AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 143 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 20, 1997 *No. 67*

House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Ms. PRYCE of Ohio].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 20, 1997.

I hereby designate the Honorable DEBORAH PRYCE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 21, 1997, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member except the majority and minority leader limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] for 5 minutes.

BUDGET NEEDS TO REFLECT DEMOCRATIC PRIORITIES

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, today Congress will likely vote in favor of a historic balanced budget proposal and at the same time we as Democrats must not forget that this is merely an outline, a road map, that gives general spending guidelines. Many of the details still need to be worked out, and that is basically where my concern lies this morning.

While President Clinton and Republican leaders have articulated a general agreement on the budget, I am very leery of the Republican leadership's true priorities. A recent memorandum dated May 16 from Speaker GINGRICH's office emphasizes that ''there is not a limit on the size of the capital gains and estate tax relief'' in the budget resolution. The Republican leadership has consistently made tax cuts for the wealthy a cornerstone on any budget agreement, and I believe that once we pass this resolution Republicans will attempt to do this again.

Democrats have consistently indicated support for a balanced budget agreement, but one that benefits the average American family, and we will be vigilant in protecting the family first priorities that are paramount in any budget agreement.

Now after Congress passes the budget resolution this week, the real process of determining fiscal priorities will begin. Democrats stand ready to roll up our sleeves and ensure that our priorities; that is, education, health care, and the environment, are worked into the final details. I mention this because last year the Republicans are on record for voting to cut education spending, gut Medicaid, and cripple environmental protection and enforcement, and this year it is really unknown what the Republican leadership will produce by way of details on many of these budget questions.

Madam Speaker, Democrats will fight to make sure that the Republicans stay true to their word in providing $35 billion in tax cuts for education initiatives. These initiatives are but a small investment to ensure America's competitive edge into the future. At the same time, the additional moneys for increased Pell grants and HOPE scholarships will benefit those Americans who want to better themselves and remain productive citizens in our society.

The Democratic education proposal is an important part of this budget agreement, and it must remain intact throughout the long process to ensure my support and the support of my Democratic colleagues.

In addition to the Democratic education initiatives, it is equally important that the money set-aside for children's health care coverage be used for just that, the expansion of children's health care coverage for approximately 10 million uninsured children.

Now Democrats again have worked hard to get children's health care moneys into the budget since last summer. In January of this year I authored a letter with 32 of my Democratic colleagues to President Clinton urging that funding for children's health care should be a cornerstone of any budget reconciliation. Today's budget agreement appears to include approximately $16 billion to expand children's coverage, and Democrats remain committed to ensuring that these moneys truly benefit families with uninsured children.

We as Democrats have a task force on kids' health care, and we have worked out a proposal that we think can be used to implement this $16 billion budget package. Our plan is to build on three prongs, strengthening the Medicaid Program for lower income children, providing matching grants to the States targeted to children and working families who are uninsured and require private, and the third point, I should say, is to require private insurance reforms to benefit children and families of all incomes.

We believe that with this pot of money in the budget, if we implement this 3-pronged approach, we can actually cover most, if not all, of the 10 million children that are now currently uninsured, and it is a very reasonable approach within the confines of the budget.

Again, as with the education investment, Democrats will find it difficult to support any budget that does not provide families with assistance to provide health care for their children and

☐ 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.

to insure as many of those 10 million children as possible.

Finally, I also want it to be known to the Republican leadership that we need to make sure that environmental protection is a priority in this budget. It is very important to give the EPA the tools to ensure safe drinking water, clean air, and clean oceans, and I personally will fight to keep the commitment to American families for a healthy environment.

Again, Madam Speaker, although I think the problem that I see right now, there are already rumblings by the Republican right to increase the amount of the tax cuts with further cuts in many of these important family first agenda programs, and if the Republican extremists succeed, then American families will be the ones who suffer in the end.

Hopefully, this budget agreement, which I expect to be adopted today, will be the beginning of a process that makes sure that the tax cuts in the budget are mainly targeted to the average working American, and the same is true with the spending priorities, that they help the average American family and not just the wealthy.

INTRODUCTION OF THE AMTRAK PRIVATIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Speaker, what do the Americans think of when they hear the statement ''free of Federal subsidy''? What about ''self-sufficiency''? I think these terms refer to programs that receive no Federal funding. It means that the program runs like a business and its survival is dependent upon its business practices and its customers.

Madam Speaker, someone needs to tell this to Amtrak. Tom Downs, Chairman and CEO of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, or Amtrak, has been frequently quoted as saying Amtrak could become a self-sufficient operation if Congress would give it a permanent source of funding.

Amtrak was created in 1970 as an independent and self-sufficient corporation and was given a one-time grant of $40 million. Twenty-seven years and $19 billion later, I would think Amtrak and Congress would realize that a dedicated funding source is not going to help passenger railroads make money or become self-sufficient. But Amtrak continues to cry ''Show me the money.''

Madam Speaker, let us face it. Amtrak is in crisis. The question is not whether Amtrak can reach sufficiency by 2002, as mandated by Congress. The question has become will Amtrak still be in business next spring?

As long as the Federal Government is involved in Amtrak it will not survive, and it is not as if we have not seen the light at the end of the tunnel. In 1995, with Congress pushing for a balanced budget and making cutbacks, Amtrak realized that they could no longer depend on the Federal Government for nearly a billion dollars every year. To their credit they did what a number of large corporations have done in the 1990's. They undertook a major corporate restructuring and began to look at themselves as a business. They reduced services on 16 routes across the country and saved about $54 million. They cut staffing and tried to improve service and make rail travel more attractive to the average consumer.

Amtrak has shown that if the tough decisions are made money can be saved. Much of the problem, however, is not Amtrak's fault; we are to blame. See, Federal law is prohibiting Amtrak from making the most out of their staffing reductions or forcing Amtrak to provide ridiculously generous severance packages and preventing them from making the truly tough business decisions, and as long as the Federal dollar keeps flowing to Amtrak, we will always attach a fistful of strings.

Today I am reintroducing the Amtrak Privatization Act. Some people will call this the Amtrak killer. I call these reforms Amtrak's only chance for survival. My bill will do three very important things that I think will help Amtrak survive. First of all, we need to let Amtrak operate like a business. Congress should not mandate what routes the trains take or where they should stop. Congress should no more force Amtrak to run an unprofitable route than mandate what items a local mom and pop shop stocks.

The Amtrak Privatization Act will free Amtrak from those Federal controls and allow them to make the necessary cuts to survive. Some routes may be eliminated. But remember, Amtrak has said it will be out of business by next spring if nothing is done. That means all routes would then be eliminated.

So let us say Amtrak eliminates some routes and must lay off some rail workers as a result. Congress has mandated that a laid off Amtrak employee receive up to 6 years full pay, 6 years. Show me another employee who gets full pay for 6 years after being laid off. My bill will allow them to receive a more reasonable 6 months pay after being laid off. Amtrak's labor agreements have got to go.

Finally, this bill creates a glidepath toward self-sufficiency in 2002. Until Amtrak gets off the Government till, including stealing gas tax dollars to support rail, Congress will be trying to mandate how it should operate. I contend if we take all Federal control over Amtrak away, including Federal dollars, Amtrak will find a way to survive. If we do not, Amtrak will stop rolling perhaps even next spring.

IT IS TIME TO ENFORCE HELMS-BURTON AGAINST THE CASTRO REGIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to discuss an important issue: How do we rid Castro, or Cuba I guess, of the despot Castro, is what I should say? Today is May 20. This is known as Cuban Independence Day, when Cuba was granted independence from Spain as a result of the Spanish-American War. However, the Cuba of today is looking for a new independence, one that grants them freedom from the hideous dictatorship of Fidel Castro.

