2000. If we allow that to happen, we will be putting the health care of millions of seniors at risk.

Obviously, we can't let that happen. That's why our budget includes Medicare reforms that would slow the explosive growth of this vital program. Note that I did not say cut. That's because the Republican budget does not cut Medicare. Our plan merely slows the rate of growth of Medicare from the current rate of 10 percent per year to about 7 percent a year. In doing so, our plan would save Medicare from bankruptcy, while still expanding the ability of seniors to make choices about their own health care.

But let me repeat. Our plan does not cut Medicare. In fact, Medicare spending under the Republican budget will increase from \$196 billion this year to \$284 billion in 2002.

In addition to Medicare reforms, our budget makes needed reforms to a number of other entitlements program.

For example, our proposal incorporates much of a Medicaid reform plan proposed earlier this year by a bipartisan group of our Nation's Governors. Currently, Medicaid spending is growing by an unsustainable 19 percent a year. By giving States more flexibility in how they administer Medicaid, this proposal would reduce this rate to 6.6 percent growth per year, twice the rate of inflation. In doing so, the Republican budget would save \$77 billion over the next 6 years while preserving the health safety net for the poor.

The budget resolution also calls for reform of our Nation's ailing welfare system. As my colleagues are aware, earlier this year President Clinton vetoed a Republican welfare reform bill that would have fulfilled his own promise to "end welfare as we know it." Our bill calls for Congress and the President to give welfare reform one more try, and save \$53 billion in taxpayer dollars over the next 6 years.

Let me say one last thing about the entitlement reforms proposed in our budget. We have left Social Security alone. Republicans made that promise in the 1994 elections, and we plan to stick by it.

Besides entitlement reforms, the Republican budget also proposes an overhaul of the Byzantine government bureaucracy that has grown up over the past few decades. Our budget starts by eliminating 130 wasteful and unnecessary Federal programs, including Goals 2000, the National Endowment for the Arts, and the President's AmeriCorps Program which, according to the Government Accounting Office, costs taxpayers over \$25,000 per volunteer. The bill also proposes deep reductions in our foreign aid spending—\$14.2 billion over the next 6 years.

Most importantly, however, our budget calls for the elimination of two Cabinet Departments, Energy and Commerce, that duplicate the missions of other departments and which have clearly outlived their usefulness. In doing so, this bill would save over \$10 billion per year. I am especially proud of this element of our budget—I believe that nothing demonstrates our commitment to dramatic change than our willingness to take on special interests and eliminate these wasteful Cabinet agencies.

Finally, I want to address one of the most important aspects of the Republican budget resolution: Tax relief for working Americans.

As many of my colleagues are aware, Americans spend a great deal of time working for the Government instead of for themselves. This year, the average American worked until May 7—longer than ever before—to pay their taxes.

Another astonishing statistic. According to a recent report by the Tax Foundation, the top 50 percent of all taxpayers pay 95 percent of all taxes. That means that if you are in the top 50 percent of taxpayers, you are not only working to support your own family, but you are probably working to support someone else's as well.

To me, this doesn't make any sense. We should be doing everything possible to help workers in this country make ends meet, not weighing them down with a crushing tax burden. But that is exactly what we are doing.

For this reason, I am pleased that our budget contains meaningful tax relief for working Americans. The centerpiece of our plan is a \$500-per-child tax credit for middle-class families that will help those families make ends meet. Our budget also contains a repeal of President Clinton's 1993 gas tax hike, expansion of tax credits for adoption, enhanced health insurance deductions for the self-employed, and raising the Social Security earnings limit. Finally, the bill contains a reduction in job-killing capital gains taxes.

I strongly support these tax reductions. They are fair, reasonable, and targeted toward working individuals and families who are most in need of tax relief. I also believe that the tax

relief contained in the Republican budget is a dividend to American taxpayers for our efforts to reduce wasteful Federal spending.

In sum, Mr. Chairman, the budget we are considering today represents the Republican vision for the future. Smaller, more cost-effective Government, a balanced Federal budget, and lower taxes. I don't think that there is much doubt that these priorities are the priorities of the American people. The question is: Are we going to look past partisan political rhetoric and do the right thing, or are we going to succumb to the temptation of business as usual?

For our sake, and the sake of our children, who will have to pay the bills that we leave behind, I hope that we will choose to take the former approach. It is time to do the right thing for the economic future of this country. I urge my colleagues to support the Republican balanced budget resolution.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this ridiculous, radical, and revolting Republican resolution to cram a devastating budget down the throats of the American people. When I first read the Gingrich-Army Republican budget proposal, I recalled hearing that it was *deja vu* all over again. As I studied the Republican budget more, I realized that the Republicans must have really enjoyed shutting down the Federal Government so much last year that they want to do it all over again.

Then I thought about how the drastic cuts to so many Federal programs would effect so many people—not just the hard working Federal worker who experienced so much frustration about wanting to do their jobs and not being able to—but also the many senior citizens who rely on the Medicare system to pay for their medical care. The Republicans want to cut Medicare by over \$167 billion over 6 years. These cuts are as deep as the ones the Republicans tried to get away with last year. Not only deep cuts to fund Medicare—when Medicare isn't there to pay the medical and hospital bills for seniors, they will have to pay more out of their own pocket or not receive the needed health care. The restructuring of the Medicare program proposed by the Republicans could threaten the very existence of Medicare.

All over again, just like they tried to get away with last year, the Republicans propose to cut Medicaid funds to States to provide health coverage to the poor, the disabled, and pregnant women. If the Republicans would have their way in this budget, Medicaid would be cut by \$72 billion over the next 6 years, and the total reduction in funding could be as high as \$250 billion. The Republican budget proposes to tear down the existing Medicaid Program in which the Federal Government and the American people have already invested literally billions of dollars, and replace it with a patchwork system of block grants to States. This combination would jeopardize health care for millions of low-income children and pregnant women, seniors in nursing homes, and the disabled, as well as low-income seniors who depend on Medicaid to pay their Medicare part B premiums.

All over again, the Republicans want to cut funds for the education of America's children. How many times do the American people have to tell the Republicans that education is a high priority and that the best education cannot be provided on a shoestring. The Republicans are trying to hide the fact that they are

again trying to cut education programs, claiming that funding would be frozen at 1996 levels. In discretionary programs, that would mean real cuts of about 22 percent below the already reduced 1996 level in the 6 years through the year 2002 that this resolution covers.

Now, let's talk about tax breaks. I have a quiz for you: Do you think the Republican budget attempts again to provide capital gains tax breaks for the wealthy, or, do you think the Republicans are proposing to sneak in a \$20 billion tax increase on low-income working families to pay for the rich to get a tax break? Too hard? Not if you've been awake for that last 2 years and watched the Gingrich-Armey Republicans try over and over again to pay back their wealthy supporters by trying to give the rich every tax break and funding advantage they could.

Let's get serious, Republicans. Do you think the American people are really going to lay down and let you shove this ridiculous budget down their throats? Not if I can help it, and thank goodness, not if President Clinton can help it—and he can. He has the guts and the pen to stop these radical Republican proposals. Let's defeat this Republican budget proposal now, so we can really get down to business before we have a repeat of last year's Government shutdowns and threats of tax increases and teacher layoffs. I urge a "no" vote on this Republican budget proposal.

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Chairman, as sponsor of the balanced budget amendment which passed this House last year, my concern for the financial future of our country is well known. I support a balanced Federal budget because we owe it to our children and grandchildren. It would be unconscionable to saddle them with the accumulated debts that we ourselves failed to pay. In this regard, I am very pleased that all the budget plans we are considering here today also envision a balanced budget by the year 2002, as well.

However, I am concerned about the treatment of solar and renewable energy programs and the complete elimination of wind energy research and development in House Concurrent Resolution 178. These large funding cuts will greatly harm American research efforts in these important technologies and give our foreign competitors an unparalleled opportunity to take the world lead from the United States in this high-growth field.

We have seen other kinds of new technologies invented and developed by Americans, only to be successfully deployed by foreign countries. This is the so-called VCR syndrome. We are now in danger of letting our technological leadership in another important field slip away once again.

Proponents of cutting the budget for renewables point out that they are merely eliminating corporate welfare. To this I must note that the great majority of companies involved in the research, manufacture, distribution, and supply of renewable energy technologies are classified as small businesses by the U.S. Small Business Administration. Rather than eliminating handouts to corporate giants, these funding cuts are pulling the rug from under the thousands of small businesses which employ tens of thousands of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, through careful allocation of available funding resources, we can fully support renewable energy technologies and still have a balanced Federal budget. This is a

combination that will benefit present and future generations of Americans. I will continue to work throughout the budget process this year to ensure that renewables get fair funding treatment.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution offered today. The fiscal year 1997 budget resolution represents a continued attack on the health, safety and well-being of the majority of the American people. While not as drastic as the budget proposed by the Republican majority last year, this budget also is too extreme. By cutting Medicare and Medicaid, the safety net for vulnerable populations—the elderly, disabled, and poor children and families—will be in jeopardy, I cannot support a budget that includes massive Federal spending for new tax breaks while other critical programs, including Medicare, Medicaid, and earned income tax credit—are greatly weakened. This is not a realistic budget. We cannot, and should not, enact a budget such as this that promises to cut spending and cut taxes. If we are serious about reducing the deficit—as I am—we should make the hard choices to being our Federal spending in line. This budget, however, promises to make life easier for the affluent, while balancing the budget on the backs of the poor and disadvantaged.

I support a balanced budget. In fact, I have cosponsored and voted in favor of amending the U.S. Constitution to mandate a balanced Federal budget. However, while the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution passed by this committee achieves balance on paper, I cannot support the callous and irresponsible policy assumptions it uses to achieve these savings. The policy implications have very real consequences to the citizens of this Nation.

I am especially concerned about the deep cuts in discretionary spending included in this budget. Certainly, we must take serious steps to carefully scrutinize every portion of our Federal budget in order to control Federal spending and bring our deficit under control. However, the cuts in discretionary spending included here are too harsh and will have a serious impact on millions of Americans, most notably the vulnerable populations that continue to be left behind as we change our Federal priorities.

For example, the cuts in education leave me very concerned about the future of this Nation. The education of our children must be a top priority. The education our children receive should be adequate in keeping the U.S. economy competitive as we move into the next century. American children rank dismally in math and science achievement compared with students from other nations. The proportion of young people completing high school has remained stagnant for a decade, despite the ever-increasing demands for education in the job market. National education reforms under President George Bush's Goals 2000 program pointed our Nation in the right direction. This budget, however, eliminates Goals 2000. Having all our students starting school ready to learn, increasing the high school graduation rate, teaching every adult to read and keeping drugs and violence out of schools are not goals we should abandon. While our deficit needs to be eliminated, we must not decimate the education of future generations.

Under this budget, the Legal Services Corporation is cut drastically in fiscal year 1997—

a large step toward the total elimination of the program by 1999. The Legal Services Corporation is a good example of a Federal program that is effectively being administered at the local level. The leadership of this House claims to want to expand the role of state and local authority while shrinking the size of the Federal Government. The Legal Services Corporation is a prime example of how local control of a Federal program is working. The creators of the LSC recognized that decisions about how legal services should be allocated are best made not by officials in Washington, but at a local level, by the people who understand the problems that face their communities. The LSC provides funds to 323 programs operating over 1,200 neighborhood law offices. Together they serve every county in the Nation. LSC programs provide services to more than 1.7 million clients a year, benefiting approximately 5 million individuals, the majority of them children living in poverty. The phase-out of the LSC represented in this budget eliminates a much-needed program and threatens the life and well-being of every poor or near-poor person in this country.

A well-maintained transportation network is essential for economic development. If highways cannot be maintained, our goods cannot move in commerce. Similarly, without continued attention to our Nation's airports, delays and other difficulties will slow our economy's growth. In addition, transit funding provides immediate benefits for economic development, carrying low-income people to their place of work and reducing congestion in metropolitan areas.

Transportation should not bear higher cuts than other programs. This budget phases out Federal assistance the operation of mass transit systems. Operating assistance is essential to transit systems across the Nation. Transit systems are already taking serious steps to cope with federal operating cuts of nearly 50 percent in fiscal year 1996 and 12 percent in fiscal year 1995. Transit systems, by necessity, are operating more efficiently yet still must cut services and increase fares. The complete elimination of operating assistance would have a drastic impact and could eliminate necessary public transportation in communities across our nation.

The elimination of funding for mass transit is just one example of the hypocrisy of this budget. As this budget pushes people into the workforce it takes away their means of getting to work. This budget is unfair and should not be passed by this House.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 178, the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution. I have numerous reservations with the funding priorities and assumptions contained in this resolution. However, I will take this opportunity to highlight three important issues—the deep cuts proposed in discretionary agriculture spending, the ill-advised Medicaid proposal, and the proposed elimination of Federal involvement in fossil energy research.

The budget resolution for fiscal year 1997 again makes a deep cut in agriculture spending. This Congress passed, earlier this year, an extreme overhaul of farm programs, setting them on the road to eventual elimination. Now in this budget resolution, this committee has decided to make an extreme reduction in the amount of discretionary spending for agriculture.

The resolution makes the recommendation to cut total agricultural discretionary spending from \$3.9 billion in fiscal year 1997 to \$2.1 billion in 2002, a staggering reduction in budget authority. This discretionary cut mostly takes the form of unspecified reductions in U.S. Department of Agriculture overhead costs. The members of the committee and rural America are left to wonder if these cuts will be in the delivery of farm programs, the delivery of conservation programs, or the quality of nutrition and food safety programs. Clearly each and every function of the Department of Agriculture will be impacted by these assumptions. This committee should question if this is the appropriate time to be making these cuts when commodity stocks are at their lowest point in a generation, the livestock industry remains in extreme distress and new plant diseases continue to spread across the nation's heartland.

The budget resolution does specify some specific cuts. These cuts are mainly in USDA research programs. With commodity support already cut by the new farm bill, our producers need quality agricultural research more than ever to protect themselves against diseases, insects and changing environmental conditions. The new farm bill addresses many of the concerns related to competitive research projects and facilities buildings projects. The Agriculture Committee currently is undertaking a comprehensive review of agriculture research programs and will be writing specific legislation to address the needs of agricultural research in the future. The Agriculture Committee should be allowed to do its work without being locked into an extremely restrictive budget scenario before it is finished.

Finally the budget resolution phases out both title I and title III of the Public Law 480 Food for Peace Program. Again, the new farm bill promised American farmers that their future profitability would be derived from the world market. Now we are witnessing the elimination of one of the most successful export enhancement programs ever.

In this budget resolution we see the broken promises of the freedom to farm bill. As the freedom to farm bill was being passed, sponsors hailed a new era in farm policy, promised strengthened research programs and dangled the riches of the world market in front of American farmers. Now we can see that those promises are broken barely 2 months after the bill was signed. We are willing to do our share to balance the budget, but rural Americans cannot continue to take these extreme and unfair budgetary hits.

With regard to Medicaid, I have deep concern about the provisions of the majority's proposed budget for Medicaid. I do recognize that, at least with respect to the commitment of Federal Medicaid funding, this budget makes significant progress over the majority's effort last year—from the proposed reduction of \$182 billion over 7 years last year to \$72 billion over 7 years this year. It thus appears that after a year of rigorous analysis and intense debate, the members of the majority have been persuaded that the Federal Government simply cannot make cuts on the order of those proposed last year without jeopardizing the health of some of our Nation's most vulnerable populations.

Despite the progress this budget represents, however, I remain deeply concerned that it will undermine the central mission of the Medicaid Program, which is to provide a minimum level

of health care to the children, the elderly, and the disabled of this Nation. During committee markup, I offered a sense-of-the-House amendment to preserve the basic program elements critical to the performance of Medicaid's mission. The committee rejected this amendment, indicating that the level of progress represented by this budget is not as substantial as the reduced Federal cuts suggest. Unfortunately, the improved Federal funding level in this budget masks a series of policy proposals that will jeopardize the health of children, seniors, and the disabled.

Mr. Chairman, let me be clear that my concerns about this budget stem not from any hesitation about whether to reform Medicaid. Medicaid must be reformed through such measures as utilization of managed care, enhanced State flexibility, and the streamlining of regulations. Yet the goal of reform is to improve the program's effectiveness, not to undermine it.

Perhaps the greatest threat to Medicaid's mission contained in this budget is the dramatic reduction in State contributions it allows. In addition to limiting Federal contributions, the budget caps State contributions to Medicaid at 40 percent, allowing the many States with match rates between 41 and 50 percent to lower their required contributions. Thus, although the Federal cut has been reduced to \$72 billion, the total potential reduction in Medicaid spending after accounting for reduced State contributions is \$265 billion. It is simply not possible to withdraw these vast sums from the system without endangering the health safety net that Medicaid has historically provided to North Dakotans and others around this Nation.

This budget would also permit States to use discredited—and currently illegal—funding mechanisms to further limit State contributions to Medicaid. Once again, States could establish schemes to tax providers or collect intergovernmental transfers from State entities, later rebating these funds to the payors, labeling the rebates as Medicaid expenditures, and claiming Federal matching funds for them. Given that the payment of such rebates involves no genuine State outlays for health services, legalizing these sham financing systems make State matching requirements meaningless.

The majority points with pride to the list of groups and services covered under the Medicaid proposal contained in this budget. Upon review, however, several important groups have been excluded and the list of covered services is revealed as a largely empty promise. With respect to covered services, this budget merely requires states to offer some of the various health services listed, while repealing all of the Federal standards that speak to the amount, duration, and scope of these services. Thus, a State could cover only a few days of hospital care even in the event of a serious illness such as a heart attack. Without the minimal Federal standards, people guaranteed coverage under the majority's plan may find the guarantee to be a hollow one.

One of the groups excluded by this budget is poor children. This budget repeals the guarantee of health care coverage for children over the age of 12 living in low-income families, more than half of whom have parents who work. For low-income parents in North Dakota, knowing that the basic health care of their children will still be covered if they leave

the welfare rolls has been an important element in encouraging the transition from government dependence to productive employment. Thus, not only will this repeal endanger the health of these vulnerable children, it will provide a strong disincentive for parents to move from welfare to work. With respect to the disabled, this budget repeals the federal definition of disability, allowing states to narrow this definition as they see fit and thereby exclude many disabled Americans from coverage.

Mr. Chairman, this budget also threatens senior citizens. While under the majority's plan States are supposed to abide by federal nursing home quality standards, Federal monitoring of quality is terminated and States will have nearly unfettered discretion with regard to monitoring and enforcement. We must not forget that it was precisely because many States proved incapable of ensuring quality nursing home care that Congress was prompted to enact basic quality standards in 1987. In another strike against seniors, one that will have particular impact in North Dakota, this budget substantially reduces payment by Medicaid of copayments, premiums, and deductibles for those Medicare beneficiaries whose income is below the poverty line. Given that many low-income seniors already devote large portions of their monthly budgets to health care costs, this cutback will force seniors into a cruel choice between staying healthy and meeting life's other basic expenses.

Mr. Chairman, I will work diligently to address the flaws outlined above and I am hopeful that the majority will join in this effort. As we move forward to balance the Federal budget, we must not abandon the long-standing Federal commitment to the basic health of the children, seniors and disabled of our Nation.

Finally, I have serious concerns about the provisions in this resolution which would eliminate the Federal Government's involvement in fossil energy research and development. This is very short-sighted policy. Research may not immediately improve profitability, but the long-term benefits are immeasurable. With respect to fossil energy, development of new energy processes to the point of commercially acceptable financial and technical risk is a long road that regulated industries have not been willing to go alone. Those joint private-federal ventures which have been undertaken, like the numerous projects underway at the Energy and Environmental Research Center in Grand Forks, ND, have brought a wealth of information to the energy industry.

The Federal Government has a stake in research and development of fossil fuels. For example, utilities are not going to initiate their own research on emission controls. If they did, it would be an open invitation to regulators to impose new or stricter standards and bigger costs under the doctrine of best available control technology. What's more, energy markets are specialized and highly competitive and would be unlikely to consider complementary solutions.

Without the Federal Government's involvement in fossil energy research and development, it is unlikely this important work would be done. In fact, many companies have eliminated their alternative fuels programs, leaving only a tiny contingent of researcher. It is in the national interest to preserve this infrastructure with limited Federal funding.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Republican budget resolution.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, as we all know, the Budget Resolution does not have the force of law, but is a working document Congress uses to set the spending limits and broad priorities for the appropriations process through which the spending plan for the coming fiscal year is put in place.

Our action today is just the first step in that process, and, if last year is any indication, we have a lot of work ahead of us after today's votes.

Each of the four alternatives considered today is itself the product of compromise and accommodation. I would venture to guess that no Member of this body will agree with every provision in any of them.

While I disagree with certain of its techniques to achieve budget saving, I voted for the so-called coalition budget in frank protest to several aspects of the Republican proposal, particularly its elimination of direct student lending. In addition, the coalition budget best reflects my concerns that reforms in the areas of health care and welfare remain prudent and fair and that the Federal commitment to education in general is honored.

The committee resolution may be an acceptable starting point for budget discussions, but I would place my party on notice that I can be expected in the authorization and appropriations process to object to elimination of the direct student loan program and any cuts in education. I also have doubts about the case for elimination of the Department of Commerce, although reform of its functions and merger with the Special Trade Representatives' Office may be in order.

While the hard work remains ahead, it is crucial that the goal of a balanced budget be advanced, but in such a way as to ensure fairness for all.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my opposition to the pending resolution. In an echo of last year's dysfunctional priorities, the majority has once again chosen to balance the budget on the backs of the poor, children, and the elderly.

The Republicans refer to this as an honest budget. But I do not believe they are being honest with the American people. They claim to be helping working families by reducing their tax burden. Instead, their budget cuts the earned income tax credit by \$20 billion. This action would raise taxes on more than 6 million working families. The resolution also cuts capital gains taxes for the wealthy by \$176 billion. It seems clear to me that this resolution is not a family tax relief as the Republicans refer to it, but a family tax burden.

They claim to shift power out of Washington back to neighborhoods, communities, and people. But their resolution cuts welfare spending by \$12 billion over President Clinton's balanced budget and gives no details of how neighborhoods, communities, and people are supposed to deal with poor children who are lacking the basic necessities of life.

The Republicans claim to give States authority to improve Medicaid and save Medicare from bankruptcy. However the truth is that this authority to improve comes in the form of a repeal of Federal enforcement of nursing home quality standards which have, by the way, dramatically improved the quality of nursing home care. Elderly would no longer be safeguarded from the use of restraints, drugs, or other poor quality care.

There are about 166,000 of my constituents in El Paso who are eligible for Medicaid. Of those eligible, approximately 22,000 aged and disabled use Medicaid for nursing home and in-house care or community based care. There are 826 nursing home recipients in El Paso as well.

The Republican savior of Medicare takes the form of more cuts to the program. The budget resolution cuts Medicare spending by \$167 billion. They have achieved this reduction with deep cuts in payments to the hospitals and home health providers that serve beneficiaries. This jeopardizes both quality of care and access to health services. Their \$167 billion cut would result in insufficient funded hospitals that are unable to keep up with cost. There are approximately 60,000 Medicare beneficiaries in El Paso. El Paso hospitals would have to drastically cut services and staffing. For example, El Paso's Thomason General Hospital predicts the effects of the cuts to be: reduction of staff by as much as 992 positions; clinics would be open only 2.5 days a week it would eliminate Level One Trauma services; and it would reduce all of the outpatient services.

The Republicans also claim to shift control of education out of Washington. In reality, education is once again under the budgetary ax. This proposal seeks to eliminate the direct student loan program, affecting over 2.5 million students and cutting nearly \$4.5 billion over 6 years. There are also a number of substantial cuts and terminations in discretionary education spending, including an elimination of the Goals 2000 and bilingual and immigrant education.

The termination of the bilingual education program will be devastating to El Paso. In fiscal year 1996 El Paso received \$661,246 in bilingual education grants. Losing this source of funding would put an enormous burden on our schools.

Our immigrant population is growing, and the vast majority of these immigrants are from Asia and Latin America. If we capitalize upon their linguistic abilities, we can ensure that young immigrants and the children of immigrants will be a valuable asset to our national competitiveness in the global economy. If we fail to adequately fund bilingual and immigrant education, we will set up many children for failure and lose the benefits of their valuable linguistic skills.

In the long run, the result will be that many of our young immigrants and their children will be able to contribute fully to the future stability of our economy. I do not believe that neglecting the needs of a portion of our population that speaks English as a second language is sound policy. If we do not provide adequate funding for this program now, we will pay heavily in the future.

Terminating funds for the Goals 2000 program would interrupt statewide school reform plans which set higher academic standards for all students. The elimination of almost \$400 million in resources for schools will end ongoing state and local education reform efforts affecting 9 million students and terminate 40 percent resource centers. This termination would effectively cut 351 students and 14 teachers in the El Paso area from this program.

For the preceding reasons, I do not support this resolution. It continues the Republican policy of catering to the wealthy and neglect-

ing working families, the elderly, and the poor. It will be devastating to El Paso and our Nation as a whole.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the budget resolution offered by the Republican majority. The Republican majority has once again done a bad job of putting together this most basic budget blueprint. Like last year, this resolution is a product of closed-door meetings with party leaders, pollsters, and lobbyists for multinational corporations, instead of a meaningful accounting of the needs of average working Americans and senior citizens.

This resolution is particularly deceptive and disingenuous because if the Congress follows this budget resolution, the American people will feel its harsh effects only after the November elections. The proposal will needlessly put us on another collision course with the President that could lead to new Government shutdowns and numerous stopgap spending measures. I have no doubt that the resolution's proposals will hurt seniors living on fixed incomes, middle-class and low-income families, and make it more difficult to ever balance the Federal budget. Indeed, while the bill is supposed to help the Republican party appear kinder and gentler to the American people as November draws near, there is little that is kind or gentle about this bill.

We must do better. Congress needs to put forth in this budget resolution a clear and honest vision of the future—one that says the Federal Government can work more efficiently and effectively, while also helping to empower individuals and working families to succeed. The Republican resolution offers no such hope.

I am fully prepared to support a budget plan which is balanced in 7 years using Congressional Budget Office numbers, as required by the bipartisan balanced budget agreement. Unfortunately, this legislation is neither bipartisan nor balanced. A better balanced budget plan would integrate the following principles into a new budget blueprint for the future.

RESPECT PAST SUCCESS

Not surprisingly, the Republican majority in Congress is doing everything it can to ignore the tremendous deficit reduction success of President Clinton and the previous Democratic Congress. The Federal budget deficit has been cut in half since 1992, the last year of the Bush administration. Having fallen 4 years in a row, the deficit is now at its lowest level as a percentage of the economy since 1979.

To help achieve this deficit reduction success, hundreds of Federal programs have been cut or eliminated, the Federal work force has been reduced by 200,000 workers, and 16,000 pages of Federal rules and regulations have been eliminated. All of this was accomplished as a result of President Clinton's 1993 deficit reduction plan enacted into law without a single Republican vote in either the House or Senate.

Still we are only way to a balanced budget. More can and must be done to continue to improve our fiscal condition and economy overall. The Republican majority needs to be reminded that we are not starting from scratch. Democrats have already proved that the budget deficit can be substantially reduced on a careful, considerate, and orderly basis. A radical transformation of the budget is unwarranted and unnecessary.

Unlike this budget resolution, therefore, we do not need to endanger critical programs

which promote the well-being of the neediest Americans—such as children and the elderly. Nor, do we need to eliminate programs which promote economic growth, job creation, and the competitiveness of the United States. We certainly do not need to weaken programs which help middle-class Americans retrain after losing jobs to unfair international competition and which educate their children to prepare for a rapidly changing economy.

FORGET TAX CUTS UNTIL THE BUDGET IS BALANCED

Balancing the budget is difficult enough without tax cuts siphoning off desperately needed revenue. Both the \$176 billion tax cut called for in this budget resolution and the \$117 billion cut proposed in the President's budget will make it more difficult to balance the budget. If we would forget tax cuts, we could balance the budget sooner and in a less disruptive way. That would be better in the long run for our economy and average working Americans.

Mr. Speaker, nobody likes taxes. We all believe we would be happier with a little more of our own money in our pockets. But at what cost? Should we risk not balancing the budget because some want to provide a short-sighted, election-year gift to taxpayers instead of waiting to provide tax cuts after the budget is balanced. My parents raised me to believe that you couldn't have dessert until you have eaten your vegetables. Republicans want to eat dessert first in return for a promise to eat their vegetables later. Common sense tells us that is a bad idea.

I truly believe that average working Americans are more than willing to forgo a Federal tax cut today if it means the Federal Government will be able to get its act together and balance the budget without hurting them in the long term.

Both the Republican majority and the President are wrong on tax cuts. If balancing the budget is our primary goal, tax cuts should be made contingent on balancing the budget first.

ATTACK CORPORATE WELFARE

The Republican budget resolution proposes to cut only \$26 billion in corporate subsidies and tax breaks. This is a step in the right direction, and the Republican majority should be applauded for putting forward proposals in this area. But the cuts represent only the tip of the iceberg.

President Clinton has proposed significantly more in corporate welfare savings—some \$54 billion. And, independent groups across the ideological spectrum have proposed tens of billions of dollars more. The conservative CATO Institute found \$85 billion in corporate welfare encompassed in 125 programs. The Progressive Policy Institute identified \$265 billion in potential savings spread across 120 programs. Clearly, a much greater level of savings in corporate welfare subsidies and tax breaks can be found for this budget resolution.

For example, I have been fighting for many years to eliminate what I believe to be a huge tax loophole in the federal tax system favoring foreign corporations operating in our country. The tax system permits foreign companies to overcharge for goods they provide to subsidiaries in the United States, which effectively reduces the subsidiary's tax liability. This activity, commonly referred to as "transfer pricing," may result in annual lost revenue to the Federal Government of as much as \$33 billion, according to at least one estimate. I have introduced legislation to help address

this problem and I would again urge the Republican majority to integrate my proposal into this budget resolution.

Corporations should shoulder a greater portion of the funding burden of our Government. In 1945, corporations contributed 35 percent of budget revenues. That share is down to 11 percent today, more than a two-thirds reduction. Instead of cutting taxes for wealthy stockholders and profitable corporations under this budget resolution, we should do more to reduce inefficient and unfair subsidies and tax breaks which place greater burdens on average working taxpayers.

DON'T WEAKEN GOOD PROGRAMS

Medicare has clearly been one of the most successful programs of the Federal Government. In tandem with Social Security, Medicare has dramatically reduced the poverty rate among elderly Americans and increased overall quality of life. This is no time to be making unwarranted and damaging changes to the program.

Though the budget resolution represents an improvement from the Republican budget proposals on Medicare last year, the cuts are still excessive. We can certainly find limited savings from hospitals and medical equipment suppliers, as has been done in the past and proposed by the President this year. However, if we go too far with such cuts, small hospitals will close and the quality of health care will drop, especially in areas like mine which are outside major metropolitan centers. The Republican proposals on Medicare must still be moderated significantly.

Many seniors want to see a greater emphasis on reducing waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare program. I agree. The President has just completed the first year of a major new effort to crack down on waste, fraud, and abuse which has netted \$43 million from Medicare programs so far this year. We need to build on this effort.

The budget proposals for Medicaid are also cause for great concern. While Medicaid is commonly known as the medical program for low-income families, few realize how important the program is for senior citizens. In Pennsylvania, the care of 64 percent of nursing home patients is Medicaid funded. I am worried that the excessive cuts for Medicaid proposed under the Republican budget resolution will increase the cost of nursing home and medical care to seniors and their families.

Programs to protect the environment and our natural resources have also had tremendous success over the past 25 years. Our air and water has gotten cleaner, and our national parks have been protected from adverse development and exploitation. Unfortunately, this budget resolution proposes a 26-percent cut on spending for natural resource and environmental programs. Given the urgent need to address environmental problems in northeastern Pennsylvania, such as numerous Superfund sites and coal-damaged lands spread across this region, I am greatly concerned about such cuts.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the meager amounts of money our country spends on economic development each year has brought great hope to so many smaller communities in our country, including those in my region. The Economic Development Administration [EDA], for example, has provided money to build new buildings and create hundreds of new jobs in Nanticoke, Wilkes-Barre, and Hazleton, PA.

These buildings now serve as essential anchors for local economic revival and bring in local, State, and Federal tax dollars far in excess of the original Federal investment. However, this budget resolution proposes to eliminate the EDA and its successful programs over the next 4 years. Eliminating this agency will leave small communities with few places to turn to for economic development assistance. Certainly, eliminating this agency and cutting other similar economic development programs are among the worst ideas in this budget resolution.

Another excellent program which deserves mention is the earned-income tax credit [EITC] program. Changes to the EITC proposed by President Clinton in 1993, and enacted by Congress, provided needed tax relief for working Americans. In Pennsylvania, the expanded credit for 1996 will give low-income, working families an average additional tax break of \$940 per year, and working individuals \$240 per year. This budget resolution rejects the EITC as an effective tax relief and work-promotion program, by cutting it \$26 billion. If the proposal is enacted, low-income working individuals and families who choose work over welfare will see their taxes increase. If anything, the EITC should be expanded, not cut.

ELIMINATE WASTEFUL SPENDING

Although the need to eliminate wasteful spending seems clear, the Republican majority has actually promoted new wasteful spending in this budget resolution while forgetting about obvious spending cut targets. For example, the resolution proposes serious cuts in education, including spending on libraries and job training programs, but expands unnecessary programs for the Defense Department. In fact, the budget resolution provides \$12.8 billion more than the Department of Defense [DOD] asked for in its request to the Congress, even after DOD was given an additional \$7 billion more than requested last year.

Mr. Speaker, I find it amazing that the Republican majority is perfectly willing to cut deeply into so many good federal programs, but greatly increase spending on additional weapons. Our country is no longer faced with the possibility of a major nuclear attack, yet Republicans want to spend 30 percent, or \$860 million, more than requested on national missile defense programs. The budget also proposes to spend \$504 million in excess of DOD's request for another nuclear submarine and \$305 million more for fighter aircraft. We simply do not need, and cannot afford, such unnecessary excess in the defense budget.

In 1993, I proposed to the Congress a list of proposed spending cuts totaling \$213 billion over 5 years. Many of the cuts have been enacted, and a number of the programs I proposed for elimination are no longer in place. Indeed, we have made much progress on eliminating wasteful spending.

But many large and small wasteful programs continue to be funded in the proposed Republican budget. One good example of a wasteful small program is the National Endowment for Democracy [NED]. NED will spend \$32 million on taxpayer supported projects to supposedly foster democracy around the world. NED, however, is run by U.S. political parties, business interest groups, and labor unions. As a result, the participants have promoted not only the worthy goal of democratic participation, but also taxpayer funded training in American-style lobbying for business and

labor interests, as well as the training of foreign media. We simply should not dedicate scarce resources through private organizations for such purposes.

The budget resolution also does nothing to cut wasteful subsidy programs to timber and mining companies. Our country will forgo \$700 million over the next 5 years providing below-cost timber sales and constructing logging road networks. We will receive virtually nothing for mining of public lands, even though mining companies will earn billions of dollars on mineral sales. Such subsidies are wasteful, and are unfair to hard-working taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the House to reject this budget resolution and to work to enact a genuinely bipartisan plan which incorporates the fundamental principles I have discussed. We need a budget plan which is fair and equitable, which attacks irresponsible spending and embraces good programs, and which drops reckless tax cuts. The American people need and deserve much better from this Congress.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 178, the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution.

Over a year ago, I stood on the floor in support of this essential effort to balance the Federal budget. Since then, doing so has been my No. 1 priority as a Member of Congress.

I am pleased to be able to say that over the past year we have taken the first step toward a balanced budget. We have reduced the deficit and cut Government spending by \$43 billion.

Today, I stand in support of taking the next step forward toward securing a better future for our children and for our country. This budget sets reasonable priorities for Federal Government spending, returns money to the pockets of hardworking American citizens and returns important decisionmaking power where it belongs—out of the hands of the Washington bureaucracy and into the hands of States, municipalities, and families. This resolution balances our country's economic needs with our commitment to our veterans, seniors, students, and hard-working taxpayers.

House Concurrent Resolution 178 reforms welfare and Medicaid, and preserves, protects, and strengthens Medicare for millions of older Americans. We make these reforms while increasing spending on all three of these programs, improving services and saving \$211 billion over 6 years.

This budget protects our Nation's natural resources and ensures a clean and healthy environment. The bill recommends increasing funding for actual Superfund cleanups by \$700 million. In New Jersey and around the country, this means that sites would get cleaned up more quickly and less time and money would be spent on litigation and overhead. This bill also provides more funding for our National Park System and safe drinking water. I strongly support this effort to assure Americans have cleaner air and water, greater access to outdoor public recreation, and to protect wilderness and historic areas.

Safe homes, streets, and communities are also a priority under our budget proposal and we recommend a net spending increase of \$9.3 billion, including increased spending for the violent crime reduction trust fund. We have focused over the past year on making our streets safer, improving law enforcement, and making commonsense reforms to our Depart-

ment of Justice. This budget continues that focus and provides resources to carry out these priorities.

The House Republican budget also renews America's commitment to those who have served and those who continue to serve our country in the armed services. As a veteran myself, I am pleased that under our budget we were able to increase veterans spending to almost \$40 billion and reject the Clinton administration's proposed cuts in veteran's medical care, VA hospitals, medical research, and the National Cemetery System.

This budget also continues our efforts to reduce the size of our Federal Government. Last year, we greatly reduced the size and spending of Congress. This year, we greatly reduced the size and spending of Congress. This year and over the next 6 years House Concurrent Resolution 178 envisions savings of \$5 billion by imposing a moratorium on constructing and acquiring Federal buildings, reducing overhead, and reducing funding for the Executive Office of the White House by 15 percent.

Finally, unlike other proposals House Concurrent Resolution 178 returns money to the hands of the American people while reducing the deficit. Our proposal eliminates corporate tax loopholes, provides an adoption tax credit, and contains a \$500-per-child tax credit. This resolution provides \$122 billion in permanent tax relief, of which the majority will go to taxpayers earning between \$30,000 and \$75,000 annually.

I am pleased to support this 6-year budget resolution that makes commonsense spending decisions, sets priorities, continues adequate levels of spending on important Federal programs to protect our health, safety, environment. This budget resolution is true to our commitment to balance the Federal budget and live within our means. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the plan to balance the Federal budget by the year 2002. I rise today because I am committed to balancing the Federal budget to free future generations of Americans from the shackles of an enormous national debt.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation has not had a balanced Federal budget in a generation. Since that last balanced budget, budget deficits have climbed to over \$100 billion, topping \$300 billion along the way, and the public national debt has ballooned to \$5 trillion. That represents a debt of nearly \$19,000 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. The annual interest on the debt alone is over \$235 billion. Two hundred thirty-five billion dollars that must be spent to service the debt. Two hundred thirty-five billion dollars that cannot be spent on educating our children, for providing for our veterans, and returning poor Americans to work. Mr. Chairman, the time has come to stop the failed tax and spend policies of the past, and return fiscal sanity to this Nation.

A balanced budget should provide a smaller Federal Government by slowing its growth. The balanced budget plan supported by the Republican majority increases Federal spending by \$2.5 trillion between now and the year 2002. Our balanced budget increases the money available for student loans. House Concurrent Resolution 178 allows increases in Medicare spending while ensuring its solvency

for future generations. The Republican plan curbs a bloated, inefficient Federal bureaucracy, removes decision making from inside the Washington beltway and returns it to the States, and ensures the future of this Nation for our children.

A balanced budget should adopt tax policies that allow Americans to keep more of their take-home pay and allow investors and corporations to create jobs and stimulate economic growth. Our budget enacts a \$500-per-child tax credit, eliminates the marriage penalty, provides a tax credit for adoption expenses, and creates new savings mechanisms, American families will be able to keep what they earn. Families also will save more for their own and their children's future. By allowing families to keep more of what they earn, our balanced budget will boost this Nation's sagging national savings average. Greater savings means more dollars in the economy for job creation and economic growth.

Coupling increased savings with a capital gains tax reduction and a reduction or elimination of growth-impeding corporate taxation, a balanced budget will provide the stimulus for economic growth and job creation. In a time when the Nation's economy is growing at an annual rate of less than 3 percent and many Americans are faced with increased job insecurity, House Concurrent Resolution 178 will provide a boom for the economy and create millions of new jobs. As our budget moves toward balance, the Federal Government will need to borrow less from the national savings pool. Corporations will have access to more money to invest in capital improvements which will boost efficiency while lowering operating costs. Lower costs allow corporations to create new jobs and raise wages.

Mr. Speaker, leading economic experts have concluded that once the Federal budget begins to come into balance, interest rates will begin to drop. On a mortgage of \$100,000, a 2-percent drop in interest rates will save the mortgage holder \$2,161 on interest payments for each year of a fixed-rate, 30-year mortgage. On a student loan of \$11,000, a 2-percent interest rate drop would save the student \$2,167 over the life of the average 10-year loan. On a \$15,000 car loan, the rate drop would save the loan holder \$180 each year of a 5-year loan.

Mr. Speaker, we must balance the Federal budget. We must shrink the size and scope of the inflated Washington bureaucracy and return power to the State and local level, closer to the American people. We must reform the Medicare system to ensure its solvency for future generations. We must reform the failed welfare system that rewards inactivity and discourages work. We must allow Americans to keep more of what they earn by providing tax cuts and promoting increased savings. We must allow businesses to create jobs and stimulate economic growth by providing pro-growth tax incentives.

The economic benefits that are derived from balancing the Federal budget are enormous. The time has come to end the tax and spend, Big Government ways of the Congress. A balanced budget will ensure the fiscal prosperity of this Nation now and provide a economically sound future for our children. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, today, I must express my profound disappointment at

the majority's inability to address the need to end the U.S. dependence on imported oil.

Renewable energy development is our best hope of moving away from foreign oil, and moving toward environmentally sound energy choices. Support for the Department of Energy's Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Programs is vital for our national energy security, particularly as renewables become increasingly cost-competitive and effective.

In addition, DOE's Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Programs support 45,000 jobs nationwide.

It is inconceivable to me that the majority would phase out our investment in renewables. The long-term cost savings renewables promise should make these programs a national priority, not a target for short-term budgetary gains.

I urge the Congress to reject the budget resolution's treatment of renewable energy. We should restore and reaffirm our national commitment to renewable research and development.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NORWOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. CAMP, Chairman of the Committee of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 178) establishing the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal year 1997 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, pursuant to House Resolution 435, he reported the concurrent resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

Pursuant to clause 7, rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device and there were—yeas 226, nays 195, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 179]

YEAS—226

Allard	Callahan	Dornan
Archer	Calvert	Dreier
Army	Camp	Duncan
Bachus	Campbell	Dunn
Baker (CA)	Canady	Ehrlich
Baker (LA)	Castle	Emerson
Ballenger	Chabot	Ensign
Barr	Chambliss	Everett
Barrett (NE)	Chenoweth	Ewing
Bartlett	Christensen	Fawell
Barton	Chrysler	Fields (TX)
Bass	Clinger	Foley
Bateman	Coble	Forbes
Bereuter	Collins (GA)	Fowler
Bilbray	Combust	Fox
Bilirakis	Condit	Franks (CT)
Bliley	Cooley	Franks (NJ)
Blute	Cox	Frellichhuysen
Boehlert	Crane	Frisa
Boehner	Crapo	Funderburk
Bonilla	Creameans	Galleghy
Bono	Cubin	Ganske
Brownback	Cunningham	Gekas
Bryant (TN)	Davis	Geren
Bunn	Deal	Gilchrest
Bunning	DeLay	Gillmor
Burr	Diaz-Balart	Goodlatte
Burton	Dickey	Goodling
Buyer	Doolittle	Goss

Graham	Livingston
Greene (UT)	LoBiondo
Greenwood	Longley
Gunderson	Lucas
Gutknecht	Martini
Hall (TX)	McCollum
Hancock	McCrery
Hansen	McDade
Hastert	McHugh
Hastings (WA)	McInnis
Hayworth	McIntosh
Hefley	McKeon
Heineman	Metcalfe
Herger	Meyers
Hilleary	Mica
Hobson	Montgomery
Hoekstra	Moorhead
Hoke	Morella
Horn	Myers
Hostettler	Myrick
Houghton	Nethercutt
Hunter	Neumann
Hutchinson	Ney
Hyde	Norwood
Inglis	Nussle
Istook	Oxley
Johnson (CT)	Parker
Johnson, Sam	Petri
Jones	Pombo
Kasich	Porter
Kelly	Portman
Kim	Pryce
King	Quinn
Kingston	Radanovich
Klug	Ramstad
Knollenberg	Regula
Kolbe	Riggs
LaHood	Roberts
Largent	Rogers
Latham	Rohrabacher
LaTourette	Ros-Lehtinen
Laughlin	Roth
Lazio	Roukema
Leach	Royce
Lewis (KY)	Salmon
Lightfoot	Sanford
Linder	Saxton

NAYS—195

Abercrombie	Engel	Levin
Ackerman	English	Lewis (GA)
Andrews	Eshoo	Lincoln
Baessler	Evans	Lipinski
Baldacci	Farr	Lofgren
Barcia	Fattah	Lowe
Barrett (WI)	Fazio	Luther
Becerra	Fields (LA)	Maloney
Beilenson	Filner	Manton
Bentsen	Flake	Markey
Berman	Flanagan	Martinez
Bevill	Foglietta	Mascara
Bishop	Ford	Matsui
Bonior	Frank (MA)	McCarthy
Borski	Frost	McDermott
Boucher	Furse	McHale
Brewster	Gejdenson	McKinney
Browder	Gephardt	McNulty
Brown (CA)	Gibbons	Meehan
Brown (FL)	Gilman	Meek
Brown (OH)	Gonzalez	Menendez
Bryant (TX)	Gordon	Millender
Cardin	Green (TX)	McDonald
Chapman	Gutierrez	Miller (CA)
Clay	Hall (OH)	Minge
Clayton	Hamilton	Mink
Clement	Harman	Moakley
Clyburn	Hastings (FL)	Mollohan
Coburn	Hefner	Moran
Coleman	Hilliard	Murtha
Collins (IL)	Hinchey	Nadler
Conyers	Holden	Neal
Costello	Hoyer	Oberstar
Coyne	Jackson (IL)	Obey
Cramer	Jackson-Lee	Olver
Cummings	(TX)	Ortiz
Danner	Jefferson	Orton
de la Garza	Johnson (SD)	Owens
DeFazio	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
DeLauro	Johnston	Pastor
DeLlums	Kanjorski	Payne (NJ)
Deutsch	Kaptur	Payne (VA)
Dicks	Kennedy (MA)	Pelosi
Dingell	Kennedy (RI)	Peterson (FL)
Dixon	Kennelly	Peterson (MN)
Doggett	Kildee	Pickett
Dooley	Klecza	Pomeroy
Doyle	Klink	Poshard
Durbin	LaFalce	Rahall
Edwards	Lantos	Rangel

Reed	Skelton	Traficant
Richardson	Slaughter	Velazquez
Rivers	Spratt	Vento
Roemer	Stark	Visclosky
Rose	Stenholm	Ward
Roybal-Allard	Stokes	Waters
Rush	Studds	Watt (NC)
Sabo	Stupak	Waxman
Sanders	Tanner	Williams
Sawyer	Tejeda	Wilson
Schroeder	Thompson	Wise
Schumer	Thornton	Woolsey
Scott	Thurman	Wynn
Serrano	Torres	Yates
Sisisky	Torricelli	
Skaggs	Towns	

NOT VOTING—12

Collins (MI)	Lewis (CA)	Packard
Ehlers	Manzullo	Paxon
Hayes	Miller (FL)	Quillen
Jacobs	Molinari	Talent

□ 1648

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

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BROWNBACKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Concurrent Resolution 178, the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 582 AND H.R. 1972

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 582 and H.R. 1972.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the esteemed leader of the majority, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], to give us the schedule for the coming week and perhaps beyond.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that we have concluded our legislative business for the week and I might say in time for Mr. KIKI DE LA GARZA to make his 5 o'clock plane which has worried me all day long.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I am sure that is greatly appreciated.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that we have concluded our legislative business for the week.

On Monday, May 20, the House will meet in pro forma session. There will be no legislative business—and no votes—on that day.

On Tuesday, May 21, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Members should note that we do not anticipate votes until after 5 p.m. on Tuesday, May 21.

Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday next, the House will consider: Seven bills under suspension of the rules—a list of which will be distributed to Members' offices; the rule for H.R. 3259, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997; and H.R. 3415, a bill to repeal Clinton's 1993 gas tax, which will be subject to a rule.

On Wednesday, May 22, the House will meet at 10 a.m. to consider H.R. 1227, a bill relating to payments for employees who use employer-owned vehicles and H.R. 3448, the Small Business Job Protection Act, both of which will be subject to the same rule.

On Wednesday we will also take up H.R. 3259, the Intelligence Authority Act for Fiscal Year 1997. Members should be prepared to work well into the evening on Wednesday, May 22.

On Thursday, May 23, the House will meet at 10 a.m. to consider H.R. 3144, the Defend America Act of 1996, which will be subject to a rule.

Mr. Speaker, we should finish legislative business and have Members on their way home by 6 p.m. on Thursday, May 23.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I am interested in knowing whether there is any time in the future where the dime that was added to the gas tax by Senator DOLE will be brought before the Members for a vote.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for the inquiry. It was rather interesting.

Mr. FAZIO of California. On a more relevant note on the schedule, I wondered if the gentleman could tell me, looking down the road at the long-term schedule, with the House returning from Memorial Day on Wednesday, May 29, after 2 p.m., many Members are really wondering whether or not there would be some possibility of a further movement of that 2 p.m. time frame to perhaps 5 p.m. so perhaps members from the Far West could travel and be here for votes. How immutable is the 2 p.m. on return from the Memorial Day break?

Mr. ARMEY. Let me thank the gentleman for that inquiry. That is something we have under consideration. We certainly want to be sure that we are able to resolve that early next week so that Members can have an opportunity to make whatever plans they can. I should only say that it is something that is possible at this point. I just do not feel comfortable with saying anything more definitive than that.

Mr. FAZIO of California. But it is possible that perhaps early next week we could have some notice that you have made that change?

Mr. ARMEY. I would hope to have that.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I appreciate that.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 20, 1996

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, MAY 21, 1996

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, May 20, 1996, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, May 21, for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3415, REPEAL OF 4.3-CENT INCREASE IN TRANSPORTATION FUELS TAXES

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-580) on the resolution (H. Res. 436) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3415) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 4.3-cent increase in the transportation motor fuels excise tax rates enacted by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 and dedicated to the general fund of the Treasury, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3259, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-581) on the resolution (H. Res. 437) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3259) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for intel-

ligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3144, DEFEND AMERICA ACT OF 1996

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-582) on the resolution (H. Res. 438) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3144) to establish a United States policy for the deployment of a national missile defense system, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CONTINUING NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104-214)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on developments since the last Presidential report of November 28, 1995, concerning the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order No. 12170 of November 14, 1979. This report is submitted pursuant to section 204 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c). This report covers events through March 1, 1996. My last report, dated November 28, 1995, covered events through September 29, 1995.

1. Effective March 1, 1996, the Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control ("FAC") amended the Iranian Assets Control Regulations, 31 CFR Part 535 ("IACR"), to reflect changes in the status of litigation brought by Iran against close relatives of the former Shah of Iran seeking the return of property alleged to belong to Iran (61 *Fed. Reg.* 8216, March 4, 1996). In 1991, Shams Pahlavi, sister of the former Shah of Iran, was identified in section 535.217(b) of the IACR as a person whose assets were blocked based on proof of service upon her in litigation of the type described in section 535.217(a). Pursuant to that provision, all property and assets located in the United States within the possession or control of Shams Pahlavi were blocked until all pertinent litigation against her was finally terminated. Because the litigation has been finally terminated, reference to Shams Pahlavi has

been deleted from section 535.217(b). A copy of the amendment is attached to this report.

2. The Iran-U.S. Claims Tribunal, established at The Hague pursuant to the Algiers Accords, continues to make progress in arbitrating the claims before it. Since my last report, the Tribunal has rendered one award, bringing the total number to 567. The majority of those awards have been in favor of U.S. claimants. As of March 1996, the value of awards to successful U.S. claimants from the Security Account held by the NV Settlement Bank was \$2,376,010,041.91.

In February 1996, Iran deposited funds into the Security Account, established by the Algiers Accords to ensure payment of awards to successful U.S. claimants for the first time since October 8, 1992. The Account was credited \$15 million on February 22, 1996. However, the Account has remained continuously below the \$500 million balance required by the Algiers Accords since November 5, 1992. As of March 1, 1996, the total amount in the Security Account was \$195,370,127.71, and the total amount in the Interest Account was \$37,055,050.92.

Therefore, the United States continues to pursue Case A/28, filed in September 1993, to require Iran to meet its obligations under the Algiers Accords to replenish the Security Account. Iran filed its Statement of Defense in that case on August 30, 1995. The United States filed a Reply on December 4, 1995. Iran is scheduled to file its Rejoinder on June 4, 1996.

3. The Department of State continues to present other United States Government claims against Iran and to respond to claims brought against the United States by Iran, in coordination with concerned government agencies.

In November 1995, Iran filed its latest Response concerning the United States Request to Dismiss Certain Claims from Case B/61. The United States had filed its Request to Dismiss in August 1995 as part of its consolidated submission on the merits. Iran had previously filed its initial response in July 1995, and the United States filed a reply in August 1995. Case B/61 involves a claim by Iran for compensation with respect to primarily military equipment that Iran alleges it did not receive. Iran had sought to purchase or repair the equipment pursuant to commercial contracts with more than 50 private American companies. Iran alleges that it suffered direct losses and consequential damages in excess of \$2 billion in total because of the United States Government refusal to allow the export of the equipment after January 19, 1981, in alleged contravention of the Algiers Accords. Iran's November 1995 filing failed to show why the Tribunal should not dismiss immediately certain duplicative or otherwise improperly pleaded claims from Case B/61.

In December 1995, the Department of State represented the United States in hearings before the Tribunal on two

government-to-government claims. In the first, Chamber Two heard oral arguments in Case B/36, the U.S. claim against Iran for its failure to honor debt obligations created by the sale of military surplus property to Iran shortly after the Second World War. In the second, also before Chamber Two, the Department of State presented the U.S. defense in Case B/58, Iran's claim that the United States is liable for damage caused to the Iranian State Railways during the Second World War.

In January 1996, in Case B/1 (Claims 2 & 3), Iran filed its Rebuttal Memorial Concerning Responsibility for Termination Costs, along with 20 volumes of exhibits and affidavits. In this briefing stream, the Tribunal is asked to decide whether Iran or the United States is liable for the costs arising from the termination of the U.S.-Iran Foreign Military Sales program after Iran's default and its subsequent seizure of the U.S. embassy in Tehran in 1979. The United States is currently preparing a comprehensive response to Iran's brief.

In February 1996, the Departments of State and Justice represented the United States in a hearing before the full Tribunal in a government-to-government claim filed by Iran. Case A/27 is an interpretive dispute in which Iran claims that the United States is liable under the Algiers Accords for Tribunal awards issued in favor of Iran against U.S. nationals. The United States maintains that its obligation under the Algiers Accords is satisfied by the availability of domestic judicial procedures through which Iran can enforce awards in its favor.

Also in February 1996, Iran and the United States settled Iran's claims against the United States filed before the International Court of Justice concerning the July 3, 1988, downing of Iran Air 655 and certain of Iran's claims against the United States filed before the Iran-United States Tribunal concerning certain banking matters. The cases in question were dismissed from the International Court of Justice and the Iran-United States Tribunal on February 22, 1996. The settlement, *inter alia*, fulfills President Reagan's 1988 offer to make *ex gratia* payments to the survivors of the victims of the Iran Air shootdown. The survivors of each victim of the Iran Air shootdown will be paid \$300,000 (for wage-earning victims) or \$150,000 (for non-wage-earning victims). For this purpose, \$61 million was deposited with the Union Bank of Switzerland in Zurich in an account jointly held by the New York Federal Reserve Bank, acting as fiscal agent of the United States, and Bank Markazi, the central bank of Iran. Of an additional \$70 million in the settlement package, \$15 million was deposited in the Security Account established as part of the Algiers Accords. The remaining \$55 million was deposited in an account at the New York Federal Reserve Bank, from which funds can be drawn only (1) for deposits into the Security Account

used to pay Tribunal awards to American claimants or for the payment of Iran's share of the operating expenses of the Tribunal, or (2) to pay debts incurred before the date of settlement and owed by Iranian banks to U.S. nationals. Under the terms of the settlement, no money will be paid to the Government of Iran.

4. Since my last report, the Tribunal has issued one important award in favor of a U.S. national considered a dual U.S.-Iranian national by the Tribunal. On November 7, 1995, Chamber Three issued a significant decision in Claim No. 213, *Dadras Int'l and Per-Am Construction Corp. v. The Islamic Republic of Iran*, awarding a dual national claimant \$3.1 million plus interest for architectural work performed for an Iranian government agency developing a housing complex outside Tehran, Iran.

The Tribunal held hearings in four large private claims. On October 23-27, 1995, Chamber One held a hearing in Claim No. 432, *Brown & Root, Inc. v. The Iranian Navy*, involving contract amounts owed in connection with the construction of the Iranian Navy Chahbahar and Bandar Projects in Iran. On January 18-19, 1996, Chamber One held a second hearing in Claim Nos. 842, 843, and 844, *Vera Aryeh, et al. v. The Islamic Republic of Iran*, in which allegations of fraud and forgery were considered. Finally, the United States Government filed a Memorial on the Application of the Treaty of Amity to Dual United States-Iranian Nationals in three private claims before the Tribunal: Claim No. 485, *Riahi v. The Islamic Republic of Iran*, in Chamber One on January 29, 1996; Claim No. 953, *Hakim v. The Islamic Republic of Iran*, in Chamber Two on February 27, 1996; and Claim No. 266, *Aryeh, et al. v. The Islamic Republic of Iran*, in Chamber Three on February 29, 1996. The Memorial argues that a good faith interpretation of the ordinary meaning of the 1955 Treaty of Amity leads to the conclusion that it protects all persons deemed to be U.S. nationals under U.S. laws when they undertake activities in Iran, regardless of whether they also possess another nationality.

5. The situation reviewed above continues to implicate important diplomatic, financial, and legal interests of the United States and its nationals and presents an unusual challenge to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. The Iranian Assets Control Regulations issued pursuant to Executive Order No. 12170 continue to play an important role in structuring our relationship with Iran and in enabling the United States to implement properly the Algiers Accords. I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to deal with these problems and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 16, 1996.

IN MEMORY OF ADM. MIKE
BOORDA

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a great deal of sadness and I know that every Member of the House joins me.

A little earlier our colleague, JACK MURTHA, rose to announce the tragic news of the death of Adm. Jeremy Boorda, known to many of us as Mike Boorda. Mike Boorda is a historic figure. He is the only Chief of Naval Operations to have entered at the very lowest level of the Naval ranks and rise to a four-star admiral and Chief of Naval Operations.

At this time we do not know all the facts surrounding the untimely death at approximately noontime today. But what we do know is that the Nation has lost one of its finest men, one of its finest soldiers, one of its finest sailors, one of its finest leaders.

Mike Boorda was a sailor's sailor. Mike Boorda was an American's American. He was a success story. He was, in sum, an individual for whom all of us could have the greatest respect and deepest affection.

Mr. Speaker, it is with unrestrained sadness and grief that I rise to express to all of the men and women of the U.S. Navy and all of the men and women of our armed services an empathy of personal loss to each of us in this House and to our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Washington, NORMAN DICKS.

Mr. DICKS. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment him for taking the floor and his very sensitive remarks. Mike Boorda and his wife Betty were friends of mine. They paid a great honor to my wife and I by coming out to the commissioning of the U.S.S. *Ranier* in Bremerton. I have never met a finer sailor or a person of whom I was more proud, someone who had come up through the ranks as an enlisted person to become the Chief of Naval Operations, the first time that has ever happened.

He was a tremendous leader, a person who cared deeply about the sailors, the people in the Navy and how these long deployments affected them and their families.

□ 1700

He was a tremendous leader. My heart goes out to his family. This is a tragedy. We have lost a great leader of the U.S. Navy, someone who will be missed.

I just want to commend my friend, Congressman HOYER, for taking this time. Mike Boorda will be missed, and is someone that has served our country well. I appreciate the gentleman for taking this special order.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

My district is one that has the naval submarine base in Groton. It is something we are all very proud of. The loss that we all feel, the previous speakers have expressed it, there was no one who had a better sense of the average sailor, to the complex overview of the entire structure of the Navy. I have never met anybody who was more broadly admired or anyone who did the job that he did. He will be missed by our community, those in the Navy, and those outside the Navy who worked with him as well. It is a great loss for the Navy family, and for the country as a whole.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman, and I yield to my friend from Georgia.

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

I did not know Mike Boorda personally, but I knew of him and followed a career that was meteoric. I heard of this this afternoon, standing back there talking to RON DELLUMS, and he was crushed, as was I. Our Nation is going to suffer a great and tragic loss. Our side, as well as yours, is going to miss this great man.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and would echo his words, that there is no partisanship in the grief. Each and every one of us in this House, representing every American, will grieve for the loss of such a brave and gracious and warm and capable human being.

I am glad to yield to my friend from Indiana.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I too wish to express a sense of deep loss and regret. When the news traveled through our office, I did not personally know Admiral Boorda, but my father-in-law, Captain Robert McManis, served with him in the Navy in his 30 years, and he often told me of the admirable traits that Admiral Boorda brought to that job, of his true and deep compassion for the sailors in our Navy, of his abiding faith in the U.S. Navy, as the defender of freedom in this country. And I appreciate your kind words in expressing on behalf of all of us here in Congress that deep sense of loss and regret that came to us when we heard of this tragedy today.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield to my friend from Florida, Mr. SCARBOROUGH.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland.

As someone that has NAS Pensacola in our district and CSS, and somebody that actually was with CNO this past weekend in Pensacola, it is a great loss to the entire naval community. He took time out of his busy schedule to come down and help us open up with President Bush the Naval Air Museum. The genuine affection that the people of Pensacola and the entire naval community had for Mike Boorda was just overwhelming that night.

Let me just say something in closing. It was not an easy job that Admiral

Boorda had. There is a lot of conflict in the Navy, and a lot of social problems. It was a difficult time that the Navy was going through.

I just want to go on record as saying I could not think of a man, any man or woman in the Navy, that I would rather have guide the Navy through those difficult times. He always carried himself with a tremendous amount of dignity, and I had a great deal of respect for him. We will sorely miss him in Pensacola and throughout the naval community.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I yield to my friend from New Mexico, Mr. RICHARDSON.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I, too, knew Admiral Boorda. We had several dealings on a variety of national security and foreign policy issues. He was an outstanding man. He was always up front. He was candid, he was honest, he was gracious, as you described him, and I wish to participate in mourning his great loss to the country.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, as has been stated, Admiral Boorda served this Nation with honor and distinction and carried out his duties in that manner, and we are required on this sad day to carry out ours.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

I will now yield to my friend from Mississippi, General MONTGOMERY, who is one of the Members of this House who knows the armed services the best, who serves as one of our highest ranking members of the Committee on National Security, and in that capacity has dealt very closely with and knows very well our late friend, Admiral Boorda.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for taking this time.

Really, I feel like I have just lost a brother. He was close to all of us. It is just a terrible shock, this sadness that it happened. Admiral Boorda, as has been mentioned here, of course, was an enlisted person and went up through the ranks.

I had the opportunity to go with him to about three different bases, and he would not come to your base unless you would give an hour's time to be with the enlisted personnel. They would sit there and they would give him problems, and I saw him solve the problems, right in that base, right on the scene. No question about it, he was probably one of the most popular naval officers that we have ever had in the Navy.

I even, and I am sure the gentleman tried too, after he retired where he might move and live, his father died in the naval home down on the Mississippi Gulf Coast, and Admiral Boorda every week, flying a commercial flight, would come down to see his father when he was sick. He liked that

area, Admiral Boorda did, and he thought about moving down there after his retirement.

I thank the gentleman for taking the time. This is a great tragedy to our Nation.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, in ending, let me simply say that from time to time we lose individuals who are very special, very unique who have made an extraordinary contribution to their country and to their fellow citizens. Admiral Jeremy "Mike" Boorda was one of those.

May God bless him, and may God keep and bless his family.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

A WAR ON DRUGS REALLY SHOULD BE DECLARED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I took a 1-minute on the floor to discuss a problem that I think the American people demand we address. According to experts, 70 percent of all crime in this country is caused by people who are dealing in drugs or are drug related one way or another. Our kids are being infected by the drug culture. It is destroying our inner cities and our suburbs. It is causing a myriad of problems.

The prisons are filled with people who have dealt with drugs, used drugs, or committed crimes while under the influence of drugs, and each one of these people that are incarcerated cost up to \$30,000 a year to keep in jail. Yet the war on drugs goes on and on and on, and nothing seems to be accomplished.

We read every day that more and more people have been arrested, more cocaine has been picked up by the DEA, and yet we hear about tons and tons of cocaine that is getting past them into the United States, even though they are working very, very hard to keep that kind of thing out of here.

Now, I was in a place called the Upper Yuagua Valley in Peru about 4 years ago, and I found that 65 percent of all the coca in the world is produced in this one valley that is about 25 miles wide and about 150 to 200 miles long.

We know exactly where two-thirds of the world's coca is produced. And right across the border in Bolivia another 20 to 25 percent of the world's coca is produced. So about 90 percent of the world's coca that is turned into crack and cocaine that comes into our country and affects our kids and hurts our society and costs the taxpayers billions of dollars is in these two locations, and we are not doing a darn thing about it.

They have people down there we are paying to cut down these coca plants with a thing that is kind of like a metal weed-eater, and a good campesino cutting down these coca fields can only cut down about an acre a day. As fast as they cut it down, it is replaced tenfold by the drug dealers down there, the Medellin cartel and the others, and we cannot stop them. And we call this a war on drugs.

So I said to my colleagues this morning and I say to the administration and anybody else, Mr. Speaker, that might be paying attention, that if there is a war on drugs, I missed it. And if we do not really have a war on drugs, then let us declare a war on drugs. We could put an aircraft carrier off the coast of Peru, load it up with a herbicide called tebucyrone, or spike, and at 5 o'clock in the morning take off and fly up and down the Upper Yuagua Valley and drop these little pellets that are environmentally safe. We could do the same thing in Bolivia. We would have to fly a little bit further. But we could knock out 90 percent of the world's coca production in a week. I hope everybody is listening. In 1 week we could knock out 90 percent of the world's coca production. Now if you do not have coca, you cannot make coca paste, and if you do not have coca paste, you cannot make crack cocaine or cocaine. All of the chemicals that they use to perfect coca paste and make crack cocaine that is dumped into the tributaries that is going into the Amazon River and the other rivers down there, that will no longer be going into those rivers, thus infecting the environment and killing the environment.

So I would like to say to my colleagues today, if we really wanted to stop cocaine, or if we really want to destroy the poppy plants and heroin use in this country, we know where they are producing it. All we have to do is have the guts to go in there and destroy it. And we have the ability to do it.

Now, the State Department, I talked to them about it, and they said well, we cannot violate the territorial sanctity of a sovereign nation, meaning we cannot go across the border of Peru or Bolivia without their permission.

What are they going to do, shoot down our planes? Of course they would not do that. The fact of the matter is the war on drugs really is not a war on drugs; it is a hollow political statement that does not mean a darn thing. And we are spending billions of dollars nipping around the edges and our kids

continue to be infected with this sort of thing.

□ 1715

We could deal with it very quickly. So I want to say to my colleagues, in closing, there is a way to deal with it. Go down there and destroy the coca plants and they will not make crack cocaine. They will not make cocaine, and it will send a tremendous signal to the drug cartels around the world, and that is, if they plant that stuff, we are going to destroy it.

Now, some of my colleagues say, well, then they will start making designer drugs in the United States. Well, if they do that, we can nail them at their laboratories because we will be able to pinpoint those. Now we know where the coca is coming from and we are not doing a darn thing about it, and it is a crying shame because it is killing American citizens.

TRIBUTE TO SAM RAGAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great journalist, a great poet, a great North Carolinian, a great American—Sam Ragan—who died Saturday, May 11, 1996.

Born, Samuel Talmadge Ragan, 80 years ago in Granville County, Sam was devoted to his wife of 56 years, Marjorie, their two daughters, Talmadge and Nancy, his two grandchildren Robin and Eric, his family and a host of friends. He was also devoted to his community, to North Carolina and the people who call them home.

Consider his poem:

THE MARKED AND UNMARKED

I cannot say upon which luminous evening
I shall go out beyond the stars,
To windless spaces and unmarked time,
Turning nights to days and days to nights.
This is the place where I live.

I planted this tree.
I watched it grow.
The leaves fall and I scuff them with my feet.

This is the street on which I walk,
I have walked it many times.
Sometimes it seems there are echoes of my walking—

In the mornings, in the nights,
In those long evenings of silence and stars
—the unmarked stars.

During his life Sam marked the way for those who would come after him. His résumé was long, varied, and impressive. His accolades and awards too numerous to list. After college graduation, he began his career in journalism when journalists were men of letters.

As an editor in Wilmington, NC, early in his career, when Sam needed a sportswriter, he hired a young man named David Brinkley. In 1941, Sam joined the Raleigh News and Observer as State editor.

During World War II, he served in Army Intelligence for 3 years and then

returned to the News and Observer in 1946, where he became the managing editor in 1948. From 1957 to 1968 he served as the executive news editor for the News and Observer and the Raleigh Times.

In 1968, he moved to Southern Pines and purchased the Pilot Newspaper; serving as editor, publisher, and business manager until his death. Under his stewardship, the paper grew from a weekly with circulation of 3,000 to a twice-a-week newspaper with circulation of 16,000.

Former Gov. Terry Sanford said "Sam Ragan was one of North Carolina's treasures. He was a crusading editorial force at the News and Observer where he fought for the improvement of education, the elimination of racial injustice and the broadening of economic opportunities.

In 1972, North Carolina led the Nation by creating the first State cabinet-level position for the arts. Sam Ragan was appointed as the first secretary of cultural resources by then Gov. Bob Scott who said he appointed Sam because he embodied the perfect mix of businessman, manager, and artist.

In 1982, Gov. Jim Hunt appointed Sam Ragan North Carolina "Poet Laureate for Life." He was only the third person to hold the honorary title.

Sam's tall frame, flowing white hair, trademark bow tie and fedora hat, made it easy, even for those who did not know him, to pick him out of the crowd. He had an affinity for people which was readily acknowledged and returned by those who met him.

Sam always found a moment to speak with a visiting tourist, a student, or a local resident, who dropped by his office to visit; along with the civic leaders, business leaders, political candidates and elected officials who sought his counsel.

Those who are acquainted with Sam Ragan's professional activities are fully aware that as an editor he fashioned a distinguished career of recording and examining newsworthy events. How remarkable, then, that in his poetry he focused on ordinary people, the small incidents of daily life, the quiet unfolding of nature—events that never rated a headline. His unique talent transformed simple everyday occurrences. He made ordinary people special and special people ordinary.

Throughout his life, Sam used his indomitable spirit, his influence and his opinion to steadfastly champion the arts. He enriched our literary, cultural, and journalistic heritage and the quality of our life.

To paraphrase our beloved poet laureate:

And sometimes remembering is all we have.
Other sights and sounds
Flood the memories
of someone very special.
Sam, you had a wonderful journey,
And it's the journey that counts,
Not the getting there.
Here in Washington the azaleas are in bloom

Across the miles I am proud
and others share my pride in you—
The very special you.

Mr. Speaker, Sam Ragan was truly a Renaissance man, a man for all times. How fortunate we are that he graced our time.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the following information from "Who's Who in America" regarding Samuel Talmadge Ragan.

WHO'S WHO IN AMERICA 1996

Ragan, Samuel Talmadge, newspaper editor, publisher, educator, poet laureate; b. Berea, N.C., Dec. 31 1915; s. William Samuel and Emma Clare (Long) R., m. Marjorie Usher, Aug. 19, 1939; children: Nancy, Ann Talmadge, A.B., Atlantic Christian Coll., 1936, Litt.D., 1972; Litt.D., U.N.C., 1987; D.Letters, Meth. Coll., 1980; D.Lit., St. Andrews Coll., 1987. Newspaperman in N.C. and Tex., 1936–; mng. editor, author column Southern Accent in Raleigh (N.C.) News and Observer, 1948–69, exec. editor Raleigh News and Observer, also Raleigh Times, 1957–69; editor pub., author column The Pilot, Southern Pines, N.C., 1969–; sec. N.C. Dept. Arts, Culture and History, 1972–73; conductor program, commentator sta. WTVD, Durham, 1969–; spl. lectr. contemporary issues N.C. State U., 1959–68; dir. Writer's Workshop, 1963–; instr. creative writing St. Andrews Coll., 1970–, Sandhills Coll., 1969–; cons. editor St. Andrews Rev., Pembroke Mag. Author: (collected poems) The Tree in the Far Pasture, 1964, To the Water's Edge, 1971, Journey Into Morning, 1981, In the Beginning, 1985; The Democratic Party: Its Aims and Purposes, 1961, The New Day, 1964, Free Press and Fair Trial, 1967, (with Elizabeth S. Ives) Back to Beginnings, 1969, In the Beginning (with Thad Stem Jr.), 1984, A Walk Into April, 1986, Collected Poems, 1990, Editor: Weymouth Anthology, 1987; Contrb. editor: World Book Ency., 1964–; author articles, poems. Pres. Friends Coll., Inc., N.C. State, 1961–62; mem. N.C. Library Resources Com., N.C. Govt. Reorgn. Comm., 1970–; moderator N.C. Writers Forum of Charlotte, 1963–; Trustee N.C. Sch. Arts, 1963–72; mem. N.C. Adminstrn. of Justice Council, 1964–, chmn., 1980–83; bd dirs N.C. Symphony Soc., 1975–79. Served with AUS, 1943–46, PTO. Recipient N.C. Tercentenary Poetry award, 1963. Spl. Citation for Contbns. to Journalism Atlantic Christian Coll., North Caroliniana Soc. award, 1981, Disting. Svc. medal DAR, 1974, Edward Arnold Young award, 1981, Disting., Svc. medal DAR, 1974, Edward Arnold Young award for Poetry, 1965, 72, 91, Morrison award for contbns. to arts N.C., 1976, N.C. award for achievements in arts, 1979, R. Hunt Parker award for contbns. to lit., 1987, N.C. Artists awarded United Arts Coun., 1990, Caldwell award for contbns. and achievements in humanities, N.C. Humanities Coun., 1993; inducted into N.C. Journalism Hall of Fame, 1984; appointed Poet Laureate N.C. for life, 1982. Mem. N.C. Lit. Forum (moderator 1956–), N.C. Writers Conf. (chmn. 1962–63), Eastern N.C. Press Assn. (past pres.), N.C. Press Assn. (pres. 1973–74), Asso. Press Mng. Editors Assn. (dir. gen. chmn. continuing studies 1961, sec. 1962, v.p. 1963, pres 1964), Am. Soc. Newspaper Editors (dir., chmn. freedom of info. com. 1968), Roanoke Island Hist. Soc. (dir), N.C. News Council (past pres.), N.C. Arts Council (chmn. 1967–72), Am. Newspaper Pubs. Assn., N.C. Lit. and Hist. Assn. (pres. 1977), Friends of Weymouth (pres. 1979–84), Sigma Delta Chi, Democrat, Presbyterian, Club: Sandhills Kiwanis (Southern Pines); Builders Cup 1985. Homes: 255 Hill Rd Southern Pines NC 28387–6633 Office: 145 W Pennsylvania Ave Southern Pines NC 28387–5428

APPRECIATION FOR ALL WHO FOUGHT RECENT NEW MEXICO FOREST FIRES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, imagine being face to face with a powerful beast that can frighten the most ferocious bear. This beast is a forest fire, and the U.S. Forest Service has recently confronted two immense fires in northern New Mexico. The U.S. Forest Service in our State has done a splendid job in containing these two fires and they deserve great credit.

I want to express my appreciation to Chip Cartwright, the regional forester in New Mexico; Leonard Lucero, the head of the Carson Forest; Al Defler, head of the Santa Fe Forest; and Gary Schiff of the Forest Service, whose well-executed planning led to the containment of these fires which threatened our communities and our treasured forests in New Mexico.

I also want to include for the RECORD a step-by-step analysis of exactly what the Forest Service has to do to contain a forest fire, and I will submit that information for the RECORD.

The statement highlights the mission of the Forest Service, which involved air attacks, the safe evacuation of residents, the coordination of hundreds of firefighting crews, and the overall exceptional communication that was coordinated by the Service. All this was being done while fire was burning on very steep slopes with high fuel loads, strong wind gusts, and unseasonably hot and dry weather.

Over 7,000 acres were burned. Entire communities were threatened by the fires, which creates a tremendous amount of stress that Forest Service officials must endure while making on-the-spot decisions. One decision included an ordered evacuation of the residents of Lama in northern Taos County.

As the raging storm headed their way it was critical that the evacuation was handled in an orderly and calm fashion. Most individuals worked around the clock fighting both fires, which occurred one after the other. Gary Loving, for example, just completed his duties as incident commander for the Dome fire in the Santa Fe when he was called to duty in the Carson.

While our Federal employees who manage public lands have been the subject of much criticism, now is the right time to acknowledge them for their true dedication and devoting to their duties as protectors of the land.

Before I close, I also want to mention the wonderful efforts of the volunteer firefighting organizations, New Mexico forestry officials, Federal, State, and local agencies, the Red Cross, the residents of Lama and Red River, Questa, Taos, White Rock, Jemez, Los Alamos, and Santa Fe, and everyone who gave their time toward fighting these fires. These individuals have shown an entire

Nation how caring about one another and rallying together and working together can overcome any tragedy.

I also want to thank the Small Business Administration, Phil Lader especially, the Administrator. Just today, the Small Business Administration has announced that Taos County, where this fire took place, is a Federal disaster area. That means that the residents of Lama who lost their homes, and there is a total of 31 families, can now apply for low-interest loans. In the same vein, businesses that were struck down by the fire can apply for low-interest loans to rebuild.

Mr. Speaker, here is evidence of the Federal Government being able to help. Recently, the Federal Emergency Management Agency went to northern New Mexico to inspect damage, and they are working to see if they can be helpful, along with the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Here we have a situation where nature strikes, there are a lot of victims, and then the Federal Government can come in with some good programs and well-trained people and help citizens.

Mr. Speaker, New Mexico is also not burning. Only 1 percent of northern Taos County burned. We are sending a message out to the rest of the country from New Mexico that we welcome visitors; that the State is not on fire; that we have some of the best hiking and fishing and cultural representation of our country in our State. And we hope that despite this tragedy, that America will come to New Mexico.

The fire is under control. The Carson and the Santa Fe are still at risk, and if visitors come they have to be very careful about not initiating any camp fires or throwing matches on the ground or being careless because we are faced with a very, very precarious situation, especially in the Carson.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by once again thanking members of the U.S. Forest Service for the splendid job they did in containing these two fires in New Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, the information referred to earlier is submitted herewith:

REPORT ON THE HONDO WILDFIRE AND OUR APPRECIATION TO THOSE WHO FOUGHT THE BLAZE

(By Congressman Bill Richardson)

At 12:30 PM on Sunday, May 5, our Taos Zone Dispatcher, Paul Mondragon, received a report of a fire spreading in San Cristobal canyon. Phil Tafoya, a Carson National Forest law enforcement officer, was dispatched to the scene. Fifteen minutes later, Marc Trujillo, the Carson's Fire Management Officer, ordered an air attack. By 2:15 PM planes were dropping their first loads in efforts to save homes and contain the fire.

In the meantime Ron Burnam, Red River Fire Marshall, and his fire crew as well as the Hondo/Saco and Taos Fire Departments were on site attempting to save homes from the ground. By 3:30 PM, Paul and Marc were ordering bulldozers and other heavy equipment to build fire lines around homes and communities. By 4:00 PM, it was apparent that this was a raging fire storm and Lama residents' lives were in danger as the storm headed their way. Carson National Forest

and local fire officials recommended evacuation of the Lama area.

At 4:00 PM local forest officials, realizing the severity of the fire, requested a full Type I fire team. Within hours this team of world class fire fighting specialists began to arrive. At 5:30 PM Carson National Forest Supervisor Leonard Lucero and Marc Trujillo flew over the fire and sized up the situation. By this time the fire had reached 9000 feet in elevation and was headed for Flag Mountain, just south of the Village of Questa.

Given the rate of spread, Carson National Forest officials in coordination with State Forestry and local officials and the State Police began the evacuation of residents on the southern edge of Questa and the Town of Red River. Before midnight the Class I Team, headed by incident Commander Gary Loving, arrived, having just finished work on the Dome fire near Los Alamos, New Mexico.

Within 24 hours, 32 twenty-person fire crews, six helicopters, 24 fire engines, and five tankers were working to protect homes of local residents and contain the fire. A small city of over 1000 firefighters, fire fighting strategists, safety and information officers, cooks, communications specialists and many more appeared on a mesa just west of the fire. The challenges facing the team were daunting: fighting a fire that had already engulfed almost 7000 acres, devastated one community and was threatening two others. The fire was burning on very steep slopes, fuel loads were very high, wind gusts were strong, and the weather was unseasonably hot and dry.

Yet, within days, the team managed to contain the fire. Much of the work was done by helicopters which dumped over a million gallons of water on the fire. What is perhaps most miraculous is that not a single life was lost, nor any serious injuries, neither firefighters nor residents. And from the time the team arrived, not a single home was lost.

On behalf of all of my constituents, I want to say thanks. Thanks to Supervisor Leonard Lucero and the entire Carson National Forest team for their swift response. Thanks to local volunteer fire fighting organizations, BLM, State Forestry Officials, Red Cross, the National Guard, our State Police and all the local volunteers for all working together seamlessly under great stress. Thanks to a wonderful community who pulled together to help those in need. Thanks to the Class I fire team and firefighters who came from all over the nation to help us. You are truly the best on the planet!

The Forest Service certainly receives their share of knocks from some who sometimes disagree with their decisions. But not this time. No one is knocking this agency in my district for these efforts. The men and women who helped us are nothing less than heroes. And we thank them from the bottom of our hearts. Muchas gracias a todos por su ayuda.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MCKEON address the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. FILNER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

ALLOCATION OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the place of the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER].

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

There was no objection.

EXPLANATION OF BUDGET PROCESS AND VOTES ON BUDGET PROPOSALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to talk a little bit about the budget process that has just passed, to put on the record the reasons I voted the way I did. I voted for the Coalition budget; I voted for the President's budget, both designed to get us to a balanced budget within a 6-year period, the same as the parameters set in the Republican leadership budget. I voted very strongly against the Republican budget.

Why did I vote for two and not the third? Well, basically the reason is, Mr. Speaker, because the first two at least recognized the importance of investment in the future for our young people, for our economic growth. Because those budgets, while they did balance in a 6-year period, the same as the Republican leadership budget, at the same time those budgets did not attempt to give tax breaks to the wealthiest individuals in this country.

The coalition budget had no tax cuts in it, recognizing that we have contradictory goals if we are trying to reduce the revenues coming in by cutting taxes and at the same time balancing the budget.

The President's budget, while it did have a tax cut in it, was a limited tax cut targeted for middle income working families and low income working families.

Neither of these budgets tried to take it out of the hide of low-income working people, such as the Republican leadership budget did, particularly because the Republican leadership budget sought to greatly reduce the earned income tax credit. That is the tax cut that was greatly expanded only 2 years ago, that gives tax relief to working families earning under \$26,000 a year.

□ 1730

I was also concerned because the Republican leadership budget would cut education again, and that is a battle we had just fought. It would eliminate the Department of Commerce. If anyone can tell me why, at a time when we have got a department that is actually generating jobs, generating contracts, has brought in \$80 billion of contracts and developed a national export strategy for the first time, why we seek to eliminate it. It seems to me it is simply a matter of ideology, and that is not a satisfactory reason.

I was also concerned, Mr. Speaker, because of the cuts that are proposed in Medicare and Medicaid. I have great problems in the Republican budget with the assumption of balanced billing. In other words, a senior citizen may now be charged more by the provider and the senior will be billed directly for that, as opposed to the senior paying out of pocket being limited, as is presently the law.

I am concerned about the cuts in Medicaid, because I think what that is going to mean is that it will go to the States in a block grant, but not satisfactorily enough to meet the needs. At the same time the needs will expand, the funds will decrease.

Those are a lot of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I voted against the Republican budget but for the coalition and President's budget. I have heard a lot of talk, Mr. Speaker, about the need to, and certainly we all agree that there is a need to make sure that our young people are not burdened by debt. At the same time, there is also a compelling need to make sure they are not burdened by ignorance through lack of educational opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, there is a compelling need to make sure that our young people are not burdened by lack of opportunity because we are not investing in our economy. There is a compelling need to make sure that our young people are not burdened by the problems of crime because we are not investing adequately enough in crime control and putting police officers on the street. There is a compelling need to make sure that our young people have a future, and you have to invest in order to make that future.

So I have thought that the two budgets that I did vote for balanced the budget over 6 years, what they did was to seek to keep those domestic investments up and growing, and at the same time, to reach that goal of a balanced budget within a 6-year period.

One concern I have, Mr. Speaker, is that none of these budgets adequately addresses the need of domestic infrastructure investment, that none of these budgets addresses the need to increase the growth rate in this country. The problem is that, if you accept the growth rate in any of the budgets, Republican or Democrat, and say that that is all we are going to grow, that is a ticket to economic stagnation over a period of time.

However, having said that, certainly the coalition budget and the President's budget, I felt, certainly offered much more satisfactory blueprints for the future than the Republican leadership budget. So I offer that as my explanation of why I voted the way I did, and why I am going to keep pressing for domestic investment so that our economy can grow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. DICKEY]. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

ALLOCATION OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I take the gentleman's place.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

LET'S SAVE MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss one of the most important issues facing my constituents in east-central Florida.

It is an undisputed fact that Medicare is running out of money and will be bankrupt in just 5 years.

For me, this is not a partisan issue. This is a personal issue. I am a doctor and my patients depend on Medicare. I have a father who is dependent on Medicare.

I know the value of this program for my patients and my family, and I am 100 percent committed to finding a solution to protect Medicare for current and future beneficiaries.

As a medical doctor I've been disappointed that some have sought to use Medicare to gain political advantage. This is not a political issue.

The Medicare trust fund began going broke last year, it is already \$5 billion in debt this year, and will be completely broke in 5 years. We don't have time for politics as usual.

I hear some talk about cuts in Medicare. There are no cuts in our plan.

The plan I voted for increases Medicare spending from \$5,200 per person in 1996 to \$7,000 per person in 2002. That's an \$1,800 increase in Medicare spending.

We do want to spend smarter. We do want to attack waste, fraud, and abuse. We want to give seniors choices in health care.

I urge those who have made this a partisan issue, to look beyond partisan politics and come to the table to work with us to do what is right for our seniors and future Medicare beneficiaries.

Mr. Speaker, I call for bipartisan efforts to restore and preserve our Medicare beneficiaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINTOSH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. DELAURO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. RIGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

THE MINIMUM WAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to agree with the comments of the gentleman from Florida about the Medicare cuts being not cuts but just slowing of the growth. This is something that we are finding in our State of Arkansas, people are being deceived by ads being paid for by special interests, and I am glad that that is brought up.

Mainly what I want to talk about today is the minimum wage. I am an employer, a restaurant owner, as well as a Member of Congress from Arkansas. All of those things are important in this discussion. But before I get into more of the specifics, I would like for us to direct our attention to something that we have not seemed to bring to center stage as much as we should. In the business world, in the marketplace, it is the consumer, the person who is buying the goods, who is the boss. We lose sight of that fact.

Mr. Speaker, if the boss finds that he or she cannot afford the price of the goods, then the boss will go to somewhere else where they can find a better price. If in fact the boss cannot go where he or she can get good service, they will go somewhere else. So all the time that we are talking about raising the minimum wage, we are not considering the fact who is paying it.

The consumer, the people who buy the goods are paying it. In my particular instance, it is the person who comes into restaurants, and no question I am biased in that viewpoint, but I want to share with this body some of the bases for my being opposed to the raise, to the rise in the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, some people think that the cost that we have in restaurants, the only increase that we will have in the minimum wage debate is what we will pay in addition to the present wage that we give now or whatever the increase might be, but that is not true. Everything that we buy, the meat, the lettuce, the tomatoes, even the transportation, the paper goods, all of these things will have increased prices or at least the push up from increased prices.

So, if I am going to sell a taco for 89 cents and I want to keep the same margins that I have had before, which I am

entitled to, I have to look at the boss and say, OK, can you afford two more pennies or 91 cents? When that boss says no, I am going to pay that, then what we have to do is reduce the number of employees, which then cuts down on the service. It either cuts down on the service or makes it more difficult for the other employees who are having to work without adequate coworkers.

So the effect is that it pushes at the seams of those people who are in the penny business, like we are in the restaurant business. There are 16.7 percent of our employees in Arkansas who are on the minimum wage right now. Those are people who are getting their first-time jobs. Any employer will tell you that the first-time employees are good in one respect in that they have not been taught the wrong thing. The other respect is that they have to be taught.

So there is a learning period that goes and we pay the minimum wage. During some period of time, depending on how alert the employees are or how determined they are, they really are not worth the \$4.25 because you have to put so much into them. Then you get the \$4.25 employee if they think that that is the ceiling, that is all they are going to get, the employer finds that as he, the employer, sends the employees out to greet the customers and care for them. If an employee stays on minimum wage too long, there is a staleness that occurs.

I do not believe an employee should manage to stay more than 2 years on average on minimum wage. We hope that they will either grow through achievement and improvement in our own operation or they will go get another job and take a good recommendation with them. So the minimum wage is a limiting factor in some sense.

If you go into a business or restaurant where their minimum wage employees have been there for 4 or 5 or 6 or 7, 10 years, you are going to find a place where the service is not as good as it should be. So there is a misconception that we employers want to pay the minimum wage and get a profit from it. That is not the case. We want people to be worth more and we want to gauge that by productivity, not by the decision of liberal politicians who come in and for their own benefits give a minimum wage which in effect is an unfunded mandate.

Mr. Speaker, I want to mention one other thing, and that is that the people who are hurt the most by this inflationary push of expenses and cost were the people who are on minimum wage. For example, if my tacos have to go from 89 cents to 91 cents, those two extra pennies are going to have an inflationary effect. Those pennies will affect the minimum wage people to a greater extent. It is regressive to a greater extent than they would be for somebody else who is not on minimum wage. So the inflationary effect, not only will they lose some jobs because we will have to reduce the work force

in order to meet the minimum wages, but there is also this factor that they are going to have to meet inflation at the most serious level.

So what I have said I am going to do is file an amendment to say let the States decide. Eleven States now pay more than minimum wage, and I am going to prepare and file an amendment to ask that the States be allowed to decide what minimum wage they want.

REPORT FROM INDIANA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give my weekly report from Indiana. Every weekend, Ruthy and I travel around the Second District from Richmond to Muncie, to Anderson, to Greenfield, and Greensburg. So often people share with me amazing stories about their friends and neighbors and the things that they are doing in their communities. These individuals are good people who make our communities a better place to live. They give us hope for the future and our best days are yet to come.

In my book, these individuals are Hoosier heroes, Hoosier heroes because they set examples for all of us to live by. But more importantly, they make us proud.

Today I would like to share a special story about a 10-year-old boy name Dustin Sagester. Now, Dustin comes from Greensburg, IN. Our parents' generation probably would think that Dustin's story is, well, frankly, a little bit normal. But today, in today's world, it is far from normal. Dustin Sagester found a wallet down on North St. in Greensburg. Inside that wallet was \$500 cash.

Mr. Speaker, the owner of the wallet, who lives in a neighboring town of Columbus had lost his wallet 4 days earlier. The owner had given up on the wallet. He had given up on all hope of ever collecting that \$500. The owner was Jason Humphress. He frankly said that he had written it off. But you know what? Little Dustin Sagester never looked inside that wallet.

He walked right into a local store, billing store, and he turned it in. He turned it in so that the rightful owner could have his wallet back. His parents, Don and Tressy, taught him that when you find something that does not belong to you, you do not keep it and say, hey, it is my lucky day. You recognize that it belongs to someone else. Your new-found luck is somebody else's misfortune.

They taught Dustin that you do your best to find the rightful owner, and that is exactly what Dustin did. He did not know that there was so much money inside. He just knew that the wallet and whatever was inside was not his.

Mr. Speaker, I share this special report from Indiana because the people of Greensburg have recognized Dustin as one of their heroes, and I want my colleagues and all of the American people to know that Dustin is a Hoosier hero. I share this story because I think it is time that we all learn that we have to follow those basic moral values that our parents taught us so long ago, and that Dustin sets an example for the young people of this country.

□ 1745

That is my report from Indiana for this week, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GOODLING addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

PROGRAMS THAT HELP PEOPLE MOST GET BIGGEST BUDGET CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, we have just completed phase I of the most important process that takes place here in the Congress, and that is the budget of the United States of America for a 1-year period that deals with the fiscal 1997 budget, which will run from October 1, 1996 to September 30, 1997.

It is important that the public understand that the budget that we have discussed today in the budget process is only the beginning. It sets the upper limits in terms of expenditures in broad categories, that the real spending process which gets into great detail is the appropriations process.

Now, the Committee on Appropriations oversees the appropriation process, and the way the budget appropriations process was handled in the first half of the 104th Congress, it may be that the Committee on Appropriations could just send the rest of us home and take over and run the rest of the session because the other committees have very little power in the decision making, and this particular Congress, controlled by the Republican majority, we have less power than ever.

You know, if Congress really were to be truthful about the way it is organized, about who has real power, then it is the Committee on Appropriations, it is the Committee on Ways and Means, the two or three committees that the way they have stacked the deck and the way they guarantee control from the top have all the power. The Committee on Appropriations has far too much power.

You could organize Congress another way. Each one of the committees that

has jurisdiction and authorization could also have the power to appropriate because they have the knowledge, they deal with the particular functions in an ongoing fashion, they have the oversight responsibility. They know more about each one of the functions than the Committee on Appropriations knows.

For example, in education you have a Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunity, which has existed for years under another name called Education and Labor Committee, and members of that committee know a great deal about education legislation, they know a lot about how the schools operate, they know a great deal about policies and experiments and research and the knowledge that has accumulated on that committee. But when it comes to making the vital decisions about how money is going to be appropriated, it is the Committee on Appropriations which will make the decisions about how money is appropriated for education.

Now, most corporations would go out of business if they were organized that way, where the greatest amount of knowledge and know-how is concentrated in one place and the decision making, which is vital, is concentrated another place. But that is the way it operates.

So the budget starts the process, education is function 500, and this budget sets the parameters in terms of we cannot go over the figures that are set in the budget process for education. Of course, the figures are set not just by this House of Representatives, but the Senate also will have to deliberate and pass their own budget bill. There will be a reconciliation, and then the Senate and the House together will have the final say on this particular budget process because it does not go to the President.

The President started the budget process when he sent a budget to us, and these are reactions and responses to his budget. So when the budget process is finished, he does not get it back; he will not have a chance to veto the budget. Each one of the appropriation bills that then comes out of the budget process will go to the President in each one of these functions: Labor, education, health care, et cetera.

I think it is important to take note of this at this critical point. We are often to the process which matters most to the American people. How will the Federal dollars be allocated? How will the dollars that flow into the Federal Government from all over America—they are not Federal dollars; that is the wrong term—all dollars come from neighborhoods, they come from families, they come in individuals. The dollars that make up the Federal Budget are our dollars, and how will they be allocated to meet our needs, to meet the needs of the majority of the people? That is a critical question.

There has been a lot of talk about States rights and States rights to do

various things, and in many cases States are assuming rights to spend money that comes back to them from the Federal Government, great amounts of money that did not flow out of their particular State. There are a large number of States that get far more money from the Federal Government than they pay into the Federal Government from their population.

That is the way the American system is structured. We are one Nation, and the money does not flow to the States on the basis of their contribution, it flows based on many different factors. Some States are more fortunate than others at landing defense contracts. Some States are more fortunate than others in having big power projects. The TVA is not located in New York because we did not have the kind of situation where the water and the necessary conditions to create a Tennessee Valley Authority was there. So Tennessee Valley Authority was a Federal project that poured large amounts of Federal money into Tennessee. For various reasons, NASA is located in Florida, and part of it is located in Texas, and on and on it goes.

The Speaker's district has the largest contract to manufacture fighter planes. F-22 fighter planes are manufactured in Marietta, GA, which is part of the Speaker's district.

So you have large amounts of money flowing to the States from the Federal Government, and the States now said they want the right to do everything themselves. I would be willing to listen to that argument and say that in this budget-making process let us give States the right to spend money that they generate; the amount that they receive from the Federal Government, which is above the amount that came out of the State in terms of taxpayers, let us cut that off and give it back to the States which are generating the money.

I have made this argument many times because I really am very concerned about the fact that traditionally New York State has always been on the giving side and the giving has been very great, you know. It rose as high as \$23 billion in 1993, and in 1994 it is \$18 billion. We are sending to the Federal Government more than \$18 billion more than we are getting back from the Federal Government. Before that, in 1993, we were sending \$23 billion, and I am very concerned about this, and I keep speaking about it and bringing it up as often as I can because I think that New Yorkers ought to know this, people in New York ought to know this, and I think the people in the other States on the other end who are receiving the money ought to know this, that if we have States' rights, the people in New York would be far better off if they kept their \$18 billion at home, and the States that are receiving the extra money, let them fend for themselves.

You know, that is an argument in States' rights that nobody has offered,

but we ought to take a close look at that.

So as we go into the budget-making process, the appropriations process will follow that. It is important to understand some of these basic contradictions and facts. But understand also that for the 104th Congress under the leadership of the Republican majority, this is now phase II, phase II of the drive to remake America.

You know, Speaker GINGRICH always says that politics is war without blood and that we are in a war to remake America. Those analogies and the comparisons with war are the Speaker's comparisons, and we have to live with them, I guess, and certainly they have prosecuted the effort so far as it was war. We have had a situation where the Republican majority has moved in a way that you move in war, you know, with a rapid movement. You know, it is revolution, it is extremism, it is not letting up, pushing to try to accomplish a great deal over a short period of time. There is a sense of desperation introduced into legislative process. They want to remake America, and they see themselves as having 2 years to remake America.

Automatically you have a process by which mistakes are bound to be made, dislocations in great amounts are going to take place. Maybe a great amount of people are going to suffer. The Speaker says that it is war without blood, but maybe some people are going to bleed as a result of the rapid movement of our Government to remake itself.

So far in phase I, I would say that the Republican majority has been very successful. I apologize to my Democratic colleagues who like to say that we have succeeded, but if you look at the situation in terms of the budget process, the Republican majority, the juggernaut, the great Wehrmacht of the Republican's war machine that has moved forward and established beachheads and gone for the jugular in so many cases laid out a plan where they were going to cut the budget by huge amounts of money and moved in very radical ways, very extreme ways, to accomplish that. As we all know, at one point they even shut down the Government, we shut down the Government more than once, as a result of the extremist agenda that they were trying to accomplish.

Well, it was all over, and we finally got all of the appropriations bills passed. Too many Democrats have said that we won a major victory. We did not win a major victory. The Republicans achieved \$23 billion in cuts. There were \$23 billion in cuts, and you might say, well, we wanted to downsize and streamline the Government, so why not call it a victory for everybody? Problem is that all the cuts are concentrated in nondefense areas. It is the programs that help people most that receive the biggest cuts.

Yes, we won some victories in terms of phase I in this war to remake America, we made them back away from \$5

billion in education cuts. Thanks to the common sense of the American people and their understanding of what was going on in education, they rallied, they let their Representatives know that they understood the nature of the education cuts, and they put enough people on the spot to make the majority retreat on \$5 billion worth of education cuts.

But there were \$23 billion in other cuts that were made. Some of them might have been legitimate. There is always waste in a government as big as ours, and nobody is going to argue that you cannot cut a lot of waste out. But we wonder if they really zeroed into places where the waste is. Pentagon is not downsizing. The Pentagon military establishment, as we know it, is not streamlining. In fact, in this budget, phase II of the new budget that was passed today, there is \$13 billion in increases for military expenditures. So they are not downsized.

In this budget there is no mention made of the CIA bringing it under control and guaranteeing that you never have a situation again where the CIA will accumulate \$2 billion in a petty cash fund. I talked about that before. Our auditors discovered that \$2 billion was accumulated in the CIA petty cash fund.

What steps are we taking to see that does not happen again? We have the Federal Reserve, that had \$3.7 billion accumulated in what they call the rainy day slush fund, the rainy day fund for the Federal Reserve Bank, and in 79 years they never had a rainy day. The General Accounting Office said they never had losses in 79 years. So that is a place where waste is taking place on a large scale; \$3.7 billion in the Federal Reserve.

There is nothing in this budget that talks about efforts to collect money that is lying around in various agencies like that.

So we have phase II now beginning, and the budget that has been introduced by the Republican majority for phase II in their war to remake America, this budget is as extreme as the first one was. There are a few trimmings here and there, but basically there is no change in direction. So anybody that thinks that we have stopped the juggernaut, that we have contained the war to remake America, the extreme war to remake America, you are dreaming. It is not happening. In this cut there are extreme—in this budget there are extreme cuts.

I am glad to see that again we made a breakthrough on education. There are no proposals to totally eliminate the Department of Education anymore, so that is a plus because we were in a situation where we were about to eliminate the Department of Education and become the only industrialized nation in the world not to have a central department of education.

□ 1800

Our public education is very weak as it is, and we do not necessarily want

the kind of bureaucracy that some of the other nations have, and we do not want to give the kind of power to our Department of Education that they may have in Germany or in Japan, but we definitely need to keep the Department of Education.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the Republican majority for backing away from the threat to eradicate the Department of Education. But it still has many education cuts. The budget eliminates many education programs.

What is particularly troublesome is the deep cuts in training programs; for instance, the funding for programs in the careers bill. The careers bill is where they lumped all the training programs together in one bill, and they have cut that by 42 percent, 42 percent. That is going toward one-half. These are job training programs.

Mr. Speaker, how do we expect to go forward into the 21st century and to re-adjust our economy to meet all the challenges of a high-technology economy if we are not going to give people training? How do we expect to have a work force that is being dislocated, downsized, and shuffled around? The legitimate term for it is "churning"; there is churning going on in the work place, there is churning going on in the big corporations, and the workers in the process are being churned around, spewed out, and they can always find a job somewhere else, although they have lost their regular job that they might have been on 10 or 15 years.

So the churning process, if it is going to be humane and going to help people pick up and go on, it needs to have training programs, but the training programs have been cut by 42 percent in this Republican phase II budget.

As I said before, the phase II budget is really a continuation of what we had before. It is not very different in every respect. It is still extreme. The retreat on education is only there because of the fact that we have gotten the American people alerted. They are watching to see what happens with education. They are on the job, they are letting their Representatives know, Republicans and Democrats, and they will not tolerate any drastic cuts in Head Start programs, they will not tolerate drastic cuts in title I programs. So we have that much accomplished, but everything else is still moving forward.

The contract to remake America and the budget, the budget-balancing effort, is really an assault on the New Deal programs that were developed by Franklin Roosevelt. It is an assault on the programs that were developed in the Great Society, programs by Lyndon Johnson. It is a frontal assault of trying to wipe those programs out.

Saving money is only secondary, if it is important at all, because they are proposing to put large amounts of money into star wars, which, of course, has accomplished very little. Billions have been spent there already and it has accomplished very little.

There is no great hurry to invest large amounts of money in building a

star wars system or a system to intercept missiles, when the technology probably will be far better if we wait a little later to do the building. So the President's proposal that we do research and we prepare is more than adequate. But they are going to waste money in that area, so money is really not the problem. Money is not the greatest concern.

Destruction of the New Deal programs, destruction of the Great Society programs: They want to destroy Medicaid, they want to destroy Medicare, they want to wipe out programs that have benefited people for years, and they want to do this in the interest of a small, elite group that will make a great deal of money off the destruction of these programs and the replacement of these programs with other programs.

So it is important to see the new budget as phase 2 of the war. The new budget is a blueprint for invasion, for destruction. The new budget is more of the scorched earth policy that started with the majority takeover in 1994. It is extreme, it is revolutionary, it is harmful. People will literally die as a result of what is being done in this area.

In education and training, for example, the details can become important, depending on where you sit. Goals 2000, which they proposed to eliminate last time, is again eliminated in this budget. Innovative education programs, strategies, grants, eliminated. Bilingual and immigrant education programs are eliminated. New funding for Perkins loans, student-centered grants are eliminated. Howard University funding is eliminated.

Libraries are cut 20 percent; libraries, which have a tiny amount of money, I think \$110 million, a very tiny amount of money when you consider all the libraries across the country that exist and that need help as we go toward meeting the educational needs of the 21st century, they are cut 30 percent.

Twenty-four other education programs are eliminated. Aid to education, institutional development, is cut \$46 million. National and community service programs again are eliminated, AmeriCorps.

That is a bargaining chip. They eliminate a program that they know has a high priority at the White House, and they are going to bargain later on to get the White House to accept some of these other cuts as a result of restoring that.

The Davis-Bacon Act and the Service Contract Act are eliminated. The Davis-Bacon and Service Contract Act require prevailing wages to be paid on Federal construction jobs and in Federal facilities across the Nation, and that is eliminated; although what has happened is that the prevailing wages are very close, in most cases, to minimum wages in many parts of the country at this point.

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting will be eliminated, privatized

by the year 2002. The National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, eliminated.

So what is new? The battle plan remains the same, the invasion plan remains the same. The scorched earth policy remains the same. There is not very much that is new here.

In energy, in a time of skyrocketing increases in energy prices, this budget proposes real cuts in energy funding by 47.05 percent. It wipes out all funding for research on fossil fuels, solar, and renewable energy and energy conservation, at a time when we are recognizing more and more that our environment and the dangers that the environment faces from pollution are not fantasies of environmentalists, they are very real.

People have died of certain diseases. Asthma is increasing in our big cities in large amounts. The percentage increases are quite large of people suffering from asthma and other respiratory diseases. The handwriting is on the wall that the environment is not something to be left to a handful of people who have a vision, but the environment ought to concern everybody. Then we are going to wipe out all funding for research in the areas that will deal with the pollution factors that related to that increase.

Transportation. It phases out funding that supports mass transit operations. Again, pollution will be increased, because in big cities people will drive cars more and more and use other vehicles above the surface because they cannot get money to keep supporting our subway systems. Even our bus systems above ground that do cause a problem with pollution, it is better to have more buses carrying more people than to have more cars carrying more people, because you get less of a pollution factor when you have buses instead of cars. But we are cutting the capital assistance to mass transit. We are eliminating any new starts, support for any new starts in the mass transit system.

At a time when we are trying to get people off of welfare and get them to work, we are going to make it more difficult for them to get to work, because it is going to cost more to get to work. We also at the same time are going to continue polluting the air.

In the area of crime and law enforcement, this budget defunds, wipes out the COPS Program, and abandons efforts to put 100,000 new police officers on the street by the year 2000. We thought we had settled that one, it is such a popular program across the country. We thought that the extremists would certainly yield to common sense and yield to the fact that the American people had made it clear that they want the COPS Program, they want the cops on the streets. But in this budget, no, we continue the same practice that was started in the first budget of this session. The extremist blueprint calls for an elimination totally of the COPS Program.

The earned income tax credit, which is a way to give tax relief for low-income working people, we got a \$20 billion cut in this budget for the earned income tax credit, which really provides great relief to people at the lowest levels. They say they want a tax cut, but the one tax cut that is already in effect, they take it away, in effect, for people at the lowest levels, they take it away.

They still want a tax cut, however. It is being proposed for the rich in large amounts. Twenty billion dollars has been taken away from the earned income tax credit. This cut reduces the after-tax increase of almost 8 million households in America; 6.8 million children will be hurt by this cut. This change is particularly offensive in light of the Republican rhetoric about moving people from welfare to work. We ought to make work pay. We ought to reward people when they go to work, but the earned income tax credit, which was doing that, is being drastically cut.

There is nothing in this budget about minimum wage. Minimum wage is not a function of government. The taxpayers do not have to pay for minimum wage, so it is not in the budget. It will not be in the appropriations bill. A minimum wage increase is a situation where employees pay additional wages.

The proposal that was put forth by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the Democratic minority leader, and the proposal that was endorsed, sanctioned by President Clinton, is a proposal for a 45 cent increase over the present minimum wage; 45 cents one year and 45 in another year, 90 cents that will not be in the budget, 90 cents that the taxpayers do not have to shell out. So the minimum wage increase is not going to cost us anything. Seventy-four percent of the people in America say that a minimum wage increase is a fair approach to guaranteeing that people have the opportunity to earn a decent living.

Nevertheless, the extremist blueprint, the invasion plan, refuses to entertain any increase in the minimum wage. I said before that this is about more than saving money, and the fact that the Republican majority has dug in and is adamantly opposed to a minimum wage increase is just one more indication that saving money and balancing the budget are not the only agenda.

The agenda is designed to wipe out the New Deal programs, to wipe out the Great Society programs, and the agenda is designed secretly to wipe out the gains made by working people, to destroy the effectiveness of unions. A tax on working people, a tax on unions, are not part of the Contract With America. You will not find anything in there that says they want to destroy Davis-Bacon, that they want to change the Fair Labor Standards Act so that people cannot get their overtime.

Nowhere in the Contract With America does the Republican majority say

we want your overtime. But they do want your overtime. Not only are they moving in ways which deny a minimum wage increase to all workers, but the workers who have been working for years, the workers who have enjoyed overtime when they had the necessity to be employed overtime, they would get overtime pay, we are not being told that they should not get overtime pay, that they should get comp time.

So the blueprint for the second half of the Republican war to remake America, it wants your overtime. One of the targets, one of the objectives is to take your overtime; nor to give you a minimum wage increase, but also to take your overtime. It is not in the budget. I am digressing from discussion of the budget, but it is part of the design to remake America.

It is part of a situation where, to please contributors, to please certain elite groups, the workers must be sacrificed, the workers must be given the status of serfs, peons, or sharecroppers. The workers must be put in a position where they have to beg. They must be put in a position where they have no power.

There are other moves to change labor law which we will discuss next week, but certainly the minimum wage, denial of the minimum wage increase, it should be noted, is not a budgetary item. It does not cost the taxpayers anything, but that is part of this great blueprint.

First I want to comment for the tax package. The EITC is one place where taxes are being added, and a tax increase is being forced on the low-income people by removing \$20 billion in funding for the EITC. The tax package in this budget, on the other hand, does still provide for people who are rich to have a decrease in their taxes, and part of the drive to cut Medicare and to cut Medicaid and many other worthwhile programs is to generate still the funds to fund the tax increase.

Probably the most devastating part of this effort to remake America is the part that focuses its guns on Medicare and Medicaid. That is a life and death matter. You are dealing with people's health and you are dealing with lives. We have large expenditures for Medicare, we have large expenditures for Medicaid, yes.

□ 1815

I can think of no more noble expenditure of public funds than to expend those funds to promote the health of people or to save lives. In New York State, we have large expenditures of funds for Medicare and Medicaid. In fact, our State has been criticized for spending more on Medicaid than any other State in the Union.

Yes, we do have those large expenditures. It costs the people of the State a great deal because they are matching, New York State matches the funds 50 percent, unlike other States that have a better match where the Federal Government pays a larger percentage than

the State. The percentage paid for Medicaid in New York State is 50 percent. So we are spending large amounts of money like anywhere else in the country.

We probably could trim the budget by eliminating waste, we could probably trim the budget by eliminating some corruption. Waste and corruption always exist in any program where human beings are involved. The minute you invent the program, the hustlers and the swindlers will move in and find a way to unjustly squeeze large amounts of money out of the program.

Therefore, you have to have inspectors general and you have to have strict law enforcement, you have to have accountability. We just always assume that any program, and it does not matter whether it is health care or housing, in the private sector they have devices going all the time to protect the interests of the employers and the owners from their own employees. Stealing is one of the ongoing universal traits through the world of human beings.

So Medicaid can be cut for corruption and for waste. Nobody wants Medicaid to operate more effectively and more efficiently than the constituents in my district. Since the beginning of Medicare and Medicaid, we have watched abuses and complained about abuses and sought to have the money directed as much as possible in providing health care and less in making doctors rich or in making health care facilities rich. It has been an ongoing struggle.

There was a time when people worked strictly on charitable contributions. That was a painful situation where most people who needed health care had to go to an emergency room. Then we did move into a period where Medicaid was in operation and poor people who qualified through the means test for Medicaid could for the first time have the luxury of preventive health care. They could have a doctor, they could have a situation where they did not have to wait until they were half dead to go to the emergency room.

But we saw the Medicaid mills develop. Medicaid mills were obvious facilities that were taking large amounts of money and giving poor service, and we complained about those for years, and we saw the waste and wondered if the system was not designed to guarantee that certain people would get rich. So there have been improvements in that. There are still further improvements that can be made.

Now we have the HMO's, the health maintenance organizations. In many ways health maintenance organizations are a big improvement over Medicaid mills. Health maintenance organizations when they are operating properly and when they respect the patients and the community that they operate in are a great improvement over Medicaid mills, but if health maintenance organizations are to move in ways which try to give less service

and make more money, then they become worse than the Medicaid mills and must be stopped.

So we have a situation here where there is still a drive on to remake Medicare and to remake Medicaid. This second phase of the Republican majority's war to remake America does let up a little on Medicare, but it becomes worse for Medicaid than it was before. The Republican proposal for Medicare cuts funding \$168 billion over the next 6 years. It continues to rely on the untested and potentially dangerous medical savings account, known as MSA. Medical savings accounts are the centerpiece of the Republican proposals for Medicare.

The proposal would set up a system whereby the healthiest and the wealthiest seniors would leave the Medicare system and many of the doctors who treat them would refuse to continue treating other seniors who depend on Medicare. The proposal could truly end universal health care coverage for the elderly.

In other words, Medicare is only about 30 years old and Medicare could be brought to its knees if you introduce medical savings accounts, because medical savings accounts would cover from 85 to 90 percent of the people who are healthy and who need very little health care. The insurance companies would move in and pick off those people, and the number of people in the Medicare system would drop so drastically and to such a low point until the funding of the Medicare system would fall apart.

So the MSA is a direct threat, it is a gun aimed at the heart of the Medicare system. But that is being proposed again with great gusto. As you know, it is already in legislation that is moving through the House. The Senate and House have agreed and will soon send a bill to the President which might contain the MSA proposal. The MSA proposal has received few public hearings, very few people know about it. I am taking the time to talk about it here now because most people just know it as a set of initials. The MSA, as one respected columnist Robert J. Samuelson recently said in the Washington Post, quote, "we should not unleash a health care upheaval simply as an afterthought. Clearly this proposal would cause serious harm to America's senior citizen population and it goes far beyond any change that the electorate wants."

The people, the voters, the patients do not want MSA's. It will be a radical change in their health care and wipe out a system that they have come to depend on.

Of course, finally, the Republican plan for Medicaid is even more extreme and it has a potential to cause as much or more harm than the Medicare package. Medicare is a basic program whereby the Federal Government helps States provide health care for the poorest and most vulnerable people in our Nation. This budget proposes to cut

Federal Medicaid funding by \$72 billion.

To make matters worse, the Republican proposal allows the States to drain large amounts of money out of the system by significantly reducing the requirement that the States have a maintenance of effort. At the same time it allows a return to the State financing gimmicks of the past that were banned in 1992 at the urging of the Bush administration.

The majority's plan will send a loosely defined block grant back to the States without the current guarantees of care for low-income children, pregnant women, disabled people or senior citizens. By relying heavily on the Republican Governors for the design of their new Medicaid package, the Republican Congress has proposed a program that allows States to reduce their financial commitment to the program without any guarantee that poor people and seniors will have the necessary care.

The Republican plan abolishes the current entitlement for individuals. Entitlement. Remember the word "entitlement." There is probably no more noble concept in government than entitlement. Sometimes it is abused but when you have entitlements for means-tested cases, means-tested entitlements, means-tested entitlements, it means that you have to prove and show that you are poor, that you are in need in order to be able to qualify for the entitlement.

We have some entitlements that are not means-tested. The agricultural entitlements are not means-tested. You can be a millionaire and still get agricultural subsidies. The biggest socialist program in America, the most socialist program that continues to exist and over the next 7 years will still be with us, is the agricultural subsidy program.

It has many different facets. Agricultural subsidies for various reasons, there are Farmers Home Loan Mortgages, there are many, many different ways in which socialism and agriculture takes care of people who have a great deal of money.

In fact, in Montana I point out, in Montana, the Freemen out there, the siege that is going on now, those people are people who receive large amounts of money. They are led by a person who received up to \$800,000 in Federal loans and subsidies, and he does not want to pay it back. They reached the point where they felt they had the right to keep it and the right to not be held accountable for paying it back. Their property was taken, so they are in a revolutionary mode now. They have guns and are ready to fight because the subsidy, the socialism in agriculture has thoroughly corrupted them to the point where they have lost their perspective completely.

So the loss of the entitlement, benefits defined by the State, when you lose the entitlement, the Federal Government no longer stands behind the guarantee of health care to everybody who

needs it and if you meet the means test, you lose the entitlement, the block grant goes to the State, the State has a finite, set amount of money in their budget, when they spend that amount of money, then the people who are in need after that will not get any help.

The States will also define the benefits that continue to go to some groups that are covered by Medicaid. States will not have to provide health care to certain people that are covered right now. Children in poverty will not be fully covered because the Republican proposal, the scorched earth proposal goes after the health care of children between the ages of 13 and 18.

Children ages 13 to 18 living in poverty would lose their Medicaid coverage because they are not on the list of people that the Federal legislation would require the States to serve. So a State could cut that out if it wants to. Disabled persons, people with disabilities. The States would be in a position to define who has a disability and who does not have a disability. It is unlikely they would cover all of the 6 million disabled persons who now are receiving Medicaid. Six million disabled people in this country, people with disabilities, are receiving Medicaid now. The likelihood is that if the States are able to define who has a disability and who does not have a disability, most of these people would lose their coverage. Again there is the low-income Medicare beneficiary, people who do not qualify for welfare who are covered in some States, and they will lose their coverage also if you give the Medicaid total over to the States.

That is the worst feature, the Medicaid assault. The assault on Medicaid is probably the single worst feature of the Republican majority budget. The assault on Medicaid is a life and death issue. The assault on Medicaid is worthy of a long discussion. The assault on Medicaid is worthy of a mobilization of people all across the Nation.

We have a great deal to lose. Medicaid is as close as we have gotten to universal health care. Medicaid, which provides health care to everybody who needs it, who is poor and can pass the means test, Medicaid is as close to universal health care as we have gotten in this country. We are the only industrialized country other than South Africa that does not have universal health care in one form or another.

So we are about to lose that. I am particularly concerned about it because in New York City, it seems that the extremist forces are out ahead of the Republican majority here in Congress. The Republican majority here in Congress have been thwarted in their efforts to end the Medicaid entitlement. They have been thwarted in their efforts to take steps that would reverse the quality of care in nursing homes. But we have a Republican Governor who has moved on nursing homes and tried to suspend the regulations, a Republican Governor who is threaten-

ing to change the way hospitals are funded for indigent persons, to take away that funding altogether if they do not agree to some new proposals that he had made. We have a Republican Governor who has proposed to close down one of the hospitals in my district, Kings Borough Psychiatric Center. Kings Borough Psychiatric Center is the only psychiatric center in Brooklyn. Brooklyn is a borough which has 2.5 million people; 2.5 million people is enough to need a psychiatric center with 500 beds. It has been there for 100 years. But now they are proposing to close down Kings Borough Center.

The juggernaut in New York, the Wehrmacht in New York, the scorched earth policy in New York is moving faster than the policies here at the Federal level. The mayor is proposing to sell certain hospitals. The mayor is proposing to lease certain hospitals. A notice was just issued day before yesterday that 1,600 hospital workers will be laid off immediately between now and the middle of June and between now and January 1, 8,000 hospital workers will be laid off in New York City.

This is radical, this is extreme, this is a life and death matter. Not only will patients die as a result of the extreme changes within the hospitals, but there some people employed in these hospitals who are earning basic pay as janitors, as cleaners, as maids, some people who are technicians. There are large numbers of people who will be out of work as a result of this reduction in the service for health care. Health care is a service, first of all, and that is its most important function. But health care is also an industry. It is one of the most noble industries mankind has ever created, and it does provide jobs.

So we have a situation where we are moving in an extreme manner and in a year's period 8,000 people will be thrown out of work and the work that they do in the hospitals will be dislocated and confused, and people will literally die as a result.

□ 1830

War has been declared on the health care system of the people of New York city. War has been declared by the Governor. War has been declared by the mayor. The war in New York State and the war in New York City is very much interrelated with the war that has been declared here in Washington.

In fact, the war began here. The move is here, once the proposals by the Clinton administration in the 103d Congress went down the drain. Those proposals were good proposals, idealistic proposals, and proposals which were complicated because of the fact that they reached out toward the goal of universal health care.

We can come with legislation that is much simpler as we can, in incremental steps, probably improve the health care system. But if we want to reach the goal of universal care, universal health care for everybody, it requires a

complicated system. It requires something which is very unusual and calls on our present system to be restructured.

That is what the Clinton administration program required. It was the proper approach in terms of setting the goal and seeking the goal of universal health care. The fact that the complications led to a political problem does not diminish the validity of the Clinton health care proposals.

Now we are without that national goal and without that national guidance, and we are in a situation now where we have a stampede on to restructure and to reengineer the health care system. In a place like New York, we are talking about nearly 8 million people, health care for nearly 8 million people, so it is a very tempting target.

The stampede on now is a stampede toward privatization. It is a stampede that begins with the ideas that there is a lot of money to be made if they create a health care-industrial complex. A government health care-industrial complex means that the private sector will own it, the private sector will run it, but the funding for it will still come out of the taxpayers' pockets.

Just as the funding for the military-industrial complex comes out of the taxpayers' pockets but is run by private enterprise, and great amounts of money are made out of it, now we have a foolproof system that will go on forever. The health care-industrial complex is not like the military-industrial complex. It will be here forever, and we then do not have to worry about never having a justification for it.

The military-industrial complex has done well long after it is needed at the level it is needed. It is still here. We needed a military-industrial complex to win World War II, and we needed a military-industrial complex at a certain level to fight the cold war and to maintain the security of the free world. All that was necessary, but we have not needed the extremes in spending that we have, and we certainly do not need to justify adding \$13 billion more to the existing defense budget.

That is a victory of the military-industrial complex. Its power exceeds its usefulness, but that is one of those complexes and we are governed by many different complexes in this country. Complexes have a great impact on our policies.

We have a banking-industrial complex that really is the biggest swindle of all. The banking-industrial complex pulled off the savings and loan swindle and that may cost the American people, before it is over, about a half trillion dollars to bail out the savings and loans and the other banks. There were other banks also, not savings and loans, but banks that went bankrupt. We are going to be out a half a trillion dollars by the time the Resolution Trust Corporation and all the mechanisms that were set up and designed to do this are finished.

So we have a health care complex now, health care-industrial complex.

Large insurance companies, large pharmaceutical companies buy HMO's. HMO's are health maintenance organizations. They are not evil automatically. They are not inherently evil. In fact, the Health Insurance Program of New York, called HIP, has been in existence for half a century. It was a great step forward in health care.

HIP still exists, but HIP was a non-profit-making enterprise. It is not designed to make a profit. Although they make surpluses and they have probably been taken care of very well, it was not designed to make profits, and it has worked very well.

We can have profitmaking HMO's also, and that has been proven in some places. They make profits and they also give good service. There are communities which insist that they are going to get good service or else they are going to get rid of the HMO's, so they have good service.

But in big cities and communities like the majority of the communities that my district covers, there is an attempt being made to come in and stamper the situation and restructure, re-engineer the health care system for the benefit of the big HMO's, and the insurance companies and pharmaceutical companies are going to stand behind them.

They are not listening to doctors. They are not listening to hospital administrations. They are definitely not listening to community leaders. They are very seldom listening to elected officials. We need to reestablish the dialog, and the only way we can get that dialog is by confronting them with a situation which brings to a halt the grand design to redesign our health care system.

So we have the mayor proposing to sell one of the hospitals in my district; the Governor proposing to close down another one; the layoffs of thousands of people taking place; and all this is happening very rapidly, and in the meantime the shadow of the Medicaid entitlement being taken away looms over our head.

The Medicaid entitlement will be converted to a block grant automatically. Right away there is a reduction in the amount of funds available for Medicaid because the proposal is not just to give the State what it now gets but to cut the amount of money. The State will have the power then to cut the benefits. So we will have several rapid shocks to the health care system all at once.