Cuba has been under a dictatorship for about 38 years now. It is no secret that Fidel Castro is still exercising his power in a manner contradictory to the most basic human rights held by all people. This is an absolute disgrace that such a regime exists only 90 miles from my home State of Florida. We, as a Nation, must work to correct this. We should have a long time ago.

Sometimes the only way to undermine a dictatorship short of some direct military force is through the pocketbook. In the past, Cuba could rely heavily on Soviet assistance for propping up its economy. Now that the Soviet Union no longer exists, Cuba must find benefit from a great deal of foreign investment and trading. It has done just that. According to the Cuban Government, 260 joint ventures were concluded by the end of 1996, with more than $2.1 billion in foreign capital.

Madam Speaker, we obviously cannot block all trade with Cuba without a little blockade of the island. However, we can work for a free Cuba that respects human rights in another manner. To that end Congress did its job in 1996 and passed the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act, otherwise known as Libertad or Helms-Burton. This legislation tightened the screws on Castro and had a solid chance for significant impact in bringing down the Castro dictatorship. It would have done so through three significant provisions. It codified all existing Cuban embargo Executive orders and regulations, it denied admission to the United States to aliens involved in the confiscation of United States property in Cuba or the trafficking of confiscated property in Cuba, and it allowed U.S. nationals to sue for money damages in U.S. Federal court those persons that traffic in United States property confiscated in Cuba when Castro took over.

The first of these provisions may not be waived by the President, but the President was granted authority to waive title III in Helms-Burton, in part allowing U.S. nationals to sue in Federal court, if he determines that such a delay would be in the national interest and would expedite a transition to democracy in Cuba. It is unfortunate that President Clinton, on January 3, 1997, decided to waive title III of Helms-Burton for the second time and has indicated that come the early part of July he will probably waive it for the third time. It was an outrageous move that kowtowed to our allies and to the business interests abroad rather than to the American national security interests.

It is outrageous because the biggest problem facing us is seeing the demise of the Castro dictatorship in Cuba is not a mystery at all. It is our allies in Europe, Canada, and Mexico who trade with Castro, sustaining his illegitimate regime. What is most disturbing is that some foreign firms not only work with Castro, but do so using stolen U.S. property.

When Castro took power in Cuba, he confiscated private property of countless United States firms and interests. Not only did he rob these Americans of their rightfully owned property, he then continued to use these assets, retaining the profits to sustain his regime. This continues to this day.

Furthermore, there are private foreign interests taking advantage of the confiscated property, making money in Cuba on stolen United States property. Practices such as this should not be tolerated anywhere in the world regardless of the circumstances. This unjust enrichment is taking place in Castro's Cuba despite the fact that title III of the Helms-Burton Act would have stopped that from happening.

☐ 1045

It would have placed a significant disincentive to deal in confiscated U.S. property, making foreign firms benefiting from unjust enrichment in Cuba subject to United States lawsuits, United States courts, if they do business in the United States.

Even though President Clinton succumbed to the interest of foreign businesses and waived title III, just the threat of sanctions resulted in several foreign companies reconsidering their investments in Cuba. If the current administration would actually follow through and implement all of Helms-Burton, we would see a great number of foreign interests reconsidering their Cuban involvement, thereby cutting off critical cash to the Castro regime.

Unfortunately, President Clinton has made a horrible decision, knowing that the business interests of our neighbors are putting pressure on those governments, and those governments on our governments. Instead, he has thwarted the national interests of our people in bringing democracy and respect of human rights to Cuba and of our private citizens and businesses who would have the right to recover their lost profits from foreign profiteers dealing in property stolen by Castro if they could just sue in United States courts.

Is the administration going to continue to look the other way, or will the United States actually work for democracy in Cuba? When are the tough decisions going to be made that will actually bring Castro down?

What has happened is a picture of hypocrisy. The law was signed with much fanfare and praise that Cuba would finally see some measures, only to have those tough measures immediately waived after enactment, and then again in January of this year, and probably again in July. Is that responsible? Is that honest? Madam Speaker, it is not.

I urge the enforcement of the Helms-Burton Act and will submit a bill in July to make sure that that waiver provision no longer exists if Mr. Clinton continues to waive that provision.

CARDIAC ARREST SURVIVAL ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. PRYCE of Ohio). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I am here to talk about a bill that I will be introducing today. The bill I am referring to is the Cardiac Arrest Survival Act. If this bill should become law, I say to my colleagues, it has the potential of saving thousands of lives each year.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to work with the American Heart Association on this important measure. Passage of this act would go a long way toward making the goal of saving the lives of people who suffer from sudden cardiac arrest possible. It would ensure that what the American Heart Association refers to as a cardiac chain of survival could go into effect.

Madam Speaker, the four links in a cardiac chain of survival are, one, early access to emergency care; early cardiopulmonary resuscitation; early defibrillation, which I will explain later; and early advanced life support.

While defibrillation is the most effective mechanism to revive a heart that has stopped, it is also the least accessed tool we have available to treat victims suffering from heart failure.

Perhaps it would be helpful for those of my colleagues listening and not well versed on the subject if I just take a moment and walk you through what we mean when we use the term ''defibrillation.''

A large number of sudden cardiac arrests are due to an electrical malfunction of the heart called ventricular fibrillation, or VF. When VF occurs, the heart's electrical signals, which normally induce a coordinated heartbeat, suddenly become chaotic and the heart's function as a pump abruptly stops. Unless this state is reversed, then death will occur within a few minutes, 160 seconds. The only effective treatment for this condition is defibrillation, the electrical shock to the heart.

My colleagues might be interested to know that more than 1,000 Americans each and every day suffer from cardiac arrest. Of those, more than 95 percent die. My colleagues, I find that unacceptable, because we have the means at our disposal to change those statistics, and that is why I am committed myself to this cause.

Studies show that 250 lives can be saved each and every day from cardiac arrest by using the automatic external defibrillator [AED]. Those are the kinds of statistics that nobody can argue with. Right now, the chance of survival due to sudden cardiac arrest is less than 1 in 10. We could change those odds for people through the development of model state training programs for first responders.

Madam Speaker, did my colleagues know that for each minute of delay in returning the heart to its normal pattern of beating it decreases the chance of that person's survival by 10 percent? Currently, only 14 States offer CPR training in schools and 28 States authorize first responders to use automatic external defibrillators. However, less than one-half of emergency medical technicians and less than one-fourth of nonemergency medical technician first responders in the United States are even trained or equipped with a defibrillator. Fortunately, one of those States is my State of Florida.

No one knows when sudden cardiac arrest might occur. According to a recent study the top five sites where cardiac arrest occurs, and I will list them in order of prevalence, at airports, county jails, shopping malls, sports stadiums, and golf courses.

I believe we all should take great comfort in knowing that those who are rushed to help us, to resuscitate us, have the most up-to-date equipment available and are trained to use it.

Some of my colleagues might ask, if 27 States have laws authorizing nonemergency medical technician first responders to use AED's, why do we need to pass this legislation? The reason is quite simply that prehospital medical care, which includes training, equipment, and standards of care, experiences variations from State to State, which in turn delivers inconsistent care to the public. Some might say that this is just another Federal mandate. They would be wrong in that assumption.

This legislation merely directs the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute to develop and disseminate a model State training program for first responders and bystandards in lifesaving first aid, including CPR, and direct the development of model State legislation to ensure access to emergency medical service.

Several of my colleagues might ask, will this not cost a lot of money? No, it will not cost the Government any money because we would encourage the private sector, such as those working in the medical community, to form a partnership with industry to help defray the costs. Overall, we envision this as a joint venture, with this legislation providing the model program for States to use if they so desire and the private sector picking up the additional costs involved.

Madam Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in cosponsoring this important bill whose stated goal is to prevent thousands of people suffering sudden cardiac arrest from dying by making the equipment and trained personnel available at the scene of such emergencies.