For this reason, this Sunday, we are mobilizing all over the city. Not just in my district but all over the city there are demonstrations at hospitals called Hospital Support Sunday. Churches are leading their congregations to hospitals that are threatened and they are having rallies to send a message to the mayor and to the Governor that we are the people, the health care system is for us, those of us who are patients and those of us who are alive and will someday probably become patients. We

want a voice in the restructuring. We do not want the insurance companies and the pharmaceutical companies and the HMO's to restructure our health care for their benefit. We could like to have a voice in the restructuring of the system for the benefit of all the people.

We have three demands. One is that they freeze the situation as it is now. Do not have any more sales of hospitals. Do not try to lease hospitals. Stop downsizing and streamlining, cutting the budget so that the hospitals are not able to function properly. If they cannot function properly, people stop coming, and then they use the fact that their number of patients is declining as a justification for cutting the staff.

It is a vicious game that is being played with our health care system and we want it to come to an end. We want the assault on our health care system as part of the war we make in America to come to a halt.

Maybe we can make a deal. In every war, no matter how vicious the war may be or how ambitious the maniacs are who drive the war, they do make some arrangements. As bad as the Third Reich was under Hitler, they did not attack Switzerland. For various reasons they never attacked Switzerland. As bad as they were, they did not go on to attack Sweden. They did grab little Norway because it was in the way in terms of their own strategies. They did terrible things but there were some places where even the vicious Nazis did not cross the line.

Maybe we can have a deal with the people who are trying to remake America and a Speaker who declares that politics is war without blood. Perhaps we can have a safe haven out there in health care, put it off the invasion map, take it away as a target and let us not do terrible things that our grandchildren might spit on our graves as a result of hearing about.

Let us not destroy the health care system for the elderly, which may throw people out on the streets. Because in Medicaid two-thirds of the money from Medicaid goes to nursing homes. One-third goes to poor families, and they are important, too, but two-thirds goes to nursing homes.

Many people in those nursing homes are people who were middle-class people, who had some means before they got ill and lost their jobs and lost their faculties and for various reasons became impoverished. Once they become impoverished then Medicaid is all there is left to take care of them. Take away Medicaid and they are literally in the streets.

So we do not want to hastily, in the process of remaking America, do things that would end up being counted as atrocities sometime in the future as people look back. We do not want to do thing that in the process of trying to justify them we would take ourselves into some kind of immoral era similar to the Nazi era.

People with disabilities in Nazi Germany became people who ought to be

destroyed, and it is to the credit of the German people that they would not consent to euthanasia as long as they knew about it. But when they singled out a particular ethnic group, they did go on and try to destroy a whole ethnic group. The seeds were sewn.

Human beings or nations should never begin to think in certain directions. Human beings and nations ought to automatically want to structure systems that provide for the preservation of life. To be pro-life in the most profound sense is to try to preserve the health care system; to try to see to it that at least every person has an opportunity to maintain good health and to benefit from the modern life-saving devices, and to in some way know that we care about them that far.

We cannot guarantee them an income, we cannot guarantee them a lot of things, but let us put the health care system into a safe haven status and say we are going to try to guarantee that decent health care is provided for everybody. We are going to try to guarantee that systems are maintained. We want to streamline them, make them more efficient, eliminate the waste and corruption, but we are going to maintain systems that are adequate.

We cannot maintain adequate systems if overnight we are going to make a decision to close hospitals in a big city like New York. The closing of the hospitals has not been discussed by the doctors and the administrators, it has only been discussed behind closed doors by politicians who want to make a score and save money over a short period of time. So that kind of restructuring is going to be a scorched earth kind of restructuring where people's lives will not matter.

We will not stand by idly and watch this kind of restructuring of our health care system in New York City. I hope that the rest of Americans understand that we are at a critical point and they too must get out take a look at what is happening, who is making what plans about their health care system, who is making what plans about how many hospitals we are going to have in a given area, and about the nature of those hospitals.

A burn unit cannot be maintained by an HMO. A burn unit needs a large population to support. A burn unit needs to exist within the structure of a hospital. MRI's are very expensive and cannot be maintained in some doctor's office or some clinic cannot maintain an MRI. If the hospital goes, then we have a situation where the justification and the rationale for a number of other services that are based on a density of population will no longer be there.

So we must fight to keep hospitals, or at least to have people sit down at the table and give us the blueprint; show us how they will maintain the quality of services, if they are going to restructure and eliminate certain hospitals or certain aspects of the current health care.

Now, we have the analogy of politics as war without blood. In every war monumental mistakes are made. The nature of war is such that it is going to grind down and eat up, chew up, and abuse large numbers of people because it is an emergency and we cannot set our own scenarios. We have to react to the enemy. There are a number of things in the nature of war. That is why the analogy that politics is war without blood is a bad analogy.

We should not have to move in an atmosphere of war. We should not have to rally to meet a crisis that does not need to be created. Health care could be kept at some kind of rationale level. Health care should be kept off the table.

Yes, eventually, HMO's, profit making HMO's, may make money in health care. Eventually Wall Street may have stocks in the health care industry do very well. But let us try to do that and make capitalism and the profit motive work for the benefit of the people. Let us not allow the situation to get totally out of hand and a scorched earth policy to leave us with ruins in our health care system.

Once we close a hospital, reopening it is almost impossible. Once we close down certain kinds of facilities, we cannot bring them back. And we must force those who are in place of decision-making and power to stop, listen, and negotiate.

Our demands in New York City are three basic demands. Freeze the situation. Do not go any further. Disclose your plans. Let us see what is happening. And they negotiate. And this is a pattern that I offer to the rest of the country.

□ 1845

It is your health care. This invasion plan will roll right over you unless you rally and guarantee that you are respecting and that your health care does not become cannon fodder in this so-called war to remake America.

TRIBUTE TO ADMIRAL BULKELEY AND ADMIRAL BOORDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SKEEN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, those that were watching the proceedings in this Chamber earlier saw some brief 5-minute or shorter tributes to the Chief of Naval Operations, the highest ranking naval officer in the world up until a few hours ago this afternoon when the early reports are telling us he took his own life in the Chief of Naval Operations traditional officer's home, just a few blocks from here in the Navy Yard on the Anacostia River.

Mr. Speaker, I had been intending to come to the floor tonight to finish a tribute to Admiral John Duncan Bulkeley, who had served 55 years on

active duty, retired just a few years ago in 1988, and was the squadron commander of the PT boats that took General MacArthur off Corregidor. I pointed out that in an otherwise beautiful funeral ceremony on Patriots' Day, April 19, the only sad note was that there were no Cabinet officers, no Vice President. Bill Clinton had held the wreath with Admiral Bulkeley at the 50th anniversary of D-day, the Normandy invasions to begin the day at dawn.

Together they held a wreath honoring all those who died at sea, the Coast Guardsmen driving the landing craft up to the beach, the few naval craft as they secured the waters of the English Channel for the Allied forces that died, those that died leading up to it, those that died in secret operations in the months leading up to it where we lost hundreds of sailors and soldiers, and it was kept secret for 25 years.

That wreath was to commemorate all who were lost at sea, including those landing barges that were blown up by shore artillery and mortar fire sent out by the Germans. At the funeral, which I talked about here 6 days ago, I said that the first eulogy for Admiral Bulkeley, this Medal of Honor winner, holder of two Distinguished Service Crosses, Navy Cross, two Purple Hearts, two Silver Stars, French Croix de Guerre. The first speaker was the CNO, the Chief of Naval Operations, Jeremy Michael Boorda, Mike to his friends.

Mr. Speaker, I have in front of me the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. How could I or anyone have known that, while praising Admiral Boorda here at this very lectern on the leadership desk, that 6 days later he would be joining Admiral Bulkeley in heaven? This is phenomenal that our country is getting hit with so many hammer blows of people dying. It must be tied into something to do with what the Holy Father in Rome calls the culture of death.

I got through most of Admiral Boorda's eulogy for Vice Admiral Bulkeley, and I had the son of the actual PT boat, signal boat commander, PT 41, George Cox Jr., a late-in-life child is, I guess, the way they say it, not the grandson but the direct of son of George Cox, Ensign George Cox, who was actually at the helm of the PT boat when Admiral Bulkeley with the last of his two boats out of only six to begin with, when Manila, the Pearl Harbor of Manila was December 8, across the date line, when George Cox was watching Junior, he is an LA of CLAY SHAW of Florida, legislative assistant.

I opened with words of Ronald Reagan that I used the next day when I was the graduation speaker at a beautiful traditional Catholic Christian college in Front Royal out in the beautiful Shenandoah Valley of Virginia. I talked about what Ronald Reagan had told us all to do in his goodbye words on January 11, 1989, 9 days before com-

bat Navy hero, 58-mission George Bush was sworn in. And that is what I titled this piece, or our wonderful recorders that took the title from my words. It says President Reagan commands us, remember our heroes, remember our past.

Mr. Speaker, I read beautiful moving passages of President Reagan's words, then told some history about Admiral Bulkeley that was my tribute to him and to George Cox, Sr. with George, Jr. watching. Then I got into Admiral Boorda's remarks. And then I read the stunningly beautiful tribute to Admiral Bulkeley from his second son, an active duty Navy captain, Peter Bulkeley, and my time ran out. So I was going to come back at some point this week and finish reading, because I promised Admiral Bulkeley's son and his three daughters, beautiful daughter-in-law, that I would read it word for word, it was that good.

That is what I thought Ronald Reagan wanted us to do, as RON KLING on the other side performed a moving historical tribute to the people of Crete and how it might have been the key battle that, although lost, delayed Hitler's invasion of Russia and thereby turned the course of history in World War II.

So I was going to come back tonight and finish Peter Bulkeley, Captain Peter Bulkeley's tribute to his dad. And now I have to do that and a tribute to Mike Boorda. I have Mike's biography in front of me. What a life. Just on two pages. Bulkeley served 55 years. Boorda served 40. Fibbed about his age. The one time you can talk about fibbing, downgrade the word from lie. When you are trying to wear the uniform of your country and say you are older than you are, God must smile. That is certainly not a venial sin. That is a fib to serve your fellow man. He fibbed on his age in November 1938. He is my brother's age, 2 years older, younger brother, and he joined in November 1938. Was an enlisted man for 8 years, excuse me, 6 years, and was a Navy petty officer first class. Attack squadron 144, carrier airborne early warning squadron 11.

My older brother's son, a Navy lieutenant commander who has served in the gulf 30 or some combat missions in one of these squadrons, he had all this enlisted experience and was selected for commissioning under the integration program in 1962, 34 years ago. I will get to Mike Boorda's tribute in a minute, but let me tell you again what Mike Boorda said about Admiral Bulkeley. Quoting myself, I finished talking about SONNY MONTGOMERY, SAM GIBBONS, World War II veterans in this House that had the only tribute to World War II other than about 10 or 15 that I did, was a month after the war had passed its 50th anniversary.

I finished talking about them and I said: Mr. Speaker, I just do not understand why people are not listening to what Ronald Reagan said about talking about history. So Admiral Boorda begins his remarks. Mr. Speaker, this is

his title of his tribute to Bulkeley on April 19, but I am saying it 6 days ago. Admiral Boorda says: You may cast off when ready, Johnny. Those were MacArthur's words to Squadron Commander Bulkeley. I am sure Bulkeley, as I discussed with George, Jr., turned to Ensign Cox and said—I am sorry, those are my words.

I am sure that when Bulkeley heard those words from MacArthur he turned to his PT boat skipper Ensign Cox and said: George, let's move it out of here, anchors aweigh. Those were my remarks. Admiral Boorda began, I say, this is Boorda. Will Rogers said that we cannot all be heroes. Then another aside of mine: Mr. Speaker, I say, by the way, Admiral Boorda beautifully delivered this, Mr. Speaker. Back to Mike: Some of us have to stand on the curb and clap as those heroes go by. When he made that statement, Will Rogers could only have had one type of person in mind, John Bulkeley.

We gather here today—this is the new chapel at Fort Myer, in this place meant for heroes and applaud a true American hero as he passes by. And we come together here as the rest of America stands up and cheers for a man who symbolizes the very best about our Nation. While we are saddened to no longer have the great John Bulkeley with us, Boorda continues, it is not a day of sorrow. He would not have liked or allowed that. Today is a day meant to remember, to give thanks.

Then I point out that Admiral Boorda goes on page after page telling about his early years. I put it all in the RECORD later. He tells about the film, "They Were Expendable," America's leading man John Wayne, America's sweetheart, Donna Reed. And Boorda talked about Admiral Bulkeley, how he lived his life for our navy and his country.

This is what Boorda did for 40 years. Bulkeley did so with guts and heart and, most important, with honor. His service stands as a tribute to every sailor.

This was obviously coming from Boorda's heart, Mr. Speaker, because he always considered himself a sailor. He said: Every American, every person on this Earth who cherishes freedom, Bulkeley's life touched more than just us. It touched the world. And so today America says—boy, these are words from the grave. I give Mike Boorda's words back at him, Mr. Speaker: Thank you, shipmate, for giving us the very best. And while we knew that you were always special, too extraordinary to ever need our thanks, we just thought you would like to know.

The words he ended with there were the way this legendary Admiral John Duncan Bulkeley would write a short memo, sign it and then write a four-page PS. He would always sign the PS: Just thought you would want to know.

Now, I do not want to confuse, Mr. Speaker, anybody who follows these proceedings, but I think at this point I

would like to do a tribute to Admiral Boorda, the highest ranking American naval officer in the world this morning.

Talked to our colleague, Commander DUKE CUNNINGHAM on the phone at 10, and I think I have a right to say what he told DUKE, that he was feeling pressure from the White House and Secretary Perry to undercut the Republican defense authorization budget that restores much modernization that is needed to our military, that he was under terrific pressure.

He had an interview with the news magazine this afternoon, just an hour after he died. He was getting hammered in the press a little bit, but that would not have bothered someone with 40 years in our great Navy.

But as I talk about Bulkeley later through the mouth of his son, Captain Peter Bulkeley, think about the fact that I will be back at that chapel in Myer for Admiral Boorda's funeral in a few days. This is amazing. Mike Boorda went through Officers Candidate School in 1962 in Newport, RI. Got his naval commission as a very experienced young ensign August 1962. So he would have been 24 years old. He served in destroyers, combat information center on the Porterfield, went to destroyer field in Newport, became a weapons officer on the *U.S.S. John Craig* and other destroyers, served on the *Parrot* and mine sweeper. Then he was a weapons instructor.

There is just so much here. I am going to skip through it because a lot of it is the dry bio of years and years of superb service going everywhere your country and your Navy tells you to go.

Mr. Speaker, here is where I first met him. After he was the commander of cruiser, destroyer Group 8, the Greyhounds of the Sea, and as carrier battle group commander embarked on the *Saratoga*, one of our first big angle deck carriers, he also served as the commander of battle force Sixth Fleet in 1987 in the Med.

□ 1900

And then he comes to D.C., and this is where I met him. In August of 1988 he became chief of naval personnel, a teenager of 17 up through the ranks. Everyone thought this was the crowning glory of his career, vice admiral, 3 stars, going to take care of all the kids and gals in the Navy and all the chief petty officers in the officer corps. He served there for 3 years.

In November of 1991, that is 5 years ago now, he got his fourth star. Has been a four-star general for what would have been 5 years this November, and in December 1991, 4 years ago last Christmas, he became the commander in chief of all the allied forces in southern Europe; I saw him there a year after that; and then commander in chief of all the U.S. naval forces in Europe, headquarters in London, England, in those traditional buildings that go all the way back to those D-Day victories, World War II.

On February 1, 1993 while serving as commander in chief, he assumed the

duty of commander, Joint Task Force Provide Promise, responsible for the supply of humanitarian relief to Bosnia-Herzegovina. He set up the air land and air drop dangerous night mission, C-130s coming at 10,000 feet, trying to target air drops with parachutes of heavy medical supplies and food into the besieged people of that poor war-torn land of Bosnia. He set all that up.

He has the Defense Distinguished Service Medal, the Distinguished Service Medal, second time, Legion of Merit, third award, Meritorious Service Medal and a number of other campaign awards.

He was our 25th Chief of Naval Operations.

What a history from 1775, John Paul Jones. I have not yet begun to fight. John Burrey, an Irishman, the father of our Navy Marine Corps, born November 10, same year, 1775. What a history. Only 25 CNOs.

His beautiful wife, Irishwoman Betty Moran, they have four children. It says nine grandchildren, but that is wrong. I was told today four more arrived just since this bio. No, 2 more. He has 11. I have 10. There is so much to live for, four children. Well, he has got exactly what I have. I have five children. So he has 15 children and grandchildren. I have 15 children and grandchildren. I want to get out of here some day and live for them to pass on everything that I hope is wise that I have learned in life.

Two of his sons are naval officers, Mr. Speaker. What a tragic depression must have borne down on that naval officer's chest. What a tragedy.

Just thought you would want to know that we have lost a great naval commander, a young teenaged boot going through probably Great Lakes Naval Center, where so many friends of mine went through. What an inspiration he was to the kids out there on the ships, and the young gals.

How tall was he, Mr. Speaker? Could not have been more than five foot 2, 3, 4; probably five-five. What a dynamite package. We are going to miss you, Mike.

So over there at that beautiful new cathedral at Ft. Myers, resplendent in his white uniform, a pallbearer also, of course. Many vice admirals sitting in the front row, one three-star general. Should have been a lot bigger than that for Admiral Bulkeley.

Mr. Speaker, FDR pinned on his Medal of Honor. We have got a Medal of Honor winner in the Senate. I think that should have dropped everything to be there. Got 2 or 3 Navy Cross holders, a former Navy Secretary over there. No Navy Secretary. Great Army three-star there, No. 2 man, but MacArthur pinned on his Distinguished Service Cross. Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox, under Roosevelt, pinned on one of his Navy Crosses, he got another Distinguished Service Cross, but at least he had Mike Boorda, CNO, speaking up for him.

At this point what I would like to do so that it is a coherent record is put

back in, and I will bring this down and give it to the recorders, Mr. Speaker, all of the first part of Peter Bulkeley's tribute, which took his dad through his Annapolis years through China through meeting the beautiful English girl Alice, marrying her, the dark days in the Philippines, his days as the wild man of the Philippines, his clothes ragged, the both covered in grease and diesel fuel and held together with spit and wire and prayers, and Peter's beautiful words that will be in the RECORD, took him right up through the end of World War II, the stories of D-day, the stories that I told because I had heard it and forgotten it. It was in Peter's words about sinking two German Corvettes, capturing the Nazi commanders; maybe they were not Nazis, just naval officers, but they refused to salute Old Glory, a Naval tradition, as they were rescued and brought up on the deck of Admiral Bulkeley's first major combat surface ship, the destroyer *Endicott*, and he had them thrown back in the water.

I am told last Friday how the story was repeated to me by several of the crewmen from the *Endicott* that were there to pay tribute at the funeral to John Duncan Bulkeley, and, Peter, I got to the point where I read his words telling that story, a true story how the German on the third time around worked the trick, as Captain Peter said, and he finally saluted Old Glory, and then I told something that was not in Peter's remarks told to me by the helmsman Joe Caine, who was about 20, and that was about 50 years ago plus 2, so he is about 72 years old now, spry and as chipper as ever.

He told how Admiral Bulkeley took two Jewish members of the crew from Brooklyn, from the Bronx, and gave them Thompson submachine guns and took them into the officer's ward where they had these two German Corvette commanders, captains, and said, "Now, do you speak English?" And they did. They were educated. And he said, "Well, these two fellows here have a good Bronx background, and they're Jewish. I thought you might want to know that if you make a move, you're in a lot of trouble. Cover him, guys." One was named Gottlieb and the other, they said it was either Rosenberg or Rosenstein. It was quite a story.

So that is where my time ran out, and I pick up admiral—not admiral. Maybe some day another admiral in the Bulkeley family because Peter had also talked about all the naval officers and heroes going all the way back to the battle of Trafalgar and the victory and Lord Nelson. So I picked up Peter Bulkeley's words in his eulogy for his dad, and I will continue from here, and it will have his full eulogy in the record.

Let me pause, Peter says. The admiral was a strong believer in standards. Some may say he was from the old school, as the enemy captain of one of the Corvette soon learned. I have not read this, so I will do this. Coming up

the sea ladder, the German commander would not salute the colors of the *Endicott*. He was promptly tossed back into the sea. On the third time, that did the trick, and he was taken prisoner and allowed on deck.

I heard this story a long time ago, but last year, this would be 1995, I had the privilege of attending one of the *Endicott* ship's reunions and was told the same story over and over by the crew that served and loved their captain so well, John Bulkeley.

World War II closed, and the admiral emerged as one of the Navy's and America's most decorated heroes, having been awarded the Medal of Honor, the Navy Cross, the Army Distinguished Service Cross with Oak Leaf Cluster in lieu of a second award, two Silver Stars, Legion of Medal with Combat V, the Purple Heart twice over, the Philippine Distinguished Conduct Star, and from France the French Croix de Guerre, which by the way, my father earned the hard way, with three wound chevrons that are now called Purple Hearts, in World War I, Mr. Speaker.

Asked about his many decorations, John Bulkeley would only comment, "Medals and awards do not mean anything. It is what is inside of you, how you feel about yourself, that counts."

With an eye to the future, John Bulkeley looked forward to the day he would become an admiral in the Navy he loved so much. As President Kennedy in the early months of his administration dealt with an ever increasing crisis over Cuba, the admiral got his wish and, for a quarter of a century, would serve as a flag officer in the Navy.

As I am reading this, Mr. Speaker, I am picturing Boorda, Admiral Boorda, sitting there in the front row. How many days ago? Eleven? Twenty-seven days ago.

Challenged in his first assignment as commander of the Guantanamo Naval Base, Bulkeley met and defeated the challenge of Fidel Castro's threats of severing the water supplies of the base. Today Guantanamo stands as a symbol of American resolve because men like John Bulkeley stood up and refused to bend and took the initiative to stare down belligerent threats of lesser men not friendly with America. Perhaps a tribute of the time was a wanted poster offering 50,000 pesos for commander—Captain Bulkeley, dead or alive, by the Communist leadership of Cuba, along with the description a guerrilla, the worst species. I take it back. He was a flag officer by this time.

At Guantanamo, for those that have visited, there is a hill that overlooks the northeast gate, a gate with a sign that reads "Cuba, Land Free from America." I remember standing there with former members Bob Lagomarsino and Eldon Rudd of Arizona.

Peter says, "I stood with my dad on that hill almost 32 years ago. Cuban troops began moving about. They were armed. My dad's 19-year-old driver, a

Marine lance corporal, comes running over and stood directly in front of the admiral ready and willing to take the bullet that could end the life of his commander."

The admiral loved his Marines, and the Marines loved and respected him in return. He would be with them day and night in fatigues ready to conduct war, if necessary, but more, to defend Americans and the land of the free against the Communist yoke of tyranny.

Colonel Stevens, the former commanding officer of the Marine barracks at Guantanamo, wrote just recently adding three more stories to the legend of John Bulkeley. The admiral had the compassion of the men in the field, taking time again and again to bring them relief, whether cookies on Christmas morning or visiting with them at odd hours of the night to ease their nerves. They loved this man, the young men—not so young. The 70-year-olds at his funeral from the *Endicott* told me he knew every man's name on the ship; every nickname and would pop up in the dead of night to have coffee with whoever was on watch in the wee hours of 2, 3 and 4 o'clock in the morning.

The admiral would construct on that hill, his hill overlooking the northeast gate in Guantanamo, would construct the largest Marine Corps insignia in the world as a quiet reminder that the U.S. Marine Corps stood vigilant over this base, and in tribute a Marine would write John Bulkeley, Marine in sailor's clothing. Camp Bulkeley is still there in Guantanamo today, and that Marine anchor and globe has a fresh coat of paint.

John Bulkeley never forgot his early years, the hard iron-like discipline, the poor material condition of the fleet and the need to always be ready. He was talking about the '30s, 1930's. In his own words, to be able to conduct prompt, sustained combat operations at sea assigned as the president of the Board of Inspection and Survey, inspector general position unique to the Navy. The Army and Air Force do not have this as you know, Mr. Speaker; a post held by many distinguished naval officers since its inception almost since the beginning of the Navy. Bulkeley's boundless energy would find him aboard every ship in the Navy from keel to the top of the mast, from the fire control system to inside a boiler discussing readiness and sharing sea stories and a cup of coffee with the men who operate our ships, our planes and our submarines. This throughout the end of this 55-year career. He was relentless in his quest to improve the safety and material condition of the fleet and the conditions for the health and well-being of those men. He conducted his inspections by the book and strict accordance with standards, as many a man well knows, but his love for the sailors always came through.

His "Just thought you'd like to know" memos was another invention of his that was designed to be a, quote, unofficial report, unquote. But of

course they were often greeted by a groan by the recipient in the Navy's leadership knowing that John Bulkeley had another concern that needed attention, and the number of information addresses receiving the same "Just thought you'd like to know" letters often were longer than the letter itself. The admiral would laugh about his informal invention less than 30 days ago. That is last March.

After 55 years of commissioned service, John Bulkeley retired to private life. I was there at his retirement ceremony with Admiral Trost, then Chief of Naval Operations.

□ 1915

"John Bulkeley, as you recall, did not like notoriety and wanted to keep a low profile, throughout his life, even his last day in his Navy. His ceremony, as requested, was brief and to the point. Held in the CNO's office, with family present, all he sought after giving his entire life to his country and his service was to have the CNO's flag lieutenant open the door so he could slip his mooring line and leave quietly.

"Today we celebrate the final journey of a great American, John Bulkeley, and let him sail away."

Ironically, we should have all the flags in D.C. at half mast today, Mr. Speaker, for Adm. Jeremy "Mike" Boorda.

"We should not mourn, for he would not want that, preferring we celebrate his long life, fruitful life, and the life he chooses to lead. When asked to describe his own life he said," listen to this, Mr. Speaker, 'Interesting, Fascinating, and Beneficial to the United States.'"

Would not every Congressman and Senator like to say their career was interesting, fascinating, and beneficial to the United States of America?

"The spirit of John Bulkeley is here. You can see it everywhere. You can see it in the faces of our young sailors and marines, the midshipmen and our junior officers who will be challenged to live up to his standards of integrity, loyalty, bravery, and dedicated service to country and to service.

"John Bulkeley's career and service to the Nation spanned six turbulent decades of this century, he saw firsthand desperate times and the horrors of war. Yet he was also a father, marrying the woman he loved, and in his own words, 'It was the best thing I ever did.'"

He said that to my face at D-day when he introduced me to his wife and several of his grown children. Peter continues: "And raised the family he could be proud of, because we are proud of him." Then, in a tearful moment in the audience for us, Mr. Speaker, Capt. Peter Bulkeley looked at his mother, and he says, "Mom, you were his right arm, his closest friend for a long and full life. You gave him your love and your support. You truly were the Wind beneath his Wings," and they had played that hymn. "Yellow roses and his Colt 45 that he gave to

you on your wedding night, while he stood watch out in Swatow Harbor, China provide us comfort of this love for you and his service to country. Before he passed away, every member, child, and grandchild, sons and daughters-in-law all came to be with him in his last days. This by itself is testimony of the legacy he leaves behind and the love his family had for him.

"Today we face a different challenge than what John Bulkeley did. Old enemies are our allies. But now there are new foes who challenge our country's interests and our way of life sometimes, even inside our own borders." Narcotics.

"Admiral Bulkeley's efforts and sacrifices for a better world, a free world, his integrity and honor, and a combat-ready fleet, ready to conduct prompt, sustained combat operations are his legacy to our Nation.

"Seated before me are many of the warriors that fought alongside the admiral, shared in his beliefs, his determination, his losses, his grief, and his unfailing lover of family, service, and country.

"With his passing, the watch has been relieved. A new generation takes the helm and charts the course. His Navy, he shaped for so many years, is at sea today, stronger and better because of him, operating forward in far-away places, standing vigilant and engaged in keeping peace and helping our fellow man, but ready for war.

"In his own words, he leaves this with you: 'Be prepared. Your day will come, heaven forbid, when you will be called to go forward to defend our great Nation. Your leadership, bravery, and skill will be tested to the utmost.'"

He continues with his dad's words: "You should never forget that America's Torch of Freedom has been handed down to you by countless others that answer their country's call and often gave their lives to preserve freedoms so many take for granted. This torch is now in your hands. You have a great responsibility to uphold duty, honor, country. God bless each of you and protect you.

"Just thought you'd like to know."

"So, we gather together today to say farewell to a man we love, a man we respect and cherish, a man that did his duty, that made his mark in life, and left the world a better and safer place. Peter Bulkeley looked toward his father and said, 'God bless you, Dad. All lines are clear.' A beautiful tribute. I could look over about 6 people, see the tears in the eyes of the Naval CNO, Chief of Naval Ops."

So I will just make Peter's tribute to his legendary father a tribute to your 40 years, Admiral Boorda: God bless you, Mike, all lines are clear. I will see your family over at Fort Myer Cathedral.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a tough week. My honor has been challenged more than once by some of the biggest papers in this country: U.S.A. Today, New York Times, L.A. Times. People

who are ignorant of what I am trying to do for our military have been taking cheap shots at me all week long. They just bounce off my back, because I am the one who has done the research on this moral crisis in our country and in my beloved military, all the services. I have never felt parochial about the Air Force, I belonged to all the forces.

I will spend all day tomorrow at West Point. I have four or five cadets up there from my little California, Orange County, district. I will have lunch with them, I will meet with the instructors. I come back here Saturday, and I am going to the ordination of 12 priests, the biggest ordination of priests anywhere in this country this year in a diocese, Arlington, across the river, that is on fire with the Holy Spirit; great priests. One of them is my son-in-law's priest from the Mission San Juan Capistrano, Joe Dressler. He is coming back here to meet with some of his underclassmen from the seminary that he studied at.

Then on Sunday, I am taking my wife and the Air Force is driving me down to an Air National Guard base at Richmond, and I am going to fly the F-16, if I pass my morning physical down there, with an Air National Guard squadron of great tradition; flew the F-105 Thunder Chief after Vietnam for years, and now flies the F-16 Falcon.

They have been given the duty of working out the tactical reconnaissance mission in pods on F-16's, instead of taking over the whole aircraft of the F-101 Voodoo, the RA-5 Vigilante in Vietnam, or the RF-4 Phantom in Vietnam and all over the world, all over the world, right up through Desert Storm.

Now, instead of a dedicated reconnaissance fighter aircraft, we are going to have a pod and a mission where in every fighter squadron, or in handpicked squadrons, there will be a few aircraft capable of reconnaissance and fighting if they get in trouble and have to jettison the pod; quite an airplane, that single-engine single-seat single-tail F-16. I will be doing that.

Next weekend, depending on our votes, I am going up to Greenland to close the circle on trips that I have made to the North Pole with Admiral Mauz, another great four-star nuclear engineer who runs all the nuclear programs in the Navy. He took AL GORE and I up to the North Pole to go under the North Pole ice cap on the U.S.S. *Sea Horse*.

Navy officer Bart Roper, back seat radar intercept officer who is now the AA of the gentleman from Florida, JOE SCARBOROUGH, who was earlier doing a tribute to Admiral Boorda; Lt. Comdr. Bart Roper, now working as one of our allies on the Hill, he took me down to Antarctica. I flew with the greatest Navy pilots I have ever flown with in my life, old Huey helicopters, ski-equipped LC-130's. They call themselves the ice pirates. I have a great patch of theirs on one of my flight jackets.

I want to see how our Air Force operates at Greenland. I have wanted to do

that all my life, since when I had a young commander who said, "I am sending you to Thule, Greenland, Dornan, if you don't shape up." So I am going to go up there to see one of our young men and women up there who was on one of our key flights with one of our C-141 aircraft, the stretch B model that is aging.

This is what I did all the time as a regular back-bencher, a minority member activist, a ranking minority member, and now on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and chairman of Subcommittee on Military Personnel, I know what I am doing on this floor, Mr. Speaker, when I put forward an amendment not to have homosexuals in the military.

It won so big in full committee they did not even vote, and it won so big here Wednesday nobody would challenge me with a vote, but behind the scenes they are talking about dumping it in conference, in a secret star Chamber session, with Senators who either had never served or do not work their tail off the way I do visiting with the men and women in the field at all ranks, from sailors and boot camp young men going through paratrooper training in Benning or Special Forces senior heroic Delta Force master sergeants and first sergeants.

I visited the graves of our two Medal of Honor winners, Randy Shugart and Gary Gordon, Gary up in the land of his birth in Lincoln, ME, Shugart born in Lincoln, NE, but buried up in Carlisle, PA. I took my son Mark to both of their graves, so he could see what heroes were sent to their death by a stupid foreign policy in the filthy alleys of Mogadishu.

I only learned in the last few weeks that they held up the arms and legs of our men to show to the crowd. I saw pictures this week of young punks wearing the sunglasses of our aviators, or Durant's crew after they had murdered all of them. Durant, fortunately, came home. I met with him at Fort Knox. It is just amazing that people will ascribe to me motives for what I am doing without ever talking to a man or woman in uniform.

I called a smart-alecky reporter, David, and I will not mention his whole name, he writes for *Armed Forces Journal International*. He starts off and says, "Dornan is now a bad joke because he has done all the social stuff in the military." I got him on the phone, he was very respectful last night, I called him from an Intel secure phone, because we had a briefing going up there about the dangerous world we live in, and I said, "Where do you get off? Have you worn a uniform?" "No, I haven't. You have got me there."

"Where do you get off telling me that and ripping me up in the press?" I said, "I'm not bothered by the heat. I kind of like Harry Truman's line, take the heat or move on, but you don't follow me through the Pentagon, you don't go to the funeral with me at Arlington, where I got 5,000 people the Armed

Forces the Expeditionary Medal by myself; no help in the Senate, none, nobody."

They fought me. Senior four stars fought me in the Pentagon, but I was there to meet Colonel Pickett, whose son, Lieutenant Colonel Pickett, was executed with a bullet to the back of his head by the Communist FMLN, the Faribundo Marti, down in El Salvador. I met his grandson. I listened to them play taps standing on his grave at Arlington, the only one of our 21 men killed in a battle with communism, where we were not going to give them decorations for even showing up, just an Expeditionary Medal.

None of these reporters were with me. They do not know anything about the military, anyway. They do not know that my heart goes out to these thousand people who have been given a slow, long death sentence with a fatal venereal disease; no matter how they caught it, that is what it is, it is syphilis II, and it is fatal.

And they all know that they serve in the military, restricted in duty, not worldwide deployable, not deployable anywhere, never again to be trained. All their combat training, if they had it, has gone down the drain. One hundred thousand healthy men and women have been discharged, Mr. Speaker, and we politically protect a little group of 1,000, all because of the homosexual lobby trying to drive the agenda here.

□ 1930

Let me just tick off some items here. Item this month—World News Washington Post. Spread of AIDS in China Alarms the Chinese. The prediction here is identical to the prediction I brought to the floor 10 year ago about Bangkok, Thailand and the Indian cities, huge population centers along the Ganges, Delhi, Bombay, Calcutta and it has all happened in southern Asia, it has all happened in Thailand.

Look at this article here. None of the centers know anything about this but it is in the papers today.

In the L.A. Times today, Mr. Speaker:

"House Okays Defense Bill with Dornan Provisions." They say that I have renewed the ban on abortion. I did not renew anything. It is law. Clinton was forced to sign it on February 10. It is law. The other side brought it up. The same people who want us to have so-called partial birth execution style organized crime. I agree with some Italian-Americans who called me and said, "BOB, we love you, please don't use the word Mafia. It is an unfair word." It is organized crime. It is in every country. It is organized crime in Moscow and they call it Mafia. We ought to just call it organized crime unless it is Sicily where it is specifically Mafia. But this is ridiculous, what they write. I did not bring up the abortion issue. HIV, I am right. Homosexuals in the military. I am right. Then it says the bill would renew provisions contained in previous defense bills. No; it is law.

Then it says staffers for Senate Republicans who oppose inclusion of all these social agendas, the HIV ban, the homosexual ban, the ban on Hustler magazine on military bases, PX's, and commissaries.

It says those who oppose it said they gained assurances from the House GOP leadership that at least the AIDS provision would be eliminated. Oh, they are not so sure about going back to George Washington and Ronald Reagan and George Bush's homosexual ban.

None of my leaders better have done this. I went to all of their staffer here, my pal Mr. ARMEY's staff, my classmate from my comeback in 1984, TOM DELAY's staff, another member of the class of 1984. I said, did anybody talk to them, to the L.A. Times, to Norman Kempster and tell anyone?

Well, actually, it is the Senate staff saying this, not Members, staffers saying our leadership is going to dump on DORNAN. Well, I am a conferee this time. This is not like the appropriations bill where Republicans gutted out for the first time in 20 years that I know of, undid public law that was fair to men and women in the military. Listen to this. Here is why I am going to make my case in conference and take names. Nothing says we have to be secret in conference.

"African Armies Weakened by AIDS Virus." This is in the Stars and Stripes May 5. Weakened is hardly the word for it, Mr. Speaker. Zimbabwe, the Zimbabwean Army has been declared by the United Nations no longer acceptable for deployable duty. That means more duty for us. Do you know why? Three out of every four soldiers, officers, enlisted men, NCO's are infected with the AIDS virus. They are all going to die within the next few years. The former commander is dying of AIDS, the commander before him is dead of AIDS and he has the AIDS virus, the current commander, three out of four.

How about Kenya? Uganda? They are pushing 70 percent, or 6 out of every 10. How about Thailand, 3 or 4 out of every 10 soldiers in Thailand infected with the AIDS virus. When we test people coming to our command and staff schools, artillery schools, armor schools, if they test HIV positive, we send them home. The armies around the world are being ruined by the AIDS virus.

Am I not entitled to say I want my military mercifully with honorable discharges and the best medical treatment in the world hopefully, if people would work with me, the same doctors, the same 35 to \$40,000 a year spent on each of these 1,000 people that have it in the military, I am entitled to say, if it is micro-redeployability for other people, even though it is only a thousand, a percentage of a percentage point in the world where there are only 191 nations and less than 100 fit for U.N. duty, where they even have trained and disciplined military, every Nation that is X'ed off by the United

Nations, by Boutros Boutros-Ghali, it means U.S. men and women who will never be deployed with AIDS, the AIDS virus, they are out when they get AIDS, the HIV AIDS virus, that means more deployability for us on a macro level.

Look at this item. Column from last year by Jeffrey Hart. I just found it in my records. He writes about Michael Warner, this is a friend, Jeffrey Hart's column, an intelligent fellow who is HIV negative but a homosexual activist, he said, why gay men are having risky sex.

On the assumption that the Voice, a New York City weekly, is not part of your regular conservative reading list, I will give you a brief outline of Mr. Warner's startling article. Warner reports that among large numbers of homosexuals, the risk of death is now part of the emotional appeal of sex, as something experienced and shared, and that sex under the threat of death is, well, better sex.

More about that when I do my rebuttal to Mr. GUNDERSON next Wednesday.

Look at this, Mr. Speaker. Baby flushed down the toilet of a Northwest Airlines airplane. Flight 25. Did you read where they found a little baby strapped in its seat at the tragic Valujet crash of Flight 592?

Well, here is a little baby that was not killed in a crash on God's call but the mother on a plane from L.A. to Manila at the Japanese stop, a big Boeing 747 of Northwest Airlines, the police find a baby. It appeared to be 2 days old. Was it born on board? Was it carried on board dead or alive, then disposed of? Was it wrapped in the toilet paper before the flight even left L.A.? We just do not know. This is last Friday. Northwest is working with the legal authorities. Plane was filled with passengers, 349. Two hundred sixty-six of them left the plane. Then for hours they had to hold the other 83 passengers there and finally they let them go on to Manila. All of that because of a little baby a few hours or a couple of days old, one little baby, part of the umbilical cord was still attached. How is that baby any different than what people in this House, including 33 Democrats who have Catholic in their biographies, how is that any different from killing that little baby with its head held in the birth canal, distressing the mother, I do not know how that is supposed to help the mother, she is in a forced birth situation, and they take the little baby's brain out with suction equipment.

Here is an item, Mr. Speaker, "Vatican Calls Clinton Abortion Veto Brutal Act of Aggression." Here is the exact statement on April 19, the day I am out, that Admiral Boorda is speaking at Admiral Bulkeley's funeral, the same day, Patriot's Day in the United States. This in practice amounts to an incredibly brutal act of aggression against the preborn. The fact that this Presidential decision legalizes this inhuman procedure morally and ethically

imperils the future of the society that condones us. The Holy See completely supports the position taken by the cardinals of the United States and the National conference of Catholic Bishops.

Today, Mr. Speaker, in Lincoln, NE, that same town where Medal of Honor winner Randy Shugart was born 37 years ago, today several dozen Catholics were excommunicated for belonging to Planned Parenthood, a phony Playboy magazine group called Catholics for a Free Choice and several other groups, about a dozen groups. The bishop there is named Fabian Bruskwitz. The clerical holy gauntlet has been thrown down, Mr. Speaker.

I had hoped to come to the floor tonight to talk about happy things. Tom Tracy, a friend of mine, is a distinguished Irish-American leader. I have got his great tribute in front of me, how he has honored all Irish-Americans. I am going to save this for next week and do Tommy Tracy right.

I will close on this item, Mr. Speaker. Time magazine, April 29. My friend from Crossfire, Michael Kinsley, did dozens of shows with him. He says:

"Character is a tempting issue and theme for the Republicans. Part of the answer lies with the media. Skeptical scrutiny of Presidents, it seems, is on a permanent upward ratchet. This is a good thing by and large but it is rough on any incumbent President. Part of the answer lies with Clinton himself. Not that his moral failings are worse than other politicians." Whoa, Michael, do not put me in that pack.

"But his relative youth which is not his fault and his occasional callousness, which is his fault, deprive him of gravitas." My 4 years of Latin tells me that means heaviness, weight, seriousness. "The anonymous novel," which my wife is reading, "Primary Colors, is especially good on the way Clinton's bad qualities and good qualities are two sides of the same coin. His ability to deliver a moving speech on great occasions is related to his ability to talk utter baloney with seeming sincerity. Reagan was a great communicator. Clinton, his opponents say dismissively, is a masterly politician. What's the difference?"

Kinsley goes on. "His enormous hunger for approval is what has led him to chase voters and to chase women and his enormous capacity for empathy helps explain why he is apparently so good at both. The empathy is genuine and for all the mockery of 'I feel your pain,' for all the telling parallels between Clinton's political and personal promiscuity, it is his most valuable gift as a national leader."

And Congressman BOB DORNAN wrote in the margin, "Ugh."

We have got a tough time in this country. I have never seen so many important people dying in any administration and I am sure there is nothing related or conspiratorial about it but we have got a rough 173 days ahead of us to the next election.

EXCERPT FROM RECORD OF MAY 10, 1996

"Admiral Boorda, thank you for your very kind remarks. As our Chief of Naval Operations and as a personal friend of the Bulkeley family, we really appreciate your deep concern, your compassion, and personal kindness from all of us. Thank you again. For everyone, please sit back and relax and let me tell you a story about a very special man. Typical of the Admiral, he would want me to come to the point, so this is what he really wanted you to know. He had no regrets of his life, that he lives a long time, married the woman he loved, raised a family to be proud of, and served a Navy second to none."

Mr. Speaker, I pause here in Peter Bulkeley's opening eulogy to remind you and anyone listening to this Chamber proceeding that Ronald Reagan asked me to do things like this, that I may have my weird detractors who do not understand why I am concerned about the social decay of our country, why I want even defense publications like Armed Forces Journal International, or Roll Call, or the Hill, Marty, why I want you to pay attention to what Billy Graham said, poised on the edge of self-destruction. That is why I am doing this. I want people to hear these words about a real hero. Why no one showed up from this administration, unbelievably. The Army did send their No. 2 man, General Reimer's deputy.

I went to another tribute a few weeks later. It was not written up in the Hill or Armed Forces Journal International. It was not written up there. But I went to a ceremony at Arlington last Sunday where I was given some small piece of thank-you for getting 5,000 warriors—men and plenty of women—the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal for what they did in El Salvador. No Senators, no Congressmen except myself, nobody from the administration. As a matter of fact, the Senate and some strange blockage at the highest levels of the Pentagon did not want these 5,000 male and female warriors to get that medal. And now I have kicked open the door and we are going to get some Bronze Stars and some combat infantry badges and combat medical badges for these people. Nobody showed up there. A beautiful Sunday, playing taps from the grave of Army Colonel Pickett. I got to meet his dad, a retired Army Colonel Pickett.

How did Colonel Pickett die? On his knees with a Communist bullet from the FMLN shot into the back of his head, killed this young enlisted man lying wounded on the ground, the copilot Captain Dawson was already dead in the cockpit of their helicopter.

When did that take place? January 1991. Nobody noticed because a week later the air war of Desert Storm started.

I will close without any more interruptions, just sit back, as Peter Bulkeley says, and listen to this story of a man who was a legend, and when I told BUCK MCKEON of our House that I could not believe nobody was there, he said, "You mean he outlived his fame."

He said, "If Ron Brown had lived to be Admiral Bulkeley's age, in his eighties, would anybody have remembered him or his less than 4 years as Commerce Secretary?"

No, I guess if you die young, on the line, you get buildings named after you. But if God gives you a good long life and a beautiful family, only a few remember and show up to say goodbye.

Peter continues:

When I pressed dad on 'no regrets,' he sheepishly told me with a twinkle in his eye that that wasn't quite altogether true. And he finally said, I do have one regret, Pete. I should have gotten a bigger boat. A destroyer is not too bad, but he was the kind of

guy who could have handled a super carrier. So if you are contemplating a bigger boat, you know what to do.

I will not have in my lifetime a greater honor than today as an officer in our Navy and as his son, because I get to talk about my dad. Admiral Boorda, Admiral Larson, Superintendent at Annapolis, Admiral Trost, General Dubia, the number two man in the Army, General Blott, Assistant Secretary Perry, Assistant Secretary, Medal of Honor recipients, two of them from Army, Vietnam, another cause for freedom that Reagan and I both believed in, and so did Admiral Bulkeley, representatives of the Senate, none were there, and the House, one, members of the diplomatic corps, a couple, allied representatives from France, they were there, Philippines, Great Britain, members of our armed forces, all of them in uniform, friends from Hacketstown, New Jersey, and around the globe, all of those who served and knew Admiral John Bulkeley, and most especially my mom, my sisters, Joan, Rigina and Diana and their husbands, my brother at the organ, beautiful, my wife, all eight of the Admiral's grandchildren, we have come together to honor a great man, a patriot, a legend, a hero in the truest sense. A husband, a father, a friend; a simple man that did his duty as God gave him the ability to do, and the man that tried to keep a low profile, but somehow always ended up in the limelight of life.

Admiral John Bulkeley is a legend. He devoted his entire life to his country and to his Navy. Six decades of his life were spent in the active defense of America. Even after retirement in 1988, he remained engaged in the direction of our Navy and our country. He represented the Navy and the veterans at Normandy during the D-Day celebrations, laying wreaths and flowers of his and our fallen comrades. He provided running parallel to Utah Beach, and picking up wounded soldiers from the sinking minesweeper Tide and the Destroyer Cory.

His World War II exploits would not be complete without the mention of his love for destroyers, of which he would command many in his years to come. As Normandy operations wound up, he got his first large ship, the Destroyer Endicott, a month after D-Day. I told this story about the British gunboats, the two German Corvettes charging in as dawn's light broke. I told that story. I want to use every minute here. Peter tells it better than I did.

When I asked about dad about that action, he said "What else could I do but engage? You fight, you win. That is the reputation of our Navy, then, now, and in the future. You fight, you win."

[From Catholic News Service]

VATICAN CALLS CLINTON ABORTION VETO
"BRUTAL ACT OF AGGRESSION"

(By Cindy Wooden)

President Bill Clinton's veto of the bill banning partial-birth abortions "in practice amounts to an incredibly brutal act of aggression" against the unborn, the Vatican said.

"The fact that this presidential decision legalizes this inhuman procedure morally and ethically imperils the future of a society that condones, it," said Vatican spokesman Joaquin Navarro-Valls.

In its April 19 edition, the Vatican newspaper printed an Italian translation of the April 16 letter written by eight U.S. cardinals and the president of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops condemning Clinton's veto of the bill.

"The Holy See completely supports the position taken by the cardinals of the United States and the National Conference of Catholic Bishops," Navarro-Valls said April 19.

"As has already been stated by the American cardinals, this presidential decision is 'more akin to infanticide than to abortion,' and thus it is not surprising that 65 percent of those who call themselves 'pro-choice' are opposed to partial-birth abortions," he said.

Navarro-Valls explained to reporters at the Vatican that the bill vetoed by Clinton would have banned a procedure used in late-term abortions. The spokesman, who is a medical doctor, said the procedure involves the partial delivery of the fetus before surgical scissors are stabbed into the base of its head. The brains are removed by suction, allowing for easier delivery of the rest of the fetus.

Clinton's decision to veto the bill passed by Congress is "shameful," the spokesman said, and "in practice, amounts to an incredibly brutal act of aggression against innocent human life and the inalienable right of the unborn."

Naturally, this situation makes even more urgent a greater solidarity in defense of the life of the unborn who cannot speak for themselves," he said.

Navarro-Valls said the fact that the United States will hold a presidential election in November played no part in the Vatican's decision to comment on Clinton's veto.

"The Holy See cannot say nothing," he said. "This is an ethical and moral problem which is very clear and very serious."

The same day the Vatican issued a statement condemning the Israeli bombing of a refugee camp in Lebanon, killing many civilians, he said. "We must also say something about this attack on defenseless, unborn babies."

Raymond L. Flynn, the U.S. ambassador to the Vatican, said he was informed April 18 "of the Holy See's disappointment with the president's veto."

[From Time, Apr. 29, 1996]

EVERYBODY DOES IT

(By Michael Kinsley)

In every presidential election from 1968 through 1988, the Democrats nominated a goody-goody (Hubert Humphrey, George McGovern, Jimmy Carter, Walter Mondale, Michael Dukakis). And they lost every election during those two decades except in 1976, when the Republicans also nominated a goody-goody (Gerald Ford). In 1992 the Democrats finally got—well, you might say cynical or you might say serious. They decided they wanted to win this time. So they nominated a man who is no one's idea of a goody-goody. They nominated a slippery politician. Not coincidentally, he is also a morally flawed character with personal and (perhaps) financial peccadilloes.

Bill Clinton had not been President more than five minutes before many Democrats began reacting in horror to the realization that their man was not a plaster saint. Many Republicans, meanwhile, seemed resentful that the Democrats had stolen the election through the devious device of nominating someone who knew how to win.

It is pretty clear now that even if Clinton is re-elected, he is destined never to enjoy a period, as even Richard Nixon did, of genuine and heartfelt popularity while in office. The best he can probably hope for is a couple of weeks of golden-glow nostalgia when he leaves office in 2001 and a historical reevaluation some decades down the road. It is fortunate for Clinton that our voting system doesn't measure intensity of feelings, because his opponents dislike him with a seething passion while his supporters can rarely muster more than grudging acquiescence.

But why is that? Is Clinton's opportunistic floppery on, say, balancing the budget any more egregious than Bob Dole's on, say,

abortion? Ronald Reagan's California business chums bought him a house while he was President, to barely a peep of protest; yet we are in our fourth year of pawing through the much smaller financial favors Clinton's Arkansas business chums tried to do him 14 years ago when he was Governor.

Yes, of course, repeat after your mother: "Everybody does it" is no excuse." But why is Clinton's "character" such a liability to him, when by any reasonable reckoning his professional and personal failings average out to a level of moral compromise so typical among Presidents and presidential candidates that it almost amounts to a job qualification?

Part of the answer lies in Republican strategy. With not much cooking on the foreign front, and with the economic issues that usually decide elections divisible into those that look pretty good right now (growth, unemployment, inflation, the deficit) and those for which the Republicans have nothing much to suggest (wage stagnation, middle-class angst), "character" is naturally a tempting theme. Part of the answer lies with the media. Skeptical scrutiny of Presidents, it seems, is on a permanent upward ratchet. This is a good thing, by and large, but rough on the incumbent. And part of the answer lies with Clinton himself. Not that his moral failings are worse than other politicians'. But his relative youth (which is not his fault) and his occasional callousness (which is) deprive him of gravitas.

The anonymous novel *Primary Colors* is especially good on the way Clinton's bad qualities and good qualities are two sides of the same coin. His ability to deliver a moving speech on great occasions is related to his ability to talk utter baloney with seeming sincerity. (Reagan was a "great communicator." Clinton, his opponents say dismissively, is a "masterly politician." What's the difference?) His enormous hunger for approval is what has led him to chase voters and to chase women, and his enormous capacity for empathy helps explain why he is apparently so good at both. The empathy is genuine. And—for all the mockery of "I feel your pain," for all the telling parallels between Clinton's political and personal "promiscuity"—it is his most valuable gift as a national leader.

It is hard to turn this point into a useful campaign slogan. "Vote for Clinton. He's Not So Bad." "Re-elect the President. He's No Worse Than All the Others." Or "Bill Clinton: You Can't Have the French Fries Without the Grease." I don't recommend this theme to the Democratic National Committee. But it is pretty close to the truth.

As a Clinton supporter of moderate but steady enthusiasm, I've been bewildered by those liberals who've veered from wild ardor in 1992 to foaming dislike in the years since. The intense hatred Clinton evokes among conservatives is less puzzling but still a bit strange. Not since F.D.R., probably, has a Democratic President inspired such emotions in his opponents. But the F.D.R. comparison merely adds to the puzzle, since Clinton's agenda is far more modest and less ideologically charged.

Maybe an explanation lies in that old joke about academia, where, it is said, "the disputes are so vicious because the stakes are so small." The differences between Bill Clinton's agenda and Bob Dole's agenda are negligible in comparison with our political culture's huge need for rhetoric and disagreement between now and November. That means it's probably going to be an especially vicious campaign.

[From the Stars and Stripes, May 5, 1996]

AFRICAN ARMIES WEAKENED BY AIDS VIRUS

MANGOCHI, MALAWI.—In some African armies, half of the soldiers are infected with

the virus which causes AIDS, a conference on the disease was told 24 April.

On a continent plagued by Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS), the military faces extra risks and in some countries like Congo, the United Nations estimates every second soldier is infected with the HIV virus that causes the disease.

"Prevalence rates in many armies of the developing world, especially in Africa, are exceptionally high," Malawian Defense Minister Justin Malewezi told an AIDS conference for high-ranking military officers from 13 South and East African countries.

He said highly trained army and air force officers seemed to be particularly at risk and that countries might find it hard to train enough men to replace them.

"When the military is weakened, so too is the security of the country it is intended to defend," Malewezi said, opening the three-day meeting in the northern town of Mangochi.

Many countries in the region estimate up to a tenth of the population is infected with human immuno-deficiency virus (HIV).

The World Health Organization director for Africa, Ebrahim Samba, said soldiers were a high-risk group because they were young, mainly between the ages of 15 and 24, sexually active and away from home for long stretches at a time.

"They are often in search of recreation to relieve stress and loneliness," he said in a message read to the meeting.

"They feel vulnerable in a profession which excuses or encourages risk-taking. Off-duty soldiers can be counted on to have money, but not necessarily condoms, in their pockets."

Samba said soldiers often paid prostitutes for sex or slept with women from the local community wherever they were based or deployed. Drug pushers also preyed on the military.

Stuart Kingma, a UN adviser on AIDS in the military, said Zimbabwe's army had an HIV infection rate three to four times higher than that in the civilian population.

One in two of the nearly 20 million people infected with the virus worldwide were in sub-Saharan Africa, he said.

Kingma listed Congo, Uganda, Gabon, Kenya and Zimbabwe as African countries where the situation in the military was particularly bad.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SKEEN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this evening I rise to address the Equal Opportunity Act, legislation which Senator DOLE and I introduced on July 27 of last year.

This legislation will, if enacted, end the use of race and gender preferences by the Federal Government in Federal employment, Federal contracting, and in the administration of other Federal programs.

The principles of equal treatment and nondiscrimination on which this legislation is based are principles which are at the heart of the American experience. They embody an ideal which generations of Americans have honored and sought to realize, an ideal to which we as a people have long as-

pired but an ideal which we have never fully attained in our life as a Nation.

On Saturday of this week, May 18, we will mark the 100th anniversary of the Supreme Court's decision in Plessy versus Ferguson, the decision which represents the culmination of disappointment in the struggle for equality before the law during the 19th century.

In Plessy by a 7-1 majority, the Supreme Court of the United States held that Louisiana's law requiring railroads to provide racially separate accommodations did not violate either the 13th or the 14 amendments. Justice Henry Billings Brown, in delivery the court's opinion, explained the difference between a distinction based on race and prohibited discrimination.

He said as follows:

A statute which implies merely a legal distinction between the white and colored races has no tendency to destroy the legal equality of the two races or to reestablish a state of involuntary servitude.

Brown went on to observe that in the nature of things, the 14th Amendment could not have been intended to abolish distinctions based upon color. According to Brown, the 14th Amendment challenged in Plessy reduces itself to the question of whether the statute of Louisiana is a reasonable regulation.

Brown then concluded:

We cannot say that a law which authorizes or even requires the separation of the races is unreasonable.

This is a shameful decision. And although the segregationist doctrine embodied in Plessy has been rejected by the courts most strikingly in Brown versus Board of Education, the case itself has never been directly overruled. Indeed, the core holding of Plessy that Government may make distinctions in the treatment of its citizens based on their race remains the law of our land.

Justice Harlan's dissent in Plessy, which, is recognized as the most famous dissent in the history of American jurisprudence, has been vindicated by history but the principles so eloquently articulated in that dissent has not finally been accepted by the courts. In words that would often be cited by those seeking to overthrow the Jim Crow system, Justice Harlan pronounced:

Our Constitution is colorblind. The law regards man as man and takes no account of his surroundings or of his color when his civil rights, as guaranteed by the supreme law of the land, are involved.

Harlan found a Louisiana statute unconstitutional because the Constitution of the United States does not permit any public authority to know the race of those entitled to be protected in the enjoyment of their civil rights.

Simply put, Government may not have regard to the race of its citizens when the civil rights of those citizens are involved.

The color-blind ideal was the touchstone of the American civil rights movement until the mid 1960's. In 1947, Thurgood Marshall, representing the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational

Fund in a brief for a black student denied admission to the segregated University of Oklahoma Law School, stated that principle unequivocally. Classifications and distinctions based on race or color have no moral or legal validity in our society. They are contrary to our Constitution and laws.

□ 1945

Marshall's support for the color-blind principle, which he later, unfortunately, abandoned, is vividly revealed by Constance Baker Motley, senior United States district judge for the southern district of New York, in an account included in Tinsley Yarbrough's biography of Justice Harlan. Judge Motley recalled her days working with Marshall at the NAACP as follows:

Marshall had a Bible, to which he turned during his most depressed moments. Marshall would read aloud passages from Harlan's amazing dissent. I do not believe we ever filed a major brief in the pre-Brown days in which a portion of that opinion was not quoted. Marshall's favorite quotation was our Constitution is color-blind. It became our basic creed.

Marshall admired the courage of Harlan more than any justice who had ever sat on the Supreme Court. Even Chief Justice Earl Warren's forthright and moving decision for the court in Brown did not affect Marshall in the same way. Earl Warren was writing for a unanimous Supreme Court. Harlan was a solitary and lonely figure writing for posterity.

In the face of the vociferous opposition to the Equal Opportunity Act, and any other proposal to end the use of preferences, we would do well to remember the long battle that was fought to establish a legal order based on the principles set forth in justice Harlan's dissent.

Professor Andrew Carl, in his admirable history "The Color Blind Constitution," identifies the centrality of the color-blind principle to the civil rights movement. Professor Carl says as follows:

The undeniable fact is that over a period of some 125 years, ending only in the late 1960s, the American civil rights movement first elaborated then held as its unvarying political objective a rule of law requiring the color-blind treatment of individuals.

In 1964, the U.S. Congress took a great stride forward toward the realization of that objective. With the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Congress established a national policy against discrimination based on race and sex.

It is the supreme irony of the modern civil rights movement that this crowning achievement was so soon followed by the creation of a system of preferences based on race and gender, a system contrived first by administrative agencies and the Federal courts and then accepted and expanded by the Congress.

The 1964 Civil Rights Act constituted an unequivocal statement that Americans should be treated as individuals

and not as members of racial or gender groups; an unequivocal statement that no American should be subject to discrimination, which Senator Hubert Humphrey, the chief sponsor in the Senate of this legislation, defined as a distinction in treatment given to different individuals because of their difference race.

Yet the ink was hardly dry on the 1964 law when a process of transformation began and the system of preferences was erected piece by piece. This took place not because Congress had failed to express its intention clearly, but because of a court system and an administrative structure determined to pursue their own purposes despite the clearly expressed purpose of the Congress.

Since the issue of imposing quotas and granting preferences based on race to compensate for historical wrongs had been the subject of controversy during the year preceding congressional consideration of the 1964 act, Congress was careful to directly address the issue in the text of the law itself.

Section 703(j) of the act stated that nothing in Title VII of the act shall be interpreted to require any employer to grant preferential treatment to any individual or to any group because of the race of such individual or group in order to maintain a racial balance.

The managers of Title VII, Senator Clark of Pennsylvania, and Senator Case of New Jersey had submitted a joint memorandum on the subject where they stated, and I quote:

Any deliberate attempt to maintain a racial balance, whatever such a balance may be, would involve a violation of Title VII because maintaining such a balance would require an employer to hire or refuse to hire on the basis of race. It must be emphasized that discrimination is prohibited to any individual.

It is, I think, impossible to imagine a clearer more unambiguous statement of congressional intent on the subject of racial preferences. But in the face of this directly expressed purpose in the law, the bureaucracy and the courts decided to chart their own course. In the place of the principles of individual rights, equal opportunity and non-discrimination, which were embodied in the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the courts and the bureaucracy moved forward with the establishment of a system based on the concepts of proportional representation, group entitlement, and guaranteed results. This approach was foreshadowed by Judge John Miner Wisdom of the fifth circuit in *United States versus Jefferson County*, where he upheld school desegregation guidelines promulgated by the Office of Education under Title VI of the 1964 act and stated, and again I quote.

The Constitution, according to Judge Wisdom, is both color-blind and color conscious. The criterion is the relevancy of color to a legitimate governmental purpose.

This is, indeed, a far cry from the clear principles articulated by Justice

Harlan and doggedly pursued by the civil rights movement throughout most of its history.

The concepts of proportional representation, group entitlement and guaranteed results found full-blown expression in the Nixon administration's Labor Department order No. 4, which was first issued in November of 1969 and was aimed at the activities of all Federal contractors.

The order stated the rate of minority applicants recruited should approximate or equal the rate of minorities to the applicant population in each location.

This was clearly a mandate for proportional representation. A more direct conflict with the provision of 703(j) of the 1964 Civil Rights Act would be impossible to devise.

After a minor flack over order number 4, a revised order was issued by the Labor Department in February 1970. No substantive changes were made. The revised order number 4 provided that the affirmative action programs adopted by contractors must include goals and timetable to which the contractor's good faith efforts must be directed to correct deficiencies in the utilization of minority groups.

This construct of goals and timetables to ensure the proper utilization of minority groups clearly envisioned a system of proportional representation in which group identity would be a factor, often the decisive factor, in hiring decisions. Distinctions in treatment would be made on the basis of race.

The concept of proportional representation embodied in order number 4 not only defied the intent of section 703(j) of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, but also contravened the express non-discrimination provisions of the Executive Order it was issued to implement. That is the Executive Order requiring affirmative action.

The course was set by the bureaucracy and the courts did little to interfere. With few exceptions, until the Supreme Court decided the *Adarand* case last year, the color-blind ideal was an eclipse. Year after year the system of preferences granted or imposed by the Federal Government grew with the active support of the Congress itself.

The dominant attitude was captured in 1978 in the opinion of Justice Blackmun in the *Bakke* case, which dealt with a California medical school's policy of preferential admissions for minority students. Justice Blackmun distilled the rationale for preferential policies. He said, and I quote, "in order to get beyond racism, we must first take account of race. In order to treat some persons equally, we must treat them differently."

In the face of the provision of title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, that no person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color or national origin be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal fi-

nancial assistance, the closely divided court in *Bakke* recognized that race could at least be a factor in determining eligibility for admission to an educational institution receiving Federal financial assistance.

The system of preferences is based on the notion that we can only overcome our history of discrimination by practicing discrimination. To guarantee the equitable apportionment of opportunities, Americans must be divided, sorted and classified by race and gender. It is the responsibility of government not to create a level playing field for all Americans, but to determine outcomes based on race and gender. Rather than dealing with its citizens as unique individuals who are equal in the eyes of the law, the Government of the United States must treat everyone as group members, as people whose biological characteristics determine the scope of their claims on our government.

The Equal Opportunity Act rejects this vision of America. It would overturn the status quo of race and gender preferences and return to the principles on which the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was based. In place of group rights, it would establish respect for individual rights.

It is very important to focus on the specific provisions of the Equal Opportunity Act. Simply stated this legislation would prohibit the Federal Government from intentionally discriminating against or granting a preference to any person or group based in whole or in part on race, color, national origin or sex in three areas: Federal contracting, Federal employment, and the administration of other federally conducted programs or activities.

In addition, it would prevent the Federal Government from requiring or encouraging Federal contractors or the recipients of Federal financial assistance to discriminate or grant preferences based on race or sex.

Let me elaborate on a few key points. First, the bill applies only to Federal programs and activities. It, therefore, does not affect programs or policies administered by State and local governments, the private sector, or colleges and universities.

Second, the Equal Opportunity Act does not affect our comprehensive regime of anti-discrimination laws. All forms of racial and sex-based discrimination that are illegal under current law would remain so under the Equal Opportunity Act.

In addition, all remedies currently available to individuals who have been discriminated against will remain completely unaffected by this bill. Though you will hear claims to the contrary, it is simply not the case that this bill weakens, undermines or otherwise affects laws that make it illegal to discriminate on the basis of race and sex.

Third, the bill draws an important distinction between preferential treatment and affirmative action. Preferential treatment is prohibited and affirmative action, as originally conceived, is permitted and expressly protected.

I think we all recognize that the term affirmative action has come to describe a whole range of measures, from casting a wider net at the recruiting and outreach stage to outright quotas, set-asides and other numerical preferences.

Section 3 of the Equal Opportunity Act expressly provides that the government may continue affirmative action in the form of vigorous outreach and recruitment efforts. Steps taken to increase the size of the applicant pool for a contracting or employment opportunity, including steps targeted specifically at women and minorities, are permissible so long as at the decision stage all applicants are judged in a nondiscriminatory manner; that is, without regard to their race or sex.

If the bill does not affect anti-discrimination laws or nonpreferential forms of affirmative action, then what does it do? It would, in short, put an end to all Federal programs that will require the Government to take into account the race or sex of American citizens and to treat them differently based on what group they belong to.

There is frustrating unwillingness on the part of many people to acknowledge what we all know; namely that there are many, many such programs and policies currently being administered by the Federal Government: Contracting set-asides and bid preferences, grant programs targeted solely at women and minorities, and hiring and personnel systems that are driven by numerical goals and timetables. These are all preference programs that, on their face, discriminate on the basis of race and sex, and these are the programs that would be eliminated under the Equal Opportunity Act.

□ 2000

The heart of the Equal Opportunity Act is found in its definition of preference. The bill as recently passed by the Subcommittee on the Constitution defines the term preference as an advantage of any kind, including a quota, set-aside, numerical goal, timetable, or other numerical objective. This functional definition makes clear that it is not what we call a policy, a practice, or a program that determines its appropriateness.

The test is how that policy, practice, or program actually operates. If the policy, practice, or program gives an advantage of any kind to individuals because of their race or gender, it is unlawful. Those who oppose the Equal Opportunity Act have the burden of explaining why anyone should receive an advantage of any kind based on race or gender.

The supporters of preferences realize that this burden is indeed a heavy one.

They understand that the American people are opposed to the system of preferential treatment that has been erected over the years since 1964. They know the power of the principles of equal treatment and nondiscrimination. They know that Americans have an instinctive respect for individual rights.

The defenders of the status quo of preferential treatment have chosen not to meet this challenge. They have decided that a principled defense of group rights and proportional representation would not be successful, since it is so clearly at odds with values that are central to the American experience. So rather than attempting such a principle defense of preferences, they have launched a campaign of confusion and distortion.

Mr. Speaker, the recent barrage against the Equal Opportunity Act is just the most recent phase of the long-standing effort to conceal the realities of the preferential system from the American people. I can cite many examples of the distortions used to defend the status quo and to attack the Equal Opportunity Act. But the remarks delivered by President Clinton at the National Archives on July 19, 1995, the President's famous "mend it, don't end it" speech, stands as the epitome of distortions in defense of the status quo of preferences.

The President's speech is indeed a handy compendium of the rhetorical devices used to obscure the issues and to mislead the American people. The core of the President's speech is found in the four so-called standards of fairness for affirmative action programs. The President summarized these standards as follows, and I quote:

No quotas in theory or practice, no illegal discrimination of any kind, including reverse discrimination, no preference for people who are not qualified for any job or other opportunity.

And as soon as the program has succeeded, it must be retired. Any program that does not meet these four principles must be eliminated or reformed to meet them.

This statement by the President represents an attempt to redescribe and redefine reality. In it, words are stripped of their ordinary, commonly understood meaning and infused with a new meaning. When the President says he is against quotas, he signals his recognition that the American people are against quotas, and that some other terminology must be used to describe the system of preferences based on race and gender, a system which apportions benefits based on group membership. But when the President denounces quotas, he fails to explain how a quota is different from a set-aside under which contract opportunities are reserved for members of a particular race or gender group. And he does not explain how a system of goals and timetables under which race and gender determine who receives a job and who does not receive a job, is any less un-

just than a system of quotas under which race and gender determine who receives a job and who does not receive a job.

When the President says no preferences for the unqualified, he conveniently glosses over the fact that individuals who are more qualified are systematically denied jobs and other opportunities solely because they belong to the wrong racial or gender group.

When the President says that, as soon as a program has succeeded, it must be retired, he fails to specify the standard of success and he fails to tell us when exactly when we can expect these supposedly temporary programs to end.

When the President says we should have no illegal discrimination of any kind, he fails to explain how the system of counting by race and gender can be reconciled with either the letter or the spirit of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The President and the other defenders of preferential policies have constructed a fictitious world, a world where discrimination pure and simple is given another name and called just.

The Equal Opportunity Act rejects that fictitious world. It rejects the false descriptions of the programs, policies and practices of the Federal Government which have been foisted on the American people by the defenders of the status quo. The Equal Opportunity Act is based on an understanding of the flaws of the system of preferences based on race and gender. It is based on a realistic evaluation of the way that system operates and the injustice for which it is responsible.

It recognizes that the system of preferences unfairly places burdens on and denies opportunities to those who have been guilty of no wrongdoing. Simply because of their race or gender, while granting benefits to individuals who are not victims of discriminatory conduct, it recognizes that the system of preferences is by its very nature discriminatory and morally wrong.

The Equal Opportunity Act is based on an understanding that the existence of the system of race and gender preferences unfairly casts a cloud over the accomplishments of individuals who are members of favored groups and deprives those individuals, the individuals the system is supposed to benefit, of the full measure of respect they are due for their individual achievements.

Mr. Speaker, finally, and most importantly, the Equal Opportunity Act is based on the recognition that the system of race and gender preferences sends a message from government to the American people that we should think along racial and gender lines, a message which only reinforces prejudice and discrimination in our society.

As long as the Federal Government is engaged in the business of classifying and sorting the American people into racial and gender groups, can we really expect to reach the goal of a society free of prejudice and discrimination? It has been 100 years since Justice Harlan

spoke so eloquently of the color-blind Constitution. Since that time, we have made much progress in reducing prejudice and discrimination in America. But we are far, far from the goal of a society in which individuals are treated as individuals and where irrelevant biological characteristics are treated as irrelevant.

As we mark the 100th anniversary of the shameful Plessy decision, we should turn our attention again to the principles so forcefully stated by Justice Harlan in his renowned dissent. Those principles find expression here in this Congress in the Equal Opportunity Act.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we reaffirm the principles of equality before the law and nondiscrimination. We can do so clearly and unequivocally by passing the Equal Opportunity Act and ending the odious system of race and gender preferences established by the Federal Government. We can recognize once and for all that each American has the right to be treated by our government, not as a member of a particular race or gender group, but as an individual American citizen, equal in the eyes of the law.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MANZULLO (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today after 3 p.m., on account of a family emergency.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ABERCOMBIE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RICHARDSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WELDON of Florida) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WELDON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DICKEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCINTOSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, on May 21.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ABERCROMBIE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BORSKI.

Ms. PELOSI.

Mr. MENENDEZ.

Mr. MORAN.

Mr. SERRANO.

Mr. VENTO.

Mr. BONIOR.

Mr. TORRES in two instances.

Mr. KANJORSKI.

Mr. BARCIA in two instances.

Ms. DELAURO.

Mr. STOKES.

Mrs. MALONEY in three instances.

Mr. CLYBURN in two instances.

Mr. TOWNS in three instances.

Mr. VISLOSKY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD in three instances.

Mr. GORDON in 10 instances.

Mr. KLECZKA.

Mr. FAZIO of California in two instances.

Mrs. THURMAN.

Ms. HARMAN.

Ms. WOOLSEY.

Mr. LANTOS.

Ms. SLAUGHTER.

Mr. WARD.

Ms. NORTON.

Mr. COLEMAN.

Ms. ESHOO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WELDON of Florida) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. QUINN.

Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. GREENWOOD.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

Mr. LAZIO of New York.

Mr. DORNAN.

Mr. GEKAS.

Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. WALSH.

Mr. LAHOOD.

Mr. HORN.

Mr. SHUSTER.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

Mr. THOMAS.

Mr. NETHERCUTT.

Mrs. KELLY.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CANADY of Florida) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

Mr. SHAW.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

Ms. WOOLSEY.

Mr. STEARNS.

Mr. CONDIT.

Mr. MCDADE.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1836. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire property in the town of East Hampton, Suffolk County, New York, for inclusion in the Amagansett National Wildlife Refuge; and

H.R. 1743. An act to amend the Water Resources Act of 1984 to extend the authorizations of appropriations through fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 20, 1996, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3036. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—RUS Specification for Aerial Service Wires (7 CFR Part 1755.700-.704) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3037. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the fiscal year 1997 appropriations requests for the Department of Agriculture [USDA], pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1106(b) (H. Doc. No. 104-215); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3038. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Secretary's selected acquisition reports [SAR's] for the quarter ending March 31, 1996, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2432; to the Committee on National Security.

3039. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Cargo Preference: Available U.S.-Flag Commercial Vessels (RIN: 2133-AB25) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on National Security.

3040. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Employment Standards, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Workers Protection Act (RIN: 1215-AA93) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

3041. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Implementation of Section 273(d)(5) of the Communications Act of 1934, as Amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996—Dispute Resolution Regarding Equipment Standards [GC Docket No. 96-42] received May 14, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3042. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of the Amateur Service Rules to Implement a Vanity Call Sign System [PR Docket No. 93-305] received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3043. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Trade Regulation Rule on Misbranding and Deception as to Leather Content of Waist Belts (16 CFR Part 405) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3044. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting an update to the PLO Commitments Compliance Act report on March 1, 1996, pursuant to Public Law 104-107, section 604(b)(1) (110 Stat. 756); to the Committee on International Relations.

3045. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and Bosnian Serb-Controlled Areas of the Republic of

Bosnia and Herzegovina Sanctions Regulations: Suspension of Sanctions Against the Bosnian Serbs (31 CFR Part 585) received May 10, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

3046. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Employment Standards, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Affirmative Action Obligations of Contractors and Subcontractors For Disabled Veterans and Veterans of the Vietnam Era; Invitation to Self-Identify; Interim Rule with Request for Comments (RIN: 1251-AA62) received May 15, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3047. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Employment Standards, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Affirmative Action and Nondiscrimination Obligations of Contractors and Subcontractors Regarding Individuals with Disabilities (RIN: 1215-AA76) received May 15, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3048. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Flaring or Venting Gas and Burning Liquid Hydrocarbons (Minerals Management Service) (RIN: 1010-AB96) received May 15, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3049. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp (Federal Duck Stamp) Contest (Fish and Wildlife Service) (RIN: 1018-AD71) received May 15, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3050. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Designation of Critical Habitat for the Marbled Murrelet (Fish and Wildlife Service) (RIN: 1018-AC33) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3051. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting the Attorney General's report entitled "Report on Federal Recordkeeping Relating to Domestic Violence," pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 14015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3052. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting the Attorney General's report entitled "Domestic Violence, Stalking, and Antistalking Legislation," pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 14039; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3053. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting the Attorney General's report entitled "The Violence Against Women Act of 1994: Evaluation of the STOP Block Grants to Combat Violence Against Women," pursuant to section 40291 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3054. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the Department's 1995 annual report on the recommendations received from the National Transportation Board regarding transportation safety, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. app. 1906(b); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3055. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; The New Piper Aircraft, Inc. PA31, PA31P, and PA31T Series Airplanes; (Docket No. 9-CE-62-AD) (RIN: 2120-AA64)

received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3056. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; The New Piper Aircraft, Inc. Models PA31, PA31-300, PA31-325, and PA31-350 Airplanes (Docket No. 90-CE-63-AD) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3057. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus A320-111, -211, -212, and -231 Series Airplanes (Docket No. 95-NM-198-AD) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3058. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9 and DC-9-80 Series Airplanes, Model MD-88 Airplanes, and C-9 (Military) Series Airplanes (Docket No. 94-NM-92-AD) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3059. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD-11 Series Airplanes (Docket No. 95-NM-191-AD) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3060. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-10-10, -15, and -30 Series Airplanes and KC-10 (Military) Airplanes (Docket No. 95-NM-108-AD) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3061. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Aviat Aircraft Inc., Models S-1S, S-1T, S-2A, S-2S, and S-2B Airplanes (Docket No. 96-CE-20-AD) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3062. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; The New Piper Aircraft, Inc., Models PA31T, PA31T1, PA31T2, and PA31T3 Airplanes (Docket No. 90-CE-61-AD) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3063. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Capital Leases (RIN: 2132-AA55) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3064. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulation: Quonset Open House, North Kingston, RI (RIN: 2115-AE46) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3065. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Long Beach Harbor, CA (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3066. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Adoption of Industry Standards (RIN: 2115-AF09) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3067. A letter from the Under Secretary for Technology, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Agency Guidance for the Acquisition of Modular Metric Construction Products (RIN: 0693-XX18) received May 15, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

3068. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Notice 96-31—Received May 10, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3069. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, United States Customs Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Prohibited/Restricted Merchandise; Enforcement of Foreign Assets Control Regulations (RIN: 1515-AB91) received May 14, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3070. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Veterans Education: Increase in Rates Payable Under the Montgomery GI Bill—Active Duty, 1995-96 (RIN: 2900-AH79) received May 14, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly, to the Committees on National Security and Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of May 15, 1996]

Mr. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 3415. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 4.3-cent increase in the transportation motor fuels excise tax rates enacted by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 and dedicated to the general fund of the Treasury (Rept. 104-576, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker: The Committee on Commerce discharged from further consideration; H.R. 3415 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted May 16, 1996]

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2909. A bill to amend the Silvio O. Conte National Fish and Wildlife Refuge Act to provide that the Secretary of the Interior may acquire lands for purposes of that Act only by donation or exchange, or otherwise with the consent of the owner of the lands (Rept. 104-579). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 436. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3415) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 4.3-cent increase in the transportation motor fuels tax rates enacted by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 and dedicated to the general fund of the Treasury

(Rept. 104-580). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GOSS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 437. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3259) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-581). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 438. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3144) to establish a United States policy for the deployment of a national missile defense system, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-582). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on National Security. H.R. 3144. A bill to establish a United States policy for the deployment of a national missile defense system, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-583, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker: The Committee on International Relations discharged from further consideration; H.R. 3144 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

The Committee on National Security discharged from further consideration; H.R. 3259 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 3107. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than May 31, 1996.

H.R. 3144. Referral to the Committee on International Relations extended for a period ending not later than May 16, 1996.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma (for himself, Mr. TALENT, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. FLANAGAN, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. NORWOOD, Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. WELLER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HOKE, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. KING, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LINDER, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. WAMP, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. DELAY, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina):

H.R. 3467. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the designation of

renewal communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Economic and Educational Opportunities, Banking and Financial Services, and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GEKAS (for himself, Mr. PAS-TOR, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. HOBSON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BURR, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FORBES, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. BUYER, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. STEN-HOLM):

H.R. 3468. A bill to establish rules governing product liability actions against raw materials and bulk component suppliers to medical device manufacturers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BORSKI (for himself, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BREWSTER, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 3469. A bill to improve economic productivity and create thousands of jobs by establishing an infrastructure reinvestment fund which will provide immediate, upfront funding of intermodal surface transportation programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VENTO:

H.R. 3470. A bill to enhance the conservation and protection of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and the Voyageurs National Park; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 3471. A bill to authorize the Corps of Engineers to enter into a cooperative agreement with the State of New York to fund one or more projects for habitat restoration in the Hudson River Basin, NY; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. FATTAH):

H.R. 3472. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 to eliminate current Federal subsidies for alcoholic beverage promotions overseas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3473. A bill to establish advertising requirements for alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 3474. A bill to require health warnings to be included in alcoholic beverage advertisements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 3475. A bill to require an annual report by the Secretary of Health and Human Services on alcohol advertising practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 3476. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide incentives to colleges and universities to develop, implement, and improve alcohol abuse prevention and education programs on their campuses, to strengthen sanctions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3477. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to restrict employers in obtaining, disclosing, and using of genetic information; to the Committee on Economic and Education Opportunities.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. FATTAH):

H.R. 3478. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate tax deductions for advertising and goodwill expenditures relating to alcohol beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3479. A bill to carry out a comprehensive program dealing with alcohol and alcohol abuse; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Economic and Educational Opportunities, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAHOOD (for himself and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota):

H.R. 3480. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to ensure the ability of utility providers to establish, improve, operate, and maintain utility structures, facilities, and equipment for the benefit, safety, and well-being of consumers, by removing limitations on maximum driving and on-duty time pertaining to utility vehicle operators and drivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LIGHTFOOT (for himself, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BARR, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ISTOOK, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. COBURN, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. MICA, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. STEARNS):

H.R. 3481. A bill to repeal the minimum wage requirement of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 3482. A bill to protect the privacy of health information in the age of genetic and other new technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself (by request) and Mr. MICA):

H.R. 3483. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to enable Federal agencies to design personnel systems suited to their missions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself and Mr. WALKER):

H.R. 3484. A bill to authorize the Federal Aviation Administration's research, engineering, and development programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of

such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NETHERCUTT:

H.R. 3485. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct an adaptive forest management research program in Colville National Forest, WA, that will provide for a creditable, science-based approach to manage fire-generated, overstocked, small-diameter, stagnated forest stands for the purposes of improving forest health, providing wood fiber for manufacturing facilities in forest-dependent communities, and meeting current and future environmental needs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ORTON:

H.R. 3486. A bill to dispose of certain Federal properties at Dutch John, UT, assist local government in the interim delivery of basic services to the Dutch John community, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 3487. A bill to reauthorize the National Marine Sanctuaries Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 3488. A bill to prevent handgun violence and illegal commerce in handguns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPRATT (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. DICKS, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. REED):

H.R. 3489. A bill to protect the United States and its Armed Forces, wherever engaged, from ballistic missile attack, to state the policy and priorities of the United States for developing and deploying more effective defenses against ballistic missiles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on National Security, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TATE:

H.R. 3490. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to reform Federal prisons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.R. 3491. A bill to repeal the American Folklife Preservation Act; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. VOLKMER:

H.R. 3492. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to ensure the ability of utility providers to establish, improve, operate, and maintain utility structures, facilities, and equipment for benefit, safety, and well-being of consumers, by removing limitations on maximum driving and on-duty time pertaining to utility vehicle operators and drivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BAKER of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. HAYES, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania):

H. J. Res. 179. Joint resolution designating the Civil War Center at Louisiana State University as the U.S. Civil War Center, making the center the flagship institution for planning the sesquicentennial commemoration of the Civil War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. Con. Res. 179. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that Bud-

dhist monks and civilians and Roman Catholic monks and priests unlawfully detained by the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam should be released; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. SMITH of Washington:

H. Res. 439. Resolution amending the rule XLIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit a Member, officer, or employee of the House from soliciting, distributing, or accepting campaign contributions in the Hall of the House, rooms leading thereto, or the cloakrooms; to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 103: Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 127: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. FARR, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. ALLARD, and Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.
H.R. 820: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. WARD, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MARTINI, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. SKEEN.
H.R. 1005: Mrs. ROUKEMA.
H.R. 1386: Mr. CRANE, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. METCALF, and Mr. ENSIGN.
H.R. 1462: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BISHOP, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. COBURN, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. KASICH, and Mr. HILLIARD.
H.R. 1618: Mr. JONES and Mr. HOKE.
H.R. 1711: Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 1733: Mr. COOLEY.
H.R. 1776: Mr. VENTO, Mr. CAMP, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. TORRES, Mr. BUYER, Mr. FRISA, Mr. BONO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. HAYWORTH.
H.R. 1791: Mr. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1797: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. OWENS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, and Mr. MANTON.
H.R. 2143: Mr. GALLEGLY.
H.R. 2237: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. KLUG, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. TORRES, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. FLAKE.
H.R. 2338: Mr. DINGELL.
H.R. 2342: Mr. TAUZIN.
H.R. 2510: Mr. FUNDERBURK.
H.R. 2530: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.
H.R. 2682: Mr. WELLER.
H.R. 2749: Mr. EMERSON.
H.R. 2757: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. DICKS.
H.R. 2807: Mr. BARR and Mrs. ROUKEMA.
H.R. 2911: Mr. PETRI, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and Mr. NEY.
H.R. 2991: Mr. DURBIN.
H.R. 3065: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 3067: Mr. WAXMAN and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 3083: Mr. EMERSON and Mr. FIELDS of Texas.
H.R. 3107: Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. COBURN, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. CAMP, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LAZIO of New York, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. TATE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. FARR, Mr. LINDER, Mr. NEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. WAX-

MAN, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3114: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. LEACH, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. KLECZKA, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 3119: Mr. RAHALL and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 3182: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. KLUG, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 3199: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Ms. PRYCE, and Ms. MCCARTHY.

H.R. 3226: Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FLAKE, and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 3265: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 3267: Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 3293: Mr. PORTER, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 3296: Mr. THORNBERRY and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 3337: Mr. SABO.

H.R. 3367: Mr. FLAKE.

H.R. 3391: Mr. CAMP and Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 3392: Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. STARK, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. RIVERS.

H.R. 3393: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 3396: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mrs. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. BONO, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BUYER, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 3401: Mr. CALLAHAN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. TORKILDSEN, and Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 3424: Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 3445: Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 3447: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 3449: Mr. POMEROY and Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 3463: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. JACKSON.

H. Con. Res. 47: Mr. FOLEY.

H. Con. Res. 156: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H. Con. Res. 160: Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. QUINN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. PALLONE.

H. Con. Res. 167: Mr. HOYER, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H. Con. Res. 175: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. LAZIO of New York, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. PARKER.

H. Res. 381: Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 429: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. TORRES, Mr. SANFORD, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 582: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1972: Ms. LOFGREN.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 12 by Mrs. SMITH of Washington on House Resolution 373: Frank Mascara and Bob Franks.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2594

OFFERED BY: MR. SHUSTER

AMENDMENT NO. 1

SEC. 6. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) REFERENCES.—(1) Section 24307(c)(3) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking "Interstate Commerce Commission" and inserting in lieu thereof "Surface Transportation Board".

(2) Section 24308 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking "Interstate Commerce Commission" in subsection (a)(2)(A) and inserting in lieu thereof "Surface Transportation Board"; and

(B) by striking "Commission" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Surface Transportation Board".

(3) Section 24311(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking "Interstate Commerce Commission" in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "Surface Transportation Board"; and

(B) by striking "Commission" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Surface Transportation Board".

(b) CLARIFYING AMENDMENT.—(1) The first paragraph of section 1 of the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 151) is amended by inserting "The term 'carrier' includes any express company or sleeping car company subject to subtitle IV of title 49, United States Code, within the meaning of such terms under this section as in effect on December 31, 1995," after "in any of such activities."

(2) The amendment made by paragraph (1) is made for the purpose of clarifying the policy stated in section 10501(c)(3)(B) of title 49, United States Code, that the enactment of the ICC Termination Act of 1995 did not expand or contract coverage of employees and employers by the Railway Labor Act.

(c) TITLE 49.—Title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 13102(10)(A) by inserting after "her dwelling" the following: "and if the transportation is at the request of, and the transportation charges are paid to the carrier by, the householder";

(2) in chapter 151 by striking "CHAPTER 151—GENERAL PROVISIONS" the second place it appears;

(3) in chapter 153 by striking "CHAPTER 153—JURISDICTION" the second place it appears;

(4) in chapter 157 by striking "CHAPTER 157—OPERATIONS OF CARRIERS" the second place it appears;

(5) in chapter 159 by striking "CHAPTER 159—ENFORCEMENT: INVESTIGATIONS, RIGHTS, AND REMEDIES" the second place it appears;

(6) in the table of sections for chapter 159 by striking the item relating to section 15907;

(7) in chapter 161 by striking "CHAPTER 161—CIVIL AND CRIMINAL PENALTIES" the second place it appears; and

(8) in section 41309(b)(2)(B) by striking "common".

(d) TITLE 28.—Section 2342(3)(A) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking "part B or (C)" and inserting "part B or C".

(e) ICC TERMINATION ACT.—Effective December 29, 1995—

(1) section 308(j) of the ICC Termination Act of 1995 (109 Stat. 947) is amended by striking "30106(d)" and inserting "30166(d)"; and

(2) section 327(3)(B) of such Act (109 Stat. 951) by inserting "each place it appears" before "and inserting in lieu thereof".

(f) ARMORED CAR INDUSTRY RECIPROCITY ACT OF 1993 AMENDMENTS.—Section 5(2) of the Armored Car Industry Reciprocity Act of 1993 (15 U.S.C. 5904) is amended by striking "is" preceding "registered".

H.R. 3259

OFFERED BY: MR. COMBEST

AMENDMENT NO. 1: In the matter proposed to be inserted by section 401, strike "Make" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Subject to such amounts as may be provided in advance in appropriations Acts, make".

H.R. 3259

OFFERED BY: MR. COMBEST

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Amend section 402 to read as follows:

SEC. 402. ELIMINATION OF DOUBLE SURCHARGE ON THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RELATING TO EMPLOYEES WHO RETIRE OR RESIGN IN FISCAL YEARS 1998 OR 1999 AND WHO RECEIVE VOLUNTARY SEPARATION INCENTIVE PAYMENTS.

Section 2(i) of the Central Intelligence Agency Voluntary Separation Pay Act (50 U.S.C. 403-4 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: "The remittance required by this subsection shall be in lieu of any remittance required by section 4(a) of the Federal Workforce Restructuring Act of 1994 (5 U.S.C. 8331 note)."

H.R. 3259

OFFERED BY: MR. CONYERS

AMENDMENT NO. 3: At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 306. ANNUAL STATEMENT OF THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF INTELLIGENCE EXPENDITURES FOR THE CURRENT AND SUCCEEDING FISCAL YEARS.

At the time of submission of the budget of the United States Government submitted for fiscal year 1998 under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress a separate, unclassified statement of the appropriations and proposed appropriations for the current fiscal year, and

the amount of appropriations requested for the fiscal year for which the budget is submitted, for national and tactical intelligence activities, including activities carried out under the budget of the Department of Defense to collect, analyze, produce, disseminate, or support the collection of intelligence.

H.R. 3259

OFFERED BY: MR. FRANK OF MASSACHUSETTS

AMENDMENT NO. 4: At the end of title I, insert the following:

SEC. 105. REDUCTIONS IN AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the aggregate amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act, including the amounts specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102, is reduced by 4.9 percent.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) does not apply to amounts authorized to be appropriated by section 201 for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability Fund.

(c) TRANSFER AND REPROGRAMMING AUTHORITY.—(1) The President, in consultation with the Director of Central Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense, may apply the reduction required by subsection (a) by transferring amounts among the accounts or reprogramming amounts within an account, as specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102, so long as the aggregate reduction in the amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act equals 4.9 percent.

(2) Before carrying out paragraph (1), the President shall submit a notification to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, which notification shall include the reasons for each proposed transfer or reprogramming.

H.R. 3259

OFFERED BY: MR. MICA

AMENDMENT NO. 5: Amend section 402 to read as follows:

SEC. 402. ELIMINATION OF DOUBLE SURCHARGE ON THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RELATING TO EMPLOYEES WHO RETIRE OR RESIGN IN FISCAL YEARS 1998 OR 1999 AND WHO RECEIVE VOLUNTARY SEPARATION INCENTIVE PAYMENTS.

Subsection (i) of section 2 of the Central Intelligence Agency Voluntary Separation Pay Act (50 U.S.C. 403-4 note) is amended by adding at the end the following: "The remittance required by this subsection shall be in lieu of any remittance required by section 4(a) of the Federal Workforce Restructuring Act of 1994 (5 U.S.C. 8331 note)."



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 142

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 16, 1996

No. 69

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, You have blessed our Nation with great leaders in every period of our history. Today, our hearts blend in oneness and our voices soar above party loyalties to express our gratitude to You for BOB DOLE. Quite apart from Presidential politics, we wish to thank You for the way that You have used him here in the Senate through the years. We affirm his leadership; we admire his statesmanship; we honor his patriotism.

Thank You for Your intervening in his life to save him in World War II, for preparing him through suffering and pain to be empathetical of the needs of others, and for opening doors for him to serve his Nation here in the Congress for the past 35 years.

We appreciate his plain-spoken, Kansas way of expressing his faith. We know that prayer has been the source of the silent strength that has given the Senator his remarkable resiliency, constantly filling the wells of his being with stability and courage. As brothers and sisters of both parties in the Senate, we ask You to continue to bless him and his wife Elizabeth as they press forward in serving You and our Nation. In the name of our Savior and Lord. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able and distinguished majority leader, Senator DOLE, is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. Thank you, Mr. President.

THANKING THE CHAPLAIN

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I say a personal thanks to the Chaplain. I appreciate it.

SCHEDULE

Mr. DOLE. As I understand it, the Senate will consider Senate Concurrent Resolution 57, the concurrent budget resolution. Under the order last night, Senator DASCHLE or his designee will offer the President's budget this morning, and we can expect a rollcall vote on or in relation to that amendment hopefully before noon today.

There will probably be a late session tonight. There will be an effort to try to complete action on the budget resolution sometime this evening. If that cannot be done, obviously, it will be done tomorrow. I am advised there is still a lot of time remaining. The Republicans have 20 hours and 57 minutes; the Democrats have 19 hours and 39 minutes. That is 40 hours and 36 minutes. It is 9:30 a.m. It may be difficult to finish it this evening. But these things do have a way of moving once we get started. So I know the managers on each side would appreciate cooperation of our colleagues who have amendments.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON], will manage on this side, so I yield the floor.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). The Senate will now resume consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 57, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that it be charged equally on 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. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3965

(Purpose: Setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002)

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, as agreed to yesterday, at this time I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON], for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DODD, and Mr. KERRY, proposes an amendment numbered 3965.

Mr. EXON. 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. EXON. Mr. President, in the arrangement between myself and the Budget Committee chairman, Senator DOMENICI, I am offering this amendment today as a substitute for the basic Republican amendment that was laid down when we began the budget debate yesterday by the chairman of the Budget Committee.

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



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

S5111

The amendment that I am offering is very clear cut. It is not difficult to understand. I am proposing the President's 7-year, CBO certified balanced budget as a substitute to the Republican budget that is now before the Senate.

Let us turn back the clock to a year ago. That is when my Republican colleagues pulled our leg on the Senate floor. The Republicans offered the President's budget recommendation as a substitute for their own amendment. They offered that as a substitute resolution. As a result of that, they had a good laugh at our expense as the amendment was voted down 99 to 0, with this Senator, the ranking Democrat on the Budget Committee, voting with the 99.

But what a difference a year makes. It is not only a different year, Mr. President. It is a different budget. And I do not think my colleagues on the other side would be smirking if they did the same thing this year as they did last year, but, of course, there is no indication that they will do that. It would not be the meaningless, hollow political gesture that it was in May 1995. This President's balanced budget is real in every sense of the word, and it is certified to be in balance by the Congressional Budget Office.

Throughout last year I heard one chorus from the Republican majority. They repeated it over and over again: "Mr. President, give us a 7-year balanced budget, certified by the Congressional Budget Office." I was urging the President to do the same thing. The difference was that I was interested in sound budget politics rather than partisan politics. It is now a done deal. The President has complied with what the Republicans were seeking and what this Senator was seeking.

Now we hear something different from the Republicans. In order to avoid dealing with the President, House Budget Chairman KASICH has now reversed course and tells CNN, "The problem is, of course, not in the numbers." It is the extremist Republican philosophy that President Clinton and mainstream Americans have soundly rejected, but they are still on that course. For my colleagues who still believe that honest numbers are important, here is a product, the President's budget, far superior to the Republican budget that is now on the floor. For, as the Republican budget delivers fresh and needless pain, across the years, the President's budget is a smart mixture of fiscal constraint and compassion.

The President's budget achieves balance in 7 years, but it does so without the terrible burden being brought on our senior citizens, working families, and the most vulnerable in America. It reflects the values and the priorities of the American people. It protects Medicare benefits and it protects Medicare beneficiaries. It invests in our children's education, it protects the environment from the search-and-destroy right wing radicals. It preserves nurs-

ing home standards and nursing home benefits. It prevents ordinary Americans from going broke to pay for nursing home care.

As I noted a few moments ago, this will be the last budget resolution of my Senate career, and I thank President Clinton for saving the best for last, as far as this Senator is concerned. In my 18 years in this great body, I cannot think of another budget that better hits the mark right from the start. I cannot think of another budget that I could endorse so eagerly. I cannot think of another budget that ordinary Americans could so readily call their own.

Having said that, of course the President's budget is not without some flaws as far as this Senator is concerned. We could all find things on which we would disagree. There is always a pea under the mattress that irritates one or more of the 100 Members of this body. And there are some things in the President's budget that cause me some concern. But what we are talking about here is a document that I am introducing today that I hope would be the basic model that we would begin from, rather than the budget proposal endorsed and put together and offered by the Republican majority. In other words, I, too, would hope we could do some fine tuning on the President's budget, which I think is necessary.

But I want to be clear on this point: The underlying mechanism in this budget, which is fiscal restraint coupled with protecting our economic investments so vital to America, is synchronized and in fine working order, but I would certainly entertain some amendments to it.

After 18 years in the Senate, I harbor few illusions that there will be a mass conversion on the other side of the table to what I consider to be my reasonable appeal. I ask my colleagues, however, to have a serious discussion and have a serious look at the amendment I am offering.

For too many months we have been talking at each other and not with each other about how to balance the budget in 7 years. This Presidential proposal is a serious and a honest budget, and I hope all of my colleagues will approach this amendment in that spirit so we can move ahead in an expeditious fashion.

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

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, we are now beginning a debate over the President's budget proposal for 1997 and for succeeding years. In a very real sense, the fact that we are debating this proposal represents a major step forward from the situation in which we found ourselves last year.

As my friend, the Senator from Nebraska, has pointed out, last year it was members of the Republican Party

who put up the President's budget to be voted on and voted down. Members of his own party were not willing, systematically, to defend that budget. Because, Mr. President, as you will remember, last year the debate was fixed very firmly on the proposition that one side, the new Republican majority, felt it vitally important not only to promise a balanced budget at some time in the future, but to make the very difficult policy decisions that were required to assure that the budget was, in fact, balanced.

We succeeded in doing so. We succeeded in doing so so well that during the entire period of time in which it looked as though this promise would be kept, interest rates declined all across the country. What did that mean? It meant that people buying homes paid less in the way of interest on their mortgages and therefore were more likely to be able to afford to buy a home or to buy a better home. It meant that businesses, small and large, paid less in interest and were therefore able to increase their productivity and increase the jobs that they had to offer and increase the quality and compensation for the jobs which they did offer. In other words, even a binding promise to reach balance in the future that was believable had a positive impact on our economy, and by the year of balance, 2002, it would have meant at least \$1,000 per family in the pockets of the average American family.

During the entire development of that balanced budget, the other side refused to come up with any alternative that would reach that balance, and the struggle was between a group of Republicans who felt it absolutely unethical and immoral to continue to spend money by the hundreds of billions of dollars, the bills for which we sent to our children and grandchildren, and a side led by the President who felt this was not relevant and was unimportant.

Beginning in December, however, and culminating with the offer of this Presidential budget, we have had, in fact, at least lip service—and I must say that lip service is important to the proposition that a balanced budget is of great help to all Americans by removing some of the burdens of Government from their shoulders, by freeing them up and, implicitly, leaving more of their hard-earned money in their own pockets.

Unfortunately, however, doing that job is more difficult. It is harder work than the President of the United States is willing to undertake.

His dedication to the proposition is welcome. The product itself is seriously flawed. As a consequence, that makes even less valid his characterization of our efforts as being extreme in nature. In fact, the President has never made any real steps in our direction, even when compromises and modifications were made on the part of the Speaker of the House and the majority leader of the Senate and the distinguished chairman of our Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI.

So we now have a unity with respect to our goals, but a dramatic difference in connection with the way in which those goals are reached. What we have in this proposal, the amendment that is the subject matter before the Senate right now, is spending increases in 1997, rather than a move on a steady path of lowering spending so that we reach a goal on a gradual but even path between now and the year 2002, 6 years from today.

What we get are a series of mechanisms and gimmicks rather than choices that do require the Congressional Budget Office to show reduced spending and reduced deficits, though there is not a single detail as to how we get there in the key years right after the turn of the century.

More accurately, if we look at the policy judgments that are contained in this Presidential budget, we see that it has a deficit of \$84 billion in the year 2002, according to the Congressional Budget Office. Mr. President, \$84 billion is not a modest amount of money by any stretch of the imagination, just under \$100 billion after 6 more years of lip service to a balanced budget and at that—to get to that figure, our one-time savings and assets sales, which is immediately after that year, will have resulted—the budget deficit would increase very, very substantially.

So this proposal is a very modest step in the right direction, but it is not a balanced budget. It is not a serious attempt to make decisions now that will lead to a balanced budget. It is, in fact, a promise of very difficult choices for the President after next, for the President who is elected not in 1996 but in the year 2000.

What are the gimmicks, what are the mechanisms that allow this to be determined as a balanced budget that are, in fact, no more than gimmicks? A discretionary trigger, No. 1; an end to the tax reductions that are called for in the bill, No. 2; outrageous shell games with respect to Medicare, one of the vital social safety nets in our entire society; welfare reform that is not reform; and a number of other sleights of hand.

Let us go to some of the gimmicks first. This proposal increases domestic discretionary spending for next year, the one year of the budget that is absolutely binding, by \$10 billion, so that the President, during the course of the reelection campaign, can point to a wide variety of increases in programs supported by various interest groups and by large numbers of people.

Then from 1998 to 2002, there are a significant number of cuts, none of which is specified, none of which can be attacked because they are amorphous. They are simply figures on the wall without any detail to back them up.

Finally, for the last 2 years, the President calls for increased discretionary spending, even though the Congressional Budget Office says that the trigger mechanism to balance the budget included in this proposal will

reduce discretionary spending by \$45 billion in the year 2002 alone. But worse than that—worse than that, Mr. President—as gimmicky as it is, is the President's treatment of Medicare. This budget takes one of the most vital elements of Medicare, an element that is now protected by being in the Medicare trust fund, paid for by the payroll taxes that each of us at work pays every single year: Home health care, not an insubstantial program, Mr. President, which costs \$55 billion. It is taken out of the trust fund by the President's proposal, out of the protection of the trust fund in order that the President can show that the trust fund stays solvent for a longer period of time than would otherwise be the case, and transfers it we really know not where.

In one sense, this Presidential budget says, "Well, we're going to transfer home health care to Medicare part B," the part that pays for physicians' fees in Medicare, an element of Medicare that is not covered by the trust fund, an element of which about 75 percent is paid by general taxes, that is to say, the deficit, and 25 percent by premiums paid by the beneficiaries.

Medicare part B, of course, is voluntary. It is such a good deal that there is practically no one eligible for it who does not take it when you are only paying 25 percent of its cost. But it is voluntary. So home health care at one level is transferred into part B. But it does not become voluntary, it is still there. It is not subject to any of the copayments that are a part of part B. It is not subject to the 25-percent premium cost that part B is subject to otherwise. So, in fact, it simply becomes a completely, totally, absolutely unfunded entitlement, Mr. President.

What does that mean? It means \$55 billion a year more in bills transferred to working Americans, out of the trust fund, which they are already paying and—incidentally, those payments are not cut at all—simply into the general fund to be added to the deficit.

That does one of three things, Mr. President: either it greatly increases the deficit by that \$55 billion, or it will result in a tax increase of \$55 billion on the American people, a new tax, or at some point or another, when things get tough, it just will not be paid for at all, and it will disappear, home health care will disappear.

Mr. President, I use the word "gimmick." This does not really get appropriately covered by the word "gimmick." This is a fraud. This is something to which people are entitled now, that is being paid for now, that is in a trust fund now, that suddenly is just hanging out there with a new bill for the American people.

There are other gimmicks in the Medicare cuts that are in the President's budget. The amount of money he claims to save is not saved, according to the scoring of the Congressional Budget Office, what they come up with for it. There are more triggers on the

amounts of money for outpatient hospital services. There is a new entitlement program for workers temporarily unemployed, but it sunsets in the year 2000.

Taxes on working families, college students, and small businesses will be increased in the year 2001. Payroll taxes will be accelerated at that particular period of time, Mr. President. And these really are gimmicks. A whole slew of asset sales are pushed into the year 2002 to show a one-time balance with, of course, no balance thereafter.

There is a spectrum auction of spectrum for the year 2002, of spectrum that will not be returned to the Federal Government until 2005, even if it is ready to be returned at that particular time. Will it get less money than if it were auctioned at the time it is actually available? Obviously those will be lower.

So as CBO indicates that they will be \$6 billion short, there is just a contingent \$6 billion charge on broadcasters to make up the difference for the year 2002. Governors Island in New York Harbor is going to be deserted after 1998, but it will not be sold until 2002 so that it can balance the budget in that year. The strategic petroleum reserve, the Weeks Island Naval Petroleum Reserve—the same thing, they get sold long after we have assumed that they would be sold to balance the budget in that year.

In welfare, the President's welfare reform program does not require its recipients to be enrolled in Work First until 2003 so that the payment for their new education and training management does not begin until later.

So even if you accept all of the gimmicks, all of the tax increases, all of the unspecified spending cuts, to get us to balance in 2002, it all goes to hell in a hand basket immediately thereafter.

Mr. President, I have only begun to list the gimmicks and the outrageous transfers of responsibility that are included in this proposal. It just is not serious. Successive speakers will speak to some of the circular reasoning that is contained in this proposal. It is a proposal that is very comfortable for next year, one in many respects in connection with discretionary spending I wish that I could support, but one I cannot support when it does not really reform entitlements, when it leaves all of the heavy lifting to the President after next, and when it leaves that President after next with a huge unfunded liability in the third year of his or her Presidency.

As I said to begin these remarks, Mr. President, it is a major step forward to have a commitment to a balanced budget on the part of the President of the United States. But when that commitment is lip service only, when there is no heavy lifting, when there are no serious reductions or serious policy changes, we have not even gotten halfway. We should be and we are grateful that we are halfway.

I am grateful that the Senate is actually seriously debating two—no, three before we are done—serious possibilities. I will support two of those possibilities, the bipartisan budget which will come up, I suspect tomorrow, and the Republican one because, while they take a slightly different path, they both deal seriously with the problem of balancing the budget. They have a real balanced budget. They have policy decisions that will affect the years not directly covered by this budget as well as those that are covered by it. I regret to say that the proposal that we have before us this minute does none of those things. Lipservice, Mr. President, is not enough. Action is required.

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, we are hearing repeatedly today what we heard from the Republican side of the aisle yesterday—every time it is said I intend to correct it—and that is that the President's budget is not in balance.

As I said in my opening remarks yesterday, and in my opening remarks this morning, contrary to the statements that are being made from that side of the aisle, the President's budget is certified to be in balance by the Congressional Budget Office. Lest we forget what that is, the Congressional Budget Office is run and managed by a Republican appointee whom I supported to be the head of that organization.

The Congressional Budget Office, whether run by a Democrat or Republican, has always been considered to be about as fair as you can get with regard to certifying numbers.

I quote once again, as I did yesterday—and I will keep quoting it today every time somebody on that side of the aisle says that the President's budget is not balanced—and that is this quote from the Congressional Budget Office headed by June O'Neill.

The President's budget proposes policies that the Congressional Budget Office estimates would balance the budget by the year 2002.

Yet that side of the aisle keeps saying, "It does not. It does not. It does not." I am not going to get into "You said that, she said that, he said that." But their claims are fundamentally wrong and they do not contribute to a legitimate debate on the budget when they keep saying, "the President's budget doesn't balance."

Likewise, I would say, that the Congressional Budget Office has said that the Republican budget proposal introduced by Chairman DOMENICI yesterday does balance. There are several things that I could pick apart on that. There are several things that I could get up and say, "I don't agree with CBO. I think that the Republican budget does not balance in the year 2002 for this reason, for that reason, for the gimmicks that are included in their budget."

But it seems to me that when I take that kind of an argument, I am undermining the basic context that I think is important; that is, that CBO has certified that in their best judgment and by their best estimates both the President's budget, that I have just offered, and the Republican budget offered yesterday by Chairman DOMENICI, have been certified to by CBO as balancing the budget by the year 2002.

Now, I do not think we accomplished very much since both of the basic budgets that we are arguing about here have been certified by CBO. Last year, I repeat again, the Republicans hounded the President, hounded the Democrats and challenged the President to come forth with a budget that could be certified to as being balanced by the year 2002 by the Congressional Budget Office. Now that it has been done, as I said yesterday, they are moving the goal posts once again.

I think we can have legitimate debate on what are the rights and what are the wrongs in both the President's budget and, the Republican budget. I admitted and conceded in my opening remarks this morning, that there are some parts of the President's budget that I do not agree with. I think we accomplish very little by getting up on the floor of the U.S. Senate, as Republicans did yesterday and as they are starting out to do today, to say the President's budget is not balanced. Says who? Says the Republican majority. The Republican majority is a partisan referee and therefore their claims should not be considered as authentic with regard to whose budget balances best and in what timeframe.

As I say, I think there are many policy problems with the Republican budget, and I think there are policy problems with the President's budget. I suggest we could expedite the proceedings and come to more intelligent debate if we stop saying this budget does not balance and that budget does not balance, and agree, if we can, that the CBO has certified both the Republican budget and the President's budget that I have just introduced as being balanced by the year 2002. If we are going to go down that road, we are just going to be throwing stones at each other's budget without getting to the specifics of what we would like to see done.

Once again, to bring that point home, I want to talk for just a moment about the Medicare part A and B trust funds that have become focal in the debate, and justifiably so. Once again, I am going to introduce for the RECORD and read a very short letter from June O'Neill, the Republican-appointed Director of the Congressional Budget Office. The letter is dated May 9, 1996:

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, May 9, 1996.

Hon. J. JAMES EXON,
Ranking Minority Member, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: At your request, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) has examined the effects of the Administration's budgetary proposals on the Hospital Insurance (HI)

trust fund. Under current law, the HI trust fund is projected to become insolvent in 2001. CBO estimates that the Administration's proposals would postpone this date to 2005.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL,
Director.

Mr. President, in listening to the Senator from Washington, he seems to assert that the home health care part of the budget would be safer in Medicaid part A than it would be in Medicaid part B. I find this association somewhat ironic in view of the fact there is no place in the entire Republican budget where the majority seeks to find more savings, or, placed in a better context, there is no place where reductions from real needs have been more savaged by the Republicans than in Medicare part A. Yet, the majority wants to reduce \$123 billion from protected Medicare part A spending. If that is what they do to programs that they claim are safe, I hate to see what they would do to programs they dislike.

What I am saying is the sound and fury from the other side with the President's shift in home health care—he is shifting it into an area that would make it safer. The President is taking and transferring this out of the part of the budget that the Republicans are savaging with cuts that would be far below real needs.

Once again, I am not sure we are talking about apples and apples and apples and oranges here. Suffice it to say, I think so far the attack on the President's budget, while, once again, I say is not perfect in my eye, is not honest and straightforward. I think some of their arguments are somewhat suspect.

Mr. President, one more quote, again from my remarks of yesterday, that are found on page 203 of the committee report:

The Republican budget is rife with gimmicks. The tax cuts mysteriously drop off from \$23 billion to \$16 billion by the year 2002. The Republicans count on savings towards balancing the budget from spending cuts that they already used in the Kennedy-Kassebaum health bill. They similarly count twice the savings in housing. Without these gimmicks, the Republican budget would not be in balance.

I only cite that, Mr. President, to say this Senator, too, could be charged with trying to undermine the Republican budget. The term "gimmicks" in the President's budget was used by my friend and colleague from Washington in remarks just concluded. This Senator used the term "gimmicks" yesterday explaining shortcomings that I see in the Republican budget.

I do not believe that either of us should keep hounding the other side on gimmicks because the facts of the matter are, there are lots of things in the President's budget and there are lots of things in the Republican budget that could be deemed as gimmicks. Those of us who call parts of the Republican budget gimmicks and, likewise, when the Republicans call parts of the President's budget gimmicks, we are voicing

an opinion. Only time will tell whether it is true or not.

While I have attacked parts of the Republican budget as gimmicks, I say in the end what we should all do is recognize and realize that gimmicks or no gimmicks, the Congressional Budget Office, which we all recognize as a legitimate referee, has certified that, in their opinion, both budgets reach balance by the year 2002. And I suspect, because I respect the professionalism of the Congressional Budget Office, that they are not necessarily blindsided by what the Senator from Nebraska calls gimmicks in the Republican proposal, or likewise, when the Republicans charge that parts of the President's budget has gimmicks in it.

So, gimmicks or no gimmicks, I think we should get on with the debate by recognizing that while there is legitimate criticism in order to both of the budget proposals, I hope that we can get off the kick of saying it over and over again that the President's budget does not balance and that the Republican budget does not balance. We can say that, but I think it contributes not a great deal to the legitimate discussion, since it is a moot point.

The Congressional Budget Office has said that both budgets are balanced. I think there is plenty of room for debate on changes that should be made to improve the two budgets. But let us, hopefully, agree that we are talking about two budgets that do meet balance by the year 2002, and that should not be a key part of the debate.

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

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Washington. Let me say, I am going to agree with—

Mr. EXON. If the Senator will withhold for a minute so we can talk about time here, a lot of people have asked me when we are going to vote. I simply say—and I have not had a report from the Senator yet this morning—that we have about 34 amendments that Democrats are intending to offer. We asked last night that they try and advise us, and your side advise you, what amendments we have. We are trying to complete this effort by tomorrow night. We are certainly going to have to have some discipline somewhere along the line to get that done.

I would like to ask, first, about how many amendments do you see on your side, or do you know about at the present time? When we have that, we will add that to the 34 that we have here and multiply that out by the number of hours that each one of those amendments are entitled to. Then we will begin to see the difficult task we are going to have by trying to finish this by tomorrow night.

The second question I want to ask to move this debate along is this. Last

night, Senators on both sides suggested that we put off this debate until this morning and not have a vote before noon. I am wondering if we could possibly get an agreement that we would try and balance out time so that we could have a vote in the vicinity of noon today on this matter. Is that a feasible proposal? Does the Senator think that might move things along?

Mr. GORTON. The Senator from Nebraska has me at a certain disadvantage. As he knows, I am sitting in for the chairman of the Budget Committee this morning. I cannot give him definitive answers to either of his questions. I can say, however, that I have no anticipation that we would vote before noon. I am sure we can informally divide the time between now and noon and give Members assurance we will not vote before then. It may be that it is after noon before we get to do so.

As was the case with the Senator from Nebraska, our chairman asked Republican Members to report to him on all the amendments they would have by noon today. Well, it is still an hour and a half from noon. We have only a relative handful.

Mr. EXON. That is a good sign.

Mr. GORTON. That is certainly a good sign. We will be able to answer his question, of course, more definitively in a relatively short period of time. I think that, on an informal basis, we can agree to simply go back and forth. We have yielded time to the Senator from Missouri. I see the Senator from South Carolina. It would be appropriate for him to go next, and then back and forth for a period of time, at least.

Mr. EXON. I thank the Senator. That helps answer some of the questions. Let us move forward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE.) The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I assume that did not count against my 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It did not.

Mr. BOND. If we can start afresh, let me thank my distinguished colleague from Washington and warn my good friend from Nebraska that I am going to agree with him. I know that maybe this will help the process move along. But we have before us the President's budget. This is a massive work that would cost about a hundred dollars if you want to buy it. It has the numbers in here that the President proposes.

Mr. President, in one sense, the Senator from Washington is right. The numbers here do not balance. The numbers in the book do not come to balance. Now, the President has done something in this budget. You have to look at the supplement to see what he has done. He said, if it does not work, I have a trigger. On page 13, it says, "In case the new assumptions produce a deficit in 2002, the President's budget proposes an immediate adjustment to the annual limit, or caps on discretionary spending, lowering them enough to reach balance in 2002."

I agree with the Senator from Nebraska. When you impose those caps, the President's budget does come to balance in 2002. I am not going to call that automatic cut a gimmick, or that trigger a gimmick. Let us just take it for what it does. The President has presented a budget, and he said if it does not balance, you take a whack at it. Well, that whack is a \$16 billion tax increase on families in the year 2002. It is a \$67 billion cut in spending, 10 percent in 2001 and 18 percent in 2002.

So when you take a look at all these numbers, remember that these numbers do not balance. You have to apply the trigger. You have to shoot that budget down to get it to balance. I am going to show you what that does to some of these discretionary spending programs. I hope that my colleagues, before they vote on the President's budget, will understand the impact of these cuts triggered because the President claims he wants to get to a balanced budget.

Now, that may sound kind of complicated. Let me reduce it to common, everyday terms. It is as if you went to the grocery store and you filled up your basket; you gathered all the things you needed and all the things you wanted. You took it to the checkout counter, and the clerk ran it up at the checkout counter, and all those bar scanner codes recorded the numbers. At the end, the bill comes out to be \$100. You look in your wallet and you say, "Whoops, I only have \$80." You have \$100 worth of wishes and wants, but you only have \$80. So you are going to have to start putting some things back. So you put \$20 worth of stuff back, and you pay your \$80 and take the goods home.

Well, when we talk about the budget that the President proposes, let us talk about that \$80 that he is actually going to spend. Do not be misled if somebody talks about the \$100 he wants. Do not be misled about the tax cuts because there is going to be a \$16 billion increase for individuals and families. There will be a \$16 billion tax increase for families in 2002 because, unless you do that, these numbers do not add up.

Mr. President, the point I made yesterday and the day before is that numbers do not lie. Let us take a look at the numbers.

Mr. President, I think it is important that we take a look at some of the vital impacts on health and children in this. I mentioned yesterday the Food and Drug Administration. The budget we have before us reported out of the Senate Budget Committee essentially keeps funding for the Food and Drug Administration on an even keel. The Food and Drug Administration is vitally important because its diverse responsibilities include licensing blood banks, monitoring clinical investigations, reviewing and approving prescription drugs, generic drugs, animal drugs, vaccines, biologicals, medical devices, and food additives. The FDA ensures the quality of a trillion dollars

worth of products. This year it proposes to certify over 10,000 mammography facilities across the country—vital to the health and well-being of our country.

What happens when the President applies that trigger, those caps, those cuts to the FDA? Look at this red line that shows the dramatic reduction in funding for the FDA from almost \$900 million to under \$700 million in 2001 only coming up above \$700 million in 2002. This is a tremendous cut in the vitally important activities of the Food and Drug Administration.

I mentioned yesterday the National Institutes of Health looking for new cures, new ways of dealing with the diseases. The President has a nice little blip up here. But when he gets over to get to balance and you apply the trigger, you take the cuts, you take the whacks, that funding drops off the map. It goes from almost \$12.5 billion to below \$11 billion, \$1.5 billion cut year to year from 2,000 to 2002—\$1.5 billion.

Are we going to have all the answers to health and well-being? Are we going to still need the National Institutes of Health? I think so. We cannot afford the cuts that the President proposed. We are dealing with real numbers.

This is what would happen, if you believed the President and if you believed this budget will get to balance.

Child care and development block grant. I was very pleased to work with my colleague from Connecticut on the act for better child care. We turned it into a development block grant because we recognized the importance of assisting working families with care for their children. The President has a little upswing this year. This is an election year, of course. But then look what happens. From over \$1 billion, about \$1.5 billion, this thing drops off the cliff to about \$800 million in the year 2002—almost a \$250 million cut in child care because of the President's trigger.

Do we really want to say to people who are trying to get off welfare, "Hey. Get off welfare this year. We are going to assist you with your child care expenses. But sorry about the ensuing years. There is not going to be the money there."

That is what the President's budget does. That is if you implement the mechanism the Senator from Nebraska rightly pointed out is in the President's budget. That is how it gets to a balance.

WIC, funding for women, infants, and children. We both support this at least in the early years. The President's line goes up. The Republican line goes up. But, whoops. The President had said he wants to balance the budget. So you fire the gun, you put on the cap, you pull the trigger, and what happens to funding for women, infants, and children? It goes, in his budget, from over \$4.2 billion down to about \$3.7 billion.

This is a significant cut. If you believe and advocate and want to stand

up for the President's budget, you have to be willing to say, "Hey. We are going to get to balance in the year 2002 by taking this much of a whack out of the feeding program for women, infants, and children."

Mr. President, I do not believe that is going to happen. That is not a realistic budget. But the President is standing by that budget. Anybody who votes for it says, "I am voting for it. I believe in it." If you vote for the President's budget, then, Mr. President, you have to be saying, "I believe these numbers, and I will support these numbers."

I have talked a good deal about the Veterans' Administration because that happens to be one of the vital functions that is funded in the appropriations subcommittee which I chair. The Veterans' Administration budget has been very contentious. Last year we had a floor amendment, an amendment sponsored by the Senator from West Virginia, Senator ROCKEFELLER, and Senators MIKULSKI, LEAHY, and WELLSTONE.

They said, if we kept an even spending level, we would have to close four veterans hospitals. The Republican budget has even funding. This cuts almost \$13 billion—25 percent. That means that one out of four facilities, or more, in the United States would have to be closed. Here are the States with veterans facilities. Florida has 6, Massachusetts has 5, New York has 13, and California has 11. One out of four—that means California is going to have three, four, or five closed. The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] was complaining that we did not open a hospital last year. The question is, Which of these is going to be cut?

Mr. President, the budget provided by the President is not workable. Those numbers do not lie.

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

Mr. HOLLINGS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I yield such time as is required for the moment.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Missouri talks about assumptions. With respect to assumptions, I only have to point out that when I asked the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI from New Mexico, about the budget assumptions, he said, "No. That is no magic asterisk. Assumptions are not binding on anyone. Use the assumptions in the President's budget. Do what you want to be bound by it. It does not make any difference."

With respect to the trigger, I remember that trigger when they had it last year in the Republican Medicare assault. Unfortunately, the distinguished President of the United States, coming from Arkansas, having balanced budgets for 10 years, had taken on some of the bad habits of this Republican crowd.

Right to the point, Mr. President: I was listening this morning to the chat-

ter on the early morning shows, and the pundits were all allowing that the distinguished Senator from Kansas was having to retire from the Senate because he wanted to get away from the Senate itself; that the Senate had such a bad reputation.

I take exception to that, Mr. President. It is the Republican program that has such a bad reputation. I feel for the distinguished Senator from Kansas as the Republican nominee going around the country because, though he physically removes himself, he still has to carry that load. I told him so yesterday afternoon.

It is a ridiculous contract. Get rid of plans that are working and the programs on crime. The policemen on the beat; they were all here yesterday in support of those programs.

That is what is really frightening the American people. It is a ridiculous plan: let us get rid of the Department of Commerce, the Department of Energy, the Department of Housing, the Department of Education. Whoever heard of being elected to public office and then trying to tear down the office itself? We are elected to come to Washington to make the Government work. But this pollster party is running on hot button items like 5-cent gas taxes and that kind of thing, trying to throw the long pass play. They are not really giving the American people a program of responsibility and direction, a sense of where we are headed in the next 4 years. The truth of the matter is that the wrong man resigned from the Congress. We ought to have gotten the distinguished Speaker to be gone with that silly contract. Let him move out and maybe the pollster party would have a chance in November.