AMERICANS WILL STAND WITH THE CUBAN PEOPLE FOR FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, this Independence Day for the Republic of Cuba, May 20, finds the Cuban people still bound and gagged, more than by a Marxist-Leninist, and some have called him a fascist; more than by totalitarianism of those natures, by an Al Caponist, in his essence a gangster, an extortionist who is seeking the almighty dollar at all costs and in all ways.

My community was deeply moved, Madam Speaker, last week when the news, and actually the video taken by the Brothers to the Rescue when they passed over a rock in the Caribbean that belongs to the Bahamas, appropriately named Dog Rock, and we saw a family there, actually it was a group of 14 Cuban refugees, one of them, Rolando Martinez Montoya, a pro-democracy activist, opposition leader and independent journalist. He had been given a visa by the United States to leave with his family in 1995. However, despite the agreement between the Castro dictatorship and our Government, when the Castro dictatorship, every time it wants it, it simply ignores that agreement, and even though his family had been given a visa by the United States to come to our country, the Castro regime simply ignored the visas and did not let them out.

So he in desperation took his wife and four daughters to sea, and they landed on Dog Rock; and we saw last week how Adianet, the 11-year-old daughter of Rolando, died of exposure and lack of water and food on Dog Rock and how his youngest daughter, Camila, 4 years old, also died on Dog Rock.

So that is where the Cuban people find themselves on this Independence Day, having to flee in that type of desperation from a 38-year-old tyranny led by an Al Caponist madman.

We would expect, would we not, Madam Speaker, that the press and the international media might have had the sensitivity to cover the story of the 14 Cuban refugees last week, some of whom died on Dog Rock. No, I did not see a single story on our networks, national or international.

What I do see is this week, interestingly, there seems a be a little campaign about visit the exotic islands. If we look at this week's U.S. News and World Report whose owner, of course, Mr. Zuckerman, is looking for a deal at a ferocious pace from the tyrant, you will see News You Can Use: Hemingway's Cuba. Go to the mojito at the Hemingway Marina. Smoke a Cuban cigar. The Washington Post, on May 18: Return to a forbidden island. Also, about how Americans can go and visit the exotic nature of the forbidden islands.

The story of Cuba, the story of the discrimination, of the degradation, of the apartheid system imposed by the tyrant on the Cuban people, anyone who does not have access to dollars or is not a member of the hierarchy of the regime, is not a tourist, does not have access to the luxurious restaurants and hotels and the health care centers that are hard cash generators for the dictatorship, but we do not read about that. No. We read about return to the forbidden islands and Hemingway's Cuba.

Madam Speaker, I would insert into the RECORD these infamous stories at the time, at the time that the real story of Cuba is the suffering of its people, the agony of its people, the fact that its people have to seek refuge, even by going to sea, risking the lives of little children, and many of them actually die. That is the real story of Cuba that because of some unwritten conspiracy of silence is simply not reported by the media. That is what we are facing.

But the reality of the matter is that despite the little campaign of visit the exotic islands and another little campaign that is going on, interestingly enough, supposedly, we are supposed to have, according to another little campaign, a prohibition on the sales of medicines to Cuba when our law says, the Cuban Democracy Act that this Congress passed, said that we can sell, American pharmaceutical companies can sell medicines to Cuba as long as the medicines are not used for torture and are not used for reexport.

So, Madam Speaker, we will continue talking about this. It is a dreadful situation, the situation the Cuban people are faced with, but we are going to stand firm, we are going to stand with the Cuban people, and we are not going to lose sight of our objectives. The American people will continue to stand with the Cuban people until the Cuban people are free.

Madam Speaker, I include the following newspaper articles for the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, May 18, 1997]

RETURN TO A FORBIDDEN ISLAND: IN IMPOVERISHED CUBA, NOTHING—AND EVERYTHING—HAS CHANGED

(By Elinor Lander Horwitz)

Maritza smiles wistfully and passes her tongue slowly over her lips. ''The '52's and '53's are best,'' she says. ''Fifty-four was not so good a year, but '55—it was really excellent.'' She's not talking wine: She's talking Chevrolets.

Parked randomly along a street near the Plaza de Armas in Havana's old city, where she has taken me sightseeing, is a particularly dense grouping of 40- to 50-year-old American cars, predominantly Chevrolets plus one Dodge, an Oldsmobile, a Buick and a Plymouth. These are not rich people's collectibles. They are poor people's means of transportation. Maritza, a Cuban woman whom a friend had urged me to contact, casts a connoisseur's eye on a red-and-white, wide-finned 1953 relic parked next to her midget 1972 Polish-made Fiat. How in the world do the owners get replacement parts? She laughs at my simple-minded question. ''We make them, we improvise,'' she says. ''Cubans are very good mechanics.''

I feel caught in a time warp. The decaying Chevys—the very ones I might have seen hot off the assembly line more than four decades ago—suddenly take on the status of metaphor for the once elegant, now deteriorating city. This is the second visit my husband, Norman, and I have made to Havana. The first, a few years before the 1950 revolution, was on our honeymoon. I was a college student-bride who longed to go abroad, and Havana was the only patch of abroad we could afford. And it was so easy to get there!

This time we arrived via three tedious flights: Washington to Miami, Miami to Nassau, and Nassau to Havana. With long waits in between. We carried impeccable visas and letters from the U.S. Treasury Department and our sponsoring organization verifying our permission to visit (there are severe restrictions for U.S. citizens trying to travel to Cuba). Norman, a neurosurgeon, was coming as a volunteer with an international relief agency in a program it runs jointly with the Cuban Ministry of Health. He would spend a week conferring with colleagues, examining patients, teaching interns and residents, and presenting research material. I was licensed to tag along. Earlier participants in the program had given us the names of people they'd met here, which is how I came to know Maritza and a number of other engaging Habaneros.

We had always hoped to return to Havana and, according to the laminated Cubana Airlines boarding pass I handed over as I boarded the flimsy-looking old Russian plane in Nassau, the feeling was mutual. ''*Cuba te espera*,'' it said in decorative script. ''Cuba is waiting for you.'' The bright yellow card was decorated with three red hearts.

The 1950s Cuba, under the repressive rule of Fulgencio Batisa, had plenty to offer American tourists. It was romantic, and it was glossy! Most people stayed in the pricey and glamorous Hotel Nacional, with its luxurious accommodations, highly regarded dining room and nightclub, and private talcum powder beach. We stayed at the Ambos Mundos on Obispo Street, in the heart of Old Havana.

Hemingway, still very much alive when we first visited the island, had lived in the Ambos Mundos while writing—depending on your informant—either ''A Farewell to Arms'' or ''For Whom the Bell Tolls.'' We ogled the room he had occupied, dined at the rooftop restaurant where he had often dined, and drank daiquiris at the Floridita, which we were assured was his favorite bar. When we had dinner at a sidewalk cafe, ragged children came up to the table and begged for the bread on our table. We gave them that and pesos and smiles, and we told each other it was wrong to be having such a good time in a country where so many lived in unconscionable splendor while others didn't have enough to eat. And then a man with a guitar strolled over to our table and began to sing while we held hands across the table and blissfully dug into dinner.

Maritza is amused by my honeymoon tales. First stop on our 1996 tour is the Ambos Mundos. The hotel was closed for many years and has been in the process of renovation for many more. The place is entirely gutted and a man on the ground is sending a small bucket of plaster up to the fifth floor on a pulley-and-rope contraption. A pamphlet I've picked up says that you can learn about the life of Ernest Hemingway by staying there. ''Ambos Mundos Hotel will open up in summer 1996 with 53 rooms of which 4 suites,'' it promises, but it is now fall, and it still looks like it's going to be a while.

Nearby, in the palace occupied by Batista way back then, is the Museo de la Revolution. There are photographs of the rebels in the mountains, bloody shirts and pants, canteens, rifles, the engine of an American plane shot down over the Bay of Pigs, and other mementos of turbulent times. One display titled in English ''The Hall of Cretins,'' features huge, cartoonist figures of Batista in military garb, Ronald Reagan dressed as a cowboy and George Bush dressed as a Roman senator. Above the figure of Reagan, the caption says, ''Thank you cretin for strengthening the Revolution.'' Bush's caption is, ''Thank you cretin for consolidating the Revolution.''

In the nearby Plaza de la Catedral, craftspeople hawk costume jewelry, maracas, woodcarvings and other knick-knack. Che Guevara's face appears on key rings, ashtrays and T-shirts. Why doesn't Castro's face appear on T-shirts and key rings? I ask Maritza. ''It wouldn't be respectful,'' she says and it's impossible to determine whether her inflection is dead serious or mocking.

I am trying hard to recapture the city I remember. One afternoon Norman and I journey uptown to peek furtively into the splendidly titled lobby of the Hotel Nacional, fearful of being accosted and asked whether we are paying guests. (Reopened and refurbished after years of being shut down, the hotel is as handsome and crowded as ever.) We gape at the splendid Spanish colonial mansions on the tree-lined avenues of the Vedado and Miramar districts. And then we retreat to the colorful narrow streets and shady squares of Old Havana, where we remember Cubans strolling, singing aloud. Our memories of this are so vivid, it must have been true, although there is no evidence of such today.

West of Old Havana is the Vedado neighborhood and our hotel, the Victoria, which is across the street from a row of picturesquely decaying Spanish colonial mansions, now occupied by many poor families. Up close, things aren't quite so picturesque. Laundry hangs from the windows, balusters are missing from the galleried rooftops, stairs are broken, garden statues are headless, yards are littered with trash. Nothing has been painted or repaired in decades. And venturing out at night onto the darkened, crumbling sidewalks and streets—where hordes of bikes without lights scoot by—is dangerous whether or not you encounter the street crime everyone warns about (we didn't).

Tourism has been revived in Havana, and crowds of Europeans, Asians, South Americans, Canadians and a much smaller number of Americans can be seen in the more celebrated restaurants. There is the luxurious new Melia Cohiba hotel, a joint venture between Cuba and Spain; much talk of further foreign investment in tourism; and work is going on around the clock on a new airport. Baseball games and performances by the excellent national ballet company provide stimulating entertainment, yet information about schedules is difficult to glean.

Restaurant food ranges from so-so to bad. The Cubans we invited to dine with us all chose paladares—the small, often-excellent restaurants families are now permitted to run in their own apartments. Families licensed to establish a paladar may set up no more than 12 chairs, arranged in whatever grouping of tables they prefer. Some paladares have signs, but most are known only through word of mouth. You ring a doorbell and enter a lobby, push the button for the proper floor and walk into someone's living room, where tables are prettily set and family members graciously rush to serve you.

At one paladar, we are seated on a breezy balcony, overlooking the water. At another, a particularly pleasant three-course dinner with assorted tasty appetizers set up on a small buffet table, a roast lamb entree and dessert of a rich fig pudding costs $12 a person, including beer and coffee.

These paladares, named for a family-run restaurant dubbed Paladar in a popular Brazilian TV sitcom, are one of the few forms of self-employment now permitted in Cuba. Since they accept payment only in U.S. dollars, paladar owners have the means to buy a wide range of foods at the hard currency stores.

The Hemingway shtick is still going strong here. Several restaurants and bars in the old city claim to have been his favorite. One of these, the tiny, crowded La Bodeguita del Medio, a block from the cathedral, still has ambiance aplenty. Since the 1920s, customers have carved their names on wood paneling, and there's no more space. Above the bar is a blow-up of a scrawled message by the great man himself. ''The best mojitos are at the Bodeguita,'' it reads. ''The best daiquiris at the Floridita, Ernest Hemingway.''

Squeezed into a corner, in full view of this snippet of immortal prose, we order a mojito. It arrives in a tall glass, jammed with what appears to be seaweed but is, in fact, very soggy mint, and filled with a watery rum, lemon and sugar mixture. An undistinguished meal is tossed at us irritably. It is almost heartening to find that there still are tourist traps in Havana.

Just about everything is in short supply in this underdeveloped island country. Everyone is short of soap, and I lift a few tiny bars from the hotel maid's cart and pass them along to my new friends. All food is rationed. Staples—rice and beans—are cheap and abundant, although milk is available only for children under 7. At the Hotel Victoria, the milk is made from powder and manages to be foamy and lumpy at the same time. Meat, chicken and fish are not generally available, and at the time of our visit, the egg ration was seven a month. Each person is permitted one piece of bread a day.

Cubans call this is a periodo especial, a special period that dates from the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991 and the sudden cessation of what had been lavish subsidies. Gas, electricity, public transportation—all are in very short supply. When the periodic blackouts occur, not only the lights go out, but also the water, which is pumped by electricity.

The glittering and bustling tropical city I remember is a drab and quiet place today. For decades, there has been no money to maintain buildings and streets. Automotive traffic is light at all times. Gas, at $4 a gallon, is too experience for most Cubans, who earn on average $12 to $15 a month.

I ask a highly placed government official what he hopes, expects, fears the future will bring if Castro, now a fit-looking 70-year-old, retires? He laughs at the notion of retirement. ''When Fidel dies,'' he says, ''people won't be ready for raw capitalism. That's certain. They think they want more free enterprise, but they are too accustomed to free education and health care to ever give that up. It will be some sort of socialism.

''Don't misunderstand,'' he adds, when I ask about the one piece of bread a day. ''Things here are difficult now, but there is absolutely no question that life under Batista was far worse for most Cubans. What you have to recognize is this: Cuba has always had one corrupt form of government or another.''

While we are in Havana, everyone is talking about the International Trade Fair, an annual event that showcases products from countries worldwide (72 of them at this fair). Finally, I decide to go to the new exposition grounds outside the city with Robrto, a translator for the medical program that brought us to Cuba. The fair is jammed with people. Cuba is displaying pharmaceuticals, rum and cigars, and there are sparkling new cars from Japan and France, shoes from Italy, tablecloths from Mexico, furniture from Canada and children's clothing from Panama. As Roberto seats himself longingly behind the wheel of a shiny little yellow Fiat mounted on a revolving stand, may eyes falls on an Argentinean food exporter's display of Oreo cookies, Ritz crackers, Libby's Vienna Sausages, Wrigley gum, M&M candies, Kellogg's Frosted Flakes and Froot Loops.

Will Cuban children get to eat Froot Loops despite the U.S. embargo? Roberto rolls his eyes, but declines further comment.

I buy lunch at a sunbaked outdoor cafe, and we dine greedily on a cholesterol nightmare of fried chicken, french fries, beer and ice cream. Four musicians—two guitar players, a man on a bongo drum and another on maracas—suddenly appear at my elbow, grinning with mock flirtatiousness and breaking into the songs their fathers sang to diners in the cafes of Obispo Street in the 1950s: ''Besame Mucho'' and ''Perfidia.'' I am overcome with nostalgia and tip generously, and they repeat the two songs over and over. And then, with almost manic zest, they break into a long song about Che Guevara.

The next day, at the airport gate, waiting hours for our return flight, we Americans—doctors, missionaries, journalists—exchange stories about the charm of the people we've met and the hardships we've witnessed. No one has answers.

The airport's air conditioning has been turned off to save electricity. Everyone is hot and avid to leave. But everyone wants to return ''someday.''

''Bring soap,'' we remind each other. ''next time don't forget to bring everyone a few bars of soap.''

A NATION FOR ALL TIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, if we were to take a poll of the American people on the question, should the Government of the United States ever be allowed to shut down, everyone knows that the overwhelming answer would be no, of course not. Perhaps a 98-percent return on such a poll would indicate that response.