But my point this morning is that yes, I am going to vote for the President's budget. It is the nearest to a factual approach to this particular dilemma. It does not use the CPI. It does not have these mammoth tax cuts that are down to \$8 billion. We do not have any taxes to cut.

That is another flaw in the contract, it leads the American people to believe that you can balance this budget by merely cutting spending. I have voted for many, many cuts in spending. I voted, as did a third of the Senate, to do away with a good part of the payroll tax—\$190 billion in tax cuts to put Social Security on a pay-as-you-go basis. But I do not believe in cutting taxes when we are running these horrendous deficits, when the debt is going up and the interest cost on the debt ruining the land. And so what I am trying to do is get the nearest as I can. We tried every approach. In January 1993, we put in what would be required of a really true, honest balanced budget. It included both the horrendous cuts that would be necessary in discretionary spending and taxes. I challenge and continue to challenge. At the Commerce Committee the other day, the distinguished Senator from Texas said that she believed the budget could be

balanced by spending cuts. I challenge her. I challenge anyone in the Congress to give me a 7-year balanced budget without a tax increase. I want to see it. You can eliminate the Government as they call it, but we have worked our way into such a dilemma that, if you did away with Government as the people know it to be—foreign aid, the Department of Commerce, Interior, Agriculture, Justice Department, the FBI, the DEA, do away with the President, the Congress, the courts—it would still only be \$228 billion.

Now, look at the bottom line, what are we spending? This pollster party has got us to the point that we are required to spend \$353 billion in interest costs on a national debt that they quintupled. They did it, not President Clinton—\$353 billion, \$1 billion a day spending on automatic pilot for absolutely no Government. We do not get anything for it. It is merely the carrying charges. If they had not engaged in that misconduct, we could have two Departments of Commerce, two Departments of Energy, two Departments of Education—double the Government. We are spending the money for it, but we are not getting the Government.

And that is this particular Senator's dilemma. We are supposed to be rebuilding our economy in the wake of the cold war, putting more into education, more into technology, more into the Department of Commerce. Instead the Republicans pursue their political endeavors solely for reelection purposes. They are not looking at the next generation but at the next election. And we have to go through this false nonsense of a budget fraud because it is their contract.

Unfortunately, we Democrats, to get any kind of results, have to go along with this kind of thing. President Clinton put out a good budget when he first came. We had to cut \$500 billion in spending. We had to increase taxes on cigarettes, beer, liquor, gasoline. Yes, we voted to increase taxes on Social Security, we performed a real act of fiscal discipline and responsibility without a single Republican vote in the Senate, without a single Republican vote in the House of Representatives. And they have the audacity, the unmitigated gall to come around here talking about hoaxes.

Let me get everybody to turn to pages 4 and 5 of this wonderful document, Senate Concurrent Resolution 57, by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], for the Committee on the Budget. This is the budget resolution now in debate. Look on pages 4 and 5 under "Deficits." For fiscal year 2002 you will see a deficit of \$108,300,000,000.

Mr. President, for Heaven's sake, you pick up the morning paper, the Washington Post, and it is talking about the "Republican Balanced Budget Proposal." There is no idea of balancing this budget by Republicans or Democrats. It is one big political exercise, one grand budget fraud. And that is

what everybody is running on. I am trying to get them to state what the law is and what the truth is.

The fact is here in the budget book itself: "Budget Process Law Annotated," up to date, 1993 edition. You will find in this book no such word as "unified." That is a political gimmick that the press, the money market in New York and politicians use. We have to hear about fraud; we have to hear about hoaxes; we have to hear about trickery, but the truth of the matter is there is no such thing as unified. There is such a thing as not being able to rob the Social Security trust fund. Look at it. Section 13301 of this particular document says thou shalt not use the Social Security funds to obscure the size of the deficit. We owe Social Security at this moment \$503 billion, and in this particular budget that I hold up, this document here, they continue to rob the Social Security trust fund in violation of the law. They are robbing other trust funds as well that are not written in the law. I wish they were. But we continue to rob the Social Security trust fund of approximately \$500 billion over a 6-year period and over \$600 billion over 7 years. So that by the year 2002, 2003, we come around, under this political drama—the best off-Broadway show you are going to find, running currently on C-SPAN—and they will say, "Oh, we have balanced the budget. We are the party of responsibility and we balanced the budget."

Even if it were true, using their own figures we have decimated—decimated, exhausted the Social Security trust fund. We will owe it over \$1.1 trillion. Then we will not have to hear the arguments about the year 2012 or 2023—just by that year 2002 we will already owe that money. Who is going to raise \$1 trillion to make Social Security solvent? You should have heard it—I wish I had that record before me—the distinguished chairman of our Budget Committee in his prepared statement stated: We are making Medicare solvent for 10 years. Under this budget we are making Medicare solvent for 10 years; we are making Social Security totally insolvent in 6 years. It will be totally insolvent in 6 years. And they want credit for their so-called fiscal responsibility.

Unfortunately, both sides are guilty. Why? Why do I say that about this budget fraud? I have not seen a budget yet that does not immediately start off by moving deficits—not eliminating deficits—moving them from the general Government over to the Social Security trust fund to the tune of \$500 billion. The Republican budget does it. The President's budget does it. And the so-called centrist coalition does.

They think it is wonderful they can get together, Republicans and Democrats, in a fraud. I did not join them. I told them: It is a fraud on the face of it. You can see it. You know it. Look at it. You are not only robbing trust funds to the tune of what will amount to almost \$1 trillion, but we owe the

civil service retirement, the military retirees.

You go down the list. Medicare is solvent right now. They have been robbing the Medicare trust fund and on down the line to highway trust funds. Finally, over on the House side, they have been robbing the airport funding. There are not enough inspectors. We just had a hearing on that. Why? Because we have been taking the money that the traveling public has been putting in. While they have been paying their taxes in order to provide those inspectors, Congress has been using the moneys to politically obscure the size of the deficit. This way they can say, "Reelect me, I am fiscally responsible up there in Washington but the other crowd is a bunch of bums."

They know what they are doing. Not only do they rob trust funds, but all of their spending cuts are backloaded. There is the gimmick. That is why, when President Reagan first came to office, he said he was going to balance the budget in 1 year. After he got here he said it was such a disaster that it would take him 3 years. When Congress saw that was not working with the so-called Reaganomics, that we were going in the exact opposite direction, we tried the spending cut approach with Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. But all along, then after Gramm-Rudman-Hollings—and I'm talking about the crowd that voted to repeal it on October 19 at 12:41 a.m.—they are now all writing books now how responsible and how against deficits they were. Gramm-Rudman-Hollings worked. The reason the Senator from South Carolina asked for a divorce is that instead of using Gramm-Rudman-Hollings as a spear to prod fiscal responsibility, they were using it as a shield to obscure fiscal irresponsibility.

When they started doing that, I said let me out of this thing. We raised the point of order, made cuts across the board. And Gramm-Rudman-Hollings worked. Do not say it did not work. It was about to work too well, until they got into that cabal to reelect the President in 1992. Everybody knows what happened there, in 1990, when they voted for its repeal. But they all, then, started backloading. Now, instead of 5 years of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, we are going up to a 7-year budget. If this crowd can get reelected they will come back next year and they will have a 10-year budget. They keep moving the goalposts and getting the good government award.

The fact of the matter is, two-thirds of these cuts occur after two Presidential elections. They come out here and talk about the President—a hoax. But it is not a hoax—come on. Everybody can see what is going on. Every one of them, including the centrist budget, uses tax cuts.

If you look at the centrist document, the centrist document says the President cuts \$8 billion in 6 years. The Republicans cut \$122 billion, the Breau-Chafee in 7 years cuts \$105 billion. We

do not have any taxes to cut. So the closest to responsibility is President Clinton's budget. They are running around still trying to lead rather than demand. The consultants will demand. Poor Presidential nominee DOLE will have to respond, run all over the land trying to tell people that which he knows not to be the case. He was chairman of the Finance Committee. He did not favor that Reaganomics. It was Kemp-Roth at that time. I know him, but now he is caught up with the Gingrich contract and he has to go around and sell it. That is his dilemma, not the Senate as a body. They will be here long after we are gone, long after the contract crowd is gone.

Mr. President, we finally see the free world voting in free elections. We witness the spread of, not only capitalism, but democratic representative government; which is, according to Arthur Schlesinger, the greatest gift of the American people to free men the world around. And it has taken root, Mr. President, in 14 different countries. Over in Russia now, the Communists are getting ready for a vote. Over in China, where I recently traveled with the distinguished Senator from Maine, Senator COHEN, in the provinces they are beginning to have local elections. Now, when free democratic government is just taking root, the contract crowd says, "Get rid of the Government. The Government is not the solution, the Government is the problem. The Government is the enemy." And they wonder why they are down in the polls.

Back to the point: tax cuts. They talk about a dividend. I speak as the former chairman of the Budget Committee. I speak as an original mover, along with Senator Muskie. I am the last of the Mohicans on the House or the Senate side who was in on the game back in the mid-1970's. I voted for a balanced budget in 1968. I worked there with George Mahon. We said, "Talk to President Johnson. Can we cut another \$5 billion?" We cut another \$5 billion. The entire Great Society and the cost of the war in Vietnam was \$178 billion. Interest costs on the national debt is \$353—double the amount. And you wonder at the trouble we are in? They do not want to talk sense. They want to engage in another fraud. A \$254 billion dividend. That came up in 1990.

We called it into question. They say, "Oh, no, you look at the 1990 budget." They have their charts and everything else. The 1990 budget said that by 1995, last year, we would not only be balanced we would have a \$20 billion surplus. Can you imagine the word surplus in a Government document? They put it in there.

Instead, the real deficit was in the neighborhood of \$277 billion. There was not any surplus—using the dividend. So they play more games. Now the centrist coalition crowd has come up with a new one, the CPI. They come in and want to monkey around with the Consumer Price Index.

So if you do one, you have to do the other, but they only do one. They are

not only going to cut the benefits of the Social Security recipient, which could be done—this Senator has recommended a freeze, a freeze, if you please. But instead of inuring to the benefit of the Social Security trust fund, they take even more money, robbing Social Security and allocating it to the deficit. All the Medicare plans call for an increase in the premiums in order to get the benefits. Then they come around with this lower CPI and give them less money. A double whammy.

They are doing it. But it is a political year and the media is supposed to cover Congress and give the American people the truth. And what is the headline? "Balanced Budget." A balanced budget, come on. There is not any balance in the budget before us, and they know it.

For Heaven's sake, deliver me from this characterization of the President's character. A hoax. The pollster says they have to attack President Clinton on his character. So every 10 seconds the Republicans get up: "Hoax," "Character." One Senator even said, "Liar." "We'll just get in on a true-false quiz in November, and we are the truth and the Democratic Party is false."

I do not think the American people are going along with that nonsense. Deliver me from that, particularly when they are the ones engaged, with the misrepresentation. That is the nicest word I can think.

Yesterday, May 15, 1996, I heard it again in the Budget Committee. This is a statement by the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee:

This budget will restore America's fiscal equilibrium. It will balance the budget by the year 2002 without touching Social Security.

Absolutely false. He said that in the Budget Committee. I called his hand on it, but they continue to insist on it and the news media will write it. It touches Social Security. The best rationale the chairman can give is, "We didn't cut, momentarily, the benefits." But he means the benefits for me at 72—old STROM and I are going to get ours. But that Parliamentarian is not going to get his money. And I have to ask the Parliamentarian if this really is a budget resolution. Because section (C) where they have in there a provision for tax cuts in September, will actually increase the deficit.

But the truth of the matter is, Mr. President, they not only touch it, they emasculate the fund. I made that clear. Do not come along and say "without touching Social Security." They know what they are doing.

We have had a group of off-the-record sessions to try to get together on the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. I favor such an amendment, and said I would vote for it in a flash. I voted for it before. But I am not going to vote by repealing section 13301. The proposal has been made time and again, "Well, let's just use up So-

cial Security until 2002 and stop using it."

I remember when I had Clement Haynesworth before the U.S. Supreme Court—he had been charged with using his office in conflict with the stock investments that he had. They said that under the law, he should have recused himself. One day, unbeknownst to me and Attorney General Mitchell, he came and said, irrespective of what occurred, he was going to take all these stock holdings and put them in a trust fund.

The next morning, Herblock had that cartoon with the Congress as the court. The Attorney General is the lawyer and a little client who looked like a school boy with a school bag with stock tape and tickets streaming out on the floor. "But Your Honor," said Mitchell, the Attorney General, "my client hasn't done anything wrong, and he promises to stop doing it."

No, they have not done anything wrong—"We do not touch Social Security"—they just take Social Security to mask the deficit. Government is borrowing from itself and writing IOU's from \$503 billion to \$1.1 trillion. But they promise to stop doing it in 2002. By that time, who is going to put on the taxes to pay back \$1.1 trillion?

The New York crowd keeps talking about entitlements, entitlements, entitlements. In Time magazine and other major papers, they say: "The trouble is, we have to get a bridle on this Social Security causing the deficits." Social Security has not caused a deficit. It is in the black. Every one of the 100 Senators would have to agree with that.

What is causing the deficit, I say to the distinguished Presiding Officer, is all these general uses of Government, from defense to education to housing to foreign aid to law enforcement. I happen to handle the law enforcement budget. Everybody is for more policemen on the beat, everybody is for more FBI, more DEA, more Border Patrol, more immigration control, more this, more that. In 1987, it was just at \$4 billion. Now it is at \$16.7 billion. They are complaining about the growth of Government, saying "cut spending, cut spending." Do you think they ever recommended a dime to pay for it all the programs they demand? No.

I joined with Republicans back in 1987. We saw the dilemma. We put in a value-added tax of 5 percent to get rid of this monster deficit growing and growing, the interest costs growing up to where we cannot have Government.

But that is the effect of pollster politics. The pollster party says, "Get rid of the Government." They succeed. If we do not have a Department of Commerce, they are happy. If we do not have a Department of Education, they are enthralled. If we can get rid of the Department of Energy and Department of Housing and just leave them all on the streets, so be it; let the market forces operate.

That is why they are down in the polls, and leaving this august body

does not release the distinguished Senator from Kansas from that silly contract of getting rid of the Government. That is what he has try and sell today as he goes around in Chicago. The contract is frightening the American people.

At least he had the excuse of trying to keep us organized here in this particular body. Now he has to sit back and listen on the hot line to Speaker GINGRICH saying, "Wait a minute, you've got to stick with the contract, stick with the contract."

All this chatter. Meanwhile we face the largest deficit in the history of the Republic.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from January 1, 1995, by Judy Mann in the Washington Post.

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

[From the Washington Post]

FIDDLING WITH THE NUMBERS

(By Judy Mann)

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman, the Republican meteor from New Jersey, had the unusual honor for a first-term governor of being asked to deliver her party's response to President Clinton's State of the Union message last week.

And she delivered a whopper of what can most kindly be called a glaring inaccuracy.

Sandwiched into her Republican sales pitch was the kind of line that does serious political damage: Clinton, she intoned, "imposed the biggest tax increase in American history."

And millions of Americans sat in front of their television sets, perhaps believing that Clinton and the Democrat-controlled Congress had done a real number on them.

The trouble is that this poster lady for tax cuts was not letting any facts get in her way. But don't hold your breath waiting for the talk show hosts to set the record straight.

The biggest tax increase in history did not occur in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993. The biggest tax increase in post-World War II history occurred in 1982 under President Ronald Reagan.

Here is how the two compare, according to Bill Gale, a specialist on tax policy and senior fellow at the Brookings Institution. The 1993 act raised taxes for the next five years by a gross total of \$268 billion, but with the expansion of the earned income tax credit to more working poor families, the net increase comes to \$240.4 billion in 1993. The Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982, by

comparison, increased taxes by a net of \$217.5 billion over five years. Nominally, then, it is true that the 1993 tax bill was the biggest in history.

But things don't work nominally. "A dollar now is worth less than a dollar was back then, so that a tax increase of, say, \$10 billion in 1982 would be a tax increase of \$15 billion now," says Gale. In fact, if you adjust for the 48 percent change in price level, the 1982 tax increase becomes a \$325.6 billion increase in 1993 dollars. And that makes it the biggest tax increase in history by \$85 billion.

Moreover, says Gale, the population of the country increased, so that, on a per person basis, the 1993 tax increase is lower than the one in 1982, and the gross domestic product increased over the decade, which means that personal income rose. "Once you adjust for price translation, it's not the biggest, and when you account for population and GDP, it gets even smaller."

He raises another point that makes this whole business of tax policy just a bit more complex than the heroic tax slashers would have us believe. "The question is whether [the 1993 tax increase] was a good idea or a bad idea, not whether it was the biggest tax increase. Suppose it was the biggest? I find it frustrating that the level of the debate about stuff like this as carried on by politicians is generally so low."

So was it good idea? "We needed to reduce the deficit," he says, "we still need to reduce the deficit. The bond market responded positively. Interest rates fell. There may be a longer term benefit in that it shows Congress and the president are capable of cutting the deficit even without a balanced budget amendment."

Other long-term benefits, he says, are that "more capital is freed up for private investment, and ultimately that can result in more productive and highly paid workers."

How bad was the hit for those few who did have to pay more taxes? One tax attorney says that his increased taxes were more than offset by savings he was able to generate by refinancing the mortgage on his house at the lower interest rates we've had as a result. The 1993 tax increase did include a 4.3-cent-a-gallon rise in gasoline tax, which hits the middle class. But most of us did not have to endure an income tax increase. In 1992, the top tax rate was 31 percent of the taxable income over \$51,900 for single taxpayers and \$86,500 for married couples filing jointly. Two new tax brackets were added in 1993: 36 percent for singles with taxable incomes over \$115,000 and married couples with incomes over \$140,000; and 39.6 percent for singles and married couples with taxable incomes over \$250,000.

Not exactly your working poor or even your average family.

The rising GOP stars are finding out that when they say or do something stupid or

mendacious, folks notice. The jury ought to be out on Whitman's performance as governor until we see the effects of supply side economics on New Jersey. But in her first nationally televised performance as a spokeswoman for her party, she should have known better than to give the country only half the story. In the process, she left a lot to be desired in one quality Americans are looking for in politicians: honesty.

(Mr. CAMPBELL assumed the chair.)

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I quote:

A dollar now is less than a dollar was back then—

Talking in the eighties under President Reagan.

so that a tax increase of, say, \$10 billion in 1992 would be a tax increase of \$15 billion now. . . . In fact, if you adjusted for the 48 percent change in price level, the 1982 tax increase would become a \$325.6 billion increase in 1993. That makes it the biggest tax increase in the history by \$85 billion. Nominally then, it is true that the 1993 tax bill was the biggest in history. However, the biggest tax increase in post-World War II history occurred in 1982 under President Reagan.

And the Senator from South Carolina voted for it.

I voted against Reaganomics. Senator DOLE was against it in the original instance. The then-majority leader Howard Baker called it "a riverboat gamble." Then-Vice President Bush called it voodoo. But they want to forget that. Read Warren Rudman's book. He lays it all out. A substantial group of Republicans said this could not possibly work.

But I ask, Mr. President, to include in the RECORD the budget tables. If you look at the budget tables, back when President Reagan came into office, the key figure is the Gross Interest Cost, which at that time was \$74.8 billion. Today it is \$353 billion. This crowd is against increasing spending—I'm against spending increases; I'm against spending increases. We have put spending increases on automatic pilot to the tune of \$1 billion a day. I ask unanimous consent that those tables be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUDGET TABLES

President and Year	U.S. budget (outlays in bil- lions)	Trust funds	Real deficit	Gross Federal debt (billions)	Gross interest
Truman:					
1945	92.7	5.4		260.1	
1946	55.2	3.9	-10.9	271.0	
1947	34.5	3.4	+13.9	257.1	
1948	29.8	3.0	+5.1	252.0	
1949	38.8	2.4	-0.6	252.6	
1950	42.6	-0.1	-4.3	256.9	
1951	45.5	3.7	+1.6	255.3	
1952	67.7	3.5	-3.8	259.1	
Eisenhower:					
1953	76.1	3.4	-6.9	266.0	
1954	70.9	2.0	-4.8	270.8	
1955	68.4	1.2	-3.6	274.4	
1956	70.6	2.6	+1.7	272.7	
1957	76.6	1.8	+0.4	272.3	
1958	82.4	0.2	-7.4	279.7	
1959	92.1	-1.6	-7.8	287.5	
1960	92.2	-0.5	-3.0	290.5	
Kennedy:					
1961	97.7	0.9	-2.1	292.6	
1962	106.8	-0.3	-10.3	302.9	9.1

BUDGET TABLES—Continued

President and Year	U.S. budget (outlays in bil- lions)	Trust funds	Real deficit	Gross Federal debt (billions)	Gross interest
1963	111.3	1.9	-7.4	310.3	9.9
Johnson:					
1964	118.5	2.7	-5.8	316.1	10.7
1965	118.2	2.5	-6.2	322.3	11.3
1966	134.5	1.5	-6.2	328.5	12.0
1967	157.5	7.1	-11.9	340.4	13.4
1968	178.1	3.1	-28.3	368.7	14.6
Nixon:					
1969	183.6	-0.3	+2.9	365.8	16.6
1970	195.6	12.3	-15.1	380.9	19.3
1971	210.2	4.3	-27.3	408.2	21.0
1972	230.7	4.3	-27.7	435.9	21.8
1973	245.7	15.5	-30.4	466.3	24.2
1974	269.4	11.5	-17.6	483.9	29.3
Ford:					
1975	332.3	4.8	-58.0	541.9	32.7
1976	371.8	13.4	-87.1	629.0	37.1
Carter:					
1977	409.2	23.7	-77.4	706.4	41.9
1978	458.7	11.0	-70.2	776.6	48.7
1979	503.5	12.2	-52.9	829.5	59.9
1980	590.9	5.8	-79.6	909.1	74.8
Reagan:					
1981	678.2	6.7	-85.7	994.8	95.5
1982	745.8	14.5	-142.5	1,137.3	117.2
1983	808.4	26.6	-234.4	1,371.7	128.7
1984	851.8	7.6	-193.0	1,564.7	153.9
1985	946.4	40.6	-252.9	1,817.6	178.9
1986	990.3	81.8	-303.0	2,120.6	190.3
1987	1,003.9	75.7	-225.5	2,346.1	195.3
1988	1,064.1	100.0	-255.2	2,601.3	214.1
Bush:					
1989	1,143.2	114.2	-266.7	2,868.0	240.9
1990	1,252.7	117.2	-338.6	3,206.6	264.7
1991	1,323.8	122.7	-391.9	3,598.5	285.5
1992	1,380.9	113.2	-403.6	4,002.1	292.3
Clinton:					
1993	1,408.2	94.2	-349.3	4,351.4	292.5
1994	1,460.6	89.1	-292.3	4,643.7	296.3
1995	1,514.4	113.4	-277.3	4,921.0	332.4
1996	1,572.0	126.0	-270.0	5,191.0	344.0
1997 est.	1,651.0	127.0	-292.0	5,483.0	353.0

Source: Historical Tables, Budget of the U.S. Government, Fiscal Year 1996; Beginning in 1962, CBO's 1995 Economic and Budget Outlook.

Mr. HOLLINGS. If any Members want to, they can get the entire record of each one of the particular Presidents. What happened is—let me quote David Stockman:

The root problem goes back to the July 1981 frenzy of excessive and imprudent tax-cutting that shattered the nation's fiscal stability. A noisy faction of Republicans have willfully denied this giant mistake of fiscal governance, and their own culpability in it, ever since. Instead, they have incessantly poisoned the political debate with a mindless stream of anti-tax venom, while pretending that economic growth and spending cuts alone could cure the deficit.

So they have given the Senator from Kansas the chant, "Growth, growth; tax cuts, tax cuts; growth, growth; tax cuts." Will we ever learn?

The debt from the beginning—from 1776 up until 1981—the debt was less than \$1 trillion. With all the wars, the Revolution, 1812, Civil War, Spanish-American, Mexican War, World War I, II, Korea, Vietnam, the costs of all the wars were less than \$1 trillion—\$903 billion. Now, in 15 years, without a war—without a war, because the other crowd are supposed to have paid for the gulf war—in 15 years, we have gone up to \$5 trillion and automatic tax increases, because that is what the automatic spending of interest costs amounts to.

You cannot evade death, you cannot evade taxes, and you cannot evade interest costs or interest taxes on the national debt. So those who say that "I am against increasing taxes," is the crowd that comes in here without shame and derides President Clinton and this particular budget.

President Clinton came to town, and he is the only President to reduce the

deficit. Since 1968, President Nixon did not. President Ford, President Carter, President Reagan, and President Bush all increased the deficit. The one man in town not responsible for this nonsense, President Clinton, the only man in town that has done anything about it, has reduced the deficit in half, and is derided now with all these monkey-shine charts. "Look at how he said this. Look how he did this. Look how he did that."

The economy is working, is it not? Unemployment is down. Job creation is up. Interest is down. How do we get the truth out to the American people? The truth is, as I said before, that Gramm-Rudman-HOLLINGS was repealed. But we continue to read suggestions that we have already tried, suggestions that totally ignore the track record of some of us who have tried.

A couple days ago our distinguished friend, Mr. Dave Broder, allowed that what we ought to do is do away with the payroll tax with a flat tax, recommended by Senators DOMENICI and NUNN. Well, in April 1991, the Senator from New York, Senator MOYNIHAN, the Senator from Wisconsin, Senator Kasten, and the Senator from South Carolina, Senator HOLLINGS, we all said, "Look, if you are going to continue to violate section 13-301 and rob the Social Security trust fund, then, Heavens above, let's put Social Security on a pay-as-you-go basis so they will know it," we were completely against an increase in the Social Security taxes at the time.

It would have been a tax cut, Mr. President, of \$190 billion. But they voted against that tax cut. They say

they are for tax cuts for the rich, for capital gains, but not for the wage earner, the fellow who is pulling the wagon. But Congress is in the wagon. We have to get these Senators and Congressmen out of the wagon. We are the ones using the trust funds, not paying the bills, and wrecking the economy.

Mr. President, for the poor wage earner, who is pulling the wagon, we said, "Let's cut their taxes," the payroll taxes suggested by Mr. Broder, we had that vote in 1991. But they do not want it that way. They want to continue the charade.

So, Mr. President, I only hope there is a free press. Jefferson said it better than anyone. He said, if it is between the free press and a free Government, I would choose the former—intoning, if you please, that you can have a free Government, but it is not going to be free long unless you have a free press. It is supposed to keep us honest, supposed to keep us politicians honest.

Instead, as Jim Fallows says in his wonderful book, "Breaking the News," the press has joined in the post-party pap of "I'm against taxes. And we can balance the budget by just cutting spending."

I have made my point on that. I wish it could be done. I have tried. We tried, first, cuts across the board. We tried spending cuts. We continue to try spending cuts where possible. We have tried a value-added tax. We have tried everything possible, but we cannot get the truth out to the American people.

Yes, I am voting for President Clinton's budget. His track record is true. He is the only President we have had around here that has done something

about this deficit. He has cut it in half. He has done it with tax increases as well as \$500 billion in spending cuts. And the ones that caused this deficit—there ought to be ashes in their mouths—the ones that caused this rotten dilemma of spending \$1 billion a day for nothing, have the audacity to be running around saying how honest they are and how true they are and how balanced their budget is.

Read page 5: Deficits. It does not say "balance" in their document. It cannot under the law. In fact, it is really more than the \$108 billion listed, because the law does not require them to list robbing the distinguished Chair's retirement, robbing the military retirees, still robbing the Medicare trust fund, and others. All told, it is \$151.9 billion. That is why these funds are not being used for the highways, the airports, or workers' retirement. We are robbing them. It is a shabby act.

But they know no shame. They come around with their little charts. We hadn't seen their budget or anything else. They had the President's budget for 4 months, so they would work up their charts. And we would go into the Budget Committee, and they would go through their little acts. They had the Senator from Texas complaining about exactly what they have in defense.

They had the Senator from Missouri talk about veterans, the next one talked about defense and came on with all his charts. It was just all apple-sauce, just a show on C-SPAN. We had no choice except to take their plan or leave it. What they offered was a three-way breakdown of the reconciliation process and ultimately, in my opinion, a violation of the Byrd rule.

For the first time to my knowledge, they are using the reconciliation process to actually increase the deficit. By at least \$122 billion. You can read it again in this document, in section (c) on page 51, that if the legislation is enacted pursuant to sections A and B no later than September 18, the Committee on Finance shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill proposing changes in laws with any jurisdiction necessary to reduce revenues. That is so they can go around to the rich crowd in New York and say, "We will give you capital gains." It is in their contract but it will not work.

The one that should have set himself aside and be done with that silly contract is the distinguished Speaker. I yield the floor.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, on behalf of this side, I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM], is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I am going to get back to the subject that we are here to talk about, the President's budget. Rather than getting into all of this argument about what is phony and what is not phony, it seems to me we what we ought to do is look at what this budget claims to do. The

budget is the one issue of the year through which we define what we want America to be. In this case, we are talking about what we want America to be over the next 7 years.

Let me begin by doing something that we do not do much of around here. Let us assume that every word in the President's budget is true, let us assume that we are going to do everything he asks us to do, and let us assume that everything he says will work will indeed work. We will grant him every assumption you would grant somebody to try to give them the benefit of the doubt.

Let us take this budget, this great big thick document that we now have debated for 2 hours, and view it as Bill Clinton's vision for the future of America. What I want to do is ask not whether you can find on page 54 something that does not make sense, but rather to ask "What kind of vision is this?" Is this an America we want? This is the question that we are here today to talk about.

First of all, let me just look at the Clinton budget and assume that everything works out exactly the way the President wants it to work out. I want to talk about what kind of America we will have if this happens and compare it to the America of the 1940's, the 1950's, the 1960's, the 1970's, and the 1980's. This, again, assumes that everything works out exactly as the President hopes it will. This is the best case Bill Clinton scenario.

First of all, let us look at the tax burden. In the 1940's, the average American family sent to Washington about 16.5 percent of everything they made; the Government took about 16.5 percent of all goods and services produced in America. In the 1950's, it rose to 17.6 percent. In the 1960's and 1970's, it was up to 18 percent. If we adopt Bill Clinton's budget and enforce it exactly as it is written, where everything works out exactly as he wants it to and with the most rosy scenarios he can assume, we are committing ourselves to the highest tax burden in the history of the United States of America: 19.3 percent out of every dollar earned in America is going to come to Washington and be spent by Bill Clinton. These are the President's numbers and this is the President's vision. Under the best of circumstances, where everything works out exactly as the President would like it to, the American taxpayer will face the highest tax burden in the history of the United States of America.

Further, under the President's plan, the cumulative tax burden will never have been higher. When you add up State, local, and Federal taxes, over 30 percent of all money earned by all sources in America will be spent not by the people who earn the money but by their Government. So this is the first part of the Clinton vision—the highest taxes in American history.

The second part of his vision is social spending, by which I mean nondefense

spending. In the 1950's, the Federal Government spent 7.4 cents out of every dollar earned by every American on nondefense programs. This rose in the 1960's, in the so-called Great Society period, to 10.2 cents out of every dollar earned. It rose to 14.6 cents out of every dollar in the 1970's, and then 17.1 cents in the 1980's. If we adopt Bill Clinton's budget, and if it does everything he says it will do, we are still talking about social spending taking 17.3 cents out of every dollar earned by every American. That is the highest level of social spending in the history of the United States of America—thus giving us both the highest taxes in American history and the highest level of social spending.

What about defense? In the 1940's, 7.9 percent of all income earned by all Americans went to national defense. As the cold war heated up in the 1950's, it grew to 10.6 percent. In the 1960's, it was 8.9 percent, and then it leveled out at 6 percent in the 1970's and 1980's. If we adopt Bill Clinton's budget and all the dramatic cuts in national defense expenditures that it entails, expenditures on national security as a percentage of the income earned by all Americans will be at the lowest level since the 1930's, with only 3.4 cents out of every dollar going to our national defense. This is the President's vision: the highest tax burden in American history, the highest social spending in American history, and the lowest defense spending in the post-war era. If we adopt the President's budget, we will have social spending twice as high as the Great Society's social spending, we will have taxes substantially above the tax burden of the Great Society, and we will have defense spending substantially below the Jimmy Carter era. That is the Clinton vision.

In addition, what kind of growth rate does the Clinton administration say his budget is capable of generating? Let me begin with a brief reminder of the country we live in. If you have ever wondered why Americans, until this generation, have always been confident that their children will have a brighter future than they had, it is because up until now this has been true. We live in one of the few countries in the history of the world where it has been the routine for people's parents to do better than their grandparents, who did better than their great-grandparents, and where people knew that if they worked hard, if they were dedicated, they were going to do better than their own parents.

Here is the reason why: In the 1950's, we had real economic growth in America which resulted in job creation, growth in the value of the things that we produced, and, as a result, real GNP grew on average by 4 percent. It grew by 4.4 percent in the decade of the 1960's.

But then something happened in the decade of the 1960's. What happened in the decade of the 1960's is that we traded an economy which was growing at 4

percent a year for a government that would grow at 9 percent a year, and, as a result, economic growth started falling. We had 3.2 percent growth in the 1970's, and 2.8 percent growth in the 1980's. The most optimistic assumption that the Clinton administration could come up with, given their budget, given what they are doing in taxing and spending, is that the economy will grow by a mere 2.3 percent. This is their rosy scenario.

So, when you go back and look at it, what is the Clinton vision? It is the highest tax level in American history. It is the highest level of spending on social programs in American history. It is the lowest defense expenditure level since World War II and it is the lowest economic growth rate that we have had in the 20th century. That is the vision of this budget and that is exactly why it ought to be rejected.

Let me address another issue: Medicare. It is an issue that frustrates me, because almost nobody is facing up to this problem, least of all the Clinton administration. The trustees of Medicare did a study last year which, given the rate that money is being spent out of the Medicare trust fund, and given the rate that it is coming into the trust fund from the high premium you pay in your payroll tax and the part B premium that our senior citizens pay for physician services, concluded that only people who were age 60 and above had any kind of guarantee of receiving benefits. This means that the remaining 93 percent of the people in America, many of whom had paid in excess of \$30,000 into Medicare, had no guarantee whatsoever that they were going to ever get a penny of benefits from Medicare. Now, I remind you that three of these trustees are Cabinet officials of the Clinton administration. So this is not Senator DOMENICI talking; this is the Clinton administration.

What happened since that time? Well, two things have happened. The commission has gone back and looked at the data and, because costs are up sharply, they have concluded that Medicare is not 7 years from bankruptcy, it is now 6, and we are moving toward 5—so the numbers are actually worse than what is on this chart. The Clinton administration claims that it has submitted a plan that will protect 13 percent of the beneficiaries of Medicare and will roughly guarantee benefits to everybody who is 55 or older. That means that, according to President Clinton's own figures, 87 percent of the people who have paid into Medicare have no guarantee whatsoever.

But when CBO looked at the Clinton proposal, they concluded that, at best, it would keep Social Security solvent only for one extra year. So the best the Clinton administration could do, while telling senior citizens that the people who want to deal with the Medicare crisis are trying to take their benefits away, is give us a Medicare policy that says to 92 percent of the people who have already paid into Medicare, "We

are not going to guarantee your benefits. The problem is getting worse, but we are not going to fool with it." Why? Well, 7 years is two Presidential elections away so it's not this President's problem.

Now, we can be sure that after the election, they are going to start talking about raising the payroll tax because if you raise that payroll tax by about a third, you can begin to come to grips with this problem.

Let me remind you of what the Republicans tried to do in the balanced budget act that the President vetoed. The President went on and on about how we were going to decimate Medicare. But let me just show you how modest our attempt was relative to the crisis we are facing. We tried to guarantee Medicare for a generation. Had our reforms been signed into law, it would have guaranteed Medicare, under the current estimates, to everybody who, based on an average life expectancy, is 46 years old or older. But you will notice that for 72 percent of the people who have paid Medicare taxes, we could not have guaranteed their benefits. We have, in our budget today, a modest proposal on Medicare, with the goal of making it solvent for another decade. Some day, we are going to have to come to grips with this.

The great tragedy is, rather than the President doing what, very much to his credit, Ronald Reagan did—that is, getting a bipartisan group together in the mid 1980's and solving, at least for 20 years, the Social Security problem—the President is now playing politics. He calls dealing with a third of the problem an assault on Medicare while letting 92 percent of the people stand with no guarantee of medical benefit is called responsible.

The truth is that the President has not come to grips with this problem, and the real crime is that our senior citizens are being told that the Republicans, who are attempting to deal responsibly with this situation, are trying to take something away from them. The truth, however, is that leaving the current situation in place, where in 6 years Medicare is going to be bankrupt, creates an environment in which a great tragedy is just waiting to happen. In the private sector, anybody in a position of fiduciary responsibility in who let this happen would go to prison.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRAMM. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Parliamentarian be sure to advise us when the Senator's time has expired? I will yield him time off the resolution.

Will the Senator look at the last column, the 31 percent, which is the Republican proposal? Is it not true that in order to get that which was vetoed by the President—and we are talking about the trust fund only—is it not true that there was not any increase in payments by senior citizens, that this was done by reform, that was done by

provider changes and giving options to the senior citizens, and there were no increases in the costs of part B protection to the seniors? Is that not correct?

Mr. GRAMM. That is right.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GRAMM. I want to note one other thing. I do not want to get into a big discussion on Medicare but one of the clearly irresponsible actions that ought to be denounced on a bipartisan basis is what the President has done with his nursing home provision. One of the things the President's budget does in order to make Medicare look less insolvent is to take the nursing home component, which costs \$55 billion over 7 years and which is now being paid for out of part A, out of Medicare. But he is not putting it anywhere, and, as if by magic, he assumes that somewhere this \$55 billion is going to appear.

The final issue I would like to talk about is the issue of taxing and spending. Let me start by talking about taxes. It never ceases to amaze me that we have something underway here in Washington that the public is beginning to understand, but has not quite come to fully appreciate, and it is very much like the defense realization that occurred in the 1980's. By the early part of the 1980's, the American people understood that, in foreign policy, the Democrats had a basic approach of blame-America-first. Whatever happened, according to the Democrats, it was our fault. If there were troubles in the world, the Democrats said it was because of our greed and our imperialism. But finally, in the 1980's, the American people began to disregard these claims because they realized that this was just the knee-jerk approach of the Democrats. I want to talk about taxes from this point of view and the point I want to make is this: To the Democrats, every tax increase is fair, and no matter how unfair it may actually be, they define it as being fair and go to incredible lengths to convince people it is fair.

The second point I want to make is that, according to the Democrats, every tax cut is unfair, no matter who it goes to and no matter who it affects. By definition, the Democrats say every tax cut is unfair. And after a tax is increased and it actually turns out to be unfair, only then do the Democrats say it is unfair—yet they propose to correct it by raising taxes again.

Let me give you an example. In 1993, we heard on the floor of the Senate—and the President to this day says, "We only taxed rich people." Let me take a couple of examples that I think reveal the errors of this statement.

The President proposed in his budget in 1993, in his largest tax increase in American history, to raise taxes on people who earned Social Security benefits. He raised taxes on people who made \$25,000 or more, but how did he go about hiding it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would tell the Senator that his time has expired.

Mr. GRAMM. Will the Senator yield me 10 minutes?

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield 10 minutes off the resolution.

Mr. GRAMM. How they went about hiding it is, first, they said that really they are not talking about people earning \$25,000 because these are older people who own their own homes. So we are going to impute, for the first time ever, income, and it became part of a concept of American budgeting. So if your mother owns her own home, the President would say, "Well, look, if she had to rent that home she would have had to pay \$400 a month or \$500 a month. So we are not really taxing her at \$25,000 because we are not taxing the imputed value of her home." Or she owns a lawn mower, or she owns a car, or she owns a dishwasher; if she rented those things, it would be imputed income. Actually, she is rich. She is making \$25,000 a year, but she is rich because she may own a dishwasher, she may own a car. She worked a lifetime. She owns her own home. If you imputed the value of all of those things, her income would be higher.

The Congress rightfully rejected that. But our Democratic colleagues imposed the tax on anybody making \$34,000 a year or more who gets any Social Security. They said, this is not an income tax. But I want to show you that it is.

This chart is a page from the advisory that was put out to go with your 1040 form in 1994, the year after the tax increase went into effect. People get a notice from the IRS that they are getting ready to be taxed again, then later get a form telling them how to fill it out, and then they get the tax form.

Let me read for you what the IRS said when they sent income tax forms to 120 million Americans. Here is what they said:

Social Security benefits. If your income, including one-half of your Social Security benefits, is over \$34,000 if single (over \$44,000 if married, filing jointly), more of your benefits may be taxable. See the instructions for lines 20(a) and 20(b).

Let me show you on the 1040 form. This is income taxes. Look down here at line 20(a) which I have blown up. What line 20(a) says is, "Social Security benefits." In other words, you put your Social Security benefits right there and then you pay an income tax on them.

So do you know how the Democrats argue that they were taxing rich people? Basically, they argued if you make \$25,000 or more, you are rich, and if you own a dishwasher or if you own your own home or you own your own car, you are richer than you think, because if you had to rent all of those things, it would cost you money.

We are trying to cut taxes on working families. The only tax cut in our budget this year is the \$500-per-child tax credit. That would mean that if you have two children, you are going to pay \$1,000 less in income taxes. You are going to be able to invest that

money in your own children, your own family, your own future.

We know that most people who are rich or who are upper-middle income really only start making money once their children are grown. So we are not shocked to hear that 75 percent of the benefits of this \$500 tax credit goes to families that make less than \$75,000 a year. But do our colleagues say, "Well, we are against cutting taxes for working families because we believe Government can do a better job spending their money than they can do for themselves"? No. They say this is a tax cut for the rich. When they tax people who make \$25,000 a year, they say they are rich. So, in one sense, they are consistent.

But let me remind you what they are consistent about. They are consistent in saying that every tax is a tax on the rich and that every tax is fair.

Another example which disproves this is the gasoline tax. President Clinton tried to implement a so-called Btu tax that would have raised the price of gasoline 7 cents a gallon. What he got was 4.3 cents. I am glad every Republican voted against it. I am proud of it. This was the first permanent gasoline tax that went to general revenue, and not toward build highways.

Historically, the gas tax has gone to highways because to do otherwise makes it a discriminatory tax. If you live in Texas, the odds are you spend almost twice as much on gas than if you live in New York. If you live in a rural area where you have to drive great distances to get to work, you spend more on gasoline. If you live in the West, you spend more. If you live in the East, you spend less. If you live in the South, you spend more. If you live in the North, you spend less.

The way we have dealt with the inequity is that we have used the gasoline taxes to build highways. So if you pay more, you get more. But President Clinton took the 4.3-cent-a-gallon tax on gasoline and spent it on his social programs. So we took money away from people driving their car and their truck to work to give money to people who do not work.

Is that taxing the rich? No. It is taxing working people. We are trying to repeal the tax—the Democrats say it is a great idea. The problem is, this is the 21st day that we have tried to offer an amendment to repeal that 4.3-cent-a-gallon tax and, to this day, we have not gotten a vote.

So, the principle I want people to understand is: whenever the Democrats raise taxes, whether they tax people who make \$34,000 a year or whether they tax gasoline, they always claim to be taxing rich people. Whenever we try to cut taxes, therefore, they say we are cutting taxes for rich people.

The plain truth is, God did not make enough rich people to make the Democrats's claims hold true. As these tax burdens, year after year after year, have gone up, what we have discovered is, if you are going to take 19.3 percent

out of every dollar earned in America, you are going to have to take it from the people who earn that money. That is basically middle-income or upper-middle-income families and that is what the Democrats have consistently done.

One very final point—and I do not want to get into the sparring contests with our colleagues about what is phony and what is not phony, but to stand up here and say that President Clinton's budget is in balance with a straight face neglects the fact that when the Congressional Budget Office Director, Dr. June O'Neill, was before the Finance Committee and she was asked, "Is the Clinton budget in balance," here is what she said: "CBO estimates that the basic policy proposals in the President's budget would lower the deficit substantially below the Congressional Budget Office baseline projections, but the deficit would still total \$84 billion 7 years from now."

So how does the President close that gap? He closes that gap with a little piece of fine print where, in essence, he says, if for some reason the budget is not in balance, take back the tax cut.

Tax America first. Spend first, tax first. Always tax. Never give the tax back. This is the Clinton prescription that we are talking about here.

In the end, we are talking about competing visions. What kind of vision do we have for our country? The vision of Bill Clinton, the vision of our Democratic colleagues, is one of more Government, more social spending than ever in history, less defense than ever in the postwar period, and the highest tax burden in American history. That is their vision.

Our vision is different. You can be for it. You can be against it. But our vision is a vision of more freedom and opportunity. We want to control spending. We want to let working families keep more of what they earn. We think families can spend their money better than the Government.

That is the choice. The Democrats believe Government can do it better. We believe that families can do it better. It is a choice the American people need to make. We are going to make part of that choice here on the Clinton budget. The question is, do we want to commit ourselves to a future of more taxing and more spending? I think the answer is no. I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes off the resolution.

Before Senator GRAMM leaves the floor, would you put up your Medicare chart?

I want to share a few observations with you about this, and you can tell me whether you think I am right, and you can add your marvelous way of expressing things to what I am talking about.

We have in our files a letter from the Congressional Budget Office that says if you do not do something about part A, the Medicare trust fund, in 10 years—10 years—it will be \$440 billion in the red.

Now, you have been talking about whether we ought to do something or not based upon what we understand the facts to be.

It seems to me that what the President is doing—and yesterday I gave the President's budget an award. I crowned it with a new award. It is going to get the Oscar for fiction. The Oscar for fiction.

Let me ask you if you do not think this is a marvelous fiction in this budget. While this fund is going to be \$440 billion in the red, the President says, "I want to fix that, so I will take away some of the responsibility of this trust fund." Right? That is what you have been telling us about. What is the responsibility in that trust fund that is growing the fastest of all of the accounts?

Mr. GRAMM. Home health care.

Mr. DOMENICI. Home health care. Right.

Now, if you wanted to fix that trust fund without doing anything real, then you would say, "Let us not pay for the fastest growing part of Medicare. Take it out." So the President's budget says, "We are not going to pay for that out of the trust fund and, seniors, you ought to be thrilled; I am making your trust fund more solvent."

My mind has not yet permitted me to reduce this to some simple statement, but it is smoke and mirrors at least. It is gimmickry at its worst.

Mr. GRAMM. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMENICI. Please.

Mr. GRAMM. It seems to me it goes beyond that because there is already a lot of cynicism in budgeting—probably because the numbers are so big and we are doing it over multiple years. But to simply take home health care, the fastest growing part of Medicare and say we are going to help Medicare by taking it out of the Medicare expenditure accounting but we are not paying for it in any other way, we are just simply taking it out of accounting, that creates a level of cynicism which I think reaches a new level.

It would be like if the Senator went to the doctor and the doctor says: You are in great shape except you have liver cancer. I cannot cure that but let me tell you, I can work on the rest of your body. You can go on an exercise program, you lose a little weight; you can quit smoking—

Mr. DOMENICI. You did not mean me.

Mr. GRAMM. No, but you would not just do all this other stuff until you died. No doctor in the world would do that. Instead he would say: Look, we have got to do something about this cancer. We have got to do it right now.

All I am saying is, and I am not giving us the Academy Award for solving the Medicare problem, but we are try-

ing to solve the problem for at least a generation. The President, however, is simply saying: Look, it is not going to happen until after the election. After the election, maybe we can raise the payroll tax.

I think this is something we ought to do something about now.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, let me say that the Senator actually said it right. The President takes \$55 billion worth of the responsibility from the protected care for seniors. They are guaranteed it under that trust fund, and he takes it out. And you said he does not provide any means of paying for it.

Now, in a sense, that is because the taxpayers are going to pay for it—\$55 billion worth of new taxes are going to be required for that \$55 billion that, lo and behold, made Medicare solvent so the President did not have to bite any difficult bullets with reference to Medicare.

Now, that is how I see it. I am being as honest as I can.

Now, let me finish the thought and you fill in anything if I have not said it right. There is the second part of Medicare, which is the part B insurance program, started under Dwight Eisenhower, a great idea. We said back then we will put up 50 percent; seniors, you put up 50 percent, and we will write you a health insurance. Everything that is not covered in the trust fund we cover. That is essentially the rules of the game. But we always thought the senior would pay part and the Government would pay part.

Incidentally, the whole argument last year was what that part should be. Should it be 31 percent or 25, should it be \$6 more or \$7 more or \$2 more. The President decided that for this new \$55 billion, the seniors would pay nothing. The taxpayers will pay the \$55 billion.

Now, frankly, that is nice. That is nice except I wonder about the working families around who have two or three children and they do not have any health insurance or they are struggling for it. They have just been given a nice present—\$55 billion of your taxes over the next 6 years have to be used to pay for the President's gimmick, as I see it.

I thank the Senator for accommodating me.

Mr. GRAMM. If I may just conclude with this point. I have always believed that not addressing this problem before the election means sometime later we will be looking at a massive increase in the payroll tax. I believe that next year or the year after, if we do not address this problem now, we are going to be here on the floor of the Senate debating a 20- or 30-percent increase in the payroll tax, and all because the President was unwilling to do anything about these exploding costs.

Mr. DOMENICI. I want to just close my remarks. There was an article by Robert Samuelson found in the Washington Post a few days ago. Actually, it was about Senator DOLE's opportunities. That was the styling of it. I am

going to put it in the RECORD after my remarks. But I want to read two sentences.

At some point, spending and benefits will be cut to avoid costs that seem politically intolerable. The trouble is that the longer the changes are delayed, the more abrupt and unfair they will be. That's why silence is irresponsible.

I believe that is true. Silence or gimmickry on this issue is irresponsible.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment by the distinguished minority leader, Mr. DASCHLE, and the distinguished ranking member of the Budget Committee, Mr. EXON.

I have been talking with the people of Massachusetts about this budget. The people of Leominster and Worcester and Falmouth don't come up to me and say: "Senator, how does that spending compare to the OMB baseline?" They don't scream out: "What is the savings in the outyears compared with the savings in next fiscal year?" They don't ask: "What is the cap on entitlement spending?" But, Mr. President, that does not mean that the people of Massachusetts are apathetic about the Federal budget. They want to know if the Congress is going to work with the President to balance the budget. And they want to know how the budget is going to help them.

The proposal submitted to Congress by the President of the United States balances the budget. This proposal before us eliminates the deficit in 2002.

When he came to office in 1993, the President worked with Democrats in Congress, and we took a \$290 billion deficit and cut it in half in 3 years. That achievement fulfills the President's promise in 1992 to halve the deficit in his first term.

America's deficit is still pernicious—but right now, we are doing better than any other nation in the world. Our deficit is smaller as a share of our economy than the shortfall in any other major economy in the world.

Mr. President, let me state clearly: President Clinton and the Democrats in Congress worked together to enact this economic plan—and we did this without one single Republican vote.

This budget reflects our priorities of deficit reduction without forgetting our commitment to middle-class Americans. Please remember, Mr. President, something the Republican Party seems to forget: Deficit reduction, in and of itself, is not an economic policy.

It is part of a larger picture. It is part of a vision—the Democrats' vision—of this country's future which will lead us into the next century with a healthier American economy and a stronger middle class. That's good for America's corporate headquarters and America's households.

Our plan has kept interest rates low, so more Americans have been able to buy a first home or a new car.

Our plan has subdued inflation to 2.7 percent since 1993—the yield on 10-year

Treasury notes dropped a full point when this plan was enacted. That helped alleviate the credit crunch which hurt so many of my friends and neighbors in Massachusetts during the Reagan-Bush recession.

Our plan has created more than 8 million jobs—including 1 million jobs in basic industries like construction and manufacturing. It has fostered robust and steady growth of gross domestic product—unlike the recession of the early 1990's which crippled the American family.

This proposal before us, the President's budget, continues our good record. It balances the budget the right way—by making Government smaller and more efficient, by promoting a strong economy and a healthy business environment, by investing in the programs that matter to working Americans.

There is a right way to balance the budget—to make Government more efficient without ripping away the safety net from the American family. This budget leaves no one behind. It helps people who need help and closes loopholes on those who don't.

The American people understand this, Mr. President. This is a budget which reflects their priorities.

Mr. President, let me take a moment to tell our colleagues about the impact this budget has on the families in my home State of Massachusetts. The President's budget designates more American cities as empowerment zones—a program designed to stimulate community revitalization. Our colleague from Connecticut, Senator LIEBERMAN, understands how important this program is to America's cities. He has introduced legislation which would expand the tax credits under the Empowerment Zone Program to cities designated as enterprise communities. I support his efforts and I support the President's expansion of the current successful program.

The expansion promises to help communities across Massachusetts like Boston, Lowell, Springfield, and Lawrence. The President's budget will allow these cities and others to develop and expand opportunities for their residents through a series of tax benefits, social service grants, and better program coordination.

At a time when some cities face high unemployment and high poverty rates, the Congress should be passing a budget which encourages economic growth and citizen participation in strategic plans for revitalization.

We, Democrats, are fighting to expand empowerment zones while we hold back Republican attempts to distress our urban centers further by cutting services vital to low-income Americans, like the low-income tax credit.

The President's budget commits a full \$1 billion for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program in fiscal year 1997, \$1 billion in advanced appropriations for fiscal year 1998 and \$300 million for emergency funding. Mr.

President, this past winter, my State survived one of the most brutal winters we have seen in a century.

There was record snow in Boston and small towns all over New England. Families in Dorchester, in Everett, and in Malden—families all across Massachusetts—relied on LIHEAP to assist with staggering heating bills.

This program literally kept families from freezing: I am proud the President has committed Federal resources necessary to meet the needs of working Americans, and I am discouraged that the Republican budget resolution is silent on funding for LIHEAP. The President and the Democrats are committed to the working families in Massachusetts and New England. The Republicans are silent.

The President's budget proposes \$200 million to electrify the Amtrak segment between Boston and New Haven—a project which will make possible high-speed rail travel between Boston and Washington, DC, by the year 2000.

The President and Democrats commit \$5.5 million to conservation and management of fisheries which would help restore New England's collapsed stock of cod, flounder, and haddock. The Republicans are silent.

The President and the Democrats are fighting for \$500 million in mass transit operating subsidies for Massachusetts. This means commuters to Boston will not constantly be asked to pay higher fares just to get to work. Republicans are silent.

The President and the Democrats are fighting for \$650 million for the Central Artery. The Republicans are silent.

The President and the Democrats are fighting to expand the Summer Jobs Program which gives so many young people in Massachusetts their first work experience.

This budget follows the wisdom of Mayor Menino who joined me in fighting against the Republican shut-downs earlier this year. He knew the effect these shut-downs would have on summer jobs. We forced them to open the Government, fund the Summer Jobs Program and we will together fight to expand it by giving another 500,000 kids a chance for employment. But, then as now, the Republicans are silent.

The President and the Democrats are fighting the AIDS epidemic and have committed resources to highly affected cities like Boston by fully funding the Ryan White CARE Program. This means nutrition services to people living with AIDS, and testing and counseling for those who fear HIV-infection, will continue at the AIDS services organizations across the State. The Republicans are silent.

The President and the Democrats are fighting for \$100 million for the cleanup of Boston Harbor, and the Republicans are silent.

That silence is unacceptable, Mr. President.

I will do all I can to break the silence. I will come to the floor as often as possible and discuss the ill-effects of the Republican budget.

If the President's proposal is not accepted by the Senate, I will not give up on the environment. I will offer an amendment at a later stage in this debate, and I will fight to restore drastic cuts in environmental programs the Republicans have imposed on the American people and the residents of Massachusetts.

And, while we fight to clean our air and our water, the Republicans have locked arms against the American taxpayers. The Republican plan slashes funding for the Environmental Protection Agency and allows polluters to foist the tab for their mess on the taxpayers rather than forcing the polluters to clean up after themselves.

If the President's budget is not accepted, I will offer an amendment that recognizes education as the key to economic and income security. I will offer an amendment to add-back the cuts the Republicans are making to the President's plan. I am proud he has included a provision for which I have been fighting in this Congress—the President's budget calls for a \$10,000 deduction for educational expenses. That is real money to working families who face double-digit inflation in the cost of higher education.

Real money to help real people. Listen to some of the letters I have received recently:

Melvin Harris of Roxbury wrote to me:

My son is currently attending school at Morgan State University in Baltimore. He and I were shocked to find that federal funds had been cut drastically which he was depending on. With me being a retiree, it is hard for me to pay his tuition, room and board. Would you please do something to help me?

The President's budget will help Mr. Harris.

Timothy Crawford of Wellesley wrote to me:

As a senior in high school, I am looking forward to going away to college next year. I have worked hard to get good grades throughout high school and have been accepted to good schools and am now trying to make the decision of where to attend. One very important part of my decision is the price of the school and the assistance I can get.

I am afraid the Republicans in our government will cut education programs and I may not be able to attend college, my brother may not be able to attend college, or we have to work out a plan so that one of us goes to college while the other works.

I hope you will continue to support education and do something to help us.

The President's proposal will help Timothy Crawford and his family.

I have dozens of letters from students at Wellesley College. And, hundreds of letters from physicians and attorneys who cannot repay their student loans, and millworkers and musicians who ask for help sending their kids to college. And, the President's proposal will help them all.

The President has learned from Massachusetts the importance of science and technology to the American economy. This budget marks the fourth

straight year the Democrats have proposed an increase in science and technology programs—while the Republicans would cut science and technology programs by 30 percent by the year 2002.

I will fight for the President's proposal for an increase of \$13 billion for university-based research: it is the key to America's future. And, Massachusetts knows this better than almost every other State in the Union.

The President and the Democrats have given us a chance to fight back against crime in our neighborhoods. This budget proposes \$2 billion for 49,000 new police officers to protect America's neighborhoods. Putting additional cops on the beat in communities across Massachusetts will help deter crime, break the cycle of violence, and make our towns and neighborhoods safer places to live.

In 1994, I fought successfully to increase the funding in the crime bill to put an additional 100,000 cops on the street by the year 2000. And, it is paying off for Massachusetts. Just this week, 99 Massachusetts cities will receive more funding—Worcester will receive \$1.85 million to hire 18 officers. Springfield will receive \$1.25 million to hire 17 officers and Lowell will receive \$1.5 million to hire 20 new officers. To date, thanks to this program, my home State has received funding for 1,300 new police men and women.

While the Republicans continue to threaten the community policing fund—jeopardizing the safety of corner stores and neighborhood schools and households—the President's budget understands the needs of Massachusetts' neighborhoods. That's why I support this proposal.

The President and the Democrats also propose \$25 million for new advanced police officer education and training. State and local police departments need assistance to meet the growing demands of law enforcement and I am prepared to fight to help them.

And, Mr. President, what do we hear from the other side of the aisle? The same, war-torn, threadbare rhetoric about tax and spending. The same partisan bickering. Is this proposal all tax and spend? Of course not. The President's budget is certified by the Congressional Budget Office to balance in 6 years. It protects the environment. It protects our elderly. It funds education and puts cops on the street. It takes care of the little guy.

In the face of the extreme Republican budget, the President and we, Democrats, have given the country hope by reducing the deficit with common sense and compassion. It saves the Medicare Program for our seniors, and the Medicaid Program for our children and low-income Americans.

My friends in Massachusetts just don't buy it when you tell them: "this isn't a cut—it's merely a reduction in the growth of spending." They understand that the extreme Republican

budget forces them to spending twice as much on Medicare premiums.

They understand that Cape Cod beaches will be under attack, and Boston harbor clean-up will be stalled while their water and sewer rates are skyrocketing. They understand that they are paying into the system and—under the Republican plan—they will be getting little in return.

They understand that when the Republicans are not speaking in arcane, incomprehensible, confusing budget jargon—they are silent.

The President's budget speaks to the people I meet at home in Massachusetts. This budget meets our spending priorities and promises more good economic news for the American family. That is why I support it.

I urge our colleagues to support his balanced budget.

Mr. DODD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I yield myself as much time as I may consume off the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, let me begin my remarks by commending my colleague from New Mexico, who is the chairman of this committee, who has the unenviable task of chairing the Budget Committee. While we have our disagreements from time to time, I have a great deal of respect for him as a colleague, as a Member, and I appreciate the fine work that he does on behalf of his State and on behalf of the country.

I will take a few minutes and go over some of the budget items. He does not have to stay. I know he has other things to do. But I did not want him to leave the floor without expressing my appreciation for the work he does.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. DOMENICI. I want to say for the RECORD, it is mutual. While my colleague does not chair the budget committee—there cannot be that mutuality—he probably would not want it anyway. In any event, I want to say that my colleague's participation and contribution in matters that we work on, from my standpoint, is very much appreciated. I commend the Senator on the way he has handled himself.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, at some later point I will also have some extended remarks on the announcement by the majority leader, who has decided he is going to retire from the Senate the first part of June. While we, too, have our differences, suffice it to say, as a colleague and a friend, he will be missed. I mean that very deeply and sincerely.

Mr. President, I will just begin my remarks here by asking unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from June O'Neill, who is the

Director of the Congressional Budget Office, dated May 9, 1996, in response in part to the colloquy between my colleague from New Mexico and our colleague from Texas regarding the condition of the hospital insurance trust fund. She says in that letter, here, and I am quoting it now:

Under current law, the HI trust fund is projected to become insolvent in 2001. CBO estimates the administration's proposals would postpone this date to 2005.

She goes into greater length here, responding to that, but I thought for the RECORD my colleagues ought to know what the Congressional Budget Office says with regard to the hospital trust fund.

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

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, May 9, 1996.

Hon. J. JAMES EXON,
Ranking Minority Member, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: At your request, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) has examined the effects of the Administration's budgetary proposals on the Hospital Insurance (HI) trust fund. Under current law, the HI trust fund is projected to become insolvent in 2001. CBO estimates that the Administration's proposals would postpone this date to 2005.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL,
Director.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I want to begin by trying to, if we can, get back to some basic information here, because you can get lost in a lot of the data and charts and numbers that get thrown around. Let us just remember we are talking about the President's budget. There is a budget presented by the committee and there will be some alternatives that will be offered in the coming days when we debate what the budget of the country ought to be, but I think it is worthwhile to point out we are talking about the President's budget to begin with.

Remember, this is a man who arrived in town in January 1993, 40 months ago—not 40 years ago, not a decade ago or 15 years ago; 40 months ago he arrives in town. He never served in Congress, never served in the Cabinet. He was the Governor of a small State. As he arrives at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, he has left on his doorstep a mountain of debt. A mountain of debt is left on his doorstep. As you begin to look back at 1980 and start there and follow this redline, where the Congressional Budget Office projections were before, those are facts, where the deficit was going, where it was headed just prior to the President's arrival in town, and then what has happened to the projection of the deficit since his arriving, right here, in 1993. Here we get clearly where things were going up until his arrival here, and now the same Congressional Budget Office says we are headed this way.

So, just for the purpose of clarity, let us keep in mind conditions when this

President arrives. We had mountains of debt, most of it accumulated between 1981 and 1993. In fact, we had a debt that went up almost \$4 trillion, from \$1 trillion in 1981 to \$4 trillion the day this President arrives in town. Then, in the 40 months he has been here, he has taken the projection of our deficit, which we are told was headed in this direction, and we are now moving it downward. So you begin with at least looking at the trend lines and where we are going.

The President's budget is a common-sense approach. It cuts more than half a trillion dollars in spending over 7 years, yet, at the same time, it maintains our priorities as a nation. The President's budget invests in people. It protects Medicare and Medicaid, education and the environment, and it would maintain our national investments in education, job training and technology, all of which I think we agree are important.

The budget maintains access to health care for our Nation's most vulnerable citizens. It keeps our natural environment and our workplaces safe. It understands that our overwhelming focus on balancing the budget should not cause us to ignore our national priorities. The President understands that all of this talk about balancing the budget should not cause us to lose sight of our most important national goals.

As I have said in the past, this body, in my view, needs to be focusing more of its attention on increasing economic growth. We need to reform the Tax Code so it promotes savings and investment and higher growth. We need to increase opportunities for education and job training so that all Americans will have the tools to succeed. We need to make pensions and health care portable so that Americans can better cope with the technological and economic changes that are occurring in their lives.

We should all remember that an increase of as little as one-half of 1 percent in the growth rate of the United States could create enormous opportunities for new jobs and expand options for millions of working Americans. Increasing growth is a priority, in my view, that should be reflected in everything that we do in Washington, and it should be reflected in the Federal budget. It is reflected in the President's budget.

All along, President Clinton has stressed there is a right way and a wrong way to balance the budget. The right way is by maintaining our commitment to Head Start, to police officers on the beat, to clean and healthy drinking water, to summer jobs, and to encouraging community service. Those are the kinds of priorities that help build a strong nation.

The wrong way to balance the budget is by having unnecessary, unwise spending cuts and tax cuts for those, frankly, who do not need them. I am going to get to that in a minute here.

Our dear friends on the other side, with all due respect, have not learned the lesson. The American public have said over and over again: You are going in the wrong direction. We want our budget balanced. We want it done, if we can, in the next 6 or 7 years, but we want our priorities to be reflected in that decisionmaking process.

What good does it do if you balance the budget and simultaneously make it impossible for my children to get a decent education, have access to higher education in this country? Balancing the budget and depriving the next generation of the tools it needs is foolhardy.

What good does it do to talk about balancing the budget if you are going to rip the heart out of the environmental laws that have made this a stronger and a healthier nation? What good is it to balance the budget if you then increase the financial burden of older Americans, if you begin to make it more difficult, because Medicare is being reduced, for these people to make ends meet? How many middle-income families depend upon Medicaid so their parents and their grandparents can have a decent, long-term health care program?

These are the kinds of things people say we need to invest in intelligently, making choices about where you reduce spending so we can achieve a balanced budget but make our country strong simultaneously. In our view, the President has done that with his budget. No one is suggesting any budget proposal is perfect, but certainly, given the evidence of the last 40 months, the direction we are heading in will make the case that this is a good proposal and one we ought to be working on, if we can, to achieve some common ground over the next 20 or so days left here so we can complete this budget process and do what the American public have asked us to do.

Let me, if I can, address some of these issues with greater specificity. I want to begin with the budget being cut. I say this because I think it is important that people understand where we have come from in the last 40 months. This is what is called a primary budget. This is entitled "Budget Without Interest Payments."

Obviously, interest payments must, like any financial obligation, be paid. But if you remove the interest payments—remember, you only get interest payments because of the burdens you accumulate. So if you take away the interest payments, here is the deficit that occurred over the 12 years from 1981 to 1993, those 12 years: \$660 billion. If you took away the interest obligations in the last 40 months, we have created a surplus of \$239 billion in this country in the last 40 months. Those numbers are not being made up. Those are real numbers.

So with all of this talk of what has happened here, here is a President who arrives in town in Washington for the first time in a Federal Government po-

sition, and in 40 months he is able to move us into the black, if you will—this chart is in the blue—but into the black for the first time in years.

President Clinton inherited a \$290 billion deficit in the year that he arrived in office. This year, the 1996 deficit will be \$144 billion. That is cut in half. Those are the realities.

Back in 1993, the Congressional Budget Office projected the deficit would hover around \$300 billion. That was their projection. Following the implementation of the Clinton budget plan in 1993, as I pointed out earlier, the budget has declined sharply. In fact, Mr. President, let me point out one additional statistic reflected in this chart. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the 1996 deficit will come in at 1.9 percent of the gross domestic product. That will be the first time since 1979 that the deficit has been below 2 percent of the gross domestic product. That is significant progress, and we ought to stay on that track, if we can.

This chart is without interest payments, as I said, and has been cut in half as a result of what has happened just in the last 40 months of this administration.

Let me, if I can, turn to the chart on job growth rate, because this is what people care about. Again, you can balance the budget tomorrow if you want to, just by juggling some numbers around here and getting rid of a lot of things. But this cannot be a process of just people with green visors and sharp pencils. What happens to real people in this country as a result of the decisions we make? If our only function were to balance the budget, we could do that simply by cutting out all our spending, if we wanted to, and raising taxes on everybody.

We have to ask the question: What happens to real people when you do this? So while we have been able to cut the deficit in half, and, if we eliminate the interest payments, actually we put this country into surplus for the first time in years. What has happened to jobs out there? What has happened to people's jobs? Again, look at jobs created per year.

In 1981 to 1992, jobs created per year were 1,540,000. That is the number of jobs created each year in those years. In 1989 through 1992, it averaged 608,000 jobs per year. But from 1993 to the present time, Mr. President, we have created in excess of 2,684,000 jobs a year. Compare that with 1,500,000 from 1981 to 1992; 600,000 from 1989 to 1992. We are now getting close to 3 million new jobs a year, while simultaneously bringing the deficit down.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield, because I think it is so important.

What that chart shows is the number of jobs created essentially under the Bush Presidency as opposed to the Clinton Presidency. What my friend is saying, and it is so dramatic I would like him to repeat it, is that under the Bush Presidency, there were how many new jobs created?

Mr. DODD. Under the 4 years President Bush served as President, we created on average of 608,000 jobs per year, and in the last 40 months, from January of 1993 through December of 1995—it does not include these last 4 or 5 months, but my colleagues will recall there were in excess of 620,000 jobs created in the month of February alone. That is more jobs created on a yearly basis than between 1989 and 1992.

Quickly someone is going to say, "Well, those aren't great jobs." That is wrong. The overwhelming number of these jobs, more than 90 percent of these jobs, are private sector jobs, and well over 60 percent of these jobs are high-paying jobs. Not every one of them is, but the overwhelming majority are high-paying jobs in the private sector.

Mrs. BOXER. My last question. When President Clinton ran for office, he made a promise on new jobs. As I understand it, that promise has been met; is that correct?

Mr. DODD. I say to my colleague from California, I believe it has, and promises were made in terms of cutting the deficit in half. Those are real numbers. The CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, says they are real numbers. So here is the deficit coming down, job creation is going up, and my colleagues on the other side are treating this like bad news, as if this was some dreadful information.

If we are on the right track, if things are working right, why do you not stick with the plan and the program here so that you have a healthy balance—investment in education, investment in our environment, cutting back our spending where we can, trying to have some sense of fairness about all of this so we move into the 21st century as a healthy nation.

Today, of the G-7 countries, we are the healthiest economy. We are the healthiest economy of all the great economic powers in the world. We are the healthiest today in terms of job creation and deficit reduction. Why are our markets responding the way they are? The people on Wall Street are not making those investments because they want to help Bill Clinton get re-elected. It is not because they are Democrats. They are making cold, hard financial decisions: Are we heading in the right direction or the wrong direction? They are investing because they think things are going in the right direction. It is their money they are putting on the table, and they like the trend lines they see: the deficit coming down, job creation going up.

You can dance all around this, you can try to throw out a lot of misinformation about it, but the hard line bottom facts are, we are on the right track, we are going in the right direction. A lot more has to be done. It would be foolish for anyone to stand up here and say our work is over with. It is not. There are going to be some difficult decisions that have to be made. But you cannot argue with the facts. Job creation, deficit reduction, the

trend lines of where we are going in this country are on a solid and sound footing.

So, Mr. President, I urge my colleagues in the coming days to move away from politics as usual. We need to come together. We have 20 to 25 days to get a job done. There is no debate here about whether or not we ought to balance the budget. I know some hope others will take a position—in fact, I heard someone the other day in the House of Representatives say, "We don't want to settle this because it is too good of an issue."

It reminds me of the story of the law clerk who arrives in a law firm and he has only been there a month. He walks in to the senior partner with this huge file, a file that has been around 20 years. He says to the senior partner of the law firm, "I've got great news, boss. This case that has been here 20 years. I've settled this case. It's over with. It's done. Everybody's happy."

The senior partner says, "Why did you do a thing like that for? I've educated four of my children on that file. You don't want to close that case, that's too good a case, keep that case open."

So we have certain friends who want to keep the case open, because it is a good case politically for them. Do not let it settle. For God's sake, do not come to an agreement, they say. Do not try to resolve your differences. The politics of that are dreadful; they are dreadful politics. Keep the issue alive, keep the debate going.

We are here to say today, let us end the debate. We can. We have agreed on balancing the budget in 7 years. We all have agreed to do it according to the Congressional Budget Office numbers. We are on the right track. The differences are not that great. They can be resolved. We can get the work done.

I urge my colleagues today on both sides, particularly those on the majority side—it is difficult, I know, to admit when you are wrong. That is a hard thing for anybody to do in this world. It is particularly hard, if you are in politics, to admit you are wrong, but the facts do not lie. The deficit has come down. A young Governor arrives from a small State in January of 1993, gets dumped on his doorstep—dumped on his doorstep—\$4 trillion in debt, some \$290 billion, \$300 billion in an annual deficit.

In 40 months, that deficit is down to \$144 billion. The Congressional Budget Office now says we are heading in the right direction, going in the right direction now. That is the right direction to be going in.

Job creation is up, the basic thing people need. The best social program anybody ever created is a job, a good job in this country. Here we have jobs being produced in the Nation while the deficit is coming down, and intelligent priorities, good priorities.

I heard the other day the House majority leader—put aside whether you are for or against a gasoline tax; we

can debate that, and will, in the coming days—but, my Lord, to hear the majority leader of the House of Representatives say, "I'll tell you how we'll pay for that—we'll cut education."

In my State, my working-class families in my State need the Pell grants and the student loans and the Stafford grants and so forth. Otherwise, they could not get an education. We have commencements coming up.

I am going to give a commencement speech at Western Connecticut State University, a State university in my State. Fifty percent of their students receive some form of financial help or assistance. Here we have the majority leader of the House of Representatives saying we ought to just pay for that gasoline tax by going after education. You wonder why people are suspicious.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. With some reluctance, I yield to my colleague.

Mr. DOMENICI. I just say—

Mr. DODD. I am on a roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. The distinguished majority leader in the House has not said that since that day.

Mr. DODD. My colleague from New Mexico obviously got a hold of him and straightened him out. I appreciate that. But come on, what else do you rely on, when you get up on a national news program and you say, "I'll tell you how I'd do it. This is how I'd do it"? Immediately the phones were ringing off the hook. What a foolish thing to say. So immediately they start to backtrack.

But if you wonder why the American people get suspicious about what the priorities are, it is statements like that. What are your real intentions?

So when we hear statements about Medicare, and we say, "We will let it wither on the vine," or, "I'm proud I voted against it 35 years ago," then everyone gets upset. You can understand the average person in this country gets a little nervous when they hear that. If they are relying on Medicare, relying on Medicaid, in order to meet basic health care costs, they are wondering, which side do we chose here? Who is going to watch out for me? They have one person saying, "Look, I think it ought to die or we get rid of it. I never thought it worked very well." And others say, "Look, we're going to have to make it work better and make tough decisions so it's there." Then you begin to understand the suspicions, the worries, the fears, the insecurities that many people feel. This is not an abstraction to them.

We have a good health care program as Members of the U.S. Congress. Thank God for it. We have a good health care program. But millions of Americans outside of Washington, Mr. President, they rely on Medicare. They rely on it. For many, Medicare is the difference between having a life of relative decency and being wiped out financially. It is not an abstraction to them.

So when we talk about these numbers and CBO and OMB and percentages and GDP, and so forth, that person out there today watching this debate says, "What does that mean in terms of me, my kids, our jobs, our health care? Where are we going? Who is on my side?"

So, again, I come back to the point, Mr. President, I tried to make at the outset here. Put aside all the glitter and all the distractions; we are going in the right direction on deficit reduction. It is a major issue. People care about it deeply. This President in 40 months, not 40 years, not 15 years, but 40 months, has moved the country in the right direction on deficit reduction for the first time in decades.

At the end of this fiscal year, we will have now had 4 years of deficit reduction, 4 consecutive years. You have to go back to Harry Truman's administration—Harry Truman's administration—to find another American President who took us through 4 years of consecutive deficit reduction.

We have reduced the size of the Federal work force under President Clinton by 270,000 jobs. Now, 30 percent of those jobs were in the military. My colleagues on the Budget Committee pointed that out. That is accurate. But 70 percent of those jobs came from the civilian work force.

By contrast, with all due respect, under President Reagan, the Federal work force increased by 188,000 positions; 188,000 positions during the 8 years of President Reagan. Contrast that with 270,000 fewer jobs in 40 months under President Clinton.

Under the leadership of AL GORE, the President has ripped out 16,000 pages of the 80,000 pages of Federal regulations, so that businesses in this country can work with less paperwork cluttering their desks.

Is it done yet? No; but for the first time, there is a real reduction in paperwork, real reduction in the size of the Federal work force, real reduction in the deficit, getting the unemployment rate down. Those are the things that people care about, seeing to it that Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment are going to get proper protection.

It is a commonsense budget. That is what has happened under this proposal. That is why I urge my colleagues on the other side in these coming few days to sit down. Let us work out this budget.

The President extended the hand to our majority leader. He said, "Let's come on down, you and I, no staff, no one else, and let's work this out together." Our majority leader is going to be here until June 11. I hope he will take him up on that offer. What a great thing it would be, before the majority leader leaves and retires from the Senate, with one of the great issues we have tried to resolve, if an American President and the majority leader, from the two different parties in this country, the two major parties, came

together, with no one else in the room, and the two of them sat down and worked out this problem before June 11.

What a great achievement that would be. I think both individuals would deserve the sincere praise and credit from the American public. I know we have an election in 25 weeks, but this issue deserves resolution, and we are close to achieving it.

You have a President taking us in the right direction. You have a majority leader who is about to retire from here, who I think could close the gap. I urge that that offer the President made to our majority leader be picked up before he retires, and let's see if we cannot complete this work.

For those reasons, Mr. President, I urge our colleagues to take a good, strong hard look at the budget that has been proposed by the President. It takes us in the right direction for all the reasons I mentioned. I urge its adoption. With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I speak off the resolution, Mr. President.

I might say to Senator DODD, I cannot at this point, because we are going to offer an amendment—but so the Senator will know, I will have an interesting rebuttal to what the Senator has said. I will give the other side of the coin sometime today. I do not want to do that and not have the Senator know about it. I cannot do it right now while the Senator is here because I have some commitments. But we will let the Senator know in advance, so if he wants to come down and sort of chide me, as I did him, he can.

I say, I had a little trouble with the Senator's analogy of the law firm and the old case, because it seems to me it is the President who is gaining from this budget debate. He is the one who has that old case. He is the one who ought not to get rid of it because it has been good for him. I have a strong suspicion that unless you settle the case his way, he is going to have that old case right on through the election because it is, as that senior partner said, it is a great livelihood and it has kind of been a great political livelihood for him.

Mr. DODD. If my colleague will yield.

Mr. DOMENICI. Of course.

Mr. DODD. Our colleagues will appreciate that my friend from New Mexico and I have spent a lot of time working together on old cases.

Mr. DOMENICI. That is right.

Mr. DODD. So we share at least our concern about old cases. I appreciate his comments. I will try to be here when he makes them.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I think we have tendered an amendment, second-degree amendment. We have given it to the minority so they know what it is. I understand that there are 7 minutes left on our side for our statu-

tory time to rebut the President's budget. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield back the 7 minutes. Now I yield to Senator FRIST for a second-degree amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is yielded back.

AMENDMENT NO. 3968 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3965

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that the discretionary spending caps should not include triggers that would make drastic reductions in nondefense discretionary spending in fiscal years 2001 and 2002 (the last 2 years of the budget) for the purpose of achieving a balanced budget in fiscal year 2002)

Mr. FRIST. 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 Tennessee [Mr. FRIST] proposes an amendment numbered 3968 to amendment No. 3965.

Mr. FRIST. I ask unanimous consent that further 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 pending amendment.

SEC. . COMMON SENSE BUDGETING AMENDMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) President Clinton proposed in this fiscal year 1997 budget submission immediate downward adjustments to discretionary caps after the year 2000 if the Congressional Budget Office projected that his budget would not balance in 2002;

(2) the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) has estimated that President Clinton's fiscal year 1997 budget submission will incur a deficit of \$84,000,000,000 in 2002;

(3) as a result of CBO's projected deficit in fiscal year 2002, the President's budget would trigger drastic reductions in discretionary spending in 2001 and 2002 to reach balance;

(4) these drastic reductions would have to occur in nondefense programs such as education, environment, crime control, science, veterans, and other human resource programs;

(5) 100 percent of the nondefense discretionary cuts in the President's budget occur in 2001 and 2002; and

(6) the inclusion in a budget submission of triggers to make immediate, drastic reductions in discretionary spending is inconsistent with sound budgeting practices and should be recognized as a "budgetary gimmick" that is antithetical to legitimate efforts to achieve balance in 2002.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the discretionary spending caps should not include triggers that would—

(1) result in 100 percent of the nondefense discretionary reductions occurring in fiscal years 2001 and 2002; and

(2) make drastic reductions in nondefense discretionary spending in fiscal years 2001 and 2002 (the last 2 years of the budget) for the purpose of achieving a balanced budget in fiscal year 2002.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I submit what is a very simple and straightforward amendment today that strikes, I think, at the heart of one of the major problems that we all have with the President's proposal.

To set the stage for this amendment, let me go back and set the background, starting with where we are today and how we have gotten here.

The President proposed in his budget, the 1997 fiscal year budget, that there would be immediate downward adjustments to discretionary caps after the year 2000 if the Congressional Budget Office projected that his budget would not balance in the year 2002.

The Congressional Budget Office, second, has estimated to us that President Clinton's fiscal year 1997 budget submission will, indeed, incur a deficit of \$84 billion in the year 2002. Now, as a result of the CBO's projected deficit in the year 2002, the President's budget will trigger drastic, drastic reductions in discretionary spending in the years 2001 and 2002. It is important for my colleagues to understand that these drastic reductions which will kick in would have to occur in those non-defense programs such as education, the environment, crime control, science, veterans, and other human resource programs.

It is also interesting, and, again, important for our colleagues all to understand, that 100 percent of the non-defense discretionary cuts in the President's budget that occur in 2001 and 2002, over that 2-year period, 100 percent of those cuts will occur.

Now, the inclusion of a budget submission of triggers to make immediate drastic reductions in discretionary spending is simply inconsistent with sound budgeting practices and needs to be recognized for what it is—budgetary gimmickry, smoke and mirrors. This is, indeed, inconsistent with our bipartisan, I hope, legitimate efforts to balance the budget by the year 2002.

Thus, this sense-of-the-Senate amendment says it is the sense of the Senate that the discretionary spending caps should not include triggers which would result in 100 percent of the non-defense discretionary reductions occurring in fiscal year 2001 and 2002, and, second, should not include triggers that make drastic reductions in non-defense discretionary spending in fiscal years 2001 and 2002, the last 2 years of the budget, for the purpose of achieving a balanced budget in the year 2002.

This amendment is very simple. That is it. You just heard the sense-of-the-Senate amendment. It is straightforward. By passing this amendment, the Senate, today, can make a strong statement opposing budgetary gimmickry, smoke and mirrors, and in support of nonsense budgeting.

We all travel around this country and to our town meetings. It is very clear that the American people are tired of gimmicks out of Washington, are tired of the smoke-and-mirrors budgeting that we have undertaken in the past and that is reflected in the President's budget. Repeated use of these gimmicks over time has contributed to the overall lack of confidence that we see in our budgetary process in our Federal Government today.

A few months ago, the President introduced his 1997 budget, proudly claiming that his budget balanced in the year 2002 using Congressional Budget Office numbers. Now, this is the 2,200 pages of the President's budget for 1997. Intrigued by the President's new enthusiasm, very different than a year and a half ago, for a balanced budget, my colleagues and I on the Budget Committee went through the 2,000 pages. It was very interesting what we discovered. Buried in the budget supplement on page 13, we discovered a very troubling budget gimmick that it is important for all of our colleagues to understand, to note that is in there. It is really the purpose of the sense of that amendment to point this out and to refute it.

On page 13, it says that in case the new assumptions produce a deficit in 2002, the President's budget proposes an immediate adjustment to the annual limits or caps on discretionary spending, lowering them enough to reach balance in the year 2002.

Let me explain how this proposal works. The proposal is called a trigger here in Washington, but to the typical American it is not a trigger. It is a gimmick. It is a smoke-and-mirrors approach. The CBO, the nonpartisan Federal budget analysts that look at this information, says the budget of the President will have a deficit of \$81 billion in the year 2002. To make up that deficit which the CBO tells us will exist in 6 years, the President's budget, in this document, includes a trigger. That trigger will make unspecified cuts in discretionary spending over those last 2 years. That is how his budget achieves so-called balance, through this gimmick.

Now, discretionary spending, what is it? It makes up one-third of our entire Federal budget. It includes spending on our basic Government functions, including education, including roads, including the environment, including science and scientific research, including veterans, including medical research. The President's trigger says it cuts discretionary spending in these fields in the years 2001 and 2002 but does not say where these cuts will come from. It does not say which programs will have to absorb these drastic and instant cuts of such magnitude.

Let me refer to this first chart. It basically is headed "Spend now, save later." In red is the President's budget. In green is the budget proposed today before the U.S. Senate, the chairman's mark. The President's budget frontloads the spending and backloads the savings. The President proposes to increase spending over the next several years. This is 1996, 1997, and 1998.

The President's budget says: Yes, increase the nondefense discretionary spending over the next several years and then drastically cut thereafter. Contrast that to the mark that we have before us today, the chairman's mark for spending cuts; reductions begin and continue evenly over that entire period of time.

These drastic cuts are really what we are focusing on in this sense-of-the-Senate amendment today because what the President's budget tells us in the supplement, that if they do not reach balance and the CBO says it will not reach balance, these cuts come in. Look at the drastic cuts occurring in these 2 outlying years. The chairman's mark shows a steady glidepath of decreased spending over time.

Now, discretionary spending is an inside-the-beltway term. Let me show how the cuts and the President's budget compare to the cuts in the Senate balanced budget resolution. On the second chart we will look at one such area that is of the Food and Drug Administration. As we can see in our budget before the Senate today, in the Senate budget, we see we assume a freeze at a spending of about \$880 million over the next 6 years. In contrast, we see the President's budget also has a freeze the first year but then a reduction over time—again, with drastic cuts coming in to the year 2000.

The Food and Drug Administration, a program we all know is valuable to the safety of our country, that is valuable both in terms of food and drug safeguards, we see the significant cuts. If we look at the Environmental Protection Agency, the Senate plan, again, in green, increases spending about \$900 million next year and freezes it over the period out to the year 2002. In contrast, the President's plan increases spending over time. But, again, in those last 2 years, because of this smoke and mirrors, because of this budgetary gimmickry, we see drastic cuts that have to take place according to the budget as presented and written by the President in these last 2 years.

It is these drastic cuts that we are addressing in this sense-of-the-Senate amendment. On the one hand, we have had many attacks on this side of the aisle for ravaging the environment. Look at the difference of what actually occurs in the Senate-reported budget versus that of the President of the United States.

Let me turn to another area which is obviously quite close to me, being a scientist in the U.S. Senate. That is the National Science Foundation. Once again, you see that what is in the chairman's mark, passed out of the Budget Committee, is very different than what is proposed in the President's budget—once again, if we focus on the last 2 years.

The National Science Foundation funds many of those important scientific research policies, projects, and investigations, which have long-term payouts and affect our individual lives.

Another area I am very close to is the National Institutes of Health. If there is one thing I keep coming back to this floor talking about, it is that we need to think long term. We cannot just think short term and think just what gets us to the next election, or what will be politically appealing to the masses of people today. We have to

think long term. The National Institutes of Health, as you can see, is at about \$12 billion in spending right now. Under the Senate-reported plan, it will be frozen and will continue at that level. Right now, under the President's plan, there is a proposed increase. It makes us feel good because this is long-term investment for this country. But look what is also in the document. Look what happens in 2001 and 2002, which is 5 years from now. There are drastic cuts in the President's plan for the National Institutes of Health—a valuable program that engages in life-saving research that will affect everybody's lives in this body and all Americans lives in the future. It is this long-term view, not just the short-term view, that we must take.

We can look at another area, again, that I have been close to, which is veterans' medical care and hospital services. I have had the privilege, over the last 12 years of my life, to spend every week operating in a veterans' hospital, either in Tennessee or in California. It has been a big part of my life to see the sort of care that can be delivered to our veterans, who deserve this care. Well, once again, we see in green on the chart what happens under our budget proposal, which came through the U.S. Senate Budget Committee. You can see that over time, there is essentially a freeze of about \$17 billion. But contrast that with the realities that are in the President's budget. The realities are that we have extreme and drastic cuts, over time, into the year 2000.

Again, we will focus on the years 2001 and 2002. These charts are really selected charts. You can go on and on, program by program. But what is important is for all of our colleagues to understand what happens by putting in this budgetary gimmickry. These are just a few examples, and there are many, many more. The simple fact is, Mr. President, that these cuts are never going to happen. I hope that they will not happen because they are so drastic, and they would occur in fields that need sufficient funds. And that is, science, education, the environment, and the Veterans' Administration. People know that these drastic cuts will never happen. We have this feeling put forward in the President's budget that we can spend more right now, and we can worry about saving later, and that we can cut drastically later. This is not fair to the American people or to Members of this body.

We, as Senators and elected leaders, must avoid gimmicks when we are dealing with taxpayers' money. Earlier today, there has been a lot of pointing as to what happened in the past, 10 years ago, and with asterisks, and 15 years ago. Well, it is a new day and time, and there are new people in this body, and we have come here and said, "No more gimmicks. That is not what the American people want. No more smoke and mirrors. Let us address the problems that can be addressed in a bipartisan way." We know what the prob-

lem is and the problem is that we have not been spending very smart in the past. We have been spending too much. Now is the time to avoid gimmicks and to spend smarter.

Again, I will also re-echo what my distinguished colleague from Connecticut just said. This can be done in a bipartisan way; this can be done bringing both sides of the aisle together. I hope that in that spirit of bipartisanship both sides of the aisle will come together and join me in opposing the budgetary gimmicks and the budgetary smoke and mirrors that are in the President's plan, and support common-sense budgeting.

Mr. President, at this juncture, I will yield 5 minutes to my colleague from the State of Missouri, and that 5 minutes should be taken off the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BOND. I thank and congratulate my colleague from Tennessee. Senator FRIST has put his finger on the real problem in this budget. The President, in his budget, has glowing words, as several of my colleagues on the other side have, about the priorities that they think are important. The President has said that we must invest in education and training, the environment, science and technology, law enforcement, and other priorities.

But, as I pointed out earlier today, when it comes to making these sets of numbers balance out, they have a meat ax, a paint-by-numbers meat ax that whacks 10 percent out of all of those budgets in 2001, and 18 percent in 2002. Now, are you for the priorities? If so, this is an opportunity to vote for some honesty in budgeting. The President has claimed he gets to balance. I think most of the people in this body say we want to get to balance. But do we really want to get to balance by taking the drastic cuts that my colleague from Tennessee has just talked about?

I talked earlier this morning about the cuts in NIH, National Institutes of Health, FDA. Yesterday, I talked about the serious cuts that would happen to the Environmental Protection Agency if you apply this meat ax arbitrarily in 2001 and 2002, because the President's numbers do not add up, unless you have the meat ax.

What the Senator from Tennessee is saying is, if you are serious about this budget, serious about reporting a responsible budget that gets to balance, let us take a look at what your budget, as now proposed, would actually do. It savages some of the very programs the President said he wants to promote and defend on the way to a balanced budget.

Well, Mr. President, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, if you are serious about establishing priorities, if you really believe that numbers do not lie, if you believe that budgets should say what they mean and mean what they say, let us get rid

of the arbitrary cuts in NIH, funding for the Women, Infants and Children Program, funding for child care, funding for the National Science Foundation, and NASA, and, yes, funding for the Veterans' Administration.

My distinguished colleague who has had experience in working with the Veterans, Administration knows how compelling the needs of those veterans are. I have visited facilities and talked with people who are finding that the problems in those Veterans' Administration facilities cannot be dealt with.

If we follow this meat ax budget approach, we would be closing more than one out of four veterans' facilities in the Nation. That means, as I said, California, with 11 hospitals, would lose 3, or probably 4. Our friends from California might want to tell us which of these four hospitals would be closed; and Florida, with six facilities, would probably lose at least one, maybe two; Illinois, with six, would also lose one or two; Massachusetts, at least one; Missouri, at least one; New York, at least three, and probably four; Pennsylvania, at least two, and probably three; Texas, at least two; Ohio, at least one.

Do we arbitrarily want to close all of these facilities because we do not want to meet our obligations to the men and women who have defended this country who are either injured in war or who are now medically indigent? I cannot believe that is a serious budget proposal.

If my colleagues really want to pursue the President's budget and defend his priority, then I urge them to vote for the Frist resolution so that they can go back and make some intelligent decisions rather than taking a meat ax to the very programs the President said he wants as his priorities. His program would slash environment, children, education, and health care for veterans. Mr. President, that is not acceptable.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment which I think is very well considered presented by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. LAUTENBERG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes off the amendment.

Mr. President, as we begin consideration of the fiscal 1997 budget resolution, we ought to take a good look at the history of what has happened to the Federal budget in the last 15 years.

The fiscal records of Presidents Clinton, Bush, and Reagan could not be more different. For 12 years the Reagan and Bush administrations racked up \$2.3 trillion a day. In fact, if we did not have to pay the interest on the debt that was chalked up in these 12 years, the budget would be balanced in fiscal 1996.

Just to be sure there was not too much confusion to make the point, let me repeat that, if we did not have to

pay the interest on the debt that was stacked up in these 12 years, the 12 years of the Reagan and Bush administrations, \$2.3 trillion worth of debt, the budget would be balanced in fiscal year 1996. Not once did President Reagan or President Bush propose a balanced budget. Fortunately, President Clinton's 3-year record is much different. President Clinton promised a change in 1992, and he has produced one.

If you would consider the following, it makes the point very clearly. The deficit has gone down for 4 straight years. The deficit for the year that we are in now is expected to be only \$144 billion which is 1.9 percent of our gross domestic product. This is the lowest annual percentage of any industrialized country. For example, Japan's deficit is over 3 percent of its GDP. Great Britain's is 7 percent, and Italy is 9 percent budget to GDP.

Finally, President Clinton is the first President to put forward a balanced budget proposal since the 1974 Budget Act created the Budget Committees.

So the question is no longer whether we will balance the budget. The question is how we will balance the budget. President Clinton has laid out the right way to balance the budget. He did exactly what the Republicans demanded last year. He put forward a 7-year balanced budget scored by the Congressional Budget Office.

President Clinton once again has put forward a 7-year balanced budget scored by the Congressional Budget Office. His budget is much different than the Republican budget. His budget protects Medicare and Medicaid, education and the environment, and does not increase taxes on working families. The President's budget not only protects 37 million senior citizens from deep Medicare cuts contained in this budget but would also make the Medicare trust fund solvent until the year 2006. It preserves the guarantee of Medicaid for 37 million seniors and disabled persons. It protects our Nation's environment by ensuring full funding for implementation of the major environmental programs that so many support like clean air, clean water, and toxic waste cleanups. It makes critical investments in education and training. It provides increased funding for programs like Head Start, title I, and Safe and Drug-Free Schools.

Finally, the President's budget maintains the EITC, the earned-income tax credit, which provides tax relief for working families who earn less than \$28,000 a year. This allows them to maintain their family needs for basic essentials for sustenance.

The Republican budget is much different. It is punitive to working families and senior citizens. In reality, the underlying budget resolution should be dubbed "extremist budget, part 2."

For example, they claim that they have lowered their Medicare care cuts. But have they? The answer is no. They claim that their cuts have come down to the President's level. But they have

not. In January the final Republican offer in the budget negotiations included a \$226 billion cut in Medicare over 7 years. This budget resolution calls for \$228 million in Medicare cuts over 7 years. The number is virtually the same.

These large cuts combined with their structural changes will truly make Medicare, as it is said, "wither on the vine." I think that quote comes from the Speaker of the House. If the Republican budget is enacted Medicare will become a second-class health care system.

The Republican budget also eliminates the guarantee of Medicaid coverage for seniors, for the disabled, for children, and for pregnant women.

This budget continues the Republican assault on education. Over 7 years the budget cuts \$70 billion in education and training compared to the President's budget.

This budget contains the Republican trashing of the environment. It will cut environmental programs by 19 percent in the year 2002. It will slow down toxic waste cleanups.

I am not going to stand idly by, and neither are many, and watch this pillaging of the environment go unchallenged. Senator JOHN KERRY and I will offer an amendment to restore these deep cuts in the environmental protection programs.

Finally, their budget contains the Republican war on working families. At the same time the Republican leadership is opposing an increase in the minimum wage, they are also proposing a tax increase on working families who earn under \$28,000 a year. It is hard. It is unfair. And that is why this resolution should be called "extremist budget, part 2."

Mr. President, as we heard the debate here, I have heard references to moral fiber; to the fact that the President lacks the moral fiber to produce a budget that truly answers the question as to balance in 7 years. Mr. President, when we talk about moral fiber I cannot help but think about the moral fiber that is necessary to say to 12 million Americans that you ought to make more than \$4.25 an hour, that on \$180 you are still way below the poverty level, and when you go, if we finally can get there, to \$5.15 an hour, you are still being asked to get by on less than the poverty level.

Where is the morality of that issue? I cannot see it. We can talk about the accountants' version of morality. That is what we are discussing. We are discussing whether or not this budget is balanced in 7 years.

The President, President Clinton, has delivered on his promise, and the budget deficit has come down 4 years in a row. It is the first time since President Truman that has happened. And we question the moral fiber of the proposal? It is an outrage.

Part of the proposal put into the underlying budget resolution is a reduction, or the elimination, of much of the

earned income tax credit. That is the payroll tax portion of the incomes less than \$28,000. Give it back—\$28,000.

The poverty level for an individual today is \$8,000 worth of income, and \$11,000 for a family of three. But we are saying that even though the average income is substantially above the \$28,000 that we ought to raise taxes on those people. Does anybody have an idea how well you can support a family in the high-cost areas of the country on \$28,000 a year? At the same time, Mr. President, it is proposed that we furnish a tax break for those in the higher income levels. Under the original proposal, if someone earned \$350,000, they would have gotten an \$8,500 tax deduction, but we do not want to give a 90-cent raise to people making \$4.25 an hour. It is outrageous. We ought not to loosely talk about morality when we discuss these. If we want to discuss them as numbers, if we want to challenge the figures, everyone has a right to do that. But when we get into the subjective evaluations of what is moral and what is right, it is more hokum than a serious evaluation of morality.

Mr. President, I have had the good fortune to have spent a lot of my years in the corporate sector, and I ran a fairly successful company. The company today employs 29,000 people, the company that I started with two other fellows, all of us from poor families in the working community of Patterson, NJ. So I know something about the corporate world, and I know something about how one conducts business. When I hear about how we have to achieve this balance in our budget, eliminate the deficit in 7 years, I think it is a worthwhile target, but I think we have to include in that evaluation which part of the budget is important and which part of it is simply paying attention and fulfilling obligations to special interests.

There are few companies worth their salt in this country that do not brag about their creditworthiness, about their ability to borrow to make investments in the future. Unfortunately, the accounting technique that we use in Government does not permit us to take capital investments and amortize them over a period of years. They are treated like cash investments. So we have a skewed view of what national accounting is about.

I announce here and now that I, too, want to achieve a budget balance, but I do not want to do it on the backs of poor working-class families. I do not want to do it on the backs of citizens who have been promised as they paid into the Medicare trust fund that they would get particular benefits, that they had a contract with their Government. I do not want to balance the budget on their backs. I do not want to balance the budget on the backs of young people who desire and have the ability to get an education who are not going to be able to get it if we continue to cut into college loan funds.

So it is a question of not when we are ready to balance the budget—the President has laid down a budget that will balance in 7 years; CBO says they agree with him; they are the objective voice that we are using here—it is only a question of how we get that budget balanced. I think if we all work at it, we all try our best, we can achieve something that is fairer to all of the members of our society.

So I hope my colleagues will support the President's balanced budget and oppose the extremist Republican budget. Last year, we stopped the extremist Republican budget that gutted Medicare to pay for tax breaks for the rich. They want to do it again.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask how much time we have on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 15 minutes 45 seconds.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I yield the remainder of that time to the distinguished Senator from Oregon to use as he sees fit.

Mr. FRIST addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. FRIST. I ask, how much time on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 13 minutes 45 seconds.

Mrs. BOXER. May I ask the Senator from Oregon if he would reserve just 3 minutes of his 15 minutes. We do have an offer we want to propound to the other side.

Mr. WYDEN. I would be happy to.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WYDEN. Let me say thank you to my friend from New Jersey as well and say that I think he has made a fine statement and offered much on this issue with which I agree. I commend him for it.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, many Americans see the process of setting a budget resolution as a murky, inside-the-beltway exercise that, charitably speaking, leaves them confused and frustrated. More than occasionally I have shared this frustration. But Americans also know that the decisions we make now are going to affect their futures and the futures of their children and their grandchildren. At home in Oregon, that means doing the hard work that the majority budget resolution simply ignores. At home in Oregon, it means making tough choices, not politically expedient ones.

For example, it means fixing Medicare and Medicaid, not just sucking billions of dollars out of these extraordinarily important health care programs. At home in Oregon, we have ground down the cost of health care and Medicare to one of the lowest per capita averages in our Nation. Republican budget drafters could have built on Oregon's success. They could have helped transform the Medicare Program, its management and its finances, in a way to encourage innovation and

equality and efficiency as we have done in much of my State. But this budget simply cuts rather than transforms. It leaves behind many of the same old problems in the Medicare Program, the problems that have seen so often results in rewards for inefficiency and instead again pounds the vulnerable. I think it is a mistake, and I think it is possible to do far better.

On the welfare reform issue, all of us understand this is a job that must be done. Again, at home in Oregon, we found a way to make a real start by reforming our health care system for the working poor and launching a new welfare-to-work program that is putting our citizens in good-paying jobs. It took an up-front investment that is already paying dividends and is expected to be yet more successful in the future. But it took political will. It took reasonable public support to get the job done, and again I think this budget is not going to make that possible.

I am afraid this budget on the welfare reform issue promises a stillbirth for future efforts in other States by operating on the idea that you can just out-cheap the system rather than transform it to make it work.

If you look at the budget offered by the majority, we would have to cut \$56 billion more than the administration foresees for education and training. On one of the issues most important to the future of Oregon families, this budget says it is more important to spend on a number of outdated military weapons systems than it is to support education and vocational training for our children who are going to need the skills and the experiences essential to compete in a global economy.

I say to my friends, the cold war is over. We won it. But the majority budget does not reflect this reality.

The new war, the economic war that enlists every schoolchild in my State and across the country, is the one that we are going to have to fight aggressively. Our competitors in Asia and Europe shoot with real bullets. They are making stronger investments in education and training than we are, and they are creating world standard, technical quality work forces.

What is the response in this budget? The majority budget extracts funds that we need for training and educating our schoolchildren and reinvests it in goldplated weapons systems that even the military questions today. The majority budget goes on to cap the Direct Student Loan Program at 20 percent, a program that eliminates red-tape and middle-level bureaucracy in order to get funds to working families and students. Head Start would be frozen, eliminating opportunities for up to 20,000 children. And, while Americans across the country are talking about the specter of corporate downsizing, this budget would deny assistance over the next 6 years through the Job Training for Dislocated Workers Program to many of the workers in our Nation who have lost their jobs.

On the environmental issue, an issue of great importance to our State, we see again how there is a retreat in this budget from much of the great bipartisan progress that has been made in the last 20 years. For example, in my State this bipartisan progress has led to effective stewardship of great natural treasures like Crater Lake and the Three Sisters Wilderness. This budget would put that bipartisan tradition of environmental protection in reverse, simply by cutting the National Park Service budget by 20 percent below the administration's proposal. This is going to force some parks to close, others are going to cut back on maintenance and access, and we are going to spoil, in my view, much of the important progress in environmental protection that has been made in the last few decades.

In the early 1960's, citizens of my State launched a huge public program to clean up the polluted Willamette River, a project that, at that time, was one of the biggest and most expensive environmental efforts in our history. We understand the value of clean water and resource protection, and we were willing to pay the price of renewing that great river. And that wise investment has been paid back many times.

The people of our State want to see those special values and environmental stewardship projected in this budget resolution. But this budget makes a retreat from those values by cutting the environmental programs nearly 20 percent in 2002. The budget would relieve polluters of certain Superfund cleanup costs and make every taxpayer shoulder new burdens. EPA enforcement activities would be rolled back, and there would be fewer environmental cops on the beat.

I am particularly concerned that the need for salmon restoration funds in the Columbia River and maintaining our fish hatcheries in this Great Basin are priorities that again come up untended and short in this resolution.

So I say to my colleagues on both sides, one of the efforts I have been proudest of in my early days in the Senate was getting 34 Senators to join me in a letter that I authored, making it clear that it was important to get the nongermans and devastating environmental riders out of the omnibus appropriations bill. We were successful at that. The spending bill does not gut the environmental protections that have been pushed so hard by so many for so long. If this budget resolution forces a retreat on environmental protection, we will make the same effort, as this process goes forward, to turn it around as we did in our successful work in terms of getting the antienvironmental riders out of the omnibus appropriations bill.

Let me conclude with a word or two about taxes. Oregonians want tax reform and they believe that this should be a priority as part of this budget resolution. But this majority budget cuts taxes in strange and mysterious ways

that many of my constituents challenge. A \$500 per child tax credit for a person making \$110,000 per year? How does that square against increasing taxes to low-income working families, families that work hard, that play by the rules, and have had a chance to see work rewarded under the earned income tax credit? This budget, unfortunately, retreats, in terms of support for working families that are struggling to get ahead. It retreats on the question of Medicare and Medicaid. And I believe, as a result of those changes, we are going to see lower quality health care, a sicker pool of individuals relying on those Government programs, and we will see, as a result of the tax changes and the health changes, a significant reduction in the opportunities that all of us want to see for individuals in these public programs who want to get out having that opportunity to do so.

The proposed cuts in Medicaid would end guaranteed health coverage, for example, for 36 million Americans. For seniors, the \$250 billion in Medicaid cuts over 7 years risks cutting off prescription drugs, home and community-based care, and assistive devices such as wheelchairs. I do not think our families can afford those additional burdens.

So, as we now go to the amendments on this issue of extraordinary importance, let us look beyond the cold, stark figures of the budget. Budgets just are not about numbers, they are about the hopes and aspirations of the American people. We have to get a balanced budget. The families of my State balance their budgets. It is important for the Congress to balance the Federal budget as well. But it has to be approached in a way that ensures a sense of fairness, that sacrifices are not just singled out for those who do not have political power. Let us make sure that this budget resolution, this budget resolution which would provide an opportunity to reform Medicare and Medicaid in a way that Oregonians have already begun, would be pursued by the Congress as a whole.

I am happy to yield time to the Senator from California.

Mr. FRIST addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. FRIST. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not.

Mr. FRIST. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is not a sufficient second.

Mrs. BOXER. If the Senator will yield, I would explain we would just like to assure the vote is after 2 o'clock and we will be delighted to vote on this amendment.

Mr. FRIST. That will be fine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 2 minutes and 25 seconds.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, do we have a unanimous-consent agreement now we are going to vote on the Frist amendment at 2 o'clock?

Mrs. BOXER. We do not yet.

Mr. DOMENICI. Is all time yielded back?

Mrs. BOXER. No. We have 2 minutes and 30 seconds we would like to use.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, does the Senator from Tennessee have any additional time he would like to use?

Mr. FRIST. We still have 13 minutes on our side. If we have time, the Senator from Michigan would like to use some of that.

Mr. DOMENICI. In any event, I ask unanimous consent we vote on the Frist amendment at 2 o'clock, and there be no intervening amendments or requests for votes in the interim.

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

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I would like to just ask—we would like to use a few minutes off the bill as well as this 2½ minutes. We would like to do that. Under the rules, are we permitted to do that? Would I have that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. You may choose what block of time you would like.

Mrs. BOXER. I would like to add to the 2 minutes another 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are you yielding it from the time on the resolution?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes; that is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I am a little bit puzzled by the amendment the Senator from Tennessee has offered because it is an amendment regarding a trigger that is supposedly in the Democratic budget that is on the table, and there is no trigger mechanism in the budget we have offered. I ask my colleagues to carefully peruse this document, and you will not find a trigger mentioned in the budget that is before you.

So this is really a phantom amendment about something that is not happening in the Democratic budget. Behind me is a chart which shows the Democratic budget that we have before us, and it shows that the discretionary spending is fairly close between the two budgets, the Democratic one and Republican one, despite the fact Senators on the other side have decried steep reductions in veterans, so on and so forth. That is not true. There is no trigger in this budget. We spend \$65 billion more on discretionary spending than does the Republican budget.

So, in our view, this is a kind of bizarre situation. We are happy to vote for the Senator's amendment because we agree that we do not want to see deep cuts in the outyears, and we do not have them in our budget. So we would be happy to take this without a vote, although Senator DOMENICI says he prefers a record vote. We are happy to do that. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota who has comments to make on this.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, it seems to me a mistake has been made here, and I do not know the genesis of the mistake. As I understand it, we have an amendment that has been offered that suggests there should not be a triggered reduction in discretionary spending pending certain events, and there is no such trigger in the legislation before the Senate.

Mr. FRIST. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DORGAN. Momentarily—I will be happy to yield, just briefly.

Mr. FRIST. The word "trigger" is not used, but if you look in function 920 of the document—I do not have it before me, I will have it shortly—you will see a series of numbers, and in those series of numbers the trigger is spelled out in actual numbers. So the effect of the trigger is spelled out in function 920, and that is what we are addressing.

Mr. DORGAN. This is a matter of fact, not a matter of conjecture. There is no trigger that would automatically reduce discretionary spending pending certain events in the future. If we are going to legislate this way, maybe we should legislate against four or five other triggers that do not exist. As long as there is no prohibition against legislating to prohibit things that do not exist, let us amend this by saying, "Let's prohibit a trigger that would reduce defense spending." There is no such trigger, but why not add that.

I do not quite understand the circumstances here. There is, in fact, a trigger that given certain circumstances would allow an increase in certain discretionary spending, but there is no trigger that would provide for the decreases that are the subject of this amendment.

In fact, the important point here is contrary to the assertions that have been made on the floor of the Senate yesterday and today about a whole range of issues, including funding for the NIH, funding for the EPA and others, contrary to those assertions, the budget that has been proposed by the President would provide more spending in these areas. In the aggregate, it proposes more spending in the discretionary spending accounts because that represents what he believes to be a priority.

We have the circumstance of people coming to the floor of the Senate saying, "We want more spending"—the majority party—"We want \$11 billion more spending on defense. We want to buy trucks the Defense Department did not ask for, planes they do not need, ships they do not want. We want to spend it on defense."

The President has said he believes we ought to spend slightly more on discretionary spending than the majority party is proposing. But this amendment is a real Trojan horse. It seeks to preclude something that has not been proposed, and if that is a new standard of amendments, then let us have fun by precluding a dozen additional proposals that have never been made. But it is not, in my judgment, a very sensible way to legislate.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DORGAN. I will be happy to.

Mrs. BOXER. I want to thank the Senator for participating in this. As a member of the Budget Committee, I will tell you right now, we have looked at this document. There is no word "trigger" in it. The Senator from Tennessee, who wrote this, admits there is no word "trigger." And yet, he has a sense-of-the Senate amendment that says the discretionary spending caps should not include triggers. We agree. That is why the bill we have put forward, the Democratic budget, has no triggers.

This is what it has. We have used these numbers. They are \$65 billion more than the Republicans have put forward, and they are complaining that we cut the budget too much—we cut the budget too much. They spend \$65 billion less on veterans, \$65 billion less on all of these discretionary spending areas.

So this amendment is a phantom amendment, and that is why we are going to support it, because we do not like the idea of a trigger. We have not offered a budget that has a trigger, so why have an argument about it?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. DORGAN. I simply observe, it seems a waste of the Senate's time to have a record vote on an amendment designed to prohibit something no one proposed. It might be fun to offer an amendment like this, but it serves no purpose and will simply delay the Senate.

I think the Senator from California, I think the Senator from Nebraska also said, since this has not been proposed, if someone feels the urge to offer an amendment to prohibit something not proposed, we accept it. It seems to me irrelevant and nonproductive to have a record vote.

Mrs. BOXER. We are ready to do a voice vote, but if the chairman wants a record vote that has nothing to do with the budget on the table, we will vote for it.

Mr. FRIST addressed the Chair.

Mrs. BOXER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I will be referring to function 950 in the amendment. This is the President's policy which is laid out, the numbers that were put before us in the President's bill. Let me just read, again, what that policy is, and I quote page 13 of the President's budget:

In case the new assumptions produce a deficit in the year 2002, the President's budget

proposes an immediate adjustment to the annual limits or caps on discretionary spending, lowering them enough to reach balance in the year 2002.

June O'Neill from the Congressional Budget Office came before our committee, and I will quote from her testimony on April 18, 1996. She says:

The basic policies outlined in the President's budget would bring down the deficit to about \$80 billion by the year 2002 instead of producing the budget surplus that the administration estimates.

Mr. DORGAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FRIST. Let me finish this line of thinking. We are going to have a deficit in the year 2002, according to CBO, using the policies set forth in the budget presented by the President of the United States. That is the President's plan. The President does have a trigger in his plan, and it is spelled out in function 950, which I ask you to refer to. Correction, 920. And if you look on page 41, those triggers, the trigger in the reduction is actually spelled out in numbers. The trigger has already taken place, and what my sense-of-the-Senate amendment simply says is that those triggers, which result in drastic reductions in the year 2001 and 2002, which are spelled out on page 41 of this document, are already written and worded right now. Those triggers have taken place.

My sense-of-the-Senate amendment says those drastic reductions spelled out in actual numbers, as spelled out in the policy by the President of the United States, are wrong.

Mr. DORGAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FRIST. Yes.

Mr. DORGAN. I appreciate that. I yielded to the Senator when he asked. I enjoy the opportunity to discuss this. I guess the Senator's point is accurate with respect to what he read from the document in front of him. That is not what is before the Senate.

Will the Senator not agree with me that is not what we have laid before the Senate, and if that is the case, you are talking about something we are not debating today?

If I can make one final point. When you talk about cuts, there is not any way to deny that the amount of discretionary spending proposed by the majority party is substantially less than the amount of discretionary spending proposed by the President.

So those two questions: Is it not true that we are debating something here that is not before the Senate? And what is laid before the Senate does not contain a trigger; is that correct?

Mr. FRIST. To answer the Senator's question, is this the President's budget? This is the President's budget. I read the policy. The budget is spelled out in actual numbers on page 41 of function 950, the actual numbers which is the trigger in place, the actual numbers of policy spelled out in the document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, how much time remains on either side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 9½ minutes.

Mr. FRIST. I yield to my colleague from Michigan on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I think we should begin by just reminding everybody what we are about. Pending is an amendment to the Republican budget resolution which would substitute the President's budget for our own. So I will incorporate here in my comments remarks both about that budget itself, as well as the amendment by the Senator from Tennessee.

The President's budget, in my judgment, is quite deficient in a variety of ways. We can call it a balanced budget if we want to, but as the amendment before us reveals, it is only a balanced budget if drastic reductions in discretionary spending take place in the final years of that budget. But that is not the only problem with the budget.

First, and foremost, I believe the budget is inadequate to deal with the Medicare crisis which faces this country. We know already that the Medicare part A trust fund is headed towards bankruptcy. We have not gotten the most recent projections of the trustees of the Medicare trust account, but we believe that the date of bankruptcy will be much sooner than anticipated just a year ago when the majority attempted to try to address the problem and were thwarted by the President and the minority.

The fact is that Americans expect the trust fund to be solvent. Right now the trust fund is paying out more than it is taking in. It will reach insolvency far sooner than anticipated. What we have attempted to do, in the budget that the majority has presented here today, is to try to keep that trust fund solvent for 10 years.

The President's budget attempts to do that by simply removing a very vital part, home health care, from the trust fund and moving it off the trust fund somewhere else.

If that is the way we are going to approach Medicare, Mr. President, then who knows what will be taken out of the trust fund next. Americans have a right to expect that trust fund will remain constant, that the items covered will remain protected, and that every time we face a crisis, Congress does not simply remove more and more parts of the trust fund and eliminate the coverage it provides.

By moving them, as they have in the President's budget, the President and his budgeteers are, in fact, moving some \$55 billion of trust fund responsibility to the taxpayers as part of the general account. That is not the way to guarantee the solvency of Medicare, and it is in contrast to Republican efforts to ensure Medicare's solvency for 10 years its solvency in the budget we have presented.

The second concern I think needs to be addressed is the issue of taxes. As Senator GRAMM just a few moments ago indicated in a series of charts that the tax burden faced by America's hard-working families is the highest in the history of this Nation. Indeed, if the President's budget becomes the law of this land, under this budget we will move to the highest federal tax burden ever.

At the same time, Mr. President, under this budget, social spending will also reach record highs at 17.3 percent of the gross domestic product of this country. That means more and more working families sending more and more dollars to Washington to pay for more and more programs that Americans find to be overbloaded, bureaucratic and, in many cases, unnecessary.

That is not the direction we should head, Mr. President. That is why the President's budget sends us in the wrong direction.

To just once again comment on the tax portion of this budget, as I said, it heads us toward the highest tax burden in history. There has been an effort in the budget to address the question of high taxes with a purported tax cut. But when one examines the President's budget and calculates all the taxes that are cut and all the taxes that are raised, what you come up with is a final bottom line number of \$6 spread over 6 years. Distributed to 250 million American people, that works out, Mr. President, to \$4 per year per American.

I have talked to the taxpayers in my State. When they think in terms of getting a tax break, they at least were hoping for something slightly more substantial than that, Mr. President. The \$4 a year will not make much of an impact on the hard-working middle-class families of my State or any of the other States.

But I would like to more totally focus my comments at this point on the amendment before us to this budget. In this amendment, we are trying to address what we consider to be the truly extremist issue before us today. That is the proposal that in the final 2 years of this budget we will see drastic cuts, across the board virtually, in the domestic discretionary spending programs, huge cuts, cuts which I think go way too far. I think probably most of my colleagues, one way or the other, would agree they go too far.

To approach balancing the budget in this fashion, to approach it by having all of these cuts happen somewhere in the far distant future, and to happen at this drastic of a level, literally 100 percent of the President's discretionary spending reductions happening in the years 2001 and 2002, in my judgment, totally undermines any validity to claim that this is a balanced budget.

This is the same thing as having a family say, "Well, we're running in the red right now. We're spending more money than we take in. We've got to correct this. The way we're going to do it is not by addressing the problems

over a period of time, this year, next year, and the following years, but 5 years from now we're going to eliminate all our expenditures on food."

That might make the budget of the family balanced in the fifth year, but it is unrealistic and wholly improbable that in one year an American family is not going to consume any food. The same way, it is inconceivable that 100 percent of the discretionary spending cuts are going to take place in the final 2 years of this budget to achieve balance. Neither will happen, Mr. President.

For those reasons, I think the approach that is taken in this amendment is on track. I think we have to make a clear statement to the American people that we are not going to achieve a balanced budget with any kind of cook books, any kind of gimmickry, any kind of last-year changes of this magnitude. We are going to go at it in a responsible way.

So for those reasons, Mr. President, I am pleased to support the Frist amendment and urge my colleagues to do so as well. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. What is the situation? Do we have a unanimous consent to vote at 2 p.m. on the pending amendment? What exists with reference to time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. Senator FRIST's side has 1 minute 50 seconds. The Senator from Nebraska has 2 minutes. The remainder of the time can be taken from the general-issue pool.

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, while the distinguished manager of the bill is here, I will just make a comment or two and see if we cannot do something to move this process along. I understand that a rollcall vote has been demanded on that side of the aisle, which is surely their right to demand a rollcall vote. I understand—I do not know who it is—but someone on this side of the aisle could not be here to vote until after 2 o'clock.

I simply point out that we are wasting an awful lot of time. In the committee, as the chairman knows, this Senator has tried to move things along. On the floor, this Senator has been trying to move things along.

Here we are debating a sense-of-the-Senate resolution which we all know has no effect in law whatsoever. But if we are going to spend this much time on sense-of-the-Senate resolutions that have no effect in law, and then put off votes that should have occurred an hour ago until some time after 2 o'clock—if that holdup is on our side, I apologize—I simply say that I guess we have given up all chances of finishing this bill by tomorrow night as was clearly stated was the goal.

Since that goal was stated, we have had one vote. We have been locked pretty much in meaningless debate in the view of this Senator, since yesterday morning at 9:30. We had only one vote yesterday. Like yesterday we came in at 9:30 this morning. Here we are at 2 o'clock this afternoon and we are continuing to move around, politicize and question the motives of others.

We have so much to do in the U.S. Senate. I would have liked to have seen this finished by tomorrow night. I recognize now that is impossible. I simply say that this Senator is interested in reducing the number of the amendments that we have, as best we can. I simply say I hope we do not get tied up for this lengthy period of time as we have on the amendment before the Senate. We have agreed to accept the amendment.

Earlier today I said we had 31 or 32 amendments. We now have 51 Democratic amendments on this side of the aisle. If we take as much time on those and other amendments that I am sure are pending on that side, we could be here through July 4th on the budget resolution, talking past each other. We have agreed to accept this meaningless amendment by voice vote, but that is not good enough. Why? I do not quite understand. I simply say I think we are bogging down this process in an unreasonable manner. I renew my pledge to do whatever I can to expedite the process.

I do not think there is any question that the majority is going to vote down the budget of the President of the United States, which is their right. Why do they not just go ahead and do it and move on with the process?

I renew my pleading to the chairman that we move forward and expedite this process.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes. I very much want to not use up our time. Senator HUTCHISON would like to have some time before this 2 o'clock time. She has been waiting a long time.

Let me suggest to my good friend, Senator EXON, first, if the Senator wants to work with me to establish policy for the rest of this debate, that sense-of-the-Senate resolutions—what was your word—are irrelevant, unnecessary.

Mr. EXON. I said it had no effect in law, which it does not.

Mr. DOMENICI. We will make a deal with you. We will get a grand agreement. You do not offer any of them, we will not offer any of them. I put that before you, since sense of the Senates have no effect in law. We are ready to negotiate. Just have real amendments from now until tomorrow afternoon at 3 o'clock and we will be finished with this. I am authorized to speak for the majority leader. We intend to finish this budget resolution this weekend so people who have plans better start talking to our leaders about how they might help us get this budget resolution finished. Everybody has plans, but

we have plans to get a budget resolution finished. Frankly, I think we can. I look over the list of amendments on our side. I have not had a chance to look over them on your side. I will shortly.

Frankly, I do not know why, from now until 3:30 tomorrow afternoon, giving us until 10 o'clock or 11 o'clock tonight, and a nice chunk of time tomorrow, we could not get it finished.

Let me talk a little bit about this amendment. The interesting thing about this amendment and the budget tendered by the minority, they may have pulled the trigger but they have replaced it with a giant plug. There may be no trigger but there is a plug. The plug is \$67 billion out there in a little compartment of Government called function 920. You do not have to tell anybody how you got there, just put \$67 billion in. What it will do, who it will hurt, what it will cut, is not itemized, as ours is. We would like to make sure that the vote says we want to pull the plug, pull the trigger on that plug so it is not there.

Having said that, Senator, I seriously will work with you to try to narrow what we are doing and get on and try and get this done. Thank you for your cooperation.

Mr. EXON. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your cooperation. This is an irrelevant amendment, a sense of the Senate that we should not have debated as long as we have. But we have. Talk about plugs, the kettle keeps calling the pot black.

I simply cite on page 43, line 20, there is a \$43 billion plug in your budget. Take a look at it. Maybe you can explain it. I simply say that it seems to me we keep blaming each other for the delays, when it is a responsibility of both of us. I think this sense-of-the-Senate matter is irrelevant. That is why I agreed to a voice vote. But you are entitled to a rollcall vote.

I yield 4 minutes off my time to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, this is not a debate about plugs and triggers but a debate about that we feel is important in terms of investments for the future of this country. I am going to speak, after we have voted on this amendment, about the budget more generally. I want to stay on this subject because I think it is very important to lay out the facts.

The facts are these: If you get rid of all the discussion about any triggers, all the discussion about plugs, the question of who is spending more or investing more in discretionary spending, especially nondefense discretionary spending, is not a serious question any longer at all. The President's budget proposes more investment in the kinds of things that many of us think are very important—college financial aid, Head Start, cops on the beat, the WIC Program. Things that we think are important are going to be better funded in the President's budget.

Now, the majority party says their priority is to add \$11 billion above what

the Pentagon asked to be spent to buy trucks, planes, ships, and submarines that the Pentagon did not request. They want to add \$11 billion in that spending. Then they want to make the case that somehow they are spending more money in discretionary spending than the President's budget. It is simply not true.

If you pull out the defense numbers from that chart, which is included in discretionary spending, the Republican budget would put \$10 billion less in nondefense discretionary, which means that the Republican budget over those 6 years is \$116 billion below the budget submitted by the President in budget authority—\$116 billion below in discretionary spending.

You cannot paint those numbers any other way. That chart does not lie. That chart, if you take out the \$11 billion increase in defense the majority party wants, would show a wider gap in nondefense discretionary spending. The President is requesting a much more substantial amount of spending in things like Head Start, WIC, education, student financial aid, cops on the beat, and a whole series of those issues than would exist in the majority party budget. They would have us believe somehow with charts and all kinds of tapdances around these numbers that they are proposing more funding for discretionary spending. It is simply and demonstrably not true. That is the point that is important as we cast this next vote.

The Senator from Nebraska has it absolutely right. I do not know why we are wasting time voting on a proposal to eliminate something that does not exist, but, I suppose, some people will feel better if they can amend something that did not exist and maybe we can have six or eight more of these, but it wastes time and accomplishes nothing.

I yield the floor.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I yield the remaining time on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time on the amendment has been consumed. The Senator would now have to yield time on the resolution.

Mr. FRIST. I yield time from the resolution to the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON], is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Thank you, Mr. President. I thank Senator DOMENICI and Senator FRIST for all the work they are doing to try to draw distinctions between the President's budget, which is before us as an amendment, and the underlying budget resolution, which is the responsible budget resolution that really balances by the year 2002.

My colleagues have said that the President's budget balances and that it provides for middle-class tax relief. The American people want a Federal budget that balances, and they also want to keep more of the money that they work so hard to earn. But let us

look at the President's budget and let us respond to the demands of the American people. As Paul Harvey would say, "Now it is time for the rest of the story."

Let us look at the issue of balance. I really think the President cannot have a straight face when he says his budget balances, when more than half of the cuts—more than half—come in the last 2 years—2001 and 2002—of the 7-year period the budget covers. There are \$600 billion in cuts over 7 years, and some \$350 billion of those are in the last 2 years.

I think it is very obvious that whoever is elected President this year, 1996, is not going to have to face the issues in the year 2001 and 2002, because there will be yet another President.

I do not think we can, responsibly, with a straight face, pass the President's budget and tell the American people that we have done the responsible thing. I want to use some examples of what the President's budget does. Take NASA for an example. Under the President's budget, the NASA budget lopes along about where it is now for 3 years, and then it drops 10 percent over 2 years. Now, that is not a responsible approach toward a research, technology, or scientific endeavor. How can you be midway into an experiment and, all of a sudden, not have the money for it?

The Republican budget, on the other hand, has steady declines in the NASA budget, for which they can prepare. NASA officials can see very clearly what is going to happen and plan how they are going to have to allocate their resources.

Let us take defense spending, another example. The President is proposing another \$3 billion in cuts this year. That would make it the 12th straight year of decline in defense spending. Today we spend only a little more than one-half of what we spent on defense in 1985. Weapons purchases alone are down 70 percent from 1985. And here we are, at a time when we have American troops all over the world that are seeking to keep peace in some way or another; while we must maintain the highest defense readiness, and we are looking at a major technology initiative in theater missile defense to defend against the very real ballistic missile threat to our country and our troops in the field; with all these priorities, we are looking at a Presidential budget that reduces defense spending again.

Now let us look at tax cuts. The President's budget has a tax credit of \$300 per child up to the age of 13. But the tax credit is only temporary, because it ends if a balanced budget isn't reached in the year 2002. And, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the President's budget will not be balanced by the year 2002.

By comparison, the Republican budget, the underlying budget, has a permanent tax credit of \$500 up to the age of 18 for middle-income taxpayers. That is

a big difference to an American family. Anyone who has a teenager knows that those are the years when you face the most urgent demands on their hard-earned income.

Let us talk about the homemakers of this country. The budget that is underlying—like the budget that we sent to the President last year and which was vetoed—hopefully will include homemaker IRA's. But the President's budget does not. He does not think that the work done inside the home is every bit as important as the work done outside the home. Therefore, he did not provide for the retirement security options for the homemakers of this country. We must not stand for that. We must make sure that this year we do address that terrible inequity, so that a one-income-earner family and a two-income-earner family will have the same retirement security options. It is only fair that homemakers have their retirement nest egg and that one-income-earner families, who are sacrificing to have a homemaker at home when their children come home from school, will not have to suffer in retirement years.

So there are big differences between the President's budget and the budget that we are trying to pass today. We must reject the President's budget. It is a hollow budget. The balance will only occur if we make huge cuts in the year 2001 and the year 2002.

Mr. President, now is the time for Congress to act responsibly, to have cuts that are sloping very gradually, so that agencies or people that are entitled to benefits will know exactly what is there in a responsible manner. The cuts in the rate of growth of spending should be gradual, not staying at the same level until no one around here will be in office anymore, and then cutting to the bone and saying, "Oh, yes, we are going to set the budget numbers, but we are going to let you in the future make the tough decisions." No, Mr. President, now is the time to make the tough decisions, and that is the issue before us.

Are we going to do the responsible thing for our children and grandchildren for the future of this country, or are we going to adopt the President's budget that is before us on the floor right now, which will not really balance? Those tough decisions being put off now will not be any easier then. Most certainly, we cannot expect a defense budget to go up, down, and back up. Nor can we afford to have an experiment at NASA proceed to a certain point and then drop off the face of the Earth—figuratively speaking.

Mr. President, that is not responsible. We know it, and the American people know it. Let us do the responsible thing and reject the President's hollow budget and make the real tough decisions now. That is what the American people asked of us in 1994. It is what we promised. Let us keep the promise.

I yield the floor.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, how much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 2 minutes before the vote. There is no time remaining on the amendment.

Mr. FRIST. We yield back our time.

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. GREGG. 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. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed immediately to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 114 Leg.]

YEAS—99

Abraham	Feinstein	Lugar
Akaka	Ford	Mack
Ashcroft	Frist	McCain
Baucus	Glenn	McConnell
Bennett	Gorton	Mikulski
Biden	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Gramm	Moynihan
Bond	Grams	Murkowski
Boxer	Grassley	Murray
Bradley	Gregg	Nickles
Breaux	Harkin	Nunn
Brown	Hatch	Pell
Bryan	Hatfield	Pressler
Bumpers	Heflin	Pryor
Burns	Helms	Reid
Byrd	Hollings	Robb
Campbell	Hutchison	Rockefeller
Chafee	Inhofe	Roth
Coats	Inouye	Santorum
Cochran	Jeffords	Sarbanes
Cohen	Johnston	Shelby
Conrad	Kassebaum	Simon
Coverdell	Kempthorne	Simpson
Craig	Kennedy	Smith
D'Amato	Kerrey	Snowe
Daschle	Kerry	Specter
DeWine	Kohl	Stevens
Dodd	Kyl	Thomas
Domenici	Lautenberg	Thompson
Dorgan	Leahy	Thurmond
Exon	Levin	Warner
Faircloth	Lieberman	Wellstone
Feingold	Lott	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Dole

The amendment (No. 3968) was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SNOWE). The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, let me tell my colleagues where we are. Frankly, we have a long way to go. Once again, I am urging that Senators on our side—and I will yield to Senator EXON on his side—we need all the amendments, everybody who has an amendment to get us the amendment or at least the substance of it. We are

going to try to work something out so we can get out of here at a reasonable time.

We are not anywhere close to that. I think on our side we have 22 proposed amendments. We are looking them over, first with staff and then with various Senators.

Senator EXON has a tentative list that is not even completed, of how many?

Mr. EXON. Fifty-one.

Mr. DOMENICI. That is 51, and 22, that makes 73 amendments.

Our leader has told me his desire is that we finish this budget resolution over this weekend. That means we have all night tonight and we have all day tomorrow and perhaps we have part of Saturday. I know that brings a lot of grumpy looks on lots of faces, because I am sure everybody has something they planned to do tomorrow. I have great respect for that. But if I am the general, I will do the job. If I am the follower, I will do the job. Right now, I am the follower. I am doing what the leader suggested.

We are going to be here a long time unless we can reach some agreement. In fairness, we are working with the minority leader and with Senator EXON, who is being very cooperative, to see how we can narrow this down.

Maybe my colleague could report to the Senate from his side?

Mr. EXON. I thank the chairman for bringing this up.

Mr. DOMENICI. We need order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Order in the Chamber.

Mr. EXON. Madam President, everything he said I second. The way we are going we will not be through even if we would stay here all weekend including Sunday. The way we are going that would not be enough, we would not get out of here until July 4 sometime, and I am not saying what year. We must move this ahead, not only because I think we are wasting a lot of time but because we have other things that we must address.

I say to the leader, we are sending out a hotline at the present time to try to get an agreement that all the Democratic Senators would file amendments with me by 4 o'clock, or maybe 5 o'clock. I think something like that would very likely be acceptable on my colleague's side. Then we would know how many amendments we have and we might be able to work out something so we can maybe come to a reasonable agreement and if necessary go over sometime until next week, which I think everyone would like to do.

But we are not going to do that, I suggest, following up on the statement of the manager of the bill, the chairman of the committee, as he has just indicated, unless we can have some movement. I think we can get that small amount done, and that small amount is simply to get the amendments listed as we have previously. I think that can happen, but I cannot commit to that now because we are running a hotline. But I believe that

will come to pass. I think the immediate thing we have to do is decide where do we go from here? The Senator from Nebraska is interested in going to a vote as soon as possible on my amendment offered this morning at 9:30, to have a vote on the President's budget. We have had a lot of debate on it. I do not know whether we shed much light, but we have had a lot of debate.

In the meantime, I understand the next amendment on that side, and correct me if I am wrong, is an amendment that is supposed to be offered by the Senator from Missouri. Is that correct?

Mr. DOMENICI. That is correct.

Mr. EXON. I am looking at this for the first time now. Is this a sense of the Senate? It is not a sense of the Senate?

Mr. DOMENICI. No, sir, it is a substantive amendment.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield for a question?

Mr. EXON. Certainly.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have been here listening to the dialog between my colleague from Nebraska and the Senator from New Mexico, the manager of the bill. I just have a question maybe one of them can answer.

I have been faithfully attending to my duties here in the Senate the last 3 weeks. Frankly, we have not been doing anything. We have been playing here on the gas tax, minimum wage, and something called the TEAM Act. What, all of a sudden, when we finally have something we can work on that is substantive—what is the rush? Why, suddenly, are we going to work like we have not been working before? Is there some reason suddenly we have to work on these very weighty issues into the middle of the night and on weekends?

Mr. EXON. I do not know for sure how to answer my friend and colleague from Nevada, except to say I do not think it would hurt the image of this place very much, in the public mind, if we would at least appear to be getting something done. That is the reason that I have to say we should move on this more expeditiously. But I think the question can more likely be answered by the chairman of the committee, with whom I have been working. I suspect maybe that is who the question was directed to anyway.

Mr. REID. The Senator from Nebraska had the floor. I certainly am willing to work whatever hours anyone wants. I, like most Senators here, when there are not things going on on the floor, still have lots of work to do on committees.

Mr. EXON. May we have order in the Senate?

Mr. REID. I will await the judgment of the manager of the bill and the Democratic manager of the bill and be available whenever it requires. My only comment was that we have not been doing a great deal the last few weeks and I hope since we are on the bill now substantively, where we do not have

the opportunity to offer an amendment on minimum wage which 90 percent of the American public wants, that we can handle this—expeditiously, of course—but I see no reason to treat this bill any differently than we do other bills. There is a lot of work that needs to be done and I think we should do it in an expeditious fashion, not necessarily work in the middle of the night, on weekends, on this bill when we have not been doing it on others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I would say to my good friend, Senator REID, from Nevada, it is not like we are trying to hurry this thing through. We almost always have agreed to waive substantial portions of the time on budget resolutions. Almost every evening as we went out we would say we have agreed to use up 5 hours or 7 hours, and I am checking so we will know and next time we can answer you, how we have been doing that.

Second, it is very important we get this finished because we want to give the Appropriations Committee—the Senator serves on that committee—we want to give them their numbers at the earliest possible time so the 13 appropriations bills can be done early this year, rather than holding them over until December and maybe next year.

In addition, we are not in any way talking about forbearing, precluding amendments. We are talking about whether we really need to do 75 amendments.

Mr. REID. If my friend will yield, I understand. I know how hard he has worked on this bill.

I do say, however, the budget resolution was not reported on time. I say to my friend from New Mexico, and I am not speaking for anyone other than myself, I have listened to the debate on this. I think it has been a productive debate to this point. I think it has been good for the Senate. I think it has been good for the American public to have this debate.

I hope this budget resolution can be debated in its entirety. I think we need to have debate on the issues. I say to my friend, I agree with my friend from New Mexico, I do not think we need 75 or 100 amendments on this budget resolution but there are some substantive amendments that I think we need to fully debate and arrive at conclusions on.

My only point is, as my friend knows, he works hard, I work hard. I am willing to do that. I just am a little bit concerned that there is some attempt to stop a full and complete discussion on this, one of the most important matters we are going to decide all year. But I appreciate the courtesy of explaining the Senator's position.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator. Madam 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. 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. Madam President, I have just received word, I want to say—Senator DASCHLE is here—I just want to say we are going to have Senator BOND's amendment ready in 5 or 10 minutes. He will come down and offer it. In the meantime, I want to say it is the intention of the majority that we proceed well into the night to see how much time we can use and how many amendments we can take care of.

I wanted to make sure you knew that, your Senators know that, and I am informing ours right now.

Mr. DASCHLE. I appreciate the Senator's comments. I hope we can get a good debate on amendments. We have a number of them we are prepared to offer just as soon as we dispose of the amendment offered by the distinguished ranking member. We will be prepared to offer those. I assume we will alternate back and forth.

I think it is good to put Senators on notice that we will be here tonight. We are prepared to vote, and we ought to continue as we are.

I thank the Senator.

COAST GUARD BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, with an extensive shoreline in Washington State, the Coast Guard plays an important role in protecting those people who rely on the waters of the Columbia River, Puget Sound, and the Pacific Ocean for commercial and recreational purposes. Whether it is dangerous search and rescue operations, enforcement of existing fishing treaties with Canada, or maintenance of navigational aids, the Coast Guard does its job and it does it well.

For that reason, Mr. President, I included language in the report accompanying the budget resolution that commends the Coast Guard for both its current operations, as well as its efforts to streamline and reduce its overall budget. Under Adm. Robert Kramek's leadership as Commandant of the Coast Guard for the past 3 years, the Coast Guard has reduced its work force by 4,000 positions and lowered its budget by \$400 million per year. All of this done without reducing any valuable services to the general public.

In all of the debate over the next 9 months regarding funding for specific programs, I hope that the fiscal year 1997 Coast Guard budget appropriately reflects the efforts being made by Admiral Kramek and all of his staff to provide better government at less cost, while still providing important services to the citizens in Washington State and across the country.

Mr. DOMENICI. I suggest the absence of a quorum just for a few moments until Senator BOND arrives and that it be charged equally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. 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. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. How long does the Senator desire to speak?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Ten minutes.

THE MORAL CHARACTER OF CONTENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, after 3 years of inaudible policy on drugs, the administration is suddenly trying to find its voice. Naturally, after not having been used for so long on this issue, the voice is a bit rusty and unsteady. For those of us not used to the sound after so long a silence, it is just a little hard to make out the meaning. At the moment, the meaning sounds a lot like a New Year's resolution—full of seasonal promises. It is not too clear just what is being said or how much faith we ought to put in this election-year resolution. It is also not too clear if what is being said bears any relationship to the issue being addressed.

The question is, Is the voice speaking from principle or opportunism? The answer lies in finding clues to see whether we are in the presence of conviction or convenience. Sincerity, after all, is not measured in the volume of one's words or the lofty sentiments with which they are pressed. It is to be gaged by actions that match rhetoric. It is measured not in sound bites or self-serving gestures but in commitments made and promises kept. It is signified by candor and stout-heartedness. It is judged by deeds. It is marked by courage. And it is generally easy to tell the difference between stage-managed courage and the genuine article. The genuine article generally has a past and a future because it is based on substance, on character. Its history is not one of fair-weather friendships and will-o'-the-wist obligations. The counterfeit tends to swell on cue and to fade when the audience leaves.

So, as the administration clears its throat on the drug issue, it might be timely to take a look at the content and context of the pronouncements that are likely to ensue. At the moment, the new-found conviction of the President on the drug issue, as I said, looks a lot like a New Year's resolution. It is probably only a coincidence that this new year is also an election year. I hope, however, that the present resolution is a little sturdier than most New Year's declarations—so full of promise and so short on fulfillment. We do have some guideposts to go by to decide whether what we have on the drug issue reflects principle or calculation.

It is no secret to the press or to many in the public that the President is can-

dor-challenged. He has a problem with consistency when it comes to what he says. And much of this fidelity deficit seems to owe a lot to expediency. The question is, Does policy grow from sound foundations or from what sounds good at the moment? It was one of the chief advisers to the President who gave us some insight on this. As Mr. Stephanopolous told us, to this President, words are actions. Just listen to what I say, don't look at what I do—or say tomorrow.

There is something of the magician in this philosophy. It is, after all, essential to the illusionists' art that you be distracted by words from what the hands are up to. Thus, it is possible to have no consistent policy but to claim one. It is possible to have mismanaged foreign affairs and assert the opposite. It is possible to have reneged on a bounty of campaign promises and to call it keeping faith. It is possible to make a virtue of having offered no fiscally responsible budgets while blaming others for the lapse. It is possible to have discovered the drug issue on the eve of an election and then to denounce critics as playing politics. And all of this with an elegant turn of phrase.

But there is more involved here than words. We have actions to guide us, to help us go beyond the sleigh of hand. What do they tell us when it comes to sincerity on fighting drugs? In this case, actions do speak louder than words.

The echoes of the Inauguration balls were hardly over before the President cut the Office of National Drug Control Policy—the Nation's drug czar—by 80 percent. That gesture was not an economy it was a massacre. It would also seem to be a statement about the importance of drug policy in the President's own household. But it was not singular.

The new-car smell of the administration had hardly dissipated when the Nation's chief medical officer, the Surgeon General, suggested we could legalize our way out of the drug problem. The tepid condemnation that followed from the President did nothing to foreclose this line of thinking. In fact, the idea of normalizing drug use has gathered strength in the last few years. But this was not all.

The administration also cut interdiction funding. This controlled shift in the priorities in our interdiction policies produced uncontrolled muddle here and abroad. We may not have scared our enemies with this policy, but we successfully confused our friends and our own people. But the story does not end here.

Along with these actions, the President also abandoned the bully pulpit. This is, perhaps, the truest measure of intent. If there is one thing that the President is able to do, it is to talk. He has a gift for words. We must ask ourselves, knowing this, why the President spoke virtually not at all on the drug issue for 3 years? What does this

say about a commitment to the drug issue? In over 1,700 utterances in 1994 alone, illegal drugs were mentioned less than a dozen times. As they say, "silence is golden." This is a silence that speaks volumes. But there's more.

In these years of just say nothing, the nature of our drug problem began to change. Although we still had a hardcore addict population largely resistant to our efforts to treat them, we had made major strides in reducing use, particularly among our young people. Between 1980 and 1992 we had succeeded in reducing so-called casual use by more than 50 percent for all drugs, and over 70 percent for cocaine. We had succeeded in persuading young people that drugs were both dangerous and wrong to use. That is now changing.

Since 1992, teenage drug use has surged. The age of people using drugs has dropped. The belief that drugs are dangerous and wrong has reversed. Popular culture once again abounds in drug glorification messages. The legalization movement is better funded and organized, and has found allies like William Buckley. Much of the media has declared a moratorium on discussing drugs—unless it is to give space to legalization arguments. All of this in 3 years, and all of it with hardly a word from the Nation's leading wizard of words.

If the past is any guide, then, we need to approach the present born-again resolution on drug policy with some questions about its meaning and purpose. In this regard, I was struck by comments in several leading periodicals about the new resolution on drugs coming from the White House this election year. These may give us a hint about the future, about whether the President's new found voice speaks from principle or poetic license.

The Weekly-Standard, a policy journal, recently editorialized that "Bill Clinton is mostly talk. He enjoys daily political combat and negotiates its demands with rare talent. But he has never been much for actual, week-in, week-out government. Over any given administrative term in his long career, the Clinton record is thickly stained with the evidence both of his personal disengagement and of the ideological inclinations of his loosely supervised appointees." The piece further notes, "So the early months of a Clinton election year always look the same: He mounts a slick and furious propaganda offensive to muddy that evidence, the better to confuse and silence his opponents. What looks bad, Clinton knows, can often be made to look good—if you jabber about it enough."

If this view is any indication of the depth of the recent pronouncements on drug policy by the President, then we are in the presence of a pretty shallow reservoir. We have words filling in for action. But this was not the only comment on the President's newly found vocabulary on drugs.

A recent piece in the Wall Street Journal noted that "Bill Clinton's retreat in the drug war is among the

worst sins for which his administration should be held accountable." The editorial reminds us that the President didn't inhale. It also reminds us that "some dozen White House employees, including senior staff, had been 'requested to be part of an individual drug testing program' because of their prior drug history." But past indiscretion may be no guide to the future.

The Journal piece, however, touches on something more fundamental. Something that I have talked about before that may be more telling. This involves the character issue. The Journal notes, " * * * we would like to know exactly why Bill Clinton took a powder on the drugs wars * * * ." It then adds, " * * * the heart of our complaint with this President's attitude on drugs has to do with what we would call its character, its moral content."

It goes on to make the following point: "Unlike the Reagans, you will never see the Clintons articulating the war on drugs as an essentially moral crusade * * * the Clintons, like the generation of liberal constituencies that they lead, are going to be rhetorically correct, believers in the powers of bureaucratic healing—and nonjudgmental." In other words, Clinton is unable to be a leader on this issue because his opinions on the subject have no fixed address. If this is an accurate assessment, then the President's newly found fervor on the drug issue is likely to have moved on by next November. If true, the present commitment will not last much beyond the echo of his pronouncements. It is not based on principle but on opportunism.

There are many more news accounts about the President's election-eve conversion. These provides us with more insight on how we are to judge the present situation. They do not give us a definitive answer. We must judge for ourselves. But there is not much in the past to indicate that strong principle informs the present sincere-sounding rhetoric. It must have content not just context. For the content to be serious, it must be backed up by character. Without principle what confidence can we have in the words? What we need, what we are looking for, is not resolutions but resoluteness. We do not live by words alone. But it seems that words are all we are likely to get.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that these news items be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 2, 1996]

WAITING TO EXHALE

Now, in April 1996, with eight months left on a four-year term, Bill Clinton flies the press into Miami so he can be seen standing shoulder to shoulder with General Barry McCaffrey, a decorated war hero he's enlisted to lead a war on drugs. Standing among school children Monday, the President poured his great rhetorical heart onto the drug war. Along the way came these key words: "Make no mistake about it, this has

got to be a bipartisan, American, nonpolitical effort." Translation: Don't blame me for this problem, especially during an election campaign.

In fact, Bill Clinton's retreat in the drug war is among the worst sins for which his Administration should be held accountable. After years of decline in drug use, recent surveys make it clear that a younger generation of Americans is again at risk (see the chart nearby). The number of 12-to-17-year-olds using marijuana increased to 2.9 million in 1994 from 1.6 million in 1992. Marijuana use increased 200% among 14-to-15-year-olds during the same period. Since 1992, according to large surveys of high school students, there has been a 52% increase in the number of seniors using drugs monthly. One in three report having used marijuana in the past year. Private anti-drug advocates such as Jim Burke of the Partnership for a Drug Free America and Joe Califano of Columbia University's Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse have been running alongside this drug fire, yelling for help to anyone who'd listen.

Better late than never, of course, and it is good that Mr. Clinton wants to mend his ways with General McCaffrey. We applaud the appointment and think General McCaffrey has sounded many right notes. Legalization, he says, "is out of the question."

A quarterly regional analysis put out by his office brings the problem up to date: "A recent New York State high school survey reports that 12% of New York teens said that they smoked marijuana at least four times a month, double the number in the 1990 survey." Discussing "Emerging Drugs," the report notes methamphetamine's popularity in the San Francisco area: "in addition to its use by young users who combine it with heroin ('a meth speedball') it can also be found in 'biker's coffee,' a combination of methamphetamine and coffee popular among young, fairly affluent urbanites." Additionally, the report notes that "Club drugs, a name which generally includes MDMA, Ketamine, 2c-B, LSD, psilocybin and a range of other hallucinogens, are increasingly mentioned in this quarter."

These recent events are not a coincidence. The drug retreat was the result of a series of explicit policy decisions by Mr. Clinton and those around him. Which is why we think it is worth focusing on the meaning of his wish that the anti-drug war be "bipartisan, American, nonpolitical." This means that between now and November's election no one is allowed to utter the phrase "didn't inhale." No one is allowed to remember Surgeon General Joycelyn Elders talking about drug legalization, even as her own son was arrested and convicted on drug-sale charges.

Nor should anyone be allowed to bring up White House deputy personnel director Patsy Thomasson's admission to a congressional committee that some dozen White House employees, including senior staff, had been "requested to be part of an individual drug testing program" because of their prior drug history. Ms. Thomasson's experience in these drug mop-up duties extends back to her days in Arkansas when she took over the business of Dan Lasater—Little Rock bond dealer, Clinton campaign contributor and friend-of-brother Roger—while Mr. Lasater served prison time for "social distribution" of cocaine. This week Mr. Lasater is testifying before the Senate Whitewater Committee, and we assume he will be asked to enlighten the committee about the millions of dollars of mysterious trades that his firm made through an account without the knowledge of the account's owner, Kentucky resident Dennis Patrick.

On matters of pure policy, among Bill Clinton's first acts was to cut spending on the war. The staff of the Office of National Drug

Control Policy was cut to 25 from 146. Drug interdiction funds were cut. The number of trafficker aircraft seized by Customs fell to 10 from 37 in FY '93-'95. Drug czar Lee Brown wandered the nation's editorial pages seeking the public support he rarely got from his President. New York Democratic Congressman Charles Rangel announced: "I really never thought I'd miss Nancy Reagan, but I do."

Finally, about a year ago, Mr. Clinton received a stinging letter from FBI Director Louis Freeh and DEA director Tom Constantine, charging that the President's anti-drug effort was adrift. So now we have General McCaffrey, who says, "There is no reason why we can't return America to a 1960s level, pre-Vietnam era level of drug use."

Sorry, General, but pre-Vietnam America is not coming back. General McCaffrey's current President is a founding member of the generation that transformed America in the years of Vietnam and those that followed. It bequeathed to all of us a culture and ethos of such personal and moral slovenliness that we must now enlist a battle-hardened soldier to save the children of the anti-Vietnam generation from drugs. It is perhaps the most perfect, bitter irony that when these parents now exhort their children to stop using marijuana (of a strain that is significantly more potent than anything they dabbled in), the kids reply: "Why should we? We're not hurting anyone."

Basically, we'd very much like to know exactly why Bill Clinton took a powder on the drug wars after he became President. There was in fact a rationale of sorts offered at the time for the change in tone and direction. In contrast to what was thought to be the Republican approach of throwing people in jail for drug offenses, the Clinton approach would emphasize prevention and treatment. There is a case to be made for prevention and treatment, but the heart of our complaint with this President's attitude on drugs has to do with what we would call its character, its moral content.

Unlike the Reagans, you will never see the Clintons articulating the war on drugs as an essentially moral crusade. With its emphasis on treatment and programs and prevention, it is mainly the kind of effort that the sociologist Philip Rieff identified as the triumph of the therapeutic. Rather than the schoolmarmish Nancy Reagan, the Clintons, like the generation of liberal constituencies that they lead, are going to be rhetorically correct, believers in the powers of bureaucratic healing—and nonjudgmental. In their world, no one is ever quite caught for disastrous personal behavior or choices. Instead of absolutism, there are explanations.

This, in our opinion, is the real reason the drug war waned when Bill Clinton became President. The message this new President sent to his young, yuppie, MTVish audiences was that he was just too cool to go relentlessly moralistic over something like recreational drugs. Sure he had an anti-drug policy in 1992 and a czar and speeches, but Bill Clinton wasn't going to have any cows over the subject. Surely, the drug-testing White House staff understood that much.

We don't doubt that a lot of people in this country, especially parents of teenaged and pre-teen children, would very much like to rediscover General McCaffrey's pre-Vietnam world of less constant cultural challenge. But the people who turned that culture upside down, making it a daily challenge for parents, have at last been given the chance to run the government. But this death-bed conversion on drugs simply lacks credibility. As much as we applaud General McCaffrey's new offensive, only a triumph of hope over experience could lead anyone to believe it would be sustained past November if Mr.

Clinton and his crowd are returned to the White House.

[From the Weekly Standard, May 13, 1996]
GENERAL CLINTON, LOSING THE DRUG WAR
(By David Tell)

Bill Clinton is mostly talk. He enjoys daily political combat and negotiates its demands with rare talent. But he has never been much for actual, week-in, week-out government. Over any given administrative term in his long career, the Clinton record is thickly stained with the evidence both of his personal disengagement and of the ideological inclinations of his loosely supervised appointees. So the early months of a Clinton election year always look the same: He mounts a slick and furious propaganda offensive to muddy that evidence, the better to confuse and silence his opponents. What looks bad, Clinton knows, can often be made to look good—if you jabber about it enough.

This is your president's brain. And this is your president's brain on drugs: Clinton is justifiably nervous that his credibility gap in the nation's drug war—still a major public preoccupation—might be exploited by Republicans in the fall.

Candidate Clinton didn't inhale. President Clinton's surgeon general, Joycelyn Elders, made repeated pronouncements on the virtues of drug legalization. Before the ink was dry on his presidential oath, Clinton gutted the White House drug office with a two-fold, shabby purpose: satisfying a campaign pledge to trim his staff, and purging a hundred-odd career civil servants whose only sin (shades of Travelgate) was to have worked under a Republican administration. That massacre remains the president's best known drug-war initiative; three years later, he has spent very little time on the effort. "I've been in Congress for over two decades," Democratic Rep. Charles B. Rangel grumped late last year. "I have never, never, never seen a president who cares less" about drugs.

So it is now, predictably, "inoculation" season, as the Clinton campaign embarks on a weeks-long media tour designed to portray the president as fully and effectively engaged in the war on drugs. Much of it is typical hokum. A talk-show schlockmeister has been recruited to produce anti-drug television commercials; "Montel Williams's leadership on this crucial effort is inspiring," bumbles the White House. A Gallup poll on the drug war has been commissioned, as the White House admits without embarrassment, "to demonstrate thinking which will support our efforts." And the president himself—in a spare Miami moment between rounds of golf and multimillion-dollar Democratic fundraisers—has unveiled a "new" drugfighting strategy. He is "working hard in Washington," he tells a group of network cameramen and middle-school students. And his work is paying off, since "every year for the last three years . . . drug use has dropped."

We'll come back to this falsehood in a moment. Were the Clinton drug-fighting record purely a matter of Elders-like bloopers and mere inattention, the president's current show of concern—and the debut of his newly minted tough-guy "drug czar," retired army general Barry McCaffrey—might be sufficient protection against GOP election-year complaints. But it really isn't true that Clinton has done "nothing" about drugs, as Republicans may want to charge. It's worse, far worse: His administration has engineered the most significant redirection of federal drug policy in several decades. This is a poorly reported story. And an alarming one that begs for informative political debate.

Throughout the 1980s and early 1990s, the federal government pursued what might fair-

ly be described as a "do everything" strategy against illegal drugs. Executive-branch agencies conducted crop eradication and criminal investigative efforts in foreign countries. They launched "interdiction" programs against smugglers operating in the so-called transit zone between those countries and the United States, and on our borders. They undertook a dizzying variety of law-enforcement, drug-prevention, and rehabilitative-treatment initiatives here at home. It was a richly funded campaign; total federal spending on the drug war rose nearly 700 percent between 1981 and 1992. And it roughly coincided with a more than 50 percent decline in the rate of overall drug use nationwide, from its historical high in 1979 to its subsequent low in the final year of the Bush administration.

There was a standard Democratic critique of government drug policy during this period of Republican presidencies: The executive branch was supposedly placing exaggerated emphasis on efforts to reduce the supply of illegal drugs to American neighborhoods, and shortchanging an equally necessary therapeutic approach to addicts and schoolchildren. The drug war's most visibly warlike aspects—its overseas and interdiction programs—were subjected to particular scorn. As the Customs Service was spending millions of dollars to get radar balloons tangled in high-tension electrical wires on the Southwest border, the scoffers said, cocaine addicts went homeless and died for want of bed-space in federally funded treatment facilities.

Of course, it is a simple fact that federal law can only be enforced by the federal government, and that effort—G-men and prisons, most obviously—is intrinsically more expensive than even the most lavish education and drug-treatment programs could ever be. And so the federal drug budget will always be heavily weighted toward "supply reduction" (and away from "demand reduction") activities. Even in a Democratic administration. President Clinton still spends twice as much money on restricting drug supply as on ending demand.

But he is spending it very differently. Democratic hostility to drug-war "militarism" is alive and well in the Clinton administration. Under his supervision, the federal government is now conducting an anti-drug effort almost exclusively inside the United States. At our borders and beyond, the drug war has, for the most part, been canceled. By formal White House directive.

In 1993, the administration instituted what is technically called a "controlled shift" of federal drug-war assets. Money and personnel devoted to anti-smuggling efforts in the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and on the U.S.-Mexican border were ostensibly redeployed directly to the Latin American countries in which most illegal drugs originate. But that redeployment has never actually occurred. The federal drug-budget accounts from which any new Latin American initiative could be funded are 55 percent smaller today than in 1992. The old-fashioned anti-smuggling effort has been "shifted" to nowhere. It has been eviscerated.

The result? Coast Guard cocaine and marijuana seizures are down 45 to 90 percent, respectively, since 1991. In 1994, the Customs Service let two million commercial trucks pass through three of the busiest ports-of-entry on the Mexican border without seizing a single kilogram of cocaine. Between 1993 and early 1995, the estimated smuggling "disruption rate" achieved by federal drug interdiction agencies fell 53 percent—the equivalent of 84 more metric tons of cocaine and marijuana arriving unimpeded in the United States each year. Drug Enforcement Agency figures suggest that cocaine and heroin are

now available on American streets in near-record purity—and at near-record-low retail prices.

Which can only be evidence that the supply of illegal drugs on American streets has significantly expanded on Bill Clinton's watch. Because the only other possible explanation, that the demand for drugs has fallen, is at variance with the facts. The president was sadly mistaken—or, well, he lied—when he told those Miami schoolchildren that American drug use "has dropped" every year since he took office. Drug use has steadily risen since 1992, especially among the young. Overall teenage drug use is up 55 percent. Marijuana consumption by teenagers has almost doubled.

This is a pretty striking picture of deliberate government decision-making gone disastrously awry. It's the president's fault. He has proposed nothing to correct it, Gen. McCaffrey and Montel Williams notwithstanding. And he should be called to account. All the president's facile election-year speechifying aside, there are serious differences of personnel and policy that divide this Democratic administration from the Republican administration that would replace it in 1997. Where the drug war is concerned, as in so many other respects, those differences should be clear. They do not flatter President Clinton.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEMPTHORNE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa has made a 10-minute attack on the President on an issue dealing with the fight on drugs. I ask that the same courtesy be extended and that I be permitted to speak in morning business for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FIGHT ON DRUGS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, let me say, Mr. President, that it always saddens me when the floor of the U.S. Senate is turned into a place to debate issues regarding the Presidential race. I think it is very important that when things are stated on the floor that are not true, we have an opportunity to respond. I thank the chairman of the Budget Committee for giving me that opportunity.

There is a lot of talk around here about the failure of this President to crack down on the issue of drug enforcement. I want to set the record straight. Federal drug prosecutions are up 13 percent from 1994. Federal prosecutors achieved an 84 percent conviction rate in all drug cases in 1995. So we are beginning to see a change. During the past 3 years, there has been a 9.4 percent increase in prosecutions of the toughest, most complex drug cases. There are now about 48,000 convicted

drug dealers in Federal prisons, three-fifths of the total Federal inmate population, and the highest number in history.

There has been a drug-testing initiative. The President ordered Federal prosecutors to seek drug testing of all people arrested on Federal criminal charges, and is seeking \$42 million to fund this initiative in 1997. These tests will help Federal judges determine whether a defendant should be granted bail.

The Justice Department has funded 65 grants, totaling \$8.5 million to help communities establish and expand drug courts that help break the cycle of drugs and crime. The 1994 Crime Act authorized \$1 billion through the year 2000 to support State and local drug courts.

So, Mr. President, people can come down here and make speeches about our President. But at least have the facts. I think this President, and every President, is entitled to the facts. Who is the President that came up with the idea of putting 100,000 cops on the beat? It was this President of the United States of America, Bill Clinton, who came up with the idea that we need more cops on the beat, because it is prevention to have cops on the beat, it is prevention to have community policing. It is the other side of the aisle that wants to rescind that law providing 100,000 cops on the beat and replace it with a block grant, and who knows where the money will go. We want cops on the beat. We are on our way to getting it done. Which President signed the Violence Against Women Act? I am so proud of that because I worked with Senator JOE BIDEN on it for 5 long years. It was this President. And we are going after violence in domestic situations. We are going after the crime of rape. We are working toward making streets safer. Do we have a long way to go? Of course, we do. This is complicated.

Clearly, if we can get drugs out of society, there will be a decrease in crime. We know there is a definite correlation here. We have a President who understands we need enforcement and understands we need very good people to prosecute these cases. We have a President who has cracked down on the border. I come from California, and we are seeing an entirely different situation down there, with large increases in the Border Patrol, and with the U.S. attorney who has just done wonders with the conviction rate of second-time criminal aliens coming back into this country from Mexico. He has prosecuted more of them in 1 year than the previous 5 years altogether.

So when we come down to this floor and we start to use it as a debate over the Presidential race, I wish we would not do it. But if we do it, let us be honorable about it. Let us be factual about it. This is the President who fought so hard to take prevention, effective prosecution, enforcement, interdiction—take all of those aspects of fighting

drugs and putting them into one policy, getting through an effective crime bill, and making sure that in fact we are waging an effective war on drugs. This is the President who understands this issue.

So I want to thank my chairman of the Budget Committee for giving me this opportunity to put into the RECORD what the record truly is. And the fact of the matter is since I have been here all I have heard from many on the other side is a desire to repeal the crime bill, repeal the ban on assault weapons which are used by gangs, repeal the Brady bill which has kept weapons out of the hands of 67,000 people who have had mental health problems in the past. We do not want those people getting guns.

I appreciate this opportunity to correct the record.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

The Senate continued with the consideration of the concurrent resolution. Mr. BOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 3971 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3965

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk in the second degree.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] proposes an amendment No. 3971 to amendment numbered 3965.

Mr. BOND. 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:

In the pending amendment:

On page 30, line 5, decrease the amount by \$175,000,000.

On page 30, line 6, decrease the amount by \$7,000,000.

On page 30, line 11, decrease the amount by \$907,000,000.

On page 30, line 12, decrease the amount by \$246,000,000.

On page 30, line 17, decrease the amount by \$2,256,000,000.

On page 30, line 18, decrease the amount by \$1,920,000,000.

On page 30, line 23, decrease the amount by \$3,621,000,000.

On page 30, line 24, decrease the amount by \$3,033,000,000.

On page 31, line 4, decrease the amount by \$3,302,000,000.

On page 31, line 5, decrease the amount by \$3,124,000,000.

On page 31, line 10, decrease the amount by \$2,355,000,000.

On page 31, line 11, decrease the amount by \$2,187,000,000.

On page 33, line 5, increase the amount by \$175,000,000.

On page 33, line 6, increase the amount by \$7,000,000.

On page 33, line 12, increase the amount by \$907,000,000.

On page 33, line 13, increase the amount by \$246,000,000.

On page 33, line 19, increase the amount by \$2,256,000,000.

On page 33, line 20, increase the amount by \$1,920,000,000.

On page 34, line 1, increase the amount by \$3,621,000,000.

On page 34, line 2, increase the amount by \$3,033,000,000.

On page 34, line 8, increase the amount by \$1,708,000,000.

On page 34, line 9, increase the amount by \$1,552,000,000.

On page 40, line 23, increase the amount by \$1,594,000,000.

On page 40, line 24, increase the amount by \$1,572,000,000.

On page 41, line 5, increase the amount by \$2,355,000,000.

On page 41, line 6, increase the amount by \$2,187,000,000.

On page 45, line 15, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 45, line 16, increase the amount by \$10,952,000,000.

On page 47, line 9, increase the amount by \$175,000,000.

On page 47, line 11, increase the amount by \$7,000,000.

On page 47, line 13, increase the amount by \$907,000,000.

On page 47, line 14, increase the amount by \$246,000,000.

On page 47, line 16, increase the amount by \$2,256,000,000.

On page 47, line 17, increase the amount by \$1,920,000,000.

On page 47, line 19, increase the amount by \$3,621,000,000.

On page 47, line 20, increase the amount by \$3,033,000,000.

On page 47, line 22, increase the amount by \$3,302,000,000.

On page 47, line 23, increase the amount by \$3,124,000,000.

On page 48, line 2, increase the amount by \$2,730,000,000.

On page 48, line 3, increase the amount by \$2,623,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous agreement the debate on the Bond amendment is limited to 1 hour.

Mr. BOND. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, my colleagues, this is a simple amendment. It increases function 700 for veterans by \$13 billion over the period of 1997 to 2002, and to pay for that it increases the reconciliation instructions for welfare reform by \$13 billion which raises the total number under the President's plan from \$39 to \$52 billion.

I think it is time that we get back to talking about the budget which is the subject in front of us today. We have just had a very clear-cut indication in this body that people want to talk about a real budget that does not make drastic cuts in the last year. They said it was a bad idea. This is the first good opportunity to vote on the President's proposal to achieve the balanced budget by taking a tremendous whack out of discretionary programs including those items which he cited as his high priorities in the last 2 years.

I am very pleased that our colleagues unanimously on both sides of the aisle said that did not make any sense, and that we should not go at it in a meat ax way. I think we ought to start taking a look at responsible adjustments to try to bring this proposal back into the realm of reality.

The amendment that I have just offered has a series of numbers. Those numbers ensure VA medical care will not be one of the victims of the President's drastic outyear cuts, and it also restores the cuts proposed for the years 1998, 1999, and 2000 before the trigger—before the cap—hits.

My amendment would bring the VA medical care up to what is included in the Senate Republican budget proposal, an almost \$13 billion add-on. As I said, it offsets this by asking for greater savings in welfare.

Let me address the second part of that first. After 30 years of ever more expensive and less effective approaches to poverty, last year Congress came up with a plan that we sent to the President which he vetoed which would have reformed welfare in a meaningful way. I think our approach struck a fair balance between the role of the Federal Government in providing a safety net and giving States increased responsibilities. You would have saved \$64 billion over 7 years in the process.

Since the creation of Aid to Families with Dependent Children, public aid has been regarded as an entitlement. If you meet the requirements for eligibility, you receive the cash with no strings attached. The current system has been rightly maligned by persons from all walks of life, including researchers, advocates, politicians, and even the recipients themselves. They know the system does not work. The system is impersonal. It is inefficient. It encourages continued dependency.

I am concerned that, if we do not require recipients of public assistance to work, or at least behave responsibly, or take steps to wean themselves from public assistance, our efforts at reform are just going to be another word for more of the same.

Our welfare bill which passed the Senate overwhelmingly on a bipartisan basis had a real work requirement. In that bill, we also permitted States to implement reform ideas without undertaking a lengthy and cumbersome waiver process. States who wanted to require welfare recipients to obtain preventive health care for their children, or to ensure their children stay in school and wish to allow recipients to keep more of their earnings from a part time job—all of them a good idea—now have to go through a waiver process from HHS. It is costly, time consuming, and silly.

I have addressed before a silly problem that came up in Sedalia, MO. You have heard me talk about this on previous occasions. But this is the example of what the Federal law, as it now stands, does not permit States to do. The State of Missouri working through their local family services office and the employers in the area decided in Sedalia, MO, to try a pilot program to get people jobs in an expanding new industry in town. People seeking food stamp assistance were sent, if they were able bodied, to the employer for job interviews. If they were offered a

job then they got off the need for food stamps. If they refused to show up, or if they were offered a job and refused it, then the State could sanction them, and did not have to give them food stamps. There was a real incentive for these people to make an effort to get work. A lot of them did get work. Some of them did not like the work that was offered. They went out and took another job. That is fine.

A lot of people in that community who had been depending upon public assistance went back on the work rolls. Two of the people, however, who were sent to the employer they failed the employer's mandatory drug test. When they went back to the State the State could not cut them off of welfare, or food stamps in this instance, because they had failed a drug test. And the State wants a waiver. The State said this is crazy. And they are right. If we want to get people off of welfare and to work, and we prohibit States from saying, "If you cannot get a job because you failed the drug test, then we will pull you off the welfare rolls. We will not give you assistance." That means, if somebody wants to stay on public assistance and get food stamps, or welfare, all they have to do is take drugs. What a perverse incentive.

The State has been battling to get a waiver. My view is the States should not have to get a waiver. The States ought to be permitted to make those commonsense determinations and see what works.

The current system that President Clinton is defending by his vetoes keeps those nonsensical requirements in place.

Where States, despite the best efforts of the Clinton administration to keep control, have been able to implement significant reforms the results have been astounding. Welfare caseloads have dropped to 25 percent from 30 percent in some States including Massachusetts, Indiana, and Michigan. That is why we are here. More families are able to obtain self-sufficiency which has the added benefit of saving the Federal Government money.

As I pointed out, the welfare reform plan that we sent to the President which he vetoed would have saved \$64.1 billion over 7 years. In this amendment before us I am proposing that we save \$53 billion in welfare programs so that we can keep a promise we made to our Nation's veterans who risked their lives for us that they would always have health care.

This, I would think, is not an unrealistic number. The Senate Budget Committee plan calls for \$54 billion in welfare savings. Some of the savings would be achieved in the Supplemental Security Income Program, which, as the fastest growing entitlement, desperately needs reform. We can make these savings by reforming the programs and returning them to the States for them to administer, thereby eliminating huge Federal bureaucracies.

I think the people of America want to see us get serious about welfare reform. If you believe what the President says—he says we want to change welfare as we know it—I think it is time we did what the people want and the President says rather than rely on the President's veto to keep the status quo.

Now, what this will do on the other side, for the Veterans' Administration patients, is to ensure that when they need health care they are not going to be denied. The people who are served in Veterans' Administration facilities around the country are the ones who have been injured in combat overseas and/or those who are medically indigent.

This is where they are cared for—in all of these locations. These are 170 Veterans' Administration facilities across the Nation. Last year, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle said that we could not have a flatline of spending in veterans affairs because it would result in closure of four of those hospitals. Frankly, there are savings that can be made in the Veterans' Administration, and I think that those savings are being pursued in the health care area by Dr. Ken Kizer and others. But there is no way that an almost 25-percent cut, \$12.9 billion, can do anything but devastate the program. Millions of veterans will not be served. At least a quarter of these hospitals and veterans facilities will have to be shut.

Pick a State, any State. As I mentioned earlier, some of the major States like California would probably have to have three or four closures. My home State of Missouri would have to have at least one closure. All of the States with veterans facilities would be faced with losing some of those facilities, as well as service to many of their most needy people.

Massachusetts would lose at least one; Washington, at least one; Texas, two; Pennsylvania, two, probably three; Illinois, with six facilities, one or two; and Florida, the same position, at least one or two. I do not think that is acceptable. When we asked the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, who came before our committee, to comment on these proposals, he said he could not live with that scenario.

He did not like our scenario, which was a flatline, but I believe they can live with that. But he sure cannot live with a scenario that takes a tremendous whack out of the budget and, beginning after 1997, takes funding for the Veterans' Administration in a precipitous decline. That is why I think we need to have a realistic budget. It is time that we started talking honestly about what our needs are going to be in the future.

We are joined in this concern by a number of organizations which have expressed their grave concern over this. The Independent Budget, a group comprised of Amvets, Disabled Veterans, Paralyzed Veterans of America, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United

States, wrote to Secretary Jesse Brown on May 14, 1996, which I will submit. I received a copy. My colleagues, chairs, and ranking members of the VA-HUD Appropriations Committee, received it. I will cite to you just the middle paragraph of the letter. It says:

Our Nation's sick and disabled veterans deserve a viable health care system devoted to them and their special health care needs. Many of us have opposed budget plans brought up in Congress because we believe they call into question the continued existence of such a health care system. President Clinton's 7-year balanced budget proposal does not provide the funding necessary to meet these needs. This is true in view of the fact that we have yet to witness true VA health care eligibility reform.

I send that letter to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE INDEPENDENT BUDGET,
Washington, DC, May 14, 1996.

Hon. JESSE BROWN,
Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Department of
Veterans Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY BROWN: On behalf of AMVETS, Disabled American Veterans, Paralyzed Veterans of America, and Veterans of Foreign Wars, the collective authors of the Independent Budget for the Department of Veterans Affairs, we are writing to inform you of our concern over President Clinton's seven year budget plan as it relates to the Department of Veterans Affairs' (VA) medical care.

Our nation's sick and disabled veterans deserve a viable health care system devoted to them and their special health care needs. Many of us have opposed budget plans brought up in Congress because we believed that they called into question the continued existence of such a health care system. President Clinton's seven year balanced budget proposal does not provide the funding necessary to meet these needs. This is true in view of the fact that we have yet to witness true VA health care eligibility reform.

We all are aware that we live in fiscally constrained times, and we all support taking steps to continue on the path of deficit reduction. But we cannot, and must not, set budgetary targets for VA medical care that are unrealistic and which are not a clear response to the problems faced by the VA, and the many veterans who rely upon the system. When budget plans do not reflect the true needs of the VA medical system, we will oppose them, and call on others to oppose them.

Sincerely,

KENNETH WOLFORD,
National Commander,
AMVETS.

RICHARD GRANT,
National President,
Paralyzed Veterans of
America.

THOMAS A. McMASTERS III,
National Commander,
Disabled American
Veterans.

PAUL A. SPERA,
Commander-in-Chief,
Veterans of Foreign
Wars.

Mr. BOND. I also would note that the American Legion, in a letter to me dated May 10, 1996, states:

After reviewing President's Clinton's FY '97 budget proposal for the Department of

Veterans Affairs, the American Legion is deeply disturbed with the outyear funding levels recommended.

They conclude by saying:

The American Legion strongly believes there are acceptable alternatives Congress should seriously consider before turning its back on American veterans and their families.

Mr. President, that is simply what is at issue here. Are we going to turn our backs on veterans, or are we going to make some responsible choices and say it is time to get serious about welfare reform and make sure we put people to work and use some of the funds that we save to ensure that we care for our Nation's veterans, the elderly, the sick, the war-injured, the medically indigent who need our help and care.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Will the Senator yield.

Mr. BOND. I will be happy to yield. I relinquish my time, and I will be happy to yield the time on the other side.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I came over to speak on the budget, and I just came out on the floor, and I apologize to my colleague. But if I understand the context, could I ask the Senator, first of all, exactly what cuts are being made in the welfare area? Is this food stamps? Is this the Supplemental Security Income Program? Where exactly are you proposing to make these cuts?

Mr. BOND. I say to my friend, we are proposing in the reconciliation numbers, if you will look at the copy of the amendment, which is not very descriptive unless you have the whole document with you, and I assure him that these change the numbers for reconciliation so that in the reconciliation process—

Mr. WELLSTONE. Is this in food stamps?

Mr. BOND. The Finance Committee will have to make the changes to come up with the numbers which show the actual reforms made. We, on the Budget Committee, cannot make those reforms. The Finance Committee has to make those reforms. This will give them the same directions that the current Budget Committee report, now on the Senate floor, makes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Is the Senator prepared to say that there would not be reductions in, for example, the food stamps or the Supplemental Security Income Program, or does the Senator believe there will be deductions in order to make the target?

Mr. BOND. We are not saying, Mr. President, exactly what the outlines of this welfare reform proposal will be. The Finance Committee has previously presented welfare reform proposals. We presented and adopted in this body a measure taking \$64 billion out of welfare. It was included in the Balanced Budget Act. I would expect that the beginning point would be that point, and if Members wish to change that measure, they can even reduce that by some \$10 billion and still achieve the savings that are necessary.

Mr. WELLSTONE. If the Senator will yield, the Senator is saying now in the

Chamber—just a couple of other questions—that, in fact, there would not be cuts in the Supplemental Security Income and Food Stamp Programs? Because the Senate has gone on record in voting on the proposition I introduced that we would not take any action which would create more hunger among children.

The Food Stamp Program is a major safety net program. Is the Senator prepared to say that we are not going to be taking any action by this offset that would create more hunger among children?

Mr. BOND. This offset is not designed to create hunger among children. I would point out to my colleague from Minnesota that if he were here earlier, he would have seen the drastic slashes that the President's budget proposes in the feeding program for women, infants, and children. This is a program devoted to providing vitally needed nutrition.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President—

Mr. BOND. Since the Senator from—

Mr. WELLSTONE. I did not ask about WIC.

Mr. BOND. Let me show this chart.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. BOND. This is the President's proposed spending on women, infants, and children. This drops off the cliff. We propose to continue to fund it.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, on the question, could I ask—

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I appreciate the questions, I say to the Senator from Minnesota. I have been asked for my attention by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Could I ask a question? We had a debate for about an hour and a half about this trigger idea. Lo and behold, we found the position of the Democrats is this budget does not have any trigger in it. You know, the trigger was the President's way of getting to a balanced budget when he did not have a balanced budget. So they have suggested they do not have a trigger.

But I say to my very good friend, sitting over in a little category called function 920, allowances, is \$68 billion in budget cuts. So that was the trigger under the President's budget which permitted him to say, "We are not cutting anything. It is those bad Republicans who are cutting everything, including veterans."

Now the cat is out of the bag. Your budget, the President's budget as submitted by the Democrats—which they are going to vote for, I understand, willingly—it says to get to balance we really have to cut a lot of things we have not told anybody about yet. Right?

Mr. BOND. This is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. This is the Oscar for fiction that I described: We do not have

to cut anything except that big bunch of money that is there. You are suggesting that even cuts more than Republicans expected to cut in our budget, and on veterans you have shown what it does. Is that correct?

Mr. BOND. That is correct, the cuts in veterans are absolutely devastating and would result in closing at least one-quarter of all veterans facilities. To me that is totally unacceptable.

Mr. DOMENICI. I want to just make one last observation and a question. The amount of money that you say should be taken out of welfare in the President's budget, Senator WELLSTONE wants to know details. As a matter of fact, is it not true that the bipartisan welfare bill which passed the Senate with 87 votes cuts more in welfare, and had 87 votes, Democrats and Republicans, than the final product even when you take the additional amount out? Is that not correct?

Mr. BOND. That is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Could I ask one more question?

Mr. BOND. If this has been on our time, I need to reserve the time. I will be happy to respond, if there are further discussions, on time on the other side. But I wish to yield the floor. I will be happy to listen to my colleagues.

Mr. EXON. How much time does the Senator need, I say to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. WELLSTONE. How much time is left?

Mr. EXON. How much time do you need?

Mr. WELLSTONE. All the time that is left.

Mr. EXON. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for up to 3 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, I actually came out to talk about the President's budget versus the Republican budget, but I will say to my colleague from Nebraska I will do that later on.

I did want to, in responding to this amendment, just say to my colleague from Missouri, I have not really sorted out the whole amendment, but I did want him and my good friend from New Mexico to know that, as a matter of fact, the Office of Management and Budget came out with a report saying that that welfare reform bill that passed would, in fact, lead to more poverty among well over 1 million children. So, before we start talking about all these cuts, it would be helpful to know exactly where you intend to make the cuts and what impact it is going to have on the most vulnerable citizens in this country. It is true they do not have lobbyists outside. It is true they are not the heavy hitters. It is true that they are not the big players. But I think we ought to be careful. Again, I have to look at the specifics. But I never did hear a response to my

question as to what impact this would have on what has been a major food and nutrition program.

My second point is it is my understanding from talking to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Jesse Brown, that the agreement with the President on the outyears is that each year this will, in fact, be negotiated. The interesting thing is that many of us fought against the last Republican budget which did have the reductions which we thought violated a contract with veterans. As a matter of fact, the President held very strong on that issue.

What I find interesting when I hear my colleague from Missouri talking about veterans is I know what I have been trying to push, which is what I hear from the veterans community, which is health care eligibility reform, which would make a huge difference. So I wonder why it is that all of a sudden we have this amendment out here on the floor when in fact it is not clear exactly who is going to be cut. I cannot get an answer to my question how it is going to affect children in this country.

In addition, what has been left out, from what I heard from my colleague from Missouri, is the very clear understanding between the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, who has been a huge advocate for veterans, and the President, is that of course there will always be negotiation when it comes to the out years because we all know that we take a look at this year by year with a very strong commitment to veterans.

So I take rather serious exception as to whether or not the President has been hanging in there strong for the veterans community versus the Republican budgets that we have had before us.

I say to my good friend from Nebraska, I will not take any more time now. Later on I hope I will have a chance to talk about this budget in overall terms, but I gather we do not have time on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I hope the manager of the bill, the chairman of the committee, could be present because I would like to straighten some things out. We had made an earlier agreement that we would move back and forth.

I thank my friend, the chairman of the committee, for being on the floor.

We made an arrangement. Good-faith arrangements are something this Senator has always lived up to in 18 years in the U.S. Senate. I was to offer the next amendment. I could not do so since the Senator from Iowa was on the floor, got the floor, and was talking as in morning business for 5 minutes. It went on way beyond that.

In the meantime, I have been working diligently with the chairman of the committee to try to work out the increasing number of amendments that

are coming forth. We had discussed this, either off or on the floor. There were private discussions going on in good faith, I thought, with Chairman DOMENICI and myself, as ranking member. I went in to visit, to try to work that out and accommodate everyone. I came back out to find that the Senator from Missouri, probably unknowingly, broke the arrangement. The Senator from Nebraska had been faithfully waiting to offer the next amendment and I thought my prerogative would have been protected, as is customary in this body.

I ask the chairman of the committee whether or not it is true that the Senator from Nebraska was to be next recognized to offer an amendment, under the previous agreement?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I say to the Senator, I am quite certain that somewhere in the record it will reflect we were going to your side after we had finished our last amendment.

I do not think we should cast any aspersions on Senator BOND. He came to the floor. Nothing was going on. He was unaware of this. We had been running him down at committee hearings to try to get him here. Frankly, when he first arrived, I told him to sit down and rest, he had hurried over here with such enthusiasm. He is not the great athlete he was 20 years ago. I should not say that. Obviously, he still is.

But what would the Senator like? He will finish his and you have one? It was not ready a while ago, but your staff told me it is ready. Would you like to offer yours and then what? Vote on yours first?

Mr. EXON. What I was hopeful of is that I would offer my amendment, we would have a vote on that, then go on to your amendments and proceed in the usual fashion. That is what I would like to have done. But it seems to me now you have used up considerable time on the time that you had. Is that right, I ask the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, how much time has the Senator used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has 11 minutes remaining. The Senator from Nebraska has 21 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOMENICI. On the Bond amendment.

Mr. EXON. I simply say what I would like, and I would like to work our way out of this situation—the Senator from Nebraska was expecting to be recognized to offer an amendment, and I would like to have had a vote on that. Then you would go back to your side, and I assume the Senator from Missouri would be next in line?

Somehow we got out of whack. My knowledge of the Senator from Missouri is that he has always been a very fair and articulate person. Maybe he came in here and maybe staff ignored him, maybe staff did not tell him what the proper procedures were and he went ahead. Whatever the situation is, the agreement that we have and entered into has been violated, and I think it is

up to the chairman to say how he wants to straighten it out.

Mr. DOMENICI. I do not want anybody to have this idea that anybody violated anything.

Mr. EXON. That was the result.

Mr. DOMENICI. I propose that we fix it this way: Whatever time is left on this amendment, we complete the amendment. We set it aside, and Senator EXON proceed with his amendment for whatever amount of time you want. When you are finished, we will vote in sequence, voting on your amendment first, but we will do them together so Senators will come down and vote twice, vote on yours first, and then Senator BOND's amendment second.

Mr. EXON. If I understand you correctly, you are suggesting that we finish the debate with the allotted time—

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes.

Mr. EXON. Then allow me to come in and have whatever time I need that can be agreed to, then we will vote on my amendment first and his second, to get back on the right course.

I have no objection to that, and I say to my friend from Minnesota, if he needs additional time, I will be glad to yield. The reason I did not yield unlimited amounts of time before was because I thought it was important that we get straightened out the violation of what I thought was the agreement. Now that we have done that, I yield—

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me get a unanimous-consent agreement on this so nobody will be objecting.

I ask unanimous consent that when the time has expired or yielded back on the Bond amendment, that it be set aside temporarily for the purpose of permitting Senator EXON to offer an amendment; that when the time has expired on the Exon amendment or yielded back, that we will vote on the Exon amendment or in relation thereto first, to be followed by a vote on Senator BOND's amendment, and I also ask at this point that the second vote be a 10-minute vote, since the Senators will be here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. EXON. May I suggest one other extension? Maybe we do not have to have a unanimous-consent agreement on this because we generally go with a gentlemen's agreement. Our side would offer the first amendment after the two votes; is that correct?

Mr. DOMENICI. By agreement, that is the way we are doing it. I do not know we should put it in the consent. I do not intend to violate the agreement.

Mr. BOND. First, I was going to ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. DOMENICI. Let us get the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, just so I understand, so we do not have another disagreement, the agreement that we have gone back to, to recognize the

agreed-to procedure, that the Senator from Nebraska will go next—I will do that—then we will have the vote on my amendment, then we will vote on the amendment from the Senator from Missouri. After we finish the second vote, then it will be a Democratic amendment up at that time?

Mr. DOMENICI. That is correct.

Mr. BOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I think we have kicked this one along and around far enough. I am very happy that we have reached an accommodation where we will finish debate on this and then we will set it aside to go to Senator EXON's amendment.

To set the record straight, I was called out of a hearing that I was chairing because it was envisioned that I would offer an amendment at 3 o'clock. I came to the floor. There was a quorum call, and then the Senator from California was speaking. When she concluded, there was no one else around, and I offered an amendment. I figured that we might get on to the business of the Budget Act.

I apologize for preempting the Senator from Nebraska, but I trust that everyone is happy now, that his vote will be ahead of ours, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. May I ask my friend from Minnesota, we may have some other speakers on this amendment, you sought additional time. We have 21 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. EXON. Can I yield 7 minutes, will that be adequate?

Mr. WELLSTONE. That will be fine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Nebraska.

I want to respond to some of the comments of my colleagues on the other side, from Missouri and New Mexico, about the President's overall budget, what has been presented by my Republican colleagues.

I will say that as I look at the Republican's plan, I really do not quite understand what I think is a real disconnect with the people we represent, because as I look at this plan over a 6-year period of time, I see the same too deep of reductions in both Medicare and medical assistance.

Just to talk about this from a Minnesota perspective, I want to make it very clear that in my State, we are the skinny kids on the block. We have kept our costs down. We do not have the same fat in our system and, therefore, the effects of these cuts would, in fact, do harm to the quality of care for elderly people within our State. I am talking specifically about Medicare.

Some of the changes that the Republicans have made in their plan now put even more of an emphasis on the reimbursement to the providers. But in greater Minnesota, Mr. President, as high as 60 percent of the patient payment mix for some of our rural hospitals is Medicare, already below the cost of delivering care.

So I will say what I have said many times on the floor of the Senate in this debate, the numbers cannot drive the policy. The policy has to drive the numbers. This is a rush to recklessness. It will not work for Minnesota and, therefore, I hope that it will be rejected, and I know that people in Minnesota will reject it.

Mr. President, on the medical assistance, I will just say, again, to my colleagues, you have chosen to target some of the citizens who are the most vulnerable in America. In the State of Minnesota, 60 percent of medical assistance, which is what we call it in Minnesota as opposed to Medicaid, goes to people in nursing homes. I ask my colleagues, why do we want to make cuts there?

We have about 300,000 children in my State who receive medical assistance. It is the best safety net program in our State to make sure that children receive health care. Why do we want to cut there?

Then, Mr. President, I see another disconnect. I say to my colleagues here—I see the Senator from California—it was not more than about 2 months ago I had an amendment on the floor. We received 84 votes for it where we restored the funding that had been cut in title I, school to work, safe and drug-free schools, Head Start, and all the rest. Now I see similar kinds of cuts in education and job training.

The cuts proposed in the Republican budget are too extreme, they are too harsh, they are shortsighted, they go beyond the goodness of Minnesotans, they go beyond the goodness of America, and they should be rejected.

Mr. President, then I look to the higher education. I am going to have an amendment out on the floor. It is an amendment Democrats are going to offer, and we will have a vote on it. I will say to my colleagues, once you go beyond the tax credits that go to children and families, anything else you have left over in your budget should go to tax deductions to pay for higher education.

Mr. President, I do not see tax cuts that flow disproportionately to higher income people. I think we ought to reinvest it in education. If you want to talk about a middle-class issue, talk about making sure higher educational is affordable.

Mr. President, I have said it before, at least in committee—I will say it on the floor of the Senate today—I do not think some of my colleagues with their proposed cuts, again, in higher education, understand the squeeze that students and their families feel.

We have students in Minnesota that sell plasma at the beginning of the semester to buy textbooks. We have students in Minnesota working at two or three minimum-wage jobs—it would help if we raised the minimum wage—while going to school. Therefore, it takes them 6 years. We have students in Minnesota no longer 19 living in the dorms. They are older. They have families. They are trying to afford the education to get back on their feet, to be able to obtain decent employment.

I am going to have an amendment out on the floor that will hold all of us accountable and see who is committed to making sure there is affordable higher education.

Mr. President, I want to mention two other amendments that I am going to introduce, one of them which speaks to the question I raised for my colleague from Missouri, by the way, who I think is a great chair of the Small Business Committee. I think we are good friends. We do not always agree on issues.

But I am going to have this time a recorded vote, because I had an amendment at the beginning of this Congress. I could see it coming, that it was the sense of the Senate that we would not take any action that would create more hunger or homelessness for children. And I lost. People voted against that amendment.

The third time around it was voice voted for approval. I wish I had not done that because I think it was dropped in the conference committee, as I remember. As I look at some of these proposed reductions, I see the same kind of action taken.

So this time I am going to have a recorded vote where we go on record that we will not pass any legislation that could create more hunger or homelessness among children; and if in fact the result of some of these cuts is to do just that, then the next year we will revisit the action that we have taken. It is important that the Senate go on record this time with a recorded vote.

Finally, Mr. President, I want to say to my colleagues, we went through the battle on the COPS Program, community policing, and we made sure that it was not block granted. We made sure that there was a focus on community police. I could brag for the next 24 hours, and I only have probably 2 minutes—I ask unanimous consent that I have 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELLSTONE. About some of the work of the police chiefs and sheriffs in Minnesota and the men and women in law enforcement; very creative work to reduce violence in homes, very creative work with some of the kids, at risk kids, some of the kids that have the most trouble in schools, very creative work in some of the neighborhoods and some of the cities, but a program that has been extremely effective in metropolitan Minnesota and greater Minnesota.

I think I may come out with an amendment that makes sure that we in fact have the funding this next year for that program and make a commitment over the 6-year period.

Finally, Mr. President, let me just say that on the President's budget I do not find everything in there to be perfect. I think there is too much for the Pentagon. I think there is too much by way of tax cuts.

If I had my way—but I could never get my colleagues to vote for this; in fact I could not get quite a few Democrats to vote for it; I hardly got any support among Republicans. I want one more time on the floor of the Senate, with 1 minute left, to shout it from the mountaintop.

Why are you so anxious to cut educational opportunities for children, and job training, and not adequately fund community police, but you are more than willing to give away the wasteful subsidies to the pharmaceutical companies, to the oil companies, to the tobacco companies, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera?

Where is the Minnesota standard of fairness? What we have here, with the Republican proposal, is deficit reduction, a balanced budget, one more time, based on the path of least political resistance. You have your deepest cuts that affect those citizens who have the least amount of political clout. And when it comes to the big players, and the heavy hitters, and all the wasteful subsidies that go to so many of these large corporations, you hardly touch it. You hardly touch it. It is not credible. It is too extreme. And it should be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, would the distinguished Senator from Missouri yield me 2 minutes for a brief statement?

Mr. BOND. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader is recognized.

THE DEATH OF ADMIRAL BOORDA

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I take just a few minutes now to advise the Senate that I have just learned of the tragic death of Adm. Mike Boorda, the Chief of Naval Operations.

Since many of us were close personal friends with Admiral Boorda, and have dealt with him on a very close basis, I will take a moment to offer our prayers and very best thoughts to his family.

Admiral Boorda has been a model for our country. He rose through the enlisted ranks to become the leader of our Navy through hard work and perseverance. He was what is known in the Navy as a Mustang. He went in just as an enlisted sailor. He became the Chief of Naval Operations. Along the way, he was a surface warfare officer, and he commanded the U.S.S. *Farragut*, Destroyer Squadron 22, Cruiser-Destroyer Group 8, and Battle Force Sixth Fleet.

Most of us first saw the bright, intelligent and personable style of Admiral Boorda when he took over as Chief of Naval Personnel in August 1988. In 1991 he received his fourth star and became the commander in chief, U.S. Naval Forces, Europe. As CINCSOUTH, Admiral Boorda was in command of all NATO forces engaged in operations enforcing U.N. sanctions against the warring factions in the former Republic of Yugoslavia. On April 23, 1994, Admiral Boorda became the 25th Chief of Naval Operations.

Over the years, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have known many naval officers, and I have known, since being a Member of Congress, many Chiefs of Naval Operations. I have never known one better than Mike Boorda. The men and women of the Navy loved him.

I know my colleagues join me in remembering Admiral Boorda and expressing our deepest sympathies to his family. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that before the whip leaves that I may just say a word or two and ask a question of him.

We have had a lot of shocking developments around this place, but none has shocked me more than the statement he just made.

Admiral Boorda was a truly outstanding man, a great friend of mine. In fact, the last time that I saw him was just a few weeks ago. And he stopped in my office, without any notice whatsoever, and he said that "I have nothing on my mind at all except to thank you for all the help that you have been over the years to the U.S. Navy." That is the kind of person he was.

Do you have any details at all on this? This had to be a very sudden affair. Do you know what caused his death? Could you explain a little bit?

Mr. LOTT. We do not know all the details, only what is being reported on CNN and through the Naval Congressional Liaison Office. I understand it was an accident of some sort of gunshot wound, that he perhaps went home at lunch, and this bullet wound was inflicted during that lunch period. And he had been discovered in the last couple of hours. I do not know any details other than that.

Mr. EXON. I thank my friend.

Mr. STEVENS. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. EXON. I will be glad to yield to the Senator from Alaska on the same basis.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have come to the floor in a state of shock. Adm. Mike Boorda, a personal friend, traveled with me to my home State this year. I have spent many times with him in my office and in his office.

We will say a lot about him later, but Mike Boorda was the first Chief of Naval Operations to have been a walk-in enlistee. He was an enlisted man who worked his way through the Navy to the highest position in the Navy, as the CNO and Chief of Staff.

I really say to the Senate that this is a great loss. He suffered the loss of his father this year, very dramatic for Mike Boorda. And we talked a lot about that. But I hope that this is something that we can find a way to deal with very quickly because he is going to be sorely missed in this mix of our national defenses.

I think that from what I have heard, what the assistant majority leader just said, that we are in a different circumstance now. This is hard for us to take for certain what we have heard, which I hope is not true. It is a very difficult situation.

Mike Boorda I think was one of the bright stars of our military system today as it stands and is responsible for a lot of the initiatives that would have brought the Navy back to its prominence of days gone by. So I am really sad to be here.

I am pleased you have made the announcement, Senator LOTT. But that it is a most disturbing development is all I can tell the Senate, very disturbing.

Mr. BOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I also had the privilege, just several months ago, to be traveling with Admiral Boorda, and a couple weeks ago visited with him in my office again.

He was truly an outstanding person, had great ability and great dedication to this country, and was more than willing to make any kind of contributions he could. All we can say is that our thoughts and our prayers are with his family and loved ones. And it is with deep, deep sorrow and shock that we receive this news.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, suffice it to say I still have not recovered from the shock. I find myself in one of those positions that maybe we have all found ourselves in sometimes, having some kind of a bad dream but you know it will all turn out right and you will wake up. I am asking myself, am I having a dream? Obviously, I am not. This is a terrible, terrible shock. I simply want to join the others in wishing the best to the family. Our prayers are with all of them during these very, very difficult times.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I add my words of condolences. My memory of Admiral Boorda is coming to a meeting with women Senators with a number of other leaders from the military and being so concerned about making sure that this military moves forward in a way that is fair to women as well as to men. I will always remember that meeting.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I was here when Admiral Boorda was first announced as the Chief of Naval Operations, the first man to come up through the ranks to become the Chief. I worked with him then on a variety of issues, but especially on his mind was the aftermath of Tailhook. As the only woman on the

Armed Services Committee, we had a chance to sit down and talk about what had happened and what could be done to get the Navy going in the right direction.

The Navy is very special to me because it is the service that my husband chose during the Korean war. I love the Navy, and Mike Boorda loved the Navy.

I want to say that I thought he did as much as any human being could do to be in charge of a service during the downsizing time, which everyone knew had to be done. He did it in a way that would plan for the future, to make sure that the strategic part of what the Navy does for our national defense and our security were strong. Yet, he had the compassionate side that worried very much about sexual harassment. He wanted to make sure that he instilled in the men and women that he served as their leader, that, in fact, the value system that was instilled in the men and women of the Navy was the most important part of their service. He did everything a human being could do to instill that value system in them. Every time a problem arose, I would talk to Mike Boorda and he would be showing concern and saying, "What more can we do?"

I think that he was a fine leader. I am stunned, as every one of us is, that we have lost this fine leader. I hope that his memory will be served as the person who was a man of his word, who served his country well, and who had the respect of everyone that met or touched his life. I yield the floor.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

The Senate continued with the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

AMENDMENT NO. 3971

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, how much time is remaining on each side of the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is advised each side has approximately 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. President, I have a heavy heart about this amendment, because I think if we do anything on this floor we should cross party lines and honor the children of this country.

What this amendment will do is hurt the children of this country and hurt them badly. We know that right now one in five children in America lives in poverty. Yet, this amendment would turn these children against the veterans in this country. That is not what we should be doing.

The fact is, we are talking here about assistance to disabled children. We ought to think about what I mean when I say a disabled child. We are talking about a child with cerebral

palsy. We are talking about a child with spina bifida. We are talking about a child with heart problems. We are talking about children who are so vulnerable they cannot even get up in the morning without assistance. And we are going to cut from their sustenance? I do not know how we do that.

The irony about this amendment, it does not increase the caps on discretionary spending. So even if we vote for this, the chances that veterans will get more are not very good.

I think I really have to say there is something that I think my friend from Missouri is missing in his amendment. Maybe he does not realize that half a million veterans are on welfare. Half a million veterans are on welfare. So when he cuts welfare to give to veterans, he forgets that half a million veterans are going to get hurt by this. We know who they are—veterans who just cannot make it back, who were suffering from disabling diseases, be they physical or mental, half a million of whom are on welfare, some form of welfare. So we cut this. We are saying we are cutting it in order to help veterans, yet we are cutting 500,000 of the most vulnerable veterans.

I really believe there are other ways we can help the veterans. I would like to cut corporate loopholes. I would like to cut corporate welfare. That is what I am going to vote to do. We have a lot of corporate loopholes out there that need to be closed, businesses that get favorable tax treatment if they leave the country, people escaping taxation who were very wealthy. We should go after corporate welfare, not go after the disabled children, the disabled veterans. Then, we should spend it on the veterans.

I think we, on the Democratic side, will have an opportunity to honor our veterans by increasing what we spend on them by taking the money out of corporate loopholes, corporate tax loopholes. I think everyone can get behind that. However, we should not hurt the most vulnerable children, the most vulnerable veterans.

I really do believe that my ranking member is going to have an excellent amendment, instead of this one, which turns our veterans against the most severely disabled children and the most severely disabled veterans.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COHEN. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for a few minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADMIRAL BOORDA

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, Senator LOTT a moment ago spoke about the life and death of Adm. Jeremy Mike Boorda. I think all of us were stunned by this revelation.

Yesterday, most of us, Republican and Democrat alike, were shocked, and saddened, in some respects, at the announcement of another man of character and courage who decided to leave

a position he loved most to achieve a higher dream.

Today, just moments ago, we are advised of another man in our public service, one of the best and brightest that the Navy has ever had to offer, took leave of life. The reports at this point have not been confirmed. On one network they have indicated that it was a self-inflicted wound. I hope that is not the case. We are trying at this particular point to verify rumors. No such confirmation has been forthcoming at this point. We do not wish to add to the speculation any further than what is on the television at this moment.

I say a few words about Admiral Boorda from a personal point of view. He was a very close friend of mine. He attended my wedding a few months ago. Our relationship goes back several years, at least, when we were in Munich together, the Wehrkunde conference. It was memorable to me because one night while we were there, Sarajevo had been shelled. There was a great loss of life. Admiral Boorda took charge immediately. He ordered C-141's to get to Sarajevo. He did so over the objection of the U.N. command at that point. Akashi could not be reached. They said, wait until tomorrow; do not send any aircraft down. Mike Boorda said, "I am not waiting for anything. Get those planes in there. Get those wounded people out of there and get them to the hospital."

That was the kind of man of action and passion that I came to know and admire. He, over the last several years, demonstrated that time and time again in terms of his commitment to the Navy.

Yesterday, Senator DOLE talked about life being a hardship. Nothing came easy to Senator DOLE. I might say that for Mike Boorda. Life was a hardship as well. He was not born into wealth. He was not a man of privilege, but he is what we call a common man. He rose through the ranks of common men and women to the highest position in the U.S. Navy. He was admired by everyone who ever came within his presence. He was inspiring to those men and women who now served in our U.S. Navy. All of them will be equally stunned and shocked, as we were, to learn of the news of his death. I can only hope that the reports I have heard to date are not correct.

I pray for the members of his family who are alive today and no doubt in a state of shock and grief. I can only indicate to them that every person who has ever been touched by Jeremy Mike Boorda will remember him for the rest of their lives. I can only express my condolences at this moment and hope to have further comments about the life and times of Mike Boorda at a later time.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

The Senate continued with the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BOND. How much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has 8 minutes, and the Senator from Nebraska has 2 minutes 55 seconds.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

We have heard a lot of straw men set up by opponents on the other side. We have heard about all kinds of horrible cuts that would come if we get a responsible budget number for welfare. This body should know that the \$53 billion cut, which we propose in this amendment to include in reconciliation instructions, is equivalent to the \$53 billion cut that was passed by an 87-vote majority in this body when we debated welfare previously.

Now, there could have been as many as 13 Members of the body that did not like what was in that welfare bill. But I can assure you, with 87 Members of this body voting for welfare reform, the horrible, tragic things that we hear about that could happen if we have to achieve reconciliation savings of \$53 billion in welfare are so much smoke and mirrors. What we are concerned about in the numbers is assuring that veterans health care does not take an impossible hit, a \$12.9 billion reduction. There is no way that one can work out.

My colleague from California, who has argued so eloquently for the veterans and has talked about them, did not propose any changes when she voted for the amendment that would slash Veterans' Administration spending by almost \$13 billion in the Budget Committee. The Senator from Minnesota had said we should not worry about the cuts in veterans. We just cannot adopt a budget number that is consistent with the previous welfare reform that 87 Members of this body, on a bipartisan vote, supported when we first passed welfare reform.

Mr. President, budgets are about setting reasonable expectations for Government so that we can carry out our functions in a responsible manner and not continue to add to the deficit. All of the horror stories, all of the very difficult and compelling cases that were cited are not the ones that would be hit by the budget reconciliation proposal that this amendment contains.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. EXON. How much time is left on each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes for the majority, and 2 minutes 55 seconds on the Democratic side.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I want to associate myself with the comments of the distinguished chairman of the

VA--HUD and Independent Agencies Subcommittee on Appropriations, Senator KIT BOND of Missouri. He does a tremendous job. I have watched him through the years. He is attentive, he does his homework, he is impressive, and he gets quite involved in every way and in every issue in a most positive way.

What has been curious to me, as chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, is the remarkable behavior of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Jesse Brown. He is continually distancing himself and the VA from the President's budget. I understand he testified early last month before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee that he "felt the President's budget would be devastating for veterans."

Later in the month, April 24, the Secretary appeared before the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which I chair, and which I oversee as chairman. In response to a question from my friend, Senator CRAIG of Idaho, the Secretary stated that the VA budget described in a document submitted to the Congress—over the signature of the President and entitled "Budget of the United States of America"—does not represent the policy of the President.

I ask, whose policy does it represent? Did an employee of the Government Printing Office change the numbers for the proposed VA budget on his or her own, making the President of the United States and the Congress the victims of some wild practical joke? Did some cyber surfer hack his way into the White House computer system and change the numbers? Did somebody forge the signature of the President of the United States on a document submitted to the Congress in his name? My Heavens, we may have a real scandal here on our hands.

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs told the committee that VA's future medical budget will be subject to annual renegotiation by the President. He tells us he has received the President's assurances that the budget numbers are not binding. Well, that makes quite a puzzle.

The President of the United States has proclaimed to the American people that he will balance the budget in 7 years. His plan, like any budget, includes difficult decisions allocating limited resources between many worthwhile programs.

But, according to the Secretary's testimony, the President does not stand behind the parts of that plan relating to the Department of Veterans Affairs.

There are only 2 ways the President can deliver on his commitment to Secretary Brown. He can increase the VA spending by abandoning the goal of the balanced budget. But the President has made a commitment to the American people to present a balanced budget. We have heard that discussion for several hours. So I am sure that he would not take that course. Or, in the alternative, the President could increase the VA's budget by reducing the budget of other programs.

Does that mean the President has a secret plan to cut non-VA discretionary spending programs in order to fund increases in veterans' health care? I am sure he does not, Mr. President, because his budget also represents a funding promise made to the beneficiaries of non-VA programs.

Mr. President, the veterans' health care budget proposed by the President—when examined through the lens created by the statements of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs—presents the Senate with a remarkable mystery.

Veterans may wonder upon which rock the Senate should build their future, Mr. President—the budget proposed by the President? Or Secretary Brown's hopes that those budget numbers will be changed? That is what he said.

Mr. President, on April 24, Secretary Brown testified that, since 1980, VA's medical care funding has increased 20 percent—after adjusting for inflation. The resolution reported to the Senate by the Committee on the Budget builds on that rock.

So I submit to America's veterans—and to the Senate—that a generous history of increasing funding, combined with already-identified proposals for more cost-effective operation of the VA Health Care Administration, are much firmer rock upon which to build for the future than the administration's budget—a budget Secretary Brown tells us the President has already repudiated.

That, I think, is a most extraordinary thing.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GREGG). Who yields time? The Senator from Nebraska has 2 minutes 47 seconds.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, when I introduced the President's budget this morning, I indicated that there were several features of the President's budget that I wish to change and would attempt to make changes in. One of those certainly was the fact that the Veterans Affairs allocation under the President's budget was not one that those of us on this side of the aisle were satisfied with. So I thank the Senator from Missouri, who has brought up this matter.

We recall during the deliberations of the Budget Committee that it was something we wished to correct also. We may have some differences of opinion on where the money should come from to do the correction. But I simply say that I think we all agree that a correction has to be made.

This is one of the things I had in mind—without spelling them out—when I said I am for the President's budget, with some changes. This is one of them. I want to say that I am offering an amendment that will precede the vote on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, along the same lines. I am taking the money from a different source. Regardless of where the money comes from, it is something that will probably have 100 votes for to

make a correction in this particular area.

However, after we finish this debate, as agreed to previously, I will offer my amendment and we will vote on that first. It essentially does the same thing as the Senator from Missouri does, but it takes the money to fund it from a different source. We will not need to go into that in any great detail now. We might talk about that when I offer my amendment.

I want to correct one thing before we finish debate on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri. We may be wrong, Mr. President, but I would simply note that we feel—I state this for the RECORD—if corrections are necessary by the offer of the Senator from Missouri, we will certainly cooperate in trying to offer an amendment. We feel that the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri attempts to increase spending for veterans, which is a worthy cause. We agree with that. His amendment raises the functional category for veterans. Unfortunately, the amendment as drawn, in our view, would not increase discretionary spending, which I think the Senator from Missouri wants to do; that is, the discretionary spending limits and the appropriations caps as it affects that.

So, in reality, it is our view that the Senator's amendment would merely cut income security and leave the discretionary spending levels just the same as in the President's budget. I am sure that is not his intent. I am just making that suggestion. Is that something that the Senator has agreed with? Should we correct it? If so, in fairness, we would like to give time to do it. If we are not reading this right, please tell us so. I want to call it to the Senator's attention in the interest of fairness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has 36 seconds.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I guess I had better talk rapidly.

We have raised the caps in the amendment in the copy we have. We would be happy to have staff be sure we are talking about the right numbers. The fact remains that both sides agree that we cannot cut, as the President has proposed, spending on the Veterans' Administration.

I thank the distinguished ranking member of the Budget Committee for his kind comments. We will have more to say about veterans affairs and the credibility of the President's budget on the next vote.

I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be set aside to permit the introduction of an amendment by the ranking member of the Budget Committee and that the amendment so set aside be placed sec-

ond in the order for votes at the end of debate on the amendment by the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the regular order the amendment is set aside, the amendment by Senator BOND is the second in order, and we now turn to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska with 1 hour equally divided.

Mr. EXON. I thank the Chair.

I yield myself what time I may need, and there will probably be others to speak on this.

AMENDMENT NO. 3973 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3965

(Purpose. To cut corporate welfare to fund veterans' benefits)

Mr. EXON. 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 Nebraska [Mr. EXON] proposes an amendment numbered 3973 to amendment No. 3965.

Mr. EXON. 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:

In the pending amendment:

On page 2, line 9, increase the amount by \$7,000,000.

On page 2, line 10, increase the amount by \$246,000,000.

On page 2, line 11, increase the amount by \$1,920,000,000.

On page 2, line 12, increase the amount by \$3,033,000,000.

On page 2, line 13, increase the amount by \$3,124,000,000.

On page 2, line 14, increase the amount by \$2,187,000,000.

On page 2, line 18, increase the amount by \$7,000,000.

On page 2, line 19, increase the amount by \$246,000,000.

On page 2, line 20, increase the amount by \$1,920,000.

On page 3, line 1, increase the amount by \$3,033,000,000.

On page 3, line 2, increase the amount by \$3,124,000,000.

On page 3, line 3, increase the amount by \$2,187,000,000.

On page 33, line 5, increase the amount by \$175,000,000.

On page 33, line 6, increase the amount by \$7,000,000.

On page 33, line 12, increase the amount by \$907,000,000.

On page 33, line 13, increase the amount by \$246,000,000.

On page 33, line 19, increase the amount by \$2,256,000,000.

On page 33, line 20, increase the amount by \$1,920,000,000.

On page 34, line 1, increase the amount by \$3,621,000,000.

On page 34, line 2, increase the amount by \$3,033,000,000.

On page 34, line 8, increase the amount by \$1,708,000,000.

On page 34, line 9, increase the amount by \$1,552,000,000.

On page 40, line 23, increase the amount by \$1,594,000,000.

On page 40, line 24, increase the amount by \$1,572,000,000.

On page 41, line 5, increase the amount by \$2,355,000,000.

On page 41, line 6, increase the amount by \$2,187,000,000.

On page 47, line 10, increase the amount by \$175,000,000.

On page 47, line 11, increase the amount by \$7,000,000.

On page 47, line 13, increase the amount by \$907,000,000.

On page 47, line 14, increase the amount by \$246,000,000.

On page 47, line 16, increase the amount by \$2,256,000,000.

On page 47, line 17, increase the amount by \$1,920,000,000.

On page 47, line 19, increase the amount by \$3,621,000,000.

On page 47, line 20, increase the amount by \$3,033,000,000.

On page 47, line 22, increase the amount by \$3,302,000,000.

On page 47, line 23, increase the amount by \$3,124,000,000.

On page 48, line 2, increase the amount by \$2,355,000,000.

On page 48, line 3, increase the amount by \$2,187,000,000.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, before I start my formal remarks, let me straighten out any misunderstanding.

Were we not furnished a copy of the amendment. Is that what I understand? I am just trying to make sure that we know where we are coming from.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, we will be happy to show the distinguished chairman. I am sure it is there.

Mr. BOND. If it is there, that is all I need to know. We were concerned it might not be.

You made a change. You made a change in the copy of the amendment after it was given to us. Is that the mixup? The best guess is that we were not furnished the final copy of the amendment. It is no big deal. The fact is it is in there. That is what I wanted.

Can you give us a copy of yours?

Mr. EXON. Yes. We will give a copy of the amendment to the majority. It does the same thing.

Mr. President, this amendment addresses the veterans proposition also. This amendment does much of the same as that intended to be done by the Senator from Missouri. It adds back to veterans the source of funds in the same amount. However, the Senator from Missouri cuts welfare to make up the difference. My proposal would cut corporate welfare. It is this Senator's belief that the majority turns too quickly to reducing projected spending on means-tested programs that go to the heart of the needs of the most needy in our society. Some of that was brought up during debate on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

Some may believe that we are all too eager to cut the neediest programs that we have—those so-called means-tested programs.

I am simply saying, while I consider it a must to better fund the veterans programs almost exactly as the Senator from Missouri has suggested, let us cut corporate welfare to pay for this and keep our reduction in the unnecessary spending under control.

We have had a good debate, I think, on veterans affairs. We do not need to extend the debate for any lengthy pe-

riod of time because I think we would just be repeating ourselves over and over again. What we come down to, therefore, is that the amendment before the body is the amendment which we will vote on prior to voting on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

At this time, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment presently pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. EXON. I simply say, Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time and recognize any of my colleagues who wish to speak in behalf of the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

With that, I reserve the remainder of our time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I would like to be able to enter into a debate on this. But I am still waiting to see what it is the amendment does. I know it deals with veterans. But I am a bit at a loss to know how we should debate it when we do not have the amendment before us. I have been in some difficult situations, but this is probably one of the toughest ones.

Mr. EXON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BOND. I am happy to.

Mr. EXON. We have the only copy we had of this at the desk. We are making a copy for you. I think the Senator from Missouri is probably justified in wanting to see the amendment. The amendment does exactly what I said it would do; that is, to have the same figures that you have proposed but rather than take the money to make up the difference out of welfare as we know it, we take it out of corporate welfare. But, once again, in the interest of fairness, I suggest that we temporarily stand in recess until a copy can be made and delivered to the majority and give them whatever reasonable time they want.

Mr. BOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I suggest we do not need to go into recess. I would make my friend an offer. If he will just tell us what he means by cutting corporate welfare, maybe we can carry out the debate, because I would trust his characterization. I would ask the Senator from Nebraska, does he mean he is raising taxes? Could he be a little more specific about the things we are doing?

Mr. EXON. The Senator, certainly as a member of the Budget Committee, knows full well what I am talking about with regard to corporate welfare. These are moves that we have made over the years that have been prominently under discussion for the last year with regard to the budget negotiations between the Congress and the White House.

If the Senator will refer to the material that I think he now has, page 3 of this year's Republican budget resolution states that in addition to the child tax credit, and I quote, "The committee recommendation would accommodate further tax reform or tax reductions to be offset by the extension of expired tax provisions of corporate and business tax reform."

It continues, "Such receipts could be used to offset other tax reform proposals such as estate tax reform, economic growth, fuel excise taxes or other policies on a deficit-neutral basis."

To outline this further, last year's vetoed reconciliation bill, supported by virtually every Senate Republican, included approximately \$26 billion in revenue increases for corporate and other reforms.

That is what I am talking about. President Clinton has proposed nearly \$40 billion in corporate reforms in his balanced budget submission to the Congress. Although the proposals are not identical, Republicans and Democrats agree that revenue can be raised from this category which is customarily referred to, as I think the Senator from Missouri knows, as corporate welfare.

The committee report to this budget, on page 63-67, describes expenditures in our Tax Code that lose hundreds of billions of revenue over a 5-year period. In that context, the Republican proposal as well as those of President Clinton are modest efforts to reduce loopholes that have allowed corporations to benefit.

That is what corporate welfare is all about. It eliminates corporate welfare to the extent that it is necessary to adequately fund the veterans programs at essentially the same figures that both you and I would like to see. Another way of saying this: What it does is make our tax laws fair for all Americans.

I am not surprised that the first words out of the mouth of the Senator from Missouri were, "Are you going to raise taxes?" If cutting corporate welfare, which I think the corporations are not entitled to during a time when we are strapped for money, if that is raising taxes, call it raising taxes. I think closing unfair corporate loopholes to take care of the needs of our veterans is far better than taking it away from what I referred to earlier, from the general welfare fund that goes essentially to the neediest among us.

I would simply say that these are modest efforts, modest loophole closings. Our amendment ensures that additional receipts from closing corporate loopholes will be used to lessen the cuts on the veterans rather than apply it to help pay for additional tax breaks for the wealthy, which I basically feel is in the mind of the Republican budgetmakers some time down the line.

In any event, whether that is true or not, all that the Exon amendment does is to return to the welfare funds the amount that the Senator from Missouri and others are proposing. And we

think that is good. We are simply saying that rather than to subtract this from welfare, the neediest among us, let us take the necessary funds from corporate welfare that we all know has drawn far beyond due bounds in recent years.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. I yield myself such time as I may require.

We obviously are getting some basic philosophical differences here. My distinguished friend from Nebraska has accused us of reflexively turning to means-tested entitlements.

What we have done, Mr. President, in fact, is to turn to failed programs and say it is time to reform them. The President himself has said it is time to end welfare as we know it. That is why 87 Members of this body, Democrats and Republicans, said we need to reform welfare. The system is not serving the people it is supposed to serve—the taxpayers who fund it, the communities that see its impact, or the future generations who hope that we could help people get out of welfare and into productive employment. What we are saying is it is time to reform these programs. We are going to keep saying that because I think the overwhelming body of American citizens knows that welfare needs to be reformed.

By the same token, my friends on the other side of the aisle reflexively turn to tax increases. If it moves, tax it. We are talking about an amendment to the budget presented on behalf of the President by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

Let me point out that that bill already has \$36 billion in new taxes in extenders. It raises \$36 billion in extending taxes. It has \$54 billion in other loophole closings. They have already got \$90 billion of tax increases. And the distinguished ranking member of the Budget Committee says, let us just hit them with another \$13 billion of taxes.

Now, Mr. President, I thought that maybe our friends would have learned something when President Clinton proposed and they voted for the significant tax increases of 1993. I have cited before on this floor the studies have shown that raising taxes in the way that was done in 1993 did not generate the kinds of revenue expected because it discouraged economic activity. It has slowed economic activity, economic growth and jobs in this country, and we have no less of an authority than the President himself, who said at a reception attended by people, I guess, whose taxes he had raised markedly in Texas, that he raised taxes too much.

We agreed with him at the time. Unfortunately, he just did not see it our way until later on. Now we want to take a \$90 billion gross tax increase here and add another \$13 billion to it. Certainly, our budget provides for

changes in the mix of taxation if we need it. That can be done right now.

The chairman of the Finance Committee will offer a bill that may raise some taxes and lower others and shift the mix of taxes. But when we talk about the total burden of taxation, that is one of the problems which is causing our country to slow down, jobs not to be created, and as we get into a debate on the President's budget the one argument I have not heard made about it is that it does not raise enough taxes. But that is really what the amendment by the Senator from Nebraska would do. Are we really in trouble because we do not tax enough? I don't think so, Mr. President.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment and vote for the amendment which will follow it.

I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 22 minutes and 30 seconds.

Mr. EXON. It may well be we can shorten down the time. We have been trying to move this ahead, move forward.

I did not realize we would be getting into a rehash of what we did 2 years ago with the President's budget. Once again, the Senator from Missouri is certainly entitled to his position. He indicates that the budget that we passed 2 years ago, the President's budget, has hurt jobs creation, has been devastating to the country. Evidently, from what he said, it has hurt employment.

The facts of the matter are that those same things were said in one form or another by those on that side of the aisle during the debate, and we passed that proposition with all Democrats supporting that to get it by, without a single Republican vote in either the House of Representatives or the U.S. Senate. The facts of the matter are, as we explained yesterday, that primarily because of that, coupled with the excellent leadership of President Bill Clinton, this Nation has been on a steady, logical growth pattern in all areas.

I remember hearing people on that side of the aisle who attacked that budget at the time saying it would be devastating to the economy of the United States of America, that we would never recover if we passed this. We have more than recovered, we have had one of the most astonishing periods of growth in American economy since that was passed that we have ever seen.

At the same time, coupled with that tax increase package and coupled with the economic growth that we have had under the direction of the Clinton administration, we have seen a dramatic drop, 3 years in a row, of the deficit of the United States of America, from basically \$300 billion a year, now down to \$147 billion.

I did not know we were going to get into a debate all over again on that measure that I voted for, and would vote for again, because I thought it was the right thing to do. In addition to being the right thing to do, we would not be in a position here in the Congress this year, nor would we have been in a position last year, to work toward a balanced budget, were it not for the fact that the Democrats, under the leadership of Bill Clinton, reduced dramatically the deficit which has spurred growth in the United States of America.

So if anyone wishes to take me on for what I did wrong 2 years ago, I am willing to do that because the facts of growth in the economy speak for themselves. I do not generally say how the stock market goes is how America goes, but certainly that is one factor in our economy that we need to look at. I suggest to all that since the development of that sound package by all Democratic votes and not one Republican vote in the House or the Senate, we have seen the stock market break every record that it ever established before.

The people are happy with it. It has reduced the deficit. It has gotten us to the place where we have a chance—although it is still a tough task—to balance the budget by the year 2002. Were it not for that particular measure that is now being criticized—in my opinion irresponsibly once again—we would not be in the shape we are in today of reaching for a goal of balancing the budget by the year 2002, which is something this Senator and many like me have fought for ever since I have been here.

I yield 5 minutes, or whatever time he needs, to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Senator from Nebraska. This is one of those debates, as I listen to it, that I think causes people who are watching from outside the beltway to just shake their heads, because they have to wonder what is this all about? I must say, unless you are a green eyeshade type and spend all of your time poring over the subaccounts of the Federal Government, it is a little confusing.

I think one of the things that perhaps has been lost in this discussion is that if we are looking at a comparison between the various budgets on domestic discretionary spending—and that is, after all, the pool of money from which veterans benefits are drawn and all of the other discretionary spending elements of the Federal budget—the reality is, the Republican budget over 6 years cuts \$296 billion, the President's budget, \$229 billion, so the cuts in discretionary spending in the Republican budget are substantially greater than the cuts in the President's budget.

The issue has been raised, what are the subtotals? When you distribute those reductions, when you distribute them among all the functions in domestic discretionary spending, how do

veterans come out? I think one of the things that has been lost in this debate is that these functional totals are not binding. They are not binding. That is the way the budget process works. There is no requirement that the committees of jurisdiction abide by that functional subtotal.

I ask my colleague from Nebraska, is that not the case? As the ranking member on the Senate Budget Committee, is it not the case that these functional subtotals are not binding?

Mr. EXON. I would certainly emphasize that the Senator from North Dakota is so right. I am so glad he has pointed that out.

Mr. CONRAD. So, we get lost here in the details, but the overarching truth is the Republican budget, over 6 years, cuts \$296 billion out of domestic discretionary spending. The pool of money for domestic discretionary spending is reduced by \$296 billion. The President's budget reduces it by \$229 billion over 6 years. I point out the centrist budget, which a bipartisan group of Senators, Republicans and Democrats, have agreed to, is \$179 billion over 6 years.

Frankly, I would say both the Republican budget and the President's budget have unrealistic reductions in domestic discretionary spending. They are unlikely to ever occur. One of the reasons is, in both of those budgets, that the overall pool of money available for domestic discretionary spending is so sharply reduced that future Congresses are unlikely to adhere to the spending path outlined in either one of those budgets.

The fact is, the bipartisan group, which has tried to put together a budget alternative that would really have some prospects of actually holding course, holding to the course set for a 7-year period, has lower domestic discretionary savings than either of the other budgets. It is also true the President has less in the way of domestic discretionary savings than the Republican budget has. So if people are really concerned about veterans or any other subcategory of the budget, and they are comparing the President's budget and the Republican budget, the President's budget is more adequate, has less reductions over a 6-year period, or a 7-year period, than does the Republican budget.

So if you are concerned about veterans or if you are concerned about education or you are concerned about all of the other elements that are part of domestic discretionary spending, the President's budget is superior to the Republican budget.

The fact is, these functional subtotals that are the concern of the amendment of the Senator from Missouri are not binding. Those are the rules we work on around here. Those totals are not binding.

Somehow I think we are missing the point. We have bogged down in the details in an attempt to score partisan political points. Unfortunately, that is what is happening around here more

and more. We have not gotten into what is the heart of the debate and the discussion, what is the heart of the matter. The heart of the matter is, all of us need to move toward a balanced budget. We need to do that because we are on a course that cannot be sustained.

The Entitlements Commission told us last year if we stay on the current course, we are going to have an 82 percent tax rate in this country, or a one-third cut in all benefits. That is the harsh reality of what we confront. And all of these budgets—all of them—are reducing domestic discretionary spending, they are reducing every other element of the Federal budget from what current law provides in an attempt to move towards fiscal responsibility.

Mr. President, I will just say in conclusion, I hope my colleagues will remember, the reality is, the President's budget has less reductions in domestic discretionary spending than does the Republican budget. That is just a fact. And the second fact that is important to remember is these functional subtotals that are the subject of debate here are not binding in any event. I thank my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I call on my distinguished friend, how many minutes?

Mr. THOMAS. Five minutes.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute first and just say, I thank the Senator from North Dakota. He has been a great champion for reforming entitlements. He and I agree entitlements need to be reformed.

My amendment proposes reforms in the entitlement programs. The amendment of my friend from Nebraska, Senator EXON, adds another \$13 billion in tax increases. And in looking at the extensive list on page 153 and 154 of tax increases that are already included in the President's recommendation, I am puzzled where they find another \$13 billion. But that is the argument: Do we reform entitlements or raise taxes?

I now yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, this is the first time that I have spoken on the budget. I am not on the Budget Committee, I am not an appropriator, but I, obviously, am very interested in this process, perhaps more interested in it as it pertains to the policy direction it would take than specifically in the dollars.

The budget is a document that has more impact than simply spending. The budget document is one that gives us some direction in terms of where we go. It gives us some direction in terms of philosophy. Do you want more Government or would you have less?

I have to tell you that I believe the people in Wyoming think the Federal Government ought to be less expensive, ought to be smaller, we ought to spend

less. It has to do with balancing the budget, and it is interesting to listen to those who have worked so hard through the years: "Balance the budget."

Have you ever heard anyone rise who did not want to balance the budget? I do not think so. It has not been balanced for 25 years. I begin to wonder if all this rhetoric has been so meaningful. But in any event, we need to balance the budget. It is morally and fiscally responsible to do that.

It is a philosophical question if you want to balance the budget. We hear a lot of talk about how we moved the deficit down. How did we do that? By the largest tax increase in the history of this country. I do not happen to think that is the proper way to do that. I think we ought to reduce spending.

Of course, whenever you talk about reducing spending, somebody says, "No, I don't want to reduce it there, I want to reduce it there. I want to reduce it for you, not for me." I understand that. When the average family spends 40 percent of their income in total taxes, that is an excessive amount. So we need to talk about that, and we need to take a look at our goals and see if this really, really does it.

I agree with the Senator from North Dakota that maybe we get bogged down entirely with all these details, which somebody has to do. But for most of us, it is a direction, a philosophy, it is where we are going, and the budget has something to do with that, a great deal to do with that.

I was very involved in our budget in the Wyoming Legislature. It was much smaller, much easier, same principle. One of the differences was we had a constitutional amendment that said we had to balance the budget. We could not spend more than we took in. What an idea.

So we talk about that Washington has never spent more on bureaucracy than it does now—this administration—never spent less in real dollars on defense since World War II. The tax burden has never been higher than it is now. Americans will pay half a trillion dollars more in taxes because of our tax increase.

I am concerned as well about the backloading. Now I hear, "Well, we all backload." That is true. But the fact is that the Clinton budget backloads much more than the other one, 66 percent of the savings in the last 2 years.

Mr. CONRAD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS. No, this is the first time I have talked. I would like a chance to do that. Thank you.

So it is backloaded, and no one can argue with that. It is there and perhaps none of it should be backloaded. Of course, it will be when you reduce so much this year, it builds up, and I understand that. But we have to make some tough decisions if we are going to do that, and that is what it is about.

Raising taxes—as I understand, the Clinton budget takes out \$97 billion in taxes, puts back 60, a net reduction of

\$37 billion. That is really not much of a bite; not much of a bite for a country that pays that much in taxes.

The Republican budget, on the other hand, is about 122, I believe; \$500 credit for children. That is a pretty good idea, I think. Permanent; age 18. We do not start with three.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. I appreciate that, Mr. President. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CONRAD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. EXON. How much time does the Senator wish?

Mr. CONRAD. One minute.

Mr. EXON. I yield 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I would just like to say to my colleague from Wyoming, I am disturbed by backloading, too, but the reality is the Republican plan has 64 percent of its savings in the last 2 years. So this is a case of the pot calling the kettle black. Both of them have 82 percent of their savings in the last 3 years. They are both backloaded.

So to come and criticize the President's plan when your own plan does exactly the same thing is a little misleading.

Let me just say—

Mr. THOMAS. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CONRAD. I think if we were going to be direct with each other, we would acknowledge both plans are backloaded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired. Who yields time?

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has 16 minutes, and the Senator from Nebraska has 10 minutes.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, let me thank my friend from North Dakota for his excellent remarks. His statement with regard to the savings that are talked about in discretionary programs is something that I intend to follow up on in my closing remarks.

I will just say at this time that I have been here on the floor since this debate began. I have heard the same things over and over and over again—the Republicans seem to think if they say something enough times, it is true. They have said on many occasions that the President's budget does not balance in the year 2002. I do not know how many times I have refuted that point, and noted that the Republican-appointed head of the Congressional Budget Office says that the President's budget does balance in the year 2002.

The same CBO office says that the Republican plan balances in the year 2002. So if the Republicans are trying

to impeach the written word of their own appointed CBO office, then they impeach the source of their balanced budget as well.

Why can we not be realistic? Both programs are estimated—and I use the word "estimated" with emphasis—by the Congressional Budget Office as reaching balance.

I have heard another myth that is repeated over and over and over again and that is with regard to the terrible backloading, as alleged by the Senator from Wyoming.

I refer to the chart behind me once again. We have had it out here before. I am going to drag this chart out every time I hear on that side of the aisle that there is backloading going on.

This chart has been here before, but the red line on that chart is the President's backloading and the blue line on that chart is the GOP backloading. The years are below, and the numbers are up there.

So suffice it to say, it is not accurate, nor is it fair, nor does it contribute to the debate for me to get up and say, "Oh, boy, there's all kinds of backloading in that GOP budget."

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EXON. I will not yield.

I would be fearful that the Republicans would bring out something like this and show me that what they are accusing the Democrats of doing is what the Republicans are doing. Essentially they are one and the same.

I simply say that I will reserve the remainder of my time for my closing statement. But I just wish that we could keep our debates on something that is realistic, without going overboard and saying things over and over again, things that I do not know how many times I refuted. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, before yielding to the Senator from Washington, I just want a point of clarification with my distinguished friend from Nebraska.

Does that chart show the President's numbers with or without the automatic trigger?

Mr. EXON. The automatic trigger, we went through that earlier, did we not?

Mr. BOND. That chart, does it show it with or without the automatic trigger?

Mr. EXON. Once again I say, whether it triggers or not, this is an honest chart on honest numbers that has been verified by the CBO.

Are you indicating there is something tricky about these numbers?

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, the CBO said the only way the President's numbers get to a balance in 2002 is if an automatic trigger clicks in and cuts 10 percent of discretionary spending in 2001 and 18 percent in 2002. I am simply asking whether that chart—and I did not prepare the chart—does that chart present the President's number assuming no trigger or assuming a trigger? Which way is it?

Mr. EXON. I have been advised this is the chart with the figures in it. If I find out differently, I will correct it for the RECORD.

Mr. BOND. I thank my good friend from Nebraska. That is all I wanted to ask, because we have, as he indicated, I think on a bipartisan basis, voted overwhelmingly that we do not want the trigger. We have said, no trigger. We do not want a meat ax.

So the only difference between the President's budget and the Republicans' budget is that the President's budget, by CBO numbers, does not now get to balance—without the trigger, it does not get to balance. Ours does. With that, I will yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, in my few minutes, I will make three points. The first point is to agree with my colleague, the Senator from Nebraska, by the analysis of the Congressional Budget Office, the President's budget does indeed balance in the year 2002. It does, according to the Congressional Budget Office, because of an automatic set of tax increases and spending cuts in the years 2001 and 2002, if the Congressional Budget Office's projections of spending and of the economy are correct.

In fact, Mr. President, the President's budget would balance if the Congressional Budget Office showed half a trillion dollars' difference between now and the year 2000 with automatic huge tax increases and spending cuts in the years thereafter.

If you put in such a trigger, the balance is automatic. The real point is that in the real world, using the same set of figures, it will not reach balance unless that trigger is pulled. We have just voted against the trigger.

The second point I would like to make is with respect to the debate right now on two amendments in front of us. Those two amendments each say that we should not reduce veterans benefits in the way that the President's budget indicates they will be reduced, a little increase in the first couple of years, then a huge reduction thereafter.

The difference is the classical difference between the parties. Republicans restore those veterans benefits by welfare reform. Democrats restore them by tax hikes, tax hikes sufficient so that the President's very modest tax reductions in his budget become a net tax increase over the period of time covered by this budget.

That is a classical difference. People can decide, would they rather support our veterans with welfare reform or would they rather support them with tax hikes? I think that is a relatively simple question.

But, Mr. President, my third point is that I am not sure of the total relevance either of the debate on triggers that the Senator from Nebraska has

spoken of, or even of the two amendments with which we are going to engage now. It is at this point I want to compliment and support the remarks of my Democratic colleague from North Dakota, Senator CONRAD, who points out that there is a superior way of going toward either of the proposals that are on the floor here right now, one which I believe we will debate early next week, the first proposal in several years that is in fact bipartisan in nature, the one that most decisively deals with a reform of entitlement programs, that makes them more realistically affordable by the people of the United States and, therefore, is more reasonable with respect to the amount of money that we have to spend on education and the environment and law enforcement and national parks and the myriad of other year-to-year responsibilities of this body.

So in that respect the Senator from North Dakota is right. I have the privilege to work with him. We will later on in this debate be presenting that budget.

I believe the Republican budget much superior and much more honest to the one that is before us right now, and I intend ultimately to vote for it if that is the last vote before us. But I believe the one worked out by this bipartisan group to be markedly superior to any of the others that have been presented this year.

Mr. ABRAHAM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOND). The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Let me yield myself up to 5 minutes to also speak on the amendment.

Mr. President, as I look at this amendment that is before the Senate offered by the Senator from Nebraska in response to the previous amendment from the Senator from Missouri, once again I am struck by the approach that is being taken with regard to the President's budget. I talked several times about the President's budget during the course of this debate and tried to point out the extent to which the claims the budget includes relief for America's taxpayers are exaggerated.

Once again we see the approach being taken to make sure taxpayers end up with less. The President's budget claims initially it will provide Americans with \$99 billion in tax relief. When you include the various so-called corporate loopholes and other increased revenues involved with the President's budget, the net tax relief drops to \$36 billion. Then, when you terminate the various tax cuts as triggered in the year 2000, it reduces total tax relief between the year 1996 and the year 2002 to \$6 billion approximately.

Mr. President, \$6 billion works out to about \$1 billion a year, or 250 million Americans working out to \$4 per American per year in the budget that the President is offering. That is not a lot of tax relief by my standards. I think it would not be seen that way by the American people.

Here comes yet another wrinkle. An amendment that would further change the bottom line on taxes with regard to this budget. Indeed, by increasing the revenue side of this equation by an additional \$13 billion, we now eliminate all of the tax relief contained in the President's budget and instead have turned the President's budget, should this amendment pass, into one which would have a net tax increase of \$7 billion. I cannot imagine that is the approach the American people want us to take, to actually increase, on a net basis, the taxes we burden them with.

Some will argue that these taxes would somehow fall on the corporations, the big companies, and so on. I question that, Mr. President. It seems to me the big taxpaying entities have discovered a lot of ways to pass along the taxes to the average working families in America. Indeed, during the recent debate about the gas tax repeal, we were told that the 4 cent repeal would never get to the consumers because the intermediate-stage corporations would somehow find a way to pocket the dollars for themselves. If that is true for the gas tax, it will certainly be true for this tax. If this increase is put into our budget, we will again see the actual people paying for it, the hard-working families of our country.

I have to stand in support of what the Senator from Washington just said, complimenting the Senator from Missouri for his amendment and urging its support and urging our colleagues to oppose an increase in taxes as would be contained in the amendment being offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Senator from Nebraska. I simply say to my colleague on the other side with respect to the Senator's amendment, you can close a tax loophole and not raise taxes on any Americans. As a member of the Finance Committee, I have been trying for some time to deal with the question of the fact that 73 percent of the foreign corporations doing business in the United States do not pay a penny of taxes here.

The question is, how can that be? How do they avoid paying taxes in the United States when they are obviously doing very well here?

Mr. President, the reason is, we have a scheme called transfer pricing in the international tax system that allows corporations to put their taxes or their profits where there are no taxes. Foreign corporations who are in here competing with American corporations have been taking advantage of this loophole in a very significant way to avoid paying any taxes here. That is not only unfair to U.S. taxpayers, that is unfair to U.S. companies who are expected to compete with the foreign en-

terprise that escapes and avoids tax responsibility, that an American-based corporation cannot escape and avoid.

I say that my colleague from Nebraska has come up with a very reasonable way to take care of the needs of our veterans by closing a tax loophole. Now, some of our friends on the other side have never seen a tax loophole they do not like. They have never seen a tax loophole they do not endorse.

There is absolutely no reason to allow foreign corporations to do business in this country and not pay any taxes here. It is not fair, not only to U.S. taxpayers, it is not fair to American corporations with whom they compete.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, might I inquire how much time we have and how much time Senator EXON has?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority has 6 minutes remaining, and the Senator from Nebraska has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, without using that time, might I exchange with Senator EXON about where we are going next. If we use our 6 minutes and you use your 4 minutes, are we ready to vote in the sequence that we heretofore agreed to?

Mr. EXON. We are ready. That sequence, just to set the record straight, we would vote on the Exon amendment first and the amendment from the Senator from Missouri second. And I believe, if I remember correctly, the first vote would be a 15-minute vote, and the second vote, I believe it was stipulated by the Senator from New Mexico, is to be 10 minutes. Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes, Mr. President, first, I want to congratulate Senator BOND on his amendment and Senator EXON on his amendment, because we are going to have an opportunity here, in about 12 minutes, to vote on 2 proposals.

There could be nothing closer to reflecting the difference between the 2 parties than these two amendments. So, make no bones about it, we will first vote on a Democrat amendment, which will increase taxes, no matter what you call it. You increase taxes to pay for appropriated accounts that are cut, which they are finally admitting in cutting this budget—that is, the veterans of this country. So the first vote is going to be: Do you want to raise taxes to spend more money? The second vote is going to be a Republican vote, and it will be very simple: Do you want to increase spending for veterans by cutting spending someplace else?

We say, yes. We say, the American people are not interested in raising taxes. We already raised taxes 2 years ago, which was the largest tax increase in history. The President has, in his budget, \$90 billion, under the rubric of "corporate welfare"—but it is \$90 billion. Senator EXON says that \$90 billion is not enough to do what we want to do. We want \$13 billion more because

we caught them with the reality that they are reducing the level of expenditures for the veterans of this country by at least \$13 billion, decimating our commitment to the veterans.

As our President is prone to say, we do not want to violate our values. Our values are very simple: Protect the veterans of America. Live up to your commitment. We do not want to violate that value. But I will suggest that the reality of it now is that the President violates that value. But he almost got away with it, with nobody understanding it—except for this amendment today, which clearly now says it, and even the Democrats understand. They understand veterans is cut enough that they want to raise taxes to pay for it.

Now, they were not saying they were cutting veterans just 4 or 5 days ago because, obviously, they just wanted to say Republicans were cutting programs to get to balance. There is a nice little gimmick. The President called it a "trigger." The problem is that the trigger would not work on the floor, because if you have to use CBO economics, and not the President's choice of economics, then you have to pull the trigger, and they did that and they put a giant plug in their budget. That plug, so everybody will know, is a big whopping plug. It is \$32 billion in tax cuts that have to be sunsetted. So we raise taxes \$32 billion after having cut them. That is the first thing in the plug. We add Medicare cuts of \$13 billion, and the President adds spectrum fees of \$6 billion. This is kind of the cornucopia of solving budget problems. Spectrum fee. Mr. President, \$38 billion is in the budget. This says \$6.6 billion more to get to the balance of the President and the balance the distinguished minority manager put before the Senate.

And then is the big ticket item: discretionary cuts of \$67 billion are in this new plug. Pull the trigger and expose the reality and there sits a plug, without which you cannot balance the budget. And \$67 billion of that is in the discretionary programs, such as veterans. And we are trying to fix veterans with this amendment. We do it very simply, very simply. We say, we think veterans ought to get this \$13 billion because we have a high value on our relationship to veterans. We think the welfare program of the country could be reduced by \$13 billion to pay for it. Reduce welfare and turn it into workfare. And even at that, we have not reduced welfare to the extent that the bipartisan welfare reform that cleared this place would have.

So, in summary, we have now exposed the reality of the President's budget. We have exposed the reality of it. He did not want anybody to know that, to really get to balance, we needed \$124 billion, and we now have that before the Senate—a piece of it before us. Do you want to increase taxes to take care of our veterans? Or do you want to reduce welfare to take care of our veterans?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. EXON. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, Will Rogers once said, "It's not what he knows that bothers me; it's what he says he knows for sure that just ain't so."

Two points: No. 1, the President's budget proposes more in discretionary spending than the Republican budget. There is no debate about that, and there is no amount of bluster on this floor that can change that.

No. 2, this is not about tax increases. The fact is, if this is a song with unlimited verses—tax increases, I guess—we spend \$2.2 billion to pay companies to shut their American plants and move them overseas. How about shutting that down and using the money in a constructive way? Two men from Florida did a study that says we lose \$40 billion a year by foreign corporations doing business in America that do not pay taxes here, and 73 percent of the foreign corporations doing business in America pay zero taxes.

To close tax loopholes is somehow increasing taxes? No. We are talking about big, fat, juicy tax breaks for some of the biggest enterprises in the world, and we are talking about closing them. Is there anything wrong with that? I do not think so.

Mr. MCCAIN. Will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for 1 minute to acknowledge the departure of a truly great American.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this time not be charged to either side, as we have been doing all afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

THE PASSING OF ADM. MIKE BOORDA

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I cannot begin to express how terribly saddened I am by the news of Adm. Mike Boorda's death this afternoon. My heart goes out to his wife, Bettie, and his children, Anna, Eddie, Bobby, and David. I pray that God's love, and the memory of a wonderful husband and father will comfort them in this moment of profound grief.

Mike Boorda was my friend of more than 20 years. He was an exceptional American, the first enlisted man to head the world's greatest Navy. He dedicated his entire adult life to the security of our country. He was a great sailor who loved the Navy beyond measure. He honored the uniform he was so proud to wear and the country he served so well. Most of all, I am grateful for the honor he did me by blessing me with his friendship. We all shall miss him very much.

May God grant him the eternal peace he deserves.

I yield the floor.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

The Senate continued with the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I think we should alert all—and I believe the managers of the bill would agree—that we, most likely, will start voting in about 5 minutes, is that right?

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes. Would the Senator mind if the first vote is 15 minutes, to be immediately followed by a 10-minute vote?

Mr. EXON. No. Let the RECORD show as the Senator from New Mexico indicated. We are going to start voting in about 5 minutes. The first vote will be a 15-minute vote, immediately following, without any intervention, by a vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri, and that will be a 10-minute vote.

Mr. President, let me wind up briefly within the time I have left. I just find it a little bit odd that the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Missouri continue to complain that the discretionary numbers in the President's budget are too low. This has been mentioned by other Senators in debate, and I had this written down because I wanted to comment on it in closing.

Mr. President, if the President's appropriated savings are steep, then the Republican appropriations savings are positively cataclysmic. That is the point. Over the 6 years of the budget, the Republican budget cuts \$65 billion more from appropriations than does the President. And in the final year of the budget, 2002, the Republicans cut \$13 billion more in appropriated spending in that 1 year than does the President.

The Senator from Missouri knows that the Appropriations Committee will distribute those cuts—not this resolution. Indeed, neither the Republican budget, nor a Republican budget of any kind, contains program-by-program detail for appropriated accounts. The fairest comparison of appropriations in the outyears, therefore, is to compare totals of spending levels.

If I need additional time to close, I take it off of the time I have on the amendment.

In sum and in closing, the Republicans want to cut projected spending on the very poorest in the Nation. We want to plug some corporate loopholes that have been alluded to here and some specifics, and there are many more. We agree. We want to honor our veterans. That is the reason for this Democratic amendment. The real question is whether we want to protect the disabled kids or the corporations who are moving jobs overseas.

Mr. President, I yield any remaining time that I have. I believe the Chair will confirm that we have previously

agreed to the yeas and nays on the Exon amendment.

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. Have the yeas and nays been approved for the Bond amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. Before we vote, let me ask Senator EXON a question.

According to our understanding, your side has the next amendment after we vote on these two.

Mr. EXON. That is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. Can we see that amendment during the vote?

Mr. EXON. We will provide that amendment to you during the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] is necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 115 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Akaka	Feingold	Leahy
Baucus	Feinstein	Levin
Biden	Ford	Lieberman
Bingaman	Glenn	Mikulski
Boxer	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Bradley	Harkin	Moynihan
Breaux	Heflin	Murray
Bryan	Hollings	Nunn
Bumpers	Inouye	Reid
Byrd	Johnston	Robb
Conrad	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Daschle	Kerry	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kerry	Simon
Dorgan	Kohl	Wellstone
Exon	Lautenberg	Wyden

NAYS—53

Abraham	Gorton	McConnell
Ashcroft	Gramm	Murkowski
Bennett	Grams	Nickles
Bond	Grassley	Pell
Brown	Gregg	Pressler
Burns	Hatch	Roth
Campbell	Hatfield	Santorum
Chafee	Helms	Shelby
Coats	Hutchison	Simpson
Cochran	Inhofe	Smith
Cohen	Jeffords	Snowe
Coverdell	Kassebaum	Specter
Craig	Kempthorne	Stevens
D'Amato	Kyl	Thomas
DeWine	Lott	Thompson
Domenici	Lugar	Thurmond
Faircloth	Mack	Warner
Frist	McCain	

NOT VOTING—2

Dole Pryor

The amendment (No. 3973) was rejected.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. HATCH. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 3971

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now proceed under the previous order to vote on the Bond amendment, No. 3971.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] is necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 75, nays 23, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 116 Leg.]

YEAS—75

Abraham	Feingold	Levin
Ashcroft	Feinstein	Lott
Baucus	Frist	Lugar
Bennett	Gorton	Mack
Biden	Graham	McCain
Bingaman	Gramm	McConnell
Bond	Grams	Murkowski
Brown	Grassley	Nickles
Bryan	Gregg	Nunn
Burns	Harkin	Pressler
Byrd	Hatch	Reid
Campbell	Hatfield	Robb
Chafee	Heflin	Rockefeller
Coats	Helms	Roth
Cochran	Hutchison	Santorum
Cohen	Inhofe	Shelby
Conrad	Jeffords	Simpson
Coverdell	Johnston	Smith
Craig	Kassebaum	Snowe
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Specter
DeWine	Kerry	Stevens
Domenici	Kerry	Thomas
Dorgan	Kohl	Thompson
Exon	Kyl	Thurmond
Faircloth	Leahy	Warner

NAYS—23

Akaka	Glenn	Moynihan
Boxer	Hollings	Murray
Bradley	Inouye	Pell
Breaux	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Bumpers	Lautenberg	Simon
Daschle	Lieberman	Wellstone
Dodd	Mikulski	Wyden
Ford	Moseley-Braun	

NOT VOTING—2

Dole Pryor

The amendment (No. 3971) was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FORD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3973

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the Senate just voted on an amendment by the Senator from Nebraska to increase veterans health care funding by changes in the Tax Code. Purportedly the revenue would be derived from closing corporate tax loopholes, although there is no guarantee that's where the money would come from. Proponents of the amendment have characterized the amendment as cutting corporate welfare.

First, I want to say that I support additional funding for veterans health

care. In fact, I voted for the Bond amendment to increase health care spending by \$13 billion.

Senator EXON's amendment also recommends a \$13 billion increase. However, I want to address the issue of how the Senator from Nebraska intends to pay for the increase.