Benjamin Franklin and John Adams and George Washington and James Madison and their colleagues in Philadelphia in 1789 established a nation which they conceived to be one that would last for all time, never to be shut down, not even for 5 minutes. Yet, since I have been a Member of the Congress, and it has happened many times before that, but since I have been here, the Government of the United States has shut down eight separate times and the budget of the United States has not been completed on 53 occasions.

☐ 1100

This alarmed me when I first came to the Congress, so I began to introduce legislation some 8 years ago that would prevent a Government shutdown; that would say that if we have not, as a Congress, completed the business of the day and formulated a budget by September 30, the end of the fiscal year, if we have failed to do that, then the next day there should be an automatic replay, an instant replay, of last year's budget just to keep the Government going that would prevent a shutdown while allowing the Congress to proceed to negotiate to complete the budget that it has deemed necessary to accomplish.

I have never been able to get it passed by the Congress because the President of the United States, whether it is Republican or Democrat, and the Congress, Republican- or Democrat-controlled, have failed to see the efficacy of the bill that I have introduced.

It seemed to me a simple proposition. We have a budget. If we come to the end of the budget process and no new budget has arrived, there are only three alternatives.

One is that the Government must shut down because of the lack of a budget. That is the constitutional result of having no budget.

No. 2 is to pass temporary funding measures, called continuing resolutions, for a specified time, a month, 6 months, 8 months, whatever we want, until the Congress and the President can agree on a budget.

Or third, we can adopt my proposition, which would simply say that if we do not have a budget, then the law should require an instant replay of last year's budget, thus ensuring that the Government of the United States would never shut down.

After 8 long years I finally was able to muster enough support from well-wishing Members, colleagues on both sides of the aisle, to bring it to a vote as part of the supplemental appropriations legislation just last week. I was really shocked, then, with the result. We won, and I felt elated about that. But the rhetoric that accompanied the opposition to my bill was astounding. All but a handful of enlightened Democrats voted against the bill and spoke against it.

What the Democrat rank and file, through their leadership, were saying is, you Republicans caused the shutdown last time. Therefore, we are not supporting your proposition to prevent shutdowns. Does that make sense? They say, you shut down the Government. Now the Gekas bill, which would prevent Government shutdowns, is unacceptable.

Figure out the logic to that, because I cannot. All that would do would be to continue Government, prevent Government shutdown, and the budget process could take on its own evolution in its own good time between the President and the Congress of the United States.

Many of them said that the reason they are voting no on this proposition to shut down the Government was because President Clinton, as he has, has promised to veto it. If the President of the United States does not want to see the Government shut down, why would he veto a proposition that would prevent Government shutdowns? Explain the logic of that to me, I ask the Speaker and the Members.

What in the world does that mean? We want to prevent a Government shutdown. Well, let us prepare legislation that would prevent Government shutdowns. Well, then let us veto the legislation that would prevent Government shutdowns.

The point is that it logically can be assumed that the people who vote against prevention of a shutdown favor the risk of a shutdown.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. PRYCE of Ohio). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the House stands in recess until 12 noon.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 3 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 12 noon.

☐ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU) at 12 noon.

PRAYER

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

We offer these words of prayer, gracious God, and we do so with humility and with grateful hearts. We place before You our own special petitions, asking that You would bless us when we need encouraging and give us vision for a new day. It is right to place these supplications before You, knowing that You have created each person in Your image and have given the gift of life and the opportunity for service to all. So we pray that You would breathe into our very souls the breath of forgiveness and the faith and hope and love with which to meet the responsibilities of the day. 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.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 311, nays 44, not voting 78, as follows:

[Roll No. 139]

YEAS—311

Aderholt	DeGette	Johnson (CT)
Allen	Delahunt	Johnson (WI)
Andrews	DeLauro	Johnson, Sam
Archer	Dellums	Kanjorski
Armey	Deutsch	Kaptur
Bachus	Diaz-Balart	Kasich
Baesler	Dickey	Kelly
Baker	Dicks	Kildee
Baldacci	Dingell	Kilpatrick
Ballenger	Dixon	Kim
Barcia	Doggett	Kind (WI)
Barr	Dooley	King (NY)
Barrett (NE)	Doolittle	Kingston
Barrett (WI)	Dreier	Kleczka
Bartlett	Duncan	Klink
Barton	Dunn	Klug
Bass	Edwards	Knollenberg
Bateman	Ehlers	Kolbe
Becerra	Emerson	LaHood
Bentsen	Engel	Latham
Bereuter	Eshoo	LaTourette
Berman	Etheridge	Leach
Bishop	Evans	Levin
Blagojevich	Everett	Lewis (CA)
Bliley	Ewing	Lewis (KY)
Blumenauer	Farr	Linder
Boehlert	Fawell	Lofgren
Boehner	Flake	Lowey
Bonilla	Foley	Lucas
Boswell	Ford	Luther
Boucher	Fox	Maloney (CT)
Boyd	Frank (MA)	Manzullo
Brady	Franks (NJ)	Mascara
Brown (OH)	Frelinghuysen	Matsui
Bryant	Furse	McCarthy (MO)
Bunning	Gallegly	McCarthy (NY)
Burton	Ganske	McCollum
Buyer	Gejdenson	McCrery
Callahan	Gekas	McDade
Camp	Gibbons	McGovern
Campbell	Gilchrest	McHale
Canady	Gillmor	McHugh
Cannon	Gilman	McIntosh
Capps	Gonzalez	McIntyre
Cardin	Goode	McKeon
Castle	Goodlatte	McKinney
Chabot	Gordon	Meehan
Chenoweth	Goss	Meek
Christensen	Granger	Metcalf
Clayton	Hall (OH)	Mica
Clement	Hall (TX)	Millender-McDonald
Coble	Hamilton	Miller (FL)
Coburn	Hansen	Minge
Collins	Harman	Mink
Combest	Hastings (WA)	Moakley
Condit	Hayworth	Molinari
Cook	Herger	Mollohan
Cooksey	Hinojosa	Moran (KS)
Costello	Hobson	Moran (VA)
Cox	Hoekstra	Morella
Cramer	Hooley	Murtha
Crane	Horn	Myrick
Crapo	Houghton	Nadler
Cubin	Hoyer	Neal
Cummings	Hutchinson	Ney
Cunningham	Hyde	Northup
Danner	Inglis	Norwood
Davis (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Nussle
Davis (VA)	Jenkins	Obey
Deal	John	

Olver	Salmon	Stokes
Ortiz	Sanchez	Strickland
Owens	Sandlin	Stump
Oxley	Sawyer	Sununu
Packard	Saxton	Talent
Pappas	Scarborough	Tanner
Pastor	Schaefer, Dan	Tauscher
Paul	Scott	Tauzin
Paxon	Sensenbrenner	Taylor (NC)
Pease	Sessions	Thomas
Pelosi	Shadegg	Thornberry
Peterson (MN)	Shaw	Thune
Petri	Shays	Thurman
Pickering	Sherman	Tierney
Pitts	Shimkus	Torres
Pomeroy	Shuster	Traficant
Porter	Sisisky	Turner
Pryce (OH)	Skaggs	Upton
Quinn	Skeen	Vento
Radanovich	Skelton	Walsh
Rahall	Slaughter	Wamp
Regula	Smith (MI)	Watkins
Reyes	Smith (NJ)	Watt (NC)
Riley	Smith (OR)	Weldon (FL)
Rivers	Smith (TX)	Weldon (PA)
Roemer	Smith, Adam	Wexler
Rogers	Snowbarger	Weygand
Rohrabacher	Snyder	Whitfield
Rothman	Solomon	Wicker
Roukema	Spence	Wolf
Roybal-Allard	Spratt	Wynn
Royce	Stabenow	Yates
Rush	Stearns	Young (AK)
Ryun	Stenholm	Young (FL)