As my colleagues are aware I have been outspoken and active in the effort to cut inappropriate corporate subsidies. In fact, last year I offered an amendment to the reconciliation bill to cut over \$50 billion in corporate pork spending. Unfortunately, that amendment was defeated. I might note that the effort did not enjoy the support of the Senator from Nebraska.

In addition, I have authored bipartisan legislation to review and eliminate corporate subsidies, including tax loopholes.

The Senator from Nebraska says the increase in veterans health care would be paid for by filling corporate tax loopholes. That sounds good, Mr. President, but the way that the amendment is written, that result is not guaranteed.

Moreover, even if we could be sure that loopholes were closed, I believe we owe it to the American people to dedicate the revenues derived from such reforms to reduce the tax burden on American families across the board.

Simply stated we can and should pay for necessary increases in veterans health care by offsets in other Federal spending, not by increasing the overall Federal tax burden.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I understand now the minority may have found another way to offer the President's budget and they intend to do that; is that correct?

Mr. NICKLES. 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. THURMOND. 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 DEATH OF ADM. JEREMY MICHAEL BOORDA, U.S. NAVY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I was informed this afternoon that Adm. Mike Boorda, the Chief of Naval Operations, died today. I have little additional information at this time on what happened or how; but I want to take a minute to acknowledge the passing of a fine naval officer who made many extraordinary contributions to the Navy and to his country. I think this is a tragic day for both the Navy and the Nation. We lost an individual who was both a strong leader and a decent man.

Admiral Boorda enlisted in the Navy in 1956 and rose from seaman to admiral. He was selected and confirmed as

the 25th Chief of Naval Operations in April 1994. Prior to his confirmation as Chief of Naval Operations, he commanded all United States and NATO forces in Bosnia. As ranking minority and now Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I had the opportunity to work closely with Adm. Mike Boorda on many occasions. I found him to be an officer of great professional skill, who instilled confidence and stood as a model of what a dedicated and courageous officer and leader should be.

Admiral Boorda took command of the Navy at a challenging time. His steady hand and firm leadership during a period of great change, a turbulent period of declining force structure and personnel reductions, and his firm commitment to professionalism and operational readiness, have kept the Navy on a steady course and sustained its excellence as a fighting force.

Particularly impressive was the empathy and concern that Adm. Mike Boorda had for those under his command. As a former enlisted sailor, he had a keen appreciation of the hardships of service at sea and family separation that are a part of a sailor's daily existence. He understood their sacrifice and worked extremely hard to ensure the welfare of naval personnel. He never failed to advise me on conditions in the fleet during our frequent meetings. His concern for the quality of life of the men and women in the naval service was remarkable.

During more than 40 years of service to the Navy and to his country, Adm. Mike Boorda made many extraordinary contributions to his country. He was a man of great energy, vision, commitment, and patriotism. He was a man who deserved our gratitude and respect for his service while he lived, and our praise and prayers now that he is gone. We will miss him greatly.

Our thoughts are with his family, his wife Betty, his four children, and his nine grandchildren. They include two sons and one daughter-in-law on active duty in the Navy. We extend our sympathy to them and wish them well.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

The Senate continued with consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, let me say to fellow Senators there will be additional votes tonight, but we are now trying to work on some aspects of handling this in a more expeditious and orderly manner. We will do that for the

next hour and 30 minutes. There will be no votes before 8 o'clock.

I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask that it be charged to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADMIRAL BOORDA

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am saddened, as my colleagues are, by the news we just received about Admiral Boorda's death. His loss is a tragedy for the Navy, the Armed Forces, and for the entire Nation.

Admiral Boorda was an outstanding leader and had the best possible qualifications to be Chief of Naval Operations because he rose through the ranks. He entered the Navy as an enlisted man in 1956. He is the only enlisted person ever to reach that high position.

As ranking member of the Armed Services Subcommittee on Seapower, I had the privilege of working with Admiral Boorda for several years. I had great admiration for his knowledge, skill, leadership and dedication. President Kennedy was a Navy man, too, and he said at the Naval Academy in 1962:

I can imagine a no more rewarding career of any man who may be asked in this century what he did to make his life worthwhile. I think I can respond with a good deal of pride and satisfaction: I served in the U.S. Navy.

Admiral Boorda's life and career exemplify the best in that tradition. I join the Navy and the Nation in mourning its loss, and express my deepest condolences to his wife, Betty, and to his entire family.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time will be equally divided, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADMIRAL BOORDA

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from Massachusetts, having just recently learned of the tragic death of the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Boorda. Admiral Boorda was a native of Indiana and had a distinguished military career, rose to the very top as Chief of Naval Operations. As chairman of the Personnel Subcommittee, I had numerous discussions

and meetings with him, so I felt that I got to know him as well as you can in a busy Washington and all the busy activities we are involved in.

I was shocked by the news, deeply saddened by the news, and concerned for his family. While we do not have all the details of his death, I think we all feel the sense of grief that comes with this type of an announcement.

Admiral Boorda came into leadership at a difficult time for the U.S. Navy. Many changes have taken place in the Navy that brought to his desk a number of problems that were difficult problems to deal with. Yet, he did so with skill and did so with great thoroughness and determination to seek a proper solution.

So, Mr. President, I intend to say more later about Admiral Boorda and his career and service to this Nation. But I join with those in saying how shocked and saddened we are with this particular announcement.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEATH OF ADMIRAL BOORDA

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I, too, want to join my Senate colleagues in expressing how profoundly saddened we are about the death of Adm. Mike Boorda, Chief of Naval Operations. He was truly one of the most impressive figures who has ever been selected to serve as Chief of Naval Operations. He rose from the ranks of the enlisted personnel to become an officer, and not only that, but the highest-ranking officer in the U.S. Navy. He brought to that job an enthusiasm for the work, a love for the Navy, and a respect for everyone in the Navy that was unparalleled.

I recall very clearly a visit that I had the good fortune to make with him to the Meridian Naval Air Station in Meridian, MS. He gone down to our State and was visiting other States in the South looking at naval installations. He visited the Pascagoula base on the gulf coast. I was with him in Meridian when, after a tour of the naval air station, he wanted an opportunity to meet with everybody on the air station. So a meeting was called and everyone was invited. All hands were invited to come see the Chief of Naval Operations in the gymnasium there on the base.

He talked to everyone. He had a hand-held mike. He walked out in the middle of the gymnasium, as people were seated in the stands all around. After his remarks, without any notes at all, he took questions and he was asked questions about everything from pay allowance issues, to housing, to the status of some repair contracts on Navy fighter aircraft, to the status of trainers, and how long they would remain in service. He knew something about everything that he was asked

that day, and he handled the questions in a way that showed a genuine respect for each person who asked the question, whether it was an officer, a pilot of an airplane, or an enlisted personnel. He left that place that day with everyone really endeared to him and totally impressed with him as a person and proud to be in the U.S. Navy with his being the highest ranking officer in that Navy.

So it is with deep regret and sadness that we heard today the tragic news of his death. Our condolences go out to his family and to all of those who worked closely with him, because they have to be deeply, deeply saddened by this terrible event. But his legacy will be long remembered and appreciated as an enduring gift of unselfish public service by a person who was a true patriot.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

The Senate continued with the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask that the time be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. EXON. 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. EXON. Mr. President, Senator ROCKEFELLER is here. We are trying to move things along. He is ready to offer an amendment. We had a discussion here a few moments ago. As I understood it, the arrangement would be that there would be no more votes before 8 o'clock, and that, in the meantime, we had agreed to set aside, temporarily, the Exon amendment, which is before the body, to allow other amendments to be offered. I am pleased to see my friend from New Mexico here. Senator ROCKEFELLER is here.

I ask unanimous consent that the Exon amendment be temporarily set aside for the purpose of other people offering amendments. I simply say that, under the rules that are still in effect, it would be the Republican's turn to offer an amendment. If there is no Republican here and ready to offer an amendment, with the approval of the chairman of the committee, we could recognize Senator ROCKEFELLER for his amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. Reserving the right to object. We have not seen Senator ROCKEFELLER's amendment. We do not know what it applies to, the underlying bill, or what.

Mr. President, I have no objection. I will just ask, since we did this for you last time, you can proceed with the Rockefeller amendment, and then we

will have an amendment. Since we are entitled to go next—

Mr. EXON. I guess I was wrong on that, Mr. President. I was ready to offer an amendment. I would have gone next. Out of deference to the agreement we made, I am not offering that. So I guess the slot really would be on our side. I see nothing wrong if the Senator agrees that Senator ROCKEFELLER will take the place of the Democratic slot I was prepared to take, and then the next amendment will be on your side. Eventually, sometime tonight, we will get back to the Exon amendment that is being temporarily set aside.

Mr. DOMENICI. I have no objection.

Mr. EXON. I yield as much time as is necessary to the Senator from West Virginia for the purpose of offering and explaining the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I thank the Chair and the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, and also the chairman of the Budget Committee, for their courtesy.

AMENDMENT NO. 3979

(Purpose: To restore \$50 billion in excessive Medicare cuts designed to pay for new tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans, offset by the extension of expired tax provisions or corporate and business tax reforms; to protect seniors against unjustified increases in premiums and other out-of-pocket costs; to prevent the closing of rural hospitals and other excessive provider cuts that erode access to needed medical services; to prevent the implementation of policies designed to force seniors to give up their own doctors to join private health plans; and to protect Medicare against policies that will cause it to wither on the vine)

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of myself, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DODD, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. FORD, and Mr. EXON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), for himself, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DODD, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. FORD, and Mr. EXON, proposes an amendment numbered 3979.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. 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 3, line 5, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.

On page 3, line 6, increase the amount by \$3,400,000,000.

On page 3, line 7, increase the amount by \$5,900,000,000.

On page 3, line 8, increase the amount by \$9,200,000,000.

On page 3, line 9, increase the amount by \$13,200,000,000.

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by \$18,700,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by \$3,400,000,000.

On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by \$5,900,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by \$9,200,000,000.

On page 3, line 18, increase the amount by \$13,200,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by \$18,700,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by \$3,400,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by \$5,900,000,000.

On page 4, line 11, increase the amount by \$9,200,000,000.

On page 4, line 12, increase the amount by \$13,200,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by \$18,700,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by \$3,400,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by \$5,900,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by \$9,200,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by \$13,200,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by \$18,700,000,000.

On page 29, line 10, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.

On page 29, line 11, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.

On page 29, line 17, increase the amount by \$3,400,000,000.

On page 29, line 18, increase the amount by \$3,400,000,000.

On page 29, line 24, increase the amount by \$5,900,000,000.

On page 29, line 25, increase the amount by \$5,900,000,000.

On page 30, line 6, increase the amount by \$9,200,000,000.

On page 30, line 7, increase the amount by \$9,200,000,000.

On page 30, line 13, increase the amount by \$13,200,000,000.

On page 30, line 14, increase the amount by \$13,200,000,000.

On page 30, line 20, increase the amount by \$18,700,000,000.

On page 30, line 21, increase the amount by \$18,700,000,000.

On page 49, line 17, decrease the amount by \$100,000,000.

On page 49, line 18, decrease the amount by \$50,500,000,000.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I rise today in order to offer an amendment to restore \$50 billion to the Medicare Program. This amendment restores \$50 billion by closing corporate loopholes and by extending expired tax provisions already included in the Republican budget.

Mr. President, we are back again trying to make sure that the Medicare Program is not gutted to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy. This is where we were a year ago. This is where we are again now. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have tried to dress up their budget. They are proposing all kinds of fancy maneuvers and 3 separate budget packages. They are pretending their latest budget is somehow kinder and gentler. But there is really not much new here compared to what we had last year. They lost the budget battle last year with the American

public when the public realized that the drastic cuts in the Medicare and Medicaid programs were going to be used to pay for tax breaks for the wealthy.

Instead of going back, as I would have thought they would have done, to the drawing board and come up with some new ideas and better health policies, they have merely changed the rhetoric. Instead of proposing ways to strengthen the Medicare Program, they have come up with some complicated three-tiered reconciliation process so that they can send three different bills to the President in a desperate attempt to score some political points. Instead of working with Democrats and with President Clinton to actually enact a bipartisan balanced budget, the Republicans continue to work behind closed doors.

The budget resolution before us has been preconferenced. I want my colleagues to understand this. It has already been preconferenced between the House and Senate Budget Committees. I have only been here 11½ years. I have never heard of that—a preconferenced bill involving something so massive as Medicare, for example. The deals have already been worked out and they have shut the door on any serious attempt to reach an agreement on a balanced budget. It is either their way, with massive Medicare cuts to finance tax cuts for the wealthy, or it is no way at all.

Mr. President, last year the Finance Committee did not hold a single hearing on the so-called "chairman's mark" to cut Medicare by \$270 billion; totally different approach than the one that Senator KENNEDY and Senator KASSEBAUM in their respective minority-majority positions took in their committee. The Labor and Human Resources Committee has done their legislation in a bipartisan, open-to-all, way. We did not do that in Finance. We held hearings on the problems of the Medicare Program earlier in the year. But not a single hearing was held on the Republican's actual plan to cut \$270 billion out of the Medicare Program. Not a single hearing was held to figure out what the impact of these really very radical cuts would be on the average Medicare beneficiary who already spends, let my colleagues understand this, 21 percent of their budget on health care.

I wrote Dr. O'Neill, head of the Congressional Budget Office, last year asking for estimates of what she thought this \$270 billion might have in the way of an impact on the average senior's pocketbook. Needless to say, I never got a response.

It is no different this year, Mr. President. This year the Finance Committee has failed to hold a single hearing on any aspect whatsoever of the Medicare Program—not one hearing. This budget resolution assumes enactment of the same type of radical policy changes without even preserving current law financial protection for seniors.

Mr. President, this debate is not about whether we should balance the budget but how we should balance the budget. This Republican budget still seeks the unprecedented cuts in the Medicare Program, just as it did last year. Just as that was rejected by the American people, here we are back again.

The President's budget achieves balance with \$50 billion, or 44 percent, less in Medicare cuts.

If they both achieve balance, then it seems to me quite reasonable to take the President's approach and simply restore \$50 billion knowing that the budget would then be in balance.

Mr. President, even the Congressional Quarterly wrote, "This year's Republican Medicare budget proposal looks a lot like last year's proposal." The same thing—a huge public outcry last year, and with a new year out it comes once again.

On the surface, the Medicare cuts appear somewhat reduced. But a lot of the reduction can be attributed to CBO's revised Medicare baseline estimates and because this year's budget only includes 6 years worth of cuts rather than 7 years.

For hospitals, though, this year's budget resolution is much, much worse than last year's. The American Hospital Association estimates that the projected hospital cuts in the budget are 20 percent greater than the cuts in last year's proposed hospital budget cuts.

I have here a letter which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 16, 1996.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the undersigned organizations representing hospitals and health systems, we strongly urge your support of any amendment to S. Con. Res. 57 (the FY 1997 Budget Resolution) which lowers reductions to Medicare. We cite in particular an amendment to be offered by Sen. Jay Rockefeller (D-WV) to restore \$50 billion to the Medicare program.

While it appears that the overall Medicare budget reductions of \$165 billion included in S. Con. Res. 57 are roughly the same as those in the last Republican offer in January, the budget drastically changes how the reductions would be allocated within the program. The FY 1997 budget proposal achieves the total reduction by saving \$124 billion from Part A Medicare (the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund) and \$44 billion from Part B.

The net result is that in S. Con. Res. 57, the reductions in Part A have increased by approximately \$25 billion. Not only are these unprecedented reductions, but they would have a disproportionate adverse impact on hospitals. To achieve reductions of this magnitude, Congress may need to adopt policies that would freeze or actually reduce payment rates per beneficiary.

Hospitals and health systems support a reasonable deficit reduction package, and believe that changes in Medicare are sorely needed to keep the Part A trust fund solvent. Many of us have supported various proposals that achieve a balanced budget with reductions in Medicare. However, we are gravely concerned about the level of Medicare Part A reductions proposed in S. Con. Res. 57.

Again, we ask you to support any amendments that temper the level of reductions to Medicare Part A, including Sen. Rockefeller's amendment to restore \$50 billion to the Medicare program, and seek a more balanced approach to achieving savings.

Sincerely,

American Hospital Association, American Association of Eye and Ear Hospitals, Association of American Medical Colleges, Catholic Health Association, Federation of American Health Systems, InterHealth, National Association of Public Hospitals and Health Systems, Premier, Inc., VHA Inc.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, this letter is signed by the American Hospital Association, the Catholic Health Association, the Federation of American Health Systems, and seven or eight others, in which they say the budget drastically changes how the reductions would be allocated within the programs.

They refer to: "Not only are these unprecedented reductions, but they would have a disproportionate adverse impact on hospitals," and so on. It is a much more drastic cut for hospitals. That is something that we all need to worry about.

The Prospective Payment Review Commission, ProPAC, a highly respected, nonpartisan commission that advises Congress on hospital payment issues, has warned us in their March report that severe reductions in hospital payments could have a severe impact on hospitals. They go on to say, "The required restraint on cost growth may not be feasible, or desirable. Low updates over an extended period could affect a hospital's financial health and compromise access and compromise quality of care. They could also impede the diffusion of quality-enhancing technological advances."

Mr. President, this is not a partisan conclusion reached by this Senator or the Clinton administration about the hospital cuts proposed in the Republican budget. This is a conclusion that has been reached by a group of health care experts who have been advising Congress on the financial health of hospitals since 1983.

This budget truly ignores the heavy reliance of rural hospitals on the Medicare Program. Small rural hospitals may have to shut their doors. We have heard that before. But with this 20 percent greater impact, it is far more dangerous.

Mr. President, in West Virginia one-half of all seniors live in rural areas. Well over half of our hospitals are rural and are, therefore, clearly and logically disproportionately dependent on the Medicare Program for their payments.

Mr. President, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will yet again claim that they are proposing these massive reductions in Medicare to save the trust fund from insolvency.

Once again, I say this is nonsense. While the most recent Medicare trustees' report showed the trust fund in somewhat worse shape than last year,

the variation falls within the typical margin of error. There is over \$120 billion in that trust fund, and there is no imminent danger that claims cannot or will not be paid.

During my almost 10 years' tenure on the Finance Committee, Mr. President, we have been faced with many of these situations, to be quite honest, with many scenarios of impending trust fund short-term insolvency crises. You have not heard very much about them. The reason you have not heard very much about them is that each time, except for the last time, Finance Committee members worked together to enact Medicare payment reforms to extend short-term solvency to that one and same trust fund. We have done it time and time again, maybe seven or eight times over a period of 15 years.

We enacted major reforms in hospital payments in 1983 and followed up with physician payment reform, something that Senator Durenberger and I were closely involved in in 1989, as well, of course, as Senator KENNEDY. We made countless payment and policy adjustments to rein in Medicare spending and extend trust fund solvency, but we did it together. It was bipartisan. You heard very little, if anything, about it.

In fact, until very recently, the Medicare Program outperformed the private sector in containing its health care costs. The private sector is doing slightly better right now, but realize that the private sector is ensuring fewer and fewer people while Medicare's enrollment is increasing. Medicare pays for home care services and skilled nursing home care, types of services that are not normally covered by private insurance policies, and Medicare pays for an older and sicker population.

So in spite of this, except for this year, they have held their costs below the rate of increase of the private sector. They have done very well. As everybody knows, or hopefully knows by now, their administrative costs are about 2 percent, which is virtually impossible to imagine but true.

At the beginning of the Clinton administration, the trust fund was projected to be exhausted by 1999—not 2002 but 1999. The Democrats on the Finance Committee were forced to work single-handedly in 1993 to extend the solvency of the trust fund by 3 more years, and I am aware of that because I negotiated the Medicare part of that.

I can tell you, Mr. President, that we did not have a single Republican vote. We did it, nevertheless. I did not hear one single concern expressed by the current congressional majority about the solvency of the trust fund back in 1993, which was not very long ago.

The Congressional Budget Office has certified that the balanced budget proposed by the President would extend the solvency of the trust fund for 10 more years. That is about the same level of solvency achieved by the Republican budget. But the President's budget does so without damaging pro-

grammatic changes and drastic cuts that would eventually cause the Medicare Program to, as one noted public servant said, "wither on the vine." We can address the short-term solvency needs of the trust fund without slashing and burning the Medicare Program. We can extend short-term solvency without shifting huge new costs to senior citizens. The President's budget proves that it can be done.

The tougher issue, of course, is the long-term solvency of the trust fund, and about that we are all concerned. When the baby boomers begin to age into the Medicare Program, there will be a huge strain on the trust fund. None of the balanced budget proposals deal with the issue of long-term solvency. The Democratic proposal does not. The President's proposal does not. The Republican proposal does not do that.

Last year, I introduced legislation—which I believe is strongly supported by Senator DOLE; he said he strongly supports it—that would establish a bipartisan Medicare commission. When people hear the word "commission," they say, "Oh, yeah, one of those." Well, yes, one of those was what solved the Social Security problem for a great many years under President Reagan and Alan Greenspan back in 1981. The House and the Senate and the President, Republicans and Democrats, all went along with that. Tough decisions were made. Bullets were bitten. The bill was passed, and Social Security is not the concern that it was at that time.

None of the balanced budget proposals, as I indicated, deal with this, and I think a Medicare commission to make recommendations to Congress on ways to deal with the long-term solvency of the Medicare Program is the intelligent, rational way to go. If we adopted the President's proposal on Medicare, we would have plenty of time, plenty of time, to adopt a bipartisan solution that addresses this long-term solvency.

It has always been a matter of some amusement to me; if it is solvent until the year 2002—the Medicare HI trust fund—and this is 1996, that is called 6 years.

The President could call this commission into being next year, if he is reelected, or, if Senator DOLE is elected, then he could do it. He says he is for it. It would meet for a period of 6 months or a year or whatever it would be, and the problem, therefore, would be resolved and we could vote on it in 1998, 4 years before the crisis even hit us. Six years is ample time. Medicare is not in danger. Congress will not walk away from our responsibilities on Medicare. We simply will not do it.

So from my point of view, in concluding, the Republican budget is designed to raid, not save, the Medicare Program. Medicare's money is going to be used to finance tax cuts for the wealthy. It is that simple. It has nothing to do with assuring long-term sol-

veny of the Medicare trust fund. I find that abhorrent. It has nothing to do with making sure that Medicare programs continue to provide high-quality health care for our senior citizens and the disabled. It has everything to do with the Republican promises to balance the budget in 7 years and hand out tax cuts to the rich.

Mr. President, I hope my colleagues will adopt my amendment.

Mr. President, I send a modification of my amendment to the desk in that there was a small error.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to modify his amendment.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 3, line 5, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.

On page 3, line 6, increase the amount by \$3,400,000,000.

On page 3, line 7, increase the amount by \$5,900,000,000.

On page 3, line 8, increase the amount by \$9,200,000,000.

On page 3, line 9, increase the amount by \$13,200,000,000.

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by \$18,700,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by \$3,400,000,000.

On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by \$5,900,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by \$9,200,000,000.

On page 3, line 18, increase the amount by \$13,200,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by \$18,700,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by \$3,400,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by \$5,900,000,000.

On page 4, line 11, increase the amount by \$9,200,000,000.

On page 4, line 12, increase the amount by \$13,200,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by \$18,700,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by \$3,400,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by \$5,900,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by \$9,200,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by \$13,200,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by \$18,700,000,000.

On page 29, line 10, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.

On page 29, line 11, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.

On page 29, line 17, increase the amount by \$3,400,000,000.

On page 29, line 18, increase the amount by \$3,400,000,000.

On page 29, line 24, increase the amount by \$5,900,000,000.

On page 29, line 25, increase the amount by \$5,900,000,000.

On page 30, line 6, increase the amount by \$9,200,000,000.

On page 30, line 7, increase the amount by \$9,200,000,000.

On page 30, line 13, increase the amount by \$13,200,000,000.

On page 30, line 14, increase the amount by \$13,200,000,000.

On page 30, line 20, increase the amount by \$18,700,000,000.

On page 30, line 21, increase the amount by \$18,700,000,000.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ABRAHAM. I thank you, Mr. President. I yield myself 10 minutes to speak to the amendment.

Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia and I from time to time agree on things in the Chamber, and on this occasion we disagree on the approaches being taken to Medicare. Let me just begin by trying to put in context the magnitude of the problem which we confront. While it may be true in the past there have been projections that Medicare, the part A trust fund was headed toward insolvency at some point in the future, we have never come this close before in the following sense. We have never before faced a situation where we actually were paying more dollars out of the trust fund than taxpayers were paying into the trust fund, but that, indeed, is where we are today.

Last April, the Clinton administration estimated that the trust fund balance would increase by \$4.7 billion in fiscal year 1995 and 1997 would be the first fiscal year in which it would run a deficit. However, Department of Treasury figures indicate now that the Medicare Program ran a deficit of \$37 billion in fiscal year 1995, 2 years earlier than expected. CBO has projected that based on this change in circumstance, Medicare is now likely to become insolvent as early as the year 2000. I ask unanimous consent to enter into the RECORD at this point a letter from the head of the CBO, June O'Neill, which indicates their projected timetable.

Mr. President, the concerns I think all of us have about the solvency of the part A trust fund are ones that need to be addressed. They need to be addressed decisively. I agree with the Senator from West Virginia that we must confront the long-term population projections, the aging of the baby boom generation and the impact that will have on Medicare, but I do not think we should postpone dealing with that problem until down the road in some commission. I think we have to begin laying the foundation for dealing with that problem now. That is what we are trying to do with the Republican budget before the Senate here tonight.

New estimates, as I said, by the Congressional Budget Office post the year 2001 as the likely point at which the trust fund part A will be insolvent.

Matters seem to be getting worse. Last year, Republicans offered a systematic change, an effort to try to create a competitive choice system for Medicare recipients. We were able to get that through the Congress, but, unfortunately,

it was vetoed ultimately. But the direction we are moving in is one that will try to address this problem both short term and long term. Contrary to some of the comments that have been made, the Finance Committee has had, it is my understanding, 13 hearings already on Medicare in this Congress.

But the fact remains that there are two basic choices for us to make here in the U.S. Senate. The President has offered a proposal which essentially maintains the solvency of the part A trust fund by shifting, from the part A trust fund, vital programs, home health care, to the tune of approximately \$50 billion, maybe a little bit more than \$50 billion, and through that mechanism produces a greater solvency for the trust fund.

We, on our side of the aisle, do not think that is the appropriate way to address the problem. Countless Americans depend on the part A trust fund to provide those home health care services. Moving them out of the trust fund, moving them into the general account, making them, instead, subject to congressional deliberation and imposing their costs on the taxpayers, or to force those programs to be competitive with others, is not the way to go.

If that is the solution we are going to take every time the trust fund approaches insolvency, if we say the answer is to move parts of the programs under the trust fund out of the trust fund, I do not think that is providing seniors with much security at all. In fact, I think for any senior who is listening to this debate, I would warn them if we set the precedent saying the way we are going to address the pending insolvency of the Medicare part A trust fund is by taking away services and putting them up for negotiation and debate in part B, or in some other way to be dealt with by the Congress, we are undermining the confidence that seniors will have in Medicare, and it will continue in my judgment.

So, instead of approaching it that way, what we have attempted to do on the majority side is to provide what we think is a comprehensive approach to guaranteeing the solvency for 10 years of the part A trust fund. In addition, what we have done is to take the President's own number, which is \$44 billion of savings in the part B Medicare portion of the budget. So what that means is that we are taking action that will guarantee the solvency of part A for 10 years, through the year 2006. That is, I think, a goal worthy of us and one that we should, I think, accomplish for purposes of protecting the American people who are dependent on Medicare. And we are using the President's own projected savings in part B of \$44 billion to arrive at our Medicare objective.

Now that may not be the approach that others support. They seem to feel we need to try to increase the funding. But if we increase the funding in Medicare we are only creating, I think, a

more serious insolvency problem. If we do not begin now to reform the programs to create the options and the choices for Americans so we can begin to reduce the rate of growth of the Medicare Program, we are inviting even greater problems at a sooner point, in my judgment.

We strongly oppose the amendment that is being offered. We think that the President's approach is not the proper way to go. We think that the approach of just spending more money without trying to reform the system is not the approach to take. Certainly we do not think the way to go is to have the usual solution around here of more taxes to fund programs. We need to reform the programs themselves.

So, for those reasons, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment. I yield the floor at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

(Mr. ABRAHAM assumed the chair.)

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I would like to respond to the distinguished Senator from Michigan in his reference to treatment of home health care financing. I am addressing, in fact, the distinguished Senator from Michigan as the Presiding Officer.

It is complicated, but it is very important. I would like to take just a couple of minutes, if that is all right, outlining why this change in home care financing does, in fact, make sense. And then also why, therefore, it is a legitimate way to improve the solvency of the part A trust fund.

A little history: Before 1980, financing of the home health care benefit was divided between part A and part B, pre-1980. At that time only the first 100 days of home visits after a 3-day hospital stay were financed from the part A fund. All other visits were financed by part B. The policy behind this was that Medicare part A was designed to pay for short-term recuperative home care services. In 1980, Congress enacted legislation that improved Medicare's overall home health care benefit by removing the 100-day visit limit and the prior hospitalization requirement, the so-called 3-day requirement. As a result, financing of all home care services was shifted at that point to part A, even though part A was never intended to pay for long-term home health care services. That is the rationale, and it makes sense.

The President's proposal restores financing of the home health care benefit back to the original intent of Medicare, and that is what happens in his proposal. It brings Medicare financing in line with use patterns that show home health care has evolved into two distinct benefits: Care to persons recovering from an acute care hospitalization and care where there is no hospitalization but long-term care services are required. This proposal extends the solvency of the part A trust fund by capping part A financing of Medicare's home health benefit and saves the trust fund almost \$60 billion over 7 years.

I just wanted to make that point. The Senator from Michigan, the Presiding Officer, had raised this point and I think it does bear explanation on a policy basis.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

Mr. BENNETT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I was listening to the presentation of the Senator from West Virginia and felt I had to respond in some particulars. I appreciate the Presiding Officer giving me relief from the chair so that I might do this.

I hear the Senator from West Virginia use the statement that we have heard many times on the floor, that the purpose of the Republican number for Medicare is to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy. I say once again, if these tax cuts are going to benefit the wealthy, the wealthy have to have awfully big families because the tax cut is limited to \$500 per child and I do not know anybody who is really wealthy who is going to make any money off of this at \$500 per child. The people who need this are the people who have low incomes and big families. Those are the people in my State who are getting a little tired of the rhetoric that this is a tax cut for the wealthy. I have heard the statement made on the floor that this is going to mean \$10,000 in tax cuts to some people. They have to have an awful lot of kids to get \$10,000 at \$500 per child.

Second, "slash and burn" is a phrase that was used, on the amount of money to be spent on Medicare; the incredible cuts. I was a Member of this body when the Senator from West Virginia cosponsored the Clinton health care plan. In the Clinton health care plan, as explained in hearings before the Congress by Mrs. Clinton, the growth of Medicare spending was to be slowed. Mrs. Clinton made the very specific point, and some of us have seen that on videotape as it has been replayed, that we are not cutting Medicare, she said, we are simply slowing its growth so that we can pay for all the things we need to do in health care.

The bill that is before us slows the growth of Medicare less than the amount proposed by Mrs. Clinton in the bill that she proposed, and which the Senator from West Virginia cosponsored.

I do not consider that it was slashing and burning Medicare when Mrs. Clinton proposed it, and I do not think it is slashing and burning Medicare now. I hope we will stay with the numbers as they really are. We are proposing increasing spending on Medicare, and the Republicans are proposing increasing spending on Medicare at a higher rate than Mrs. Clinton proposed, and that was in the bill that the Senator from West Virginia cosponsored.

Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia has talked about the repeated actions of the Finance Committee in

dealing with short-term solvency problems. An analogy sprang to my mind. We have watched the Government of the District of Columbia give us repeated short-term solutions to their short-term solvency problems, and the long-term solvency problem has gotten continually worse until finally the District of Columbia is facing the crisis that it is.

I am not proud—I did not participate, so I was not involved—but I am not proud of the actions of the Finance Committee over the years in the way they have solved the short-term solvency problem. I am not proud of administrations that I would call my administration—that is the Bush administration—in the way it has addressed the short-term solvency problem, because all they have done repeatedly is postpone the day of reckoning, and to say, "Well, we've been able to do it on a bipartisan basis."

All right, shame on both parties. But what happens again and again when you are faced with the short-term solvency problem in Medicare is, say we are going to reduce the amount we will reimburse to the doctors and we will make those greedy doctors and hospitals pay by putting a lid on the amount they can charge. There is another word for that, Mr. President. It is called wage and price controls. We have been trying to solve our inflation problems in this country with wage and price controls perhaps from the beginning of time. They have never worked in any other arena, and they have not worked in Medicare. Every time the Finance Committee or the administration puts wage and price controls on Medicare payments, the people who are faced with those wage and price controls find ways around them. Then the costs start going up again, so we have to have another short-term fix with wage and price controls.

The only solution is to forget the pattern of the past and make systemic changes in Medicare, and my party has had the courage to attempt that. The party of the Senator from West Virginia has said, "No, we will not attempt systemic changes in Medicare. Let's have a commission."

I would be happy to serve on such a commission and endorse such a commission if the charge of that commission was to say that we are not going to do what we have historically done because it is what we have historically done that has brought us to the point we are today. We have to face the fact that Medicare is a wonderful 1960's program frozen in time by virtue of its having been made a Government monopoly. We have to break the monopoly, open this thing up to free market forces, recognize that wage and price controls do not work, and start with a clean sheet of paper. If we had that kind of circumstance, I would be happy to do whatever is necessary to cooperate with the Senator from West Virginia in a bipartisan fashion. But more of the same, a repeat of what we have

done in the years that have gotten us to this, is not the kind of call we need to deal with Medicare.

Mr. President, I recognize that I have opened a can of worms or a hornet's nest here, and I should return to the chair, but if the President will grant me the indulgence, I recognize that the Senator from West Virginia is now on his feet and wants to defend himself, and I congratulate him for that. If I may be allowed to stay here and defend myself and we have this debate, I think it will be a worthwhile circumstance.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor, in anticipation of hearing a rebuttal from my friend from West Virginia.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. General reminders, perhaps, would be more appropriate in terms of the phrasing. I certainly listened to what my distinguished friend said, and respect him. In fact, in all that he says, because he has a particularly articulate, modified way of saying things which I have long respected, which the Senator knows from our previous conversations.

The Senator has brought up a number of points, such as wage and price controls, and this is something which is not necessarily totally accurate, but which I ask the Senator to contemplate. He talked about the evils of wage and price controls. Let us leave wages out for the moment—no, let us not leave wages out for the moment.

I submit to the Senator what we are now seeing increasingly in private sector managed care—you made reference to the Clinton health care program which is long gone. It seems to me like the debate on health care reform was 10 years ago. Since it failed, there was this convulsion in the marketplace, an extraordinary explosion of activity, and managed care took off. We have health maintenance organizations, HMO's, which are wonderful in their concept of paying a doctor so much to keep a patient healthy. Therefore, the incentive was to keep the patient healthy, and the incentive was always on the relationship between the doctor and the patient. Then we see the introduction of for-profit HMO's, which are now sweeping the Nation. That introduces quite another concept, and that is the interest of the shareholder of the company as opposed to, perhaps, in contrast to, in contradiction with, perhaps, the relationship between the doctor and the patient.

I just wonder out loud if what we have seen, therefore, and the resulting kind of caps and limits, and "this will be allowed and that will not be allowed," is, in fact, a form of wage and price controls, but under the guise of the private sector, therefore, we do not think of calling it as such. I just raise that as something for the Senator to think about.

Second, on the short-term basis aspect, the Senator expressed great concern about having to do this all the time. I am in total agreement. I am in total agreement, and I think the reason that we have had all of these short-

term fixes is because we have not had to consider Medicare in a longer term context.

The Senator made some correct observations. But that is why I think that a commission, never before entered into, on Medicare, which has grown enormously because Congress has added enormous new burdens on it, services to be paid for, as well as the cost of health care and everything else, that it is, in fact, a long-term commission approach which is the answer to solidifying patterns, making adjustments, and biting the bullet on some very difficult issues.

I think that the deal, so to speak, would be that the commission would be so well balanced as to who was on it—experts, seniors, consumers, et cetera, it would be fairly done and expertly done—that it would be voted through by the House, voted through by the Senate and signed by the President almost without debate, like the Social Security Commission's recommendations were. It was an enormously controversial problem. Senator DOLE and Senator MOYNIHAN were on that commission.

With respect to when the Senator talked about the old bromide, or whatever it was, of Democrats talking about tax cuts for the rich, I have to go by what people in the majority say, because we in the minority have to respond to that.

The Senate budget resolution would, and I quote, "accommodate further tax reform or tax reductions, to be offset by the extension of expired tax provisions or corporate and business tax reforms. Such tax reductions could include proposals such as economic growth, a capital gains tax reduction package, State tax reform, economic growth, fuel excise taxes * * *."

And on to the end of the quote.

So I have to believe that tax cuts for the wealthy are still very much in the mind of the Republicans. I cannot prove it, but I can point to the Republican budget resolution before us.

What am I to think as I see this?

Mr. BENNETT. Would the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Of course.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not have the figures in front of me, but I would be happy to supply them to the Senator. If you take the total amount set aside for tax cuts, you would find that the vast bulk, I think in the neighborhood of something like 80 percent of the value of the tax cut, goes for the \$500 tax credit for children. The taxes that the Senator is pointing out, in terms of the total impact, are relatively small and can honestly be described as minor in their financial impact.

By far, the greatest bulk of the tax money is going for the \$500 rebate for children. That is the expensive item in the tax cut bill. I am sure the Budget Committee would be happy to give the Senator those details.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. We will see on all of this, because there is a very

strong predilection on the part of the majority party to make—when you are talking about inheritance taxes, you know, that is pretty heavy stuff. That would raise questions. The Senator who is speaking knows something about that.

The other thing I guess I want to say, if the Senator would further yield—

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. This amendment is about restoring \$50 billion that was cut by the Republicans from Medicare. That is what my amendment is about. That is kind of what I would like our discussion to be about.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his reasoned response. I remain unconvinced by it, but I appreciate the manner and the tenor in which it is offered. May I make several comments, and then I will return to the chair, and perhaps this will pass on for those who want to read about it in the RECORD.

The reference to wage and price controls and HMO's. Wage and price controls, by definition, are imposed by Government. Market conditions may set prices elsewhere. One of the main things wrong with our whole health care system—and the Senator and I can have this discussion at length at some other time—is the very fact that market forces do not operate here and cannot because of the Government's attempt to enforce wage and price controls.

We have a circumstance, I say to the Senator, where the user of the service is not the purchaser of the service, and market conditions therefore cannot operate.

If I, for example, am enrolled in an HMO I do not like, there is nothing I can do about it because the person who chooses that HMO is my employer. It is the employer who purchases the service, pays for it and makes the deal. It is I, the employee, who uses the service.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Would the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I will yield in a moment.

I have been the chief executive officer of a company and, therefore, in a position to choose what kind of health care the employees will get. It will come as no surprise to say that I chose a program that I liked.

During the debate over the Clinton health care plan, people would say to me, "Why don't you give us as good a health care plan as you have as a Member of Congress?" My response was, "I wish I had as good a health care plan as I had before I came to Congress," because the only health care plan I have now, as a Member of Congress, is that which the Government has decided to make available to Government employees. If you want the same kind of health care plan I have, go get yourself a Government job. But if you want a different kind of health care plan, go petition your employer.

That does not make sense. In any other circumstance, you make the

choices if you buy the service. But we have created a circumstance here in our country—frankly, we can debate the historical roots of it—where the employer makes the decision but the employee receives the service. So whom does the HMO have to please? It has to please the health and human resources person at the employer's desk. If the employee does not get what he wants, too bad. The employer has made the choice.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. If the Senator will yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. The Senator—and I apologize to my colleagues because we are no longer debating this amendment, which is about restoring \$50 billion in Republican cuts to Medicare. That is what will be, hopefully, voted up later.

But when the Senator said, "I ran a company, and I decided what my employees were going to get. I made the decision"—

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. That is a very powerful statement. What that basically says is that the employees were denied any choice as to whether or not, for example, their doctor happened to be included in that program or not.

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Whether certain services were offered in that program or not.

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct. The Senator is exactly right. He is describing the way health care works in this country.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. If I might then just go back for a moment to the thoroughly savaged Clinton health care plan on the floor this evening, which, as I indicated is now a part of history. One of the things that the Senator is now able to do, if he in fact takes the trouble to do this, under the so-called Government health insurance program, which I would submit is hardly Government, because, for example, I have a Blue Cross-Blue Shield card, and the last I heard Blue Cross-Blue Shield was a private insurance company—

Mr. BENNETT. I say to the Senator, the Government—

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. If I could continue my point, I say to the Senator.

Mr. BENNETT. By all means.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. That the Senator and this Senator and all those who work for the Federal Government have, in fact, between 25 and 29 different plans that they can choose from every single year. I have watched my daughter go through this process of spreading out the different programs, sitting on the floor cross-legged, and just looking at all of these 29 different programs spread out before her, 29 different options of health care which she gets to choose from. With Blue Cross-Blue Shield, through that arrangement, she pays them, she can pick her doctor, she can pick her service. She can reject one thing from one year to another. But the choice is hers.

The point I would like to loudly insert in this debate is that the Senator in mandating for his employees what they will have. And, indeed, it occurs to me that that is a mandate. That is an entirely different situation from Federal employees, or those in the alliances that were contemplated in the Clinton health care plan. Through their joint purchasing power, they could have in fact a great variety of programs that would be spread before them. In fact, the Federal intervention that came in was from something called a Federal Quality Board which was made up of medical experts who would certify that any health plans that were being offered to the public through alliances or otherwise would have to be certified as being qualified and of high quality.

One of the great complaints one hears across the land today in America from physicians, hospitals and persons conversant in health care public policy is that the word "quality" is rapidly disappearing from the discussion, if not the practice of medicine.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, we perhaps should end this. I hope it is instructive. I am sure the Senator from West Virginia and I will continue this at another venue.

We clearly are not communicating here. He has outlined what I consider to be a prime example of what I was talking about. The Government has decided that his daughter's choices will be limited to Blue Cross-Blue Shield. The Government has decided that the plan I was under before coming to the Senate will not be available to me now that I am in the Senate. The Government has picked, yes, 29 different plans, and that is a lot, but that is not all that is available. I cannot take my money that is being spent for health care, deducted from my pay, go out in the open market and buy something else with it. I can only use it within the framework that this commission that he has described has made available to me.

Now, I will concede to him, absolutely, the commission he described did a good job and most employees will find that in the choices the Government offers they will find something that covers their needs. The point is that 29 choices is not the universe. If I want to make choice number 30, my employer—in this case the Government—has decreed that I cannot make choice number 30 with the money they are spending on my behalf for health care.

That is another debate for another time. We can have it. But I wanted to introduce it into this circumstance because I think it addresses the basic issue and goes back to the amendment that the Senator has offered.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Will the Senator yield for a closing thought?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. There were many more insurance plans than Blue Cross-Blue Shield involved at that time.

I just ask the Senator to contemplate the difference between the 25 to 29—and yes, there might be 30 on the one hand—as compared to the one that the Senator as president and chairman of the corporation which he ran picked out on behalf of his employees.

Mr. BENNETT. This is not the place to get into these details. I say the plan I chose had a number of choices within it so that the employees could make, frankly, almost as many choices as Government employees could make. Ultimately I had to make the decision as to what the framework would be for our employees. I made a decision to a plan that, in my opinion, was better than the one that is currently available to me.

My employees, I think, were better served with that decision that I was making than the Government employers and the decision you are talking about. Those are not appropriate questions here. We can have this discussion elsewhere. I think they go to the core of what has to be addressed when we talk about fixing the health care system in this country.

To summarize, and then I will return to my duties in the chair, I have always congratulated President Clinton on his leadership in addressing America's health care problems. I am one Republican who has been critical of my party's inability to exercise the proper leadership here. President Clinton did a courageous thing in taking this issue on. I had congratulated him at the time. I congratulated him all the way through, even while disagreeing with him on the details of his plan. I have congratulated him for his courage in being willing to face the fact that our health care system in this country is broken and badly needs fixing. I just do not think his solution fixed it. In my opinion, his solution made it worse.

I feel the same way about Medicare, that my party has had the courage to recognize that Medicare, to be handled as business as usual, is headed for disaster, and it is headed for disaster quickly. We have taken the political heat. We have taken the political rhetoric. We have been accused of slashing and burning. However, we have stood up to facing the problem.

As the Washington Post has said in its editorials, the Republicans deserve credit for telling the truth about Medicare and the Democrats have slipped into the posture of "Mediscare." That, in fact, does not add and contribute to the debate.

I thank my friend from West Virginia for the opportunity to have this exchange. I thank the Senator from Michigan for allowing me to escape the enforced silence of the chair long enough to vent my feelings on this issue, which I am sure will continue to provide opportunity for lots of dialog for lots of months and perhaps years to come.

I yield the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise to express my strong support for the

Rockefeller amendment on Medicare. The amendment restores \$50 billion to the Medicare Program. It keeps Medicare solvent. It honors our national commitment to seniors.

Haven't we been this way before? It's the same old story—big cuts in Medicare to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy. Yes, we must balance the budget and keep Medicare solvent. But we can do that with the President's budget.

I will fight to protect health care for all seniors. Medicare pays for medical care for almost 38 million seniors. Over 500,000 of these seniors live in my State of Maryland. In my travels to senior centers throughout the State, I hear the same thing over and over. Seniors tell me they're afraid of losing their Medicare coverage. They fear they won't be able to keep their own doctors. They are worried they will be forced into managed care plans.

Our seniors count on Medicare for their health care. I want to keep the CARE in Medicare. This amendment will do that. It protects seniors from excessive premium increases and out-of-pocket costs. It lets seniors keep their own doctors. It attacks fraud and abuse. Doctors and hospitals won't be able to charge patients above the cost of Medicare. And seniors will have access to care because it prevents the closing of rural and urban hospitals.

There has been a lot in the news lately about Medicare going bankrupt. I am concerned about the solvency of the Medicare trust fund. We owe it to what I like to call the GI Joe generation and future generations to keep Medicare solvent. The GI Joe generation is the generation that fought for freedom and democracy for the world during World War II. They didn't hesitate to serve. When the war was over, they came home, raised their families, and contributed to the greatest prosperity this Nation has ever known. We would not be a nation much less a world power today if it weren't for the GI Joe generation. They have worked hard all their lives and played by the rules. Now they need Medicare to be there for them. Promises made must be promises kept.

We can balance the budget with far fewer Medicare cuts. At the same time, we can keep Medicare solvent and protect seniors from new costs. The President's budget accomplishes these goals. Under his plan, the solvency of the trust fund is extended for 10 years.

Medicare is one of the best health care systems in the world. Before Medicare was enacted 30 years ago, less than 50 percent of seniors had health insurance. Now 99 percent do. Let's not dismantle this successful program.

I oppose increasing seniors' out-of-pocket costs. That's why I oppose balance billing. This lets doctors and hospitals charge patients above the cost of Medicare. It increases seniors out-of-pocket costs. Ninety-seven percent of Medicare funds are spent on recipients with incomes less than \$50,000. Seniors

already spend 21 percent of their income on health care. They can't afford to spend more. Let's not hurt middle-income Americans. We need to renew our commitment to help those who help themselves.

The budget cuts Medicare part A by \$98 billion. This part pays for hospitals and providers. We can't overlook the effect these drastic cuts will have on hospitals. What will happen to institutions like Johns Hopkins School of Medicine and the University of Maryland Medical School under these cuts? Cuts this large will put some hospitals out of business. It will cut down on the training of new doctors. And in the end, our seniors will be the ones hurt the most.

I say to my fellow Senators, do the right thing today. Don't balance the budget on the backs of our seniors. Preserve the Medicare Program. Let's keep our commitment to senior citizens.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I rise today in support of Senator ROCKEFELLER's amendment to reduce the size of the Medicare cuts to the level of the President's budget and to preserve the basic health care protections this nation now provides for senior citizens.

Without Medicare, many and perhaps most of the 38 million Americans who are Medicare beneficiaries would have inadequate health care and treatment—or no treatment at all. This year's Republican budget would cut Medicare by \$167 billion over 6 years, \$50 billion more than the President's budget. This cut would reduce Medicare spending growth far below projected private sector growth rates, resulting in reduced quality and access to health care for millions of Americans.

This year's Republican Medicare cuts are all too similar to last year's Medicare cuts. In their fiscal year 1996 budget, the Republicans would have cut Medicare by \$270 billion over a 7 year period to finance a \$245 billion tax cut primarily for America's wealthiest people. These cuts would have resulted in a \$9.5 billion loss to Massachusetts alone over the next 7 years. These cuts, if allocated evenly among all beneficiaries, would have cost each of the 900,000 seniors and disabled people who depend on Medicare an additional \$1,240 a year.

But this year's Republican cuts in Medicare are still too large and will risk turning Medicare into a second-class system for seniors who cannot afford to opt out of the traditional Medicare Program through Medical Savings accounts. It is also amazing that Republicans still have not disavowed their intention to increase premiums to pay for a tax cut. Our Nation's senior citizens, with an average annual income of \$17,000, spend more than 20 percent of their incomes on health care. Additional health care expenses would put an even greater burden on this population.

I believe that Medicare can be reformed without totally dismantling the

fundamental security that the system provides. The President's budget shows that premium increases, deep cuts, and damaging structural changes are not necessary to balance the budget and guarantee the solvency of the Medicare trust fund. By failing to identify and eliminate corporate subsidies, and adamantly insisting on tax cuts for the rich, the Republicans are forced to cut programs for middle-class Americans far deeper than the President's plan, and the Medicare Program is bearing the brunt of this attack.

Medicare is a part of Social Security, a contract between the Government and the people. People pay into the trust fund during their working years and then receive good health care in their retirement years. The Republicans would break this fundamental contract with the American people.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment offered by Senator ROCKEFELLER which I am proud to cosponsor. We must stop the Republicans from using the Medicare trust fund as a slush fund to pay for tax cuts. We must carefully and responsibly reform Medicare for the sake of preserving and strengthening Medicare and those who depend on it. The Republican budget really fails this test once again. In colloquial terms, Mr. President, "They just don't get it."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT). The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, might I ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Michigan? If this amendment which is about trying to restore \$50 billion to Medicare, is it the intention of the majority that we will discuss but not vote or that we will vote tonight?

Mr. ABRAHAM. It is my understanding, I say to Senator from West Virginia, we at least will not vote on anything before 8 o'clock. There is an agreement to not have any votes prior to that. At whatever point debate on the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia ends, if there is no further debate, I plan to speak briefly about it.

I am prepared to offer another amendment which, I think, would be in order, which will address Medicare and probably open up further discussion about the topic we have been discussing for the last half hour or so. Whatever point we decide there is no further debate on this, I am prepared to bring another amendment for discussion. I do not believe there is an agreement on specifically when we would vote. My understanding is we would not vote on anything prior to 8 o'clock.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I say to my friend that is approximately 22 minutes from now. Medicare is a pretty important subject. There may be people who want to speak. On the other hand, part of the deal around here is that if you want to say something you have to be here.

Can I assume that maybe by 8:30 or 9 o'clock we could vote?

Mr. ABRAHAM. I say to the Senator, I do not know of any other people right now on our side who are prepared to speak. I have been told several Members were coming to the floor earlier, but I have not seen them. I am not certain we will not have speakers. I have a few brief comments to make on the amendment before us, and I am prepared to bring up another amendment discussing the topic of Medicare that I presume we will debate for some period of time. I have received no further word from anyone on our side with an interest in speaking. I do not know whether on your side there are others who plan to come down.

It is my understanding there are approximately 30 minutes left on each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ABRAHAM. And I can offer my amendment when we either exhaust the time or it has been yielded back.

Mr. President, I will speak to the amendment for such time as I may need at this point. I want to make a couple of points, following up on my earlier statement. As you know, Mr. President, I expressed the concern that we have on our side over the way the President has attempted to address the Medicare issue. Specifically, the provisions in his budgets which would transfer the home health care expenditures from the part A to the part B fund.

The Senator from West Virginia has indicated that the rationale from a policy standpoint for doing this is the fact that some 16 years ago, or just prior to the year 1980, there was a limit on the duration of part A's coverage for home health care and a prerequisite of a previous hospitalization was necessary to trigger that part A coverage.

I only say this. If we are going to use as a standard for changes in Medicare the fact that at one time we did it differently, there would certainly be plenty of other Medicare-related issues then that would fall under that policy justification. For example, last year, there was a pretty significant debate here before the Senate over the question of the percentage of part B premium that would be paid by the recipients, by the people in the Medicare Program, a debate on whether or not the percentage would be dropped from 31 to 25 percent. It was argued at that time that we should not maintain a 31 percent, we should reduce it. That is a debate that has passed, but the fact is, there was a time in the program where the percentage of co-pay of the part B recipients was much higher than 31 percent.

So I do not think it is at least a reasonable justification to say that, because 17 years ago, the Medicare Program was structured a certain way, that that alone, or in any sense, is a justification to return to that approach. The same, presumably, is true for a variety of other ratios, formulas, reimbursements, and so on, whether it is for direct medical, education, or

other components. Clearly, they have changed over the years. It just seems to me that to say we can move home health care out of part A because at one time it was structured differently does not reach the most important element here, which is, by doing this, we are changing dramatically the expectations of part A Medicare recipients.

Those people believe that home health care is, in fact, part of that trust program. It is, in fact, not subject to the availability of funds or the need to either increase taxes or find other spending cuts to justify payments for it. And that is why we feel the President's budget does not really meet the challenge for us.

I would like to say a couple of other things with respect to the specifics of the amendment before us. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the President's Medicare proposal would not maintain solvency of the part A Medicare trust fund for the full 10 years that we want. In fact, the projection is that it would be insolvent by the year 2005. Now, I would like to bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that, in the President's budget, the reductions in the growth—I will give the President the benefit of the doubt and not call it a cut. By reducing the growth by \$116 billion, the President's budget maintains solvency not for 10 years but for 9 years. If, in fact, the \$50 billion that is proposed in this amendment were used to increase the rate of growth of the Medicare Program, as proposed in our budget, then the actual total net change under our budget would only be \$108 billion over the period of time our budget covers, through 2002. In other words, it would be less savings than in the President's budget. So, in other words, if this amendment were to pass, Mr. President, then we would be, in fact, not ensuring the solvency of part A of the trust fund as long as the President even does, and we believe on this side that the President's proposal to maintain solvency through 2005 is not adequate.

So I think it is important for our colleagues to understand that, in supporting this, they are in fact supporting an amendment that would bring about the insolvency even earlier than that which would be the case under the President's budget, and certainly which would be the case under our budget.

I also wanted to clear up one other point, Mr. President. In the tax cut provisions in the budget we are offering, the total amount of \$122 billion, I believe, is targeted—it does not, in fact, even cover fully the \$500-per-child tax credit. So there, in fact, would not be enough money to fund the other tax cuts beyond the \$500 tax credit in the budget which we have.

To summarize, we have several facts that I think need to be revisited. First, the Medicare trust fund is going broke. At the current rate of growth in spending, at the current rate of projection

from the Congressional Budget Office, it will go broke in 2001. We cannot let that happen, Mr. President.

Second, I think we want to make sure that its solvency is not maintained for a short duration of time—3, 4, 5, 6 years—but we want it to be solvent for 10 years. The President's budget would not accomplish that. If this amendment passes, our budget would not accomplish that either.

Finally, we on the majority side do not want to eliminate the home health care protections under the part A trust fund. The President's budget would do that and, obviously, there is a sharp difference there.

So, in short, Mr. President, we are prepared and desire to fix and repair the trust fund and maintain solvency for a decade. We think that is the least we can do to address this problem at this time. In our judgment, at least, anything short of that does not meet the mark, does not provide our seniors with the protections they need, does not provide the trust fund with the protection it needs.

We want to give families a chance to keep more of what they earn. That is why we have the money in this budget for a tax cut. But it is not connected to the Medicare issue at all. Once again, to portray it that way is simply inaccurate. We have the Medicare part A trust fund headed toward bankruptcy. For the first time, in 1995, it was actually spending more than it was taking in. The time has come to repair it for a sufficient period of time, and to allow us to focus on a broader and even longer term fix, which is clearly needed.

I yield the floor.

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT). The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, in keeping with what we have done several times today, I ask unanimous consent at this time that the Senator from Georgia be recognized for appropriate remarks on the tragedy that faced all of us today, especially the U.S. Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN], is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO ADMIRAL BOORDA

Mr. NUNN. I thank my friend from Nebraska. I join my colleagues in being both shocked and deeply saddened by the sudden death of Adm. Mike Boorda, Chief of Naval Operations. Admiral Boorda had a truly remarkable career in the Navy. Many people do not recognize it and do not realize it, but Mike Boorda rose from the lowest enlisted rank to become the most senior officer in the Navy. He never forgot where he came from. The welfare of the men and women of the Navy were always foremost in his thoughts and in his actions. He never let us forget that when he testified before the committee. The men

and women of the Navy were first for him. He was always looking for additional ways to help the Navy families and, particularly, the people who served in the Navy and those who are directly affected by that service.

Admiral Boorda was well-known to Members of the Senate, and to the Armed Services Committee, for his devotion to the Navy and the ideals of military service. He was always available and helpful. Never have I asked a single question when he was not responsive immediately, if the information were available. I had the opportunity to work closely with Mike Boorda over the years on a wide variety of projects and programs, particularly during his service as Chief of Naval Personnel, as commander of Joint Task Force Provide Promise, which was responsible for the mission throughout the Balkans, and as Chief of Naval Operations. Many of us have been briefed by Admiral Boorda when he was head of that task force in a very tough period during the Balkans problems. I visited him overseas when he was planning the Bosnia operations, and I relied on his wise counsel many times.

Mr. President, I could go on and on about Mike Boorda. I will summarize it by saying that he was a superb military commander and a true friend. Admiral Boorda was an inspiring leader and a man of vision. I extend my deepest sympathies to his wife, Bettie, to his children, David, Edward, Anna and Robert, and to his many friends and admirers in the Navy and throughout this great country.

I thank the Chair and my colleagues.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

The Senate continued with the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, we have had a good debate. I believe that both the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from West Virginia are prepared to yield back the remainder of the time, and that would allow us to continue to go back to the Republican side for the next amendment. I believe that amendment will be offered by the Senator from Michigan.

As I understand it, it is on the same subject that we have discussed quite thoroughly. Maybe we can cut back on the use of some of this time. I would simply like to emphasize that while it may generally not be understood in the Senate, it is not a disgrace to not use the whole hour on each side on all of these amendments. It is perfectly acceptable and it is certainly respectable to yield back time so that we can move ahead on amendments.

Depending on what happens, as you know, we temporarily set aside, in agreement with the chairman of the committee, so that we could move ahead. We are not going to have any votes before 8 o'clock. I would simply suggest that if the two managers of the

measure before us are ready to yield back this time and set the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia up for a vote when agreed to by the managers of the bill, then we could move to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan and start debating that.

Mr. ABRAHAM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield back time?

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, the majority is prepared to yield the remainder of its time on the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I want to say one sentence and then yield the remainder of my time.

The Senate GOP resolution and the Clinton budget both achieve the same short-term solvency. Dr. June O'Neill has certified that the Hospital trust fund will be solvent until the year 2005 under the President's plan.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, now that all time has been yielded, I ask unanimous consent to lay aside temporarily the ROCKEFELLER amendment and proceed with the next amendment that I understand under the agreement would be the one to be offered by the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3980

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, at this time I would like to offer an amendment for myself and Senator DOMENICI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM), for himself and Mr. DOMENICI, proposes an amendment numbered 3980.

Mr. ABRAHAM. 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:

At the Appropriate Place in the Bill insert the following:

SEC. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING CHANGES IN THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that, in achieving the spending levels specified in this resolution—

(1) the public Trustees of medicare have concluded that "the medicare program is clearly unsustainable in its present form";

(2) the President has said his goal is to keep the medicare hospital insurance trust fund solvent for more than a decade, but his budget transfers \$55 billion of home health spending from medicare part A to medicare part B;

(3) the transfer of home health spending threatens the delivery of home health services to 3.5 million Medicare beneficiaries;

(4) such a transfer increases the burden on general revenues, including income taxes paid by working Americans, by \$55 billion;

(5) such a transfer artificially inflates the solvency of the medicare hospital insurance trust fund, misleading the Congress, medicare beneficiaries, and working taxpayers;

(6) the Director of the Congressional Budget Office has certified that, without such a

transfer, the President's budget extends the solvency of the hospital insurance trust fund for only one additional year; and

(7) without misleading transfers, the President's budget therefore fails to achieve his own stated goal for the medicare hospital insurance trust fund.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that, in achieving the spending levels specified in this resolution, the Congress assumes that the Congress would—

(1) keep the medicare hospital insurance trust fund solvent for more than a decade, as recommended by the President; and

(2) accept the President's proposed level of medicare part B savings of \$44.1 billion over the period 1997 through 2002; but would

(3) reject the President's proposal to transfer home health spending from one part of medicare to another, which threatens the delivery of home health care services to 3.5 million Medicare beneficiaries, artificially inflates the solvency of the medicare hospital insurance trust fund, and increases the burden on general revenues, including income taxes paid by working Americans, by \$55 billion.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, the amendment that I have sent to the desk is a sense-of-the-Senate amendment regarding changes in the Medicare Program. It is certainly in keeping with the sentiments which have been expressed by both the Senator from Michigan as well as the current Presiding Officer when he was here on the floor a few minutes ago.

Just to go through the salient points of the amendment, the amendment, in achieving the spending levels specified in this resolution, says that the public trustees of Medicare have concluded that the Medicare Program is currently unsustainable in its present form;

Two, the President said that it is his goal to keep the Medicare hospital trust fund solvent for more than a decade, but his budget transfers \$55 billion of home health care spending from part A to part B Medicare;

Three, that the transfer of home health spending threatens the delivery of home health care services to some 3.5 million Medicare beneficiaries;

Four, that such a transfer increases the burden on general revenues and income taxes paid by working Americans by \$55 billion;

Five, that such a transfer artificially inflates the solvency of the Medicare hospital insurance trust fund, misleading the Congress, Medicare beneficiaries, and working taxpayers;

Six, that the Director of the Congressional Budget Office has certified that without such a transfer, the President's budget extends the solvency of the hospital insurance trust fund for only 1 additional year;

And, seven, that without transfers, the President's budget, therefore, fails to achieve his own stated goal for the Medicare hospital insurance trust fund.

Therefore, it is our amendment's sense of the Congress that in achieving the spending levels specified in this resolution, the Congress assumes that the Congress would keep the Medicare hospital trust fund solvent for more than a decade as recommended by the

President and accept the President's proposed level of Medicare part B savings of \$44.1 billion over the period 1997 through 2002 but would reject the President's proposal to transfer home health spending from one part of Medicare to the another, a transfer which would threaten the delivery of home health care services to 3.5 million Medicare beneficiaries.

Mr. President, this sense-of-the-Senate amendment incorporates much of what I have been talking about here tonight and much of what we discussed during our deliberations in the Budget Committee. It is our goal on the majority side to try to achieve the two objectives that have been set forth by the President, at least his stated objectives: One, to make sure with the part A transfer of funds that Medicare remains solvent for a decade; and, two, achieve savings of approximately \$44 billion in the part B portion of Medicare.

We just do not think that is the way to do this or that it is an appropriate way to accomplish this objective by transferring vital services that have been covered by the trust fund into the part B portion of Medicare, the area that is not covered by the trust fund. We believe it is essential that the Congress be on record clearly as stating that.

So, for those reasons, we offer this sense-of-the-Congress amendment here tonight. We hope that our colleagues will support it. We feel, as I have been talking for the last hour, and others, the Presiding Officer as well, that we are headed, with respect to the part A trust fund, in a direction of insolvency far sooner than anticipated, that, in fact, with the trust fund now operating at a deficit for the first time in history, we are waiting for the new projections, but the day of reckoning is much closer at hand.

We do not think it is appropriate to stand by while the trust fund moves quickly toward insolvency. We recognize the need to act now, and act decisively. It is not inappropriate to act decisively by restraining the growth in the ways we are recommending. We are doing what is necessary to protect the fund from going bankrupt and making sure that protection extends for a decade.

Similarly, we accept the President's proposal to try to reduce the part B expenses in the growth of Medicare by \$44 billion under this budget. We think that is the most appropriate way to address the Medicare problems at this time. We would strongly urge our colleagues to reject the previous amendment at the proper time, when we come to vote, and to instead support our sense-of-the-Congress resolution which embodies much of what is in our budget as presented to the Senate here this evening.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, in responding, first of all, I say to my friend from Michigan, this is a resolution of the Congress as opposed to hard law. This is, I think, something by which the Senator is trying to express his views.

Just a few moments ago I went through the policy aspects of why this had all happened. As the Senator from Michigan indicated, before 1980 it was divided between part A and part B, and then I described the conditions at that time. I described what the Congress did after that to improve Medicare's home health care benefit—remove the 100-day limit and the 3-day hospitalization requirement, and, as a result, financing of all home health care services were shipped into part A. Then I said, even though part A was never intended to pay for long-term home health care benefits, and then I went on to say that the President's proposal restores the financing of the home health care benefit back to the Congress' original intent.

So much for the policy. I think, frankly, that it is all right to talk about the politics of this issue.

Mr. President, we did not hear anything about this issue last year. I guess that is because back then the Republicans were proposing it. In fact, every single House Republican who voted for last year's Republican budget voted in favor of a very similar transfer of funding for home health care. I am talking about the politics because I am trying to question the underlying meaning of this resolution.

So the Republicans now say that the home health care financing shift is a shell game. But they have played the game themselves. I have been talking about the House. The Senate Republicans also voted in favor of shifting money between part B and part A to improve the solvency of the hospital trust fund.

In fact, during markup in the Finance Committee, Senator NICKLES offered an amendment which the Republicans adopted that deposited part B money into part A trust funds to improve the solvency of the part A trust fund. The only policy behind Senator NICKLES' proposal was to provide political cover, if I may say so, in that they were trying to hide that they were using Medicare money to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy, but the public, as I indicated, saw through that aspect of it.

Mr. President, last year, the Republicans said that they wanted the President to submit a budget that was certified by the CBO as being in balance after 7 years. The President has done that. In addition, Dr. June O'Neill, as I said a moment ago, has certified that the President's plan extends solvency of the trust fund to the year 2005. So there is no difference. It achieves the same level of solvency but without the drastic hospital cuts that the Republicans are proposing.

I believe the President's policy has merit. So did the Republicans last

year. I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMS). Who yields time?

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as may be necessary. I wish to make a few comments about the situation here at hand.

I want to take people to Nebraska, which is a very typical State in the Midwest part of our great country. It is very typical from the standpoint of being a substantial rural State with lots of rural, small communities and is also typical of the Great Plains States and some of the other States of the Union.

Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment of my colleague from West Virginia. I am a cosponsor of that amendment. The Medicare reductions in this budget are too large and are not required to balance the budget and extend the life of the Medicare hospital insurance trust fund through at least the year 2005. I am particularly concerned about the deep and disproportionate cuts that will be borne by hospitals, particularly rural hospitals. The Senate Budget Committee said its \$170 billion in reductions and spending growth would include a \$123 billion reduction in Medicare part A. This will threaten the quality and the financial viability of hospitals, particularly the rural and inner-city hospitals. Previous Republican budgets slowed the rate of growth in hospital payments, but under this year's plan the Congress may need to adopt policies that would actually reduce payments, not simply reduce the rate of increase in these payments. Under any definition, that represents a true cut in spending. So we will not have to get into all that argument that we continually get into about what is a cut.

What I am talking about is it appears to me from some of the other information that I will furnish the Senate during these remarks that what we are threatened with is a real cut. That means less dollars, less dollars and cents than last year, and by any definition that is a cut.

I recently received a letter from Harlan Heald that I will read. Harlan Heald is an acquaintance of many, many years way back to the time when I was Governor of Nebraska, and if there is a Mr. Rural Hospital in Nebraska, it is Mr. Heald. Mr. Heald is President of the Nebraska Association of Hospital and Health Systems. They are not a political organization. They are an organization that devotes time, talent and effort to represent the people who provide hospital services in rural Nebraska primarily.

According to Mr. Heald's analysis, a reduction of \$50 billion would have a devastating impact on Nebraska hospitals. Mr. Heald writes, and I quote:

Sixty-five rural hospitals would lose \$69.1 million over 7 years and 12 large rural hos-

pitals would lose \$100 million. Thirty out of Nebraska's 65 small rural hospitals would lose money in providing care.

Mr. President, I will ask unanimous consent that the full text of Mr. Heald's letter be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, after I read that letter, because there are so many interesting factual and true statements in it, not from a political standpoint but from what the Republican effort and the Republican bill will do to rural Nebraska. If it is going to do something to rural Nebraska, it is going to do it to rural North Dakota and rural South Dakota and rural Kansas, and rural Oklahoma, and every rural State in the United States of America.

These are the consequences of the \$50 billion reduction over 7 years. What would be the impact then of a \$123 billion reduction over 6 years that we are now faced with? A loss of this magnitude in a State where Medicare patients account for 60 to 70 percent of hospital admissions clearly threatens the health care system on which all of us depend. Several hospitals in my State are teetering on the brink of insolvency while we are here talking about the bankruptcy of Medicare.

This latest Republican proposal will very likely drive them over the edge.

Mr. President, I wish to read from the letter that I have just referenced. This letter is dated May 14, 1996, addressed to me.

DEAR SENATOR EXON: I have reviewed a summary of the current fiscal year 1997 House and Senate Budget Committee proposal with respect to the Medicare Program. On behalf of the 94 acute care hospitals in Nebraska, I wish to call your attention to a very serious potential problem.

While it appears that the overall Medicare budget reductions of \$158 billion are roughly the same as those in the last Republican proposal in January, the budget committees have significantly altered the allocation of reductions within the program, reducing part A spending by \$123 billion versus the \$77.5 billion proposed in January.

We have been told on numerous occasions that the reductions are not cuts—

This is not in the letter. I just want to add here, how many times have we heard that here? Back to the letter.

but are reductions in the rate of spending over a 6-year period. The current budget resolution includes lower budget reductions in part B of Medicare, while the reductions in part A have been significantly increased since the January proposal. The larger Medicare Part A reductions in the current proposal means hospitals will experience actual reductions in payments—not merely a reduction in the rate of payment increase.

We are talking about real cuts here. I am away from the letter. We are talking about real cuts here, when every time we talk about cuts, people stand up and say, Oh, only in Washington, DC, is an increase a cut. I have always said we must legislate to real needs, what the costs are going to be.

Another editorial comment before I go on with reading this letter from an expert on the subject in Nebraska, and that, Mr. President, is simply this: I

am convinced that the reductions in the amount for real needs that the Republicans have been espousing are below the projected costs and rises in health care over the next 6 years.

Putting that another way, what I am saying is that the Republicans have been saying, "Oh, well, this is not a cut, this is just a slowing down of the growth." Time and time again that has been used on the floor of the U.S. Senate. Mr. Heald brings us back to reality by saying what I indicated when I first started talking on this subject, that these cuts are not simply a reduction in the growth. They are cuts, dollars and cents, below what hospitals have received before. Back to the letter:

Although I have not received enough detail to permit me to make an analysis of the impact of the proposed reduction in Medicaid Part A spending, I do have information from an earlier proposal last fall that looked at Part A reductions of about \$50 billion out of the total reductions over a seven-year period. Although it is a "crude" approximation, the impact on Nebraska hospitals looks like this:

Sixty-five small rural hospitals would lose an aggregate of \$69.1 million during the seven-year period of 1996 to 2002. Twelve large rural hospitals would lose a total of \$100.4 million, and 11 metropolitan (Lincoln and Omaha) hospitals would lose \$337.4 million, during the seven-year period. Note—In 1994, 30 hospitals out of Nebraska's 65 small rural hospitals lost money providing care.

Let me repeat that:

In 1994, 30 hospitals out of Nebraska's 65 small rural hospitals lost money providing care.

Again, this is based on a Part A reduction of about \$50 billion over a 7-year period. I hate to think what these numbers might resemble under the current proposal with Medicare Part A targeted for a \$123 billion hit.

Reimbursement reductions of this magnitude in a state with a disproportionate share of the elderly population, a state in which Medicare patients account for 60 to 70 percent of hospital admissions, clearly threatens the health care system upon which all of us depend.

Medicare needs to be fixed. There is an opportunity for Congress to change Medicare, but the change must be driven by sound health care policy, not budgetary or political imperatives. The proposed Medicare reductions would crush Nebraska hospitals.

As always, Nebraska hospitals look to your leadership.

Mr. President, I also would like to read a letter from the following groups: The American Association of Eye and Ear Hospitals, the American Hospital Association, the American Osteopathic Healthcare Association, the Association of American Medical Colleges, Catholic Health Association, Federation of American Health Systems, InterHealth, National Association of Children's Hospitals, National Association of Public Hospitals and Health Systems, and Premier. This letter is dated May 10, and it is addressed by those organizations I just read, to the Honorable WILLIAM ROTH, chairman, Committee on Finance.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROTH: The undersigned organizations representing hospitals and health care systems have reviewed the Fiscal Year 1997 House and Senate Budget Commit-

tee proposal, particularly with respect to Medicare and Medicaid programs.

While it appears that the overall Medicare budget reductions of \$167 billion are roughly the same as those in the Republican offer in January, the Budget Committees have significantly changed the allocation of reductions within the program.

The letter goes on and essentially makes the same exact points made by the letter that I read, by Harlan Heald.

So the professionals know what is going on. We know what is going on here. I must continue to make the point that Nebraska is not unique in this. But if you have a hospital, because of the aging population in rural areas of America in toto, where 60 to 70 percent, and some places higher, have their beds dedicated to people who are eligible and receive Medicare, and for many of them that is the only health care system available to them, and you compare that with a hospital, for example in Lincoln or Omaha or other more metropolitan areas that have their patients coming in only about 20 to 25 percent seniors, you quickly understand that what we are doing here is socking it right between the eyes of the rural hospitals in the United States of America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent both of the letters I have referenced be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEBRASKA ASSOCIATION OF
HOSPITALS AND HEALTH SYSTEMS,
May 14, 1996.

Hon. J. JAMES EXON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR EXON: I have reviewed a summary of the current Fiscal Year 1997 (FY '97) House and Senate Budget Committee proposal with respect to the Medicare program. On behalf of the 94 acute care hospitals in Nebraska, I wish to call your attention to a serious potential problem.

While it appears that the overall Medicare budget reductions of \$158 billion are roughly the same as those in the last Republican proposal in January, the Budget Committees have significantly altered the allocation of reductions within the program, reducing Medicare Part A spending by \$123 billion vs. \$77.5 billion proposed in January.

We have been told on numerous occasions that the reductions are not cuts, but are reductions in the rate of spending over the six-year period. The current budget resolution includes lower budget reductions in Part B of Medicare, while the reductions in Part A have been significantly increased since the January proposal. The larger Medicare Part A reductions in the current proposal mean hospitals will experience actual reductions in payments—not merely a reduction in the rate of payment increase.

Although I have not received enough detail to permit me to make an analysis of the impact of the proposed reduction in Medicare Part A spending, I do have information from an earlier proposal last fall that looked at Part A reductions of about \$50 billion out of total reductions over a seven-year period. Although it is a "crude" approximation, the impact on Nebraska hospitals looked like this:

"Sixty-five small rural hospitals would lose an aggregate of \$69.1 million during the

seven-year period of 1996 to 2002. Twelve large rural hospitals would lose a total of \$100.4 million, and 11 metropolitan (Lincoln and Omaha) hospitals would lose \$337.4 million during the seven-year period. Note—In 1994, 30 hospitals out of Nebraska's 65 small rural hospitals lost money providing care."

Again, this is based upon a Part A reduction of about \$50 billion over a seven-year period. I hate to think what these numbers might resemble under the current proposal with Medicare Part A targeted for a \$123 billion hit.

Reimbursement reductions of this magnitude in a state with a disproportionate share of the elderly population, a state in which Medicare patients account for 60 to 70 percent of hospital admissions, clearly threatens the health care system upon which all of us depend.

Medicare needs to be fixed. There is an opportunity for Congress to change Medicare, but the change must be driven by sound health care policy, not budgetary or political imperatives. The proposed Medicare reductions would crush Nebraska hospitals.

As always, Nebraska's hospitals look to your leadership.

Sincerely,

HARLAN M. HEALD,
President.

MAY 10, 1996.

Hon. WILLIAM ROTH, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROTH: The undersigned organizations representing hospitals and health systems have reviewed the Fiscal Year 1997 (FY 97) House and Senate Budget Committee proposal, particularly with respect to the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

While it appears that the overall Medicare budget reductions of \$167 billion are roughly the same as those in the last Republican offer in January, the Budget Committees have significantly changed the allocation of reductions within the program. While it is difficult to assess the overall impact of the budget resolution in the absence of greater detail, now larger Medicare Part A reductions mean hospitals are likely to experience actual reductions in payment rates under the committees' proposal.

The budget resolution now includes lower budget reductions in Part B of Medicare, while the reductions in Part A have increased by approximately \$25 billion since the January offer. While the FY 97 budget resolution offers a milder overall approach to deficit reduction compared to last year's resolution, its impact on hospitals appears worse. To achieve reductions of this magnitude, Congress may need to adopt policies resulting in payment rates per beneficiary that would be frozen or actually reduced.

We also have serious concerns about the Budget Committees' Medicaid reductions. We would like to take this opportunity to reiterate our support for maintaining the entitlement nature of the Medicaid program to ensure that those who have coverage today will continue to have coverage tomorrow. Furthermore, we support maintaining current law provider assessment restrictions and Boren amendment payment safeguards. While the overall reductions are somewhat lower than the January offer, if combined with corresponding state reductions through lower state matching requirements or new provider assessments, these reductions could be quite significant for providers.

Hospitals and health systems support the need to adopt a reasonable deficit reduction package, and believe that changes in Medicare are needed to keep the Part A trust fund solvent. Many of us have supported various proposals that achieve a balanced budget with reductions in Medicare and Medicaid.

However, we are gravely concerned about the level of reductions proposed by the Budget Committees in these programs.

We strongly urge you to reconsider both the overall level of Medicare and Medicaid reductions included in the budget resolution and, in your capacity as chairman of the authorizing committee, adjust the allocation between Parts A and B proposed by the Budget Committees.

American Association of Eye and Ear Hospitals, American Hospital Association, American Osteopathic Healthcare Association, Association of American Medical Colleges, Catholic Health Association, Federation of American Health Systems, InterHealth, National Association of Children's Hospitals, National Association of Public Hospitals and Health Systems, Premier.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I understand at this time we are trying to reach a unanimous consent agreement to have a vote at 8:30. Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. ABRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. EXON. Go ahead.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a vote occur on or in relation to the Rockefeller amendment, to be followed by a vote on or in relation to the Abraham amendment, beginning at 8:30 p.m. this evening, with the first vote being the standard 15-minute vote, the following vote being limited to 10 minutes in length.

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object, I do not want to object because the Senator knows I have been waiting for quite a while. I would like to ask if we could have debate on the Boxer Medicaid amendment immediately following the vote, so we can get that done. There are Senators who wish to speak to it. I will be glad to agree to a reasonable time agreement.

But it is very important to this Senator because this is the time I can debate. I want to make sure I can get it done tonight.

Mr. EXON. Let me respond to the Senator from my perspective, and I cannot speak for the majority. We are now considering the Abraham amendment. We will vote on that. If this unanimous consent request is agreed to—and if I agree to it, I must say—immediately following that, we would be up for consideration of an amendment from the Democratic side. I have indicated to my friend from California that she would be first up with her amendment.

So I will simply say, after the vote, you would, as far as I am concerned, be recognized to offer your amendment. If it is possible—obviously it is not between now and the scheduled vote at 8:30—I would certainly recommend to Chairman DOMENICI that we proceed with the order which would allow you to follow the vote.

Mrs. BOXER. I am sure that then there would be a Democratic amendment; is that part of the agreement, immediately following the vote on the Abraham amendment?

Mr. ABRAHAM. We have not agreed to that at this point. Let me just state

for the benefit of all our colleagues, it is also my understanding there is an interest on both sides to proceed at some point to a vote on the President's budget tonight. I think, as I understand, the Senator from California would like to have debate on her amendment tonight, not necessarily a final vote tonight.

So I think we can work out something else: A vote on the President's budget can take place in a way that would allow those Members who have other obligations to fulfill them this evening and still accommodate your desire to have the debate, for the next amendment to be yours. But I do not think we have worked those two parts out. I think on your side there is an interest in making both of those things happen. I guess we just have not proceeded to the point of having that agreement worked out. This is as far as we were able to, basically, negotiate.

Mrs. BOXER. If my friend will yield, I am reassured by the conversation of the two managers. I feel comfortable that sometime this evening—and I am willing to stay here as late as necessary—I will have an opportunity to do that. With that verbal assurance, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. EXON. I say to my friend from California, there has been one or two attempts previously to include what would follow in a unanimous consent agreement. We have shied away from that and not made that kind of commitment at all. I suspect we will not be able to at this time.

I simply say that I think there is every likelihood that we may, if we can break the logjam, get a vote on the President's budget that this Senator has been trying to accomplish since 11 o'clock this morning. That may happen before the debate on your amendment, but I think there is every likelihood that you will have an opportunity to offer your amendment and engage in a debate, whether that is at 10 o'clock or 1 a.m. tomorrow morning, sometime in that general timeframe.

Mrs. BOXER. I am gratefully reassured. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to get an indication of how much time has been used on each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has used about 39½ minutes. That is how much time is remaining in the debate.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Approximately 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has used approximately 20 minutes, and the Senator from Michigan has used approximately 10 minutes.

Mr. ABRAHAM. I am wondering in light of that—we have Senator FRIST who has been hoping to have a chance to speak to this. There are only about 5 minutes left. Can we agree to let him finish the debate to the point that the

vote has been agreed to? With that, I yield to the Senator from Tennessee until the vote is at hand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for approximately 6 minutes.

Mr. FRIST. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I rise in support of the sense-of-the-Congress amendment of the distinguished Senator from Michigan. Just to bring it back, because we have been traveling a great deal over the last hour, that particular amendment says that the Congress assumes that Congress would keep the Medicare hospital insurance trust fund solvent for more than a decade, as recommended by the President; No. 2, accepts the President's proposed level of Medicare part B savings; and No. 3 and most important, what I would like to speak to is reject the President's proposal to transfer home health spending from one part of Medicare to another which threatens the delivery of home health care services to 3.5 million Medicare beneficiaries.

Mr. President, it was exactly 13, almost 14, months ago that we all received the status of the Social Security and Medicare Programs which was compiled and written by six trustees, three of whom were from President Clinton's Cabinet. In that, they use very simple words. And, again, this is 14 months ago. We are waiting for the April edition—it is a month, a month and a half late now—of this so-called Medicare trustees' report.

The very first page says:

The Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, which pays inpatient hospital expenses—

Which I should add is part A—will be able to pay benefits for only about 7 years and is severely out of financial balance in the long range.

Mr. President, it continues to say that:

The trustees believe prompt, effective and decisive action is necessary.

Last year, we took that action. We passed in this body a proposal that would save and preserve Medicare. It was sent to the President of the United States and it was vetoed.

The Medicare trustees' report basically said this. This is 1995 and the year 2000. This is bankruptcy on this line. This is the Medicare part A trust fund. Last year, the report said we would be going bankrupt in 7 years, the blue line.

What we have found happen over the last 14 months is that things are much worse than we had even anticipated at the time. Without doing anything over the last year and a half, in large part because of scare tactics put on television to scare our senior citizens away from change which will preserve this program, we now find that Medicare is going to be going bankrupt almost a year and a half earlier unless we act. It is 1996. We have about 5 years before Medicare goes bankrupt.

That is part A. Medicare part A is hospitals, part B physicians. Part A is

going bankrupt much quicker than we ever anticipated. The President's answer to that is,

Let's take the fastest growing part, the home health care out of part A and transfer it elsewhere and then we can say part A is solvent long term and we'll feel good about that.

That is more gimmickry. That is more smoke and mirrors. It is really deceptive to the American people. We need to make part A truly solvent. To make it truly solvent, we need to address the real problem. This is the amount of deficit spending. We began deficit spending last year. The trustee report said it would be next year. It actually began last year.

A report from the monthly Treasury statement, the highlight of fiscal year 1996 through March 31, tells that for the first 6 months of this year, we are running a \$4 billion deficit. We are on our way to bankruptcy.

Mr. President, the problem that we have today in this transfer of home health care is this: If we transfer this \$55 billion of assets out of the part A trust fund and put it elsewhere, yes, we can say part A is solvent for 10 years, but the overall Medicare Program is not, and unless the overall Medicare Program is solvent, we cannot deliver care to those 37 million Americans out there. More smoke and mirrors. Let us say we do not transfer that \$55 billion of home health care out, then what happens to the solvency of the trust fund? You can see that it is going to go bankrupt between the year 2000 and the year 2001. Therefore, we must act and we must act decisively.

How do we respond? In the balanced budget resolution proposal which is before us, we can see that we have solvency out to the year 2006. This is 1996, 2006, this line is solvency. Current law, if we do nothing, we are bankrupt in the year 2001.

Under the President's proposal, we extend that 1 year—only 1 year. That will scare seniors once they know that. We need to look at that balanced budget proposal, look what we do by opening it up, allowing some competition, slowing the growth from 10 percent down to 6 percent, and that is not a cut. We are slowing the growth from 10 to 6.1 percent. We are going to increase spending from \$4,800 in 1995 to \$7,000 a year in the year 2002. That is not a cut.

Mr. President, by supporting this sense-of-the-Senate amendment, we do

reject the President's proposal to transfer home health spending. Why? Because it is more gimmickry, it does not assure long-term solvency of the Medicare trust funds. I urge all my colleagues to vote to support this amendment.

Mr. ABRAHAM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ABRAHAM. 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. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3979

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, in accordance with the earlier unanimous consent agreement, at this time I move to table the Rockefeller amendment, and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on the motion to lay on the table the Rockefeller amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM] is necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 117 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Abraham	Coverdell	Grassley
Ashcroft	Craig	Gregg
Bennett	D'Amato	Hatch
Bond	DeWine	Hatfield
Brown	Dole	Heflin
Burns	Domenici	Helms
Campbell	Faircloth	Hutchinson
Chafee	Frist	Inhofe
Coats	Gorton	Jeffords
Cochran	Gramm	Kempthorne
Cohen	Grams	Kerrey

CHAIRMAN'S MARK BUDGET AGGREGATES

[Dollars in billions]

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	6-year total
Discretionary:								
Defense	265	265	263	266	269	268	268	1599
Nondefense	271	271	264	260	256	250	249	1551
Subtotal discretionary	536	536	527	526	526	518	516	3150
Mandatory:								
Social Security	348	365	383	402	422	444	467	2484
Medicare	196	209	224	236	249	263	279	1459
Medicaid	96	105	111	117	126	133	139	731
Welfare programs	85	89	89	102	100	98	106	583
EITC (outlays)	16	18	18	19	20	20	21	116
Other mandatory	57	62	82	71	83	84	82	464
Net interest	240	242	244	243	240	238	236	1444
Total outlays	1575	1626	1678	1717	1764	1798	1846	10430

Kyl
Lott
Lugar
Mack
McCain
McConnell
Murkowski
Nickles

Nunn
Pressler
Roth
Santorum
Shelby
Simpson
Smith
Snowe

Specter
Stevens
Thomas
Thompson
Thurmond
Warner

NAYS—43

Akaka
Baucus
Biden
Bingaman
Boxer
Bradley
Breaux
Bryan
Bumpers
Byrd
Conrad
Daschle
Dodd
Dorgan
Exon

Feingold
Feinstein
Ford
Glenn
Graham
Harkin
Hollings
Inouye
Johnston
Kennedy
Kerry
Kohl
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin

Lieberman
Mikulski
Moseley-Braun
Moynihan
Murray
Pell
Reid
Robb
Rockefeller
Sarbanes
Simon
Wellstone
Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Kassebaum

Pryor

The motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 3979) was agreed to.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, in the vote to table the Rockefeller amendment, I supported the budget resolution, which is moderate and maintains the solvency of Medicare.

Contrary to the argument that there are Medicare cuts, the fact is that Medicare expenditures increase by an average of 6.1 percent annually with the following total expenditures each year: 1996, \$196 billion; 1997, \$209 billion; 1998, \$224 billion; 1999, \$236 billion; 2000, \$249 billion; 2001, \$263 billion; 2002, \$279 billion.

On the 1996 budget resolution, I voted to increase Medicare expenditures when the rate of increase was reduced by \$268 billion and there was a tax cut of \$245 billion. In this budget resolution, the tax cut is limited to \$122 billion to cover a child tax credit.

I ask unanimous consent that the table on the "Chairman's Mark Budget Aggregates" be printed in the RECORD together with the "Medicare Fact Sheet."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAIRMAN'S MARK BUDGET AGGREGATES—Continued

[Dollars in billions]

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	6-year total
Revenues	1431	1471	1532	1600	1675	1755	1846	9879
Resulting deficit/surplus	-147	-155	-146	-117	-89	-43	0

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding. All totals shown on a unified budget basis.
Prepared by SBC Majority Staff, 08-May-96

MEDICARE FACT SHEET

THE COMMITTEE-PASSED RESOLUTION

Total medicare spending, 1997-2002: \$1.459 trillion.

This is \$60 billion more government spending than was in the BBA, and \$103 billion more than in last year's budget resolution.

Total savings, relative to new CBO baseline: \$158 billion.

Part A: Meets the President's test of keeping the part A trust fund solvent for a decade without gimmicks, which requires \$123 billion of savings (CBO).

Part B: Assumes part B savings equal to the President's part B savings (\$44 billion).

Graduate Medical Education: Assumes \$10 billion of spending.

Total spending growth from 1996 to 2002: 43 percent.

Average growth rate from 1996 to 2002: 6.1%, or more than two times inflation difference between Committee-passed and the President's plan: 58 per beneficiary per day per capita spending—1995: \$4,800, 1996: \$5,300, 2002: \$7,000.

Keeps the Hospital Insurance Trust fund solvent through 2006, without gimmicks, meeting the President's stated goal.

Makes no assumption about the part B premium, but is consistent with a plan that matches the President's premium proposal.

THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN

Total medicare spending, 1997-2002: \$1.526 trillion.

Total savings, as scored by CBO: \$116.1 billion.

Total savings claimed by the President: \$124 billion.

Average growth rate from 1996 to 2002: 7.2%.

Total growth from 1996 to 2002: 52%.

HI Trust Fund goes bankrupt in 2002, buying only one additional year of solvency.

Transfer \$55 billion of home health spending from part A to part B, artificially inflating the life of the HI trust fund. Even with this gimmick, the HI trust fund goes bankrupt in 2005, and the President fails to meet his stated goal of solvency for a decade.

BASIC FACTS

Number of beneficiaries, 1996: 37.5 million.
1995 total medicare spending: \$180 billion.

1996 medicare spending: \$199 billion increase in spending, net of premiums, from 1995 to 1996: +\$19.2 billion (+12%).

This increase in spending from 1995 to 1996 is more than is spent in 1996 on: elementary, secondary, and vocational education (\$15.5 billion); all justice / crime / law enforcement spending (\$17.5 billion); all spending for science, space, and technology (\$16.5 billion); and comparable to all spending for natural resources and the environment (\$21.5 billion).

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I understand the next vote is going to be on the Abraham-Domenici amendment. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the third vote in this voting sequence be on or in relation to the Exon amendment No. 3965, the so-called President's amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. So that will follow the Abraham-Domenici. I think that will be the last vote tonight.

Has this been ordered for 10 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been ordered for 10 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent that there be 10 minutes on the Exon amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask for the yeas and nays on the Exon amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I think I should announce that while we are going to try to stay on after this vote to see what we can do to negotiate and get some consent—

Mr. MURKOWSKI. We cannot hear you.

Mr. DOMENICI. Perhaps if some of you would not talk so much you could hear me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be order in the Chamber, please.

Mr. DOMENICI. I am not running for anything around here. That is why you do not pay attention.

Could we have order, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Could we have order in the Chamber, please?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, we are going to convene tomorrow morning at 9:30. We cannot tell you yet whether there are going to be votes. We think there will be. Certainly tomorrow we are going to work a long time trying to get amendments up. If Senators have amendments and can be here tomorrow, they ought to be here. We are going to use a lot of time on this budget resolution tomorrow. If we can get an orderly sequencing of amendments, we might not have to stay here and vote. If we can just get started in the morning to let us see where we are, but for now you ought to be here because we may have votes early in the morning.

Is that a fair statement, Mr. Minority Leader?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Are there additional votes tonight?

Mr. DOMENICI. There are no additional votes tonight—I have already announced that—after the two remaining ones.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, could I add one thing that I think should be driven home? If we are going to expedite this process, we are going to have to have people who are on the list to come and offer their amendments on Friday, or on Monday and not leave here tonight and assume that they are home free until sometime on Tuesday because, if we all do that, then Tuesday is going to be a much worse day than it is destined to be in any event. So I hope people listened to what Senator DOMENICI said and be here tomorrow to offer amendments, and not just assume, and then everybody flock in here as they usually do at 2:30 on Tuesday afternoon and say, "Why can't I have 2 hours on my amendment?" It will not be.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, fellow Senators, I want to repeat what I said. I have been asked by the majority leader to indicate to all of you that we are trying to finish this budget resolution Tuesday night. If that means at 12 o'clock on Wednesday morning at 1 or 2, that is included in the definition of Tuesday. It may be Wednesday, or Tuesday morning at 4 a.m. But we are going to try. If you can start offering amendments tomorrow, we may have an agreement that on Monday there will not be any votes. If we get a sequencing of amendments where you offer 10 or 15 amendments and offer them on Monday, then we may, indeed, be able to give some of you the opportunity to not have to be here on Friday and Monday. But we need cooperation before we do that.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, may I add one other thing? I ask the Democrats before they leave here tonight and the Republicans before they leave here tonight to come to our desks and tell us when you will be here tomorrow, or want to be here tomorrow, or Monday with regard to offering your amendments. If you will do that, and we will be working back and forth as best we can on amendments as we have been, then we might be able to reach some kind of an agreement that, yes. You want to be here at 10, maybe not 10, or 10:30, we might be able to get an orderly process going because otherwise Tuesday is going to be unbelievably bad.

So please drop by if you can be here on Friday like you are supposed to be, and tell us when you will be here, and we will be glad to accommodate you as best we can on timing.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 3980

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM] is necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT OFFICER (Mr. BURNS). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 118 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Abraham	Frist	McCain
Ashcroft	Gorton	McConnell
Bennett	Gramm	Murkowski
Bond	Grams	Nickles
Brown	Grassley	Pressler
Burns	Gregg	Roth
Campbell	Hatch	Santorum
Chafee	Hatfield	Shelby
Coats	Hefflin	Simpson
Cochran	Helms	Smith
Cohen	Hutchison	Snowe
Coverdell	Inhofe	Specter
Craig	Jeffords	Stevens
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Thomas
DeWine	Kyl	Thompson
Dole	Lott	Thurmond
Domenici	Lugar	Warner
Faircloth	Mack	

NAYS—45

Akaka	Feingold	Levin
Baucus	Feinstein	Lieberman
Biden	Ford	Mikulski
Bingaman	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Boxer	Graham	Moynihan
Bradley	Harkin	Murray
Breaux	Hollings	Nunn
Bryan	Inouye	Pell
Bumpers	Johnston	Reid
Byrd	Kennedy	Robb
Conrad	Kerry	Rockefeller
Daschle	Kerry	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kohl	Simon
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Exon	Leahy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Kassebaum Pryor

The amendment (No. 3980) was agreed to.

Mr. EXON. 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 3965

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, the President's fiscal year 1997 budget builds on the immense economic success of his 1993 budget.

Since the enactment of that historic deficit reduction package, the Federal deficit has been cut in half—from \$290 billion to a projected \$144 billion in 1996, according to the Congressional Budget Office. The deficit as a share of the economy is down from 4.7 percent in 1992 to 2.3 percent today. Last week CBO projected the 1996 deficit may be even lower—down to \$130 billion.

These favorable reports serve as testament both to the effectiveness of the 1993 deficit reduction package and a strong Clinton economy. Actual total deficit reduction achieved by the 1993 budget package is now estimated by CBO to be approximately \$800 billion

over 5 years. All this progress has come from a deficit reduction package that was enacted without a single Republican vote.

Although most of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle predicted the 1993 package would bring about job loss and recession, economic indicators have improved vastly since the Bush recession. Unemployment is down from 7.3 percent in January 1993 to 5.4 percent in April 1996. Inflation has been remarkably low during these times of sustained economic growth, with the consumer price index increasing less than 3 percent in each of the last 3 years. Since January 1993, 8.5 million jobs have been created, and more than 90 percent of those were private sector jobs.

Interest rates—responding to sound fiscal policies—have fallen well below the levels of 3 years ago, with the 30-year average rate dropping from 7.67 percent in 1992 to about 7 percent today. Business investment in equipment is up 11 percent per year in real dollars since the fourth quarter of 1992. And corporate profits are up to a 13-percent annual rate since fourth quarter of 1992.

The economy is strong. But the new Clinton budget is sensitive to the underlying anxiety and apprehension of America's working families. This budget secures the integrity of the Medicare trust fund through 2005, and it does so without ravaging Medicare. In contrast, the Republican budget cuts \$50 billion more.

The President's budget maintains guaranteed health care for nursing home seniors and poor children under Medicaid. In contrast, the Republican budget could cut as much as \$250 billion in Medicaid.

The President's budget maintains America's investment in education and job training—Head Start, Basic Education Assistance (title 1), and Job Training for Dislocated Workers. In contrast, the Republican budget cuts \$60 billion from these priorities.

The President's budget does not raise taxes on working Americans. In contrast, the Republican budget cuts \$20 billion from the earned income tax Credit, raising taxes on 6 to 10 million hard-pressed working families.

The President's budget protects the environment. In contrast, the Republican budget cuts EPA operating programs by 11 percent in 1997 and by 23 percent in 2002.

The President's budget does not offer tax breaks for the rich at the expense of Medicare and education. In contrast, and contrary to the representations made by some of my colleagues, the Republican budget provides \$180 billion in tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans over the next 6 years.

Mr. President, the President's budget would balance the budget by 2002 using CBO economic assumptions. But, unlike the Republican budget, it would balance the budget without abandoning America's priorities. It would preserve

paycheck security, health security, and retirement security for America's working people.

The spending cuts in the President's budget are significant, yet they are made in the right places. The President's budget would achieve more than \$600 billion in spending cuts by 2002. It would reduce the size of the Federal Government work force by 200,000, making it the smallest it has been in 30 years.

Finally, the President's budget would provide targeted tax relief for working families and for families trying to send their children to college.

The bottom line, Mr. President, is that the President's budget is a budget that reflects the priorities of the American people. In contrast, the Republican budget is the same extreme proposal the American people rejected last year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on amendment No. 3965, as amended, offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON]. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM] is necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 119 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Akaka	Feinstein	Levin
Baucus	Ford	Lieberman
Biden	Glenn	Mikulski
Bingaman	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Boxer	Harkin	Moynihan
Bradley	Hefflin	Murray
Breaux	Hollings	Nunn
Bryan	Inouye	Pell
Bumpers	Johnston	Reid
Conrad	Kennedy	Robb
Daschle	Kerry	Rockefeller
Dodd	Kerry	Sarbanes
Dorgan	Kohl	Simon
Exon	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Feingold	Leahy	Wyden

NAYS—53

Abraham	Faircloth	McCain
Ashcroft	Frist	McConnell
Bennett	Gorton	Murkowski
Bond	Gramm	Nickles
Brown	Grams	Pressler
Burns	Grassley	Roth
Byrd	Gregg	Santorum
Campbell	Hatch	Shelby
Chafee	Hatfield	Simpson
Coats	Helms	Smith
Cochran	Hutchison	Snowe
Cohen	Inhofe	Specter
Coverdell	Jeffords	Stevens
Craig	Kempthorne	Thomas
D'Amato	Kyl	Thompson
DeWine	Lott	Thurmond
Dole	Lugar	Warner
Domenici	Mack	

NOT VOTING—2

Kassebaum Pryor

The amendment (No. 3965), as amended, was rejected.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the

amendment was rejected, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CLARIFICATION OF OPPOSITION TO GRASSLEY AMENDMENT NO. 3963

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, yesterday, during debate on an amendment to cut defense levels in the budget resolution, the senior Senator from Iowa cited certain statements contained in my recent paper on military readiness. I have great respect and friendship for my colleague. However, I must point out that those quotations were taken out of context and were used to give the impression that I supported the Senator's amendment to reduce the defense spending level in the pending resolution.

I want to take this opportunity once again to state very clearly my strong opposition to the Grassley amendment.

First, I strongly oppose any amendments to reduce the level of defense spending in the pending resolution. Last year, I was at the forefront of efforts in the Senate to add funding to the President's defense budget. Ultimately, the Congress added \$7 billion, most of which was allocated to modernization programs.

And I strongly supported the Senate Armed Services Committee's bipartisan letter to the Senate Budget Committee requesting a significant increase in the Defense budget. The pending resolution includes the increase we requested.

Second, President Clinton's defense budget request for the coming fiscal year seriously neglects future readiness, putting at risk the ability of our military forces to prevail in future conflicts. Our highest ranking military officers, including the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, cited the need for increased procurement funding to ensure a modern, ready force in the future. The Senate Armed Services Committee recently reported to the Senate a Defense authorization bill for the coming fiscal year that includes significant increases in the procurement and research and development accounts for future modernization.

Third, the statements cited yesterday by the Senator from Iowa were taken completely out of the full context of my paper. The Senator should re-read the paper in its entirety, in which it is clearly stated that funding for our Nation's military is far too little to fully meet our vital national security needs.

I do believe, as the Senator quoted, that we must look for ways to do more with less. That statement is based both on an acknowledgment of fiscal reality as well as a sense of responsibility to the taxpayers. Regardless of whether we increase the top line of the Defense budget, we have a responsibility to the American people to spend their tax dollars wisely. Every dollar of defense

spending should be spent carefully and for programs which enhance the ability of our service men and women to do their jobs, whether they are assigned to combat units, support units, or the Reserve components.

I also believe, as the Senator quoted, that eliminating excess infrastructure is necessary and would free up funds for military modernization. The Department of Defense, with the help of Congress, must continue its ongoing efforts to streamline operations and improve efficiency by eliminating wasteful spending and practices. The Senator from Iowa has been active in promoting financial and other reform efforts in the Department of Defense, and I commend him for his efforts.

However, the Senator seems to have missed the larger point of my paper.

On page 19 of the paper, I clearly stated, as follows:

There are many approaches to streamlining defense operations and activities that could result in cost savings and which should be done to ensure the best value to the American taxpayer. However, the magnitude of savings from these efficiencies is negligible in comparison to the funding required to modernize and maintain a ready military force.

Finally, let me note this clear concluding statement:

In all of the decisions we face about our future defense requirements, we must not allow fiscal considerations to be the single, dominant factor. Instead, we must focus on the most cost-effective means of maintaining the military capabilities necessary to ensure our future security. We must pay what it costs for a military force capable of deterring aggression and achieving success in any future conflict. In short, we must be prepared to accept the cost of being a world power.

These statements clearly represent the full context of my paper, which focused principally on a proposal to reform the military readiness system, but also repeatedly cited the need for additional funding for military modernization. I am sorry the Senator from Iowa seems to have missed the point of my paper.

Just like the quotations from my paper, the amendment of the Senator from Iowa missed the mark. His amendment would have done nothing to encourage the Department of Defense to operate more efficiently, if that was his intention. His amendment did not even address alleged Pentagon waste and mismanagement, which would be permitted to continue unabated even if his amendment had been adopted. Instead, his amendment would have cut needed funding for the military modernization programs added by the Senate Armed Services Committee in the recently reported Defense Authorization bill for Fiscal Year 1997.

I voted against the Grassley amendment, which failed by a vote of 57 to 42. I intend to vote against other such amendments to cut the defense function.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following

amendments be the only remaining first-degree amendments that will be in order to Senate Concurrent Resolution 57, and that all other provisions of the Budget Act remain in effect, provided that the amendments may be offered by a designee.

The list is as follows:

REPUBLICAN LIST

Chafee/Breaux—alternative budget.
Simpson—SOS accurate inflation index.
Brown/Simpson—CPI.
Brown/Simpson—SOS eligibility ages.
Lott—U.N.
Campbell—at risk youth.
Thompson—delete Presidential check off.
Hutchison—SOS homemaker IRA.
Faircloth—SOS national debt.
Faircloth—welfare.
Kyl—LIHEAP.
Kyl—SOS tax limitation.
Kyl—Americorp.
Murkowski—relevant.
Domenici/Gorton—Medicare Part A.
Domenici—Spectrum.
Snowe—SOS tax cut sunsets.
Ashcroft—payroll taxes.
Gramm—SOS Soc. Sec. taxes.
Thomas—biannual budgeting.
Grams—SOS bal. budget/taxes.
Snowe—SOS student loans.
Roth—Amtrack.
Specter—Labor-HHS.
Domenici—tax reform.
Jeffords—relevant.
Nickles—unified budget.
Nickles—relevant.
McCain—SOS spectrum.
Helms—SOS education.
Dole—SOS drug crimes.
Dole—relevant.
Domenici—EITC spending.

DEMOCRATIC AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

Baucus—SOS essential air service.
Biden—(1) crime; (2) higher education.
Bingaman—(1) EDA; (2) relevant.
Boxer—(1) SOS taxes; (2) Medicaid and nursing homes.
Bradley—EITC restoration.
Bryan—CBO certification.
Bumpers—(1) asset sales; (2) fire walls; (3) mining reclamation.
Byrd—(1) restore infrastructure investment; (2) relevant; (3) relevant; (4) relevant; (5) relevant.
Conrad—relevant.
Daschle—relevant.
Dorgan—relevant.
Exon—relevant.
Feingold—tax cut.
Graham—Medicare solvency waste/fraud.
Harkin—(1) Medicaid changes; (2) relevant.
Hollings—gas tax to highway and aviation trust fund.
Kennedy—(1) spousal impoverishment; (2) seniors abuse; (3) prescription drugs; (4) premium surcharge; (5) Davis-Bacon; (6) worker safety.
Kerrey—(1) SOS reduction CPI; (2) SOS long term entitlement.
Kerry—(1) environment; (2) education, (3) crime; (4) preserve Presidential campaign checkoff; (5) LIHEAP; (6) relevant.
Kohl—SOS crime prevention funds.
Lautenberg—(1) relevant; (2) relevant.
Levin—(1) reduction defense number; (2) drug blocker research money.
Mosely-Braun—SOS budget priorities.
Murray—(1) SOS GSA priority transfer excess property re: education and technology.
Nunn—(1) Long-term entitlement reform; (2) SOS CPI.
Pryor—Glaxol/GATT.
Reid—environment.
Rockefeller—medicare.

Simon—shifting defense spending.

Wellstone—(1) COPS; (2) children's impact; (3) welfare and domestic violence; (4) LIHEAP; (5) SOS education tax language; (6) relevant.

Wyden—(1) SOS eliminating deductibility environmental damage; (2) DOD expenditures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. The list has been submitted along with that unanimous-consent request. They are both Democrat and Republican amendments.

Mr. EXON. We have agreed to the list. The chairman has submitted that. We agree those will be the only amendments in the first degree.

Mr. DOMENICI. That does not mean, Mr. President, that every one there will be offered. It depends on the offeror or their designee. But we surmise some will not. But there will not be any other first degrees submitted that are not on that list. We have not waived the Budget Act, as we indicated, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I have another statement to discuss with the Senate.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, MAY 17, 1996, AND MONDAY, MAY 20, 1996

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tonight, it stand in recess until 9:30 a.m., on Friday, May 17, and immediately resume the budget resolution at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business on Friday, May 17, it stand in recess until 10:30 a.m., Monday, May 20, and immediately resume the budget resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair and I thank the Senate.

PROGRAM

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will consider the budget resolution on Friday and Monday. Since a large number of Senators have indicated they will be available to offer their amendments, no votes will occur either Friday or Monday. Senators who have amendments must offer and debate their amendments either Friday or Monday. It will be the intention of the leadership to conclude the budget resolution by the close of business on Tuesday, if at all possible.

As an example of Senators that have already indicated they will work with their amendments, let me state on Friday—this is not binding in any order—but Senator WELLSTONE will be here at 9:30, Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN, somewhere around 10 o'clock, Senator BYRD somewhere around 11 o'clock, Senator SIMPSON around noon, Senator KERRY has two amendments, somewhere

around 1:30, Senator LOTT in the afternoon, Senator KYL in the afternoon, Senator GRAMM in the afternoon, Senator DORGAN, and Senator KENNEDY, sometime tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. FORD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMENICI. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. FORD. We had worked out on this side an opportunity for the Senator from Washington, Senator MURRAY, to be somewhere between noon and 2 o'clock.

Mr. DOMENICI. We will put that in between Senator KERRY and Senator LOTT, who would go later. Senator MURRAY could be somewhere after Senator KERRY.

Mr. FORD. We would like to reverse that, Senator, and put Senator MURRAY before Senator KERRY.

Mr. DOMENICI. We would have Senator MURRAY coming ahead of Senator KERRY, with his two amendments.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, was putting Senator MURRAY ahead of Senator KERRY cleared with Senator KERRY?

Mr. FORD. Yes, and Senator MURRAY will be speaking in favor of the amendment of Senator KERRY. She has an amendment also. It would work out for her travel plans. We agreed the 12 to 2 o'clock period she could introduce her amendment.

Mr. EXON. This timing is getting rather complicated. Senator KERRY is making a special trip back from Boston and will be in Pittsburgh then he has to go back. He told me he would be here hopefully between 2 o'clock and 3 o'clock. He will be very strapped for time to meet the connection. I simply say as nearly as possible I hope we can accommodate Senator KERRY when he shows up, maybe put him before or after. I did not know about Senator MURRAY.

Mr. FORD. It is somewhere before 2 o'clock.

Mr. EXON. All right. We will do our best to accommodate everyone. I think we have that general understanding.

Mr. DOMENICI. Might I continue. On all the amendments that the Senator from New Mexico just listed, this is not a unanimous consent request, this is a bona fide effort to indicate that these Senators will offer their amendments tomorrow, in somewhat of the order I have described.

Now, Senators are going to be accommodated. We will stay until they are accommodated, and try to use a substantial amount of time. I will not be here after 3:30 but there will be someone here so we get this finished.

Now on Monday, I told the Senators we are doing well on Friday, and on Monday we are doing better. We do not have to have votes because we will have a lot of amendments and stack them in an orderly matter. Senator ASHCROFT, Senator KYL, Senator HARKIN, Senator BUMPERS, Senator FEINGOLD, Senator BAUCUS, Senator LEVIN, Senator SIMON, Senator SNOWE, Senator CHAFFEE and Senator BREAUX, the full substitute, they will take 3

hours on Monday afternoon and then they will wrap it up with 1 hour on Tuesday when we sequence them into a voting pattern.

Mr. EXON. What is the time allowed for that amendment?

Mr. DOMENICI. A total of 4 hours equally divided, 3 hours on Monday, and wrap it up with 1 hour on Tuesday.

Then we have Senators BROWN and SIMPSON who will also be ready Monday, Senator ASHCROFT will be ready Monday. Feingold is for Monday.

The last list, starting with Senator HARKIN and ending with Senator ASHCROFT, are Monday amendments in some kind of sequencing related to what I have just described.

Again, nobody is bound to a time but I am really urging and my friend Senator EXON is, and the whip and the minority leader, that we appear and offer them, because that means we will be well on our way to a manageable schedule on Tuesday.

Mr. EXON. I agree. I think it can and will work.

Mr. FORD. May I ask one more question? I apologize for taking so long, but would Senator DOMENICI advise me about the amendment by Senator NUNN on long-term entitlement reform. It seems to me he and Senator BROWN may have a joint amendment. I wanted to be sure that Senator NUNN was accommodated.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, that is known as the Brown-Simpson-Nunn amendment.

Mr. FORD. That will be sometime late Monday?

Mr. DOMENICI. It looks like it is close to 5 o'clock.

Mr. FORD. That would be ideal, sometime around 5 o'clock or after.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

The Senate continued the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. DOMENICI. I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask it be charged to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. 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. DOMENICI. Mr. President, we understand Senator BOXER from California is prepared with an amendment at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 3982

(Purpose: To preserve, protect, and strengthen the Medicaid program by controlling costs, providing state flexibility and restoring critical standards and protections, including coverage for all populations covered under current law. The amendment restores \$18 billion in excessive cuts, offset by corporate and business tax reforms)

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you very much, Mr. President. I thank my chairman

and ranking member for allowing me to offer this amendment at this particular time. On my side, Senators KENNEDY and GRAHAM would like to speak to this amendment, and I send it to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], for herself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. DORGAN, and Mr. KENNEDY, proposes an amendment numbered 3982.

Mrs. BOXER. 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 3, line 5, increase the amount by \$1,900,000,000.

On page 3, line 6, increase the amount by \$2,500,000,000.

On page 3, line 7, increase the amount by \$3,200,000,000.

On page 3, line 8, increase the amount by \$2,700,000,000.

On page 3, line 9, increase the amount by \$2,600,000,000.

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by \$5,400,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by \$1,900,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by \$2,500,000,000.

On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by \$3,200,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by \$2,700,000,000.

On page 3, line 18, increase the amount by \$2,600,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by \$5,400,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by \$1,900,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by \$2,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by \$3,200,000,000.

On page 4, line 11, increase the amount by \$2,700,000,000.

On page 4, line 12, increase the amount by \$2,600,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by \$5,400,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by \$1,900,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by \$2,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by \$3,200,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by \$2,700,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by \$2,600,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by \$5,400,000,000.

On page 27, line 16, increase the amount by \$1,900,000,000.

On page 27, line 17, increase the amount by \$1,900,000,000.

On page 27, line 23, increase the amount by \$2,500,000,000.

On page 27, line 24, increase the amount by \$2,500,000,000.

On page 28, line 5, increase the amount by \$3,200,000,000.

On page 28, line 6, increase the amount by \$3,200,000,000.

On page 28, line 12, increase the amount by \$2,700,000,000.

On page 28, line 13, increase the amount by \$2,700,000,000.

On page 28, line 19, increase the amount by \$2,600,000,000.

On page 28, line 20, increase the amount by \$2,600,000,000.

On page 29, line 2, increase the amount by \$5,400,000,000.

On page 29, line 3, increase the amount by \$5,400,000,000.

On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by \$18,300,000,000.

At the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE.

It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions contained in this budget resolution assume Medicaid reforms shall—

(1) maintain the guarantees in current law for Medicaid coverage of seniors, children, pregnant women, and persons with disabilities;

(2) preserve current laws protecting spouses and adult children from the risk of impoverishment to pay for long-term nursing home care;

(3) maintain the current Federal nursing home quality and enforcement standards;

(4) protect states from unanticipated program costs resulting from economic fluctuations in the business cycle, changing demographics, and natural disasters;

(5) maintain the successful Federal-State partnership and protect the Federal Treasury against practices that allow States to decrease their fair share of Medicaid funding; and,

(6) continue to provide coverage of Medicare premiums and cost-sharing payments for low-income Medicare beneficiaries, consistent with current law.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am honored and pleased to be able to offer the Boxer-Graham-Dorgan-Kennedy amendment regarding Medicaid. The purpose of this amendment is really quite simple and straightforward.

First, my amendment restores the \$18 billion in excess cuts made by the Republican budget, and it will be offset by closing corporate tax loopholes.

Second, my amendment contains a sense of the Senate that any reforms made to Medicaid maintain six particular principles, and I will outline those principles briefly.

But before I do, I think it is important to ask the question, Who does Medicaid really help in this everyday world? Who are the people out there who depend on Medicaid?

First of all, 2 million senior citizens who are in nursing homes are on Medicaid and depend on Medicaid. Two out of every three residents in nursing homes depend on Medicaid.

We also know there are 18 million children who depend on Medicaid—children. It is their lifeline. Half of these children live in working families where their families work very hard. They are the working poor, and their children rely on Medicaid.

The disabled—6 million of our citizens who are disabled rely on Medicaid and perhaps up to 1 million pregnant women rely on Medicaid. Of our children between the ages of 13 and 18, there are 2.5 million.

So millions and millions of Americans rely on Medicaid, and, therefore, this amendment, I think—and I am so pleased that it has broad support on this side of the aisle—is really key to real people.

So the first part of the amendment is that we restore \$18 billion that has

been cut, what we call excess cuts. Second, we have a sense of the Senate on six principles. They are as follows: First, maintain Medicaid coverage for low-income seniors, children up to 18 years of age, pregnant women, and the disabled; second, maintain current protection against the impoverishment of spouses and adult children whose family member is in a nursing home; third, maintain Federal nursing home standards; fourth, protect States from unanticipated increases in enrollment, which can occur as a result of economic fluctuations such as recessions, changing demographics or natural disasters; fifth, maintain the successful Federal-State partnership and protect our Federal Treasury against practices that may allow States to decrease their fair share of Medicaid funding; and sixth, continue to provide Medicare premiums and cost-sharing payments for low-income Medicare beneficiaries that are consistent with current law.

I would like to make this point, Mr. President. All of these six principles that are outlined in this amendment are contained in the President's budget, as well as in the Chafee-Breaux budget proposal; however, they are not maintained or referenced in the Republican budget.

So of the budgets that we will be looking at, namely, the President's budget, the Republican budget, and the Chafee-Breaux budget, we find the Republican budget does not address these six principles. Frankly, we feel it is very important that these principles be adhered to.

Why do I say that? I think the backbone of all the other principles is the guarantee of coverage that exists in current Medicaid law for seniors, children, pregnant women, and persons with disabilities. We know this is a real problem because in the reconciliation bill we saw that there was a walking away from this commitment.

We also believe that a person with certain disabilities in one State might not be considered disabled in another State under this budget. We want to make sure that does not happen. Some States could decide to define disability in such a way that it will not cover many serious disabilities.

So we think it is very important that the people who are now covered remain covered. We do not have that assurance at all in this budget. As a matter of fact, the plans that the Republicans have talked about would allow the States to decide these questions. I think it is very important that it be a national standard here as to who is disabled and who should definitely have coverage.

I want to talk about the guarantee to children. We have no certainty in this Republican budget that children from the ages of 13 to 18 would be covered. Let me tell you the problem. It would mean that a low-income teenage girl, the only way she could get health coverage, if the State decided to cut her

off, is to get pregnant. This is not a message that we want to send to our young people. We should cover children until they turn 18. I think we owe them that.

I want to talk a minute about the other principle, the spouses and adult children who are at risk of impoverishment if one of their family members winds up in a nursing home. Remember, there are 2 million senior citizens in nursing homes, and two out of three of them are on Medicaid. We passed a very important law, when I was over in the House of Representatives, that said we will not drive the adult children of nursing home residents and we will not drive the spouse of a nursing home resident into the poor house simply because their family member is in a nursing home.

I am very fearful that without saying something affirmative in this budget, we could repeal this very important spousal impoverishment provision. We should not be forcing spouses or adult children to be thrust into poverty.

Why do I say that? The average cost for nursing home care, Mr. President, is about \$36,000 a year. Clearly, how many of our people could really pay that?

I think it is crucial that we protect spouses and the adult children of nursing home residents. I think if we do not pass this amendment, our amendment that we have worked on here, that could happen.

Nursing home quality standards. Very clearly we ought to say that we believe there ought to be national standards. Why do I say this? Because we know what can happen. We saw what happened in the 1980's. There were nursing home scandals. We know that our senior citizens were being mistreated, abused. Some of the stories are hair-raising. I will not go into them because time does not permit it. But they were drugged, they were put into baths that were scalding.

What happened? We decided we would have standards and enforcement. Now we have absolutely no assurance in this particular budget that is before us that this will happen. That is why we hope we can get bipartisan support for this particular amendment that I am offering. So it is key to save those nursing home national standards.

One senior citizen in Nebraska is as important as a senior citizen in New York or Ohio or Wyoming or Montana. We want to treat our grandmas and grandpas and our great grandmas and great grandpas with respect. We should have national standards and not back away from them.

We protect the States from unanticipated program costs in the sense of the Senate. We say that, in fact, when you have a natural disaster such as my State of California, or there is an unanticipated cost from a recession, that we will help the States meet their Medicaid burdens.

Finally, an issue that I know Senator GRAHAM is going to speak to because he

was a Governor of the great State of Florida. We want to maintain the successful Federal-State partnership involving Medicaid. We also want to make sure there are no scams in the States, that, in fact, the States do not abuse the Medicaid program.

So, Mr. President, that concludes my remarks. I know that Senators KENNEDY and GRAHAM would like to speak.

I would like at this time to yield them some time, if that is agreeable.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts and then to the Senator from Florida. We have had a little bit of intervening debate and I just want to remind everyone what we are talking about here are the people in our country who need us to stand with them: The seniors in the nursing homes, the children with disabilities, the pregnant women, the working poor, the people who are working very hard to stay afloat and need us not to abandon them. I think this amendment we are presenting to you will give them that reassurance that they will not be abandoned.

It is my pleasure to yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, my friend and colleague from Florida will address the Senate on an extremely important aspect of this whole issue of the cutback in Medicaid. I will try to be to the point but also speak about the importance of this particular amendment.

First of all, I want to thank the Senator from California, Senator BOXER, for being the leader on this particular issue as she has been on so many of the issues involving working families, children, and their parents and the disabled. All of us are grateful to her for her leadership on this issue of restoring some \$18 billion in the Medicaid Program over the next 6 years.

Now, I think Members can ask whether this \$18 billion we see under the Republican program, the reduction of \$72 billion, I think it is important as we commence this debate to understand where that serious cut will come from in the Republican budget and the benefits that this program reaches in terms of children, the disabled and the elderly. The importance of this amendment of the Senator from California is that with the acceptance of some cuts in the Medicaid, those cuts basically will be out of what we call the disproportionate share payments, which go not to the individual reduction in benefits, but are basically funds that go to the State generally. It is extremely important to understand that every dollar in the Senate's program is a dollar that will make a difference in the quality of life of children and seniors.

The second point which is an enormous part of the Senator's amendment which I know that the Senator from Florida will cover is the significance of the Republican budget cuts, which will mean \$250 billion in reduced payments of benefits over the period of the next

6 years because of the changing of the formula in terms of what is required by the States.

This is a very, very dramatic reduction and cut in who will be affected by this. The people that will be affected by this, as the Senator has pointed out, will be the children, the elderly people, nursing homes, and the disabled in our country.

The further point I want to make this evening is that it is important that we had the earlier vote on the Medicare and now on the Medicaid because to a great extent we are talking about the same populations. We are seeing the reductions in the Medicare programs that will affect our seniors, and this is another significant reduction in services for our elderly people as well as the children.

So if you look at the reductions in the Medicare Program, and you look at the reductions in the Medicaid Program, you are finding those cuts, together, are going to be an extremely heavy burden on the most vulnerable in our society—the children, the frail elderly, and the disabled in our community.

Medicaid is the companion program to Medicare, and the Republican assault on Medicaid is just as misguided and unfair as their assault on Medicare. The Republican plan would cut Federal Medicaid payments by \$72 billion over the next 6 years—but that is only the tip of the iceberg. Under the Republican plan, total Medicaid spending would be cut by a staggering \$250 billion—and States will be allowed to spend Federal Medicaid dollars on roads, bridges, and political patronage rather than health care services.

In large measure, the Republican cuts in Medicaid will strike another heavy blow at the same groups hurt by the Republican cuts in Medicare—senior citizens and the disabled. Ten million elderly and disabled individuals are enrolled in Medicaid. Seventy percent of all spending under the program is for these two groups—much of it for long-term nursing home care.

Another group will also be injured by the Republican plan—America's children. Seventy percent of those who rely on Medicaid are children and their parents—a total of 18 million children. One in every five children in America depends on Medicaid. One in every three children born in this country depend on Medicaid to cover their prenatal care and delivery.

Every child deserves a healthy start in life. Under the Republican plan millions of children who have adequate medical care today will be forced to do without it tomorrow.

Medicaid provides good coverage to children today. They are guaranteed prenatal care, immunizations, regular checkups, developmental screenings, and both chronic and intensive physician and hospital care.

The great bulk of Medicaid-covered children are in families with working parents. Most of these parents work

full time—40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year—but all their hard work does not buy them health care for their children, because their employer does not provide it and they cannot afford it.

Even with Medicaid, over 10 million children are uninsured, and each day the number rises. Soon, less than half of all children will be covered by employer-based health insurance. We tried to address this problem in the last Congress—but the Republicans said no. Today, they are trying to undermine the only place that families can turn without employer-provided coverage.

Last year, the Republicans proposed to eliminate all guarantees of coverage for children. This year, it is “only”—only—poor children 13 to 18 who will lose their coverage. In addition, children of all ages—even babies—will lose their current guarantee that all medically necessary treatments will be covered.

The 6 million disabled who depend on Medicaid are even less fortunate. The Republican plan repeals all Federal standards for coverage of the disabled.

States are also free to set any limits on scope and duration of services that they choose. If a State budget is tight this year, why not limit the sick to shorter hospital stays. If they need a week to recover from serious illness or surgery—too bad. That’s somebody else’s problem—if the Republican plan is adopted.

In a very real way, Medicaid is a lifeline for children and families who have nowhere else to turn. Without access to Medicaid, many healthy children will become sick and many sick children will die. It is wrong to put children at risk to pay for tax breaks and special favors for the wealthy and powerful. Greed is not a family value.

Under the Republican plan, senior citizens and the disabled suffer a one-two punch. Deep Medicare cuts, and even deeper cuts in Medicaid. Many will lose their Medicaid coverage or see their benefits cut back. But they will also be victimized by one of the harshest parts of the Republican plan—the elimination of Federal enforcement of quality standards for nursing homes.

Strong quality standards for nursing homes were enacted by Congress with solid bipartisan support in 1987, after a series of investigations revealed appalling conditions in such homes throughout the Nation and shocking abuse of senior citizens and the disabled.

Elderly patients were often allowed to go uncleaned for days, lying in their own excrement. They were tied to wheelchairs and beds under conditions that would not be tolerated in any prison in America. Deliberate abuse and violence were used against helpless senior citizens by callous or sadistic attendants. Painful, untreated, and completely avoidable bedsores were widespread. Patients were scalded to death in hot baths and showers. Others were sedated to the point of unconsciousness, or isolated from all aspects of normal life by fly-by-night nursing

home operators bent on profiteering from the misery of their patients.

These conditions, once revealed, shocked the conscience of the Nation. The Federal standards enacted by Congress ended much of this unconscionable abuse and achieved substantial improvement in the quality of care for nursing home residents.

Last year, the Republican proposal eliminated these standards altogether. When the public outcry was too great, they weakened the standards instead. This year, they claim to leave them unchanged—but they are proposing to leave enforcement to the States, even though it was the States’ failure to protect senior citizens that necessitated passing the 1987 law in the first place.

Whatever the formal rules and regulations say, the Republican cuts in Medicaid are so deep that even conscientious nursing home operators who want to maintain high quality care will be hard-pressed to afford the staff and equipment necessary to provide it.

It is difficult to believe that anyone, no matter how extreme their ideology, would take us back to the harsh conditions before 1987. But that is what the Republican plan will do.

Further, the Republican plan victimizes not only the elderly but their families as well. Last year, the Republicans proposed to repeal the spousal impoverishment protections that protected the husband or wife of a nursing home resident against the double loss of a loved one and the chance to maintain even a modest standard of living. They proposed to repeal protections that have been in place since the Medicaid program was enacted against adult children being required to impoverish themselves to pay for the care of an aged parent.

Again, the public outcry was so great that the Republicans were forced to modify their plan—but they left the fine print in place. Spousal impoverishment provisions were supposedly retained—but they were rendered meaningless by other parts of the Republican plan.

Without a guarantee of coverage, a protection against spousal impoverishment is useless for those who can no longer qualify for assistance in the first place. The plan allowed nursing homes to add extra charges that Medicaid did not cover, and require families to make large up-front deposits before a patient is admitted. Adult children were protected—but only if their income was below the median. Families whose total income is less than the cost of a year in a nursing home would still be liable for the cost of care for their elderly family member.

Republicans claim their new plan avoids this last set of abuses, but the American people should read the fine print.

The Republican plan for Medicaid is an outrage. It says that our society does not care about the most vulnerable groups in our country—people

with disabilities, senior citizens, and children.

These Republican proposals are too harsh and too extreme. They are not what the American people voted for in the last election. They should be rejected out of hand by the Congress, and the American people should reject their sponsors in the next election.

I thank the Senator from California. I yield back whatever time remains.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Massachusetts. Before he leaves, I think we have a chance to win this amendment, I say to my friend, because, actually, the Democratic budget addresses these issues. This amendment gives us a chance, those of us who supported that budget, to vote in favor of it. The Chafee-Breaux budget actually that will be presented to us does, in fact, make these commitments. So if everyone who voted for Chafee-Breaux, who voted for the Democratic budget, votes aye on this amendment, I say to my friend that maybe we will have some better luck in the outcome.

My friend talked about turning our backs on those who need us the most. I was present for a hearing that we held when we were doing the health care bill in which we had disabled children who were relying on Medicaid come into the Congress with their caregivers. Usually it was their mom or dad. Just looking at those kids with spina bifida, with kidney problems, with muscular dystrophy, or with multiple sclerosis, trying to live their life with some dignity, relying completely on these payments, it seems to me, I say to my colleagues at this late hour, even if it is late, this is a little sacrifice to make when we think of those children and the sacrifices that they make every day of their lives and the sacrifices that their families make every day of their lives. It is shameful that we would walk away from these children. It is shameful.

Nobody needs to hear a lecture from one Senator to another. I do not mean at all to sound that way, because I do not think that anyone who votes against this amendment wants to hurt those children. But I do think, in the end, that is what will happen.

I yield 15 minutes to my friend from Florida, Senator GRAHAM.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank my colleague from California.

Mr. President, this debate should commence with one fundamental truth: The Medicaid Program for the last 30 years has been a great American success. The Medicaid Program has been a great American success. Let me give you a few examples of that success.

In the early 1980’s, in many parts of this country—I can speak specifically for the American South—the rate of infant mortality was a disgrace, rates of infant mortality that were close to those that would be found in some of the less-developed nations of the world.

In that period, leaders in the South decided that they wanted to have a different legacy for the future.

So under the leadership of Governors such as Lamar Alexander of Tennessee, Bill Clinton of Arkansas, Governor Dick Riley of South Carolina, who was designated to be the chair of a task force in the South on the children of the South, Governor Riley made a series of recommendations which were adopted by most of the Southern States. But the keystone recommendation was that the South should take steps to reduce its infant mortality by substantial increases in its commitment to appropriate prenatal care, care for pregnant women, care for infants, and care for children in those critical early days of life.

The effect of that program 10 years later has been a dramatic reduction in infant mortality in the South, and because of that, a significant reduction in infant mortality in the United States, approximately a 20-percent reduction in the number of children who were born without life or with a life that was less than it might have been.

Mr. President, Medicaid was an absolutely critical component of that effort to reduce infant mortality in our Nation, and because of it, there are literally hundreds of thousands of boys and girls who are alive today, living lives that have great promise and opportunity.

Medicare is an American success story. Medicaid has also allowed older Americans to live a life of dignity and respect when otherwise they would have been consigned to the same condition of their parents and grandparents. To get old in America and to be poor in America was to be without dignity and respect.

You say, "Why is this true of Medicaid? I thought it was Medicare that provided services for older Americans." The fact is the two programs work in a very compatible manner. Medicaid, for those elderly who are unable to pay their premiums for Medicare, pays those premiums. It allows the indigent elderly to continue to have access to Medicare physician services. For those indigent elderly who cannot pay their prescription medication, Medicaid pays for their prescriptions so that they can have access to the modern miracles that make life possible and make a quality of life possible.

For many Americans, it is Medicaid which provides access to long-term care, whether that be in a community setting or in an institutional setting such as a nursing home. As the Senator from California has pointed out, most Americans who are in nursing homes today—over two out of three—receive their nursing home monthly payments through the Medicaid Program.

Medicaid is an American success story for older Americans. Medicaid is an American success story because it has served as the fundamental safety net under millions of poor children who without Medicaid would be without any financing for their health care.

In 1980, of all Americans who were employed, approximately 65 to 70 percent were employed in a workplace which provided health care coverage for themselves and for their families. That was part of what we thought was the American dream, that if you worked hard and you supported your family, you would have access to and the capacity to afford to acquire health care. We in Congress promoted that by providing very favorable tax treatment for employer-provided health care benefits. But since 1980, there has been a precipitous decline in the percentage of Americans who are covered at this point of employment with health care. Today that number is below 60 percent, and the estimate is that in the foreseeable future it will drop below 50 percent. Less than half of the Americans who are working will be securing their health care through their place of employment.

The result of this has been literally millions of low-income, not only the employees themselves but even more the dependents of those employees, their spouses and their children, without health care coverage.

What has happened is that as these people fell into medical indigency, it was Medicaid which came to their rescue, and it has provided them with access to health care coverage. If it had not been for Medicaid, we would not be a nation today with some almost 40 million Americans without access to health care financing; we would be a nation with 45 to 50 million Americans without access because persons who had lost their coverage are able, and particularly their dependents are able, to get it through the Medicaid Program.

So the Medicaid Program has been an American success story. Because of that we should not be talking, as is suggested in the Republican proposal of 1996, as it was in the Republican proposal of 1995, about an amputation of Medicaid. Rather, we should be talking about thoughtful reforms that will preserve the fundamental values of the system while making it stronger and better and more adapted to some of the current changes in health care delivery.

What are some of the fundamental issues in that reform of Medicaid? One is, should we maintain the basic national partnership between the Federal Government and the State governments in the financing and delivery of Medicaid services?

There are those who would suggest that that partnership is an anachronism, that it has had its day, but now we should amputate it, cut it off. Let us look for some new mutation to take its place, and that new mutation is going to be some form of block grants where the Federal Government's role is essentially consigned to that of being a check writer that on the October 1 will write 50 checks, send them off to the State capitals of America and with very little involvement wash its hands of the Medicaid Program.

The irony of this proposal, Mr. President, is that the very people who make it with such ardor frequently on other issues look, as one of their political North Stars, to former President Ronald Reagan and suggest that he is in many ways the father of modern conservative political thought.

Would Ronald Reagan have supported a program of block grants to the States for Medicaid? As my colleague from California, who no doubt had an opportunity to observe former Governor and then President Reagan over a number of years, will certainly know, the answer is no, because what President Reagan proposed was that rather than Balkanize Medicaid, Medicaid should be federalized.

He had a couple of compelling reasons why he thought that should be the case. The first was that as a Californian he recognized the fact that if you had differentials in standards, there was a tendency for a mobile population of poor people to seek out those communities that had the most generous standards. In the 1960's and 1970's California had among the most generous standards in the country and therefore served as a magnet for persons to come in the State in order to access those standards. So one rationale of President Reagan was that we needed to have greater uniformity in order to avoid this inducement to move.

A second rationale which I think is extremely relevant today is that President Reagan recognized that Medicaid, which had started as being primarily a program for poor children and their families, was increasingly becoming a program for the frail elderly. In my State today about 60 to 70 percent of the Medicaid funding is spent on people over 65, a very high percentage spent on people over 85. So President Reagan felt that we needed to relook at both Medicare, the health care financing program for the elderly, and Medicaid, the program for the indigent, and attempt to rationalize, harmonize, knit those two programs more effectively together, and that that knitting together would occur with more likelihood if Medicaid was a Federal program than if it were distributed to the States.

Mr. President, I think those two reasons of President Reagan were compelling in the 1980's and, if anything, they are even more compelling today. So it is somewhat of a shock now to see that the descendents of the philosophy of Ronald Reagan want to go exactly in the opposite direction from his advice, and that is to remove the Federal Government as a continuing partner in this national program of Medicaid.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for a question for a second?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Senator from Florida is close to being through, and at the conclusion of my remarks, I will be pleased to yield.

The second point is that the Medicaid Program requires a base of financing in

order to meet its current needs and to be able to assume the new responsibilities which clearly lie just over the horizon. As the Senator from Massachusetts pointed out, the proposal of the Republicans will reduce the total funds available for Medicaid over the next 7 years not just by the some \$70 to \$80 billion that will be eliminated at the Federal level but by a figure of close to \$250 billion because the amount that will be asked of the States in their contribution to participate in the Medicaid Program will be so reduced.

Mr. President, I do not believe any serious analysis of the challenges facing Medicaid could come to the conclusion that we can meet the health care needs of Americans with a \$250 billion reduction in funds available in the fundamental safety net program of our national health care system, Medicaid. In fact, there are a number of factors that are going to put Medicaid under greater pressure. One of those factors is the fact that we have a growing number of children and adolescents in our population.

To give just one statistic, last year America graduated approximately 2.5 million students from its high schools. Within less than 9 years, we will be graduating over 3 million children from our high schools, as an indication of this surge of youth that is coming through our society, who in addition to having education needs will also have health care needs which Medicaid would be the principal instrument for meeting.

I ask the Senator from California if she could yield an additional 5 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. I will do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM. Also, there will continue, unfortunately, to be a decline in the number of children covered by the health insurance of their parents at a point of employment. The population will continue to age. More people will be in the advanced ages, which is the greatest source of additional cost to the Medicaid Program. We are making some policy decisions such as those embedded in our recent vote on the immigration bill that are going to result in greater demands on the Medicaid system.

So there is no basis for the proposition that we can meet all of these challenges to the Nation's health care system and sustain a \$250 billion cut in the Medicaid Program, most of it being a cut at the State level, not at the Federal level.

Finally, in the Medicaid system, one area of reform that cries out is to treat all States fairly. Today we have extreme disparities in terms of the funding that is provided for the poor child, the poor frail elderly, and the disabled from one State to the next. Those disparities are a function of history, the fact that we have built up a practice of inducing States to come into expanded

Medicaid services by the Federal Government, matching or more than matching those State commitments. Those States that had a sufficient level of affluence to afford a more luxurious system have developed that, and, therefore, that has led to substantially higher amounts of Federal support for their Medicaid programs than for the less affluent States.

We also have the situation in which certain States severely abused a program that had a good purpose: to recognize the special cost of hospitals that served large numbers of indigent Americans. Those hospitals were to be recognized by getting a disproportionate share of Medicaid funds in order to pick up some of that cost that was otherwise uncompensated. Unfortunately, that program was severely abused by a handful of States and resulted in extreme distortions in where Federal Medicaid money went, State to State.

The proposal we have before us would largely freeze those past inequities into place and would make us live with them for the foreseeable future. The amendment offered by the Senator from California represents a clarion voice for reform and fair treatment in that all Americans should be assured that they will be treated equally by their National Government in terms of their access to quality health care.

Those are some of the fundamental issues we are dealing with. Are we going to maintain the Federal-State partnership which has served us so well in reducing infant mortality, providing dignity for older Americans, providing a safety net under an increasingly frayed system of employer-based health insurance? Are we going to maintain an adequate funding basis at both the Federal and the State level to meet increasing demands on our Medicaid Program? And are we going to treat all Americans, wherever they live, fairly?

The amendment that is offered by the Senator from California meets those tests of fundamental fairness and vision for the future of America. The underlying proposal fails on all of those tests.

I urge the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Florida, the former Governor and distinguished U.S. Senator. He is on this floor with, I think, very important advice for Senators. It is fiscally responsible. He understands that when you help people who are trying to help themselves, when you help people who deserve help, people who have such problems, disabilities, infirmities, that in fact you are doing the right thing. I thank him very much for his leadership on this.

I say to my friend from Tennessee, that concludes our discussion of this amendment. I will be very happy to yield the floor at this time for him if

he wishes to rebut. But I again urge my colleagues to look carefully at the Democratic budget, at the Breaux-Chafee budget—or Chafee-Breaux budget, as it is called—and the Republican budget. You will see that two out of three of these budgets believe in this amendment, believe strongly in this amendment. I hope those who support both the Democratic proposal and the Chafee-Breaux budget proposal will support this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. FRIST. Does the distinguished Senator from California yield back the remainder of her time?

Mrs. BOXER. If my friend is going to speak and wishes to debate this, I have no need to take any amount of time other than to rebut, perhaps, some of his comments if I feel I need to do so. It is not my intention to prolong this debate.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendment of the Senator from California for a number of reasons. Fundamentally, this particular amendment results in more taxation and more spending. The case I would like to lay out is that that increased taxation and increased spending is unnecessary. It is unnecessary.

Let me say at the outset, we have heard a lot from people who care very much about this Medicaid Program. The Medicaid Program is something that I, too, care very much about. I have worked with Members on both sides of the aisle to guarantee that we preserve what is a very good program that has served millions of people, both today and over time.

My role as a public servant, as a U.S. Senator, is one hat that I wear, but in addition to that perspective, I wear the hat of a physician who has taken care of the very people that we have heard talked about tonight. It hurts me when people use words like "walk away from children." I have dedicated my entire adult life to helping children, one on one, as a physician, and to have words like that used on either side of the aisle hurts a great deal.

About 35 percent of the patients I have treated over the last 18 years of my life are Medicaid recipients. Night after night I have sat at the bedside of children, of mothers, of fathers, of people who have benefited from a program that served as a very important safety net for people who otherwise might not have access to care. It is to those people I say, to hear this accusation, it is not medagogy, but it is close, when we have these accusations of walking away. Again, I am not sure it is intended that way, but the fact we are talking about the case of individuals, of children, with accusations elevated to that political—rhetorical, I think—level hurts.

When we heard here words about cut, and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts used cut again and again and again, and that is associated

with the comments made about walking away from children and the amputation of programs—the growth rate in our proposal is 6.5 percent next year, the year after that, and the year after that—6.5 percent annual growth rate. That means an increase, not a cut, year after year over the next 6 years.

I think, finally, the public at large understands this is not a cut. It was President Clinton who, 3 years ago, in 1993, in an AARP meeting out on the west coast, said what we need to do for this program, Medicaid, is slow the growth from about 10 to 11 percent down to two times inflation. That is what we have done. A program that gives flexibility to States, that covers the people who need to be covered—and I will come to that shortly—we have slowed the growth to exactly what the President said 3 years ago, down to more than two times the rate of inflation. Anybody who has taken time to read what we proposed, it is 6.5 percent growth, year after year.

The President's plan is 7.1 percent. I guess we can debate whether it should be 7.1 or 6.5, but to say we are walking away from children and we are cutting or amputating programs, it is not true and the American people are going to see through that.

I do want to restate the ideas behind the Medicaid reforms and the question I was going to ask earlier of my colleague from Florida, because he kept saying this is a block grant to the States. It is not a block grant. It is not even close to a block grant.

No. 2, he talked about the dissolution, what is no longer a joint Federal-State partnership. It is just not true. It is not true. If you read what our assumptions are in the concurrent budget resolution, it is real simple. It basically says the committee's recommendation assumes implementation of a bipartisan—bipartisan—Medicaid reform plan approved by 48 Governors in early February. It was the unanimous consent of 48 Governors, who put together the plan, which is the basis, the foundation for the assumptions which resulted in our proposal.

It is important to say that, because the second half of the amendment proposed by the Senator from California lists six principles. Let me say at the outset that I agree with most all of those principles. I think that is important. I do not agree we have to increase spending by \$18 billion to accomplish that, and I will come back to it.

But let me say what our plan—the assumptions in the 48 Governors' unanimous consent bipartisan plan which is the foundation, the verbatim foundation for our proposal—does. It is not a cut, it is an increase. I have said that. It is not a block grant, it is a Federal-State partnership.

It is not walking away from children. We cover the same populations, and I will come back to that. We guarantee coverage in this plan of low-income children who I have taken care of; and of pregnant women who I have taken

care of in the past; and of the senior citizens who I have taken care of; and the individuals with disabilities for whom I am an advocate. We guarantee coverage. Period.

No. 2, we maintain the Medicaid Program as a matching program. Matching, that means Federal and that means State; a partnership; hand in hand; money comes from both. It is not a block grant to the States.

No. 3, we continue the Federal minimum standards for nursing homes, which were brought out in the principles of my colleague from California.

No. 4, we continue Federal rules that prevent wives or husbands from being required to impoverish themselves just to keep and obtain Medicaid benefits for their spouses, requiring nursing home care. We continue those Federal rules. Period.

No. 5, we provide coverage of Medicare premiums and cost sharing payments for low-income seniors consistent with the unanimous 48 Governors—at the National Governors Association—Medicaid policy. That is what we do. Let us strip away the rhetoric.

The fundamental problem with Medicaid, because we do have a problem with the program that does serve over 30 million people—we do have a problem. Let us step away and look at the numbers, because we have the budget. We have the assumptions I just talked about, but let us go back to the numbers for one second.

The problem: Federal spending on Medicaid has doubled over the last 5 years; \$90 billion in 1995. It is 20 percent of the State budget. That means if you are a Governor today, anywhere from 18 to as high as 23 percent of all the money in your budget is going to Medicaid. You can say, "Should it be 20 percent? Should it be 15 percent? Should it be 25 percent?" None of us can really answer that question. But what we do know, if you have 20 percent of your budget and the other 80 percent is being spent on crime and the environment and education and roads and police, that if you let that 20 percent grow to 25 percent or 30 percent or 35 percent, what suffers? Education, environment, crime, police, roads.

So at some point, the Governors have to sit back and say, "We have to do something about a program that is one-fifth of our budget that is skyrocketing year after year at the Federal level," and by definition at the State level, is doubling at least every 5 years. If you do not, schools are going to get even worse, our environmental protection is going to get worse, there are going to be fewer police on the streets.

So we have a problem. We all know it is a problem. We are all trying to work together, in a bipartisan way—at least the Governors are, 48 of them—in addressing that problem.

This is why you do not have to raise taxes \$18 billion in this amendment that has been put on the table. You do

not have to. Excessive regulation results in waste.

What has happened over the last 30 years in this program is that with our good intentions in this body, Washington, DC, inside the beltway, we want to help people. How do we do that? We do that by coming to this floor and passing a layer of regulations, and the next year, another layer of regulations put on that, and then another layer of regulations, to where you get to 1996 and you have a program with 50,000 regulations telling you how to spend a health care dollar, which is the taxpayers' dollar, in taking care of that child who I had to do a transplant on or do a heart operation on back at Vanderbilt Medical Center where I was 3 years ago before I came here.

That taxpayer dollar gets eaten up, literally eaten up by the time it gets down to the doctor-patient relationship, and that is the problem we have. It is excessive regulation and waste.

Somebody else has realized that. It is not just us. Governor Bill Clinton, before the House Government Operations Committee, December 8, 1990, I think said it much better than I can. He has been at this a lot longer than I have. He knows how to say things, I think, pretty well. He used the right words:

Medicaid used to be a program with a lot of options and few mandates.

We are the ones who do the mandates.

Now it's just the opposite.

Let us face the facts. He had it right back in 1990, and in this proposal we have today, we have it right. It is not perfect, but it is a lot better than what we have today.

Why do we have to spend another \$18 billion, increase spending \$18 billion, increase taxes \$18 billion, which is what this amendment implies we have to do? Our contention, and the contention of the Governors, is that if you strip away the regulations, if you strip away the requirements of dictating that doctor-patient relationship, what goes on, eligibility, out of Washington, DC, if you strip away those 50,000 regulations and you give much of that responsibility back to States and give them the flexibility to run their programs, you can save money.

You do not have to cut, you can still allow Medicaid to grow over 6 percent, over twice inflation, which is what we do, but you do not have to let it grow at 15 to 17 percent a year.

Let me turn to this one chart just to show you. Tennessee—and we have had discussions on both sides of the aisle of what are called 1115(a) waivers. It is hard to get these 1115(a) waivers. I can tell you, before I came to this Senate, I went through that process with Tennessee and it ain't easy.

The 1115(a) waiver says, in essence, we will let you, as a State, run a program how you see best; we will give you the flexibility, instead of mandating how you run it out of Washington, DC, and let us see what you do.

Tennessee applied for a waiver, received that waiver and let me just show you—it is not a perfect program, and I am not going to be here defending everything about the program—but let me show you just the dollars and cents of what can be done if you give those Governors the responsibility, let them design an appropriate program over time.

This is the Medicaid expenditure growth in the State of Tennessee. This starts in fiscal year 1986, 1987, continues to 1992, 1993, and 1994. The yellow bars are the percentage change in increased expenditures in a State, the overall program, joint State and Federal match.

You can see in fiscal year 1986, the Medicaid Program in Tennessee was growing at 21 percent, and it has happened in all of our States at varying levels. In 1987, it grew at 16 percent; in 1988, it grew at 21 percent; in 1989, a pretty good year, it grew at 14 percent; it grew at 20 percent; 20 percent; 1993, 13 percent; 1992, 34 percent.

Think, if you are a Governor and have a program growing on average about 20 percent, which is this red line, each and every year and you have your budget, 20 percent a year, that part of your budget is growing, all of a sudden, you have to start saying, I can't spend as much on education, I can't spend as much on fighting crime, on putting police on the streets, because we're growing at 20 percent per year.

In Tennessee, for the same amount of money being spent, both at the State and Federal level, by having these 50,000 regulations stripped away, growth in 1994 was right at 1 percent—1 percent. That overall budget about \$2.5 billion did not grow over the course of 1 year. That shows what can be done. It can be done if you give States that flexibility.

That is why I oppose this amendment. You do not have to charge it; \$18 billion more in increased taxes and increased spending.

Let me go back to one other chart just to demonstrate what that actually means. Again, we are talking dollars right now. I am coming back to the eligibility.

This is TennCare in yellow. This is Medicaid in red, which is what would have been projected if we had to still live under the Federal regulations in the State of Tennessee, which other States have to live under. This is in 1994 when the program started. If you look over time with TennCare, you can see that cost and expenditures are controlled, increasing, ironically, at a rate of about 6.5 percent a year in the State of Tennessee.

Look what it would have increased to if we had to live under those excessive, burdensome regulations. President Clinton said it best back in 1990.

Someone might say, Well, I bet you did it in Tennessee by not covering as many people. You are not doing as good a job. In some way you are cutting back on benefits and cutting back

on services. The beauty is we do not have to let taxes grow, and at 20 percent of expenditures. In 1993, 89 percent of the population was covered. This is not very good. This is, of the entire population, 89 percent of all Tennesseans were covered.

By giving States the right to look at their own programs, strip away their regulations, for the same amount of money, for the same amount of money for controlled growth, we were able to cover 94 percent of the population. It is ironic; 89 percent was probably in the lower 10 or 15 of all States of people covered.

In 1994, Tennessee was the No. 1 State in the country in terms of numbers of people covered. Why? Because we were able to cover more people for the same amount of money by stripping away these excessive Government regulations. What? This proposal? We heard a lot of things. A lot of it has been rhetoric.

What is actually in our proposal? I have said, we are going to increase Medicaid spending more than two times inflation, at a rate of an average annual growth of 6.5 percent. Is that a cut? That is not a cut. We are going to spend, in fact, \$54 billion more than in last year's budget resolution.

So we have moved from the resolution last year. The President's plan, as I said, is 7.1 percent growth. The big thing, I think, is that all of our assumptions, all of our savings, are based on the Governors' Medicaid proposal. I think this was missed in all of the earlier comments when we talked about block grants, we talked about no nursing home standards, we talked about lack of eligibility.

Let me just tell you what the Governors' Medicaid proposal says.

Restructuring Medicaid. These are our assumptions.

Eligibility. It is guaranteed for pregnant women up to 133 percent of poverty. It is guaranteed for children to age 6 to 133 percent of poverty; age 6 through 12 to 100 percent of poverty. It is guaranteed for the elderly who meet SSI income and resource standards. It is guaranteed for individuals with disabilities.

Benefits. The following benefits are spelled out by the National Governors' Association recommendation, which was accepted. We based all our assumptions on adopting this plan. The benefits remain guaranteed for in-patient and outpatient hospital services, physician services, prenatal care, nursing facility services, home health care, family planning services and supplies, laboratory and x-ray services, pediatric and family nurse practitioner services, nurse midwife services, and early and periodic screening and diagnosis treatment services.

Nursing home reforms. Again, let me say that in terms of the principles outlined in the amendment under discussion, I agree with many of those principles.

Nursing home reforms. What is in the Governors' plan which is our plan?

States will abide by the OBRA '87 standards for nursing homes. States will have the flexibility to determine enforcement strategies for nursing home standards and will include them in their State plans.

Financing. We heard this statement that this was a block grant to the States. Each State will have a maximum Federal allocation that provides the State with the Federal capacity to cover Medicaid enrollees. The match will continue.

We also have in that plan an insurance umbrella. The insurance umbrella is designed to ensure that States will get access to additional funds for certain populations if, because of unanticipated consequences, the growth factor fails to accurately estimate the growth in the populations. Funds are guaranteed on a per beneficiary basis for those described below who are not included in the estimates of their base and their group.

In closing, Mr. President, I oppose this amendment. I have made the point that we do not need to spend and tax \$18 billion or more to accomplish the goals that are laid out. I have shown, in fact, how one State required zero percent growth, not 10, 15, 20 percent growth, and was able to treat, was able to cover more individuals. We do not need to tax more and we do not need to spend more.

We heard of the amputation of programs. We heard of walking away from children. I do hope we can stay away from that rhetoric because I, as a physician—I am a Senator for awhile, but basically I am a physician. I have taken an oath, and I have lived my life in the service of individuals, again, with about a third of that population being Medicaid recipients.

I want it there. I understand the value of it to be there. I understand the importance of this program and feel that I, in a bipartisan way, with 48 Governors who put their proposal on the table, can achieve the goals that we all want, and that is to provide a safety net for this population, for all three populations who need Medicaid over time.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mrs. BOXER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I do not intend to take a great deal of time at all, but I just want to make certain points in response to my friend from Tennessee.

He said it hurt him to hear Senators on this side—and I guess he was quoting me—say their budget, the Republican budget, is walking away from children and poor seniors. When I made that remark, I said specifically, I know no one intends that to be the case. I just happen to believe it is the case. I do not think anyone intends to hurt a child. To hurt a child with spina bifida, to hurt a child in a wheelchair, to hurt a senior citizen who depends on others in nursing homes—no one would ever want to hurt those people.

I just happen to believe that is the outcome. I am not alone in this. I am not alone in this. I am going to talk a little bit about who on the Republican side of the aisle would like to add even more back than Senators GRAHAM, KENNEDY, DORGAN, and I are adding back.

So when I say I think this Republican budget, in terms of its Medicare cuts—I call them excessive cuts—walks away from kids, I do not mean it to hurt any Senators. I am saying it because I think in pragmatic terms it is going to hurt kids and people who are quite vulnerable.

I heard the Senator say that he is proud of the Governors and that they decided they would cover children and they would cover the seniors who are disabled and they would cover pregnant women. I am very glad that they want to. But I would have to take it another step. If the Senator believes it so important to cover pregnant women, if the Senator believes it is so important to cover the disabled and the seniors in nursing homes, then why do we not do it as Americans, as a national Government, and not leave it up to 50 States? Because, let me say this, States can say one thing today. They could be hit with a natural disaster tomorrow, and simply not have the wherewithal to do the job.

You know, when States want to get block grant funding, they may say one thing, and a few years later, change their mind. Why does the Senator think we have Federal nursing home standards? It is simply because the States set the standard, and there was scandal after scandal after scandal. And there were hearings.

I do not know what condition the Senator's State was in, but I can tell you in my home State, there were scandals. Seniors were scalded in bath tubs and were drugged. I know the Senator from Oregon, who has been a champion for senior citizens, knows about those stories. We saw spouses becoming impoverished. We saw adult children of those nursing home residents becoming impoverished. We worked hard over in the House, he and I, with HENRY WAXMAN—and I remember it well—and BARBARA MIKULSKI over here on this side. We said never again will that happen.

Now the Senator from Tennessee says, is it not great that Governors care. I believe that Governors care. But so do I. I happen to be a U.S. Senator. He happens to be a U.S. Senator. We have a chance in the U.S. Senate to say it is important to have Federal nursing home standards and enforcement.

I also would like to say this. My friend says this is a very expensive proposal, \$18 billion. Does he know that Breaux-Chafee, a bipartisan proposal in this U.S. Senate, adds \$31 billion more to the Republican budget? Does he think those people are spendthrifts? Does he think Senator BENNETT, Senator BOND, Senator BROWN, Senator CHAFEE, Senator COHEN, Senator GOR-

TON, Senator JEFFORDS, Senator SPECTER, Senator SIMPSON, Senator SNOWE, his colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle are spendthrifts and do not care about fiscal responsibility? I am sure that he agrees with me that they do care. Yet they are going to be \$31 billion over the Republican budget.

In conclusion, I say this: This is not about rhetoric. This is about adding back \$18 billion, when Breaux-Chafee with all these Republican Senators want to spend \$31 billion more in that same time period.

My friend talks about bipartisanship. My goodness, our amendment is less than their budget in terms of Medicaid. Clearly, there are three proposals out here dealing with Medicaid: The Republican proposal, the Democratic proposal, and Breaux-Chafee. The one, in my opinion, that hurts children, and I do not mean to hurt the Senator when I say this, I just think it is a result of his priority, that hurts seniors, that hurts the disabled, happens to be the Republican budget. That is why I hope we can join hands together, all of us, and support this amendment.

I know the hour is late and I thank my colleague from Florida, my colleague from Massachusetts, my colleague from Oregon for his patience.

I yield the floor.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment. I disagree on the closing that this proposal hurts children. It is a statement, but there is no data, evidence, or suggestion given that it hurts children. I said eligibility covered children to age 6 through 12 to 100 percent of poverty. This is a National Governors' assumption, proposals.

I guess we could say it hurts children, but there is no evidence and no data that it hurts children. I see nothing, having taken care of children with my hands in a Medicaid Program, I see nothing, nothing, in this proposal that hurts children. Walk away from kids, hurting children—I guess we will just disagree on that.

The Senator from California did strike—I think, again, this is a difference we will not agree upon, but when she has argued that it takes a national program, a National Government, to be able to protect children—

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield?

I said national standards, not a national program. I said national standards.

Mr. FRIST. If the statement was national standards, let me just say that the standards in the Governors' proposal are basically standards that will be carried out by every State. That is part of the assumption. If it is just national standards, we are OK.

My feeling was at a national level it took us to best decide how to take care of people in Tennessee or in Washington State or in Alabama or Mississippi. That is a fundamental difference, I believe. I think the more we can do at the State level and at the local level, the better. That is where accountability will rest.

I argue strongly that this body, Washington Government, Washington, DC, is not the body that can best cover children or protect children or prevent people from hurting children. I argue it is the people closest to home, that it is the Governors, it is the local governments that can best watch after our children. That is a fundamental difference.

Third, on the Chafee-Breaux, Breaux-Chafee proposal, we have not had that presented yet. I do not know what the dollar figures will be. There are some assumptions that it might be that reform is delayed a year. I have heard that mentioned in these particular proposals. I cannot comment. I do not know the fact that they spend more makes it a better program. I argue that increasing at 6 percent a year based on what we have seen in at least one State, in Tennessee, we can accomplish all of our goals without this radical increase in taxation, more taxation and more spending.

Last, we will come back to the word "bipartisan." I have already mentioned from where we were in the budget resolution last year, we have shifted \$54 billion already. I will say what we have endorsed is a bipartisan plan that Governors together came and endorsed. That is 100 percent of the assumptions we put in our budget. That is bipartisan. We have endorsed that. That is the basis of our assumptions.

With that, I hope when we do vote on this amendment, again, agreeing with many of those principles laid out, but arguing that many, if not most of those proposals are spelled out in this very document which we have endorsed, that we do not need that increased spending. It is unnecessary.

Mr. President, could I ask my colleague from California if she is willing to yield back her time?

Mrs. BOXER. I am happy to yield back all my time on this. I assume, I say to my friend, that we will be voting on this amendment on Tuesday. Is that correct?

Mr. FRIST. I understand it will be stacked on Tuesday.

Mrs. BOXER. I also ask unanimous consent that each side be allowed 1 minute before the vote to explain the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be laid aside so the Senator from Oregon can offer an amendment.

Mr. FRIST. I yield back all my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 3984

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN], for himself and Mr. KERRY, proposes an amendment numbered 3984.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent 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 new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING REVENUE ASSUMPTIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) Corporations and individuals have clear responsibility to adhere to environmental laws. When they do not, and environmental damage results, the federal and state governments may impose fines and penalties, and assess polluters for the cost of remediation.

(2) Assessment of these costs is important in the enforcement process. They appropriately penalize wrongdoing. They discourage future environmental damage. They ensure that taxpayers do not bear the financial brunt of cleaning up after damages done by polluters.

(3) In the case of the Exxon Valdez oil spill disaster in Prince William Sound, Alaska, for example, the corporate settlement with the federal government totaled \$900 million.

(4) The tax code, however, currently allows polluters to fully deduct all expenses, including penalties and fines associated with these settlements. In the case of the Exxon Valdez disaster, deductibility on that settlement at the current corporate tax rate will result in \$300 million in losses to federal tax collections . . . losses which will have to be made up through increased collections from taxation of average American families.

(5) Additionally, these losses also will make it more difficult to move aggressively and successfully toward a balanced federal budget.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—assumptions in this resolution assume that revenues will be increased by a minimum of \$100 million per year through legislation that will not allow deductions for fines, penalties and damages arising from a failure to comply with federal or state environmental or health protection laws.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, this amendment which I offer tonight with Senator KERRY of Massachusetts would put the U.S. Senate on record as saying that it is time to end tax writeoffs under our Tax Code for polluters.

We know our country wants the Senate to get serious about balancing the budget. I know this has been a slow moving exercise in the past. They want a serious sprint to balancing the budget. I believe it is possible to make real progress in balancing the budget. I said in my campaign that I believe you can balance the budget, just the way Oregon families have to balance their budget.

Under the proposal that I offer tonight, if it had been law over the last 6 years, about \$500 million would have gone to reducing the deficit simply by ending tax writeoffs for those who pollute in our country.

What happens today, even though we want a polluter-pay philosophy with respect to environmental protection, what we do is under the tax law provide a Macy's basement discount for those who actually have to pay penalties.

So what I am proposing tonight with Senator KERRY of Massachusetts, is basic tax fairness. Under our amendment, no longer would average working

families pay more on their taxes just because the polluter has received a writeoff on their tax return. What we propose is to put the Senate on record that all revenues collected, when you have the kind of current tax treatment for these penalties, would go back to the Treasury. It would not go into the pockets of the polluter.

Let me talk, for a moment, about the way it works today under our tax laws. If you have a polluter who violates the Safe Drinking Water Act, a statute that assures that the water our kids drink is safe, they then have to pay a penalty. But under the Federal tax laws, they get a tax break for that penalty that they would be paying.

The Clean Air Act assures that the air our families breathe is pure. But if a polluter violates it and pays a penalty, they get another tax break when they violate that important environmental law.

The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act protects our communities against hazardous waste. When a polluter violates that statute, they have to pay a penalty under the law, but they get a tax break under the Tax Code when they do so.

The CERCLA Act is the one designed to clean up our Nation's Superfund sites, some of the most hazardous and dangerous waste in our country. When a polluter violates those laws, they pay penalties, and, again, get tax writeoffs.

The Oil Pollution Act is a particularly important example of why this change Senator KERRY and I propose tonight is needed. The Oil Pollution Act seeks to guard against devastating oil spills like the *Exxon Valdez*. In the case of the *Exxon Valdez* disaster in Prince William Sound, the polluter agreed to a settlement of approximately \$900 million. The defendant in that case took an immediate \$150 million tax deduction. Over the course of that 10-year payout on that particular settlement, you have a polluter that is going to be able to write off nearly \$300 million of the total cost.

Now, some are going to argue that it makes sense to provide a tax deduction as an incentive for polluters to somehow settle these damage suits. I argue that the knowledge that these polluters are going to pay the full freight of their damage is a lot more than incentive for them to comply with the environmental laws and get serious about cleanup. I do not think it provides any real incentive if you allow people to write off on their taxes when they violate the environmental laws and have to pay penalties. I think it erodes the fairness of the Tax Code when you provide almost unlimited deductibility arrangements for the polluters, where they get a discount of everything they pay up to 34 percent.

Now, the fact is, Mr. President, that all of the major environmental organizations are in support of this particular amendment. They have said this is one of their priorities with respect to the environment and this budget resolution.

Every Member of this body who cares about tax fairness ought to support this amendment. I do not see how a Member can go and stand up at a community meeting, a town hall meeting in their own home State, and justify, at a time when we are seeing pressure for deficit reduction and many valuable programs cut, allowing a tax writeoff of up to 34 percent when you have somebody violating environmental laws and paying a penalty as a result.

So, Mr. President, if the manager for the majority is prepared to yield back time on the amendment, I am prepared to yield back time, as well. Let me see what the desire of the majority is.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I will yield back my time, as well.

Mr. WYDEN. I yield back my time, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE DEATH OF ADM. JEREMY BOORDA

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I was deeply saddened to learn today that our Nation has lost one of its finest Naval officers. Throughout his entire career Adm. Jeremy Boorda showed an incredible dedication to serving his country. After joining the Navy at the age of 17, Jeremy Boorda became the first enlisted man to rise through the enlisted ranks to become the Navy's top uniformed officer. His outstanding record of service and achievement should be remembered by all of those who are called on to defend their nation and will stand as an outstanding example of how a man through dedication and sacrifice can achieve great things. My wife and I had the pleasure of knowing the admiral and I send my condolences to his wife Bettie and their four children in this difficult time.

ADM. MIKE BOORDA

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to the life of Admiral Mike Boorda. He was one of our Nation's finest military officers. He was also a friend, whose counsel and advice I often sought—and always respected. I send my deepest sympathy to his wife Bettie and their children. They are in my prayers.

One of my strongest memories of Admiral Boorda is from my visit to Bosnia. The admiral was called away from dinner because of the terrible bombing of the market place in Sarajevo. I went with him to the operations

center where he monitored intelligence reports and oversaw the American response. I was so impressed with his courage and professionalism. I saw first hand that our Navy was in good hands.

Admiral Boorda was the first sailor to rise through the ranks from enlisted sailor to four star admiral. Going from seaman to Chief of Naval Operations was an extraordinary accomplishment that served as an inspiration for young sailors in the fleet.

He learned a lot along the way. He cared about the welfare of every man and woman in our Armed Forces and he cared deeply about the United States Navy.

We have all heard stories about how he cut through redtape to help improve the lives of individual sailors. I remember one story in particular. A young sailor said he needed to be reassigned so that his child could receive proper medical care. Admiral Boorda saw that it was done immediately.

He also cared deeply about the honor and integrity of the United States Navy. Perhaps more than anyone else, he helped the Navy to change—to provide real opportunity and dignity for women and minorities. I worked closely with him after the Tailhook scandal shook the Navy. He made sure that there wasn't a whitewash or a witch hunt. He displayed the kind of honor that is a model for all of us.

Admiral Boorda's death is a tragedy. But his life was a triumph. His contributions to our Nation will live on forever.

BUDDY ZAIS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, we all know the adage, that one is never too old to learn. I would like to call attention to a very special Vermonter, Buddy Zais, who embodies this truism.

Last Saturday, May 11, Buddy was one of the 203 students to graduate from Trinity College of Vermont. What makes Buddy stand out in this crowd is that he is receiving his bachelor of arts degree in philosophy 63 years after attending his first year of college at Boston University.

At the age of 80 years old, Buddy is the oldest person ever to graduate from Trinity College. In true form, Buddy graduated with magna cum laude honors. Now that he has his bachelors degree behind him, he is looking ahead to the next challenge he will undertake. I wish Buddy much luck in his next endeavor. I've been his friend for over 30 years and I'm so proud of him.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from The Burlington Free Press celebrating Buddy's graduation be printed in the RECORD.

On a final note, I must add that it comes as no surprise to me that Sister Janice Ryan, the president of Trinity College of Vermont, was one of the forces behind getting Buddy started back on his degree. Sister Janice has been a good friend for many years. Buddy and I know only too well that

once she sets her sights on something she makes sure it happens.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Burlington Free Press, May 12, 1996]

ONE TRINITY GRAD MAGNA CUM LATELY (By Tamara Lush)

It took starting a business, raising a family and the death of his wife before Bernard "Buddy" Zais decided to return to college.

Now, after 63 years, Zais has finally gotten his college degree.

The 80-year-old Zais was one of 203 Trinity College graduates Saturday at the school's 71st commencement ceremony. Zais received his bachelor of arts degree in philosophy, and after the ceremony, had a few wise words of his own.

"I figured before I check out, I ought to have a college degree," said Zais, pausing to hug other graduates old enough to be his great-grandchildren.

As Zais—the oldest person to graduate from Trinity—was handed his diploma, he received a standing ovation from the hundreds of people who attended the ceremony at the Patrick Gymnasium.

Zais said he was prodded into going back to school by Trinity College President Sister Janice Ryan, who marked her final commencement speech Saturday, following 17 years as the college's top administrator. Ryan is stepping down from her post this summer.

Shortly after his wife Mary died in 1992, Ryan asked Zais how he and his family were doing. Zais reported his two grandchildren had just gotten their college degrees. "That means that all three of my grandchildren, and my two children, and Mary, had a degree, and I was the only one in the family without one," he said.

So Ryan asked Zais to apply to the school, and even had an admissions counselor contact him.

Zais, who formed a company called Health Insurance of Vermont and had been an insurance agent his entire working life, decided to study philosophy with a concentration on the Greek philosophers.

He received credit for the one year he had gone to college—in 1933, he went to Boston University and studied journalism.

Going back to school and spending time with young people was one of Zais' best life experiences. "It was the most satisfying, gratifying experience of my life, other than raising my family," he said. "It was much important than my business life, much more important than selling insurance."

And Zais, who graduate magna cum laude, isn't going to stop at one degree.

He is considering attending school for his master's and possibly his doctorate in philosophy. To do that, he said, he might have to go out of state because no Vermont school offers those degrees in philosophy. "I'll have to go to Albany, Boston or McGill University," he said. "Will I do it? Probably."

THE FDR MEMORIAL

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, thousands of people come to Washington, DC, each year to learn about the history of our country and the legacy left to us by the great men and women that have built the strongest, most powerful nation the world has ever known—the United States of America.

Our country's finest hours have been ones where prejudice and discrimina-

tion have been acknowledged and addressed. The key to our overcoming and addressing discrimination has been education and understanding.

The most recent debate over the FDR Memorial is an opportunity for our country to once again beat back discrimination. Discrimination is not always blatant. Discrimination also includes exclusion.

I strongly believe that portraying FDR in a wheelchair in one of the three statues that are being built as part of the memorial would be an incredibly powerful statement to all who visit this tribute to a great, vibrant, forceful leader. The fact that FDR had polio and spent most of his waking hours as President working in his wheelchair does not change any of these truths. In fact, FDR's disability was a great source of his strength.

A main tenet of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 was to ensure that the Federal Government plays a central role in enforcing the standards established in the act on behalf of individuals with disabilities.

In this effort, I hope that the FDR Memorial Commission will depict President Roosevelt as he was—a great, courageous man who had polio and still led our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the New York Times and a letter from eight of FDR's grandchildren to Michael Deland and Alan Reich of the National Organization on Disability be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 12, 1996]

THE AIRBRUSH OF POWER

Most Americans are aware, if sometimes vaguely, that Franklin Roosevelt was stricken by polio in 1921 and was unable thereafter to stand unassisted. Yet there will be no visual reminder of this fact in the F.D.R. memorial due to be dedicated in Washington next spring. On the contrary, he is to be shown standing tall in one of three sculptures planned for the seven-acre site on the banks of the Potomac.

This fiction, however benign, is being protested by the National Organization on Disability, whose chairman, Michael Deland, urges that at least one bronze image depict F.D.R. as he often was, in a wheelchair. Logic and sentiment support Mr. Deland. But alas, the leaden weight of tradition stands all too squarely behind the memorial commission's penchant for make-believe.

Through the ages, rulers of every stripe, male and female, have sought to improve upon or alter nature. The Egyptians led the way. Ramses II was not content to show himself mowing down adversaries in scores of battle friezes. His artists had to depict him twice as big as everyone else. Going further, Queen Hatshepsut, the first great female ruler known to history, had herself replicated in stone with a false beard, thus visually changing her sex.

Roman emperors and their wives were tidied up in marble and bronze, their faces deftly nipped and tucked on imperial coins. European rulers in the Middle Ages invoked theology to justify the lies of art. Every monarch, it was said, is at once mortal and incorporeal, so that in a higher realm all were immune to the blemishes of the flesh.

On their death, an image was carved delineating their idealized features.

We learn through written records, not portraits, of Richard III's crookback and Henry VIII's terminal corpulence. In art, Elizabeth I is always the same iconic virgin queen; in life, she banish mirrors from her palaces as her hair thinned and her cheeks hollowed. In the same spirit, Elizabeth II, who has turned 70, has firmly resisted suggestions that she permit an updating on coins of her youthful profile, as Queen Victoria did after her Jubilee in 1887.

By contrast, the Puritan regicide Oliver Cromwell is said to have told the artist Lely: "Flatter me not at all. But remark all these roughnesses, pimples, warts, and everything as you see me. Otherwise I will not pay a farthing for it." Yet this splendid story was printed long after Cromwell's death and may be apocryphal, according to his biographer, Antonia Fraser. More characteristic was Winston Churchill's response to an unflattering portrait by Graham Sutherland: he hid it away, Dorian Gray fashion. Some years later his widow, Clementine, apparently burned it.

Presidential portraits in the White House are a study in illusionist brushwork. Richard Nixon resembles a scoutmaster, Lyndon Johnson everybody's kindly uncle, and John Kennedy a saintly matinee idol. Interestingly, a dark and gloomy portrait of Lincoln is tucked from sight in the Lincoln bedroom. It was painted in 1930 by Douglas Volk, whose father, Leonard, once sculpted Lincoln from life. The son's haunting portrait, or a copy of it, turns up in Oliver Stone's film about Nixon, who at one point talks to the painting.

Official art, in real life, rarely speaks truth to power. It would indeed be refreshing, even liberating, for the memorial to show F.D.R. as he was. According to Mr. Deland, who uses a wheelchair himself, only two photographs are known to survive showing Roosevelt in the same device. This is the result of an unwritten protective rule among White House photographers. Like the kings of old, and most sitting politicians today, F.D.R. wanted his incorporeal self to linger in posterity's memory.

ANNE ROOSEVELT,
April 29, 1996.

DEAR MESSRS. DELAND AND REICH, Franklin Delano Roosevelt looms large in the hearts and minds of many, including his grandchildren who now survive. Some of us knew him personally, but most of us did not. We hold him in memory, as families will, as a whole person whose life touched a nation and whose affection still reaches us. We want him to be remembered as he was, in all his strength, courage and humanity.

It is quite clear that FDR developed his strength of character, determination and discipline most distinctly as a result of his having polio. He also became a more sympathetic and modest person. He made a political decision to downplay his disability because of his understanding of the role of public perception and the norms of the day. At times he did not.

But when it came to inspiring and encouraging others who were disabled—such as at his beloved Warm Springs, Georgia, or with amputees and wounded soldiers in wartime hospitals—he freely showed himself in wheelchairs or on crutches, with braces. He was in no way embarrassed by his disability. Life was bigger than that.

Were he alive today we are convinced that he would wish to have the people of this country and the world understand his disability. He would be comfortable, possibly eager, in light of current increased understanding of disability issues, to share awareness of his and other types of disabilities and

others. We firmly believe that more factual knowledge, particularly about and from public leaders, encourages and inspires those without disability to accept and support all people, including people with disabilities to live full, productive and joyful lives.

FDR's commitment to leadership, to excellence and to life, with a disability not well understood by many, nor accepted by some, sustained him and the Nation through one of the most challenging periods in American history. There is no better memorial than a complete picture of who he was.

While we wish no delay in the construction of the proposed memorial we urge an adequate inclusion of all facets of the man as he was, not as some think he ought to have been.

Sincerely,

Anne Roosevelt, on behalf of Chandler Roosevelt Lindsley, Christopher D. Roosevelt, Eleanor Roosevelt Seagraves, Franklin Roosevelt III, Kate Roosevelt Whitney, Nina Roosevelt Gibson, James Roosevelt, Esquire.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, 4 years ago when I commenced these daily reports to the Senate it was my purpose to make a matter of daily record the exact Federal debt as of the close of business the previous day.

In that first report (February 27, 1992) the Federal debt as of the close of business the previous day stood at \$3,825,891,293,066.80, as of the close of business. The point is, the Federal debt has since shot further into the stratosphere.

As of yesterday at the close of business, a total of \$1,289,803,057,697.20 has been added to the Federal debt since February 26, 1992, meaning that as of the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, May 15, 1996, the exact Federal debt stood at \$5,115,694,350,764.00. (On a per capita basis, every man, woman and child in America owes \$19,315.06 as his or her share of the Federal debt.)

HONORING THE RICHARDSONS CELEBRATING THEIR 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, families are the cornerstone of America. It is both instructive and important to honor those who have taken the commitment of "til death us do part" seriously, demonstrating successfully the timeless principles of love, honor, and fidelity. These characteristics make our country strong.

I rise today to honor Mr. Kenneth and Mrs. Barbara Richardson who on June 9, 1996, will celebrate their 50th wedding anniversary. My wife, Janet, and I look forward to the day we can celebrate a similar milestone. The Richardsons' commitment to the principles and values of their marriage deserves to be saluted and recognized. I wish them and their family all the best as they celebrate this substantial marker on their journey together.

NATIONAL NURSING HOME WEEK

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, during National Nursing Home Week, May 12-18, we celebrate the more than 100,000 people in Massachusetts who live and work in our State's 590 nursing facilities.

Nursing facilities have become an integral part of our health care delivery system, providing rehabilitative care for individuals who expect to return home as well as long-term care for the chronically ill. Currently, about a quarter of all Massachusetts residents 85 years of age and older need nursing facility care. Approximately half of these individuals suffer from Alzheimer's disease. In addition, nursing facilities also care for many younger people, including severely disabled children, individuals who have suffered traumatic head injuries, and those who depend on ventilators to live.

Nursing facilities also make an important contribution to the Massachusetts economy by providing jobs for more than 55,000 people and adding more than \$2 billion to the local economy through wages and the purchase of goods and services.

As our population ages and nursing facilities assume an even more important role, it is critical that we maintain the quality of care provided by these facilities. Recent proposals to dramatically reduce Federal Medicare and Medicaid spending would have a devastating impact on elderly and disabled people in nursing facilities, 80 percent of whom rely on these two programs to pay for their care. In addition, we must maintain the protections contained in the 1987 nursing home reform law, which have helped nursing facilities to improve the quality of services they provide to the Nation's 1.5 million nursing facility residents.

National Nursing Home Week should mark a renewal of our commitment not only to the 55,000 elders and disabled people who live in our State's nursing facilities, but also to the 55,000 nursing facility employees who have dedicated their lives to caring for our most vulnerable citizens. In honor of this week, I salute all these employees whose contributions are so important to the well-being of so many in Massachusetts.

REQUEST FOR REFERRAL OF S. 1718

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, pursuant to section 3(b) of S. Res. 400, I ask that bill S. 1718, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997, be referred to the Committee on Governmental Affairs so that the committee can consider, among other things, provisions of the bill relating to the establishment of the Intelligence Community Senior Executive Service and the establishment of a Commission to Assess the Organization of the Federal Government to Combat the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction. These specific provisions pertain to

matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed with this statement the text of a letter from both Mr. GLENN, the ranking member of the Committee on Governmental Affairs, and myself advising the Select Committee on Intelligence of this action.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, May 13, 1996.
Hon. ARLEN SPECTER,
Chairman, Select Committee on Intelligence,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. BOB KERREY,
Vice Chairman, Select Committee on Intelligence, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR ARLEN AND BOB: This is to advise that we have requested sequential referral of S. 1718, the intelligence reauthorization bill, which was marked up by the Select Committee on Intelligence on April 30, 1996. Under Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Governmental Affairs (the Committee) has jurisdiction over, among things, the organization and reorganization of the executive branch; Federal Civil Service, including employee classification, compensation, and benefits; and the organization and management of United States nuclear export policy.

To this end, and pursuant to the authority in section 3(b) of S. Res. 400, we have requested that S. 1718 be referred to the Committee so that we may review provisions of the bill pertaining to issues within the jurisdiction of this Committee. Further, we requested that S. 1718 be referred to the Committee following its consideration by the Senate Armed Services Committee, to which the bill was referred on May 2, 1996.

With best wishes,

Cordially,

JOHN GLENN,
Ranking Member,
Minority
TED STEVENS,
Chairman.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting one nomination which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 146

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on developments since the last Presi-

dential report of November 28, 1995, concerning the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order No. 12170 of November 14, 1979. This report is submitted pursuant to section 204 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c). This report covers events through March 1, 1996. My last report, dated November 28, 1995, covered events through September 29, 1995.

1. Effective March 1, 1996, the Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control ("FAC") amended the Iranian Assets Control Regulations, 31 CFR Part 535 ("IACR"), to reflect changes in the status of litigation brought by Iran against close relatives of the former Shah of Iran seeking the return of property alleged to belong to Iran (61 Fed. Reg. 8216, March 4, 1996). In 1991, Shams Pahlavi, sister of the former Shah of Iran, was identified in section 535.217(b) of the IACR as a person whose assets were blocked based on proof of service upon her in litigation of the type described in section 535.217(a). Pursuant to that provision, all property and assets located in the United States within the possession or control of Shams Pahlavi were blocked until all pertinent litigation against her was finally terminated. Because the litigation has been finally terminated, reference to Shams Pahlavi has been deleted from section 535.217(b). A copy of the amendment is attached to this report.

2. The Iran-U.S. Claims Tribunal, established at The Hague pursuant to the Algiers Accords, continues to make progress in arbitrating the claims before it. Since my last report, the Tribunal has rendered one award, bringing the total number to 567. The majority of those awards have been in favor of U.S. claimants. As of March 1996, the value of awards to successful U.S. claimants from the Security Account held by the NV Settlement Bank was \$2,376,010,041.91.

In February 1996, Iran deposited funds into the Security Account, established by the Algiers Accords to ensure payment of awards to successful U.S. claimants for the first time since October 8, 1992. The Account was credited \$15 million on February 22, 1996. However, the Account has remained continuously below the \$500 million balance required by the Algiers Accords since November 5, 1992. As of March 1, 1996, the total amount in the Security Account was \$195,370,127.71, and the total amount in the Interest Account was \$37,055,050.92.

Therefore, the United States continues to pursue Case A/28, filed in September 1993, to require Iran to meet its obligations under the Algiers Accords to replenish the Security Account. Iran filed its Statement of Defense in that case on August 30, 1995. The United States filed a Reply on December 4, 1995. Iran is scheduled to file its Rejoinder on June 4, 1996.

3. The Department of State continues to present other United States Govern-

ment claims against Iran and to respond to claims brought against the United States by Iran, in coordination with concerned government agencies.

In November 1995, Iran filed its latest Response concerning the United States Request to Dismiss Certain Claims from Case B/61. The United States had filed its Request to Dismiss in August 1995 as part of its consolidated submission on the merits. Iran had previously filed its initial response in July 1995, and the United States filed a reply in August 1995. Case B/61 involves a claim by Iran for compensation with respect to primarily military equipment that Iran alleges it did not receive. Iran had sought to purchase or repair the equipment pursuant to commercial contracts with more than 50 private American companies. Iran alleges that it suffered direct losses and consequential damages in excess of \$2 billion in total because of the United States Government refusal to allow the export of the equipment after January 19, 1981, in alleged contravention of the Algiers Accords. Iran's November 1995 filing failed to show why the Tribunal should not dismiss immediately certain duplicative or otherwise improperly pleaded claims from Case B/61.

In December 1995, the Department of State represented the United States in hearings before the Tribunal on two government-to-government claims. In the first, Chamber Two heard oral arguments in Case B/36, the U.S. claim against Iran for its failure to honor debt obligations created by the sale of military surplus property to Iran shortly after the Second World War. In the second, also before Chamber Two, the Department of State presented the U.S. defense in Case B/58, Iran's claim that the United States is liable for damage caused to the Iranian State Railways during the Second World War.

In January 1996, in Case B/1 (Claims 2 & 3), Iran filed its Rebuttal Memorial Concerning Responsibility for Termination Costs, along with 20 volumes of exhibits and affidavits. In this briefing stream, the Tribunal is asked to decide whether Iran or the United States is liable for the costs arising from the termination of the U.S.-Iran Foreign Military Sales program after Iran's default and its subsequent seizure of the U.S. embassy in Tehran in 1979. The United States is currently preparing a comprehensive response to Iran's brief.

In February 1996, the Departments of State and Justice represented the United States in a hearing before the full Tribunal in a government-to-government claim filed by Iran. Case A/27 is an interpretive dispute in which Iran claims that the United States is liable under the Algiers Accords for Tribunal awards issued in favor of Iran against U.S. nationals. The United States maintains that its obligation under the Algiers Accords is satisfied by the availability of domestic judicial procedures through which Iran can enforce awards in its favor.

Also in February 1996, Iran and the United States settled Iran's claims against the United States filed before the International Court of Justice concerning the July 3, 1988, downing of Iran Air 655 and certain of Iran's claims against the United States filed before the Iran-United States Tribunal concerning certain banking matters. The cases in question were dismissed from the International Court of Justice and the Iran-United States Tribunal on February 22, 1996. The settlement, inter alia, fulfills President Reagan's 1988 offer to make *ex gratia* payments to the survivors of the victims of the Iran Air shootdown. The survivors of each victim of the Iran Air shootdown will be paid \$300,000 (for wage-earning victims) or \$150,000 (for non-wage-earning victims). For this purpose, \$61 million was deposited with the Union Bank of Switzerland in Zurich in an account jointly held by the New York Federal Reserve Bank, acting as fiscal agent of the United States, and Bank Markazi, the central bank of Iran. Of an additional \$70 million in the settlement package, \$15 million was deposited in the Security Account established as part of the Algiers Accords. The remaining \$55 million was deposited in an account at the New York Federal Reserve Bank, from which funds can be drawn only (1) for deposits into the Security Account used to pay Tribunal awards to American claimants or for the payment of Iran's share of the operating expenses of the Tribunal, or (2) to pay debts incurred before the date of settlement and owed by Iranian banks to U.S. nationals. Under the terms of the settlement, no money will be paid to the Government of Iran.

4. Since my last report, the Tribunal has issued one important award in favor of a U.S. national considered a dual U.S.-Iranian national by the Tribunal. On November 7, 1995, Chamber Three issued a significant decision in Claim No. 213, *Dadras Int'l and Per-Am Construction Corp. v. The Islamic Republic of Iran*, awarding a dual national claimant \$3.1 million plus interest for architectural work performed for an Iranian government agency developing a housing complex outside Tehran, Iran.

The Tribunal held hearings in four large private claims. On October 23-27, 1995, Chamber One held a hearing in Claim No. 432, *Brown & Root, Inc. v. The Iranian Navy*, involving contract amounts owed in connection with the construction of the Iranian Navy Chahbahar and Bandar Projects in Iran. On January 18-19, 1996, Chamber One held a second hearing in claim Nos. 842, 843, and 844, *Vera Aryeh, et al. v. The Islamic Republic of Iran*, in which allegations of fraud and forgery were considered. Finally, the United States Government filed a Memorial on the Application of the Treaty of Amity to Dual United States-Iranian Nationals in three private claims before the Tribunal: Claim No. 485, *Riahi v. The Islamic Republic of Iran*, in Chamber One

on January 29, 1996; Claim No. 953, *Hakim v. The Islamic Republic of Iran*, in Chamber Two on February 27, 1996; and Claim No. 266, *Aryeh, et al. v. The Islamic Republic of Iran*, in Chamber Three on February 29, 1996. The Memorial argues that a good faith interpretation of the ordinary meaning of the 1955 Treaty of Amity leads to the conclusion that it protects all persons deemed to be U.S. nationals under U.S. laws when they undertake activities in Iran, regardless of whether they also possess another nationality.

5. The situation reviewed above continues to implicate important diplomatic, financial, and legal interests of the United States and its nationals and presents an unusual challenge to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. The Iranian Assets Control Regulations issued pursuant to Executive Order No. 12170 continue to play an important role in structuring our relationship with Iran and in enabling the United States to implement properly the Algiers Accords. I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to deal with these problems and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 16, 1996.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-2636. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, the report of the texts of international agreements, other than treaties, and background statements; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2637. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State (Legislative Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a Presidential Determination relative to the former Yugoslavia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2638. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State (Legislative Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2639. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State (Legislative Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of U.S. government assistance to and cooperative activities with the New Independent States of the Former Soviet Union for fiscal year 1995; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2640. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of the Treasury, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation entitled "The Bank for Economic Cooperation and Development in the Middle East and North Africa Act"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2641. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of the Treasury, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to authorize consent to and authorize appropriations for a United States contribution to the Interest Subsidy Account of the

successor (ESAF II) to the Enhanced Structural Adjustment Facility of the International Monetary Fund; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2642. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of the Treasury, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to authorize consent to and authorize appropriations for the United States contribution to the fifth replenishment of the resources of the African Development Bank; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2643. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of the Treasury, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the United States contribution to the tenth replenishment of the resources of the International Development Association; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2644. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulations Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a final rule (RIN 2900-AH95) received on May 13, 1996; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-2645. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a final rule (RIN 2900-AH79) received on May 13, 1996; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

EC-2646. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to consolidate toxic substance health programs with related preventive health programs; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2647. A communication from the Director of the Regulations Policy, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a final rule (received on May 9, 1996) relative to warning statements for products containing or manufactured with chlorofluorocarbons and other ozone-depleting substances; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2648. A communication from the Deputy Executive Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a final rule (received on May 9, 1996) amending regulations of Valuation of Plan Benefits in Single-Employer Plans and Valuation of Plan Benefits and Plan Assets Following Mass Withdrawal; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2649. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Employment Standards, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Affirmative Action and Nondiscrimination Obligations of Contractors and Subcontractors Regarding Individuals with Disabilities" (RIN 1215-AA76) received on May 13, 1996; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2650. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Employment Standards, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Affirmative Action Obligations of Contractors and Subcontractors For Disabled Veterans and Veterans of the Vietnam Era; Invitation to Self-Identify" (RIN 1215-AA62) received May 13, 1996; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2651. A communication from the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation entitled "The Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997"; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. STEVENS, from the Committee on Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

S. 1080. A bill to amend chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, to provide additional investment funds for the Thrift Savings Plan (Rept. No. 104-274).

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 1635. A bill to establish a United States policy for the deployment of a national missile defense system, and for other purposes.

S. 1762. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 1763. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for defense activities of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes.

S. 1764. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for military construction, and for other purposes.

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. THURMOND:

S. 1762. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Armed Services; placed on the calendar.

S. 1763. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for defense activities of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Armed Services; placed on the calendar.

S. 1764. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for military construction, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Armed Services; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. COVERDELL:

S. 1765. A bill to authorize substitution for drawback purposes of certain types of fibers and yarns for use in the manufacture of carpets and rugs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1766. A bill to amend the Utah School and Lands Improvement Act of 1993 to provide for lands for the Goshute Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1767. A bill to harmonize the application of the antitrust laws to professional sports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLENN:

S. 1768. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain fatty acid esters; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER:

S. 1769. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to provide for duty-free treatment for certain inorganic products used as luminophores; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SANTORUM (for himself, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. DOLE, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. HELMS, and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 1770. A bill for the relief of Wayne T. Alderson; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. SANTORUM (for himself, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. DOLE, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. HELMS, and Mr. THURMOND):

S. Con. Res. 59. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should award a medal of honor to Wayne T. Alderson in recognition of acts performed at the risk of his life and beyond the call of duty while serving in the United States Army during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1766. A bill to amend the Utah School and Lands Improvement Act of 1993 to provide for lands for the Goshute Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

THE GOSHUTE INDIAN RESERVATION BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1996

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I am introducing a bill to amend the 1993 Utah School and Lands Improvement Act, Public Law 103-93. The purpose of this legislation is to correct boundary problems on the Goshute Indian Reservation in Utah.

The Goshute Tribe is a federally recognized tribe whose reservation is located on the western border of Utah. Approximately one-half of the Goshute Reservation is in Utah, the other half is in Nevada. This legislation would transfer about 8,000 acres of state land to the Tribe along with about 400 acres of public land administered by the BLM.

The public law to be amended by this bill was enacted without opposition in 1993. This law transferred approximately 200,000 acres of Utah state lands to the federal government with the understanding that the federal government would compensate the state in an amount equal to the appraised value of the transferred land. When the law was passed, it was done so with the understanding that state lands located within the reservation boundaries of both the Navajo and Goshute Tribes would be transferred to the United States to be held in trust for the respective tribes.

At that time, the Goshute tribe requested that the Utah delegation address a boundary issue on the reservation. After some initial negotiation, the Tribe agreed to withdraw their request to address the boundary issue, contingent upon a commitment that we would resolve the issue at a later date. Mr. President, I want to follow through on that commitment now.

The "southern boundary issue" refers to a block of land which consists of 8,000 acres in a very irregular shape. Because of the remoteness and the configuration of the tract of land, it is al-

most impossible to properly manage and as a result, there have been several instances of poaching and trespassing. This legislation seeks to create a much clearer and more definitive boundary. The lands would be held in trust by the Federal Government for the benefit of the Goshute Tribe, which with the help of the BIA will be able to regulate grazing and other uses in the area. The Tribe has agreed to be responsible for the cost of appraisal of the additional lands in the bill. This is quite a commitment, given the limited resources of the Tribe. I appreciate their willingness to assume such a commitment.

The legislation is supported by the State of Utah, Juab County, and the Board of Trustees of the School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration. From what I understand, the Department of Interior does not oppose the bill. Perhaps most surprisingly, the Utah Wilderness Coalition does not oppose it either. The Goshute Tribe has met at length with representatives from this very vocal group and have obtained their support.

Mr. President, I hope my colleagues will support me in this effort to assist the Goshute Tribe in creating a more manageable border to their reservation.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1767. A bill to harmonize the application of the antitrust laws to professional sports, and for other purposes.

THE PROFESSIONAL SPORTS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I like almost all Americans, am a fan of professional sports. We all enjoy following the competition on the field and on the hardwood and watching the performances of our favorite players. Even as I make this statement today, my fingers are crossed for the Utah Jazz in this evening's playoff game.

But professional sports is not just a game, it is a business, and it is the future of professional sports as a business that my bill, the Professional Sports Protection Act, seeks to address. I am afraid that the current rash of franchise relocations is only the symptom of larger economic trends in professional sports. If these trends are allowed to continue, we will see the same fan disaffection that has occurred in Major League baseball, with the result that professional sports—one of our growing national industries—will suffer.

My bill will protect professional sports by permitting the leagues—the National Football League, the National Basketball Association, and the National Hockey League—to review and, if necessary block, franchise relocation decisions. Under some interpretations of the antitrust laws, the professional sports leagues may be liable for treble damages for blocking franchise relocations. This prevents leagues from preventing moves that are not in the best long-term economic interests of the sport because they have the threat of billions of dollars in damages hanging over them.

As chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I am concerned about sports not just because I am a sports fan, but because I want to make sure that the antitrust laws are properly applied to professional sports—just as they should be to any other business—to ensure healthy competition and economic growth. I am concerned that the current ambiguous application of the antitrust laws to franchise relocation decisions actually may suppress the healthy competition and economic growth that has characterized professional sports in our nation. My bill will permit leagues to make these franchise relocation decisions—which seem to me to be, in this case, the decisions of a single joint venture rather than of economic competitors—without fear of antitrust liability.

I understand that some fear that the leagues might use their antitrust immunity in franchise relocation as leverage in other, unrelated areas. Some think that the leagues might block a franchise move unless the franchise favors certain policies and decisions in, say, revenue sharing. I have addressed this concern by providing for specific standards that leagues are to consider when reviewing a franchise move. If a league considers a factor that is unrelated to the franchise move, then it will be in violation of the law, and it will not receive antitrust protection. My bill also provides for judicial review of these decisions, with proper deference given to the league's business decisions, to ensure that the league has not used the antitrust immunity to abuse its authority.

Let me be clear that this is a narrow bill. It does not contain several provisions that were included in a House bill reported out of the House Judiciary Committee a few weeks ago. In particular, I am opposed to any provisions that would force the sports league to create new expansion franchises to replace teams that relocate. I do not believe that the Federal Government should nationalize professional sports, and I do not believe that it is in the national interest to take such intrusive steps into the internal operations of an industry such as professional sports. My bill intends only to codify what I believe is the proper interpretation of existing antitrust law: that franchise relocation decisions are not violations of the antitrust laws, but instead are the decisions of team owners who are collaborating in the joint venture of a sports league.

Some might question why Congress needs to turn to this subject. Shouldn't we concern ourselves in Congress with more important matters? Professional sports is important to our nation. According to some estimates, the professional sports leagues, in the form of Major League Baseball, the National Football League, the National Hockey League, and the National Basketball Association, generate more than \$5 billion in annual revenues in the United States. There are literally tens of thou-

sands of people whose jobs depend on professional sports. Professional sports is one of America's fastest growing industries, with numerous teams being established in new cities, both in the United States and overseas. Professional sports also generates billions of dollars in revenue for other industries, such as advertising, telecommunications, construction, and sports equipment. And let us not forget the fun and pleasure healthy professional sports leagues bring to millions of fans both in America and abroad.

But the improper application of Federal antitrust law to franchise relocation may end the rapid economic growth in professional sports. I have held hearings on this issue, as has my good friend and colleague, Senator THURMOND of South Carolina. According to the league officials, sports agents and businessmen, economists and law professors who testified, a potentially destructive economic dynamic is behind the recent spate of team moves. In order to win games, teams must hire the best players. Because of the salary cap structure in football, for example, the only way to attract the top players is to offer large bonuses and financial incentives. The only way some teams feel they can pay these salaries is to move to new cities, in return for generous stadium revenues and tax packages. This financial imperative is fed by the desire of new, up and coming cities that want the prestige and the financial benefits of having a major sports franchise located in their area. This is ironic because some economic studies indicate that major league teams do not bring a significant economic benefit to their new cities.

Congress must address this dynamic because it will injure interests of the industry and of the fans. I was convinced during my hearings that short-sighted franchise relocations eventually will hurt professional sports. Professional sports, after all, is a product that is consumed by all of us, the sports fans. If teams move around too often, the fans will lose their enthusiasm and support for their teams. If the fans lose interest, eventually the overall economic pie created by the sports will begin to decrease. Fewer fans will attend the games or watch them on television; fewer fans will purchase merchandise; fewer children will want to play the sport.

We have already seen a similar phenomenon occur in major league baseball. After the strike, which canceled the World Series and shortened the following season, fans began to lose interest in baseball. Much of this was the result of the owners, whose actions against the players during collective bargaining have shown an utter disregard for the best interests of the game and of the fans. The owners were able to engage in their practices in part because they benefit from a judicially created immunity from the antitrust laws that has no basis in the law.

Accordingly, I have introduced legislation, which has passed the Judiciary Committee, to remove baseball's antitrust exemption, except in regard to franchise relocation.

I intend that this bill will not move forward until the problems in baseball are addressed. Since it appears that the same economic trends are affecting all of the professional sports, then it makes sense to provide the same antitrust standard to all of the leagues. It also makes no sense for the other leagues to operate under the rules of the antitrust laws, while baseball can operate in an anticompetitive fashion free from the rule of law. The antitrust exemption for baseball has been an embarrassing anomaly in antitrust law—one that has led to profound distortions in the sport. In the near future, I will take action to ensure that baseball and the other professional sports leagues receive the same treatment. Either this bill must be merged with my baseball legislation, or baseball legislation must be added to this bill. Either way, the professional sports soon will operate under a uniform antitrust standard.

I believe that the time for Congress to act is now. We have already seen several teams move in recent years, and even more moves—the Cleveland NFL franchise to Baltimore being the most noteworthy example—are planned. Professional sports should not be a game of musical chairs, and fans deserve better than to have their loyalties treated with disrespect. As importantly, the sports industry deserves the right to have a say in its destiny. Congress has the chance now to address this problem in its early stages, before even greater dislocation, fan unhappiness, and industry losses, occur. For this reason, Congress should pass the Professional Sports Protection Act in 1996, not years from now when it may be too late.

By Mr. GLENN:

S. 1768. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain fatty acid esters.

LEGISLATION TO SUSPEND THE DUTY ON IMPORTS OF CERTAIN METHYL ESTERS

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill to temporarily suspend the duty on imports of certain methyl esters. These methyl esters are used by Procter & Gamble in the production of shampoo and other personal care products. Formerly, these products were eligible for the Generalized System of Preferences [GSP] program. However, as of January 1, 1997 Malaysia will no longer be eligible for GSP.

My legislation is drafted very narrowly to cover only those very specific methyl ester mixtures which P & G imports from Malaysia. P & G's methyl ester imports are produced by a relatively recent joint venture. The first full year of the joint venture's production was 1994. The fact that there was duty free treatment under GSP was an important part of the decision to undertake the joint venture. The joint

venture located production at the source of the raw material (palm kernel oil) and results in a cost efficient production process.

While there are several companies in the U.S. that manufacture relatively small amounts of similar methyl esters, this production is almost entirely consumed in the manufacture of their own personal care products. Hence no opposition to the proposed duty suspension is anticipated.

By Mr. SANTORUM (for himself, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. DOLE, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. HELMS and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 1770. A bill for the relief of Wayne T. Alderson; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE RELIEF LEGISLATION

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill and submitting a concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 59, that are identical to legislation I introduced in the House of Representatives in both the 102d and 103d Congresses. As this particular issue remains unresolved, I again urge my colleagues' consideration and support.

The legislation I introduce today is an effort to secure the Congressional Medal of Honor for a Pennsylvania resident, Mr. Wayne T. Alderson. The legislation itself speaks to the background and experiences of Wayne Alderson and equally to the need and merit in extending the Congressional Medal of Honor.

As you can see from a review of the bill, Mr. Alderson acted meritoriously in the line of duty as a private in Germany during World War II and was recommended by his commander for a Medal of Honor. Unfortunately, his papers were destroyed in a fire. The Department of Defense has said that since the statute of limitations expired in 1952, and that without a statement from one of Mr. Alderson's commanders, they cannot award him the medal. An affidavit by Pfc. Daniel Parisi, which verifies that Mr. Alderson's commanders did indeed recommend him for the medal, was not considered by the Department as sufficient for them to act.

Therefore, I am introducing legislation today that Mr. Alderson should receive a Medal of Honor. I am joined by several of my colleagues in calling for the extension of congressional recognition to Wayne for his service, valor, and commitment to defending our country in time of war and acting meritoriously in the line of duty. I appreciate Senators SPECTER, DOLE, CRAIG, HELMS, and THURMOND joining with me as sponsors of this legislation.

I thank my colleagues for their attention and consideration of this legislation.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 288

At the request of Mr. WELLSTONE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S.

288, a bill to abolish the Board of Review of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority, and for other purposes.

S. 309

At the request of Mr. BENNETT, the name of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] was added as a cosponsor of S. 309, a bill to reform the concession policies of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 948

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the name of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 948, a bill to encourage organ donation through the inclusion of an organ donation card with individual income refund payments, and for other purposes.

S. 984

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 984, a bill to protect the fundamental right of a parent to direct the upbringing of a child, and for other purposes.

S. 1233

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1233, a bill to assure equitable coverage and treatment of emergency services under health plans.

S. 1401

At the request of Mr. BENNETT, the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1401, a bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to minimize duplication in regulatory programs and to give States exclusive responsibility under approved States program for permitting and enforcement of the provisions of that Act with respect to surface coal mining and reclamation operations, and for other purposes.

S. 1578

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. FEINGOLD], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] were added as cosponsors of S. 1578, a bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1997 through 2002, and for other purposes.

S. 1660

At the request of Mr. GLENN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1660, a bill to provide for ballast water management to prevent the introduction and spread of nonindigenous species into the waters of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1661

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1661, a bill to specify that States may waive certain requirements relating to commercial motor vehicle operators under chapter 313 of title 49, United States Code, with respect to the operators of certain farm vehicles, and for other purposes.

S. 1688

At the request of Mr. BUMPERS, the name of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1688, a bill to establish a National Center for Rural Law Enforcement, and for other purposes.

S. 1714

At the request of Mr. BURNS, the names of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COVERDELL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS] were added as cosponsors of S. 1714, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to ensure the ability of utility providers to establish, improve, operate and maintain utility structures, facilities, and equipment for the benefit, safety, and well-being of consumers, by removing limitations on maximum driving and on-duty time pertaining to utility vehicle operators and drivers, and for other purposes.

S. 1715

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the names of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] were added as cosponsors of S. 1715, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for adoption expenses, to allow penalty-free IRA withdrawals for adoption expenses, and to allow tax-free treatment for employer provided adoption assistance.

S. 1735

At the request of Mr. PRESSLER, the names of the Senator from Maine [Ms. SNOWE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM] were added as cosponsors of S. 1735, a bill to establish the United States Tourism Organization as a nongovernmental entity for the purpose of promoting tourism in the United States.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 59—RELATIVE TO A MEDAL OF HONOR

Mr. SANTORUM (for himself, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. DOLE, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. HELMS, and Mr. THURMOND) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. CON. RES. 59

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

Whereas Wayne T. Alderson served as a private first class in the United States Army in Germany during World War II;

Whereas, during the Rhineland Campaign of such war, which was 4 days of close, fierce combat from March 15 to March 18, 1945, Private First Class Alderson singlehandedly killed 43 enemy soldiers;

Whereas, according to The History of the Third Infantry Division, Private First Class Alderson was the 1st soldier from the United States to cross into Germany on March 15, 1945;

Whereas, on March 15, 1945, Company B of the 7th Infantry Regiment, led by Private First Class Alderson, crossed into Germany 1 mile south of Utweiler to surprise the enemy troops and advanced through heavy, armed resistance, machine gun crossfire, and a German mine field;

Whereas, during such advancement, Private First Class Alderson spotted and bypassed a German bunker and machine gun nest and entered into a close fire fight, killing 6 enemy soldiers;

Whereas, when a 2d enemy machine gun impeded such advancement, Private First Class Alderson volunteered to advance alone, forged a stream, and waged a singlehanded assault on the German machine gun crew, killing all 5 of the crew as Second Lieutenant Barbour and Private First Class Preston, along with the other soldiers of Company B, arrived to force the German enemy soldiers to withdraw;

Whereas, Company B continued to advance toward the town of Erching, where Private First Class Alderson killed 2 enemy snipers who were impeding the advance, and the town was captured as the enemy troops retreated;

Whereas, Second Lieutenant Barbour and Lieutenant Colonel Wallace stated that they intended to recommend Private First Class Alderson for high military decoration;

Whereas, on March 16 and 17, 1945, as Company B continued to attack and advance toward the Siegfried Line, Private First Class Alderson killed 4 enemy soldiers in close house-to-house fighting, captured 3 German prisoners, and led the prisoners, at great risk to himself, past enemy positions to the headquarters of Company B, where vital information concerning the defenses of the Siegfried Line was obtained from the prisoners;

Whereas, on March 18, 1945, Private First Class Alderson led Company B into its 4th consecutive day of battle at the Siegfried Line but then was cut off from the company;

Whereas, after Private First Class Alderson was cut off from Company B, he was unable to find safe cover and charged forward, killing 6 enemy soldiers in a close fire fight, then attacked the main entrance of a German trench, killing 4 enemy defenders before capturing the front end of the trench;

Whereas, when the remnant of Company B, which was in the front portion of the trench under the command of Captain James Rich and without radio contact, was about to be overrun by a German counterattack, Private First Class Alderson again volunteered to be first scout;

Whereas Private First Class Alderson immediately killed 4 advancing enemy soldiers in bitter combat as he moved down the trench and engaged a large German force that was advancing in an adjoining and interlocking trench;

Whereas Private First Class Alderson, who was fully exposed and vastly outnumbered, charged the enemy forces and entered into a fierce fire fight with them at close range, killing 12 enemy soldiers as the German counterattack was repelled and the enemy forces withdrew;

Whereas, in such action, Private First Class Alderson received a serious head wound from shrapnel when a German grenade landed at his feet and exploded in his face;

Whereas the life of Private First Class Alderson was saved by the valorous action of Private First Class Preston, who covered the body of Private First Class Alderson with his own body and was fatally wounded in the head by the bullet of a sniper;

Whereas Private First Class Alderson, while he fought to remain conscious, crawled back along the trench to brief Captain Rich on the events that had occurred in the other end of the trench;

Whereas Captain Rich stated his intention to recommend to Colonel Heintges, the commander of the 7th Infantry Regiment, that Private First Class Alderson receive a medal of honor;

Whereas such recommendation has been verified by independent affidavit; and

Whereas Private First Class Alderson has been waiting for more than 47 years to receive the medal of honor for which he was recommended and which he so richly deserves: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President should award a medal of honor to Wayne T. Alderson in recognition of acts performed at the risk of his life and beyond the call of duty while serving as a private first class in the United States Army in Germany during World War II.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

EXON (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 3965

Mr. EXON (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DODD, and Mr. KERRY) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002; as follows:

Strike all after the first word and insert the following:

1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997, including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001, as required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and including the appropriate levels for fiscal year 2002.

(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 1997.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 102. Debt increase.

Sec. 103. Social Security.

Sec. 104. Major functional categories.

Sec. 105. Reconciliation.

TITLE II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING

Sec. 201. Discretionary spending limits.

Sec. 202. Extension of pay-as-you-go point of order.

Sec. 203. Extension of Budget Act 60-vote enforcement through 2002.

Sec. 204. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution—

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: \$1,092,422,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$1,146,393,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$1,195,607,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,244,566,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,309,365,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,389,907,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: –\$7,929,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: –\$2,150,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: –\$2,743,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: –\$7,224,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: –\$1,720,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$16,024,000,000.

(C) The amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for hospital insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: \$108,053,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$113,226,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$119,361,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$123,737,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$131,641,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$138,131,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: \$1,324,976,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$1,374,596,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$1,413,101,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,454,719,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,496,341,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,528,343,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: \$1,320,969,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$1,375,663,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$1,408,058,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,447,184,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,466,082,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,498,409,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: \$228,597,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$229,270,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$212,451,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$202,618,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$156,717,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$108,502,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: \$5,441,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$5,713,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$5,964,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$6,204,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$6,495,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$6,542,900,000,000.

(6) DIRECT LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—The appropriate levels of total new direct loan obligations are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: \$41,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$36,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$36,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$36,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$36,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$36,600,000,000.

(7) PRIMARY LOAN GUARANTEE COMMITMENTS.—The appropriate levels of new primary loan guarantee commitments are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: \$267,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$267,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$268,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$269,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$270,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$271,300,000,000.

SEC. 102. DEBT INCREASE.

The amounts of the increase in the public debt subject to limitation are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: \$285,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$272,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$251,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$239,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$190,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$147,500,000,000.

SEC. 103. SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302, 602, 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 1997: \$384,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1998: \$401,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1999: \$422,800,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000: \$422,200,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001: \$463,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002: \$485,700,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302, 602, 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 1997: \$310,400,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1998: \$323,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1999: \$335,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000: \$349,300,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001: \$363,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002: \$378,800,000,000.

SEC. 104. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1997 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$254,340,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$260,777,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$258,538,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$256,319,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$263,801,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$257,794,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$192,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$270,288,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$263,258,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$187,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$279,352,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$266,579,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$185,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$287,764,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$278,219,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$183,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,346,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,680,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,333,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$18,110,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,548,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,880,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,342,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$18,262,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,887,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,543,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,358,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$18,311,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,270,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$15,595,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,346,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$18,311,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,623,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,103,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,395,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$18,409,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,115,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,923,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,387,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$18,409,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,918,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,855,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,087,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,632,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,333,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$15,970,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,572,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$15,104,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,796,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$15,461,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,168,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,590,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,235,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,131,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,033,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,723,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,746,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,039,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,034,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,324,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,045,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,728,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,865,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,036,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,333,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,062,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,000,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,627,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,125,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,031,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,949,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,202,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$37,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,616,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,281,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$41,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,424,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,073,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$38,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,931,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,499,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$38,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,761,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,760,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$38,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,964,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,587,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$38,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,961,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$11,123,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$7,794,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$5,870,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,611,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,740,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$9,346,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,637,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,084,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,243,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,743,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,586,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,199,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$9,406,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,736,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,652,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$10,584,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,695,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,595,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,641,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,825,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,868,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,570,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,709,000,000.
 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,630,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$1,931,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,856,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$197,340,000.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,276,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$646,300,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,787,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$196,750,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,157,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,844,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,763,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$196,253,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,949,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,050,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,759,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$195,883,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,109,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,238,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,745,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$195,375,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,829,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,524,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,740,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$194,875,000,000.
 (8) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,218,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,572,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,180,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,641,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,213,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,870,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,880,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,615,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,188,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,653,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,937,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,286,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,208,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$10,602,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,222,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$2,133,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,759,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$10,315,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,242,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$2,133,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,258,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,888,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,265,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$2,171,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,838,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,314,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,288,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$2,171,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,652,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,675,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,317,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$2,202,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,395,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,326,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,343,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$2,202,000,000.
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,264,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$51,262,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$16,219,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$15,469,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$54,486,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$53,678,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$19,040,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$14,760,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$56,313,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$55,041,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$21,781,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$13,854,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$58,040,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$56,664,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$22,884,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$14,589,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$60,723,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$58,906,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$23,978,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$15,319,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$63,399,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$61,446,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$25,127,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$16,085,000,000.
 (11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$136,886,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$136,272,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$187,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$144,352,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$144,778,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$94,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$151,181,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$151,707,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$158,846,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$159,149,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$164,928,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$163,942,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$176,106,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$174,617,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$193,120,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$191,422,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$209,284,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$207,559,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$222,567,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$220,295,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$236,552,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$234,803,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$252,673,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$250,932,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$272,291,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$269,881,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$231,555,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$239,009,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$244,128,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$247,084,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$255,459,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$256,461,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$270,127,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$269,571,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$270,920,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$275,743,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$293,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$290,131,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,813,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$10,831,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,477,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,576,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,220,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,271,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,980,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,031,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,776,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,904,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,608,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,822,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,013,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,557,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$935,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$26,362,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,863,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,740,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$962,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$25,925,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,589,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,990,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$987,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$25,426,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,212,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,080,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,021,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$24,883,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,273,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,001,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,189,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$24,298,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,783,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,751,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,194,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$23,668,000,000.
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,510,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,237,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,527,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,356,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,453,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,826,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,540,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,480,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,783,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,712,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,146,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,981,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (17) General Government (800):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,491,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,797,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,158,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,892,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,151,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,941,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,250,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,183,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,819,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,255,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,311,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,957,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (18) Net Interest (900):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$282,247,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$282,347,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$289,354,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$289,354,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$293,938,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$293,938,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$296,606,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$296,606,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$301,875,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$301,875,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$307,543,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$307,543,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (19) The corresponding levels of gross interest on the public debt are as follows:
 Fiscal year 1997: \$348,790,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1998: \$355,452,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1999: \$359,253,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000: \$360,639,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001: \$366,154,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002: \$369,631,000,000.
 (20) Allowances (920):
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$490,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$490,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$20,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$20,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$10,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$10,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$20,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$20,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$12,934,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$12,934,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$36,783,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$36,783,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950): Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, —\$43,338,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$43,338,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, —\$35,351,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$35,351,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, —\$34,951,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$34,951,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, —\$37,069,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$37,069,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, —\$38,893,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$38,893,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, —\$59,385,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$59,385,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

SEC. 105. RECONCILIATION.

(a) RECONCILIATION OF SPENDING REDUCTIONS.—

(1) SENATE COMMITTEES.—Not later than _____, 1996, the committees named in this subsection shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate. After receiving those recommendations, the Committee on the Budget shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(A) 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) to reduce outlays \$2,282,000,000 in fiscal year 1997 and \$21,655,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(B) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—The Senate Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to reduce outlays \$79,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1997 and \$1,828,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(C) 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 to reduce outlays \$3,291,000,000 in fiscal year 1997 and \$1,791,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(D) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION.—The Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to reduce outlays \$134,000,000 in fiscal year 1997 and \$37,168,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(E) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide

direct spending to reduce outlays \$83,000,000 in fiscal year 1997 and \$795,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(F) COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS.—The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to reduce outlays \$23,000,000 in fiscal year 1997 and \$1,375,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(G) COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.—The Senate Committee on Finance shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to reduce outlays \$6,734,000,000 in fiscal year 1997 and \$187,022,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(H) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS.—The Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit \$840,000,000 in fiscal year 1997 and \$9,136,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(I) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Senate Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to reduce outlays \$0 in fiscal year 1997 and \$476,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(J) COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES.—The Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to reduce outlays \$411,000,000 in fiscal year 1997 and \$2,877,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(K) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to reduce outlays \$148,000,000 in fiscal year 1997 and \$5,284,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

TITLE II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING

SEC. 201. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) DEFINITION.—As used in this section and for the purposes of allocations made pursuant to section 302(a) or 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, for the discretionary category, the term "discretionary spending limit" means—

(1) with respect to fiscal year 1997, for the discretionary category \$496,572,000,000 in new budget authority and \$539,190,000,000 in outlays;

(2) with respect to fiscal year 1998, for the discretionary category \$501,619,000,000 in new budget authority and \$534,785,000,000 in outlays;

(3) with respect to fiscal year 1999, for the discretionary category \$504,074,000,000 in new budget authority and \$531,100,000,000 in outlays;

(4) with respect to fiscal year 2000, for the discretionary category \$509,115,000,000 in new budget authority and \$530,937,000,000 in outlays;

(5) with respect to fiscal year 2001, for the discretionary category \$518,983,000,000 in new budget authority and \$521,682,000,000 in outlays; and

(6) with respect to fiscal year 2002, for the discretionary category \$520,292,000,000 in new budget authority and \$525,624,000,000 in outlays;

as adjusted for changes in concepts and definitions and emergency appropriations.

(b) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider—

(A) any revision of this resolution or any concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, or 2002 (or amendment, motion, or conference report on

such a resolution) that provides discretionary spending in excess of the discretionary spending limit for such fiscal year; or

(B) any appropriations bill or resolution (or amendment, motion, or conference report on such appropriations bill or resolution) for fiscal year 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, or 2002 that would exceed any of the discretionary spending limits in this section or suballocations of those limits made pursuant to section 602(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(2) EXCEPTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—This section 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.

(B) ENFORCEMENT OF DISCRETIONARY LIMITS IN FY 1997.—Until the enactment of reconciliation legislation pursuant to section 105 of this resolution and for purposes of the application of paragraph (1), only subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) shall apply to fiscal year 1997.

(c) 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.

(d) 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.

(e) 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.

SEC. 202. EXTENSION OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO POINT OF ORDER.

(a) PURPOSE.—The Senate declares that it is essential to—

(1) ensure continued compliance with the balanced budget plan set forth in this resolution; and

(2) continue the pay-as-you-go enforcement system.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any direct spending or revenue legislation that would increase the deficit for any one of the three applicable time periods as measured in paragraphs (5) and (6).

(2) APPLICABLE TIME PERIODS.—For purposes of this subsection the term "applicable time period" means any one of the three following periods:

(A) The first year covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(B) The period of the first five fiscal years covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(C) The period of the five fiscal years following the first five fiscal years covered in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(3) DIRECT-SPENDING LEGISLATION.—For purposes of this subsection and except as provided in paragraph (4), the term "direct-spending legislation" means any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that affects direct spending as that term is defined by and interpreted for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(4) EXCLUSION.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms “direct-spending legislation” and “revenue legislation” do not include—

(A) any concurrent resolution on the budget; or

(B) any provision of legislation that affects the 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.

(5) BASELINE.—Estimates prepared pursuant to this section shall—

(A) use the baseline used for the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget; and

(B) be calculated under the requirements of subsections (b) through (d) of section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 for fiscal years beyond those covered by that concurrent resolution on the budget.

(6) PRIOR SURPLUS.—If direct spending or revenue legislation increases the deficit when taken individually, then it must also increase the deficit when taken together with all direct spending and revenue legislation enacted since the beginning of the calendar year not accounted for in the baseline under paragraph (5)(A), except that the direct spending or revenue effects resulting from legislation enacted pursuant to the reconciliation instructions included in that concurrent resolution on the budget shall not be available.

(c) 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.

(d) 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 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.

(e) DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, and revenues for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(f) SUNSET.—Subsections (a) through (e) of this section shall expire September 30, 2002.

SEC. 203. EXTENSION OF BUDGET ACT 60-VOTE ENFORCEMENT THROUGH 2002.

Notwithstanding section 275(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as amended by sections 13112(b) and 13208(b)(3) of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990), the second sentence of section 904(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (except insofar as it relates to section 313 of that Act) and the final sentence of section 904(d) of that Act (except insofar as it relates to section 313 of that Act) shall continue to have effect as rules of the Senate through (but no later than) September 30, 2002.

SEC. 204. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, 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 that House.

MOSELEY-BRAUN AMENDMENT NO. 3966

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57) supra; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE USE OF BUDGETARY SAVINGS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) in August of 1994, the Bipartisan Commission on Entitlement and Tax Reform issued an Interim Report to the President, which found that, “To ensure that today’s debt and spending commitments do not unfairly burden America’s children, the Government must act now. A bipartisan coalition of Congress, led by the President, must resolve the long-term imbalance between the Government’s entitlement promises and the funds it will have available to pay for them”;

(2) unless the Congress and the President act together in a bipartisan way, overall Federal spending is projected by the Commission to rise from the current level of slightly over 22 percent of the Gross Domestic Product of the United States (hereafter in this section referred as “GDP”) to over 37 percent of GDP by the year 2030;

(3) the source of that growth is not domestic discretionary spending, which is approximately the same portion of GDP now as it was in 1969, the last time at which the Federal budget was in balance;

(4) mandatory spending was only 29.6 percent of the Federal budget in 1963, but is estimated to account for 72 percent of the Federal budget in the year 2003;

(5) social security, medicare and medicaid, together with interest on the national debt, are the largest sources of the growth of mandatory spending;

(6) ensuring the long-term future of the social security system is essential to protecting the retirement security of the American people.

(7) The Social Security Trust Fund is projected to begin spending more than it takes in by approximately the year 2013, with Federal budget deficits rising rapidly thereafter unless appropriate policy changes are made;

(8) ensuring the future of medicare and medicaid is essential to protecting access to high-quality health care for senior citizens and poor women and children;

(9) Federal health care expenses have been rising at double digit rates, and are projected to triple to 11 percent of GDP by the year 2030 unless appropriate policy changes are made; and

(10) due to demographic factors, Federal health care expenses are projected to double by the year 2030, even if health care cost inflation is restrained after 1999, so that costs for each person of a given age grow no faster than the economy.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—If the sense of the Senate that budget savings in the mandatory spending area should be used—

(1) to protect and enhance the retirement security of the American people by ensuring the long-term future of the social security system;

(2) to protect and enhance the health care security of senior citizens and poor Americans by ensuring the long-term future of medicare and medicaid; and

(3) to restore and maintain Federal budget discipline, to ensure that the level of private investment necessary for long-term economic growth and prosperity is available.

KYL AMENDMENT NO. 2967

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. KYL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57) supra; as follows:

On page 4, line 10, decrease the amount by \$90,000,000.

On page 4, line 11, decrease the amount by \$181,000,000.

On page 4, line 12, decrease the amount by \$181,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, decrease the amount by \$181,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by \$85,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by \$174,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by \$181,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, decrease the amount by \$181,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, decrease the amount by \$85,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, decrease the amount by \$174,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, decrease the amount by \$181,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, decrease the amount by \$181,000,000.

On page 31, line 17, decrease the amount by \$90,000,000.

On page 31, line 18, decrease the amount by \$85,000,000.

On page 31, line 24, decrease the amount by \$181,000,000.

On page 31, line 25, decrease the amount by \$174,000,000.

On page 32, line 6, decrease the amount by \$181,000,000.

On page 32, line 7, decrease the amount by \$181,000,000.

On page 32, line 13, decrease the amount by \$181,000,000.

On page 32, line 14, decrease the amount by \$181,000,000.

FIRST AMENDMENT NO. 3968

Mr. FRIST proposed an amendment to amend No. 3965 proposed by Mr. EXON to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57) supra; as follows:

At the end of the pending amendment, add the following:

SEC. . COMMON SENSE BUDGETING AMENDMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) President Clinton proposed in his fiscal year 1997 budget submission immediate downward adjustments to discretionary caps after the year 2000 if the Congressional Budget Office projected that his budget would not balance in 2002;

(2) the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) has estimated that President Clinton’s fiscal year 1997 budget submission will incur a deficit of \$84,000,000,000 in 2002;

(3) as a result of CBO’s projected deficit in fiscal year 2002, the President’s budget would trigger drastic reductions in discretionary spending in 2001 and 2002 to reach balance;

(4) these drastic reductions would have to occur in nondefense programs such as education, environment, crime control, science, veterans, and other human resource programs;

(5) 100 percent of the nondefense discretionary cuts in the President’s budget occur in 2001 and 2002; and

(6) the inclusion in a budget submission of triggers to make immediate, drastic reductions in discretionary spending is inconsistent with sound budgeting practices and should be recognized as a “budgetary gimmick” that is antithetical to legitimate efforts to achieve balance in 2002.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the discretionary spending caps should not include triggers that would—

(1) result in 100 percent of the nondefense discretionary reductions occurring in fiscal years 2001 and 2002; and

(2) make drastic reductions in nondefense discretionary spending in fiscal years 2001 and 2002 (the last 2 years of the budget) for the purpose of achieving a balanced budget in fiscal year 2002.

FEINGOLD (AND OTHERS)
AMENDMENT NO. 3969

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr. SIMON, Mr. BUMPERS, and Mr. ROBB) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to Senate Concurrent Resolution 57; *supra*, as follows:

On page 3, line 5, increase the amount by \$15,000,000,000.

On page 3, line 6, increase the amount by \$20,000,000,000.

On page 3, line 7, increase the amount by \$24,000,000,000.

On page 3, line 8, increase the amount by \$23,000,000,000.

On page 3, line 9, increase the amount by \$23,000,000,000.

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by \$16,000,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by \$15,000,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by \$20,000,000,000.

On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by \$24,000,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by \$23,000,000,000.

On page 3, line 18, increase the amount by \$23,000,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by \$16,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, decrease the amount by \$15,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, decrease the amount by \$20,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, decrease the amount by \$24,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, decrease the amount by \$23,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, decrease the amount by \$23,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, decrease the amount by \$16,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by \$15,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by \$20,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by \$24,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by \$23,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by \$23,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by \$16,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by \$15,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by \$20,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by \$24,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 16, decrease the amount by \$23,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 17, decrease the amount by \$23,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 18, decrease the amount by \$16,000,000,000.

On page 51, beginning with line 6 strike all through line 17.

On page 55, beginning with line 18 strike all through page 56, line 20.

FAIRCLOTH AMENDMENT NO. 3970

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. FAIRCLOTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate Concurrent Resolution 57; *supra*, as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING REDUCTION OF THE NATIONAL DEBT.

Whereas, S. Con. Res. 57 projects a public debt in Fiscal Year 1997 of \$5,400,000,000,000;

Whereas, S. Con. Res. 57 projects that the public debt will be \$6,500,000,000,000 in the Fiscal Year 2002 when the budget resolution projects a unified budget surplus;

Whereas, this accumulated debt represents a significant financial burden that will require excessive taxation and lost economic opportunity for future generations of the United States;

Resolved, That, it is the sense of the Senate that any comprehensive legislation sent to the President that balances the budget by a certain date and that is agreed to by the Congress and the President shall also contain a strategy for reducing the national debt of the United States.

BOND AMENDMENT NO. 3971

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. BOND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the amendment No. 3965; *supra*, as follows:

In the pending amendment:

On page 30, line 5, decrease the amount by \$175,000,000.

On page 30, line 6, decrease the amount by \$7,000,000.

On page 30, line 11, decrease the amount by \$907,000,000.

On page 30, line 12, decrease the amount by \$246,000,000.

On page 30, line 17, decrease the amount by \$2,256,000,000.

On page 30, line 18, decrease the amount by \$1,920,000,000.

On page 30, line 23, decrease the amount by \$3,621,000,000.

On page 30, line 24, decrease the amount by \$3,033,000,000.

On page 31, line 4, decrease the amount by \$3,302,000,000.

On page 31, line 5, decrease the amount by \$3,124,000,000.

On page 31, line 10, decrease the amount by \$2,355,000,000.

On page 31, line 11, decrease the amount by \$2,187,000,000.

On page 33, line 5, increase the amount by \$175,000,000.

On page 33, line 6, increase the amount by \$7,000,000.

On page 33, line 12, increase the amount by \$907,000,000.

On page 33, line 13, increase the amount by \$246,000,000.

On page 33, line 19, increase the amount by \$2,256,000,000.

On page 33, line 20, increase the amount by \$1,920,000,000.

On page 34, line 1, increase the amount by \$3,621,000,000.

On page 34, line 2, increase the amount by \$3,033,000,000.

On page 34, line 8, increase the amount by \$1,708,000,000.

On page 34, line 9, increase the amount by \$1,552,000,000.

On page 40, line 23, increase the amount by \$1,594,000,000.

On page 40, line 24, increase the amount by \$1,572,000,000.

On page 41, line 5, increase the amount by \$2,355,000,000.

On page 41, line 6, increase the amount by \$2,187,000,000.

On page 45, line 15, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 45, line 16, increase the amount by \$10,952,000,000.

On page 47, line 9, increase the amount by \$175,000,000.

On page 47, line 11, increase the amount by \$7,000,000.

On page 47, line 13, increase the amount by \$907,000,000.

On page 47, line 14, increase the amount by \$246,000,000.

On page 47, line 16, increase the amount by \$2,256,000,000.

On page 47, line 17, increase the amount by \$1,920,000,000.

On page 47, line 19, increase the amount by \$3,621,000,000.

On page 47, line 20, increase the amount by \$3,033,000,000.

On page 47, line 22, increase the amount by \$3,302,000,000.

On page 47, line 23, increase the amount by \$3,124,000,000.

On page 48, line 2, increase the amount by \$2,730,000,000.

On page 48, line 3, increase the amount by \$2,623,000,000.

MCCAIN AMENDMENT NO. 3972

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate Concurrent Resolution 57; *supra*, as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

“SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE—TRUTH IN BUDGETING.—It is the Sense of the Senate that:

(a) The Congressional Budget Office has scored revenue expected to be raised from the auction of Federal Communications Commission licenses for various services;

(b) For budget scoring purposes, the Congress has assumed that such auctions would occur in a prompt and expeditious manner and that revenue raised by such auctions would flow to the federal treasury;

(c) The revenue assumed to be raised from auctions totals billions of dollars;

(d) The Federal Communications Commission has not yet conducted auctions for all services where auctions were assumed, such as Local Multipoint Distribution Service (LMDS) and other subscription services, revenue from which has been assumed in Congressional budgetary calculations and in determining the level of the deficit; and

(e) The Commission's service rules can dramatically affect license values and auction revenues and therefore the Commission should seek to act expeditiously and without further delay to conduct auctions of licenses in a manner that enhances revenue and increases efficiency for any service for which auction revenues has been scored by the Congressional Budget Office and/or counted for budgetary purposes in an Act of Congress.

EXON AMENDMENT NO. 3973

Mr. EXON proposed an amendment to amendment No. 3965 proposed by him to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57) *supra*; as follows:

In the pending amendment:

On page 2, line 9, increase the amount by \$7,000,000.

On page 2, line 10, increase the amount by \$246,000,000.

On page 2, line 11, increase the amount by \$1,920,000,000.

On page 2, line 12, increase the amount by \$3,033,000,000.

On page 2, line 13, increase the amount by \$3,124,000,000.

On page 2, line 14, increase the amount by \$2,187,000,000.

On page 2, line 18, increase the amount by \$7,000,000.

On page 2, line 19, increase the amount by \$246,000,000.

On page 2, line 20, increase the amount by \$1,920,000,000.

On page 3, line 1 increase the amount by \$3,033,000,000.

On page 3, line 2, increase the amount by \$3,124,000,000.

On page 3, line 3, increase the amount by \$2,187,000,000.

On page 33, line 5, increase the amount by \$175,000,000.

On page 33, line 6, increase the amount by \$7,000,000.

On page 33, line 12, increase the amount by \$907,000,000.

On page 33, line 13, increase the amount by \$246,000,000.

On page 33, line 19, increase the amount by \$2,256,000,000.

On page 33, line 20, increase the amount by \$1,920,000,000.

On page 34, line 1, increase the amount by \$3,621,000,000.

On page 34, line 2, increase the amount by \$3,033,000,000.

On page 34, line 8, increase the amount by \$1,708,000,000.

On page 34, line 9, increase the amount by \$1,552,000,000.

On page 40, line 23, increase the amount by \$1,594,000,000.

On page 40, line 24, increase the amount by \$1,572,000,000.

On page 41, line 5, increase the amount by \$2,355,000,000.

On page 41, line 6, increase the amount by \$2,187,000,000.

On page 47, line 10, increase the amount by \$175,000,000.

On page 47, line 11, increase the amount by \$7,000,000.

On page 47, line 13, increase the amount by \$907,000,000.

On page 47, line 14, increase the amount by \$246,000,000.

On page 47, line 16, increase the amount by \$2,256,000,000.

On page 47, line 17, increase the amount by \$1,920,000,000.

On page 47, line 19, increase the amount by \$3,621,000,000.

On page 47, line 20, increase the amount by \$3,033,000,000.

On page 47, line 22, increase the amount by \$3,302,000,000.

On page 47, line 23, increase the amount by \$3,124,000,000.

On page 48, line 2, increase the amount by \$2,355,000,000.

On page 48, line 3, increase the amount by \$2,187,000,000.

THOMAS AMENDMENT NO. 3974

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. THOMAS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57) supra; as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE SUPPORTING BIENNIAL BUDGETING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that the current budget process—

(1) results in constant and redundant congressional action on spending measures and budget issues;

(2) causes instability in financial markets and creates budgetary uncertainty for recipi-

ents of Federal funds, thereby inhibiting the efficient operation of these programs; and

(3) allows insufficient time for Congress to consider national needs as a basis for sound and efficient policy approaches, thereby fostering piecemeal solutions that contribute to unrestrained growth of the Federal Government.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) a biennial budget process would—

(A) create an orderly, predictable process for consideration of spending decisions responsive to policy priorities and improve congressional control over the Federal budget and therefore promote better accountability to the public;

(B) provide greater stability and certainty for financial markets, Federal, State, and local government agencies which need sufficient time to plan for the implementation of programs; and

(C) allow sufficient time for the fulfillment by the Congress of its legislative and oversight responsibilities, including the consideration of authorizing legislation, budget resolutions, appropriations bills, and other spending measures; and

(2) the Congress should enact legislation in the 104th Congress to establish a biennial budget process.

GRAHAM (AND BAUCUS) AMENDMENT NO. 3975

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. BAUCUS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57) supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following new section:

"MEDICARE FRAUD AND ABUSE SAVINGS TRUST FUND

"SEC. . (a)(1) There is hereby created on the books of the Treasury of the United States in the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund (in this subsection referred to as the 'Trust Fund') an expenditure account to be known as the 'Health Care Fraud and Abuse Control Account' (in this subsection referred to as the 'Account'). The Account shall consist of such gifts and bequests as may be made as provided in title XVIII of the Social Security Act and amounts appropriated under paragraph (2).

"(2) Amounts equivalent to 100 percent of the Secretary's estimate of the reductions in outlays in title XVIII that are attributable to Medicare waste, fraud and abuse recoveries, as defined in title XVIII of the Social Security Act—

"(A) are hereby appropriated to the Account out of any amounts in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and

"(B) in order to assure the solvency of the Medicare system, shall not be considered for purposes of calculating the deficit increase or estimated deficit for any year under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

The amounts appropriated by the preceding sentence shall be transferred from time to time (not less frequently than monthly) from the general fund in the Treasury to the Trust Fund.

KENNEDY AMENDMENT NO. 3976

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57) supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING PROGRAMS FOR SENIOR CITIZENS, CHILDREN AND THE DISABLED.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) 18,000,000 children depend on the medic-aid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act;

(2) 6,000,000 disabled Americans depend on the medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act and are generally unable to qualify for private health insurance coverage, regardless of whether such individuals can afford such insurance; and

(3) 5,000,000 senior citizens depend on the medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act for assistance with health care services that are not covered under the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, and medicaid is the sole source of affordable nursing home care for senior citizens, the disabled, and their families.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the reconciliation bill should not include any provisions that reduce Federally mandated eligibility or benefits for programs for senior citizens, children, or the disabled.

FAIRCLOTH AMENDMENT NO. 3977

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. FAIRCLOTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57) supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING WELFARE REFORM.

FINDINGS.—S. Con. Res. 57 assumes substantial savings from welfare reform; and

Children born out of wedlock are five times more likely to be poor and about ten times more likely to be extremely poor and therefore are more likely to receive welfare benefits than children from two parent families; and

High rates of out-of-wedlock births are associated with a host of other social pathologies; for example, children of single mothers are twice as likely to drop out of high school; boys whose fathers are absent are more likely to engage in criminal activities; and girls in single-parent families are three times more likely to have children out of wedlock themselves;

Therefore, it is the sense of the Senate that any comprehensive legislation sent to the President that balances the budget by a certain date and that includes welfare reform provisions and that is agreed to by the Congress and the President shall also contain to the maximum extent possible a strategy for reducing the rate of out-of-wedlock births and encouraging family formation.

KERREY (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 3978

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. KERREY (for himself, Mr. SIMON, Mr. NUNN, Mr. ROBB, and Mr. SIMPSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57) supra; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON A REDUCTION IN CONSUMER PRICE INDEX ADJUSTMENTS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this resolution assume that the consumer

price index should be reduced by 0.5 percentage point.

**ROCKEFELLER (AND OTHERS)
AMENDMENT NO. 3979**

Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DODD, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. FORD, Mr. EXON, Mr. HARKIN, and Ms. MIKULSKI) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57) supra; as follows:

On page 3, line 5, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.
On page 3, line 6, increase the amount by \$3,400,000,000.
On page 3, line 7, increase the amount by \$5,900,000,000.
On page 3, line 8, increase the amount by \$9,200,000,000.
On page 3, line 9, increase the amount by \$13,200,000,000.
On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by \$18,700,000,000.
On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.
On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by \$3,400,000,000.
On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by \$5,900,000,000.
On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by \$9,200,000,000.
On page 3, line 18, increase the amount by \$13,200,000,000.
On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by \$18,700,000,000.
On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.
On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by \$3,400,000,000.
On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by \$5,900,000,000.
On page 4, line 11, increase the amount by \$9,200,000,000.
On page 4, line 12, increase the amount by \$13,200,000,000.
On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by \$18,700,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by \$3,400,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by \$5,900,000,000.
On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by \$9,200,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by \$13,200,000,000.
On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by \$18,700,000,000.
On page 29, line 10, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.
On page 29, line 11, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.
On page 29, line 17, increase the amount by \$3,400,000,000.
On page 29, line 18, increase the amount by \$3,400,000,000.
On page 29, line 24, increase the amount by \$5,900,000,000.
On page 29, line 25, increase the amount by \$5,900,000,000.
On page 30, line 6, increase the amount by \$9,200,000,000.
On page 30, line 7, increase the amount by \$9,200,000,000.
On page 30, line 13, increase the amount by \$13,200,000,000.
On page 30, line 14, increase the amount by \$13,200,000,000.
On page 30, line 20, increase the amount by \$18,700,000,000.
On page 30, line 21, increase the amount by \$18,700,000,000.

On page 49, line 17, decrease the amount by \$100,000,000.

On page 49, line 18, decrease the amount by \$50,500,000,000.

**ABRAHAM (AND DOMENICI)
AMENDMENT NO. 3980**

Mr. ABRAHAM (for himself and Mr. DOMENICI) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57) supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the concurrent resolution, insert the following:

**SEC. . SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING
CHANGES IN THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.**

(A) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that, in achieving the spending levels specified in this resolution—

(1) the public Trustees of medicare have concluded that "the medicare program is clearly unsustainable in its present form";

(2) the President has said his goal is to keep the medicare hospital insurance trust fund solvent for more than a decade, but his budget transfers \$55 billion of home health spending from medicare part A to medicare part B;

(3) the transfer of home health spending threatens the delivery of home health services to 3.5 million Medicare beneficiaries;

(4) such a transfer increases the burden on general revenues, including income taxes paid by working Americans, by \$55 billion;

(5) such a transfer artificially inflates the solvency of the medicare hospital insurance trust fund, misleading the Congress, medicare beneficiaries, and working taxpayers;

(6) the Director of the Congressional Budget Office has certified that, without such a transfer, the President's budget extends the solvency of the hospital insurance trust fund for only one additional year; and

(7) without misleading transfers, the President's budget therefore fails to achieve his own stated goal for the medicare hospital insurance trust fund.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that, in achieving the spending levels specified in this resolution, the Congress assumes that the Congress would—

(1) keep the medicare hospital insurance trust fund solvent for more than a decade, as recommended by the President; and

(2) accept the President's proposed level of medicare part B savings of \$44.1 billion over the period 1997 through 2002; but would

(3) reject the President's proposal to transfer health spending from one part of medicare to another, which threatens the delivery of home health care services to 3.5 million Medicare beneficiaries, artificially inflates the solvency of the medicare hospital insurance trust fund, and increases the burden on general revenues, including income taxes paid by working Americans, by \$55 billion.

**THOMPSON (AND OTHERS)
AMENDMENT NO. 3981**

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. THOMPSON (for himself, Mr. KERRY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. FEINGOLD, and Mr. BRADLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57) supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the resolution, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND.

It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals

in this resolution assume that when the Finance Committee meets its outlay and revenue obligations under this resolution the committee should not make any changes in the Presidential Election Campaign Fund or its funding mechanism and should meet its revenue and outlay targets through other programs within its jurisdiction.

**BOXER (AND OTHERS)
AMENDMENT NO. 3982**

Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. DORGAN, and Mr. KENNEDY) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57) supra; as follows:

On page 3, line 5, increase the amount by \$1,900,000,000.

On page 3, line 6, increase the amount by \$2,500,000,000.

On page 3, line 7, increase the amount by \$3,200,000,000.

On page 3, line 8, increase the amount by \$2,700,000,000.

On page 3, line 9, increase the amount by \$2,600,000,000.

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by \$5,400,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by \$1,900,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by \$2,500,000,000.

On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by \$3,200,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by \$2,700,000,000.

On page 3, line 18, increase the amount by \$2,600,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by \$5,400,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by \$1,900,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by \$2,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by \$3,200,000,000.

On page 4, line 11, increase the amount by \$2,700,000,000.

On page 4, line 12, increase the amount by \$2,600,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by \$5,400,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by \$1,900,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by \$2,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by \$3,200,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by \$2,700,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by \$2,600,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by \$5,400,000,000.

On page 27, line 16, increase the amount by \$1,900,000,000.

On page 27, line 17, increase the amount by \$1,900,000,000.

On page 27, line 23, increase the amount by \$2,500,000,000.

On page 27, line 24, increase the amount by \$2,500,000,000.

On page 28, line 6, increase the amount by \$3,200,000,000.

On page 28, line 12, increase the amount by \$2,700,000,000.

On page 28, line 13, increase the amount by \$2,700,000,000.

On page 28, line 19, increase the amount by \$2,600,000,000.

On page 28, line 20, increase the amount by \$2,600,000,000.

On page 29, line 2, increase the amount by \$5,400,000,000.

On page 29, line 3, increase the amount by \$5,400,000,000.

On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by \$18,300,000,000.

At the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE.

It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions contained in this budget resolution assume Medicaid reforms shall—

(1) maintain the guarantees in current law for Medicaid coverage of seniors, children, pregnant women, and persons with disabilities;

(2) preserve current laws protecting spouses and adult children from the risk of impoverishment to pay for long-term nursing home care;

(3) maintain the current Federal nursing home quality and enforcement standards;

(4) protect states from unanticipated program costs resulting from economic fluctuations in the business cycle, changing demographics, and natural disasters;

(5) maintain the successful Federal-State partnership and protect the Federal Treasury against practices that allow States to decrease their fair share of Medicaid funding; and,

(6) continue to provide coverage of Medicare premiums and cost-sharing payments for low-income Medicare beneficiaries, consistent with current law.

THE PUBLIC BUILDINGS REFORM ACT OF 1995

BAUCUS AMENDMENT NO. 3983

Mr. FRIST (for Mr. BAUCUS) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 1005) to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959 to improve the process of constructing, altering, purchasing, and acquiring public buildings, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 21, line 3, strike "1995" and insert "1996".

THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

WYDEN (AND KERRY) AMENDMENT NO. 3984

Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. KERRY) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57) supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING REVENUE ASSUMPTIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) Corporations and individuals have clear responsibility to adhere to environmental laws. When they do not, and environmental damage results, the Federal and State governments may impose fines and penalties, and assess polluters for the cost of remediation.

(2) Assessment of these costs is important in the enforcement process. They appropriately penalize wrongdoing. They discourage future environmental damage. They ensure that taxpayers do not bear the financial brunt of cleaning up after damages done by polluters.

(3) In the case of the *Exxon Valdez* oil spill disaster in Prince William Sound, Alaska, for example, the corporate settlement with the Federal Government totaled \$900 million.

(4) The Tax Code, however, currently allows polluters to fully deduct all expenses,

including penalties and fines associated with these settlements. In the case of the *Exxon Valdez* disaster, deductibility on that settlement at the current corporate tax rate will result in \$300 million in losses to Federal tax collections . . . losses which will have to be made up through increased collections from taxation of average American families.

(5) Additionally, these losses also will make it more difficult to move aggressively and successfully toward a balanced Federal budget.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—assumptions in this resolution assume that revenues will be increased by a minimum of \$100 million per year through legislation that will not allow deductions for fines, penalties and damages arising from a failure to comply with Federal or State environmental or health protection laws.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Special Committee on Aging will hold a hearing on Thursday, May 23, 1996, at 9:30 a.m., in room 562 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building. The hearing will discuss encouraging return to work in the SSI and DI Programs.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES, SUBCOMMITTEE ON PARKS, HISTORIC PRESERVATION AND RECREATION

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a field hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation.

The hearing will take place Friday, May 31, 1996, at 9:30 a.m. at the Montrose Pavillion, 1800 Pavillion Boulevard, Montrose, CO.

The purpose of this hearing is to review S. 1424, a bill to redesignate the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument as a national park, to establish the Gunnison Gorge National Conservation Area, to establish the Curecanti National Recreation Area, to establish the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park Complex, and for other purposes.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. Written testimony will be accepted for the record. Witnesses testifying at the hearing are requested to bring 10 copies of their testimony with them on the day of the hearing.

The subcommittee will invite witnesses representing a cross-section of views and organizations to testify at the hearing. Others wishing to testify may, as time permits, make a brief statement of no more than 2 minutes. Those wishing to testify should contact Mr. James Doyle in Senator CAMPBELL's office at (303) 866-1900. The deadline for signing up to testify is 5 p.m., Wednesday, May 29, 1996. Every attempt will be made to accommodate as many witnesses as possible, while ensuring that all views are represented.

For additional information, please contact Jim O'Toole, Energy and Natural Resources Committee, at (202) 224-5161.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be allowed to meet during the Thursday, May 16, 1996, session of the Senate for the purpose of conducting a hearing on NASA's Mission to Planet Earth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the Governmental Affairs Committee to meet on Thursday, May 16, 1996, at 10 a.m. for a markup.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 16, 1996, at 10:30 a.m. to hold an executive business meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Human Resources be authorized to meet for a hearing on oversight of the "Healthy Start" demonstration project, during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 16, 1996, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PARKS, HISTORIC PRESERVATION, AND RECREATION

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be granted permission to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 16, 1996, for purposes of conducting a subcommittee hearing which is scheduled to begin at 9:30 a.m. The purpose of this hearing is to consider S. 621, a bill to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the Great Western Trail for potential addition to the National Trails System; H.R. 531, a bill to designate the Great Western Scenic Trail as a study trail under the National Trails System Act. S. 1049, a bill to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the route from Selma to Montgomery as a National Historic Trail. S. 1706, a bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for assistance for highway relocation with respect to the Chicamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park in Georgia; S. 1725, a bill to amend the National Trails System Act to create a third category of long-distance trails to be known as national discovery trails and to authorize the American Discovery Trail as the first national discovery trail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC
POLICY, EXPORT AND TRADE PROMOTION

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy, Export and Trade Promotion of the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 16, 1996, at 9 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

COMMON SENSE ON SCHOOL
CHOICE

• Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in today's RECORD an unusually clear article on the complex subject of school vouchers. Ms. Claudia Smith Brinson at the State newspaper in Columbia, SC, has made the case eloquently that the choice of taxpayer funding for private and religious schools is a bad one. Specifically, she points out its history as a means of minimizing desegregation, its lack of results, and its lack of promise compared to other proven education reforms. I commend her for her eloquence and hope my colleagues will benefit from her column.