NAYS—44

Abercrombie	Hefley	Miller (CA)
Berry	Hefner	Oberstar
Borski	Hill	Pallone
Clay	Hilleary	Pascrell
Clyburn	Hilliard	Pickett
DeFazio	Hulshof	Pombo
English	Johnson, E.B.	Poshard
Ensign	Kucinich	Ramstad
Fattah	LaFalce	Schaffer, Bob
Fazio	Lewis (GA)	Stark
Filner	Lipinski	Stupak
Gephardt	LoBiondo	Thompson
Green	Maloney (NY)	Watts (OK)
Gutknecht	McDermott	Weller
Hastings (FL)	McNulty	

NOT VOTING—78

Ackerman	Hinchey	Portman
Bilbray	Holden	Price (NC)
Bilirakis	Hostettler	Rangel
Blunt	Hunter	Riggs
Bonior	Istook	Rodriguez
Bono	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Rogan
Brown (CA)	Jefferson	Ros-Lehtinen
Brown (FL)	Jones	Sabo
Burr	Kennedy (MA)	Sanders
Calvert	Kennedy (RI)	Sanford
Carson	Kennelly	Schiff
Chambliss	Lampson	Schumer
Conyers	Lantos	Serrano
Coyne	Largent	Smith, Linda
Davis (IL)	Lazio	Souder
DeLay	Livingston	Taylor (MS)
Doyle	Manton	Tiahrt
Ehrlich	Markey	Towns
Foglietta	Martinez	Velazquez
Forbes	McInnis	Visclosky
Fowler	Menendez	Waters
Frost	Nethercutt	Waxman
Goodling	Neumann	White
Graham	Parker	Wise
Greenwood	Payne	Woolsey
Gutierrez	Peterson (PA)	
Hastert		

☐ 1225

Mr. BAKER changed his vote from ‘‘present’’ to ‘‘yea.’’

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin 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.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 15, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a copy of a certificate of the unofficial vote totals received from the Honorable Stephanie Gonzales, Secretary of State, State of New Mexico, which indicates that, according to the unofficial vote totals received by the nominees whose names appeared on the 1997 Special Election Ballot of May 13, 1997, the Honorable Bill Redmond was elected to the Office of Representative in Congress, from the Third Congressional District, State of New Mexico.

Sincerely yours,

ROBIN H. CARLE.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE BILL REDMOND, OF NEW MEXICO, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Mexico, Mr. BILL REDMOND, be permitted to take the oath of office today. His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will the Member-elect from New Mexico present himself in the well of the House along with the members of the New Mexico delegation?

Mr. REDMOND appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter. So help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the United States House of Representatives.

WELCOME TO NEWEST MEMBER OF CONGRESS, THE HONORABLE BILL REDMOND

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, as dean of the New Mexico delegation in the House, it is my distinct pleasure and honor to welcome and congratulate the newest Member of the House of Representatives, the Honorable BILL REDMOND of Los Alamos, NM.

Mr. REDMOND won last week’s special election to New Mexico’s Third Congressional District. Mr. REDMOND won a most impressive victory in getting elected to the House, and many of us watched this race with significant interest and were involved in his successful election to Congress. I thank each and every one of my colleagues for their efforts on Mr. REDMOND’s behalf.

I look forward to working with BILL REDMOND in Congress on behalf of the principles each of us hold dear to our hearts: family values, sound and responsible fiscal budget policies, a strong national defense, and a vibrant economic and business economy.

Welcome to the Congress, Mr. REDMOND, and I wish you the best of success in representing the people of New Mexico’s Third Congressional District. You are in a tremendous body with a tremendous group of people. Welcome.

SERVING TO FULFILL A VISION FOR ALL AMERICA

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

Mr. REDMOND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN]. I am sorry that our colleague, the gentleman from Albuquerque, NM [Mr. SCHIFF], could not be with us.

Mr. Speaker, jatahe from the Navajos, buenos tardes from our Hispanic brothers, and hello from the Anglo population from northern New Mexico.

Regardless of which of New Mexico’s many languages I greet you with today, Navajo, Tiwa, Spanish, or English, we are patriotic Americans who love our country. We gave of our land to develop the weapons which ended World War II early and save hundreds of thousands of lives. We gave our language. We provided Navajo Code Talkers for the safety of our soldiers during World War II. We gave of our sons.

The Bataan Memorial in Santa Fe is a testimony to our Hispanic brothers who died in the death march. We love our families. We keenly understand the covenant of American culture, to provide for opportunity for our children that we can only imagine, while honoring our elders who gave to us what they could only dream.

I have campaigned on a vision of a free and a prosperous America, based on the idea that the hard-earned money of American workers belongs to them and their families first. I dedicate my first term in Congress to my parents, John and Mary Redmond, who sacrificed for their seven children to fulfill this covenant and this vision for their children.

So I join you today as a servant of my constituents to fulfill this vision for all of America. It is an honor to serve with you.

□ 1230

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain fifteen 1-minutes on each side.

FLOOD INSURANCE CRUCIAL FOR HURRICANE SEASON

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, first of all, welcome to Mr. REDMOND.

This Member rises to urge his colleagues from hurricane-prone areas to remind their constituents and news columns and news releases that hurricane season is quickly approaching and, the key point, that now is the time to review their flood insurance policies to ensure adequate coverage.

As of March 1, 1995, the national flood insurance program very appropriately, under congressional direction, imposes a 30-day waiting period between the time the premium is paid and the time the policy takes effect. This important change was made to encourage at-risk individuals to maintain adequate coverage at all times rather than waiting to purchase coverage only when danger is imminent.

Constituents must take proper care of their investment by purchasing adequate flood insurance coverage at least 30 days prior to a disaster. Without taking this simple step, they have no standing to ask the other policyholders or the taxpayers to bail them out if their investment is lost due to unexpected flooding.

This is fair warning that we should pass on to our constituents. If Members need more information, contact FEMA.

IN HONOR OF THE GREEN BAY PACKERS AND THEIR SUPER BOWL VICTORY

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute the Super Bowl champions, the Green Bay Packers, who are in the Nation's Capital today as we prepare in this Chamber to debate a balanced budget agreement, the first in a long time; another long road to success will be celebrated here at the White House this afternoon as the champions of the football world meet the champions of the free world.

From Lambeau to Lombardi to Holmgren, from Bart Starr to Brett Favre, it has been 29 years since the Green Bay champions, the Super Bowl champions, the Packers, have once again returned the Lombardi trophy to its home, Green Bay, WI.

Behind this great tradition of winning are the fans, affectionately known as the Cheeseheads. They are in fact the owners of the Green Bay Packers. They have raised money to keep the team in the community, built a new stadium, sold out Lambeau Field for every game since the Packer's first Super Bowl victory.

May the grand tradition of the Super Bowl Green Bay Packers continue. I ask my colleagues to salute the Green Bay Packers, America's original ''America's Team.''

BUDGET AGREEMENT INTERNET ADDRESS

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I would like those who would like the Internet address to get out a pen and paper. I will give that to my colleagues.

The Internet address for the budget agreement is http//hillsource.house.gov/budget.html. Documents dealing with the budget agreement are on the Internet, so all Americans can see how it came about, what is in it. The home page is labeled a balanced budget for America's future. This will allow the people at the same time as the Washington insiders to have the information.

Again, the Internet address is http//hillsource.house.gov/budget.html.

SUPPORT THE SHUSTER-OBERSTAR AMENDMENT

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Shuster-Oberstar-Petri-Rahall amendment to today's budget resolution.

Without a world-class highway and transit system, the United States simply cannot hope to compete in our increasingly global economy. The Pacific rim nations and Europe are spending trillions of dollars on national infrastructure for a very simple reason: It makes good economic sense. We must do the same here at home.