The column follows:

[From the State, May 15, 1996]

LET'S DECIDE JUST EXACTLY WHAT SCHOOL
CHOICE MEANS

(By Claudia Smith Brinson)

The concept of school choice has been around a long time. In the '60s, it was promoted in the South as a means of minimizing court-ordered desegregation. In the '70s, economist Milton Friedman talked up what he called the "free-choice" model. In the '80s and early '90s, as dissatisfaction with public schools grew, experimentation kicked in.

School choice covers an enormous range. At its most basic, parents exercise choice when they buy a house in a certain neighborhood. When a school provides school-within-a-school options, choice is offered. When a school district provides alternative or magnet schools, choice is offered. Some districts allow parents with a need for flexibility regarding work or child care to use intra-district choice.

While, in this state, we have few magnet schools, half of our school districts offer alternative schools or second-chance programs; more than half allow high-school students to take college courses; almost two-thirds permit inter-district transfers. Our governor's schools for arts and mathematics and science increase choice statewide for our brightest students.

Nationwide, choice is often employed to help with the urban suburban desegregation issue. In St. Louis, Mo., inner-city children can apply to attend mostly white suburban schools. To improve schooling for Hispanic students in San Antonio, the Multilingual Program provides a language and cultural focus for academically successful students. In Montgomery County, Md., a magnet school program was introduced to improve integration. In Monclair, N.J., all schools are magnet schools, and transportation is provided.

In Cambridge, Mass., parents can choose, with the help of an information center, any public school in the district. In Minnesota, the whole state allows open enrollment, although students must supply transportation.

Charter schools, in which parents and teachers contract with the state to provide a particular kind of education, are another option. Just over 100 charter schools are in operation nationwide. Here, the House has passed legislation allowing charter schools; a Senate subcommittee is discussing it.

Vouchers are rare. In Milwaukee, to desegregate schools and improve urban children's schooling, low-income parents were invited to apply for public funds to send their children to private or public suburban schools. An attempt to add church schools is on hold because the state Supreme Court deadlocked on its constitutionality. In Boston, private money is used to send low-income children to parochial schools. In San Antonio and Indianapolis, private businesses pay low-income students' tuition at private schools.

The favorite arguments for using vouchers (sending public money through parents) for private schools rest on three faulty premises. The first is that children make great academic strides in private and parochial schools. When you take out those oh-so-important factors such as parents' income and education, what remains is a very small advantage in scores for parochial and private school students.

The second faulty premise is that education can be compared to car-making. The premise goes like this: Education is just another manufacturing process; vouchers will create competition; competition will automatically improve product quality. But children and learning are far more complicated than autos and welding. Education is a service, and public education is a service with important democratic goals, such as preparing children for full citizenship, minimizing social inequities and promoting cultural unity.

It's not much better an analogy, but compare education, instead, to a service like public hospitals. No one in need is turned away, and yes, those who can afford to do so shop around. However, the patient (both consumer and product, like our students) cannot be cured at any location if destructive behaviors persist. Even with some of the magical pills our technology has created, radical changes in lifestyle are often required. Likewise, poverty, parental disengagement, behavior or discipline problems that many of our children bring into the schoolhouse cannot be quickly and permanently cured by shifting locale. (In Milwaukee, where vouchers are being tried, academic scores haven't improved and attrition remains high.)

So vouchers are not a miracle cure. And that is the third faulty premise, that any one new step, such as increased choice or vouchers, will suddenly remake education. The funding equity issue, raised by 40 of our districts, has yet to be ruled on in court. How much good would intra-district choice currently serve in some of the suing, impoverished counties such as Clarendon, Lee, Williamsburg or Jasper? How much help is a \$1,700 voucher to an impoverished family in a rural community without transportation or in an urban community where private schools cost \$6,000-plus a year? What happens then is not that parents are offered more choice, but that private schools are.

If our community, and our Legislature, want to consider choice, first the conversation has to get honest. It can be a legitimate discussion given public dissatisfaction with public schools and a universal desire by parents to do the best possible for their children.

But if we're going to talk about choice, what are we talking about? Increasing variety? Or resegregating? If our state and national constitutions forbid public money supporting church schools, why on Earth is our conversation about choice starting in forbidden territory?

In a state with limited funds, why begin with vouchers when encouragement for more magnet schools, school-within-a school programs and inter- and intra-district transfers would offer more choices to more children at no extra cost? With limited funds, why not start small and emulate programs that work, like the language option in San Antonio or the controlled-choice program in Cambridge? Why take giant, expensive leaps into ideas, such as vouchers, that have barely been tested anywhere?

We have a summer to think this out. •

TRIBUTE TO ASTRONAUT RICK
LINNEHAN

• Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate the extraordinary accomplishments of Astronaut Rick Linnehan, who will be a mission specialist on the space shuttle *Columbia*, scheduled to leave Cape Canaveral, FL in June.

In 1975, Rick graduated from Pelham High School in Pelham, NH and proceeded to earn a bachelor of science degree in animal science and microbiology at the University of New Hampshire. Later, Rick denied his acceptance to the U.S. Air Force for pilot training and instead opted to attend the Ohio State University College of Medicine to earn his veterinary degree. While Rick's heartening desire to fly was temporarily delayed, his dream never died. Upon finishing his veterinary degree in 1985, Rick applied for NASA's astronaut training program. With the 1986 *Challenger* disaster stalling the program, Rick's dream of space flight was once again put on hold. During this time, Rick worked as a veterinarian before joining an internship with the Baltimore Zoo and Johns Hopkins University from 1986 to 1988. He then joined the military as a captain in the U.S. Army Veterinary Corps, and ended up as chief clinical veterinarian with the Navy's Marine Mammal project in San Diego, CA.

Despite Rick's success in his field of study, he still held on to his dream of one day becoming an astronaut. In 1991, Rick again applied for the astronaut program and was selected along with 18 others out of nearly 3,000 applicants.

After 4 years of dedicated training, Rick will embark on his first journey into space this summer as a crewmember of NASA's Life Sciences and Micro-gravity Spacelab mission. During the 16-day flight, Rick will be part of a medical team that will be checking fellow crewmembers for the effects of prolonged space flight as part of NASA's testing program for the space station.

In memory of another New Hampshire astronaut, Christa McAuliffe,

Rick will carry a lapel pin with him into space from the Concord planetarium. Rick will also bring a New Hampshire flag from the State Legislature, which will be returned to fly in our State House, as well as a banner for the University of New Hampshire, and some personal items for relatives and friends.

New Hampshire is very proud of Rick's extraordinary commitment and hard work to achieve his boyhood dream of space flight. America needs more visionaries like Rick, who not only hold on to their dreams but work hard to achieve them. I congratulate Rick on this outstanding honor and am proud to have him represent us in the final frontier.●

CALIFORNIA CITIES ACT TO BAN JUNK GUNS

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, last month I introduced legislation with Senators JOHN CHAFEE and BILL BRADLEY to prohibit the manufacture and sale of junk guns—or as they are also called, Saturday night specials. We believe that these cheap, poorly constructed, easily concealable firearms pose such a great threat to public safety that their sale and manufacture should be prohibited.

Nearly 20 years ago, Congress prohibited the importation of junk guns, but allowed their domestic manufacture to soar virtually unchecked. Today, 7 of the 10 firearms most frequently traced at crime scenes are junk guns that cannot legally be imported. My view is that if a gun represents such a threat to public safety that it should not be imported, its domestic manufacture should also be restricted. A firearm's point of origin is irrelevant.

Earlier this year, the City of West Hollywood prohibited the sale of junk guns within the city limit. Shortly thereafter, I introduced my bill, which would ban junk guns nationwide. Since then, California cities have made progress that exceeded my expectations. Once again, California is at the leading edge of a nationwide movement.

This week, the Oakland City Council, with the support of the mayor and the police chief, voted to ban the sale of junk guns. San Francisco is expected to follow shortly. And the city of San Jose is also considering enacting a junk gun ban. The police chiefs of these three cities have all endorsed my bill to ban junk guns nationwide.

I am very proud that these California cities are acting responsibly to take these dangerous firearms off our streets. This momentum is growing into an unstoppable force. The current junk gun double standard cannot be maintained. It is simply a matter of time before Congress acts to apply the same standards to domestically produced junk guns as are currently applied to imports.●

TRIBUTE TO VERNON J. BAKER

● Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, it is indeed a pleasure and a privilege for me to speak today about the accomplishments of one of my fellow Idahoans, Vernon J. Baker. Vernon Baker is one of seven African-Americans whose heroic actions in World War II are being belatedly recognized. Vernon has been nominated for this Nation's highest award—the Congressional Medal of Honor.

When 1st Lt. Vernon Baker awoke on the morning of April 5, 1945, I am confident he did not begin the day thinking, "Today, I am going to be a hero." I am more confident he began that morning thinking, "Lord, give me the strength to get me and my men through another day."

In the smoky grayness of predawn, artillery rained on the German mountain stronghold called "Hill X" near Castle Aghinolfi, Italy. First Lieutenant Baker was a platoon leader of 25 men and a recent graduate of Officer Candidate School. Standing five foot five and weighing in at 139 pounds, he led his men to the south side of the draw, within 250 yards of the castle. Seeing a telescope pointing out of the narrow slit of the bunker, he ordered his men to stay down and he crawled to the opening, stuck in his M-1 and fired until the rifle was empty. When he looked inside, one of the two dead Germans was still slumped in his chair. Baker then stumbled upon a camouflaged machine gun nest where he killed two more Germans.

As he reported to his company commander, Captain John Runyan, who like all his superiors was white, he was hit in the head by a "potato masher" hand grenade. It failed to explode and Baker quickly shot and killed the German who had thrown the grenade. While his unit was under heavy fire, he continued into the canyon alone. Discovering a hidden entrance to another dugout, he blasted it open with a grenade and dashed inside, killing two more German soldiers with a discarded machine gun he had picked up off the ground.

Captain Runyan ordered a withdrawal of the unit and told Baker he was going for reinforcements. That was the last time Lieutenant Baker saw Captain Runyan. The reinforcements never arrived. At the end of the battle, Baker regrouped the seven survivors of the 25 man platoon. The unit had killed 26 Germans, destroyed six machine gun nests, two observer posts, and four dugouts.

Vernon Baker was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross on July 4, 1945, for his actions that day. The Distinguished Service Cross is the Nation's second highest military award. On the citation for the award, Baker is cited for "outstanding courage" and "daring leadership."

Nearly 50 years later, during an Army review of medals awarded during World War II, the absence of a single African-American from the list of Con-

gressional Medal of Honor winners was duly noted. This began the process to determine if African-Americans had not received the Nation's highest award merely because of racial bias rather than military record under fire. Seven Distinguished Service Medal awards were reevaluated and have now been recommended for upgrade to the Congressional Medal of Honor. Vernon J. Baker is the only surviving nominee from this illustrious group.

Mr. President, on behalf of a grateful nation, I once more want to thank Vernon J. Baker for his courageous actions, on that April day so long ago.●

JANET COOPER

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I rise to honor Janet Cooper who will be retiring from the State of Michigan Department of Civil Rights on June 1, 1996. Janet Cooper has given more than three decades of dedicated service in establishing one of the best civil rights agencies in the Nation.

Janet Cooper joined the Michigan Department of Civil Rights as a field investigator in 1963, about the same time I became the general counsel. I knew her as a dedicated and thorough public servant. Since then, she has served the department in many roles including director of the Conciliation and Hearings Division, deputy director of the Enforcement Bureau, and director of the Legal Bureau. She is currently the department deputy and is responsible for the Enforcement Bureau, the Office of Contractual and Business Services, and the Office of Research.

Janet Cooper is an experienced attorney who is known across the country as an expert in the field of civil rights. She has served as an adjunct professor at Wayne State University School of Law and the Detroit College of Law. The Michigan State Bar Foundation honored Janet with the title of Fellow. This title is given to attorneys who have demonstrated outstanding legal ability and a strong dedication to the community.

Janet Cooper is retiring from the Department of Civil Rights, but her work protecting the constitutional rights of all citizens will not end. She will now become the chair of the Metropolitan Detroit Branch of the American Civil Liberties Union of Michigan.

I know that my Senate colleagues will join me in honoring Janet Cooper for her many years of dedicated service in upholding the civil rights of all people.●

LT. CAROLYN J. FERRARI, M.D.

● Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to commend the selection of Lt. Carolyn J. Ferrari, M.D. as medical director and physician for Highland Medical Center in Monterey, VA. Dr. Ferrari's acceptance of this key medical position concludes a nearly 3-year-old search by the medical center board of directors.

I extend further praise to the U.S. Navy for its authorization of Dr. Ferrari's early release. Mr. President, if it were not for this authorization, Dr. Ferrari would have had to complete another year of duty.

As a former Secretary of the Navy, I believe this is a win-win situation for the U.S. Navy and the people of Highland County. The Navy has a long and distinguished history in Virginia, and I appreciate this good neighbor effort.

Dr. Ferrari and the Highland Medical Center will play an important role in providing first-class health care to the community. Moreover, this partnership represents another important step toward positive community and economic growth.

Mr. President, let me say once again that I applaud the Navy, Highland Medical Center and Lt. Carolyn Ferrari, M.D. I am proud that my office was able to play a small role in this very good development for the citizens of Highland County and the surrounding area.●

SIGNIFICANT ALASKA MILESTONE

● Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, Mark Stasik and Daryl Miller, of Talkeetna, recently achieved a great distinction in our State of Alaska—they endured a 45 day, 350 mile circumnavigation of the Denali and Foraker massifs, in Winter, on foot. Along the way, the men crossed four remote mountain passes, traveled approximately 100 miles on 16 glaciers, 80 miles on rugged and diverse, high mountainous terrain, 115 miles on frozen rivers, creeks, and lakes, and 55 miles amidst dense boreal forest. There was an estimated elevation gain and loss of 60,000 feet, the equivalent of two Mt. Everests. The two men also encountered temperatures as low as 60 degrees below zero and winds up to 100 mph, while carrying 150 pounds of gear per person.

This expedition not only shows the personal strength and perseverance of these Alaskans, but it also provided scientific and educational data for the Denali National Park. This was the first expedition of this kind. I am sure the family and friends of Mark and Daryl are very proud of their achievement.

Mr. President, I ask that an article entitled "Off The Couch" from the Climbing Magazine be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From Climbing Magazine, June 15-Aug. 1, 1995]

OFF THE COUCH—TALKEETNA LOCALS COMPLETE GRAND CIRCUMNAVIGATION

Leaving from their couches in downtown Talkeetna, the Alaska Range veterans Mark Stasik and Daryl Miller endured a 45-day, 350 mile circumnavigation of the Denali and Foraker massifs—a first in winter. Calculating an elevation gain/loss of 60,000 feet for the trip, Stasik and Miller experienced expectedly horrendous conditions, including 60-below temperatures and 100 mph winds. They also weathered a tent fire, a fall through river ice, the loss of their maps, and

three days of travel without food or fuel. The route-finding involved crossing four remote mountain passes, 100 miles over 16 glaciers, 115 miles along (usually) frozen rivers, creeks, and lakes, 80 miles of rugged mountain terrain, and 55 miles of dense boreal forest undergrowth—all while toting sleds and packs weighing in at 150 pounds per person. The extremes of terrain and conditions savaged their equipment: Miller broke two ski bindings, and then his skis, then both of his snowshoes, before borrowing Stasik's backup pair. "It was a product tester's wet dream," says Stasik.

Stasik and Miller share a great deal of Alaskan experience, with 14 Denali expeditions between them, numerous other backcountry trips, and involvement in search-and-rescue operations. Having seen the yearly circus of climbers on Denali, many unprepared for and disrespectful of the dangers, Stasik and Miller hope to make a statement with their expedition. "It was important for us to strip down to the rawest elements, to show how locals could do it, on foot, off the couch, and out the back door, to assimilate the experience into an everyday frame of reference, without it needing to become a Spandex production," says Stasik. "All this hype and lionization of climbing has gotten to be a tad much."●

TRIBUTE TO "THE GRAND OL' LADY" OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, MABEL RICHARDSON

● Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Mabel Richardson, a truly dedicated and respected New Hampshire public servant who passed away this week. Mabel, who was known to many as the Mountain Lady and the Grand Ol' Lady, served as a Republican lawmaker in the New Hampshire House of Representatives for 34 years. She was a role model for me and many other New Hampshire elected officials.

While Mabel may no longer be with us, she has left behind remarkable political legacy. From 1946 to 1980, she served as a State representative, was a strong advocate of public education and helped establish the New Hampshire Vocational-Technical College in Berlin. She was also a delegate to the National Republican Convention in the 1970's and was Chairman of the Order of Women Legislators and the State Republican Party. On her 90th birthday in 1986, then-Governor, John Sununu, read a proclamation of appreciation for her 34 years as a representative, and 4 years later then-Governor, Judd Gregg, named her Republican of the Year. She retired from politics when she was 83 years old.

Mabel lived a long, happy life of 99 years. She was born in Randolph, NH, raised on a farm and educated in a one-room schoolhouse. In 1960, she and her husband Herbert Randall Richardson became directors of the Odd Fellows' Old Folks Home in Concord, and before that they managed the Androscoggin Valley Country Club.

Many people in New Hampshire called Mabel the Mountain Lady because of her love of the White Mountains, where she had led many mountain climbs while working with the youth extension program.

I am amazed at the stamina and energy this lady had even in the later years of her life. As a representative in the New Hampshire Legislature, she was devoted to improving the lives of New Hampshire citizens. Undoubtedly, she will be missed by the many people who were touched by her devotion and hard work. I have always admired this woman, who gave so much to her State. She was truly a New Hampshire landmark, and her memory will live on—as solid as the White Mountains that she loved for her century-long life.●

THE 15TH ANNUAL PEACE OFFICERS' MEMORIAL DAY

● Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this week is National Peace Officers' Week, and the 15th Annual Peace Officers' Memorial Service is occurring today on the West Front of the Capitol.

We Americans go about our daily routines with the comfort that we can do so safely. We tend to forget that this comfort is the result of the efforts of thousands of dedicated peace officers around the country who are working to protect us from crime 24 hours a day.

While we are resting comfortably at home in the twilight hours of early morning, many peace officers are protecting our neighborhoods, patrolling our streets, and often putting themselves in harm's way. Their efforts are not without sacrifices. Police work does not always lend itself to family schedules. There are times when the children's weekend soccer matches are missed, when dinner is enjoyed in a patrol car, and when officers do not have the opportunity to tuck their children into bed. And, there is always the lingering anxiety of the spouse, worrying if tragedy will strike.

Mr. President, I am a cosponsor of Senator KEMPTHORNE's Senate Resolution 251, a resolution commemorating and acknowledging the dedication and sacrifices of the men and women who have lost their lives while serving as law enforcement officers.

A preliminary report of the National Association of Police Chiefs noted that 145 law officers died in the line of duty in 1995, including 13 in the Oklahoma City bombing.

While I am pleased to report that Alaska did not lose any peace officers in 1995, Alaska has lost 28 peace officers in the line of duty since statehood.

Today, we honor the memory of all fallen peace officers, and grieve for their families. In particular, I honor the memory of the 28 Alaskans who paid the ultimate price.

I will read the names of those 28 Alaskan peace officers and ask that their names be inserted in the RECORD of today's Senate proceedings. They are: Doris Wayne Barber, Earl Ray Hoggard, Dennis Finbar Cronin, Harry Edward Kier, Jimmy Earl Kennedy, Louie Gordon Mizelle, Ignatius John Charlie, Donald Thomas Dull, Karl William Reishus, Benjamin Franklin

Strong, Thomas Charles Dillon, Johnathon Paul Flora, Richard James Adair, Troy Lynn Duncan, Roland Edgar Chevalier, Jr., David Cameron Harris, Anthony Crawford Jones, Kenneth Grant Nauska, Gary George Wohfiel, Frank Stuart Rodman, Larry Robert Carr, John David Stimson, Gordon Brewster Bartel, Harry Biddington Hanson, Jr., Ronald Eugene Zimin, Robert Lee Bittick, Leroy Garvin Bohuslov, and Claude Everett Swackhammer.

Mr. President, in closing I bring to the attention of my colleagues the Blue Ribbon Campaign organized by Concerns of Police Survivors, Inc., also known as COPS.

Blue ribbons are being flown this week from patrol antennas nationwide to ask communities to support law enforcement, and to remember those officers who have given their lives in the line of duty. You can see them flying proudly from our Capitol Hill Police patrol cars.

In keeping with this sign of support and remembrance, I urge all Alaskans to fly blue ribbons from their car antennas this week.●

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations on today's executive calendar: All nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy.

I further ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed, en bloc, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, en bloc, that any statements relating to the nominations appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and that the Senate then return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations were considered and confirmed, en bloc, as follows:

IN THE AIR FORCE, ARMY, MARINE CORPS, NAVY

Air Force nominations beginning Brian H. Benedict, and ending Daniel K. Roberts, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 20, 1996

Air Force nominations beginning Michael G. Colangelo, and ending John J. Barlettano, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 20, 1996

Army nominations beginning Ralph G. Benson, and ending Jesse L. Thornton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 1, 1996

Army nominations beginning Wesley S. Ashton, and ending Valerie E. Holmes, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 26, 1996

Army nominations beginning Andre B. Abadie, and ending Steven Paul Zynda,

which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 26, 1996

Army nomination of Mark H. Lauber, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 15, 1996

Army nominations beginning Jeffery Dootson, and ending Jon E. Schiff, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 15, 1996

Army nominations beginning Daniel Bolas, and ending Paul S. Darby, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 15, 1996

Army nominations beginning Richard R. Eckert, and ending Robert S. Knapp, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 15, 1996

Army nominations beginning Ernest R. Adkins, and ending James C. Robertson, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 15, 1996

Army nominations beginning *Raymond A. Constable, and ending Neil W. Ahle, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 15, 1996

Army nominations beginning *William E. Ackerman, and ending *Myrna E. Zapata, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 15, 1996

Marine Corps nominations beginning Michael C. Albano, and ending Richard C. Zilmer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 20, 1996

Marine Corps nominations beginning William S. Aitken, and ending Douglas P. Yurovich, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 20, 1996

Marine Corps nominations beginning Joel H. Berry III, and ending Wayne R. Steele, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 15, 1996

Marine Corps nominations beginning Craig R. Abele, and ending Paul E. Zambelli, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 9, 1996

Marine Corps nominations beginning Carlton W. Adams, and ending Donald C. Prograis, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 9, 1996

Navy nominations beginning David L. Aamodt, and ending Schon M. Zwakman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 15, 1996.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now return to legislative session.

AMENDING THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2066, just received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2066) to amend the National School Lunch Act to provide greater flexibility to schools to meet the dietary guidelines for Americans under the school lunch and school breakfast programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, the bill before us today amends the National School Lunch Act to provide greater flexibility to school food service authorities to meet the USDA dietary guidelines for Americans. It is a positive step in providing healthy meals for our Nation's school children.

As I have stated on numerous occasions, the National School Lunch and Breakfast Programs work. School food service authorities have worked for nearly 50 years feeding millions of children each school day healthy meals. In recent years they have worked even harder to reduce the fat and sodium in the meals. I support these changes made by school food authorities to improve the nutritional profile of school meals; and I believe it is important to provide them adequate flexibility to serve meals that meet the USDA dietary guidelines for Americans and the recommended dietary allowances.

The purpose of the bill, which is similar to one introduced by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, Senator COCHRAN, is not to delete or postpone the implementation of the dietary guidelines as contained in the Healthy Meals for Healthy Americans Act of 1994. It is, however, to provide needed flexibility and clarity to meet these requirements in a cost efficient manner. Guidelines issued by the Department of Agriculture to assist schools in meeting nutrition requirements should reflect the intent of the bill and should not require intensive paperwork or sophisticated nutrient analysis of meals prior to food service.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture recently issued a policy statement revising the instructions for crediting grains and breads in the National School Lunch Program. The policy statement is complicated and potentially costly to schools. While I support the philosophy of the Department to assist schools in meeting the dietary guidelines, I question the need for such an explicit policy statement. It is my hope that this legislation, along with assistance from the Department of Agriculture, will help school food service authorities serve meals that meet the nutritional requirements and children will eat.

This legislation has strong support from the Indiana School Food Service Association and the American School Food Service Association. It is also supported by the Clinton administration.

I urge Senators to support the bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, today the Senate is considering H.R. 2066, a bill that is virtually the same as S.

1613, which I introduced in the Senate earlier this year.

The purpose of this legislation is to amend the National School Lunch Act to provide greater flexibility to schools to meet the dietary guidelines for Americans contained in Public Law 103-448, the Healthy Meals for Healthy Americans Act of 1994. This bill does not postpone or reduce in any way the statutory requirement that schools have to meet these dietary guidelines.

The National School Lunch Program currently operates in over 92,000 schools and serves approximately 26 million children each day. In my State of Mississippi approximately 7 out of 10 children participate in the School Lunch Program.

The Secretary should take measures to ensure accountability, but should ensure those measures do not reduce the flexibility in this bill. It is not the intent of this bill for the Secretary to require school food authorities to provide detailed information about recipes, menus, nutrients, or nutrient analyses in order to receive approval to use a menu-planning method other than the three prescribed by USDA. Limitations on staff time and resources could make it extremely difficult for many school food authorities to provide such information. Schools that desire to use the 1994-95 food-based meal policies are entitled to do so under this legislation without preapproval. This legislation will also allow schools to consider local and regional preferences when preparing meals.

This bill has received wide support from school representatives at both the local and national level and from the administration. Earlier this week the other body passed this bill by unanimous consent. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise in support of H.R. 2066, which is identical to S. 1613, a bill which I cosponsored. The purpose of this legislation is to provide commonsense flexibility to schools in meeting the statutory requirement of serving meals that meet the dietary guidelines for Americans under the school lunch and breakfast programs.

The dietary guidelines for Americans were first issued jointly by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health and Human Services in 1980, and have been revised several times since to reflect developments in scientific opinion. They present reasonable suggestions for how healthy Americans should eat to help them stay healthy. Congress has required that the school lunch and breakfast programs meet standards outlined in the dietary guidelines beginning with the 1996-97 school year.

Local school food service personnel have been working hard to improve the nutritional quality of school meals so that the dietary guidelines would be met. Good progress has been underway in virtually all schools, and many

schools have met the dietary guidelines for a number of years using the existing food-based meal pattern. Unfortunately, recent regulatory efforts by the Department of Agriculture seem to have been undertaken with such good-intentioned zeal that local school food service personnel found themselves being micromanaged from Washington. Mr. President, there are relatively few things that work out well when mandated in detail from Washington and then implemented without reasonable discretion across the country. In school lunches and breakfasts, that is a recipe for disaster.

This legislation makes crystal clear that the regulations, policies, and guidelines in effect in 1994-95 school year are to be available to schools as one of the reasonable means of meeting the dietary guidelines. This legislation reaches beyond the regulations to the informal policy guidance documents. For example, the Department of Agriculture has issued a new policy regarding bread serving sizes that could have been issued under the 1994-95 food plan regulations, but was not. This new policy specifies, among other things, various sizes for muffins that must be served to meet the new policy. The sizes depend on the ingredients, and in some cases, the size of muffins would have to double. This legislation provides that the previous bread policy is available to schools in serving a food-based menu plan. This legislation is not to be construed as permitting new mandates or overly-clever interpretations in informal policy statements with the effect of defeating flexibility for local schools. This is just the sort of micromanagement from Washington our schools do not need.

Mr. President, I know and appreciate the work of school food service personnel. They work day in and day out to provide the best possible meals for the children of their school. Often, they are preparing meals for their own children. The Department of Agriculture should not again lose sight of that commitment by local school personnel. Instead of detailed mandates that prove to be unworkable, USDA should strive to work with the local food service personnel who feed our children each school day.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be deemed read the third time, passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the bill appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 2066) was deemed read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS REFORM ACT OF 1996

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar No. 334, S. 1005.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1005) to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959 to improve the process of constructing, altering, purchasing, and acquiring public buildings, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Public Buildings Reform Act of 1995".

SEC. 2. SITE SELECTION.

Section 5 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. 604) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(d) CONSIDERATION OF COSTS.—In selecting a site for a project to construct, alter, or acquire a public building, or to lease office or any other type of space, under this Act, the Administrator shall consider the impact of the selection of a particular site on the cost and space efficiency of the project."

SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. 606) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—
(A) by striking the last sentence;
(B) in the first sentence, by striking "In order" and inserting the following:
"(2) PREREQUISITES TO OBLIGATION OF FUNDS.—

"(B) APPROVAL REQUIREMENTS.—
"(i) CONSTRUCTION, ALTERATION, AND ACQUISITION.—In order";
(C) in the second sentence, by striking "No" and inserting the following:

"(ii) LEASE.—No";
(D) in the third sentence, by striking "No" and inserting the following:
"(iii) ALTERATION.—No";
(E) by striking "SEC. 7. (a)" and inserting the following:

"SEC. 7. SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF PROPOSED PROJECTS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—
"(1) PUBLIC BUILDINGS PLAN.—
"(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 15 days after the President submits to Congress the budget of the United States Government under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a public buildings plan (referred to in this subsection as the 'triennial plan') for the first 3 fiscal years that begin after the date of submission. The triennial plan shall specify such projects for which approval is required under paragraph (2)(B) relating to the construction, alteration, or acquisition of public buildings, or the lease of office or any other type of space, as the Administrator determines are necessary to carry out the duties of the Administrator under this Act or any other law.

"(B) CONTENTS.—The triennial plan shall include—

"(i) a 5-year strategic management plan for capital assets under the control of the Administrator that—

"(I) provides for accommodating the office space and other public building needs of the Federal Government; and

"(II) is based on procurement mechanisms that allow the Administrator to take advantage

of fluctuations in market forces affecting building construction and availability;

(ii) a list—

“(I) in order of priority, of each construction or acquisition (excluding lease) project described in subparagraph (A) for which an authorization of appropriations is—

“(aa) requested for the first of the 3 fiscal years of the triennial plan referred to in subparagraph (A) (referred to in this paragraph as the ‘first year’);

“(bb) expected to be requested for the second of the 3 fiscal years of the triennial plan referred to in subparagraph (A) (referred to in this paragraph as the ‘second year’); or

“(cc) expected to be requested for the third of the 3 fiscal years of the triennial plan referred to in subparagraph (A) (referred to in this paragraph as the ‘third year’); and

“(II) that includes a description of each such project and the number of square feet of space planned for each such project;

“(iii) a list of each lease or lease renewal described in subparagraph (A) for which an authorization of appropriations is—

“(I) requested for the first year; or

“(II) expected to be requested for the second year or third year;

“(iv) a list, in order of priority, of each planned repair or alteration project described in subparagraph (A) for which an authorization of appropriations is—

“(I) requested for the first year; or

“(II) expected to be requested for the second year or third year;

“(v) an explanation of the basis for each order of priority specified under clauses (ii) and (iv);

“(vi) the estimated annual and total cost of each project requested in the triennial plan;

“(vii) a list of each public building planned to be wholly vacated, to be exchanged for other property, or to be disposed of during the period covered by the triennial plan; and

“(viii) requests for authorizations of appropriations necessary to carry out projects listed in the triennial plan for the first year.

“(C) PRESENTATION OF INFORMATION IN PLAN.—

“(i) FIRST YEAR.—In the case of a project for which the Administrator has requested an authorization of appropriations for the first year, information required to be included in the triennial plan under subparagraph (B) shall be presented in the form of a prospectus that meets the requirements of paragraph (2)(C).

“(ii) SECOND YEAR AND THIRD YEAR.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a project for which the Administrator expects to request an authorization of appropriations for the second year or third year, information required to be included in the triennial plan under subparagraph (B) shall be presented in the form of a project description.

“(II) GOOD FAITH ESTIMATES.—

“(aa) IN GENERAL.—Each reference to cost, price, or any other dollar amount contained in a project description referred to in subclause (I) shall be considered to be a good faith estimate by the Administrator.

“(bb) EFFECT.—A good faith estimate referred to in item (aa) shall not bind the Administrator with respect to a request for appropriation of funds for a fiscal year other than a fiscal year for which an authorization of appropriations for the project is requested in the triennial plan.

“(cc) EXPLANATION OF DEVIATION FROM ESTIMATE.—If the request for an authorization of appropriations contained in the prospectus for a project submitted under paragraph (2)(C) is different from a good faith estimate for the project referred to in item (aa), the prospectus shall include an explanation of the difference.

“(D) REINCLUSION OF PROJECTS IN PLANS.—If a project included in a triennial plan is not approved in accordance with this subsection, or if funds are not made available to carry out a project, the Administrator may include the project in a subsequent triennial plan submitted under this subsection.”;

(F) in paragraph (2) (as designated by subparagraph (B))—

(i) by inserting after “(2) PREREQUISITES TO OBLIGATION OF FUNDS.—” the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator may not obligate funds that are made available for any project for which approval is required under subparagraph (B) unless—

“(i) the project was included in the triennial plan for the fiscal year; and

“(ii) a prospectus for the project was submitted to Congress and approved in accordance with this paragraph.”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) PROSPECTUSES.—For the purpose of obtaining approval of a proposed project described in the triennial plan, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a prospectus for the project that includes—

“(i) a brief description of the public building to be constructed, altered, or acquired, or the space to be leased, under this Act;

“(ii) the location of the building to be constructed, altered, or acquired, or the space to be leased, and an estimate of the maximum cost, based on the predominant local office space measurement system (as determined by the Administrator), to the United States of the construction, alteration, or acquisition of the building, or lease of the space;

“(iii) in the case of a project for the construction of a courthouse or other public building consisting solely of general purpose office space, the cost benchmark for the project determined under subsection (d); and

“(iv) in the case of a project relating to a courthouse—

“(I) as of the date of submission of the prospectus, the number of—

“(aa) Federal judges for whom the project is to be carried out; and

“(bb) courtrooms available for the judges;

“(II) the projected number of Federal judges and courtrooms to be accommodated by the project at the end of the 10-year period beginning on the date;

“(III) a justification for the projection under subclause (II) (including a specification of the number of authorized positions, and the number of judges in senior status, to be accommodated);

“(IV) the year in which the courthouse in use as of the date of submission of the prospectus reached maximum capacity by housing only courts and court-related agencies;

“(V) the level of security risk at the courthouse in use as of the date of submission of the prospectus, as determined by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts; and

“(VI) the termination date of any lease, in effect as of the date of submission of the prospectus, of space to carry out a court-related activity that will be affected by the project.”; and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) EMERGENCY AUTHORITY.—

“(A) OVERRIDING INTEREST.—If the Administrator, in consultation with the Commissioner of the Public Buildings Service, determines that an overriding interest requires emergency authority to construct, alter, or acquire a public building, or lease office or storage space, and that the authority cannot be obtained in a timely manner through the triennial planning process required under paragraph (1), the Administrator may submit a written request for the authority to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives. The Administrator may carry out the project for which authority was requested under the preceding sentence if the project is approved in the manner described in paragraph (2)(B).

“(B) DECLARED EMERGENCIES.—

“(i) LEASE AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Adminis-

trator may enter into an emergency lease during any period of emergency declared by the President pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) or any other law, or declared by any Federal agency pursuant to any applicable law, except that no such emergency lease shall be for a period of more than 5 years.

“(ii) REPORTING.—As part of each triennial plan, the Administrator shall describe any emergency lease for which a prospectus is required under paragraph (2) that was entered into by the Administrator under clause (i) during the preceding fiscal year.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “(b) The” and inserting the following:

“(b) INCREASES IN COSTS OF PROJECTS.—

“(1) INCREASE OF 10 PERCENT OR LESS.—The”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) GREATER INCREASES.—If the Administrator increases the estimated maximum cost of a project in an amount greater than the increase authorized by paragraph (1), the Administrator shall, not later than 30 days after the date of the increase, notify the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives of the amount of, and reasons for, the increase.”;

(3) in subsection (c), by striking “(c) In the case” and inserting the following:

“(c) RESCISSION OF APPROVAL.—In the case”; and

(4) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

“(d) DEVELOPMENT OF COST BENCHMARKS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall develop standard cost benchmarks for projects for the construction of courthouses, and other public buildings consisting solely of general purpose office space, for which a prospectus is required under subsection (a)(2). The benchmarks shall consist of the appropriate cost per square foot for low-rise, mid-rise, and high-rise projects subject to the various factors determined under paragraph (2).

“(2) FACTORS.—In developing the benchmarks, the Administrator shall consider such factors as geographic location (including the necessary extent of seismic structural supports), the tenant agency, and necessary parking facilities, and such other factors as the Administrator considers appropriate.”.

(b) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Section 11 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. 610) is amended—

(1) by striking “SEC. 11. (a) Upon” and inserting the following:

“SEC. 11. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

“(a) REPORTS ON UNCOMPLETED PROJECTS.—Upon”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “(b) The Administrator” and inserting the following:

“(b) BUILDING PROJECT SURVEYS AND REPORTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator”; and

(B) in the second sentence of paragraph (1) (as so designated), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, and shall specify whether the project is included in a 5-year strategic capital asset management plan required under section 7(a)(1)(B)(i) or a prioritized list required under section 7(a)(1)(B)”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) INCLUSION OF REQUESTED BUILDING PROJECTS IN TRIENNIAL PLAN.—The Administrator may include a prospectus for the funding of a public building project for which a report is submitted under paragraph (1) in a triennial public buildings plan required under section 7(a)(1).”.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 7 of the Act (40 U.S.C. 606) is amended by striking “Committee on Public

Works and Transportation" each place it appears and inserting "Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure".

(2) Section 11(b)(1) of the Act (as amended by subsection (b)(2)) is further amended by striking "Committee on Public Works and Transportation" and inserting "Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure".

SEC. 4. FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ASSET MANAGEMENT.

Section 12 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. 611) is amended—

(1) by striking "SEC. 12. (a) The Administrator" and inserting the following:

"SEC. 12. FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ASSET MANAGEMENT.

"(a) DUTIES OF ADMINISTRATOR.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator";

(2) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

"(2) REPOSITORY FOR ASSET MANAGEMENT INFORMATION.—The Administrator shall use the results of the continuing investigation and survey required under paragraph (1) to establish a central repository for the asset management information of the Federal Government.";

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking "(b) In carrying" and inserting the following:

"(b) COOPERATION AMONG FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

"(1) BY THE ADMINISTRATOR.—In carrying";

(B) by striking "Each Federal" and inserting the following:

"(2) BY THE AGENCIES.—Each Federal"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(3) IDENTIFICATION AND DISPOSITION OF UNNEEDED REAL PROPERTY.—

"(A) IDENTIFICATION.—Each Federal agency shall—

"(i) identify real property that is or will become unneeded, obsolete, or underutilized during the 5-year period beginning on the date of the identification; and

"(ii) annually report the information on the real property described in clause (i) to the Administrator.

"(B) DISPOSITION.—The Administrator shall analyze more cost-effective uses for the real property identified under subparagraph (A) and make recommendations to the Federal agency concerning the more cost-effective uses.";

(4) in subsection (c), by striking "(c) Whenever" and inserting the following:

"(c) IDENTIFICATION OF BUILDINGS OF HISTORIC, ARCHITECTURAL, AND CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE.—Whenever"; and

(5) in subsection (d), by striking "(d) The Administrator" and inserting the following:

"(d) REGARD TO COMPARATIVE URGENCY OF NEED.—The Administrator".

SEC. 5. ADDRESSING LONG-TERM GOVERNMENT HOUSING NEEDS.

(a) REPORT ON LONG-TERM HOUSING NEEDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and the end of each 2-year period thereafter, the head of each Federal agency (as defined in section 13(3) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. 612(3))) shall review and report to the Administrator of General Services (referred to in this Act as the "Administrator") on the long-term housing needs of the agency. The Administrator shall consolidate the agency reports and submit a consolidated report to Congress.

(2) ASSISTANCE AND UNIFORM STANDARDS.—The Administrator shall—

(A) assist each agency in carrying out the review required under paragraph (1); and

(B) prepare uniform standards for housing needs for—

(i) executive agencies (as defined in section 13(4) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. 612(4))); and

(ii) establishments in the judicial branch of the Federal Government.

(b) REDUCTION IN AGGREGATE OFFICE AND STORAGE SPACE.—By the end of the third fiscal

year that begins after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal agencies referred to in subsection (a)(1) shall, to the maximum extent practicable, collectively reduce by not less than 10 percent the aggregate office and storage space used by the agencies (regardless of whether the space is leased or owned) on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 6. DESIGN GUIDES AND STANDARDS FOR COURT ACCOMMODATIONS.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, shall submit a report to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives that specifies the characteristics of court accommodations that are essential to the provision of due process of law and the safe, fair, and efficient administration of justice by the Federal court system.

(b) DESIGN GUIDES AND STANDARDS.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and after notice and opportunity for comment, shall develop design guides and standards for Federal court accommodations based on the report submitted under subsection (a). In developing the design guides and standards, the Administrator shall consider space efficiency and the appropriate standards for furnishings.

(2) USE.—Notwithstanding section 462 of title 28, United States Code, the design guides and standards developed under paragraph (1) shall be used in the design of court accommodations.

SEC. 7. DESIGN OF FEDERAL COURTHOUSES.

The Act entitled "An Act establishing a Commission on Fine Arts", approved May 17, 1910 (36 Stat. 371, chapter 243; 40 U.S.C. 104), is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following: "It shall be the duty of the commission, not later than 60 days after submission of a conceptual design to the commission for a Federal courthouse at any place in the United States, to provide advice on the design, including an evaluation of the ability of the design to express the dignity, enterprise, vigor, and stability of the American Government appropriately and within the accepted standards of courthouse design."

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, today the Senate is considering my bill, the Public Buildings Reform Act. Let me start by expressing my thanks to the Chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, Senator Chafee, and the Chairman of the relevant Subcommittee, Senator Warner, for their support of this bill.

Mr. President, the Public Buildings Reform Act will go a long way to helping Congress make wise decisions on public buildings construction. It will help Congress achieve some discipline with respect to the cost of new federal buildings and courthouses. Specifically, the bill will bring some sanity to the courthouse construction program.

I have been working on the courthouse construction program for quite some time. And the more I have learned about the program, the more concerned I have become. It is very important that we reform the courthouse construction program and this bill will do that.

Why? Because the budget requests for new courthouses get larger and larger each year. Let me give examples from

the last five years of budget requests—in FY 1993, the courthouse construction program request was \$132 million or 22 percent of the GSA budget request; in FY 1994, the courthouse construction program request was \$566 million or 76 percent of GSA's budget request; in FY 1995, courthouse requests were \$419 million or 87 percent; in FY 1996, courthouse requests were \$639 million or 63 percent and this year, FY 1997, courthouse requests are \$632 million or 88 percent.

Mr. President, this is a lot of money. And we need to spend it wisely and only on those courthouse projects that are truly needed.

The Public Buildings Reform Act will help us do just that. It accomplishes two major goals—prioritization of courthouse projects; and gaining control of the Courthouse construction Design Guide.

Let me briefly summarize the major provisions of the bill.

First, the bill will require the General Services Administration (GSA) each year to submit a three-year plan to Congress. This triennial plan will prioritize courthouse and non-courthouse projects.

The first year of the three-year plan will contain the projects requested for authorization or appropriation. The second and third years of the three-year plan will be informational lists of projects expected to be requested in the future. Each year, the projects must be listed in a priority order.

All of this information will help Congress determine which projects are truly necessary—which is more important than ever as we work to balance the federal budget. As part of the three-year plan, GSA must also submit a five-year strategic capital asset management plan—which is a long-term plan of projects.

GAO has stated that the lack of long-term planning has created a situation where "absent this information, Congress has little practical choice but to consider projects individually. And since there is no articulated rationale or justification in a long-term strategic context for GSA's proposed projects, other projects can seem just as defensible."

Now I must tell the Senate that this year, the Administrative Office of the Courts has heard our calls for a prioritized list of courthouses. And they submitted a list of projects to the Environment and Public Works Committee. This is a good step and I commend the Courts. But this bill will take us the next logical step and give Congress a preview of impending projects.

In addition to the priority list, the bill will require GSA to submit additional information to the Environment and Public Works Committee to justify project requests. For courthouse projects, this will include the projected number of judges to be housed in the new courthouse; the year when the current courthouse met or will meet its maximum capacity; the level of security risk at the current courthouse;

and the expiration date of any current leases housing the courts. This information will enable the Environment and Public Works Committee and the Congress to do a better job in assessing the need for new courthouses.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the bill will solve what I see as a major problem with the courthouse construction program. That is, the standards for courthouse design seem to be ever changing. And, of course, the changes always seem to lead to more expensive projects, not cheaper ones.

To fix that problem, this bill will require GSA, along with the Courts, to rewrite the courthouse construction Design Guide and develop fair, responsible standards for courthouse construction. GSA then will be in charge of making sure that all courthouses constructed in this country do not deviate from the standards contained in the Design Guide.

Why should this be done? One reason was cited by the GSA Inspector General in a report issued on September 27, 1995. The report said the "Courts Design Guide is a document which provides specifications, requirements, and standards for constructing and outfitting courthouses. It has evolved over the years and has produced larger, more grandly appointed courtrooms and chambers. As a result, costs related to implementing the design standards written by and interpreted by the Courts have escalated. The language and requirements in the Courts Design Guide help explain some of the perceived excesses in new courthouse projects."

This does not mean courthouses will be drab—they will continue to be appropriate to the dignity of the Courts. But they will not be palaces. It means that we will have an effective checks and balances on the design of courthouses.

Mr. President, it is important for judges to understand that this is not their money. It is the taxpayers' money. And the taxpayers demand and deserve to know that their tax dollars are not being thrown away on extravagances like marble floors and brass doorknobs.

In Montana, our judges do not have palatial courthouses. In fact, many of our judges are not even housed in a federally-owned courthouse—they are in leased space. But they are able to provide due process of the law without these extras.

As Congress looks to make deep cuts in many important social and domestic programs, it is only fair that we make sure that tax dollars are not needlessly wasted in the construction of federal buildings.

Again, Mr. President, I thank Senators CHAFEE and WARNER for their support of this bill.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, today the Senate will consider S. 1005, the Public Building Reform Act of 1996. This legislation, which will improve the way we construct, acquire and

lease public buildings, was introduced on June 29, 1995. It is cosponsored by Senators Warner and Baucus, the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Environment and Public Works Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure. The full committee approved S. 1005, with amendments, on December 19, 1995.

Before I go on, Mr. President, I would like to recognize the efforts of Senator BAUCUS and Senator WARNER. They have worked together over the last year on the Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee to shape this important and necessary set of reforms.

As I will discuss further in my remarks today, the issue of Federal building and courthouse construction has received a tremendous amount of critical commentary in the media and here on Capitol Hill. I believe that S. 1005 responds to the important problems in a thoughtful and measured way.

Over the last three to four years, we have witnessed an endless stream of General Accounting Office (GAO) reports, newspaper stories and congressional investigations citing excessive General Services Administration (GSA) spending for Federal building projects.

These reports and investigations have discussed management failures at GSA, insufficient project prioritization, the inclusion of unneeded and "luxurious" facility features, and inappropriate congressional influence upon the selection of projects as causes for wasteful and excessive spending. The courthouse construction projects, in particular, have been a source of great controversy.

Members of the Committee on Environment and Public Works have worked hard over the last three years, in particular to reform the public buildings process and to achieve significant taxpayer savings. Some here might recall that in the fiscal year 1996 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget, the Congress called for a 30 percent reduction in new construction funding at GSA over seven years.

Last year, in the first year of the seven-year period, we achieved that budget goal. The Committee cut a number of new construction projects and authorized less than 70 percent of the \$1.022 billion requested by the administration. The Committee has recently received and is reviewing the administration's fiscal year 1997 budget request. Like last year, we will be looking to authorize an overall funding level that is significantly below the levels authorized in previous years.

While thorough review of the annual project requests must and will continue, there is also the need for fundamental reform of the process by which these new construction projects are identified, designed, submitted to the Congress, authorized and finally approved for funding. We believe that the reforms contained in S. 1005 will improve the quality of the projects

submitted for congressional approval; improve and enhance congressional oversight; and ultimately, save the taxpayers millions of dollars.

The bill addresses four major issues. The first issue is priority-setting. As I stated previously, the fiscal year 1996 Budget Resolution called for a 30 percent reduction in GSA construction funding over seven years.

To achieve this target in a reasonable fashion, we must be aware of what GSA and its tenant agencies consider to be the top priorities. S. 1005 requires a clear prioritization of all GSA projects submitted to the Congress for approval. With regard to courthouse projects, I might note that the Judiciary and GSA have already begun to comply with this important requirement.

Next is the issue of long-range planning. The idea here is to know, in advance, what projects are likely to be requested in future years. Our experience has been that too many worthwhile projects—which have gone through all of the steps—get bumped out of GSA's annual request to accommodate other projects which are politically driven.

This legislation requires GSA to submit to Congress—as part of its annual authorization requests—a list of the projects it intends to request for the subsequent two years. This way, the Congress will be able to identify and plainly judge the merit of projects which might have been "hurried through the process."

The third major issue addressed by the bill is the need for specific information on project requests. If GSA is to establish project rankings or "priorities" under this bill, they must do so after following a sensible set of criteria. When did the project reach its maximum space capacity? Are there time-sensitive lease circumstances associated with the project request?

In the case of courthouse projects; how many judgeships are authorized and what is the appropriate number of courtrooms? Or, what is the security situation? The bill requires that all of this essential information be included in the prospectuses sent to Congress.

Again, with respect to courthouses, this legislation addresses the issue of design standards. While the Congress cannot and should not dictate the exact parameters of courtroom ceiling heights and judges' chambers—I am convinced that we need a consistent set of guidelines or standards. The bill before us establishes a partnership between GSA and the Judiciary on design guidelines. It is my hope that these two entities can work together to establish design guidelines which will put an end to the controversy that has followed some of these projects.

In closing, Mr. President, let me say that I am glad to be a part of this reform effort and wish to again commend Senators BAUCUS and WARNER for their leadership. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this sensible reform measure.

AMENDMENT NO. 3983

(Purpose: To make a technical correction.)

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of Senator BAUCUS and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRIST], for Mr. BAUCUS, proposes an amendment numbered 3983.

Mr. FRIST. 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 21, line 3, strike "1995" and insert "1996".

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to, the committee amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be deemed read the third time, and passed, the title be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 3983) was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1005), as amended, was deemed read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1005

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 "Public Buildings Reform Act of 1996".

SEC. 2. SITE SELECTION.

Section 5 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. 604) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(d) CONSIDERATION OF COSTS.—In selecting a site for a project to construct, alter, or acquire a public building, or to lease office or any other type of space, under this Act, the Administrator shall consider the impact of the selection of a particular site on the cost and space efficiency of the project."

SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. 606) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—
(A) by striking the last sentence;
(B) in the first sentence, by striking "In order" and inserting the following:

"(2) PREREQUISITES TO OBLIGATION OF FUNDS.—

"(B) APPROVAL REQUIREMENTS.—
(i) CONSTRUCTION, ALTERATION, AND ACQUISITION.—In order";

(C) in the second sentence, by striking "No" and inserting the following:

"(ii) LEASE.—No";
(D) in the third sentence, by striking "No" and inserting the following:

"(iii) ALTERATION.—No";
(E) by striking "SEC. 7. (a)" and inserting the following:

"SEC. 7. SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF PROPOSED PROJECTS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—

"(1) PUBLIC BUILDINGS PLAN.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 15 days after the President submits to Congress the budget of the United States Government under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a public buildings plan (referred to in this subsection as the 'triennial plan') for the first 3 fiscal years that begin after the date of submission. The triennial plan shall specify such projects for which approval is required under paragraph (2)(B) relating to the construction, alteration, or acquisition of public buildings, or the lease of office or any other type of space, as the Administrator determines are necessary to carry out the duties of the Administrator under this Act or any other law.

"(B) CONTENTS.—The triennial plan shall include—

"(i) a 5-year strategic management plan for capital assets under the control of the Administrator that—

"(I) provides for accommodating the office space and other public building needs of the Federal Government; and

"(II) is based on procurement mechanisms that allow the Administrator to take advantage of fluctuations in market forces affecting building construction and availability;

"(ii) a list—

"(I) in order of priority, of each construction or acquisition (excluding lease) project described in subparagraph (A) for which an authorization of appropriations is—

"(aa) requested for the first of the 3 fiscal years of the triennial plan referred to in subparagraph (A) (referred to in this paragraph as the 'first year');"

"(bb) expected to be requested for the second of the 3 fiscal years of the triennial plan referred to in subparagraph (A) (referred to in this paragraph as the 'second year'); or

"(cc) expected to be requested for the third of the 3 fiscal years of the triennial plan referred to in subparagraph (A) (referred to in this paragraph as the 'third year'); and

"(II) that includes a description of each such project and the number of square feet of space planned for each such project;

"(iii) a list of each lease or lease renewal described in subparagraph (A) for which an authorization of appropriations is—

"(I) requested for the first year; or

"(II) expected to be requested for the second year or third year;

"(iv) a list, in order of priority, of each planned repair or alteration project described in subparagraph (A) for which an authorization of appropriations is—

"(I) requested for the first year; or

"(II) expected to be requested for the second year or third year;

"(v) an explanation of the basis for each order of priority specified under clauses (ii) and (iv);

"(vi) the estimated annual and total cost of each project requested in the triennial plan;

"(vii) a list of each public building planned to be wholly vacated, to be exchanged for other property, or to be disposed of during the period covered by the triennial plan; and

"(viii) requests for authorizations of appropriations necessary to carry out projects listed in the triennial plan for the first year.

"(C) PRESENTATION OF INFORMATION IN PLAN.—

"(i) FIRST YEAR.—In the case of a project for which the Administrator has requested an authorization of appropriations for the first year, information required to be included in the triennial plan under subparagraph (B) shall be presented in the form of a prospectus that meets the requirements of paragraph (2)(C).

"(ii) SECOND YEAR AND THIRD YEAR.—

"(I) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a project for which the Administrator expects to request an authorization of appropriations for the second year or third year, information required to be included in the triennial plan under subparagraph (B) shall be presented in the form of a project description.

"(II) GOOD FAITH ESTIMATES.—

"(aa) IN GENERAL.—Each reference to cost, price, or any other dollar amount contained in a project description referred to in subclause (I) shall be considered to be a good faith estimate by the Administrator.

"(bb) EFFECT.—A good faith estimate referred to in item (aa) shall not bind the Administrator with respect to a request for appropriation of funds for a fiscal year other than a fiscal year for which an authorization of appropriations for the project is requested in the triennial plan.

"(cc) EXPLANATION OF DEVIATION FROM ESTIMATE.—If the request for an authorization of appropriations contained in the prospectus for a project submitted under paragraph (2)(C) is different from a good faith estimate for the project referred to in item (aa), the prospectus shall include an explanation of the difference.

"(D) REINCLUSION OF PROJECTS IN PLANS.—If a project included in a triennial plan is not approved in accordance with this subsection, or if funds are not made available to carry out a project, the Administrator may include the project in a subsequent triennial plan submitted under this subsection."

(F) in paragraph (2) (as designated by subparagraph (B))—

(i) by inserting after "(2) PREREQUISITES TO OBLIGATION OF FUNDS.—" the following:

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator may not obligate funds that are made available for any project for which approval is required under subparagraph (B) unless—

"(i) the project was included in the triennial plan for the fiscal year; and

"(ii) a prospectus for the project was submitted to Congress and approved in accordance with this paragraph."; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

"(C) PROSPECTUSES.—For the purpose of obtaining approval of a proposed project described in the triennial plan, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a prospectus for the project that includes—

"(i) a brief description of the public building to be constructed, altered, or acquired, or the space to be leased, under this Act;

"(ii) the location of the building to be constructed, altered, or acquired, or the space to be leased, and an estimate of the maximum cost, based on the predominant local office space measurement system (as determined by the Administrator), to the United States of the construction, alteration, or acquisition of the building, or lease of the space;

"(iii) in the case of a project for the construction of a courthouse or other public building consisting solely of general purpose office space, the cost benchmark for the project determined under subsection (d); and

"(iv) in the case of a project relating to a courthouse—

"(I) as of the date of submission of the prospectus, the number of—

"(aa) Federal judges for whom the project is to be carried out; and

"(bb) courtrooms available for the judges;

"(II) the projected number of Federal judges and courtrooms to be accommodated by the project at the end of the 10-year period beginning on the date;

"(III) a justification for the projection under subclause (II) (including a specification of the number of authorized positions, and the number of judges in senior status, to be accommodated);

“(IV) the year in which the courthouse in use as of the date of submission of the prospectus reached maximum capacity by housing only courts and court-related agencies;

“(V) the level of security risk at the courthouse in use as of the date of submission of the prospectus, as determined by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts; and

“(VI) the termination date of any lease, in effect as of the date of submission of the prospectus, of space to carry out a court-related activity that will be affected by the project.”; and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) EMERGENCY AUTHORITY.—

“(A) OVERRIDING INTEREST.—If the Administrator, in consultation with the Commissioner of the Public Buildings Service, determines that an overriding interest requires emergency authority to construct, alter, or acquire a public building, or lease office or storage space, and that the authority cannot be obtained in a timely manner through the triennial planning process required under paragraph (1), the Administrator may submit a written request for the authority to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives. The Administrator may carry out the project for which authority was requested under the preceding sentence if the project is approved in the manner described in paragraph (2)(B).

“(B) DECLARED EMERGENCIES.—

“(i) LEASE AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Administrator may enter into an emergency lease during any period of emergency declared by the President pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) or any other law, or declared by any Federal agency pursuant to any applicable law, except that no such emergency lease shall be for a period of more than 5 years.

“(ii) REPORTING.—As part of each triennial plan, the Administrator shall describe any emergency lease for which a prospectus is required under paragraph (2) that was entered into by the Administrator under clause (i) during the preceding fiscal year.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “(b) The” and inserting the following:

“(b) INCREASES IN COSTS OF PROJECTS.—

“(1) INCREASE OF 10 PERCENT OR LESS.—The”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) GREATER INCREASES.—If the Administrator increases the estimated maximum cost of a project in an amount greater than the increase authorized by paragraph (1), the Administrator shall, not later than 30 days after the date of the increase, notify the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives of the amount of, and reasons for, the increase.”;

(3) in subsection (c), by striking “(c) In the case” and inserting the following:

“(c) RESCISSION OF APPROVAL.—In the case”; and

(4) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

“(d) DEVELOPMENT OF COST BENCHMARKS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall develop standard cost benchmarks for projects for the construction of courthouses, and other public buildings consisting solely of general purpose office space, for which a prospectus is required under subsection (a)(2). The benchmarks shall consist of the appropriate cost per square foot for low-rise, mid-rise, and high-rise projects subject to

the various factors determined under paragraph (2).

“(2) FACTORS.—In developing the benchmarks, the Administrator shall consider such factors as geographic location (including the necessary extent of seismic structural supports), the tenant agency, and necessary parking facilities, and such other factors as the Administrator considers appropriate.”.

(b) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Section 11 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. 610) is amended—

(1) by striking “SEC. 11. (a) Upon” and inserting the following:

“SEC. 11. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

“(a) REPORTS ON UNCOMPLETED PROJECTS.—Upon”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “(b) The Administrator” and inserting the following:

“(b) BUILDING PROJECT SURVEYS AND REPORTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator”;

(B) in the second sentence of paragraph (1) (as so designated), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, and shall specify whether the project is included in a 5-year strategic capital asset management plan required under section 7(a)(1)(B)(i) or a prioritized list required under section 7(a)(1)(B)”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) INCLUSION OF REQUESTED BUILDING PROJECTS IN TRIENNIAL PLAN.—The Administrator may include a prospectus for the funding of a public building project for which a report is submitted under paragraph (1) in a triennial public buildings plan required under section 7(a)(1).”.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 7 of the Act (40 U.S.C. 606) is amended by striking “Committee on Public Works and Transportation” each place it appears and inserting “Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure”.

(2) Section 11(b)(1) of the Act (as amended by subsection (b)(2)) is further amended by striking “Committee on Public Works and Transportation” and inserting “Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure”.

SEC. 4. FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ASSET MANAGEMENT.

Section 12 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. 611) is amended—

(1) by striking “SEC. 12. (a) The Administrator” and inserting the following:

“SEC. 12. FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ASSET MANAGEMENT.

“(a) DUTIES OF ADMINISTRATOR.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator”;

(2) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

“(2) REPOSITORY FOR ASSET MANAGEMENT INFORMATION.—The Administrator shall use the results of the continuing investigation and survey required under paragraph (1) to establish a central repository for the asset management information of the Federal Government.”;

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “(b) In carrying” and inserting the following:

“(b) COOPERATION AMONG FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

“(1) BY THE ADMINISTRATOR.—In carrying”;

(B) by striking “Each Federal” and inserting the following:

“(2) BY THE AGENCIES.—Each Federal”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) IDENTIFICATION AND DISPOSITION OF UNNEEDED REAL PROPERTY.—

“(A) IDENTIFICATION.—Each Federal agency shall—

“(i) identify real property that is or will become unneeded, obsolete, or underutilized

during the 5-year period beginning on the date of the identification; and

“(ii) annually report the information on the real property described in clause (i) to the Administrator.

“(B) DISPOSITION.—The Administrator shall analyze more cost-effective uses for the real property identified under subparagraph (A) and make recommendations to the Federal agency concerning the more cost-effective uses.”;

(4) in subsection (c), by striking “(c) Whenever” and inserting the following:

“(c) IDENTIFICATION OF BUILDINGS OF HISTORIC, ARCHITECTURAL, AND CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE.—Whenever”; and

(5) in subsection (d), by striking “(d) The Administrator” and inserting the following:

“(d) REGARD TO COMPARATIVE URGENCY OF NEED.—The Administrator”.

SEC. 5. ADDRESSING LONG-TERM GOVERNMENT HOUSING NEEDS.

(a) REPORT ON LONG-TERM HOUSING NEEDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and the end of each 2-year period thereafter, the head of each Federal agency (as defined in section 13(3) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. 612(3))) shall review and report to the Administrator of General Services (referred to in this Act as the “Administrator”) on the long-term housing needs of the agency. The Administrator shall consolidate the agency reports and submit a consolidated report to Congress.

(2) ASSISTANCE AND UNIFORM STANDARDS.—The Administrator shall—

(A) assist each agency in carrying out the review required under paragraph (1); and

(B) prepare uniform standards for housing needs for—

(i) executive agencies (as defined in section 13(4) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. 612(4))); and

(ii) establishments in the judicial branch of the Federal Government.

(b) REDUCTION IN AGGREGATE OFFICE AND STORAGE SPACE.—By the end of the third fiscal year that begins after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal agencies referred to in subsection (a)(1) shall, to the maximum extent practicable, collectively reduce by not less than 10 percent the aggregate office and storage space used by the agencies (regardless of whether the space is leased or owned) on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 6. DESIGN GUIDES AND STANDARDS FOR COURT ACCOMMODATIONS.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, shall submit a report to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives that specifies the characteristics of court accommodations that are essential to the provision of due process of law and the safe, fair, and efficient administration of justice by the Federal court system.

(b) DESIGN GUIDES AND STANDARDS.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and after notice and opportunity for comment, shall develop design guides and standards for Federal court accommodations based on the report submitted under subsection (a). In developing the design guides and standards, the Administrator shall consider space efficiency and the appropriate standards for furnishings.

(2) USE.—Notwithstanding section 462 of title 28, United States Code, the design guides and standards developed under paragraph (1) shall be used in the design of court accommodations.

SEC. 7. DESIGN OF FEDERAL COURTHOUSES.

The Act entitled "An Act establishing a Commission on Fine Arts", approved May 17, 1910 (36 Stat. 371, chapter 243; 40 U.S.C. 104), is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following: "It shall be the duty of the commission, not later than 60 days after submission of a conceptual design to the commission for a Federal courthouse at any place in the United States, to provide advice on the design, including an evaluation of the ability of the design to express the dignity, enterprise, vigor, and stability of the American Government appropriately and within the accepted standards of courthouse design."

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, MAY 17, 1996

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Friday, May 17; further, that immediately following the prayer, the Journal of the proceedings be deemed approved to date, no resolutions come over under the rule, the call of the calendar be dispensed with, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, and the Senate then resume consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 57, the budget resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, tomorrow the Senate will resume consideration of the budget resolution. Senators are expected to offer amendments to the resolution on Friday and Monday. Any votes ordered on those amendments on those days will be ordered to occur on Tuesday.

Therefore, for the information of all Senators, no rollcall votes will occur on Friday or Monday. However, Sen-

ators are encouraged to offer their amendments prior to Tuesday, in that it is the intention of the leadership to complete action on the budget on Tuesday.

APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), appoints the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL], from the Committee on Appropriations, to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy, vice the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID].

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask that the Senate stand in adjournment as under the previous order.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 11:18 p.m., adjourned until Friday, May 17, 1996, at 9:30 a.m..

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 16, 1996:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

J. RENÉ JOSEY, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS VICE J. PRESTON STROM, JR., RESIGNED.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive Nominations Confirmed by the Senate May 16, 1996:

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING BRIAN H. BENEDICT, AND ENDING DANIEL K. ROBERTS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 20, 1996.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING MICHAEL G. COLANGELO, AND ENDING JOHN J. BARLETTANO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 20, 1996.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING RYAN C. BERRY, AND ENDING GERALD T. YAP, WHICH NOMINATIONS

WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 19, 1996.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING RALPH G. BENSON, AND ENDING JESSE L. THORNTON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 1, 1996.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WESLEY S. ASHTON, AND ENDING VALERIE E. HOLMES, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 25, 1996.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING ANDRE B. ABADIE, AND ENDING STEVEN PAUL ZYNDA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 26, 1996.

ARMY NOMINATION OF MARK H. LAUBER, WHICH NOMINATION WAS RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 15, 1996.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING JEFFERY DOOTSON, AND ENDING JON E. SCHIFF, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 15, 1996.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING DANIEL BOLAS, AND ENDING PAUL S. DARBY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 15, 1996.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING RICHARD R. ECKERT, AND ENDING ROBERT S. KNAPP, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 15, 1996.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING ERNEST R. ADKINS, AND ENDING JAMES C. ROBERTSON, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 15, 1996.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING RAYMOND A. CONSTABLE, AND ENDING NEIL W. AHLE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 15, 1996.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WILLIAM E. ACKERMAN, AND ENDING MYRNA E. ZAPATA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 15, 1996.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING MICHAEL C. ALBANO, AND ENDING RICHARD C. ZILMER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 20, 1996.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WILLIAM S. AITKEN, AND ENDING DOUGLAS P. YUROVICH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 20, 1996.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING JOEL H. BERRY, III, AND ENDING WAYNE R. STEELE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 15, 1996.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING CRAIG R. ABLE, AND ENDING PAUL E. ZAMBELLI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 9, 1996.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING CARLTON W. ADAMS, AND ENDING DONALD C. PROGRAIS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 9, 1996.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING DAVID L. AAMODT, AND ENDING SCHON M. ZWAKMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 15, 1996.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MINNESOTA TEACHER IS SITED AS ENVIRONMENTAL HERO

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a teacher and a fellow Minnesotan who was recently cited as an environmental hero by the Minnesota Wilderness and Parks Coalition, Ms. Cindy Reinitz. As a science educator for 10 years before serving in the U.S. Congress, I am very pleased to note the outstanding science inquiry education initiative that is being demonstrated by Ms. Reinitz.

Ms. Reinitz teaches at the Minnesota New Country Charter School and has expanded her classroom outside the school's walls, involving her students in an active inquiry project with the goal of solving what persists as an environmental mystery in Minnesota and around the globe. Scientists have documented declines in amphibian populations worldwide, and they have also detected an increase in the number of these animals who have physical deformities. The mystery is what is causing these changes in the amphibian population. Scientists are unsure of the exact cause, but human encroachment on their habitats, chemical pollution, and increased ultraviolet radiation from ozone depletion have been sited as possible suspects.

Minnesota's amphibian population, especially frogs, has been affected, and many groups, including the students in Ms. Reinitz class, have stepped in to help solve the mystery. The students, who initially discovered abnormal development of Leopard frogs in their southwest Minnesota area, have now partnered with the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency and Hamline University's Center for Global and Environmental Education to form the A Thousand Friends of Frogs program. This cooperative effort will, among other things, provide students a way to make substantive contributions to this scientific initiative. The plan is to have the students of A Thousand Friends of Frogs monitor sites where deformed frogs have been found and collect data on their populations. They will also help develop educational programs for use by other students across the State. Eventually, students will combine the data they collected in order to help researchers find the cause and solution to this problem facing Minnesota's frog population.

The enthusiasm and dedication of the students involved in A Thousand Friends of Frogs demonstrates not only their commitment to the environment, but it reflects on the quality and creativity of the students' science teachers. Cindy Reinitz is one of those outstanding educators, expanding the minds of her students and making science more than something to study, but something to explore.

At a time when many questions persist concerning the quality of schools and education programs, it is encouraging to highlight a suc-

cessful program and the positive community response to the concerns of a Minnesota teacher and her students. Teaching younger generations about science is an essential task in a world becoming increasingly reliant on technology and science to remain competitive in the global economy. It is also an important part of passing on an appreciation for the environment and the species that live within it. Educators such as Cindy Reinitz are an integral part of ensuring a quality science and environmental education in our Nation's schools, and I am glad to know that she is making a difference in Minnesota. I want to thank and congratulate Ms. Reinitz for her hard work protecting the environment and educating young Minnesotans. She is not only an environmental hero, but a hero for our young people as well.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter the following article into the RECORD regarding the efforts of Ms. Reinitz, her students, and all the scientists and researchers working to find a cause for the mysterious changes in amphibian populations in Minnesota. The article was written by Anne Brataas and printed in the St. Paul Pioneer Press on May 9, 1996.

Consider 55 years of frog history in Minnesota:

One spring night in 1941, Walter Breckenridge—a biologist who specializes in frogs, toads, snakes and salamanders—counted the dead frogs on West Mississippi River Road near his home in Brooklyn Park. His estimate: 12,000 northern leopard frogs per mile on the road surface.

The frogs were killed by cars as they left the Mississippi River, where they spend the winter, and crossed the road to small pools of water to breed. Says Breckenridge: "You'd thought they were fallen leaves, there were so many of them on the road—and I only counted the dead ones. Obviously, some made it across. It was quite a traffic hazard because it was so slippery. But these days, I see very few leopard frogs. Very few."

Last summer students in Cindy Reinitz' science class at the Minnesota New Country Charter School in Le Sueur-Henderson School District had considerably fewer northern leopard frogs to work with—about 400 that they caught with the help of scientists from the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency.

Of those, about 30 to 50 percent were found to be deformed. Some had three legs. Others were missing a leg. Still others had a bony plate jutting out from the leg. Breckenridge says he's never seen such a thing.

These two extreme frog encounters point to a disturbing trend that biologists worldwide are now documenting: Amphibian populations are declining and distressed due to a constellation of factors, including overpopulation by humans that leads to loss of habitat, chemical pollution that poisons amphibians or disrupts normal development, and increased ultraviolet radiation from the destruction of the ozone layer.

In Minnesota, the issue has taken on new urgency since the discovery of the deformed leopard frogs. As a result, a coalition of scientists, college students, Hamline University's Center for Global and Environmental Education in St. Paul and grade school chil-

dren has formed A Thousand Friends of Frogs to help the state's amphibians. Through the Minnesota Legislature—and its Legislative Commission on Minnesota Resources—this coalition has mounted an investigative and educational effort on several fronts. Among them are:

Minnesota Pollution Control Agency—With a \$151,000 grant from the Legislative Commission on Minnesota Resources, MPCA scientists are working with various university researchers to examine tissue samples and egg development and to perform chromosome analysis as a way of determining possible causes of the deformities. "What we're trying to do is see what the deformed frogs have in common," says PCA researcher Judy Helgen. These common factors will then be evaluated in terms of potential causes—from chemicals to parasites—present at the sites during the time the deformities occurred.

University of Minnesota—At the University of Minnesota, ecologist Bill Schmid dissected some of the deformed frogs and X-rayed their bone structure to determine if the deformities were superficial or part of a deeper developmental pattern gone awry. His findings thus far: the deformities appear to be the result of a miscue in the frog's development, probably occurring during limb bud development when it transforms from a tadpole to a legged adult. It seems unlikely that a genetic mutation is at work.

But just what caused the development to go wrong is not known. It could be a number of factors. For example, Schmid says that this type of deformity—known as supernumerary limbs—has been documented at various places around the world at different times in amphibians over the centuries.

Most intriguing to him is a 1990 report by California researchers in which one species of frog (the Pacific tree frog) and one species of salamander (the long-toed salamander) in nearby ponds were found to have extra limbs.

Researchers hypothesized that the cause was a parasite that uses amphibians as an intermediate host. They reasoned that the parasitic cysts may excrete a hormone that disrupts limb development, or pose a physical obstacle to tissues as they develop.

The researchers tested this last idea by experimentally implanting obstacles into frog limbs in the lab. The results: The implants induced the growth of extra limb structures. This suggests that the presence of a parasitic cyst poses mechanical disruption to development—and that this may be a mechanism for the deformities.

Says Schmid: "A lot of things can disrupt normal development. And as this study shows, here's one more thing to look at, since we have a parasite here similar to the one in the California study and we know it affects certain tadpole larvae."

Hamline University—Hamline's Center for Global and Environmental Education brought together researchers from the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, the Minnesota New Country School and its own departments to form the Thousand Friends of Frogs program. Funded by \$28,000 of the \$151,000 granted the Pollution Control Agency, the Thousand Friends project has three components:

1. This summer, students in the New Country School will monitor sites in the Minnesota River where the deformed frogs were

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

found. They will work with researchers from the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency to try to find the cause of deformities—and what their presence in this population means.

2. The New Country School and Hamline will develop educational programs to be used by children or families throughout the state to assess the health of a local frog population. "This way kids can do hands-on research and learn about science and their own environment," says Tracy Fredin, co-director of Hamline's Center for Global and Environmental Education.

3. In the fall, Hamline will host a week-long environmental education program during which students from throughout the state will compare results to piece together a portrait of the state's frog population.

And it doesn't stop here. A Thousand Friends of Frogs would like to expand into Ten Thousand Friends of Frogs—with more people and more sophisticated science—and has asked the legislative commission for \$500,000 to help them do it. They will testify in favor of their proposal at 2 p.m. May 15 at the State Capitol.

Annual Frog and Toad Survey—Hennepin County Parks biologist John Moriarty is in the third year of conducting a statewide frog and toad survey to determine the strength and health of these populations.

Though it is to soon to make definitive findings, Moriarty hopes that state funding through the proposed Ten Thousand Friends of Frogs program will speed the data collection and analysis, and make the survey a permanent effort.

The money will be used not only to analyze field reports, but to formalize a system of 80 to 100 routes throughout the state that trained volunteers—including backyard nature enthusiasts—will monitor by listening for frog calls at a specific time during the year.

Says Moriarty: "Listening to frogs and learning their calls in your own backyard is a great way to really appreciate the role of wetlands and wooded areas that frogs need. Enlisting the help of people in their backyards not only gives us more data, it will raise awareness about the role of wetlands and woods so that if you see your neighbor dumping oil in a pond or grass clippings, you'll take action."

The message is really pretty simple, he says. If we want frogs, we have to give them the habitat they need. They are more than willing to do their part—and in fact, are trying to now. We have only to listen to them.

HONORING THE ARRINGTON VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to applaud the invaluable services provided by the Arrington Volunteer Fire Department. These brave, civic-minded people give freely of their time so that we may all feel safer at night.

Few realize the depth of training and hard work that goes into being a volunteer firefighter. To quote one of my local volunteers, "These firemen must have an overwhelming desire to do for others while expecting nothing in return."

Preparation includes twice-monthly training programs in which they have live drills, study the latest videos featuring the latest in fire-

fighting tactics, as well as attend seminars where they can obtain the knowledge they need to save lives. Within a year of becoming a volunteer firefighter, most attend the Tennessee fire training school in Murfreesboro where they undergo further, intensified training.

When the residents of my district go to bed at night, they know that should disaster strike and their home catch fire, well-trained and qualified volunteer fire departments are ready and willing to give so graciously and generously of themselves. This peace of mind should not be taken for granted.

By selflessly giving of themselves, they ensure a safer future for us all. We owe these volunteer fire departments a debt of gratitude for their service and sacrifice.

RECOGNIZING THE STUDENTS OF ATIA

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to rise before this body and commend a group of American young people who are making a significant, positive impact in our world. The students named below are among many involved in the Advanced Training Institute of America [ATIA], an educational program specializing in the development of strong personal character.

At the invitation of government leaders from New Zealand and Australia, these 92 students and staff traveled to the South Pacific on April 9, 1996. In addition to conducting a seminar with over 1,000 Australian parents, young people, and children, the ATIA students met with government leaders to discuss character-based solutions for the international juvenile.

The Honorable Whetu Tirikatene-Sullivan, a New Zealand Member of Parliament representing the indigenous Maori people, and Jeff Lees of the New Zealand Justice Department received the American youth in order to discuss ways for expanding a previously established program of cooperation between the Justice Department and ATIA young people.

In Melbourne, Australia, the Honorable Ross Smith and other members of Parliament welcomed the ATIA youth with opportunities to talk about developing a work with Australian juvenile offenders. The Honorable Richard Court, Premier of Western Australia, warmly received the American delegation in Perth, where the aforementioned seminar was conducted with over 1,000 in attendance, with special training also being provided by them for 200 young children.

Among the most notable accomplishments of the trip was the drafting and signing of an agreement with the Australian Ministry of Justice. The agreement initiates a work involving families helping families and young people helping young people with the goals of strengthening families and reducing juvenile crime.

The following young men and woman from around the United States deserve special recognition for their own commitment to good character, and for their personal sacrifices to reach out to needy youth and families all over the world:

Starla Adams (OK), Grant Adams (OK), Andrew Anderson (OR), Hamish Anderson (New Zealand), Karith Astle (CA), Angel Atkinson (MO), Jonathan Bain (New Zealand), Simon Bain (New Zealand), Jamie Becker (CO), Heather Bennett (IL), Richard Bramblett (GA), Robert Breese (VA), Christy Briscoe (OK), Cassidy Brock (OR), Weston Brock (OR), Susan Burdulis (WA), Michael Canciglia (WA), Andy Cecil (GA), Tracey Collins (OH), Elizabeth Connelly (CA), James Connelly (CA), Brent Critchfield (CA).

Rebekah Crook (TN), Mandy Dennis (TX), Jason Elliot (WY), Janet Fay (PA), Amy Flora (MI), Benjamin Fryman (OH), Katelyn Gerhardt (CA), William Gothard (IL), Eva Grunewald (TX), Lois Guthrie (WI), Larry Guthrie (WI), Lydia Harmon (MI), Erik Hartstom (CA), Adam Hawkins (AZ), Jennifer Hawley (CA), Nathan Hawley (CA), Titus Heard (OK), Laurie Herbert (New Zealand), Wendy Herdlein (MO), Kay Hill (OK), Thomas Hill (OK).

Joanne Hogg (New Zealand), Nigel Iro (New Zealand), Miriam Johnson (AL), Carisa Joseph (CA), Anne Kirsten (IN), Dennis Kutuzov (Russia), Crystal Ladd (WI), Leah Lentz (WI), Joseph Lyle (GA), DeShea Mabra (MO), James Marsh (KY), Christi Martin (FL), Danielle Martin (New Zealand), Joseph Martin (TX), Richard Mast (FL), Ruth Mirecki (Canada), Lori Newsom (AL), Esther Olson (KS), Matthew Olson (KS), Inga Panapa (New Zealand), Krizia Panapa (New Zealand), Marcia Panapa (New Zealand).

Beth Pendergast (CA), Nathan Pennell (DE), Sara Ramsey (CO), Jonathan Rath (TX), David Rees (KY), Abigail Rose (CA), Kevin Rudesael (TX), David Scott (NY), Courtney Scroggins (TX), Paula Sinclair (New Zealand), Rosie Smith (New Zealand), Rachel Snell (OH), Rebecca Snell (OH).

Melissa Stahl (OH), John Stephens (IL), Jennifer Swecker (WA), Daniel Thompson (CA), Scott Towers (OH), Jennifer Vise (GA), Abby Wakefield (CA), Alyssa Wakefield (CA), Kara Wallace (WA), Jill Walton (PA), Bruce West (Australia), Randal Williams (CA), Russell Williams (VA), Kelly Williamson, (New Zealand).

IN HONOR OF OFFICER GILBERT MANGLONA TAISACAN OF TINIAN

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, a small delegation from a far corner of America, from the Island of Tinian in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands has journeyed to Washington to join the President of the United States and thousands of law enforcement officers from around the Nation in a peace officers' memorial service honoring the 174 law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty last year. The CNMI is a good neighbor of Guam and we share a common history as well as cultural traditions.

The 174 names and those of nearly 100 others who died in the past years were added to the National Law Enforcement Officers' Memorial. There are 14,064 names on the Law Enforcement Memorial. Everyone of them, like Gilbert Manglona Taisacan, are heroes who laid down their lives in the service of their communities.

In conjunction with the memorial service, I would like to take a moment today to honor a Tinian peace officer killed in the line of duty last year.

Mr. Speaker, Officer Gilbert Manglona Taisacan was a family man. He was born, lived, and died on Tinian. Brought into the world by his parents Teresita and Bernadino Taisacan. Gilbert was born on August 1969. He grew up on Tinian, was educated on Tinian until leaving for the only time in his life to attend Marianas High School in Saipan, graduating in 1987. He was active in his community, always looking to help others. It was with that spirit that he joined the Department of Public Safety and was not surprisingly, assigned to Tinian. Gilbert was an exceptional officer. He moved through the ranks with merit. In 1990, Gilbert was married and in 1991 he and his wife Alma had a daughter named Terrilynn. In 1995, Gilbert was named the Police Officer of the Year. As the month of August 1995 began, Gilbert had developed a good and meaningful life for himself in the only town he had ever known. It was in that spirit that Gilbert Taisacan was killed.

On August 20, 1995, during a routine patrol, Gilbert Taisacan was called to respond to a disturbance involving harassment against a waitress. Taisacan and his partner Sgt. R.C. Borja went to apprehend the suspect for the second time and were confronted by the suspect, who shot both before killing himself. Sgt. R.C. Borja, through the grace of God, survived the accident and today walks around with a bullet in his stomach. Gilbert Taisacan was killed.

Tinian is a small place in the middle of a small island chain known as the Northern Mariana Islands but the life and contribution of Gilbert Taisacan was as large as any citizen of the biggest city. In a small community, the presence of one special person makes a big difference. Despite his untimely death, Gilbert Taisacan stepped up and made a difference. Tinian is a better place because of that.

Accompanying the Tinian delegation to the memorial service was the Honorable Juan N. Babauta, Resident representative of the Northern Marianas, Mrs. Alma M. Taisacan, widow of Gilbert, Ms. Terrilynn Taisacan, daughter of Gilbert, Mrs. Teresita M. Taisacan Ngiraidong, mother of Gilbert, Sgt. Anthony M. Taisacan, brother of Gilbert, Gil Borja, Director of Public Safety, Capt. Juanis M. King, Sgt. Antonio S.N. Borja, and William B. Nabors, representing the mayor of Tinian.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I was unavoidably detained and was unable to cast my vote on rollcall 174, final passage of the national defense authorization bill. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

THE COPS PROGRAM

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I rise today to talk about one of the most successful initiatives of the Clinton administration—the COPS program.

Since we passed the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, over 43,000 new law enforcement positions have been funded.

In towns small and large, rural and urban, we heard from county sheriffs, chiefs of police, and prosecutors.

They told us that more officers and greater use of community policing strategies would make their jobs easier. And we responded.

Community policing has been so effective because police officers who are visibly involved in their communities are one of the best deterrents to crime.

It remains widely supported by law enforcement agencies throughout the country.

Today, we commemorate the 15th Annual National Peace Officers Memorial Service at the Capitol.

Their sacrifice remind us that we should redouble our efforts to do everything that we can to assist our towns and cities and police officers in the fight they make against crime.

It is simple—putting more cops on the beat means safer streets.

HONORING THE DEFEATED CREEK VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to applaud the invaluable services provided by the Defeated Creek Volunteer Fire Department. These brave, civic-minded people give freely of their time so that we may all feel safer at night.

Few realize the depth of training and hard work that goes into being a volunteer firefighter. To quote one of my local volunteers, "These firemen must have an overwhelming desire to do for others while expected nothing in return."

Preparation includes twice-monthly training programs in which they have live drills, study the latest videos featuring the latest in firefighting tactics, as well as attend seminars where they can obtain the knowledge they need to save lives. Within a year of becoming a volunteer firefighter, most attend the Tennessee fire training school in Murfreesboro where they undergo further, intensified training.

When the residents of my district go to bed at night, they know that should disaster strike and their homes catch fire, well-trained and qualified volunteer fire departments are ready and willing to give so graciously and generously of themselves. This peace of mind should not be taken for granted.

By selflessly giving of themselves, they ensure a safer future for us all. We owe these volunteer fire departments a debt of gratitude for their service and sacrifice.

HONORING THE BILINGUAL FOUNDATION OF THE ARTS

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join with me today in honoring the Bilingual Foundation of the Arts [BFA] for its contributions to the greater Los Angeles community.

BFA has, for over 20 years, proved itself to be an invaluable resource for artists of Latino descent. Founded in 1973, and incorporated in 1975, by my dear friend and award-winning actress, Carmen Zapata, along with Margarita Galban and Estela Scarlata, BFA has produced over 100 plays.

BFA was founded because of a need for an organization to present world drama and literature to both English and Spanish speaking audiences. BFA programs annually serve more than 125,000 adults and children for whom theater is often a new experience. BFA has helped to provide a bridge between generations and cultures, and in doing so, has brought together our community. It has become an enduring bilingual theatrical institution of international stature.

BFA carries out its work through a number of major productions and programs each year. BFA has a touring program that brings a mainstage production to California's rural areas and small towns, to reach out to those who otherwise do not have access to theatrical drama. There is also a theater in education program that helps to educate, through drama, our youth about current social and emotional issues. Both elementary and secondary school audiences are targeted and to date, over 2 million youth have been reached. BFA also presents three mainstage productions each season, alternating weekly between English and Spanish.

I also would like to recognize and thank BFA's board of trustees for their tireless dedication and selfless support of this worthy organization; Mr. Robert J. Gomez, Chair; John J. Menchaca, vice chair; Richard M. Lopez, treasurer; Zinnia C. Barrero, secretary; Joseph Arelano-Musser; Enrique "Henry" Baray; Pedro Birba; Gilbert de Cardenas; Daniel C. Carmichael III; Susana Duarte; Richard Gonzales; Albert Greenstein; Anthony Hurtado; Olivia J. Manzo; Oscar C. Parra; Vince Ramirez; Karime Sanchez; Elaine Sedillo; Martha Tapias-Mansfield; and Gregory Villanueva.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask my colleagues to join with me in saluting, thanking and honoring the Bilingual Foundation of the Arts along with its founder, president, role model, and inspiration, Carmen Zapata, for its many years of sharing the beauty of Latino drama with the entire community, and for providing artists of Latino descent with opportunities to perform before appreciative audiences.

MINNESOTA'S NATIONAL TREASURES CONSERVATION AND PRESERVATION ACT

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Minnesota National Treasures Conservation and Preservation Act [MNTCAP]. This legislation will offer further, needed protection to Minnesota's two special natural resources, Voyageurs National Park and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness [BWCAW].

As my colleagues may be aware, Congress already has enacted major legislation on Voyageurs or the BWCA on three separate occasions. Each time, Congress, by an overwhelming bipartisan majority, has determined that these two unique lakeland areas are national treasures worthy of the highest protections the Federal Government can bestow—National Park designation and National Wilderness designation. With the Republicans in control of Congress now, a vocal minority is advocating a dramatic change from over 20 years of policy designed to protect these areas for future generations. This Minnesota minority advocates lowering the high standards that we use for Voyageurs and the BWCA, replacing resource protection with economic development and personal motorized recreation preferences. I and a vast majority of Minnesotans and the American people cannot and do not support this retreat from our Nation's commitment to Minnesota's lakeland wilderness and park areas.

The Minnesota National Treasures Conservation and Preservation Act will reaffirm, renew and resolve new questions by protecting the Voyageur's Kabetogama Peninsula by designating the 74,000 acre peninsula as wilderness. The Kabetogama Peninsula is home to 3 wolf packs and has 11 active bald eagle nests. Opening this area to snowmobiles and aircraft would have a devastating impact on the continued viability of these endangered species and would fragment and shred the intact wilderness character of this peninsula.

For the BWCA wilderness, MNTCAP will close all of Lac La Croix and Loon Lake to motorized use and will close Back Bay, Hoist Bay and the international border portion of Basswood Lake. In addition, MNTCAP will designate over 14,000 more acres of almost all public lands as part of the BWCA Wilderness. This land—primarily Federal, State, and local land—incorporates key parcels and brings in portions of lakes that are currently nonmotorized. One of the most significant additions will be the Sand Point Lake addition, which extends the BWCA along the international border by less than one quarter of a mile. This area is proposed, upon the expiration of existing individual leases with the State, will link Voyageurs National Park with the BWCA!

Clearly, the MNTCAP proposal is in response to the dramatic and far reaching changes envisioned by the numerous bills that have been introduced in the House and the Senate. Under the current anti-park and wilderness atmosphere in this Congress, I fully expect the Republican leadership to give serious consideration to acting upon these harm-

ful proposals, which mark a retreat from past commitments to our special Minnesota treasures.

To combat those efforts, I am introducing an alternative that reflects the views of a majority of Minnesotans. At last summer's congressional hearings in International Falls and St. Paul, an overwhelming majority of the public opposed weakening the protections for Voyageurs and the BWCAW. That view has been reconfirmed by two scientific public opinion polls of Minnesotans. Those polls show that over 80 percent of Minnesotans want the current balance between wilderness preservation and motorized use within these areas to be maintained or strengthened.

MNTCAP will refocus the current one-way debate. Thus far, the focus has been on what protections must be dropped or concessions made to motorized interests. I am offering a positive proposal that sets forth the legal steps that must be taken to protect the unique resources of Voyageurs and the BWCA.

Last month we celebrated the 26th anniversary of Earth Day. Some may feel that the spirit of the first Earth Day has dissipated; that American people are apathetic and will sit idly by while the progress of the past 25 years is undone. I don't hold that view. Now more than ever the American people, the people of Minnesota, recognize their generation's stewardship role. They realize and are committed to protecting our fragile resources and to turning over to our children and our grandchildren our lakes, rivers, and forests in at least as good a condition as we inherited them. The Minnesota National Treasures Conservation and Preservation Act will make that dream for Voyageurs National Park and the BWCA.

RECOGNIZING THE STUDENTS OF ALERT

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the great flood of 1996 in the Pacific Northwest I would like to recognize the following 32 young men who gave their personal money, time, and energy to assist with flood relief. At the invitation of Mayor "Bud" Harrison and flood relief agencies in the communities of Clatskanie and Nehalem, OR, and under their direction, they served in and around towns for a period of 3 weeks from February 15 to March 10, 1996. During which time they assisted the local police department in maintaining order and safety on the roadways, helped in the salvage and cleanup of homes and businesses that had been damaged, and spread goodwill, faith, hope, and charity wherever they went. Their sacrifice, diligence, and thoroughness conveyed a true sense of brotherly love to the citizens of Nehalem and Clatskanie. The experiences these men received while serving will enrich their lives permanently, causing them to become better citizens, and thus have a greater impact on the world around them.

Skyler Bower, Washington; Jonathan Bowers, Tennessee; Jason Butler, Alabama; Seth Campbell, Washington; David Carne, Oregon; James Clifford, Ontario; Andrew Cope, South Carolina; Dan Davis, California; Paul Elliot,

Wyoming; Paul Ellis, Mississippi; Brian Gamotis, Washington; Ryan Gearhart, Oklahoma; Craig Guy, Missouri; Matthew Heard, Oklahoma.

Daniel Iliff, Kansas; Robert Myer, Florida; Justin Nall, Texas; Jonathon Nicholas, Wisconsin; Ryan Peterson, Minnesota; Rhett Prichard, Washington; Tim Rogers, New York; David Servideo, Virginia; Adam Shelley, Missouri; Michael Shoemaker, Indiana; Robert Smith, California; John Tanner, Texas; Joshua Tanner, Texas; Justin Tanner, Texas; Scott Westendorf, Oregon; Brian Wicker, Arizona; Matthew Wood, Texas; Matthew Yordy, Indiana.

IN TRIBUTE TO EDWARD UEHER

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ed Ueber, a steadfast steward of the gulf of the Farallones.

Ed received his master's degree in resource economics and fisheries from the University of Rhode Island, and conducted post-graduate work in maritime history at the Munson Institute. Serving for the last 6 years as sanctuary manager of the gulf of the Farallones and Cordell Bank National Marine Sanctuaries, Ed has spent his career in the marine field.

Ed served aboard submarines and merchant ships in the U.S. Navy and the Merchant Marine. He has worked for the National Marine Fisheries Service and published peer-review papers on fish biology, fishing techniques, global warming, fishery economics, fish trade, fishery management, wood boat building, wooden ship reconstruction, oceanography and marina operations. He has chaired over 20 national and four international conferences on marine fisheries, fishery valuation and management of marine protected areas.

As a sanctuary manager, Ed has been dedicated and tireless. He has worked to build support and public enthusiasm for the national marine sanctuary operations. Ed's important work as a respected sanctuary manager has been critical for much needed support for the establishment of the Nation's three newest marine sanctuaries: Stillwagen Bank, Washington Coast, and Monterey Bay.

Ed and his small staff have been vigilant stewards of the sanctuary waters and their resources. The sanctuary staff has worked diligently to initiate new and innovative programs, many of which call upon a cadre of dedicated volunteers, such as the Beach Watch Program. These efforts to engage the public interest have also led to the creation of the Nation's first sanctuary support organization—the Farallones Marine Sanctuary Association.

Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate the 15th anniversary of the gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary, the people of the bay area thank Ed Ueber for his extraordinary work on its behalf, and wish him many more years of success in protecting and preserving our Nation's marine life.

HONORING THE DODSON BRANCH
VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to applaud the invaluable services provided by the Dodson Branch Volunteer Fire Department. These brave, civic-minded people give freely of their time so that we may all feel safer at night.

Few realize the depth of training and hard work that goes into being a volunteer firefighter. To quote one of my local volunteers, "These fireman must have an overwhelming desire to do for others while expecting nothing in return."

Preparation includes twice-monthly training programs in which they have live drills, study the latest videos featuring the latest in firefighting tactics, as well as attend seminars where they can obtain the knowledge they need to save lives. Within a year of becoming a volunteer firefighter, most attend the Tennessee fire training school in Murfreesboro where they undergo further, intensified training.

When the residents of my district go to bed at night, they know that should disaster strike and their home catch fire, well-trained and qualified volunteer fire departments are ready and willing to give so graciously and generously of themselves. This peace of mind should not be taken for granted.

By selflessly giving of themselves, they ensure a safer future for us all. We owe these volunteer fire departments a debt of gratitude for their service and sacrifice.

JULITA CRUZ-AVILES, FIRST
CHAMORRO SENIOR EXECUTIVE
SERVICE APPOINTEE

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend Ms. Julita Cruz Aviles of the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for having been the first Chamorro to be appointed to the Senior Executive Service [SES] government-wide. Being appointed to this position reserved for the top managerial and supervisory positions within the Federal Government is a great honor for Julie and the people of Guam.

Julie was born on June 16, 1947 in the village of Barrigada on Guam, the daughter of the late Enrique Leon Guerrero Cruz and Joaquina Reyes Sahagon. She has two sisters, Victoria Cruz San Agustin and Rosita Cruz Sumait, and four brothers, Victor, Henry, Manuel, and Francisco. Her distinguished educational background was initiated at Barrigada Elementary School and Untalan Middle School before graduating from John F. Kennedy High School in 1966. She attended the College of Guam before joining the military in 1967. After leaving the military, Julie pursued her education earning an associate degree from the University of Maryland, a bachelor's degree in accounting and business administration from

the Northwestern State University of Louisiana, and an M.S.B.A. degree from Boston University.

Currently the Associate Director for Policy within the Directorate for Accounting Policy at the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense, Julie has over 24 years of Federal Service. This is in addition to approximately 4 years of accounting experience in the private sector and about 5 years experience as an adjunct professor for accounting and business administration with the University of Maryland and City College of Chicago. She has served under various posts in the Program/Budget and Accounting Policy Offices for the Under Secretary of Defense since 1989.

Julie is also a highly active participant in community affairs. She is a member of the Guam Society of America here in D.C., the National Conference of State Societies, the American Society of Military Comptrollers, and the Association of Government Accountants. In 1995, she was the only runner from Guam to register in the Marine Corps Marathon. She has participated and completed three of these events.

Through her distinguished career and outstanding achievements, Julie has brought recognition upon herself, the island of Guam, and its people. I join her husband, Agustin Aviles-de Jesus, and her family in celebrating her extraordinary accomplishments. On behalf of the people of Guam, I congratulate her and wish her all the best in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO JERRY W. LEVIN

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to Jerry W. Levin, a leader in the cosmetics industry. Today, I am proud to announce that Mr. Levin is being awarded the Anti-Defamation League's 1996 Human Relations Award for his many years of supporting the fight against bigotry, racism, and anti-semitism.

Jerry Levin is chairman and chief executive officer of Revlon, Inc., and executive vice president of MacAndrews & Forbes Holdings, Inc., Revlon's parent company. Revlon is world renowned for its cosmetics, skin care, fragrance, personal care, and professional products sold in approximately 175 countries and territories, under brand names including Revlon, ColorStay, Age Defying, Almay, Ultima II, and Charlie. In addition to his work with Revlon, Mr. Levin serves on the boards of directors of Revlon, Inc., Coleman Co., Inc., Fcolab, Inc.; and First Bank System, Inc.

Jerry Levin is being honored by the Anti-Defamation League for his extraordinary efforts over the years. His numerous good works embody the league's very highest ideals and aspirations. His commitment and dedication to the goals of the league are seen in his service to many organizations. He sits on the boards of the United Way of New York City; B'nai B'rith Hillel of New York; UJA—Federation of New York; the New York Philharmonic; the Council on the Graduate School of Business at the University of Chicago; and the National Advisory Committee of the College of Engineering at the University of Michigan.

Jerry Levin was born in San Antonio, TX. He attended high school in Chicago and graduated with a bachelor of science degree in electrical engineering and mathematics from the University of Michigan, and received a masters in business administration from the University of Chicago in 1968. He and his wife, Carol, have two children, Joshua and Abby.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join with me today in tribute to Jerry Levin, who deserves great praise for his many years of service. His life and his many good works exemplify the highest ideals and standards of a fair and just society.

THE WALTERS PLAN TO BALANCE
THE NATIONAL BUDGET

HON. J. D. HAYWORTH

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to continue the dialog on balancing the Federal budget. As my colleagues know, the national debt now exceeds \$5.1 trillion. Children born today will pay over \$185,000 in interest on the debt alone if we do not rein in the Federal Government's excessive spending.

Later this week, the House of Representatives will consider the 1997 budget resolution, which will put us on the path to balancing the budget. However, as you know, Mr. Speaker, the budget resolution is only an outline for balancing the budget. There are many different ways to accomplish this important goal.

In that spirit, Mr. Speaker, I offer to my colleagues a plan which one of my constituents, Arthur Walters from Payson, AZ, conceived to pay off the national debt. The Walters Plan to Balance the National Budget focuses on cutting spending and replacing the income tax with a national sales tax. I hope my colleagues will give this plan the full consideration it deserves.

THE WALTERS PLAN TO BALANCE THE
NATIONAL BUDGET

(By Arthur M. Walters)

This plan addresses the key points of this difficult problem.

1. Congress spends more than the Treasury collects.

2. The Federal Government cannot accurately forecast revenue. It is always low.

3. The government prepares its "wish list budget" and then tries to predict where the funds will come from to pay for it. It is always optimistic to say the least. The revenue never materializes. As the budget year progresses, the Treasury borrows money to pay its bills because the funds are not there when needed.

4. The IRS is incapable of administering the hodge podge Tax Code. It was carefully written so no one can understand it. This allows an army of tax experts to negotiate the tax obligations of everyone. It imposes a large expense on every tax payer just to figure this tax.

5. The author believes every single person should take personal responsibility for Federal spending. No one should escape. For those who have escaped so far, there will be great cries of injustice. Everyone has his own story of why he should be exempt. This must stop. This plan won't work if it does not stop.

6. There is no formula for budget cutting that can be agreed upon. The military, Social Security, defense contractors, welfare, etc., all have a bottomless need for money, as do thousands of government departments.

A fresh, firm plan based on equality is needed. The public will accept fairness. To date, there never has been fairness in the Tax Code.

THE PLAN

1. A Constitutional Amendment must be passed that requires a balanced budget.

2. Prior to the Amendment, Congress should immediately pass a law or establish a policy that says:

2.1 The National Budget cannot exceed 90% of last year's revenue.

2.2 Revenues in excess of the budget must be applied to debt reduction.

2.3 When all National debt is paid off and there is one year's budget (minimum) in the Treasury, then the annual budget cannot exceed last year's revenue.

3. Since no one will ever agree on whose budget is to be cut, the only thing that will work is to cut all department budgets equally. Then everyone has an equally valid complaint.

No doubt it will hurt—we need to live within our means. People are reasonable and can be convinced to accept this.

If possible, the military cut should be more than the other cuts: 1.1 to 2.0 times the percentage cuts of other major departments. This would be a tough thing to "sell," but would free up a huge sum of money.

REVENUE

There shall be a National Sales Tax of 1% of sales. This tax will be imposed on every sale by every business. To work, there can be no exceptions (wholesale, retail, professionals, doctors, dentists, lawyers, engineers, architects, inter-corporation transfers where P&L centers exist, etc.)

The tax will be added to every transaction and is to be paid by the buyer. Companies who never pay Federal taxes will now be making a contribution through their purchases. The 1% sales tax thus is 1% tax on the Gross National Product. The money is to be paid within 14 days after it is collected. The money is to be deposited into local Federal bank accounts. Banks who collect the money will be allowed to keep the deposits 2 weeks for their trouble, before forward it to the Treasury.

The Treasury must use this revenue to retire outstanding debt only.

Benefits:

1. We now have a steady flow of cash into the Treasury 52 weeks per year.

2. Minimum paper work and collection expense. We have an almost real time measure on the nation's economy week by week.

3. There are to be NO LOOP HOLES in this tax or it won't work.

4. The paper work load on business will be minimal—

Funds received from gross sales this week 0.01=tax due next week.

No complex accounting is required; just a simple deposit to a local Federal Bank account. The IRS is out of the loop; they will not be needed.

LONG TERM FUND COLLECTIONS

After the 1% sales tax has been running for one or two years, all the kinks will be worked out and we now have a clear real time picture of the Nation's economy. We will eliminate most of the effort now used to try to figure out where the country is, based on gathering a lot of data from many sources

that is history. Because a lot of businesses, such as wholesale businesses, don't pay sales tax, there is no direct way to monitor business activity.

Revenue from the IRS will be compared to Sale Tax Revenue. It will be a simple calculation to see what National Sales Tax is required to generate the revenue collected by the IRS.

The sales tax can be raised and the income tax eliminated. No more IRS. No more taxes on capital gains, etc. No more complex accounting.

This change will lower business accounting costs, depreciation accounting, etc., etc. Federal revenue collected will increase and taxpayer hidden costs will decrease. It will be totally fair. Everyone will share the cost of Federal Government.

Again—this plan can only work if there are no exemptions.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained yesterday evening, May 14, 1996, and missed two votes on amendments to H.R. 3230, the national defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1997.

Had I been present I would have voted in favor of Congresswoman DELAURO's amendment to delete provisions that prohibit privately funded abortions at Defense Department hospitals overseas. I would also have voted in favor of Congressman SHAYS' amendment to require the President to seek increased cash contributions from U.S. allies to fund the non-salary costs of U.S. troops permanently stationed in their countries.

TEMPLE BETH-EL CELEBRATING 130 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Temple Beth-El of Jersey City, NJ, celebrating the 130th anniversary of its founding. The temple also celebrates the 70th anniversary of the dedication of its magnificent sanctuary. A Sabbath service rededicating the sanctuary will be held on May 17, 1996, and a gala dinner party will be held on May 18, 1996.

In the mid- to late-1860's a small group of Jewish worshippers in Jersey City began to congregate for prayer and study. Soon thereafter, the congregation began to grow and this culminated in the formation of the Isaac Ephraim Congregation. Finally, in 1871 the congregation adopted the name Temple Beth-El.

Over the years, Temple Beth-El has grown and flourished as a prominent religious and educational institution. The selection of Rabbi Samuel A. Berman, now Rabbi Emeritus, to join Temple Beth-El in 1936 proved to be an

important decision. For 60 years Rabbi Berman has been bringing his enthusiasm, innate sense of spirituality, and devotion to Jewish learning into the temple. He created and implemented many new programs within the temple to assist its members.

The temple, headed now by Rabbi Kenneth Brickman since 1989, offers many educational and support programs for the Jewish people. The nursery school, in cooperation with the Jewish Community Center, the Violet Zall-Hordes Mishpacha Family Education Program and the Sunday School allow young Jewish families to learn, appreciate, and enjoy their rich tradition. The Violet Zall-Hordes Lecture Series provides the adult Jewish community with an opportunity to enhance and learn more about their heritage and history. Members of the temple were active in the civil rights movement in the 1960's and remain committed to the message of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Every year on the national holiday marking Dr. King's birth temple members and representatives of the African-American community join together for a celebration. In addition to Rabbi Brickman, the temple has been blessed with the leadership of Irwin Rosen, who has worked tirelessly for the membership.

I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring Temple Beth-El for its commitment to its members and the community at large. Temple Beth-El is a place that offers hope and love for all those seeking a divine embrace.

HONORING THE CENTRAL DISTRICT VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to applaud the invaluable services provided by the Central District Volunteer Fire Department. These brave, civic-minded people give freely of their time so that we may all feel safer at night.

Few realize the depth of training and hard work that goes into being a volunteer firefighter. To quote one of my local volunteers, "These firemen must have an overwhelming desire to do for others while expecting nothing in return."

Preparation includes twice-monthly training programs in which they have live drills, study the latest videos featuring the latest in firefighting tactics, as well as attend seminars where they can obtain the knowledge they need to save lives. Within a year of becoming a volunteer firefighter, most attend the Tennessee fire training school in Murfreesboro where they undergo further, intensified training.

When the residents of my district go to bed at night, they know that should disaster strike and their home catch fire, well-trained and qualified volunteer fire departments are ready and willing to give so graciously and generously of themselves. This peace of mind should not be taken for granted.

By selflessly giving of themselves, they ensure a safer future for us all. We owe these volunteer fire departments a debt of gratitude for their service and sacrifice.

IN OPPOSITION OF SENATE
MARKUP OF S. 356

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, as I rise this morning the Governmental Affairs Committee in the other body is considering legislation to establish English as America's official language. Many of us think we know why this kind of legislative mandate is necessary. We've all met up with people who don't speak English as well as we do and have been frustrated by this.

So the reason for this linguistic mandate must be that immigrants aren't learning English, right? Well actually, immigrants are learning English and they're doing it faster than ever before. According to a recent joint Johns Hopkins, Louisiana State study, only 12 percent of second generation immigrants report speaking English poorly.

So the purpose of English-only laws must be to help teach new immigrants English, right? Well actually, there are no provisions in any English-only bill that would teach one immigrant one word of English.

So if English-only seeks only to solve problems which do not exist, the reason for this legislation must be to insult other languages and those who speak them.

Our Founding Fathers understood the implications of such a declaration and were wise enough to refrain from such action. I suggest we follow their example.

RECOGNIZING THE STUDENTS OF
ALERT

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as our relationship with Mexico becomes more and more important to the well-being of our Nation. I would like to bring to this body's attention the sacrificial effort of 26 young men, who at their own expense and under the invitation and direction of Gov. Julio Cesar Ruiz Ferro and Senator Pablo Salavar, have been serving the community of Nuevo San Miguel Micotic in the Chiapas region of Mexico. They have been providing medical aid and construction assistance, meeting basic needs, and teaching skills to better the community's living conditions and ability to benefit neighboring communities. Their work continues to be heralded throughout the State of Chiapas among the citizens and leaders of Mexico. Furthermore, their experience of cross-cultural service not only strengthens global relationships, but better equips them for work in their home communities.

David Beskow, Oregon; Orlando Diaz Jr., Florida; Jason Dolan, Texas; Steve Farrand, Colorado; Ron Fuhrman, Michigan; David Her-ring, Alabama; Daniel Lamb, California; Eric Lantzer, Michigan; Mark Lassiter, Texas; Paul Lee, Texas; Matthew Lindquist, California; and Aaron Lioi, Ohio.

Also, Robert Matlack, Kansas; Joshua Meals, Tennessee; Larry Mooney, Pennsylva-

nia; Steve Nix, Texas; Joshua Ramey, California; Gregg Rozeboom, Michigan; Tim Stewart, Washington; Leon Tan, Malaysia; John Tanner, Texas; Tim Tuttle, Oregon; John Watkins, Minnesota; Paul Watkins, Minnesota; and Nate Williams, Kansas.

HONORING SANTA FE HIGH
SCHOOL AS ONE OF AMERICA'S
BEST

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the students, teachers, administrators, parents and community who make up one of *America's Best High Schools*, Santa Fe High School of the Whittier Union High School District, in Santa Fe Springs, CA.

Santa Fe High School has earned the distinction of being 1 of 5 schools in the State of California, and 1 of 63 schools selected in the Nation, recognized in the April issue of Redbook magazine for overall excellence in the national school recognition program, America's Best Schools Project.

Last year, I was honored to nominate Santa Fe High School for the Redbook's 5th Annual America's Best Schools project. This nationwide search included 400 nominations from State and national education leaders.

A national panel of educators reviewed the programs and data at each of the nominated schools. Santa Fe High School was awarded overall excellence based on a criteria which examined classroom innovation/academic achievement, parent and community involvement, special needs programs, and extracurricular activities.

Redbook said of the 63 high schools selected nationwide, that these "well-rounded schools offer students a strong mix of intellectual challenges and stimulating extracurricular activities. Dedicated teachers and parents produce an atmosphere that ensures the high academic performance that distinguishes these winners". Indeed, this a reflection of Santa Fe High School.

Santa Fe High School serves a racially-mixed community, predominantly of Hispanic decent, composed of 1850 students. Under the dynamic leadership of Principal Sandra Thorstenson, 80 dedicated staff personnel, who are the teachers, counselors and principals, work diligently to ensure success. The faculty of Santa Fe High faculty was empowered to lead the charge to improving the curriculum and instruction. Teachers and staff and the school community collaborated in the development of a vision for the future of Santa Fe High School, guiding the restructuring effort. Through innovative ideas in the classroom and in decision making, Santa Fe High School provides for student input into curriculum, academic and school-wide programs.

Santa Fe High has received State recognition for its School Age Parenting Program and Infant Development Center. It is used as a model for teen mothers and pregnant teens to encourage students to stay in school and continue their education.

Parents and the community participate in Santa Fe High School's success through the PTA (with 135 active parents currently in-

volved), Sports Club, the Bilingual Advisory Council, Band Booster, the School Site Council, and partnerships established with the Foundation, Chamber and Cities of Santa Fe Springs and Norwalk. Extracurricular programs provide the students with a well rounded education. Santa Fe High offers 20 interscholastic sports for boys and girls as well as 21 clubs and organizations. Extracurricular non-athletic teams have excelled in regional, state and national competitions, including the Chieftain Tribe Band, Chieftain Newspaper, and Future Business Leaders of America.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting the efforts of all the faculty and students of Santa Fe High School. It is an honor to have one of America's Best Schools within the congressional district I represent.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES A.
LEBENTHAL

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to James A. Lebenthal, who has made possible the rebuilding of public works and infrastructure of the United States for more than three decades. Mr. Lebenthal was given the Tree of Life Award by the Jewish National Fund for his extraordinary service to the city and State of New York, and the Nation in general.

James A. Lebenthal is the chairman and CEO of Lebenthal & Co., Inc., a company created by his parents in 1925. Lebenthal & Co. works with local governments to issue and sell municipal bonds to provide funding for capital projects. Jim is a leader in the municipal bond business, serving as president of the Commission on Saving and Investment in America, vice chairman of the Rebuild America Coalition, and director of Municipal Bond Investors' Assurance, Inc.

Jim is well known as a skilled communicator, educator, retailer, and mass marketer of municipal bonds. Prior to joining his family's bond business in 1962, Lebenthal wrote advertising copy for Olivy & Mather, worked at NBC, and was a Hollywood reporter for Life Magazine. This experience has given him the expertise to create and appear in inventive radio and TV commercials designed to educate the public about the benefits of municipal bonds. As a result of such mass marketing, the term "municipal bond" has become a household word. Through his commercials the general public has learned that the electricity that lights their homes, the water that comes from their taps, the buses, subways, bridges, and highways they use are all made possible by municipal bonds.

Jim was raised in New York City. He attended the Dalton School, Andover, and received his bachelor's degree from Princeton University. He has been married to Jacqueline Beymer for 35 years.

The Jewish National Fund is devoted to funding water projects, forests, roads, and water conservation in Israel. James Lebenthal is the perfect choice to receive its highest honor, the Tree of Life Award. Through the symbol of the tree, Jim hopes to raise awareness of both public investment and the contribution infrastructure can make to the growth and economic development of any country.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to honor, along with the Jewish National Fund, James A. Lebenthal, whose enduring belief in the possibilities of revitalization have led to three decades of tangible contribution to this Nation's public works and infrastructure. I ask my colleagues to join with me in this tribute to James Lebenthal for his many years of work in public interest.

HONORING THE COLLEGE GROVE VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to applaud the invaluable services provided by the College Grove Volunteer Fire Department. These brave, civic-minded people give freely of their time so that we may all feel safer at night.

Few realize the depth of training and hard work that goes into being a volunteer firefighter. To quote one of my local volunteers, "These firemen must have an overwhelming desire to do for others while expecting nothing in return."

Preparation includes twice-monthly training programs in which they have live drills, study the latest videos featuring the latest in fire-fighting tactics, as well as attend seminars where they can obtain the knowledge they need to save lives. Within a year of becoming a volunteer firefighter, most attend the Tennessee fire training school in Murfreesboro where they undergo further, intensified training.

When the residents of my district go to bed at night, they know that should disaster strike and their home catch fire, well-trained and qualified volunteer fire departments are ready and willing to give so graciously and generously of themselves. This peace of mind should not be taken for granted.

By selflessly giving of themselves, they ensure a safer future for us all. We owe these volunteer fire departments a debt of gratitude for their service and sacrifice.

KOSOVA: A NATION IN PERIL,
PRIME MINISTER BUJAR
BUKOSHI'S REMARKS

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, the grave situation that exists in the Republic of Kosovo. In this tenuous post-Dayton agreement environment, the United States cannot idly stand by and wait for this volatile situation to reach a crisis point. We must press for a moral and equitable resolution to the Kosovo question. I urge everyone in this Chamber to read this speech by Dr. Bukoshi; his scholarly point of view and first-hand knowledge present the Kosovo issue in a succinct and edifying way. The speech reads as follows:

IGNORING THE LESSONS OF HISTORY IN THE BALKANS

(By Dr. Bujar Bukoshi)

In the aftermath of the Dayton Accords, there remains significant unfinished business to be handled by the international community. Among this unfinished business is the Kosovo crisis.

Dayton recognized this reality. In fact, the document was quite specific with respect to conditions that must be met by Serbia-Montenegro before the so-called "Outer Wall" of diplomatic, political and financial sanctions against the Slobodan Milosevic regime would be lifted.

Regrettably, recent events confirm that some European countries who signed the Accords have violated them by prematurely extending diplomatic recognition to Serbia-Montenegro. In doing so, Europe is setting the stage for a new conflict.

It should also be noted that with respect to implementing the Dayton Accords in Bosnia, the so-called "Republika Srpska" has been extended de facto recognition, as NATO in many instances has adopted what some have described as a "can't do" attitude toward implementation that has allowed "Republika Srpska" to escape many provisions of the Accords.

In effect, the indicted war criminals [Radovan] Karadzic and [Ratko] Mladic have won virtual statehood for "Republika Srpska." They have received something where there was nothing.

In contrast with this is Kosovo, which was recognized as one of the eight political units of former Yugoslavia with the rights and responsibilities accorded by that status. How can the world expect Kosovo, which had a distinct and existing statehood, to now have nothing?

In Bosnia, and now by extending diplomatic recognition to the forces of evil in Belgrade, some European countries have exhibited a moral bankruptcy that should shock those who are committed to peace, human rights, fairness, and justice.

Albanians in Kosovo take such action as an insult that will lead nowhere. By extending the mantle of diplomatic recognition at the present time and under the present geographic shape, the situation will lead to new crisis.

Recognition will never defuse the situation. To the contrary, it sends a very bad message to the Albanians who, for seven long years, have endured the apartheid imposed by the Milosevic regime.

The message is simply this: Those who exhibit anti-social behavior, who practice ethnic cleansing and perpetrate the worst crimes against humanity since World War II will be rewarded. Those who have fought oppression, who have stood for freedom and democracy, who have resisted peacefully, will be punished. In a cynical view of the situation, some European countries seem intent on rewarding evil and punishing good.

Although some European leaders have capitulated to the sinister forces in Belgrade, the U.S. has—up until now—maintained constant, consistent and committed. And we hope it will continue to do so.

In my meeting with high-level State Department officials Monday, they reiterated that the U.S. is not prepared to recognize Belgrade, and that the "Outer Wall" sanctions will remain in place.

They reaffirmed strong U.S. support for the non-violent approach of the Kosovo leadership in dealing with Serbian repression in Kosovo. They affirmed that the Kosovo issue is very high on the agenda and reconfirmed their desire to be helpful in finding a peaceful solution. They said the U.S. would continue to work with its allies in pursuit of such a solution.

The U.S. position reflects an understanding of the lessons of the past in the Balkans. Let us remember that in World War I and World War II it was America that finally entered the conflict and brought an end to the fighting.

Throughout the four decades of the Cold War, it was the U.S. through its leadership of NATO that insured the peace and the collapse of Communism. In Bosnia, the protracted conflict continued until America took the initiative, brought the aggressor together with the victims, and hammered out the Dayton Accords.

We believe that U.S. leaders are looking at Kosovo as an opportunity for American leadership to be exerted before there is a slaughter. This pro-active strategy would work, provided America maintained the fortitude to finish the job.

As we move ahead in this post-Dayton period, the international community would be well advised to recognize the new realities and to remember the lessons of history.

Kosovo is a state, and its political future must be determined by its 2.2 million people. Serbia-Montenegro is a pariah outcast. Evil must not be rewarded. You don't make the criminal the policeman. Serbia cannot and should not be granted mini-super power status.

If Serbia strengthens its alliance with a new Russian coalition, the so-called "USSR-II," that may result from the June elections in Russia, a new Cold War may emerge, and the very Serbia that some Europeans rush to recognize today will become an enemy again, only this time more brutal, more sinister and more potent.

Serbia wants to have it both ways: To become militarily strong through arms from Russia, and to become economically powerful through ties to the West. It cannot have it both ways.

Baroness Margaret Thatcher said it best last August in Aspen, Colorado: "So what does history teach us? To me the most significant lesson is: Never appease an aggressor. If we do, he will only grow stronger and more confident, and to secure his ultimate defeat will require greater effort and greater sacrifice."

The lessons of history are clear. Those who fail to learn from mistakes of history are bound to repeat them. For our part, the Albanians of Kosovo would like to continue to peacefully pursue freedom, justice and democracy. This is our hope. This is our intention.

1996 TRIBUTE TO SENIOR GLEANERS OF NORTH HIGHLANDS

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my congratulations to Senior Gleaners, Inc. of North Highlands on 20 exceptional years of service to the community.

Senior Gleaners is a nonprofit, totally volunteer organization which was organized in 1976 by 37 senior citizens concerned about local hunger issues. It began in a volunteer's home and now operates from a 4.5 acre facility leased from the city of Sacramento. Over the last 20 years, Senior Gleaners has continued to operate with a staff consisting solely of volunteer senior citizens providing food and labor to over 145 charitable organizations in northern California.

Over 2,000 volunteers annually contribute almost 50,000 hours collecting fruits and vegetables from orchards and farms, salvaging

damaged or outdated canned and packaged foods from supermarkets, and performing all trucking, warehousing, and administrative work essential for the collection and distribution of food. In 1995 alone, nearly 500,000 volunteer hours were provided and over 17 million pounds of food were donated to those in need.

In addition to food, Senior Gleaners volunteers also provide lap robes, shawls, slippers, and other items to convalescent homes and veterans' hospitals, and baby clothes and blankets to needy children.

Senior Gleaners of North Highlands is an outstanding example of what volunteerism can achieve in our country. Their record of accomplishment in clothing and feeding the neediest children, adults, and families in northern California over the last 20 years has made a tremendous difference in the community, region, and State. I salute the efforts of Senior Gleaners, Inc., and wish them continued success in the future.

RECOGNIZING THE STUDENTS OF ALERT

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we remember the tragic bombing of the Edward P. Murrah Federal Building, in Oklahoma City, OK, on April 19, 1995. I would like to take time to recognize a group of young men who, long after the media's focus on the tragedy had faded, but with much work left to be done, volunteered time, energy, and good will to minister to the physical, spiritual, and emotional needs of the survivors while moving the residents of a destroyed apartment building to safer locations. These men were a demonstration of sensitivity, availability, and compassion, as well as initiative, in that they recognized and did what needed to be done in the lives of the people of Oklahoma City, with no thought for themselves, but only how they could help their neighbor. Their selflessness and sincerity are an embodiment of those virtues that made America great and will be an asset to them in their home communities and with all those they come in contact.

Adam Bell, Texas; Jerry Campbell, Florida; David Carne, Oregon; Steve Dankers, Wisconsin; Chad Gallinger, Maryland; Gary Gilchrist, Florida; Michael Goheen, Washington; Peter Guy, California; Chris Hulson, Oklahoma; Owen Manor, California; Seth Prescott, Mississippi; and Joshua Tanner, Texas.

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES R. VAN HORN

HON. ROBERT A. BORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Charles R. Van Horn, a great American who died on April 30, 1996.

Charles Van Horn, a graduate of the Shenandoah Valley Military Academy, Washington and Lee University, and the University of Ala-

bama; devoted his life to public service and private philanthropy. For almost 50 years, Charlie's career focused on the advancement of both the Baltimore and Ohio and Chesapeake and Ohio Railroads. Charlie's hard work and intelligence resulted in his appointment as vice president, and later the Washington executive representative in governmental relations, for the Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad.

As an active member of many well-known organizations, Charles Van Horn served as president of the P.T. Barnum Tent Circus, the Saints and Sinners, and the New York Skoal Club. In addition, he served the community as a board member of the Travelers Aid Society of Washington, the Honor America Executive Committee, and the Chatter Box Club.

Charles died on April 30, 1996, in Scranton, PA. He is survived by his wife Winifred, his 7 step-sons, and 13 step-grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I join Charlie's family, friends, and former colleagues from the Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad in paying tribute to Charles R. Van Horn. With his distinguished legacy of public service and private philanthropy, Charles R. Van Horn will be remembered as one of the best representatives the railroad has had, as well as a great American.

HONORING THE CHRISTIANA VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to applaud the invaluable services provided by the Christiana Volunteer Fire Department. These brave, civic-minded people give freely of their time so that we may all feel safer at night.

Few realize the depth of training and hard work that goes into being a volunteer firefighter. To quote one of my local volunteers, "These firemen must have an overwhelming desire to do for others while expecting nothing in return."

Preparation includes twice-monthly training programs in which they have live drills, study the latest videos featuring the latest in firefighting tactics, as well as attend seminars where they can obtain the knowledge they need to save lives. Within a year of becoming a volunteer firefighter, most attend the Tennessee fire training school in Murfreesboro where they undergo further, intensified training.

When the residents of my district go to bed at night, they know that should disaster strike and their home catch fire, well-trained and qualified volunteer fire departments are ready and willing to give so graciously and generously of themselves. This peace of mind should not be taken for granted.

By selflessly giving of themselves, they ensure a safer future for us all. We owe these volunteer fire departments a debt of gratitude for their service and sacrifice.

REGULATORY RELIEF FOR UTILITY VEHICLE OPERATORS AND DRIVERS

HON. RAY LaHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today that will offer regulatory relief for utility vehicle operators and drivers. This bill will help reduce the cost and increase the safety of utilities throughout America, and particularly in rural America.

In the past few years, natural disasters have devastated virtually all parts of our country. And, while efforts to rebuild and restore basic utility services to the victims have been gallant, these very efforts have been severely hampered by ridiculous, costly and burdensome regulations that hinder utility service drivers from performing emergency repairs and maintenance on utility lines in rural areas thereby affecting vital services.