The tremendous needs of transportation and infrastructure in my home State of Massachusetts and across this Nation depend on adequate Federal investment. The budget agreement as it now stands falls woefully short of allowing us to merely maintain our aging highway and transit system, let alone making greatly needed repairs.

The Shuster-Oberstar amendment is a sensible, bipartisan effort to increase transportation funding to minimum acceptable levels, offset by a minuscule across-the-board reduction in all parts of the budget except entitlements.

I am strongly committed to balancing the Federal budget, but balancing the budget is all about choices.

The President speaks eloquently about building a bridge to the 21st century, but that bridge is in desperate need of repair. I ask my colleagues to be bold, to be daring and to invest in our Nation's economic security and our future.

Vote ''yes'' on the Shuster-Oberstar amendment.

HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS SAVE LIVES

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

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, 42,000 Americans were killed in automobile accidents in 1995 and 1996, an increase of 2,500 fatalities since 1992.

The Federal Highway Administration says that road design and conditions contributed to 30 percent of those fatalities, which means that approximately 12,000 lives could have been saved by investing in better roads.

Highway improvements save lives. Eighty percent of all travel occurs on the Nation's highways, which means investing in better and safer roads is the single most dramatic step we can take in protecting the lives of our Nation's motorists.

The millions of dollars paid into the highway trust fund each year from our motorists is done with the expectation that it will be used not only to maintain but to improve the safety of the Nation's highways. This is not being done. Using the monies entrusted to us by the people for their intended purpose, the Shuster-Oberstar-Petri-Rahall amendment gives us the opportunity to fulfill our obligation to provide the safest roads possible for every man, woman, and child traveling on them.

In the name of safer roads, I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting the Shuster-Oberstar-Petri-Rahall amendment on the budget resolution.

NO MFN FOR CHINA

(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, the White House supports MFN for China. The United Nations supports MFN for China. The Council on Foreign Relations and the Trilateral Commission, they support MFN for China; and naturally, China more than anyone else supports MFN for China.

It seems everyone supports MFN for China except American workers, and I think their reason is right on target. America's trade policy sucks. We are not going to have a job left, folks.

I would just like to say in closing out here that while we are budgeting our limited assets together, China keeps laughing all the way to the bank with a huge surplus.

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker, dot com.

VOTE FOR THE BALANCED BUDGET AGREEMENT

(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, 1969, ''Mod Squad'' on TV, American Vietnam students in the streets and Neil Armstrong on the moon, and the budget was balanced for the last time. How long ago was that? A Burger King Whopper could be purchased for 39 cents, a Coke for 15 cents, a gallon of gas, 30 cents, a Ford Maverick, $2,995, and a Ford Pinto, $1,919.

Needless to say, that is what we had at our house. The Beatles had just released ''The White album,'' the Stones were crying ''Gimme Shelter,'' and Jimi Hendrix was ending out the year with his fine album, ''Band of Gypsies.'' He was still alive then. And then the best memorabilia of all, Mr. Speaker, and I do not know if I should show this photo or not, but after the previous speech, Woodstock, August 1969, and again the budget was balanced.

Mr. Speaker, today, if we want, we can listen to these great albums. We can vote for a balanced budget, and we can get the budget on Internet. The best technology from yesterday and the best of today is all before Members of Congress today in one single afternoon. Please vote for the balanced budget.

BALANCED BUDGET AGREEMENT PLAN OF ACTION WITHOUT DETAILS

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize that today's vote on the balanced budget resolution is essentially a plan of action without the details. While there is tentative agreement concerning Democratic tax cut and spending priorities, Republicans can still try to eliminate many of these Democratic priorities when the details are worked out.

According to today's Washington Times, the House Republican leadership has signaled that it is not opposed to the Republican right's conservative action team budget proposal, which may eliminate many of the Democrats' Families First priorities, including the HOPE education scholarship and the children's health care initiative, all in favor of larger tax cuts for the wealthy.

Democrats, Mr. Speaker, will be watchful to make sure that this does not happen. Both the tax cuts and the spending priorities must primarily benefit working families.

CAPITAL GAINS TAX CUT BENEFITS MIDDLE CLASS

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have a question for those on the other side who constantly talk about tax cuts for the wealthy. Perhaps those on the other side are simply not aware of how important tax cuts on capital gains are to the middle class. Then again, maybe for liberal Democrats, the rich whom they despise so much, the wealthy whom they rail against so often, are simply code words for the middle class.

Although those who produce the most, who work the hardest, or even those who are simply fortunate, are considered the enemy by liberal Democrats, their opposition to capital gains tax cuts is flat out contrary to the interests of the middle class.

Mr. Speaker, are those on the other side aware that middle class Americans are pouring money into mutual funds as never before? In 1995, net assets for equity funds totaled $1.27 trillion, for bond funds, $798 billion. The typical mutual fund holder has a family income of less than $60,000 a year.

Listen to this: Of all of the shareholders, two-thirds have less than $75,000 family income.

The bottom line, a cut in the capital gains rate is a tax cut for the middle class.

□ 1245

SHUSTER - OBERSTAR - PETRI - RAHALL AMENDMENT TO THE FISCAL YEAR 1998 BUDGET RESOLUTION

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to consider transportation needs of their respective districts when considering the budget resolution. I remind Members, no, I implore them, to remain cognizant of just how many aspects of human society are dependent on our transportation systems: Employment, trade, land development, environmental quality, social equity, economic activity, energy and resource allocation, access to education, and access to health care.

The Shuster-Oberstar-Petri-Rahall amendment permits us to address the serious infrastructure deficiencies of our Nation. It does not interfere with balancing the budget by fiscal year 2002 and it does not cut any entitlement programs.

Transportation accounts for over $1 trillion in commerce annually. For every $1 billion of investment, 42,000 jobs are created. Please do not stunt the economic growth of our country by denying Americans essential transportation systems. Our daily existence depends on it.

THE MOST IMPORTANT TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE VOTE

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to alert our colleagues that we will be faced later today with the single most important transportation and infrastructure vote not only in this Congress, but for the next 6 years, because the vote today on transportation funding on our amendment will determine whether or not we are going to have the barely adequate funds necessary to reauthorize ISTEA and to deal with the donor State equity issue. Indeed, if our amendment passes, we are committed to dealing with the donor State equity issue.

The levels in the budget resolution are simply too low. It continues the dishonest practice of using trust fund revenue to mask the general fund deficit.

Get this. If the budget resolution passes without our amendment, the $33 billion which is the balance today in the transportation trust fund will be raised to $65 billion in the next 5 years, and those are not my numbers, those are CBO numbers.

Forty-nine Governors have signed a letter saying transportation levels are too low. So join us, support our amendment, and we will be able to fund transportation and achieve a balanced budget.

ATTEMPT TO OFFER A TRUE BALANCED BUDGET DEFEATED

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, this was to be the year of tough decisions in Congress, as they planned for a balanced budget, decisions between tax cuts, increases in military spending, stability for Medicare and Social Security, investment in transportation or education. It is incredibly difficult for Congress and the President to decide between these competing priorities and constituencies. We cannot have it all, as we learned in the early 1980's.

So after months of wrangling and hand-wringing, Congress and the President did the predictable: They decided they did want it all and they wanted a balanced budget; big increases for the Pentagon, big tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans, and even a nod toward transportation and education.

It is too good to be true. Guess what, it is not. The budget negotiators simply assumed an additional $225 billion of income; no new CBO baseline forecast, no new economic forecast. Let us assume our way out of this problem, $225 billion that does not exist and will not exist, and I am not being allowed to offer a budget that does not assume that today.

SUPPORT BIPARTISAN AMENDMENT TO INCREASE TRANSPORTATION SPENDING

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

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, today's budget vote has unique significance to the reauthorization of ISTEA, since it locks in for the next several years the amount of transportation spending that we can include in a reauthorization bill.