Last fall, the National Highway System Designation Act included relief from Federal motor carrier regulations that were designed mainly for long-haul, cross-country drivers. While these laws did provide relief for certain agricultural drivers, water well drillers, snowplow operators, and medium-sized commercial motor vehicles from burdensome hours of service regulations, they, unfortunately, did not provide the same kind of relief for drivers of vehicles for utility companies—for example, electric, water, telephone, sewer, natural gas, etc.).

Under current Department of Transportation rules and regulations, utility vehicle drivers are limited in the number of hours that they can drive and be on duty. The practical effect of these regulations is to limit the size of the area that utility drivers can effectively service. This limitation not only increases the utility costs that consumers must pay; but it also creates health and safety risks for the public, because utility service may be interrupted due to the inability of utility drivers to reach the problem area and make the appropriate repairs within their hours of service.

The onerous effect of these regulations is particularly acute in those parts of rural America in which the service area of utility companies generally covers vast distances. Drivers often spend more time driving to the problem area than actually making repairs. The bureaucrats, however, do not distinguish driving time from repair time, choosing, instead, to count both in the overall calculation of allowable hours of service.

This bill will help ensure the public's safe access to utility service and save between \$300 and \$400 million in compliance costs that would otherwise be passed on to consumers. I urge passage of this important bill.

THE BIOMATERIALS ACCESS ASSURANCE ACT OF 1996

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Biomaterials Access Assurance Act

of 1996, legislation to ensure the availability of implantable medical devices, which include: pacemakers, heart valves, artificial blood vessels, angioplasty catheters, left ventricular assist devices, and hip and knee joints. This bill is almost identical to H.R. 753, which I introduced last year, and is the same language that was included as title II of the Product Liability Fairness Act conference report which passed both Houses of Congress.

The measure that I, along with a bipartisan group of 23 cosponsors, introduce today will provide for expedited dismissal from lawsuit of suppliers of raw materials used in the manufacture of lifesaving and lifeenhancing medical devices—biomaterials. The Biomaterials Access Assurance Act of 1996 will not limit recovery from a biomaterials supplier where the supplier is also the manufacturer or seller of the device, or where the supplier failed to provide the biomaterials described in an applicable contract or specifications.

A looming crisis exists which necessitates adoption of the Biomaterials Access Assurance Act. Biomaterials suppliers have stopped selling raw materials to medical device manufacturers. The suppliers, named in lawsuits involving medical implants because they are considered deep pockets, have been forced to pay millions to defend themselves. Although these suppliers are rarely found liable, the litigation costs are not offset by the profits realized by selling to the device market. Sales to the device market make up only a small percentage of the overall sales of these materials to alternative markets. Raw materials used in the manufacture of these devices—polyester yarn, resins, polyurethane—have other commercial applications. For example, polyester fibers used in medical implants account for less than \$200,000 of sales in a \$9 billion worldwide polyester yarn market.

Twelve suppliers have withdrawn from the biomaterials market in the past 2 years. Device manufacturers have been forced to seek overseas suppliers, many of whom refuse to sell raw materials to U.S. manufacturers. The result is a critical shortage of biomaterials. The ultimate losers are the people who depend on medical devices to extend and improve their lives.

The Product Liability Fairness Act, which contained the exact language that I introduce today, passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 259 to 158, and the Senate by a vote of 59 to 40. Despite the President's veto of the Product Liability Fairness Act, he stated that this provision in particular was "a laudable attempt to ensure the supply of materials needed to make lifesaving medical devices." Although the President went on to express certain reservations that he has concerning this legislation, I intend to work closely with the cosponsors and the administration to ensure enactment of this lifesaving measure.

CONGRATULATIONS TO DAVID GUETZKOW

HON. GERALD D. KLECZKA
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my most sincere congratulations to David Guetzkow, who was named the Wisconsin

Boys & Girls Clubs' "1996 Youth of the Year." David is an exemplary young man very deserving of this distinguished award.

David has been an active member of the Irving J. Seher Boys & Girls Club for 11 years. He has demonstrated his leadership and commitment through activities sponsored by the Seher Club, as well as the Milwaukee Trade and Technical High School which he attends. Club projects like Adopt-A-Highway on South 27th Street in Milwaukee and the graffiti removal project instilled a sense of community pride in David.

At Milwaukee Trade and Technical High, David has excelled in both academic and extracurricular areas. While maintaining a 3.5 grade point average, he has made time to tutor other students, serve as captain of the volleyball and basketball teams, and quarterback of the football team, and will be inducted into the National Honor Society this fall.

In receiving this honor, David performed exceptionally in all eight categories judged: service to the club, community service, home and family, school performance, spirituality, essay writing, interview skills, and public speaking. He speaks highly of the values and direction the Boys and Girls Club has provided throughout his youth.

So, I send my best wishes to David Guetzkow as he heads to the midwest regional competition in June. His parents, Jeanne and Joel, are no doubt proud of their son. I share in their pride and believe that with young people like David, our society indeed has a very bright future.

BOSSES' DAY 1996

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, in the Tenth Congressional District of Michigan, the personnel at Selfridge Air National Guard Base have served in the defense of the United States for over 78 years. Currently, Selfridge personnel are helping bring peace to the former Yugoslavia. I am proud to say that members of the Air Force Reserve's 927 Air Refueling Wing—927 ARW—which is stationed at Selfridge, were the first reservists to volunteer this past December for the "Joint Endeavor Express" from the United States to Germany.

Selfridge Air National Guard Base is one of the Nation's oldest and most historic military installations. It is named after Lt. Thomas Etholen Selfridge. Lieutenant Selfridge was the first military officer to pilot a heavier-than-air, engine-driven aircraft. While flying with Orville Wright on September 17, 1908, Lieutenant Selfridge, unfortunately, became the first officer to meet his death in powered flight. Wright survived only after a lengthy stay in the hospital.

Selfridge Field was activated as a military installation in 1917, 3 months after the United States entered World War I. In 1947, when the Air Force became a separate service, Selfridge Field became Selfridge Air Force Base and had grown from a 640-acre leased parcel of land to a permanent 3,600-acre base.

In 1971, the base was transferred to the Michigan Air National Guard and received its

current name. As the home of many diversified units, "Team Selfridge" takes pride in being the only Reserve Forces base to have permanently assigned units from all five of the uniformed services: the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and the Coast Guard. The Air Force Reserve and the Air National Guard also have units at the base.

This Saturday, May 18, 1996, the 927th is recognizing the employers who support its Reserve and Guard employees. Even though the deployment of these employees may cause financial and organizational strain, in times of need, their employers have subordinated company interests to those of the Nation. I applaud these employers for their sacrifice and commitment.

National Guard and Reserve Forces comprise almost half of our Nation's defense capability and are essential to national security. And, as is being demonstrated in Bosnia-Herzegovina, they are also essential to peace. "The mission of the 927th ARW is to extend the Global Reach of United States air power through trained personnel and mission ready equipment." As the first to volunteer in support of "Joint Endeavor," the 927th moved more than 6 tons of supplies in their first three missions—not only extending air power but offering a hand in peace.

These citizen-soldiers and airmen train vigorously and stand shoulder-to-shoulder with their active duty counterparts in order to be ready to meet the Nation's call at a moment's notice. And, their civilian bosses must also be ready, in a moment's notice, to see some of their best employees answer that call.

Civilian bosses and supervisors of Reserve component soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines have continued to pledge their active support. Thanks to their commitment, our National Guard and Reserve members have been able to fulfill their military missions.

Our National Guard and Reserve Forces, as demonstrated in operation "Joint Endeavor," are playing a greater and more diverse role than probably ever imagined by Lieutenant Selfridge. And with the vital support of America's employers, the National Guard and Reserves will be able to fulfill their ultimate mission of maintaining peace.

As a measure of our thanks, we should celebrate the significant contributions of our National Guard and Reserve employers. I urge my colleagues and all Americans to join me in honoring employers of National Guard and Reserve members by remembering May 18, 1996, as Bosses' Day. And I encourage the American people to express their gratitude to these employers for their extraordinary sacrifices on behalf of our Nation.

HONORING THE CENTRAL VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. BART GORDON
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to applaud the invaluable services provided by the Central Volunteer Fire Department. These brave, civic-minded people give freely of their time so that we may all feel safer at night.

Few realize the depth of training and hard work that goes into being a volunteer firefighter. To quote one of my local volunteers,

"These firemen must have an overwhelming desire to do for others while expecting nothing in return."

Preparation includes twice-monthly training programs in which they have live drills, study the latest videos featuring the latest in fire-fighting tactics, as well as attend seminars where they can obtain the knowledge they need to save lives. Within a year of becoming a volunteer firefighter, most attend the Tennessee Fire Training School in Murfreesboro where they undergo further, intensified training.

When the residents of my district go to bed at night, they know that should disaster strike and their home catch fire, well-trained and qualified volunteer fire departments are ready and willing to give so graciously and generously of themselves. This peace of mind should not be taken for granted.

By selflessly giving of themselves, they ensure a safer future for us all. We owe these volunteer fire departments a debt of gratitude for their service and sacrifice.

TRIBUTE TO SYLVIA LEWIS PARKS

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mrs. Sylvia Lewis Parks on the occasion of her retirement from Richland County School District One after 38 years of dedicated and unselfish service to the children of Columbia, SC.

Mrs. Parks joined the school system in 1958 as an elementary school teacher, where she quickly earned a reputation for her superior and innovative teaching style. After just over a decade of classroom teaching, Mrs. Parks began the first of numerous increasingly important positions within the school system, eventually becoming one of the top administrators in the entire system. Some of these positions were: Title One Coordinator; Director of Federal Programs; Executive Director for Development Programs; Executive Director for Development and Planning; and, Acting Associate Superintendent for Elementary Education. Mrs. Parks' most recent position has been Executive Director for Elementary School Services.

In addition to her work with Richland District One, Mrs. Parks has been a consultant to school districts and educational associations across the country including: the U.S. Department of Education, Seattle, WA, Public Schools, the Oklahoma City Schools, and the Fayetteville, NC, School District. She has been a presenter at the Overseas School-to-School Partnership in Gabon and Cameroon, West Africa, the South Carolina Association of Elementary and Middle School Principals, and the South Carolina Education Association.

While keeping a very busy professional schedule, Mrs. Parks has always generously found time to serve her community and to improve the lives of the world at large. She has been a member of the board of directors of the United Black Fund, the Columbia Urban League, and the Midlands Marine Institute. She previously served as president of the Richland County Chapter of the Assault on Illiteracy Program and was a member of the

South Carolina Coalition of Blacks and Jews, the Community Relations Council, the Seventy-Three Breakfast Club, and the Greater Columbia Chamber of Commerce. She is a member of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority and a former member of Jack and Jill of America, Inc.

Despite the numerous demands on her time, Mrs. Parks has always found time for her family. She is a dedicated wife, mother, and grandmother. She is a friendly neighbor and a warm smile to all who meet her. Over the years, she has served as a mentor to legions of students, teachers, and school administrators. Mrs. Parks is a dedicated member of the St John Baptist Church, where she has been a member of numerous committees and organizations.

Mr. Speaker, Sylvia Parks is a true Renaissance woman. I am proud to represent her in the Congress. While she will be missed at Richland School District One, I am sure her dedication and untiring devotion to our children will never end. I ask that you and the other Members of the House join me in saluting Mrs. Sylvia Lewis Parks as her family, friends, and colleagues gather to celebrate her retirement on Saturday, May 25, 1996, at the Clarion Townhouse in Columbia, SC.

MEDIA OBJECTIVITY

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, the professed objectivity of this country's mainstream media should be of concern to all Americans as they attempt to assess the vital issues of the day. News tinted with bias clearly prevents citizens from making truly informed decisions. I share with this body the following startling comments by Newsweek assistant managing editor and Washington bureau chief Evan Thomas from Inside Washington, a weekly public affairs show broadcast locally in the Washington area the weekend of May 11 and 12, 1996.

Apparently one member of the media establishment knows bias when he sees it.

There is a liberal bias; it's demonstrable. Boy, if you look at some statistics: About 85 percent of the reporters who cover the White House vote Democratic; they have for a long time. There is, particularly at the networks, at the lower levels, among the editors and the so-called infrastructure, there is a liberal bias.

There is a liberal bias at Newsweek, the magazine I work for. Most of the people who work at Newsweek live on the upper West Side of New York and they have a liberal bias.

I don't think it's so much Washington. It's New York. You have to look at which city we're talking about. It's where the networks are based—where the New York Times is based. I think the greatest liberal bias is amongst the people who work for large major news organizations in New York.

The network White House correspondent who writes for a conservative opinion magazine's bosses are liberal and they're always quietly denouncing him for being a right-wing nut.

The word liberalism is pretty much dead. Therefore, it's not a liberal bias; it's an anti-Republican, anti-right, anti-Christian Coalition bias. That's the bias.

I submit these observations into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the hopes they are

kept in mind when the topic of media fairness arises.

ROBERT A. FORTINSKY HONORED

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my close personal friend Robert A. Fortinsky, who, on May 20, 1996, will receive the Distinguished Community Service Award from the Greater Wilkes-Barre Society of Fellows Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. I am pleased to have been asked to participate in this event, and I take pride in honoring Bob on the House floor today.

In 1913, the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith was established to fight defamation based on religious, racial, and ethnic prejudices and to promote education, and a more mature understanding of all humankind. Bob Fortinsky has embraced the principles of the Anti-Defamation League, and through his actions has become most deserving of the organization's Distinguished Community Service Award.

Born in Wilkes-Barre in 1929, Bob experienced a traditional Northeastern Pennsylvanian upbringing with a strong commitment to academics. After graduating from Meyer's High School, he enrolled in Penn State university, but his education was interrupted in 1944 when he left college to serve his country in the U.S. Army.

While in the Army, Bob's leadership qualities became evident to his superiors who promoted him to Second Lieutenant. Upon attaining this rank, Bob became the youngest second lieutenant in the Army Chemical Corps. Following his service to his country, Bob returned to Penn State where he graduated with a Bachelor of Science degree in chemistry.

Using the resources of leadership and a strong education, Bob established Fortune Fabrics, Inc. in 1949. Since that time he has established several other companies including Wyoming Weavers, Inc. in 1975 and Jilj Enterprises, Inc. in 1983. Throughout all of his business dealings, he has always operated his businesses with adherence to the highest ethical standards and a commitment to producing the best quality products.

Bob's leadership is not only evident in his business successes, but in the community organizations and clubs to which he lends his skills and time. In 1972 and 1984, Bob was Chairman of the United Jewish Appeal Campaign, and from 1973 to 1976 he served as the President of the Jewish Community Center of Wilkes-Barre. Bob was Co-Chairman of the Jewish Community Center's Endowment Fund, and in 1985 he became Chairman of Israel Bonds. He also served as President of Temple Israel and later served as Chairman of the Board of Temple Israel. In 1988 he was honored by Wilkes University with the dedication of Fortinsky Hall.

Today, Bob Fortinsky continues to be active in many community organizations and private clubs. He is a Director of the Luzerne National Bank, and a member of the International Textile Society. In addition to being a Trustee of Wilkes University, he is a member of the university's John Wilkes Society. He became a

board member of the Fox Hill Country Club in 1996 after serving as President of the club during the previous year. Bob is also a member of the Wyoming Business Club and the King's College Century Club.

Mr. Speaker, Bob Fortinsky is a truly exceptional businessman and an outstanding community leader. He and his wife, Shirley, are responsible for making so many significant contributions to the betterment mankind. I wish Bob and his family everlasting success and happiness.

FISCAL YEAR 1997 BUDGET RESOLUTION

HON. EARL POMEROY

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, minutes ago I voted in favor of the coalition budget, a plan to balance the budget in 6 years with \$137 billion more in deficit reduction than the Republican proposal. Given that the coalition budget was not approved, the House is now faced with a choice between the President's budget plan and the Republican plan.

I rise in support of the President's proposal and in opposition to the majority budget resolution. In several critical respects—from its support for the Federal health care programs that protect our Nation's seniors, poor children, and the disabled, to the agriculture programs that support the productivity of our farmers, to the investment it provides in the education of our children—the President's plan is vastly superior to the Republican budget.

However, in the area of veterans programs, the President's plan is seriously deficient. The President should modify his budget to provide a funding commitment more like that contained in the coalition budget. The coalition budget provides \$112 billion—\$5 billion more than the Republican plan and \$10 billion more than the President's plan—for discretionary veterans programs. These programs support the medical care, education, training, and rehabilitation services for those who served our Nation in times of war. I believe the coalition budget provides the appropriate level of funding for our veterans, and I urge both sides to adopt the coalition budget's funding commitment to the programs that serve our veterans.

HONORING THE EAGLEVILLE VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to applaud the invaluable services provided by the Eagleville Volunteer Fire Department. These brave, civic-minded people give freely of their time so that we may all feel safer at night.

Few realize the depth of training and hard work that goes into being a volunteer firefighter. To quote one of my local volunteers, "These fireman must have an overwhelming desire to do for others while expecting nothing in return."

Preparation includes twice-monthly training programs in which they have live drills, study the latest videos featuring the latest in firefighting tactics, as well as attend seminars where they can obtain the knowledge they need to save lives. Within a year of becoming a volunteer firefighter, most attend the Tennessee fire training school in Murfreesboro where they undergo further, intensified training.

When the residents of my district go to bed at night, they know that should disaster strike and their home catch fire, well-trained and qualified volunteer fire departments are ready and willing to give so graciously and generously of themselves. This peace of mind should not be taken for granted.

By selflessly giving of themselves, they ensure a safer future for us all. We owe these volunteer fire departments a debt of gratitude for their service and sacrifice.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE WARD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 173 and 174 on H.R. 3230 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on both rollcalls. I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear in the RECORD immediately following rollcall vote Nos. 173 and 174.

THE SESQUICENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF THE CIVIL WAR

HON. RICHARD H. BAKER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. BAKER of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, we are quickly approaching the sesquicentennial anniversary of the Civil War and in preparation of this, I, along with several colleagues, would like to designate Louisiana State University [L.S.U.] in conjunction with Gettysburg College as flagship institutions which will plan this commemoration.

The centers' goals will include cataloging Civil War archives nationwide and studying the war from the perspective of every conceivable discipline, profession, and occupation. All of this will enable L.S.U. and Gettysburg College to plan a sesquicentennial commemoration that will celebrate Civil War heritage in the North and South, while engaging all citizens in a study of the ways in which both problems and prospects of today evolved out of many facets of the Civil War and its legacy.

Through these centers, we can educate the people about the Civil War. To quote Abraham Lincoln, "We will hope to reach the old and the young, the rich and the poor, the grave and the gay, of all sexes and tongues, and colors and conditions." These two centers will, as students and guardians of the American past, have done the most important public duty of our lives, and, with the grace of God, will have served the peoples of the United States and the world.

THE POLISH ARMY VETERANS ASSOCIATION POST 40, HAMMOND, IN

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor to congratulate the Polish Army Veterans Association [PAVA] Post 40 in Hammond, IN on its 75th anniversary. PAVA Post 40 will hold an anniversary celebration at its banquet hall in Hammond this Saturday, May 18, 1996. I especially would like to congratulate post commander, Mr. Walter Prygon, and post financial secretary, Mr. Zenon Wicinski, and all the other members of PAVA Post 40 for their time-honored dedication to preserve their Polish heritage and to assist their fellow countrymen in times of need. Joining the celebration will be Edward Repay, president of the Hammond City Council, and Lake County sheriff, John Buncich.

The history of the PAVA is one of pride and honor. At the beginning of World War I, while the United States was still a neutral country, several prominent Polish-Americans issued an appeal to organize a volunteer army to fight the threat to Poland's freedom. Because the United States was still neutral at this time, it granted permission to Polish-American leaders to form an army to help with the war in Poland. Within the framework of the so-called Act of Arming, thousands of young Polish immigrants in the United States and Canada presented themselves for training. This training took place at Camp Niagara, in Canada.

After training, the recruits were sent to France under the command of the leader of the Polish Armed Forces, Gen. Jozef Haller. General Haller named these troops the "Blekitna Armia" (Blue Army) after the color of their uniforms. Under the command of General Haller, the Blue Army contributed to the end of the Polish-Red Communist conflict. However, because Poland was destroyed by war and 150 years of bondage by neighboring countries, Poland could not compensate General Haller and the Blue Army for their heroic stand and sacrifice. After completing their duties, the Blue Army soldiers returned to the United States and Canada in tattered uniforms.

Once back in the United States, the soldiers sought to continue the traditions they developed in Poland by forming a veterans organization in the United States and Canada. This organization was registered in the United States under the name of the Polish Army Veterans Association. Currently, the national headquarters is located in Cleveland, OH, and there are 70 posts with about 2,000 members throughout the country. The purpose of the organization, as incorporated in its own constitution, is to bring help to those less fortunate, as well as to hold social gatherings in an effort to cultivate and continue Polish traditions.

Before World War I, the majority of Polish immigrants in the United States settled in industrial towns, such as Hammond, IN and others in northwest Indiana. These Polish-American settlers included discharged soldiers of General Haller's army. These immigrants registered with the national headquarters of the Polish Army Veterans Association, and, on May 5, 1921, they were officially designated as Post 40. Eventually, the members of Post

40 realized they needed their own home office, which led to the purchase of the building at 241 Gostlin Street in Hammond. This remains their current home office. Local organizations hold special events at Post 40, including the Soccer Club "Polonia," Saturday School of Polish Language, and academia group 3095. In 1936, the Women's Auxiliary at Post 40 was organized by Mrs. W. Wytrzymalski, who also became the first president. The Women's Auxiliary has offered its assistance in all veterans' undertakings, especially in its collection of "Blawatek" (Polish Buddy Poppies), which are sold to help raise money for the veterans.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate my congratulations to Post 40 Commander Prygon, Financial Secretary Wicinski, and all members of PAVA Post 40 for their commitment to remembering their Polish heritage, as well as their commitment to improving the quality of life for all residents of Indiana's First Congressional District. May their 75th anniversary celebration be a joyous one.

COLUMBUS HOUSE HONORED

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, the week of May 13–20, 1996 will officially be declared Columbus House Awareness Week. Columbus House is an organization which delivers both emergency care and shelter to the homeless and seeks to assist homeless persons in finding permanent housing. On May 19, 1996 Columbus House will honor their volunteers.

Columbus House opened in 1982 and was New Haven's first shelter for homeless men and women. The original mission of the organization was to provide basic food and shelter services. However, it has since evolved and expanded. The organization now seeks to understand and address the problems that lead to homelessness. The Columbus House has been nationally recognized for innovative programs. One such program is the Length of Stay Program, in which the residents set goals for themselves and develop a timetable in which to achieve them. Columbus House also charges residents a nominal fee for their stay, a practice which promotes the ultimate goal of self-reliance.

The dual mission of Columbus House is what makes it so remarkable and valuable to the New Haven community. Providing emergency housing is a crucial community service. The shelter has not only emergency shelter beds but also provides several outreach services. These include a mobile crisis van and outreach workers who try to link the mentally ill with the treatment and services they need. Columbus House aims to help residents become self-sufficient and able to maintain permanent housing. In addition to providing counseling, job training, and medical care, Columbus House strives to cultivate a sense of self-worth, self-dignity, and self-reliance in those who feel that their lives are beyond their control. It is rebuilding a resident's sense of self that is the key to the program's success. Columbus House gives residents the tools to

handle life on their own and to effectively seek resolutions to their problems.

The work of caring for the homeless has become increasingly difficult. Many people are no longer compassionate about the plight of the homeless and are frustrated by the many problems that come together to contribute to homelessness. I commend Columbus House for facing all the issues that surround homelessness and continuing to work every day to solve them. I am proud to join Columbus House in applauding the many volunteers who make the day-to-day operation a success. I thank Columbus House for over a decade of service to the New Haven community.

HONORING THE DEKALB COUNTY VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to applaud the invaluable services provided by the DeKalb County Volunteer Fire Department. These brave civic-minded people give freely of their time so that we may all feel safer at night.

Few realize the depth of training and hard work that goes into being a volunteer firefighter. To quote one of my local volunteers, "These firemen must have an overwhelming desire to do for others while expecting nothing in return."

Preparation includes twice-monthly training programs in which they have live drills, study the latest videos featuring the latest in firefighting tactics, as well as attend seminars where they can obtain the knowledge they need to save lives. Within a year of becoming a volunteer firefighter, most attend the Tennessee fire training school in Murfreesboro where they undergo further, intensified training.

When the residents of my district go to bed at night, they know that should disaster strike and their home catch fire, well-trained and qualified volunteer fire departments are ready and willing to give so graciously and generously of themselves. This peace of mind should not be taken for granted.

By selflessly giving of themselves, they ensure a safer future for us all. We owe these volunteer fire departments a debt of gratitude for their service and sacrifice.

INTRODUCTION OF THE MEDICAL PRIVACY IN THE AGE OF NEW TECHNOLOGIES ACT

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing the Medical Privacy in the Age of New Technologies Act. This legislation will ensure that a patient's personal health information will not be disclosed without that patient's consent.

For the first time, patients nationwide will have control of their medical records and have the right to deny outsiders access to their private medical information.

This sounds like a simple principle with which the medical community should already comply. Unfortunately, current medical privacy guidelines are inadequate and vary from State to State. In fact, the papers are filled with horror stories about insurers, banks, and employers misusing health information to discriminate against individuals. While businesses gain this medical information to the detriment of the rest of us, only 28 States, including Washington currently allow people even to examine their own medical records.

The legislation I am introducing today will give individuals the right to know what is being done with their medical information. It will place in the individual's control what is done with that information, who sees it, and why.

In addition to being inadequate, today's privacy standards fail to address the impact of new technologies on our medical system. These new technologies deeply affect the privacy of health information. This bill addresses the threats to an individual's health information from new genetic technologies, and from the computerization of medical records.

Genetic health information is an especially sensitive part of a patient's medical record. As knowledge increases about the genetic component of many common diseases, so does the possibility that information in an individual's medical file will be used to deny entire families health care coverage. One recent study documented 200 cases of healthy people being denied jobs, insurance, the right to adopt, and educational opportunities because they either had or were suspected to have a genetic predisposition for a disease, even though they did not actually have the disease.

Computers have revolutionized the way in which an individual's medical information is collected, stored, and disseminated. Without adequate enforceable standards, this information can easily be misused to breach the privacy rights of patients and lead to several forms of discrimination.

Now, I don't want to get into horror stories which already have occurred in the private sector, but I do want to warn you that Congress has yet to realize the importance and consequences of computer technologies in the medical system. Just last month, the House passed Administrative Simplification provisions as part of the Kennedy-Kassebaum health insurance reform bill. These provisions would force doctors to computerize sensitive patient medical records to make it easier for insurance companies to bill patients. Yet, in making it easier for insurance companies to maximize their profits, Congress failed to attach adequate privacy protections. New technologies have the potential to improve the quality of health care, to help doctors effectively treat their patients, and to lower the cost of health care. However, strong medical record privacy protections must be in place to ensure that such technologies are not misused to discriminate against patients and their families.

I believe this bill gives patients the right to protect their personal health information from being misused and prevent them from feeling the wrath of discrimination to which the erosion of medical standards could lead.

HONORING LANCE CPL. JACKIE
PAUL CHIDESTER

HON. ROBERT W. NEY
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the following article to my colleagues:

Approximately 2:00 a.m., on May 10, 1996 at Camp Lejeune, NC, two U.S. Marine Corps helicopters collided while participating in "Combined Joint Task Force Exercise 96." This exercise known as "war games" consisted of 53,000 British and American troops. The incident which occurred in a wooded area near Courthouse Bay boat basin at Camp Lejeune involved a troop carrier and an assault helicopter. There were 16 victims, 14 dead or in critical condition.

Lance Cpl. Jackie Chidester, 23, of Newark, OH was one of the 14 servicemen that died. Jackie was part of the S-3 BLT 2/8 24th NEU(SOC) Unit. The Battalion Landing Team of the 2nd Division, 8th Marine Regiment, 24 Marine Expeditionary Unit (Special Operations Capable).

Lance Cpl. Chidester excelled in the classroom and in athletics while attending Licking Valley High School. He was the captain of the Licking Valley football team in 1990 when they clinched the championship and won all-league honors. He also was a State qualifier in wrestling during his junior year. In 1991, Jackie graduated from Licking Valley and attended Heidelberg College in Tiffin, OH. Lance Cpl. Chidester was the son of Imogene Miller and Jackie Lee Chidester.

"He fulfilled a life long dream when he enlisted in the Marine Corps," his father stated, "he loved the Marines. It was rough, tough, and he loved it."

Whereas, the citizens of the United States and the 18th Congressional District of Ohio, with a real sense of honor join me in commending Lance Cpl. Jackie Paul Chidester on his dedication to serve and protect our great country. He will be greatly missed by his family, friends, and colleagues in the Marine Corps.

TRIBUTE TO THE HERNDON MIDDLE SCHOOL SYMPHONIC BAND

HON. THOMAS M. DAVIS
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today and pay tribute to the Herndon Middle School Symphonic Band, which will receive one of the most prestigious international awards for junior high and intermediate school bands. On May 19, 1996, the Herndon Middle School Symphonic Band will receive the John Philip Sousa Foundation's Sudler Silver Cup, an honor which recognizes junior high and intermediate school bands that have demonstrated the highest standards of excellence in all respects of their activities. Under the direction of a very dedicated and talented music director, Mrs. Noreen Linnemann, it is one of only two bands from the entire United States and Canada to receive this coveted award this year.

Each year, the John Philip Sousa Foundation awards the Sudler Silver Cup after conducting a rigorous selection process undertaken by a committee made up of nationally-known band conductors. The selection committee chooses award recipients based on the following criteria: First, the band's music director has been incumbent in his or her position for at least 7 consecutive years; second, the band has maintained a high standard of excellence in the concert area for several years; third, the band has received a superior rating at State, regional, or national levels of competition; fourth, the band has performed at significant meetings at State, regional, and national levels; fifth, a number of students in the band have participated in district and all-State honor bands or similar groups. There is no limit on the number of bands which can receive the Sudler Silver Cup each year. So indeed, not only is it a remarkable accomplishment that the Herndon Middle School Symphonic Band earned this honor, it is equally commendable that it is one of only two bands worthy of receiving the award in 1996.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues will join me in applauding the hard work and commitment of Mrs. Linnemann and this talented group of young musicians. I congratulate them on receiving this distinguished award and for making their parents, neighbors, and community proud of this exceptional achievement.

RAOUL WALLENBERG COMMEMORATIVE STAMP UNVEILING

HON. JAMES C. GREENWOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an American hero, Raoul Wallenberg. Raoul Wallenberg risked his life to save thousands of people from the Holocaust in Budapest, Hungary. His legacy is to remind us all of what is truly great about mankind. He selflessly risked his own life to save anywhere from 30,000 to 150,000 Jews from the Nazis.

On May 8, 1996, the U.S. Postal Service paid special tribute to Raoul Wallenberg by unveiling a 1997 commemorative stamp in his honor.

Mr. Speaker, the issue of creating a commemorative stamp for Raoul Wallenberg was brought to my attention in 1992 when I was first elected to the U.S. House of Representatives. My constituent, Ilene Pachman, residing in Richboro, PA, asked me to support her national effort to solicit the U.S. Postal Service in issuing a commemorative stamp for this extraordinary man.

Since that time, with Ilene's help, we sent two letters to the Postmaster General, Marvin Runyon, asking that a commemorative stamp be issued honoring Raoul Wallenberg. Both letters were signed by over 50 Members of the House of Representatives.

Initially, Mrs. Pachman was inspired by the accounts of both Dr. Vera Goodkin, a New Jersey professor saved by Wallenberg, and Angela Adachi of New York, who was his personal aide in Budapest. Later, around the time that the Elvis Presley stamp was being issued, when Mrs. Pachman read that Adolph Eichmann is better known than Wallenberg, she re-

alized the need for and the value of a U.S. Wallenberg stamp.

Ilene said that she "gleaned ideas and found supporters from watching speakers on C-Span and from endless networking." All of her hard work paid off, and like Raoul Wallenberg, Ilene did not give up her quest.

I would like to take this opportunity to personally thank Ilene Pachman. It is due to her determination and enthusiasm that the U.S. Postal Service as well as all Americans are honoring the memory and commemorating the life of a true American hero, Raoul Wallenberg.

Thank you, Ilene.

HONORING THE AUBURNTOWN
VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. BART GORDON
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to applaud the invaluable services provided by the Auburntown Volunteer Fire Department. These brave, civic-minded people give freely of their time so that we may all feel safer at night.

Few realize the depth of training and hard work that goes into being a volunteer firefighter. To quote one of my local volunteers, "These firemen must have an overwhelming desire to do for others while expecting nothing in return."

Preparation includes twice-monthly training programs in which they have live drills, study the latest videos featuring the latest in firefighting tactics, as well as attend seminars where they can obtain the knowledge they need to save lives. Within a year of becoming a volunteer firefighter, most attend the Tennessee fire training school in Murfreesboro where they undergo further, intensified training.

When the residents of my district go to bed at night, they know that should disaster strike and their home catch fire, well-trained and qualified volunteer fire departments are ready and willing to give so graciously and generously of themselves. This peace of mind should not be taken for granted.

By selflessly giving of themselves, they ensure a safer future for us all. We owe these volunteer fire departments a debt of gratitude for their service and sacrifice.

AN HONEST BUDGET FOR
AMERICAN FAMILIES

HON. RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the work that this Congress has done in the interest of our children and the generations to come. In my 20 years with the U.S. Navy and my few short years in Congress, I believe that being part of the Republican effort to balance the Federal budget is the most important work I've done in my life.

While the President is fully engaged in the campaign to save his job, the Republican-led

Congress continues the hard work to produce a sound, realistic, and responsible budget that ends the nightmare of Federal deficit spending by the year 2002.

The American people have demanded an honest balanced budget from their Government. Let's take a look at who is offering them one:

Predictably, President Clinton has once again sent the American people a budget that uses political tricks and sleight-of-hand economics to get to balance. According to the independent Congressional Budget Office [CBO] the only way that the President's budget will reach balance by 2002 is if he applies a contingency proposal in the last 2 years. In 2001 and 2002, long after this President will be out of office, the Clinton budget relies on \$67 billion in unspecified cuts and a \$16 billion tax increase in order to reach balance. Thus, the Clinton Budget fails to be honest with the American people.

Our Republican budget, on the other hand, slowly and steadily reduces the Federal deficit every year for the next 6 years. It is really a budget for our children and for the future of all Americans. Under our plan, the Federal Government will actually have a surplus of over \$3 billion dollars in the year 2002 and we get to balance by actually spending more on the programs that are important to all Americans. No more putting off the tough decisions, and no more sending the bill to our kids to pay.

The Republican budget saves Medicare from bankruptcy, increasing spending on seniors' health care from this year's \$5200 per beneficiary to over \$7000 per beneficiary by 2002. We increase access to important student loan programs that help young Americans provide for their education. To help students get these loans, the Republican plan increases student loan volume from \$26 billion in 1996 to a total of \$37 billion in 2002.

Our budget also places a priority on keeping the promise that we have made with the veterans that have defended our country over the years by rejecting the \$5.1 billion in additional cuts that were recommended in the President's budget.

Our budget continues our effort to eliminate wasteful and redundant Federal programs and reform runaway Federal spending on a broken welfare system so that we can target precious resources toward working for and with American families. The budget calls for the elimination of the Department of Energy and Commerce, as well as over 130 other Federal agencies or programs.

This Republican budget puts cash into the checkbooks of American households. It allows families to keep more of their hard earned money through tax relief. The budget includes a \$500 per child tax credit for families earning less than \$100,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support House Concurrent Resolution 178, a sound, solid, and sincere budget that takes power, money, and control away from Washington bureaucrats and special interests and returns it to the American people, where it belongs.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID PACKARD

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to David Packard, an extraordinary American leader in industry, philanthropy, business management, public and community service, who passed away March 26, 1996. He will be remembered as a legendary figure in our national life who never lost sight of the need to value people and improve the world in which he lived.

David Packard began his partnership with Bill Hewlett in 1939, founding the Hewlett-Packard Co., with \$538 in a garage in Palo Alto, CA. From those humble beginnings, he guided his company in earning a reputation for product excellence and building a work force of over 100,000 people worldwide. In the process, David Packard helped launch what eventually became known as Silicon Valley.

He developed a management system known as the "HP Way" which reflected his belief in corporate responsibility for workers, customers, and the community at large. Hewlett-Packard was among the first companies in the Nation to develop catastrophic medical insurance, profit-sharing for all employees, flex time for workers, and benefits such as stock-purchase options.

In 1964, David Packard began contributing his wealth to the community on a large scale through the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, named for him and his beloved wife. Over the years, the foundation has given generously to the Monterey Bay Aquarium Research Institute; a nationwide program of science and engineering research fellowships; scholarships in science and mathematics at historically black colleges; the Stanford Theatre, and school music programs throughout Santa Clara, San Mateo, Santa Cruz, and Monterey Counties. In addition to the foundation, David Packard also personally donated substantial sums of his personal wealth to start the Monterey Bay Aquarium and the Lucile Salter Packard Children's Hospital.

David Packard gave distinguished service to his country as Deputy Secretary of Defense during the Nixon administration. He participated in civic affairs as a member of the White House Science Council, the President's Blue Ribbon Commission on Defense Management, and the Palo Alto School Board.

Mr. Speaker, David Packard was an extraordinary leader, an exemplary entrepreneur, a manager par excellence, a philanthropist, and a highly respected national and community leader. He inspired his workers, won the devotion of his friends, and earned the gratitude of his Nation. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring David Packard and his life of extraordinary achievements.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH ESSAY CONTEST WINNERS

HON. JACK QUINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the academic efforts of three students

from Orchard Park Central Middle School in the 30th Congressional District of New York State.

For 2 years now, I have sponsored a Black History Month Essay Contest open to seventh and eighth grade students in our western New York community. This year, students from several area schools submitted essays for the contest to be judged by Mr. Donald Ogilve, superintendent of Hamburg Central Schools; Ms. Maureen Bigha, director of reading and Federal projects for Lackawanna Central Schools; and Mr. Jim Borow, chairperson of the English department at Cheektowaga Central Schools.

As a former teacher, I am very proud of all of the young people who participated in this contest. After careful consideration, however, our panel selected three winners, all from Orchard Park Central.

The 1996 Black History Month Essay Contest winner was Mr. Jacob Teplesky whose informative essay focused upon legendary track and field athlete Ms. Wilma Rudolph.

Second and third place winners were Miss Alanna Rufat and Miss Amy Nunn, respectively. The subject of each of their essays was the heroic efforts of Ms. Harriet Tubman on behalf of slaves in the 19th century.

Mr. Speaker, today I join with the families of these fine young students, the faculty and staff of Orchard Park Middle School, and indeed, the entire western New York community to recognize the insightful and informative essay submissions of Mr. Jacob Teplesky, Miss Alanna Rufat, and Miss Amy Nunn.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 14th, I was unavoidably detained and missed Rollcall Vote 168—An amendment to provide authorities to the President to achieve increases in burdensharing by U.S. allies. Had I been present, I would have voted "AYE."

Last year, as I had done in previous years, I opposed an effort to increase burdensharing by our allies, primarily due to concerns that the proposal put forth would have required the withdrawal of U.S. troops abroad. As my voting history demonstrates, I have supported amendments urging the President to enter into burdensharing negotiations, but I have opposed proposals that mandate a reduction in troop levels.

The Shays-Frank-Upton amendment to the Fiscal Year 1997 National Defense Authorization Act has been drafted in a way that provides more flexibility and latitude to the president in seeking increases in defense burdensharing by U.S. allies. For example, the president may impose taxes or fees similar to those imposed on our forces in foreign countries, and may reduce U.S. contributions to the NATO budget or other bilateral accounts. In addition, the amendment gives the president and the Secretary of Defense more than a year to negotiate increased contributions from our allies who benefit from U.S. troops stationed abroad. Given these modifications to past burdensharing amendments, I support the Shay-Frank-Upton amendment.

1996 HUMANITARIAN AWARDS,
GREATER LONG BEACH NA-
TIONAL CONFERENCE

HON. STEPHEN HORN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor both the Greater Long Beach National Conference and those who have been named as the recipients of its Humanitarian Awards—the Reverend Ken McMillian, Suzanne Norstrwothy, Henry Taboada, and Dr. David Tillman.

For more than 30 years, the Greater Long Beach National Conference has been building the bridges of good will in our community, bringing people of all races, religions, and cultures together to facilitate mutual respect, understanding, and friendship. As the United States moves into the 21st century, the strength of our Nation will be based upon the respect, appreciation, and acceptance we offer to one another. For more the three decades, the Greater Long Beach National Conference has been leading us toward that goal.

Those who are being honored by the Conference's Humanitarian Award personify the outstanding efforts of this organization. The life each recipient exemplifies the mission of the conference to be an encouraging voice for the inclusion of all peoples. Their contributions continue to make our community a better place in which to live. Their work has enriched us all.

Those who would seek to build strong ties among all members of their communities would do well to study closely the efforts of the Greater Long Beach National Conference and the recipients of its Humanitarian Award. They stand as a model for the Nation.

DR. SARAH M. WILDER, 1996 CON-
GRESSIONAL SENIOR CITIZEN IN-
TERN

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. STOKES, Mr. Speaker, each year during the month of May, our Nation celebrates National Senior Citizen Month. In communities throughout the United States, senior citizens are recognized for their contributions to their communities and the Nation. In conjunction with Senior Citizen Month, seniors from across the Nation are scheduled to gather on Capitol Hill in a few days for the annual Congressional Senior Citizen Intern Program.

The Senior Citizen Intern Program has proved to be extremely successful. During their weeklong stay in Washington, DC, seniors receive a firsthand look at their Government in action. They attend meetings, workshops, and issue forums on topics which impact the elderly community in particular. The forums also provide an opportunity for extensive dialog with congressional leaders, members of the President's Cabinet, and other policymakers.

I rise to salute my Congressional Senior Citizen Intern for 1996, Dr. Sarah M. Wilder, an outstanding resident of the Eleventh Congress-

sional District, will travel to Capitol Hill to participate in the Senior Citizen Intern Program. I want to share with my colleagues some biographical information on Dr. Wilder.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that during the forums on Capitol Hill, health care will be at the top of the agenda for discussion. I am pleased that Dr. Wilder comes to Capitol Hill armed with a wealth of educational, administrative, and instructional experience in the field of health and nutrition. She received her bachelor of science degree in institutional management from Tuskegee University, and a master's degree in public health nutrition from Case Western Reserve University. In 1988, she earned her Ph.D. in community systems planning and development: health planning administration, from Pennsylvania State University. Dr. Wilder's dissertation consisted of an exploratory study of in-home services provided to elderly citizens through informal support systems.

Dr. Wilder also has a vast amount of administrative experience. During her career, she has served as director of dietetics for a convalescent and rehabilitation center; she has served as president of an in-home health care agency; and she is past president of a traveling nutrition dietetic educational management system. In addition, Dr. Wilder is the author of the first health-oriented dietetic technology program in the State of Ohio. Further, she developed and conducted community training sessions focusing on health issues such as diabetes, hypertension, CPR, and nutrition. Dr. Wilder has also traveled extensively over the years, sharing her expertise and insight with health organizations and students around the globe.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Wilder currently serves as professor of dietetic technology at Cuyahoga Community College in Cleveland, OH. Her memberships include president and charter member of the National Organization of Blacks in Dietetics and Nutrition; past president and secretary of the Cleveland Dietetic Association; member of the American Association of University Professors; and past secretary of the American Dietetic Association Foundation. In addition, Dr. Wilder chairs the Research and Education Hunger/Malnutrition Committee of the American Dietetic Association. She has authored numerous journals and reports, and has presented lectures on nutrition and other health issues.

Dr. Wilder is the recipient of awards and honors which recognize her strong commitment and dedication. She is the recipient of the Distinguished Alumni Award from Pennsylvania State University, and the Teacher of the Year Award by the Ohio Association of Two Year Colleges. Dr. Wilder was also honored with the establishment of the S. Wilder Dietetic/Nutrition Scholarship Endowment Fund administered by the American Dietetic Association.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Sarah M. Wilder is an individual of extraordinary talent and ability. I take pride in welcoming her to our Nation's Capitol as my Congressional Senior Citizen Intern. I am certain that she will do an outstanding job, and the Eleventh Congressional District and the Nation will benefit from her service on Capitol Hill.

HUDSON RIVER HABITAT
RESTORATION ACT

HON. SUE W. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Hudson River is one of the crown jewels of America's wonders. It has helped to shape our Nation's history and its beauty has inspired generations of Americans. This is why I rise today to introduce the Hudson River Habitat Restoration Act of 1996, legislation to authorize Federal funding for needed habitat restoration projects along New York's Hudson River.

A Reconnaissance report released by the Corps of Engineers in February 1995 identified several critical habitat restoration projects along the Hudson River in New York—projects intended to restore habitats damaged by industry and agricultural operations that have occurred along the river over the past century. My predecessor, former Congressman Hamilton Fish, secured the funds for the reconnaissance study. My legislation seeks to continue this process by authorizing funding for one or more of the priority projects identified by the Corps' study.

Mr. Speaker, the Hudson River estuary is an important habitat to a wide range of waterfowl and aquatic species. Many important habitats along the river—wetlands, marshes, and so forth—have been degraded over the past century as industry and agriculture grew along the river. My legislation seeks Federal funding for critical habitat projects identified by the Corps of Engineers and New York's Department of Environmental Conservation.

Recently, I had the pleasure of touring the Manitou Marsh in Phillipstown, Putnam County, one of the sites identified in the Corps' study and an ideal candidate for restoration. The marsh is a very productive ecosystem, great habitat for raptors, waterfowl and fish, and serves to clean pollutants from the river. Road and factory construction dating from the 19th century has adversely affected the tidal flows in and out of the marsh, a problem my legislation seeks to correct.

This legislation supports an ongoing and cooperative effort that has involved various levels of government, including the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the New York Department of Environmental Conservation, local environmental organizations, such as the Museum of the Hudson Highlands, Scenic Hudson, and the Audubon Society, as well as private sector businesses, such as Metro North Railroad.

Passage of the Hudson River Habitat Restoration Act will be an important step in protecting the environmental quality of this important waterway. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation.

TRIBUTE TO GLADYS M. STERN

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, last night, hundreds of people filled Lisner Auditorium in a rare tribute to one of America's leading educators, Gladys M. Stern. Gladys Stern has

been headmistress of Georgetown Day School for 21 of her 42 years at the school. This year, she will retire leaving an extraordinary legacy.

Georgetown Day was the first private school in the District of Columbia to be integrated in a city which in virtually every respect was a Jim Crow replica of the deep South. Gladys came to the school in 1961 as an assistant director after spending her time volunteering in a variety of capacities. Gladys—as she is fondly called by students and peers alike—took on the task of building a new high school at Georgetown Day, embracing the challenge with enthusiasm that became her signature. She counts the successful completion of that project as her most fulfilling accomplishment.

In 1975, Gladys was named headmistress of Georgetown Day at a time when most private schools around the country were run by men. Stressing the values of high academic standards, respect for the individual, and diversity, Gladys soon became a model educator, not for the District alone, but for the Nation itself. To her students, the real beneficiaries of her legacy, she will always be known as just plain, "Gladys."

Gladys M. Stern, a Washington institution in her own right, was celebrated last night by students whose names are unfamiliar and by others with the most familiar names in Washington—Art Buchwald, Judith Viorst, Frank Mankiewicz, Judith Martin (Miss Manners) and Sam Gilliam, among others. I am pleased to submit the brief words of tribute that I offered into the RECORD as well:

The word is out that Gladys has gotten tired of being an institution. So she is retiring so that she can go back to being a person again. Actually, Gladys is a person with such an extraordinary persona that she has survived being institutionalized by and sometimes at GDS. Tonight she must wonder whether she can survive being ritualized. The most uncomfortable experience is hearing people say great things about you in public to your face. Uncomfortable yes, Gladys, but I hope that the gentle lady will not be heard to object.

Speaking of gentle ladies, education has become one of the hottest topics in the 104th Congress. I think I know why. This is the Congress that discovered the deficit and then discovered that talk about education is cheap. So there's a lot of it.

We'd be much better off if we talked about individual school. You don't have to be the mother of a GDS lifer to think that GDS would be counted in that number Gladys Stern is a major reason why. So Gladys, all I can say about all these wonderful things they are saying about you tonight is "Believe it." Denial will get you nowhere. I'm going to see just how much you can stand. Tonight is not the end of the endless tribute. Tomorrow I will place a tribute to you in the nation's official record, The Congressional Record. No, this is not to get back at Newt and the boys, it's the only way I have to tell the world what a first class educator and world class human being you are. You'll just have to suffer through it Gladys. Mazel tov.

HAPPY 25TH MCGILLIVRAY-
WEBSTER-SPENCER VFW POST 3735

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, military service has a proud tradition in our country, and those

who have served in the Army, Navy, Air Force or Marines have a camaraderie that cannot be matched by any other activity. That spirit of togetherness has been maintained after service through the participation of veterans in distinguished organizations like the Veterans of Foreign Wars. VFW Post 3735, in Oscoda, MI, is celebrating its 25th anniversary this Saturday, and I am honored to recognize this important event with this history of the Post.

VFW Post 3735 is known as McGillivray-Webster-Spencer Post 3735. It is named in honor of three area veterans who were killed in battle. Staff Sergeant Donald McGillivray was killed in action on October 2, 1944, on Anguar Island in the southwest Pacific. Corporal Calvin Webster was the first local fatality of the Korean conflict, having been killed in action as a platoon leader on January 28, 1945. First Lieutenant James F. Spencer died of injuries he sustained in a helicopter crash in Vietnam on October 28, 1969. The return of his dog tags helped to encourage his mother, Mrs. Mary Spencer, to urge the Postal Service to develop the POW-MIA commemorative stamp that was issued last Memorial Day.

These three heroes of democracy and self-sacrifice are an appropriate inspiration to all of us who need to understand and there are times when we must serve our country, and a strong reminder that democracy should never be taken for granted because the price of preserving it can often be high.

The charter for both the VFW post and the VFW Auxiliary were approved on April 17, 1971, with 81 founding members, under the command of Harold Davis for the Post and 33 with Madalyne Davis as the first president for the Auxiliary. Today there are 427 distinguished members of McGillivray-Webster-Spencer Post 3735, including many of the original members who will be specially recognized by current Post Commander Tom Astrom and other dignitaries from the VFW and public officials for the 25 year membership this Saturday. The entire program, chaired by Ken Ratliff, will be a moving tribute to the service and dedication of veterans who survived these conflicts, veterans who endured on-going injuries from these conflicts, and those like SSgt. McGillivray, Cpl. Webster, and Lt. Spencer who made the ultimate sacrifice for their nation.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when we must take a hard look at our Nation's priorities, never let us forget that our strength is not in our planes, ships, tanks, or other armaments. Rather, the real strength is in our dedicated men and women who serve now or who have served previously in our Armed Forces. We are a nation of men and women, under God, dedicated to liberty and justice for all, and we are only as good as our own commitment to these causes.

I am proud that we can count on wonderful people like those of Oscoda and the veterans of McGillivray-Webster-Spencer Post 3735. Mr. Speaker, I urge you and all of our colleagues to join me in wishing the members of this Post, a most memorable 25th anniversary, with our thanks for all that they have done.

BUDGET RESOLUTION

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago we were all engaged in a tough debate commonly referred to as the "battle of the budget." Once again, we are here debating the budget and lines are being drawn in the sand. While the budget which is before us is not as outrageous as the budget resolution before us last year, however, this budget resolution is still out of touch with the average American. This resolution harms programs that benefit many of our constituents and represent values which I think should define America.

For the past few years, I have been very active on the debate on welfare. We all agree with President Clinton that "we have to end welfare as we know it." The welfare provisions of this budget resolution are better than the budget which was passed Congress, but the structural changes this provision makes are fatally flawed.

All individual guarantees for assistance to needy families would be replaced with block grants to the States. The States would receive funding but there is not enough guidance from the Federal level to determine how these funds will be spent. Also, the maintenance of effort requirements are weak. The cornerstone of welfare reform should be work. The only way to successfully reform welfare is to move individuals toward work. This cannot be done without having a successful work program which is adequately funded.

Not only does this budget resolution not provide funding for work. It cuts the earned-income tax credit by \$20 billion over 7 years. President Reagan referred to the earned-income tax credit as "the best, antipoverty, the best pro-family, the best job-creation measure to come out of Congress." Why are we cutting this successful programs that provides an incentive to get off welfare and work? The proposed cuts go beyond eliminating the EITC for childless workers. In Massachusetts, 8 percent of the taxpayers will benefit from the EITC in 1996.

This resolution is less harsh on Medicaid than the resolution before us last year. But once again, the proposal calls for a massive restructuring of the current Medicaid Program and this will hurt the elderly. The proposal does not guarantee low-income seniors who cannot afford Medicare that their premiums and copayments will be covered by Medicaid. This jeopardizes guaranteed health coverage for nursing home residents. Why are we attacking the elderly in this budget? We are hurting those who need our help the most.

Deficit reduction needs to be accomplished and we need to address many complicated issues. We need to continue to talk about these issues. The budget resolution that will be before us tomorrow is not the right solution. Spending in certain areas can be reduced and programs can be reformed, but this budget just goes too far. We need to continue to work on a path to balance the budget and this should be done in a bipartisan manner.

YOUTH CRIME WATCH OF DADE
COUNTY, FL

HON. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to the staff, students, and faculty advisors who comprise Youth Crime Watch of Dade County, a program of Citizens' Crime Watch of Dade County, for their continuing meritorious service and assistance in improving the quality of life within Dade County.

In an era when violence in our Nation's schools is mounting, and the public has come to perceive many young people as apathetic, Youth Crime Watch of Dade County provides a shining example of the best in America's youth. In my community alone, students at schools such as Hialeah Senior, American Senior, Hialeah Middle, Henry H. Filer Middle, and Palm Springs Middle have worked through their Youth Crime Watch of Dade County programs to set up student patrols which have significantly reduced crime in their schools; educated their student bodies on how to anonymously report crimes; collected canned goods, toys, and clothing for needy families; visited orphanages and nursing homes; hosted students from other countries such as Japan and the Bahamas; and worked to alleviate the physical and emotional suffering of the Cuban children who had to endure the camps in Guantanamo. These young leaders undertake these activities not for class credit or special recognition, but simply to satisfy their desire to help others.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to take a moment to recognize the School Board of Dade County, FL, for their unwavering support of the Youth Crime Watch of Dade County program. They have shown great wisdom and foresight in ensuring that this much-needed program continues to reach tens of thousands of students every year.

All of these people—staff, students, and advisors—truly exemplify the ideal of community service. As a Nation, we must be proud to have such individuals in our society. I for one am privileged that so many of them reside in my community.

THE COLVILLE NATIONAL FOREST
ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT OF
TIMBER RESOURCES ACT

HON. GEORGE B. NETHERCUTT, JR.

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Colville National Forest Adaptive Management of Timber Resources Act. The intermountain west and, in particular, a portion of my district in eastern Washington State, are plagued by unhealthy, overstocked forests.

These unhealthy forests are susceptible to catastrophic fires of such intensity that they cook the forest soil and leave the forest floor lifeless. The threat of such disasters lies in the broad expanses of forest stands that are densely overstocked with small-diameter trees

of low vigor. They are highly susceptible to insects and disease, as well as fire. These stands have become that way in part because they have not been managed and because the lower-intensity fires that are nature's way of forest management have been suppressed.

The recently completed 5-year CROP—CREating OPPortunities—study commissioned by the U.S. Forest Service on the Colville National Forest starkly portrays the dimensions of the problem and also points the way toward solutions. This study, conducted during 1989 through 1994, found that more than 525,000 acres of the Colville, or just under half its total land base, had been burned between 1910 and 1934. Of the forest stands generated from these burned acres, 96 percent now have a poor to fair vigor rating, and 42 percent have a moderate to high hazard rating for mountain pine beetle infestation. The productivity of these stands is declining. Insects and disease contribute to the heavy fuel load on these acres, increasing the probability of catastrophic fire requiring a major reforestation effort. Of these fire-generated stands, 86 percent are allocated for emphasis on timber management.

The CROP study determined that thinning these stands would improve vigor, reduce risk, and ultimately create greater stand diversity. There is a 10- to 20-year window of opportunity before the insect hazard becomes significantly worse and the chances for a positive response to thinning diminish. Market opportunities presently exist for the small-diameter trees that would be removed in thinning.

In drafting the Colville National Forest Adaptive Management of Timber Resources Act, I have taken the results of the CROP study, emphasized the need and demand for scientifically based and environmentally acceptable results, and recognized the ongoing substantial reduction in Forest Service funds and trained personnel.

The Colville is a logical place to begin this research because the CROP study has already laid the groundwork, especially in terms of resource inventory and assessment. It would take more preparation time to begin the same project elsewhere.

Upon enactment, a 10-year research and experimentation effort will begin on the Colville that is intended to conserve natural resources without locking them up; provide answers applicable throughout the intermountain west; reduce waste of resources; shift activities from the declining public employees sector to the private sector for savings in cost and efficiency; and help balance the budget by generating revenues from federal assets without increasing expenditures.

The act requires the Secretary of Agriculture to prepare a research plan and supporting environmental documents that provide for implementing and evaluating controlled silvicultural treatment in the affected areas. The purpose of the research is to test the effect of adaptive management techniques in the treatment of such forest stands.

The research area is approximately 110,000 acres of the Colville National Forest. These acres are overstocked, small-diameter, stagnated forest stands in areas generated from fire up to 80 years ago. Research is to begin by the second full field season after enactment, but a demonstration project covering perhaps 10,000 acres can begin as soon as a preliminary draft of the research plan is com-

plete. The research is to continue over a 10-year period, with roughly equal amounts of acreage to be treated each year. Monitoring of the research is to continue for 15 years, with detailed reports of findings and implications to be submitted to Congress at 5-year intervals.

The research will be paid for from a combination of the proportionate funds available for the research area through the normal Forest Service budget and 50 percent of the revenues generated from sales of forest products removed pursuant to the scientific research. Counties will receive their normal 25 percent share of revenue generated by research sales.

The Secretary of Agriculture will be able to use private contractors for the preparation, implementation, and monitoring of the research. He might choose to involve the Center for Sustainable Eastern Washington Ecosystems which was substantially involved in the CROP study that underlies this research. To the greatest extent practicable, the Secretary is to use private contractors from communities adversely affected by reductions in Forest Service timber sales.

Mr. Speaker, 10 to 15 years may sound like a long time for research, monitoring, and broad application of the research finds. But the amount of time is very short before we must begin to deal with the problem of overstocked and underconserved forests. I urge all of my colleagues who despair of the soil-sterilizing large fires that have plagued our forests too often in recent years to join me in support of this bill and help get this vital scientific research underway.

RONALD G. PETTENGILL, PRESIDENT, ROCHESTER LABOR COUNCIL, RETIRES

HON. LOUIS MCINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I call your attention to the retirement of the president of the Rochester Labor Council, AFL-CIO Ronald G. Pettengill. Ron is not only an esteemed labor leader and team player, he is also a wonderful friend, whose hard work and dedication will be greatly missed.

Ron joined the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners in 1955, first as an apprentice, then as a journeyman carpenter, and later as a leader in Local 85. During his tenure the brotherhood's membership significantly grew and the joint apprenticeship program and journeyman training program greatly expanded.

Ron has also served with distinction as the president of the Rochester Labor Council since 1985. He has worked tirelessly to increase the council's influence. Since he assumed the presidency, the council's membership has grown dramatically and now even has a full-time staff person to coordinate the council's activities.

Ron's accomplishments take on even greater significance when viewed in the context of the current work environment. The labor movement must look to quality leaders, like Ron, to fight for worker protection and fair compensation. He has always stood by my side as we fought to promote the interests of our community's working men and women.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to publicly commend the achievements of Ron Pettengill and to wish him a long and healthy retirement.

SIXTH ANNUAL HONOREES BANQUET

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday, May 19, the Interracial Religious Coalition in my community will hold its Sixth Annual Honorees Banquet at the Islamic Center of Greater Toledo. The coalition is to be commended for its celebration of interracial and interreligious harmony and unity.

Four individuals who have contributed to the quality of community relations in our city will be honored at the banquet, Rev. Claude Christopher, pastor of St. Paul AME Zion Church; Joan Coleman, Toledo city councilwoman; Rev. Martin Donnelly, pastor of St. Martin DePorres; and Larry Sykes, division of business development and retail lending, Fifth Third Bank.

I also rise to commend the coalition for passing a recent resolution in response to current strife and loss of life in Lebanon:

Be it resolved that the Interracial Religious Coalition called upon its Members to pray for peace in the Middle East, pray for those who have lost their lives in the strife, and to ask our government to stop the bombing on both sides and continue the pursuit of peace.

The diplomats of Syria, Lebanon, Israel, and France brought together by the Clinton administration in Washington, DC, to arrange for monitoring of the ceasefire between Israel and Hezbollah guerrillas would do well to follow their lead.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MIRA COSTA HIGH SCHOOL

HON. JANE HARMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to salute Mira Costa High School, in the beautiful community of Manhattan Beach, on being selected for a Department of Education Blue Ribbon School Award. Mira Costa High School was 1 of only 266 schools in the Nation recognized for outstanding achievement by the students, teachers, and staff, and an education environment of the highest quality.

The Department of Education awarded Mira Costa the highest rating in areas such as instructional leadership, curriculum, student environment, and parent and community support. I am particularly impressed with Mira Costa's emphasis on technology, which is the backbone of the South Bay's economy now and in the future. In areas such as the Integrated Learning Systems Wastch Lab, the MAC lab, the school library, and as a part of the ADTECH consortium, the students of Mira Costa are developing the technological skills necessary for the 21st century.

I congratulate Mira Costa principal John Giovati, Manhattan schools superintendent

Gerald Davis, and school board trustees Kathy Campbell, Barbara Dunsmoor, Michele Memmott, Leroy Nelson, and Mary Rogers. And I especially congratulate the students and teachers of Mira Costa for setting an excellent example for other schools to follow.

A TRIBUTE TO MADELINE TAYLOR DUCKLES

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize an extraordinary human being in my district, Madeline Taylor Duckles, on the occasion of her 80th birthday. The phrase, "my district" only serves to highlight the world-wide breadth of this woman's interests and achievements. Madeline Duckles, born in rural California, was fortunate to have attended the tuition-free, University of California at Berkeley and to graduate in 1937, as the first in her family to go beyond high school. While she reveled in her academic pursuits, her earlier awareness of the commonality of humankind was strengthened by the diversities of the people she met at Berkeley.

Her life at the University of California confirmed her childhood understanding that differences in peoples' outward appearance were not measures of their worth, that discrimination and hatred based on such attributes had no place in her life. The seeds of her work in opposition to discrimination, inequality, hate and war were firmly implanted during these university years.

In the 1950's the Congressional House Un-American Activities Committee [HUAC] loomed large over the country. California had its "Little Hoover" commission, and the University of California felt its own anticommunist pressures as the specter of the loyalty oath blighted freedom and integrity. Madeline, joined the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom in the mid-1940's, braved the pressures and spoke out, with WILPF, against the witch hunting.

The Vietnam war grew from a buzz heard across many campuses to an early roar in Berkeley and the bay area. Madeline was one of the first American women to visit North Vietnam and was accused of providing aid and comfort to the enemy. Providing no aid or comfort, she did bring out the first information on prisoners of war held in the north. In the 1960's Madeline accepted an invitation from a women's group to address an outdoor rally in Florence. Her speech on Vietnam did not advocate the violent or otherwise overthrow of the American Government, but a report on her speech in the press brought a warning from the U.S. Consul that she might be dismissed from Italy.

A dossier on Madeline's activities exists in the FBI files, over several decades. This FBI surveillance led to concern by her family, particularly during her first trip to Vietnam, whether she would return in one piece. Despite the official intimidation, hate mail and telephone calls, Madeline visited areas and spoke with people thought by others as enemy. In each case, her choice to make that visit has been based in part or in whole on the belief that the way to peace begins by talking with those with

whom one currently has no peace. Madeline has consistently used her skills and strengths to join with those of others to make positive differences in this world.

In late 1966 physicians and concerned individuals formed the Committee of Responsibility, which sent observers to Vietnam to find war-injured children who could benefit from medical treatment in the United States. Madeline became the west coast organizer at the outset, and supervised the transit, treatment, housing, and other activities necessary for the numbers of children treated under this privately funded program. Every child whose injuries allowed for safe return to Vietnam was sent home; those who would not survive at home were helped to remain in this country where available medical skills would allow them to live. Each child, now adult, who remained in the United States is self-supporting. Madeline continued her work with WILPF/Women for Peace, which became synonymous with peaceful protest, and finally, the end to the American war in Vietnam. She served during this time as chair of the World Council for Peace.

Her activism continued after the Vietnam war. She educated us on the growth of American military power and the continued high level of armaments. She supported congressional efforts to eliminate arms stockpiling, reduction of nuclear weapons, and to focus governmental spending on strengthening our social infrastructure to enhance the lives of the children today and tomorrow.

Madeline Taylor Duckles' 80th birthday, on May 19, 1996, is the occasion for celebration by her family, friends and colleagues, and provides us the opportunity to recognize her life and dedicated work of more than half a century in support of the cherished American principles of the freedoms of speech, liberty, and equality and the right to live one's life, anywhere in peace. Madeline Taylor Duckles is a visionary who has been practicing the concept of thinking globally and acting locally throughout her lifetime; she has been a feminist before the term was coined, a humanist of the greatest kind and an American with a world vision. I am proud to have had a chance to work with her and join with her many friends in the ninth Congressional District, and all over the world to recognize her work and to salute this wonderful American.

CZECH CITIZENSHIP LAW UNAIDED BY AMENDMENT

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my disappointment regarding the progress of the Czech Republic in its on-going transition from Communist dictatorship to democracy. Overall, the Czech record is quite good. And the Czech Republic has made, possibly, the greatest strides of any countries in the region in its efforts to establishing a functioning free market. But in one particular area, the Czech record has been abysmal. Since the breakup of the Czechoslovak Federation at the end of 1992, the Czech Republic has imposed a citizenship law that discriminates against the Czech Republic's

largest minority group, the Roma, and violates international law.

The Helsinki Commission, which I now chair, flagged this problem in a report in 1994. More recently, in early April, the Council of Europe and the UNHCR each released reports on the Czech Republic. Although the reports differ in their specific mandate and analysis, their final conclusions are consistent: The current Czech citizenship law, both as drafted and applied, violates international standards. In particular, both reports found that—contrary to the previous assertions of the Czech Government—the Czech law has created both de jure and de facto statelessness. The Council of Europe report used particularly pointed language, noting that while some of the practices associated with the implementation of the law “might have been lawful under the Czech law of 1967. * * * [they] clearly do not meet European legal standards.” Moreover, according to the recently released State Department country report, some who are affected by this law have been deported, contrary to the assurances I had previously received from Czech officials.

I appreciate that efforts have been made to improve the citizenship law and strengthen its association with international human rights norms. In particular, I understand an amendment to the law was passed on April 26. That amendment, however, fails to address the fundamental shortcomings of the law.

For example, it appears that former Czechoslovaks who were long-term residents of the Czech Republic must still make cumbersome applications and pay so-called administrative fees in order to be considered for citizenship in the only homeland they have ever known. In addition, it has been reported that the amended law gives the Ministry of Interior complete discretion to require those applicants to have a clean criminal record. It seems to me that this would be like telling charter 77 dissidents that of course they have a right to free speech—provided they got a waiver from the Ministry of Interior before exercising it. In short, even as amended, the Czech citizenship law still stands in violation of the Czech Republic's international commitments.

In a few weeks, Czechs will return to the polls to elect a new parliament. In that context, the significance of the citizenship law is all the more poignant: those wrongly denied citizenship are also wrongly denied the right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, I do not understand what benefit the Czech Government sees in maintaining provisions of this law that have generated international criticism. Those who have criticized this law, including the Helsinki Commission, are not proposing that the Czech Republic adopt dual citizenship; we are not proposing that former Czechoslovaks who were or are permanent residents in Slovakia be given citizenship; and we are not saying that the Czech Republic does not have a right to protect its borders. Instead, a finite number of people, all of whom are, by definition, permanent residents in the Czech Republic anyway, must have their citizenship restored if the Czech Republic is to bring its law into conformity with the international standards it has adopted.

DR. JIMMY SIMON RECEIVES JOSEPH W. ST. GEME, JR., LEADERSHIP AWARD

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate Dr. Jimmy Simon, one of the preeminent practitioners of pediatric medicine in the United States. I join with the American pediatric community, who honored Dr. Simon here in Washington last week with the Joseph W. St. Geme, Jr., Leadership Award for Distinguished Service in Pediatrics, in expressing our most heartfelt gratitude for his work and continued leadership.

It is extremely important to recognize the extraordinary accomplishments of great Americans like Dr. Simon. Dr. Simon has not only been an excellent physician and teacher for 40 years, he has also provided for a bright and productive future for the field of pediatrics.

Dr. Simon, born and raised in San Francisco, CA, is currently the chairman of the Department of Pediatrics at the Bowman Gray School of Medicine in Winston-Salem, NC. Shortly after completing his medical and postdoctoral training, Dr. Simon served his country with distinction as a captain in the Air Force. He has been a physician and professor at the University of Oklahoma School of Medicine, at the Kern County General Hospital in Bakersfield, CA, at the University of Texas Medical Branch, and, since 1974, at the Bowman Gray School of Medicine.

Dr. Simon has served in numerous public service and policymaking capacities throughout his long and productive career. Through his wide-ranging memberships in professional organizations, Dr. Simon has helped develop a vision for pediatric medicine in the 21st century.

The Joseph W. St. Geme, Jr., Award is an annual award given to a practicing pediatrician who has contributed to an extraordinarily broad range of areas of pediatrics and who has created a future for pediatrics. I am extremely pleased that Dr. Simon has been recognized for possessing these outstanding qualities.

Dr. Jimmy Simon has shown us that one person dedicated to a cause can make a difference. Dr. Simon inspires us all to strive for excellence out of love for one's profession and all the benefits it can bring. I invite my colleagues to join me in expressing our appreciation of Dr. Simon's remarkable career.

TOM TRACY: DISTINGUISHED IRISH-AMERICAN LEADER

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the honorable achievement of a good friend and fellow Irish-American, Tom Tracy. Tom recently received the 1996 Distinguished Leadership Award by the American Ireland Fund. The award acknowledges an American of Irish heritage whose lifetime accomplishments personify the spirit of the Irish

immigrants who contributed to making our Nation the greatest in the history of mankind.

I am especially proud of Tom because I share his Irish roots. I value my ancestry because it has given me a feeling of being connected to a long history of a people in love with life. The Irish have suffered mightily through history, but the essence of life is to persevere and conquer the challenges that life presents. Irish-Americans like Tom Tracy have excelled at that task.

Tom has been associated with about 28 Irish-related organizations, including many devoted to achieving peace in Northern Ireland. Over the last 5 years, Tom has spent much time and money trying to work towards that peace.

I also share one of Mr. Tracy's other passions: our Catholic Church. We have both been dedicated to strengthening and protecting the church and our particular dioceses. Mr. Tracy has been deeply involved in the Diocese of Orange, CA, where he has served on key committees and numerous other Catholic organizations, including the effort to gain sainthood for Father Junipero Serra.

I thank Tom for his many contributions. He honors all Irish-Americans for his dedication and his good will.

THE AGENCY FOR HEALTH CARE POLICY AND RESEARCH

HON. WILLIAM M. THOMAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Ways and Means Health Subcommittee, I want to take this opportunity to comment on the Budget Committee's report language relating to the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research [AHCPR] that was included with its discussion of the major discretionary health programs funded under function 550. The report language refers to the committee's objections to AHCPR's role in the development of outcomes research-based clinical practice guidelines and the need to better integrate survey and data collection efforts at a number of agencies, including AHCPR. This is an important goal but think it is important to note that AHCPR has already addressed the two issues raised in this report.

First, in the area of clinical practice guidelines, AHCPR has been responsive to the committee's concerns. The Agency took this criticism seriously, engaged in a dialog with the health care community, and announced last month that it will no longer directly support the development of clinical practice guidelines. Instead, AHCPR will concentrate on its strength, the development and assessment of the scientific evidence that physicians, health plans, and other providers need so that they, not AHCPR, can develop guidelines or other quality improvement strategies. This approach will provide physicians and health plans with the information they need to develop better, evidence-based guidelines, without the implication that the Federal Government is telling them how to practice medicine.

Second, the agency has been responsive in attempting to minimize their overlap with other Health and Human Services agencies in the area of the data collection. Despite the fact

that AHCPR has only a small, but important, role in the area of data collection, the Agency took the lead in proposing a major restructuring of its medical expenditure survey to eliminate areas of duplication with other HHS surveys. The new medical expenditures panel survey that they are now undertaking reflects those survey integration efforts. I agree with the committee that it is important that the other agencies of the Department explore greater integration of their survey and data collection efforts; AHCPR has stepped up to the plate on this issue and their contribution should be acknowledged.

In light of the responsiveness of AHCPR to our concerns, I think it is time to move forward. We have seen major reform and restructuring at this Agency and now we need to let it get on with its mission of identifying what works and what is cost-effective in health care. Its research has already demonstrated that better quality care can cost less if clinicians and patients have the information they need to make more informed choices. This research is crucial to our committee's efforts to reform and save the Medicare Program and we now need to let them do their job.

COSPONSORSHIP OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM LEGISLATION

HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I recently overcame a challenge in the Pennsylvania Democratic primary, where, we believe, my opponent was able to spend more campaign funds than my campaign spent. I came away from that campaign with the certain belief that we spend too much time concentrating on campaign fundraising and that there is too much money in the political process. We must reform the way we finance our political campaigns. I have signed the discharge petition to require the Republican majority to do what they do not want to do: bring campaign finance reform legislation to the floor.

I come to the floor today to announce that I am cosponsoring two pieces of campaign finance reform legislation.

First, I am cosponsoring the Meehan-Shays-Smith campaign finance reform bill. This bill would make fundamental changes in the way we fund our campaigns. The sponsors of the bill should be applauded for the contribution they have made in moving this debate forward.

I am also cosponsoring SAM FARR's American Political Reform Act. While the two bills are similar in important respects, but there are aspects in the Farr bill that I prefer. First, it better recognizes the constitutional infirmity in banning political action committees by setting expenditure limits, restricting PAC contributions in the mix of total contributions and lowering the maximum contributions from individual PAC's. Second, it does not contain the in-State, in-district requirements, included in the Meehan-Shays-Smith bill. Those of us who seek to run in poor districts, especially challengers, would be sorely handicapped by this limitation. Moreover, it would put entities like Emily's List and the groups that come together to fight for the State of Israel out of business,

for all practical purposes—these groups have genuine first amendment interests. Third, it correctly restricts bundling but carves out a responsible exception for PAC's that do not lobby.

I hope that the Republican leadership will see the light and work with us to reform the political process.

A SPECIAL TRIBUTE TO BOB WINTERS

HON. JAMES A BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, a good education is an important tool to prepare for a successful future. Without excellent educators to provide our future generation with the kind of education they need to succeed in our technical job market, our country would not be the great Nation it is today. The people who teach or develop innovative teaching tools are the key to our continuing success. Over his 36 years as an educator, administrator, and visionary, Bob Winters has used his skills to improve the education system locally and nationally. In recognition of how much this community appreciates and acknowledges his dedication to education, they are honoring him on Friday, May 17, 1996.

Bob Winters graduated from Detroit South-eastern High School and received his B.A. in education from Wayne State University. After graduation, he began his lifelong commitment, not only providing the best education to his students, but also working to improve education for students all over the country. Bob taught social studies, history, and English in Ferndale, MI, for 5 years.

Knowing the importance of education, he returned to school to receive a masters degree from Michigan State University. Using this new knowledge, he became the assistant principal at a junior high school in Birmingham, MI. In this position he coordinated a new approach to teaching called team teaching. This new approach encouraged teachers to work and plan curriculum together to help students understand the connection between subjects. Each teacher brings his or her strengths to the school curriculum to provide students with the best possible curriculum.

Recruited to share this new teaching technique with others, Bob moved to upstate New York in 1970 to serve as the associate director of a regional educational planning center to advise other schools on implementing team teaching on a national level. Always trying to improve the education system, Bob moved to Washington years later to serve as the Senior Associate to the National Institute of Education. He shared his research and planning of the \$50 million experimental schools program as a consultant and conference planner at the National Rural Experimental Schools Conference, Little Rock, AR.

Eager to return to educating on a personal level, Bob moved back to Michigan to serve as the deputy superintendent and director of instruction for the East Lansing Public Schools. In 1979, he became the superintendent of Essexville-Hampton Public Schools where he has served for the past 17 years. As superintendent he made several significant

changes in the area including allowing student representation on the board of education and implementing substance abuse-drug awareness programs. Bob also served as a member of the Michigan Association of School Administrators [MASA] 1985 to 1987 and served as president, secretary-treasurer and served on the legislative committee.

Bob is also active in his community and is a member of the Alliance for Bay County Schools, Bay Area Chamber of Commerce legislative affairs committee, Bay Medical Center, Delta College Community advisory board, Partnership for Kids Committee, and United Way to Bay County.

Bob could not have achieved these great accomplishments without the support of his wife, Kay. As an avid golfer and member of the Saginaw-Bay Yacht Club, Bob will have many activities to keep him occupied in his retirement. He is also a member of the Bay City Players, a barber shop quartet, and is active with the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America.

Mr. Winters is a shining example of the ability of individuals to improve our society. He is the embodiment of the finest qualities expressed in the word "citizenship." I commend Bob for his lifelong achievements and I urge my colleagues to join me in extending him our best wishes in his retirement.

NEPTUNE HIGH SCHOOL NAVAL J.R.O.T.C. UNIT MILITARY BALL AND AWARDS CEREMONY

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker on Friday, May 31, 1996, at the Waterview Pavilion in Belmar, NJ, the Neptune High School Naval Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps unit will hold its Military Ball and Awards Ceremony.

It is with great honor that I pay tribute, on this day, to the Neptune High School Naval JROTC unit. Existing since 1977, this 4-year program is designed to teach high school students leadership and citizenship. To achieve this, the program stresses self-discipline, patriotism, and high self-esteem. All of this is practiced within the organization and administrative structure of the U.S. Navy.

The Neptune High School JROTC boasts a membership of 103 members with 47 of its members recently completing a 3-day mini-boot camp training weekend at Fort Dix, NJ. On November 20, 1995, the unit successfully completed their 1005-96 Navy area manager inspection with an overall grade of outstanding. I would like to take this opportunity to applaud these outstanding young men and women for their commitment and allegiance to the JROTC and also for their overall outstanding grade.

Mr. Speaker, this ceremony is an important event, not just for the proud members of the JROTC but for all of us. It should remind us all of the importance of citizenship and patriotism and what it means to be an American.

REVEREND JACQUELINE
McCULLOUGH

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, Rev. Jacqueline McCullough has spent most of her life in the church. She is the daughter of two preachers, Reverend and Evangelist Percival Phillips. Presently, she is an associate pastor at Elim International Fellowship and has been under the tutelage and pastoralship of Bishop Wilbert McKinley for over 20 years.

After 7 years of working as a nurse, Reverend McCullough left the medical field to enter full-time ministry. She has traveled for over 20 years nationally and internationally conducting and attending revivals, seminars, workshops and conferences. She is often seen on religious cable television and heard on religious talk show. Reverend McCullough is accredited with master of arts in philosophy from New York University. She is presently working toward a doctorate degree in Bible—Old Testament—at the Jewish Theological Seminary.

In 1986, Reverend McCullough founded the Daughters of Rizpah, a nonprofit religious organization where she is the president and director. This organization underwrites all of her extra-church ministerial activities and community involvements. She is also the proprietor of *Bible—The Family Bookstore*, the author of "Daily Moments—In Quietness and Confidence" and publisher of a semiannual news-magazine "Mended Bridges".

This recount only serves to give an overview of her life, work, and godly commitment. It does not reflect her passionate love for God, His word, the innumerable sacrifices for the work of the Lord and her sensitivity to the needs of God's people.

WESTHILL'S DOUBLE CHAMPIONSHIP SEASON

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating the young women athletes of the Westhill Senior High School soccer and basketball programs for their New York State Class C Championships during the past season.

From a small school of 600 in the Town of Onondaga in Central New York, two outstanding coaches have inspired, instructed, led, cajoled, and pushed in order to get the best from their girls. In each case, their best was indeed good enough.

Before I name the players, I would also like to congratulate the entire Westhill High School community—led by Superintendent Mar DeSantis, Principal Richard Cavallaro, Board President Anthony Sidoni, Athletic Director Matt Whipple and the hundreds of parents and students who make up the support infrastructure at Westhill.

Being a parent in the Westhill School District, I am especially proud today. Many of the

players are well known to me and my neighbor. We have watched these athletes grow, become stronger, become young adults, never losing their school spirit, their pride, never faltering in support of one another.

We are now gratified to see them succeed so completely. We will recognize them, and all our district's scholastic athletes, at Sports Night on June 6. These two teams give us reason to cheer, but as parents everywhere understand they also give us an opportunity to give a final round of applause this year to all the students who partake in school sports.

Members of the New York State Class C Championship Varsity Girls Basketball Team from Westhill Senior High School were coached magnificently by Sue Ludwig. They are: Jessica Adydan, Erin Davies, Sarah Detor, Lauren Fitzpatrick, Leigh Halsey, Laurie Hughes, Melissa Johnson, Sarah Johnson, Stephanie Mancini, Maura Satalin, and Kathleen Sheridan.

Members of the New York State Class C Championship Varsity Girls Soccer Team from Westhill Senior High School, Coached by Ann Riva, are: Jessica Adydan, Ellen Bronchetti, Carolyn Butler, Shannan Card, Jennifer Conway, Erin Davies, Julie Donahue, Sharon Gates, Julie Guinn, Karen Guinn, Alissa Hoover, Laurie Hughes, Jennifer Kirsch, Lindsay Lazarski, Sara Murphy, Kirsten Parody, Wallis Patulski, Megan Rogers, Courtney Spencer, Sarah Thornton, Sarah Ungerer and Jessica Vosseteig.

Westhill was further honored this year when Coach Riva was named by the National Soccer Coaches Association of America as Coach of the Year for the Northeast Region of the United States.

Under her direction, the Westhill team has won State Sectional titles for the last 4 years, and Onondaga High School League championships for the last 5 years. During 22 seasons, her teams have recorded 208 wins against 85 losses and 20 ties.

Everyone at Westhill is very proud. I salute the coaches, parents, administration, faculty, and staff and most of all, the teams.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM WHITNEY AND MOUNTAIN VIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. JOSEPH M. MCDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure today to meet with the sixth grade class from Mountain View Elementary School in Kingsley, PA.

Across our great land, there are people who dedicate their lives to the education of our children. Through their tireless efforts they give the gift of learning to their students, helping make a better future for our families, our communities, and our Nation.

The people of whom I speak are the teachers in schools across America. Today, I would like to especially recognize William Whitney of Mountain View, who is one of those dedicated teachers who not only excels in the classroom, but also makes those extra efforts to enrich his students' learning experiences.

Today's visit by the Mountain View Elementary School marks the 25th consecutive year

in which Mr. Whitney has brought his students to our Nation's Capital. In addition, Mr. Whitney also coaches several athletic teams. I commend him for his dedication to his students.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to all the teachers who play such an important role in the lives of our children. Teachers like Mr. Whitney exemplify, and impart in our children, the true meaning of citizenship in this great democracy in which we live.

ANNOUNCING COMPREHENSIVE BI- PARTISAN CHILD SUPPORT RE- FORM

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce yesterday's introduction of an outstanding bipartisan bicameral bill that will have a tremendous impact on the lives of millions of American families—the Child Support Improvement Act of 1996 (H.R. 3465). My colleague from Connecticut, BARBARA KENNELLY, as well as Senators OLYMPIA SNOWE and BILL BRADLEY, have joined me as sponsors of this important legislation.

The Child Support Improvement Act is not new language; it is the child support title of H.R. 4, the welfare reform bill that has been bogged down in negotiations for over a year. Because we have reached agreements on all aspects of the child support title of the welfare reform bill, we believe it is imperative that we liberate these provisions of the bill so that they are ready to move forward independently if necessary.

Let me make this clear—we prefer sending to the President a comprehensive, bipartisan welfare reform bill that includes our child support enforcement provisions. But no matter what happens with welfare reform this year, our goal is to have the child support enforcement provisions signed into law by the time this Congress adjourns.

Imagine this—as recently as 8 years ago, just about every State had its child support orders in file cabinets. We approved legislation in 1988 that brought us into the 20th century by requiring computer automation of this information. The bill we introduced yesterday will take us to the next level by linking States to a central Federal databank. At one time a deadbeat parent from Connecticut could find work in California and never have to worry about being tracked down to pay child support.

To all deadbeat parents, you are now on notice. Once this bill is enacted, you will not be able to hide. We will find you. We will make you live up to your parental responsibilities of supporting your children.

END VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

HON. CLIFF STEARNS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the statistics are bone chilling. Three out of four American

women will be a victim of a violent crime in their lifetime. For every 5 minutes that passes, another woman is raped. Every 9 seconds another woman is abused.

And don't think it doesn't happen in your community. While most men are respectful toward women, the statistics indicate that in every community there lives at least one weak, cowardly, and spineless man who feels the compulsion to humiliate and torment a woman.

Don't fool yourself into believing that you couldn't know a woman who is suffering. These women are someone's mother, someone's sister, someone's daughter, someone's coworker, someone's friend. This abuse breeds fear, pain, and shame in women.

It's time to alert and educate the public about the violence that is being inflicted on women and how to stop it. Violence is inexcusable in any civilized society. Only by exposing this destructive vile behavior will there be an end to the pain and suffering. Anything less is unacceptable. I urge everyone to do their part to end the violence.

TRIBUTE TO ANNA CHERNEY, PEACE AND COMMUNITY ACTIVIST

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Anna Cherney, one of California's long-time social and peace activists who passed away on April 18, 1996, at the age of 94. Until her death she was active throughout the community as a vigorous worker for civic activities, involved with the peace and labor movements, and supporting the struggle for equality.

Anna is well known for giving generously of herself and her finances. Seldom did she withhold her financial support for her beliefs.

Anna is attributed with making her community, the city of Sebastopol, CA, a nuclear-free zone. She has helped raise money for student art scholarships at the local Santa Rosa Junior College, the Sonoma County Peace and Justice Center, and continued fund raising activities, rallies, and peace marches until just recently. Her friends call her "one feisty lady," and it is her spirited nature that will be remembered and cherished by her many followers who will pick up the torch and carry it to the generations who follow.

Mr. Speaker, Anna Cherney's commitment to her community, her legacy of generosity, and her selflessness serve as an example to all Americans. It is people like Anna, working together in communities throughout America, who make our Nation so great and bring out the best in us. We can celebrate the power of one individual, Anna Cherney, by waking the giants that live within all of us to help our neighbors, our community, and our Nation. Anna Cherney did, and for this, I say thank you, Anna.

H.R. 2594 AND TECHNICAL CHANGES TO ICC TERMINATION ACT

HON. BUD SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to announce that H.R. 2594, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Amendments Act, is scheduled to be considered on the House Floor next week. This bipartisan bill improves unemployment and sickness benefits for rail workers, with no additional cost to the Federal Government.

H.R. 2594 was approved by the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee by voice vote last November. It is a consensus measure, supported by both rail labor and rail management.

Unemployment and sickness benefits for rail workers are handled under a national, employer-financed system that is administered by the Railroad Retirement Board. H.R. 2594 makes a number of changes to railroad unemployment and sickness benefits that will produce a more equitable and up-to-date program.

The reforms contained in H.R. 2594 will bring the railroad industry benefits more into line with the State unemployment benefits that apply to all other industries. Daily benefits will be increased from \$36 to \$42. Currently, most States have higher daily benefits than the railroad unemployment program. In addition, the waiting period before benefits begin to accrue is reduced from 14 days to 7 days. Again, most States have a shorter waiting period than under the railroad unemployment system. The bill also limits the amount of benefits that can be paid based on an individual's outside income, and reduces the maximum number of days of extended benefits.

Because the railroad unemployment system is financed by taxes imposed on the railroad industry, the federal taxpayer will not be saddled with additional costs as a result of this bill. Thanks to the efforts of our colleagues on the Budget Committee, the budgetary impact of the bill has been resolved so that we are able to bring the bill to the floor under suspension of the rules.

In the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2594, I will also include several technical corrections that are necessary to eliminate minor drafting ambiguities in the ICC Termination Act, which was enacted at the end of 1995. The changes are intended only to restore the status of related laws to the way they were at the time of the enactment, or to correct purely clerical errors in the text of the ICC Termination Act. The text of these technical changes follows.

One of the technical changes is necessary to carry out the explicitly stated intent of the ICC Termination Act that its enactment did not "expand or contract coverage of employers or employees under the Railway Labor Act." 49 U.S.C. 10501(c)(3)(B). The technical correction is drafted merely to restore more clearly the exact legal standards for coverage under the Railway Labor Act that existed prior to the enactment of the ICC Termination Act. Otherwise, the current text of the law could cause needless ambiguity and confusion.

H.R. 2594 will provide for much-needed reform of the railroad unemployment system and I urge your support of this legislation.

TECHNICAL CHANGES TO ICC TERMINATION ACT
TO BE INCLUDED IN H.R. 2594

SEC. 6. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) REFERENCES.—(1) Section 24307(c)(3) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking "Interstate Commerce Commission" and inserting in lieu thereof "Surface Transportation Board".

(2) Section 24308 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking "Interstate Commerce Commission" in subsection (a)(2)(A) and inserting in lieu thereof "Surface Transportation Board"; and

(B) by striking "Commission" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Surface Transportation Board".

(3) Section 24311(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking "Interstate Commerce Commission" in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "Surface Transportation Board"; and

(B) by striking "Commission" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Surface Transportation Board".

(b) CLARIFYING AMENDMENT.—(1) The first paragraph of section 1 of the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 151) is amended by inserting "The term 'carrier' includes any express company or sleeping car company subject to subtitle IV of title 49, United States Code, within the meaning of such terms under this section as in effect on December 31, 1995." after "in any of such activities."

(2) The amendment made by paragraph (1) is made for the purpose of clarifying the policy stated in section 10501(c)(3)(B) of title 49, United States Code, that the enactment of the ICC Termination Act of 1995 did not expand or contract coverage of employees and employers by the Railway Labor Act.

(c) TITLE 49.—Title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 13102(10)(A) by inserting after "her dwelling" the following: "and if the transportation is at the request of, and the transportation charges are paid to the carrier by, the household";

(2) in chapter 151 by striking "CHAPTER 151—GENERAL PROVISIONS" the second place it appears;

(3) in chapter 153 by striking "CHAPTER 153—JURISDICTION" the second place it appears;

(4) in chapter 157 by striking "CHAPTER 157—OPERATIONS OF CARRIERS" the second place it appears;

(5) in chapter 159 by striking "CHAPTER 159—ENFORCEMENT: INVESTIGATIONS, RIGHTS, AND REMEDIES" the second place it appears;

(6) in the table of sections for chapter 159 by striking the item relating to section 15907;

(7) in chapter 161 by striking "CHAPTER 161—CIVIL AND CRIMINAL PENALTIES" the second place it appears; and

(8) in section 41309(b)(2)(B) by striking "common".

(d) TITLE 28.—Section 2342(3)(A) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking "part B or (C)" and inserting "part B or C".

(e) ICC Termination Act.—Effective December 29, 1995—

(1) section 308(j) of the ICC Termination Act of 1995 (109 Stat. 947) is amended by striking "30106(d)" and inserting "30166(d)"; and

(2) section 327(3)(B) of such Act (109 Stat. 951) by inserting "each place it appears" before "and inserting in lieu thereof".

(f) ARMORED CAR INDUSTRY RECIPROCITY ACT OF 1993 AMENDMENTS.—Section 5(2) of

the Armored Car Industry Reciprocity Act of 1993 (15 U.S.C. 5904) is amended by striking "is" preceding "registered".

TRIBUTE TO JOYCE BARFUSS

HON. GARY A. CONDIT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Joyce Barfuss, a constituent and friend who has made countless contributions to our community. Joyce has lived her life to make a difference in the lives of others. I am only one of thousands who has been the recipient of her help, her kindness, her expertise, her selflessness, and her apricots. I appreciate this opportunity to honor Joyce's efforts and accomplishments.

Joyce Barfuss has been a resident of Patterson, CA, since 1974. Joyce came to Patterson and immediately made her mark. Out of her various church activities was born, The Clothes Closet, a clothing bank for the needy. The operation grew from Joyce's garage into a full-fledged volunteer organization which provided needy recipients with clothing for nearly 4 years.

After the untimely death of her husband Jim in 1979, Joyce began a new endeavor working for the Census Bureau. She worked tirelessly at the Bureau for 10 years. After retiring from Federal service she worked for the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture adding her experience and expertise to their operation.

Throughout Joyce's distinguished life, no matter what the outlet, she has been involved in the lives of those who need it most. To list every organization, movement, and cause which Joyce has lent her unique mark, would take a tome. I would, however, like to mention some of the most notable endeavors Joyce has undertaken.

Joyce has been active with the Del Puerto Hospital Auxiliary and the American Cancer Society for 20 years. She has assisted the Visiting Nurses Association with flu shots for the elderly and has served as president of the Northern San Joaquin Valley Area Council of Hospital Volunteers. She has been incredibly active in Patterson working with the city to get a senior center built and serving as Secretary of the Patterson Chamber of Commerce. Joyce has represented her community as a member of the Apricot Fiesta Board, Grand Marshall of the 1996 Fiesta Parade, appointee to the White House Conference on Aging, appointee to the Stanislaus County Commission on Aging, and as a member of the California Agency on Aging.

But Joyce is perhaps most well known for her role as the "apricot lady", passing out apricots around the country as a bit of sunshine from the valley. Joyce's apricot network would be the envy of many a corporate executive.

I consider myself very lucky to know Joyce. While we will all miss her here in the Central Valley, I am confident that her contributions to the human family are far from over. Joyce's new neighbors are indeed lucky to have this bright, talented, and dedicated woman in their lives, as are we all.

SALUTE TO COMMACK MIDDLE SCHOOL'S ANTITEEN SMOKING PROGRAM

HON. RICK LAZIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a minute to express my strong support for a program that a school in my district has been developing to combat teen smoking. Mrs. Joan Hanley's eighth grade class at Commack Middle School on Long Island have designated June 4, 1996, as Antiteen Smoking Day.

Mrs. Hanley's class has proposed a non-smoking club for their school, as well as a peer program that will assist teens to stop smoking. The class is also circulating a petition that teens can sign pledging not to smoke.

Last year over 130,000 people died from smoking related illnesses, many of these people began smoking when they were young. The average teenage smoker starts at 14½ years old and every day 3,000 young people become regular smokers. One-third of these will eventually die as a result of their habit. The work of Mrs. Hanley's class is an important way to make teens more aware of the dangers of smoking.

I salute Mrs. Hanley's eighth grade class for their initiative, to prevent teen smoking, and help save many lives. These students from my district are role models. I urge my colleagues to support antiteen smoking programs in their districts similar to this outstanding project being conducted by Mrs. Hanley's class.

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES WEEK

HON. E. CLAY SHAW, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Emergency Medical Services Week. First, let me tell a short story.

Like any healthy 4-year-old boy, Cody was thrilled to be climbing on a shiny red fire engine. He and his brother, Drew, were visiting their local fire department for a special reason. One week earlier, two of the paramedics from this fire department were struggling to save Cody's life.

On that January day in 1995, Drew saw Cody run past the family room and down the hall toward the bathroom. Sensing something was wrong, Drew scurried after his brother, reaching Cody just before he collapsed. Drew yelled for their father, then tried the Heimlich maneuver he recently learned at school. But, whatever was lodged in Cody's throat would not budge. By this time, their father had reached the boys and told Drew to call 911.

The call came in stating that a young boy was having difficulty breathing. Two paramedics responded to the call, arriving on the scene only minutes later. They found Cody pale and no longer breathing. One paramedic took the child's pulse and mentally ran through the training he had received just a few weeks earlier at a special pediatric airway manage-

ment class. At that point he could see that the object looked like a jaw breaker, but it was covered with tissue and blood.

He tried basic measures to remove the object and it seemed to move a little. In his efforts to breathe, however, Cody sucked it back down. Seconds went by. The paramedic then tried a new child-sized piece of equipment he had received during his recent training: A laryngoscope and a pair of McGill forceps, which look something like salad tongs. Again, Cody's attempts to breathe foiled his efforts. More seconds passed.

By this time a senior paramedic arrived on the scene and immediately decided to give the McGill forceps one more try. Working as a team, the two paramedics finally dislodged the object in Cody's throat. Cody began to breathe. It was a save.

I retell this story to emphasize the reality that a child's life not only requires specialized equipment and training, it also takes a thorough understanding of just how different children are from adults, both physically and emotionally. No one understands this more than Dr. Deborah Mulligan-Smith of my district in south Florida. Working tirelessly, Dr. Mulligan-Smith recently inspired the Florida Legislature to pass a bill that appropriates \$200,000 for the training of paramedics in emergency pediatrics.

In 1984, Congress funded a grant program that helps States expand children's access to proper emergency care while also improving the quality of such care. The Emergency Medical Services for Children [EMSC] program encourages States and municipalities to enhance their emergency medical systems to benefit children in ways unheard of just a few years ago. This program enhances emergency care by integrating the needs of severely ill or injured children into existing EMS systems, trains and educates EMS personnel to effectively handle pediatric emergencies, works to prevent pediatric emergencies by supporting injury prevention programs, and saves money by stimulating partnerships between grantees, local agencies, and community organizations.

Mr. Speaker, as our Nation recognizes Emergency Medical Services Week, I want to congratulate Dr. Mulligan-Smith on her efforts to save the lives of our children through the EMSC program. Children do need special attention and treatment, and they need the development of special medical equipment to help save their lives. They also need to have paramedics specially trained in emergency pediatrics. I support Dr. Mulligan-Smith's dedication to accomplishing EMSC objectives, and I encourage my congressional colleagues to do the same.

HEALTHY MEALS FOR CHILDREN ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. PAT ROBERTS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 2066, the Healthy Meals for Children Act of 1996. I know the Chairman of the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee, Mr. GOODLING, has sought a remedy for the problems caused by

the implementation of the Healthy Meals for Healthy Americans Act of 1994 and this bill represents that corrective action.

When Congress passed and the President signed the 1994 amendments, we all believed that schools would be allowed to use a food-based system to meet the dietary guidelines for the school meals programs. Unfortunately, the regulations implementing the 1994 amendments did not provide this flexibility to schools.

Local school employees involved in the planning and preparation of school meals work very hard to make sure that the meals are nutritious and good tasting. A meal not eaten provides no benefit to anyone. Their challenge is to balance good nutrition with what children will eat.

The bill under consideration today provides for the flexibility and I am pleased to support it.

When these regulations were proposed in 1994, a hearing was held in the Committee on Agriculture. Members of the committee made it clear that the proposed rules would tie the hands of local schools and impose financial hardships on these schools, especially those in rural areas. Despite the concerns expressed, the Department of Agriculture went ahead and finalized the rules. Since that time local schools have continued to express their concerns.

Therefore it was necessary to bring a second bill to the House to ensure that local schools are provided with the flexibility that will

allow them to prepare nutritious meals that meet the dietary guidelines.

There is a practical case to be made that local schools administrators should be able to decide how best to meet the needs of children participating in the School Lunch Program. No Federal regulation can guarantee that a nutritious school lunch will be consumed by children in school. No school lunch, no matter how nutritious, improves the diets of children if that lunch is not eaten. This bill represents a commonsense approach to health and nutritious meals in our schools.

Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the administration fully supports this bill and I urge all Members to support H.R. 2066.

Thursday, May 16, 1996

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S5111–S5214

Measures Introduced: Nine bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 1762–1770, and S. Con. Res. 59. **Page S5191**

Measures Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 1080, to amend chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, to provide additional investment funds for the Thrift Savings Plan, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 104–274)

S. 1635, to establish a United States policy for the deployment of a national missile defense system.

S. 1762, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces.

S. 1763, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for defense activities of the Department of Energy.

S. 1764, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for military construction. **Pages S5190–91**

Measures Passed:

School Lunch/Breakfast Programs: Senate passed H.R. 2066, to amend the National School Lunch Act to provide greater flexibility to schools to meet the Dietary Guidelines for Americans under the school lunch and school breakfast programs, clearing the bill for the President. **Pages S5207–08**

Public Buildings Reform: Senate passed S. 1005, to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959 to improve the process of constructing, altering, and acquiring public buildings, after agreeing to a committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, and the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S5208–14**

Frist (for Baucus) Amendment No. 3983, to make a technical correction. **Pages S5212–14**

Congressional Budget: Senate continued consideration of S. Con. Res. 57, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, taking action on amendments proposed thereto, as follows: **Pages S5111–40, S5143–86**

Adopted:

By a unanimous vote of 99 yeas (Vote No. 114), Frist Amendment No. 3968 (to Amendment No. 3965), to express the sense of the Senate that the discretionary spending caps should not include triggers that would make drastic reductions in non-defense discretionary spending in fiscal years 2001 and 2002 for the purpose of achieving a balanced budget in fiscal year 2002. **Pages S5129–38**

Subsequently, the amendment fell when Amendment No. 3965 (listed below) was rejected.

Page S5175

By 75 yeas to 23 nays (Vote No. 116), Bond Amendment No. 3971 (to Amendment No. 3965), to restore funds to the Veteran's Administration Medical Care program, offset by a reduction in Welfare benefits. **Pages S5143–51, S5158**

Subsequently, the amendment fell when Amendment No. 3965 (listed below) was rejected.

Page S5175

By 53 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 118), Abraham/Domenici Amendment No. 3980, to express the sense of the Congress regarding Medicare trust fund solvency. **Pages S5169–75**

Rejected:

By 45 yeas to 53 nays (Vote No. 115), Exon Amendment No. 3973 (to Amendment No. 3965), to restore funds for Veterans benefits and services, offset by corporate tax increases. **Pages S5151–58**

Rockefeller Modified Amendment No. 3979, to restore \$50 billion in excessive Medicare cuts, offset by the extension of expired tax provisions or corporate and business tax reforms. (By 55 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. 117), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S5160–69, S5173**

By 45 yeas to 53 nays (Vote No. 119), Exon Amendment No. 3965, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002. **Pages S5111–75**

Pending:

Boxer Amendment No. 3982, to preserve, protect, and strengthen the Medicaid program by controlling costs, providing State flexibility, and restoring critical standards and protections, including coverage for all populations covered under current law, to restore

\$18 billion in excessive cuts, offset by corporate and business tax reforms, and to express the sense of the Senate regarding certain Medicaid reforms.

Pages S5177–85

Wyden/Kerry Amendment No. 3984, to express the sense of the Senate regarding revenue assumptions.

Pages S5185–86

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the resolution with amendments to be proposed thereto on Friday, May 17, 1996.

Page S5214

Appointments:

U.S. Military Academy: The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), appointed Senator Kohl, from the Committee on Appropriations, to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy, vice Senator Reid.

Page S5214

Messages from the President: Senate received the following messages from the President of the United States:

Transmitting the report relative to the national emergency with respect to Iran; referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–146).

Pages S5189–90

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, Navy.

Pages S5207, S5214

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

J. Rene Josey, of South Carolina, to be United States Attorney for the District of South Carolina for the term of four years.

Page S5214

Messages From the President:

Pages S5189–90

Communications:

Page S5190

Statements on Introduced Bills:

Pages S5191–93

Additional Cosponsors:

Page S5193

Amendments Submitted:

Pages S5194–S5203

Notices of Hearings:

Page S5203

Authority for Committees:

Pages S5203–04

Additional Statements:

Pages S5204–07

Record Votes: Six record votes were taken today. (Total—119)

Pages S5138, S5158, S5173, S5175

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m., and adjourned at 11:18 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Friday, May 17, 1996. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S5177)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS—FBI/DEA/STATE DEPARTMENT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies held hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1997, receiving testimony in behalf of funds for their respective activities from Louis J. Freeh, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Thomas A. Constantine, Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration, both of the Department of Justice; and Warren Christopher, Secretary of State.

Subcommittee will meet again on Thursday, May 23.

APPROPRIATIONS—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE/NIS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Foreign Operations held hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1997 for foreign assistance to the New Independent States (N.I.S.), receiving testimony from Richard L. Morningstar, U.S. Coordinator for N.I.S. Assistance, Department of State; Thomas A. Dine, Assistant Administrator for Europe and the N.I.S., U.S. Agency for International Development; and Constantine Menges, George Washington University, and Eugene Iwanciw, Central and East European Coalition, both of Washington, D.C.

Subcommittee will meet again on Tuesday, May 21.

APPROPRIATIONS—COAST GUARD

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation and Related Agencies concluded hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1997, after receiving testimony in behalf of funds for the United States Coast Guard from Adm. Robert E. Kramek, Commandant, United States Coast Guard, Department of Transportation.

APPROPRIATIONS—NASA

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies held hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1997 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, receiving testimony from Daniel S. Goldin, Administrator, NASA.

Subcommittee will meet again tomorrow.

MISSION TO PLANET EARTH

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space concluded hearings on the status and purpose of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Mission to Planet Earth Program, after receiving testimony from Charles F. Kennel, Associate Administrator, Doug Norton, Director of Management Integration, both of the Office of Mission to Planet Earth, and Fritz Hasler, Research Meteorologist and Manager of Public Use of Remote Sensing Data, Goddard Space Flight Center, all of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Robert S. Winokur, Assistant Administrator for Satellite and Information Services, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce; Donald T. Lauer, Chief, EROS Data Center, United States Geological Survey, Department of the Interior; David P. Radzanowski, Analyst in Aerospace Policy, Science Policy Research Division, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; Frank Carsey, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, California; and George A. Seielstad, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, on behalf of the Upper Midwest Aerospace Consortium.

NATIONAL TRAILS AND PARKS

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Parks, Historic Preservation and Recreation concluded hearings S. 621, to designate the Great Western Trail for potential addition to the National Trails System, H.R. 531, to designate the Great Western Scenic Trail as a study trail under the National Trails System Act, S. 1049, to designate the route from Selma to Montgomery as a National Historic Trail in Alabama, S. 1706, to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for assistance for highway relocation with respect to the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park in Georgia, and S. 1725, to create a third category of long-distance trails to be known as national discovery trails and to authorize the American Discovery Trail as the first national discovery trail, after receiving testimony from Senators Nunn, Brown, and Bennett; Representatives Bereuter, John Lewis, and Hilliard; Katherine H. Stevenson, Associate Director for Cultural Resource Stewardship and Partnerships, National Park Service, Department of the Interior; Gray F. Reynolds, Deputy Chief, and Brent Botts, Trails Program Manager, both of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; George Boulineau, Georgia Department of Transportation, Atlanta; and Reese F. Lukei, Jr., Virginia Beach, Virginia, and John O'Dell, River to River Trail Society, Harrisburg, Illinois, both on behalf of the American Discovery Trail/American Hiking Society.

INTERNATIONAL COMMERCIAL ENVIRONMENT

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on International Economic Policy, Export and Trade Promotion concluded hearings to examine the status of the international commercial environment and the Federal Government's role in supporting United States business abroad, after receiving testimony from Joan E. Spero, Under Secretary of State for Economic, Business and Agricultural Affairs; Timothy J. Hauser, Deputy Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade; Martin A. Kamarck, President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States; Ruth R. Harkin, President and Chief Executive Officer, Overseas Private Investment Corporation; and J. Joseph Grandmaison, Director, United States Trade and Development Agency.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 1488, to convert certain excepted service positions in the United States Fire Administration to competitive service positions;

S. 88, to increase the overall economy and efficiency of Government operations and enable more efficient use of Federal funding, by enabling local governments and private, nonprofit organizations to use amounts available under certain Federal assistance programs in accordance with approved local flexibility plans, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 94, to prohibit congressional consideration of retroactive tax increases, with amendments;

S. 1130, to provide for the establishment of uniform accounting systems, standards, and reporting systems in the Federal Government, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

H.R. 2739, to provide for a representational allowance for Members of the House of Representatives, and to make technical and conforming changes to sundry provisions of law in consequence of administrative reforms in the House of Representatives, with an amendment.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of William A. Fletcher, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Also, committee began markup of S. 483, to amend Federal copyright provisions regarding preemption of laws concerning duration of copyrights, but did not complete action thereon, and recessed subject to call.

HEALTHY START PROJECT

Committee on Labor and Human Resources: Committee concluded oversight hearings on the implementation of the Healthy Start Demonstration Project of the Department of Health and Human Services, created to reduce infant mortality, and its proposed authorization for fiscal year 1997, after receiving testimony from Senator Specter; Ciro V. Sumaya, Administrator, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services; Louis W. Sullivan, Morehouse School of Medicine, Atlanta, Georgia, former Secretary of Health and Human Services; Thomas P. Coyle, Baltimore City Health Department, Doretha Strawther, and Chris-

topher Banks, all of Baltimore, Maryland; Jackie Jenkins-Scott, Dimock Community Health Center, Roxbury, Massachusetts; and Marie C. McCormick, Harvard University School of Public Health, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

WHITEWATER

Special Committee to Investigate the Whitewater Development Corporation and Related Matters: Committee resumed hearings to examine certain matters relative to the Whitewater Development Corporation, receiving testimony from Gary W. Bunch, Madison Bank and Trust, John Latham, and David Knight, all of Little Rock, Arkansas.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 26 public bills, H.R. 3467–3492; and 3 resolutions, H.J. Res. 179, H. Con. Res. 179, and H. Res. 439 were introduced. **Pages H5287–88**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed as follows:

H.R. 2909, to amend the Silvio O. Conte National Fish and Wildlife Refuge Act to provide that the Secretary of the Interior may acquire lands for purposes of that Act only by donation or exchange, or otherwise with the consent of the owner of the lands (H. Rept. 104–579);

H. Res. 436, providing for consideration of H.R. 3415, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 4.3-cent increase in the transportation motor fuels tax rates enacted by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 and dedicated to the general fund of the Treasury (H. Rept. 104–580);

H. Res. 437, providing for consideration of H.R. 3259, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System (H. Rept. 104–581);

H. Res. 438, providing for consideration of H.R. 3144, to establish a United States policy for the deployment of a national missile defense system (H. Rept. 104–582); and

H.R. 3144, to establish a United States policy for the deployment of a national missile defense system (H. Rept. 104–583 Part I). **Pages H5286–87**

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designates Representative Hast-

ings of Washington to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H5185**

Committees to Sit: The following committees and their subcommittees received permission to sit today during proceedings of the House under the five-minute rule: Committees on Agriculture, Banking and Financial Services, Commerce, Government Reform and Oversight, House Oversight, International Relations, Judiciary, Resources, Science, and Transportation and Infrastructure. **Page H5188**

Budget Resolution: By a yea-and-nay vote of 226 yeas to 195 nays, Roll No. 179, The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 178, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1997 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002. **Pages H5198–H5260**

Rejected:

The Payne of New Jersey amendment, in the nature of a substitute, that sought to achieve a balanced budget by 2002, reduce defense spending, revise tax provisions relating to capital gains and multinational and foreign controlled corporations, maintain Medicare spending at current levels, and increase funding for various programs including education and training, community development, and child care (rejected by a recorded vote of 63 yeas to 362 noes, Roll No. 176); **Pages H5204–18**

The Orton amendment, in the nature of a substitute, that sought to achieve a balanced budget by 2002, reduce defense spending, achieve savings in Medicare, Medicaid, welfare, and various discretionary programs, increase funding for programs including education and training, health, community

development, and research, assume a .5 percent change in the CPI index, and provide no tax reductions (rejected by a recorded vote of 130 ayes to 295 noes, Roll No. 177); and

Pages H5218–33

The Sabo amendment, in the nature of a substitute, that sought to achieve a balanced budget by 2002, reduce defense, veterans, and discretionary program spending, achieve savings in Medicare, Medicaid, and welfare, increase funding for programs including education, training, environmental, and health, and provide tax reductions (rejected by a recorded vote of 117 ayes to 304 noes, Roll No. 178).

Pages H5233–46

H. Res. 435, the rule providing for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution was agreed to by a voice vote. Earlier, agreed to order the previous question on the rule by a yea-and-nay vote of 227 yeas to 196 nays, Roll No. 175.

Pages H5189–98

Legislative Program: The Majority Leader announced the legislative program for the week of May 20. Agreed to adjourn from Thursday to Monday.

Pages H5260–61

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourn on Thursday, it adjourn to meet at 2:00 p.m. on Monday, May 20; and that when it adjourns on Monday, May 20, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, May 21, for morning hour debates.

Page H5261

Calendar Wednesday: Agreed to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business of May 22.

Page H5261

Presidential Message—National Emergency Re Iran: Read a message from the President wherein he submits his report concerning the national emergency with respect to Iran—referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered printed (H. Doc. 104–214).

Pages H5261–62

Amendments Ordered Printed: Amendments printed pursuant to the rule appear on pages H5288–89.

Senate Messages: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H5185.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and three recorded votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H5198, H5217–18, H5232–33, H5245–46, and H5260. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: Met at 9:15 a.m. and adjourned at 8:08 p.m.

Committee Meetings

NATIONAL CHEESE EXCHANGE—PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry and the Subcommittee on Risk Management and Specialty Crops concluded joint hearings to consider issues raised by a recently released study of trading practices and procedures on the National Cheese Exchange. Testimony was heard from Keith Collins, Chief Economist, USDA; and public witnesses.

LABOR—HHS—EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education concluded appropriation hearings. Testimony was heard from Members of Congress.

The Subcommittee also held a hearing on Consolidated Departmental Management and Consolidated Inspectors General. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Labor: Cynthia A. Metzler, Acting Deputy Secretary; and Charles C. Masten, Inspector General.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AUTHORIZATION

Committee on Banking and Financial Services: Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy approved for full Committee action amended H.R. 3399, to authorize appropriations for the United States contribution to the 104th replenishment of the resources of the International Development Association, to authorize consent to and authorize appropriations for the United States contribution to the fifth replenishment of the resources of the African Development Bank, to authorize consent to and authorize appropriations for a United States contribution to the interest subsidy account of the successor (ESAF II) to the Enhanced Structural Adjustment Facility of the International Monetary Fund, and to provide for the establishment of the Middle East Development Bank.

FAN FREEDOM AND COMMUNITY PROTECTION ACT

Committee on Commerce: Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade and Hazardous Materials held a hearing on H.R. 2740, Fan Freedom and Community Protection Act. Testimony was heard from Representatives Hoke, DeLay, Bryant of Tennessee, Jackson-Lee of Texas and Flanagan; Bob Lanier, Mayor, Houston,

Texas; Philip N. Bredeson, Mayor, Nashville, Tennessee; Jane Hague, Chairwoman, King County Council, Seattle, Washington; and public witnesses.

COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL TRAVEL GUIDELINES

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, Subcommittee on Government Management, Information and Technology held a hearing on Senior Executive Branch Officials Compliance with Federal Travel Guidelines. Testimony was heard from Bonnie Cohen, Assistant Secretary, Policy Management and Budget, Chief Financial Officer, Department of the Interior; Harold Gracey, Chief of Staff, Department of Veterans Affairs; Patricia Lattimore, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Administration and Management, Department of Labor; and a public witness.

IMPACT OF REGULATIONS ON EMPLOYMENT

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, Subcommittee on National Economic Growth, Natural Resources, and Regulatory Affairs held a hearing on the Impact of Regulations on Employment. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

WHITE HOUSE COMMUNICATIONS AGENCY—MISMANAGEMENT AND WASTE

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs and Criminal Justice, hearing on Mismanagement and Waste at the White House Communications Agency. Testimony was heard from Robert Lieberman, Assistant Inspector General, Auditing, Department of Defense; and Henry L. Hinton, Assistant Comptroller General, National Security and International Affairs Division, GAO.

Subcommittee recessed subject to call.

FEC AUTHORIZATION

Committee on House Oversight: Approved H.R. 3461, to authorize appropriations for the Federal Election Commission for fiscal year 1997.

Prior to this action, the Committee held a hearing on this measure. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the FEC: Lee Ann Elliott, Chairman; Scott E. Thomas, Commissioner and Chairman, Finance Committee; and Joan D. Aikens, Commissioner.

MFN IMPACT FOR CHINA

Committee on International Relations: Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade and the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, joint hearing on the Impact of MFN for China on U.S.-China Economic Relations. Testimony was heard from Representative Pelosi; Peter Tarnoff, Under Secretary,

Political Affairs, Department of State; Stuart E. Eizenstat, Under Secretary, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce; and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT—PROJECTED INCREASES IN LEGAL IMMIGRATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims held an oversight hearing regarding projected increases in legal immigration. Testimony was heard from Susan Martin, Executive Director, Commission on Immigration Reform; Robert Bach, Executive Assistant Commissioner, Policy and Planning, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice; the following officials of the Visa Office, Department of State: Cornelius D. Scully and Seton P. Stapleton; and Nancy Gordon, Associate Director, Demographic Programs, Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Resources: Ordered reported the following measures: H.J. Res. 70, authorizing the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity to establish a memorial to Martin Luther King, Jr. in the District of Columbia or its environs; H.R. 3068, to accept the request of the Prairie Island Indian Community to revoke their charter of incorporation issued under the Indian Reorganization Act; and H.R. 848, amended, to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for assistance for highway relocation regarding Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park in Georgia.

OVERSIGHT

Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans held an oversight hearing on the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation. Testimony was heard from Representative Chenoweth; Daniel M. Ashe, Assistant Director, External Affairs, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; Amos Eno, Executive Director, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation; and public witnesses.

DEFEND AMERICA ACT

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a modified closed rule, providing for consideration in the House of H.R. 3144, Defend America Act of 1996, with 2 hours of debate. The rule waives all points of order against the bill and against its consideration. The rule provides for one minority amendment in the nature of a substitute which shall be considered as read and shall be debatable separately for 1 hour. The rule waives all points of order against the substitute. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Testimony was heard from Chairman Spence and Representatives Dellums and Spratt.

REPEAL FUEL TAX INCREASE

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a closed rule waiving all points of order against H.R. 3415, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 4.3-cent increase in the transportation motor fuels excise tax rates enacted by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 and dedicated to the general fund of the Treasury, and against its consideration. The rule provides for the adoption of the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules. The rule provides 1 hour of debate. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Chairman Archer and Representatives Seastrand, Gibbons, Dingell, Markey and Bentsen.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a modified open rule providing 1 hour of debate on H.R. 3259, Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997. The rule waives section 302(f) (prohibiting consideration of legislation which exceeds a committee's allocation of new entitlement authority), section 308(a) (requiring a cost estimate in the committee report on new entitlement authority), and section 401(a) (prohibiting consideration of legislation containing contract authority not previously subject to appropriation) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill.

The rule makes in order for consideration for amendment under the five minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill, which shall be considered by title and as read. The rule waives clause 7 of rule XVI (germaneness), clause 5(b) of rule XXI (prohibition of consideration of legislation containing revenue provisions if not considered by the Committee on Ways and Means), and section 302(f) (providing consideration of legislation which exceeds a committee's allocation of new entitlement authority) and section 401(a) (prohibiting consideration of legislation containing contract authority not previously subject to appropriation) of the Budget Act against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The rule makes in order only those amendments to the substitute which are pre-printed in the *Congressional Record*. The rule allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill, and to reduce votes to five minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a fifteen minute vote. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Chairman Combest and Representative Dicks.

METRIC SYSTEM CONVERSION ACT AMENDMENTS

Committee on Science: Subcommittee on Technology held a hearing on proposed amendments to the Met-

ric System Conversion Act. Testimony was heard from Representative Cox of California; Mark Bohannon, Chief Counsel for Technology, Department of Commerce; and public witnesses.

ISTEA REAUTHORIZATION

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Surface Transportation continued hearings on ISTEA Reauthorization: Transportation Finance in an Era of Scarce Resources: the Highway Trust Fund. Testimony was heard from Phyllis F. Scheinberg, Associate Director, Transportation and Telecommunications Issues, GAO; Robert Sunshine, Deputy Assistant Director, Budget Analysis Division, CBO; the following officials of the Department of the Treasury: Marty Washburn, National Director, Specialty Taxes; and Edward L. Federico, Director, National Operations for Criminal Investigations; the following officials of the Department of Transportation: Anthony Kane, Executive Director, Federal Highway Administration; and Jack Basso, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Budget and Program; and public witnesses.

Hearings continue May 30.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST p. D472)

H.R. 2243, to amend the Trinity River Basin Fish and Wildlife Management Act of 1984, to extend for three years the availability of moneys for the restoration of fish and wildlife in the Trinity River. Signed May 15, 1996. (P.L. 104-143)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, MAY 17, 1996

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1997 for the Corporation for National and Community Service, 9:30 a.m., SD-192.

Committee on Foreign Relations, to hold hearings on the nominations of Avis T. Bohlen, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Bulgaria, and Marisa R. Lino, of Oregon, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Albania, 10 a.m., SD-419.

Special Committee To Investigate Whitewater Development Corporation and Related Matters, to continue hearings to examine certain issues relative to the Whitewater Development Corporation, 9:30 a.m., SH-216.

House

No committee meetings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Friday, May 17

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

2 p.m., Monday, May 20

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Senate will continue consideration of S. Con. Res. 57, setting forth the congressional budget.

House Chamber

Program for Monday: No legislative business is scheduled.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Baker, Richard H., La., E828
 Barcia, James A., Mich., E833, E837
 Bonior, David E., Mich., E826
 Borski, Robert A., Pa., E825
 Clinger, William F., Jr., Pa., E831
 Clyburn, James E., S.C., E827
 Condit, Gary A., Calif., E840
 Cunningham, Randy "Duke", Calif., E830
 Davis, Thomas M., Va., E830
 DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E829
 Dellums, Ronald V., Calif., E835
 Diaz-Balart, Lincoln, Fla., E834
 Dornan, Robert K., Calif., E836
 Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E831
 Fazio, Vic, Calif., E819, E824
 Foglietta, Thomas M., Pa., E837
 Gekas, George W., Pa., E825
 Gingrich, Newt, Ga., E827
 Gordon, Bart, Tenn., E818, E819, E821, E822, E824, E825, E826, E828, E829, E830

Greenwood, James C., Pa., E830
 Harman, Jane, Calif., E835
 Hayworth, J.D., Ariz., E821
 Horn, Stephen, Calif., E832
 Johnson, Nancy L., Conn., E838
 Johnson, Sam, Tex., E818, E820, E823, E825
 Kanjorski, Paul E., Pa., E827
 Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E835
 Kelly, Sue W., N.Y., E832
 Kleczka, Gerald D., Wis., E826
 LaHood, Ray, Ill., E825
 Lantos, Tom, Calif., E836
 Lazio, Rick, N.Y., E840
 McDade, Joseph M., Pa., E838
 McDermott, Jim, Wash., E829
 Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E819, E821, E823
 Menendez, Robert, N.J., E822
 Moran, James P., Va., E824
 Neal, Richard E., Mass., E833
 Nethercutt, George B., Jr., Wash., E834
 Ney, Robert W., Ohio, E830
 Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E832

Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E837
 Pelosi, Nancy, Calif., E820
 Pomeroy, Earl, N. Dak., E828
 Quinn, Jack, N.Y., E831
 Roberts, Pat, Kans., E840
 Serrano, José E., N.Y., E822
 Shaw, E. Clay, Jr., Fla., E840
 Shuster, Bud, Pa., E839
 Slaughter, Louis McIntosh, N.Y., E834
 Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E835
 Stearns, Cliff, Fla., E838
 Stokes, Louis, Ohio, E832
 Thomas, William M., Calif., E836
 Torres, Esteban Edward, Calif., E819, E823
 Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E838
 Underwood, Robert A., Guam, E818, E821, E823
 Vento, Bruce F., Minn., E817, E820
 Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E828
 Walsh, James T., N.Y., E838
 Ward, Mike, Ky., E828
 Woolsey, Lynn C., Calif., E839



Congressional Record

provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available on the Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via asynchronous dial-in. Internet users can access the database by using the World Wide Web; the Superintendent of Documents home page address is http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs, by using local WAIS client software or by telnet to swais.access.gpo.gov, then login as guest (no password required). Dial-in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512-1661; type swais, then login as guest (no password required). For general information about *GPO Access*, contact the *GPO Access* User Support Team by sending Internet e-mail to help@eids05.eids.gpo.gov, or a fax to (202) 512-1262; or by calling (202) 512-1530 between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday, except for Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, \$112.50 for six months, \$225 per year, or purchased for \$1.50 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, \$118 per year, or purchased for \$1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.