All Members representing donor States and donee States who have come to plead their case before the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure should pay special attention to the budget vote later today. Donor States want more equitable highway formulas, and I know their frustration, because I come from a donor State. Donee States want to protect their current shares.

Without more funding than is provided in the budget agreement, it will be impossible to satisfy all of the States, so both donor and donee States should be on notice that they will have to live with the ramification of today's budget vote for years to come.

Support the amendment of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure which increases funding for ISTEA, does not result in any cuts next year, and simply spends new revenues to keep the current $24 billion highway trust fund balance stable. The ISTEA reauthorization debate begins today. Vote ''yes'' on the Shuster-Oberstar amendment.

WE SHOULD REOPEN PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the constituents, the tourists of my colleagues come every year. If they go anywhere near Pennsylvania Avenue they will find a traffic catastrophe. The heart of downtown is closed to the public because the White House area is no longer open to traffic.

Senators and Representatives from this region today have written the President asking that the Treasury, the Secret Service, and the District of Columbia sit down to work out a plan to reopen Pennsylvania Avenue. That plan must be consistent with the Secret Service concerns about the safety of the White House complex. We are fully cognizant of that.

But this region is No. 2 in the Nation in lost time to commuters and No. 1 in economic losses to commuters because of that lost time. Many Members know what this is about because they come into town in the morning to a closed Pennsylvania Avenue and all the traffic problems that have been brought. Open Pennsylvania Avenue gradually, consistent with the President's safety.

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION ENDORSES PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT

(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, the American Medical Association struck a blow for innocent human life yesterday when it endorsed legislation to outlaw the heinous practice of partial-birth abortions. Now the major obstacles in the way of a ban on this horrific procedure are President Clinton and the leaders of the most radical pro-abortion lobbies.

Let us hope that the American Medical Association's statement that we must restrict a procedure that, and I quote, ''We all agree is not good medicine,'' will get the attention of the last remaining diehard on the wrong side of this issue. A partial-birth abortion is literally the killing in a most brutal fashion of a baby about to take its first breath of life outside the womb. It is a grotesque and inhuman practice. In a civilized society, it has absolutely no place.

Mr. Speaker, the Cincinnati Enquirer, my hometown's newspaper, in a hard-hitting editorial this morning, summed it up best. Again, I quote. They said, ''It is time to declare that our society will no longer tolerate infanticide as a choice.''

Let us ban this horrible procedure once and for all.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 815

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. HAROLD ROGERS, be removed as a cosponsor on H.R. 815.

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

There was no objection.

1998 DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION STRIPS CITIZEN SOLDIERS OF RIGHT TO PAID MILITARY LEAVE

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to address an issue that affects all of our military Reserve and National Guard members who are Federal employees. The 1998 defense authorization bill proposes to take away the right of these citizen soldiers to earn their 15 days of paid military leave each year.

Up to this point this has been a highly successful military leave policy for civil servants who serve in the Reserve and Guard. Why destroy that policy? Rather, this U.S. Government should set the example by supporting the Reserve and Guard forces. These brave men and women make up 40 percent of this Nation's armed services. Removing such incentives will significantly jeopardize the recruitment and retention of these fine service members, and reduce the number of personnel who will volunteer for operations.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, if we do not stop this proposal it will seriously jeopardize the safety of America, and the ultimate strength of our military forces and their ability to protect us.

HIGHER PRIORITY NEEDED FOR TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the NEXTEA proposal and the recent budget agreement fall short of fulfilling the Nation's, Pennsylvania's, and Montgomery County's transportation needs. Much more needs to be done to protect our highways, bridges, and transit systems. Roads such as route 309 through eastern Montgomery County, PA literally threaten the safety of my constituents. This road has one of the worst safety records for a highway of its kind in the State. We need to have the legislation adopted, this Shuster bill.

Balancing the Federal budget is important. I have stood on the floor with my colleagues to make sure we pass balanced budgets to have deficit reduction, lower taxes, and tax limitations. However, within the overall budget framework, transportation needs to be given a higher priority if we are going to have any possibility of adequately funding the reauthorization of ISTEA and preventing any further injury and death on roads such as route 309 in Pennsylvania.

I further urge my colleagues today to vote for the Shuster-Oberstar-Petri-Rahall substitute to the budget resolution.

SILVER CHARM, FROM OCALA, FL, NEARS A TRIPLE CROWN WIN

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to inform my colleagues that after one of the most exciting races in the history of the Preakness Stakes held Saturday, Silver Charm, sired and trained in my hometown of Ocala, FL, is two-thirds of the way toward winning the Triple Crown.

I congratulate Bob and Beverly Lewis, the owners of Silver Charm, and I congratulate Jack Dudley, owner of Dudley Farms in Ocala, where Silver Charm was born. Not since 1978 has there been a Triple Crown winner, and that fine animal was another Ocala-bred horse, Affirmed.

Thoroughbred horse racing is unique among competitions, a combination of skilled riders and these carefully bred and trained animals. Increasingly, Florida is producing champion horses. The horse farms of Ocala and Marion County are bringing well-deserved recognition to our State. On behalf of the people of Marion County, I wish Silver Charm all the best in the Belmont Stakes in June.

LET US HELP PRESIDENT CLINTON AND PASS THE TAX CUT ON CAPITAL GAINS

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

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I would like to do something extraordinary in politics. I want to pass legislation for which President Clinton can claim credit. It gets even stranger. The President opposes this legislation, even though he will accept it as part of a deal to get more social spending.

The legislation I am talking about is, of course, a cut in the capital gains tax. What will happen to the economy? Well, it is obvious. What will happen is exactly the same thing that has happened each and every time a tax cut in the capital gains tax has been signed into law. The economy will improve.

In a $7.5 trillion economy a cut in the tax on capital gains has a dramatic effect. So when the economy improves, President Clinton will surely cite every possible explanation for improved economic growth except for the capital gains tax. But job creators know what really creates jobs. So, ironically, he will get all the credit for an improved economy that is due solely to the change in how we tax capital investments, but I can accept that.

Let us help President Clinton, despite himself, and pass the tax cut on capital gains in his balanced budget agreement.

RECOGNIZING THE FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE ELECTION OF LI TENG-HUI

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

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the first anniversary of the popular election Li Teng-hui as the President of the Republic of China. This is historic because it was the first time in history that the people of China have elected their President, the first time a head of state in China has been elected by the people.

Last year 21 million in Taiwan went to the polls in record numbers. This was a tremendous victory, not just for President Li, who a number of Members have met over the years, but more importantly it was a victory of the people of China, because in going to the polls they defied the force and might of the mainland Chinese, who were launching missile tests and were doing everything they could to harass and intimidate the people on the island of Taiwan.

Mr. Speaker, for many years the people on Taiwan and their government have been our strong allies and friends. It is essential that we commit ourselves to standing with them. The Republic of China deserves our support, President Li deserves our support, and I am proud to stand today commemorating his election as the first ever popularly elected President in the history of China.

☐ 1300

DISPENSING WITH CALL OF PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the call of the Private Calendar today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO ENTERTAIN MOTIONS TO SUSPEND RULES ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 1997

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, May 21, 1997, the Speaker be authorized to entertain motions to suspend the rules and pass the following bills and resolutions:

H.R. 1377, Savings Are Vital to Everyone's Retirement Act of 1997;

H.R. 1306, Riegle-Neal Clarification Act of 1997;

H.R. 911, Volunteer Protection Act of 1997;

House Resolution 121, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the March 30, 1997, terrorist grenade attack in Cambodia;

House Concurrent Resolution 63, reaffirming the commitment of the United States to the principles of the Marshall Plan;

H.R. 956, Drug-Free Community Act.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken later in the day.

PERMITTING USE OF CAPITOL ROTUNDA FOR CONGRESSIONAL CEREMONY HONORING MOTHER TERESA

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) to permit the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a congressional ceremony honoring Mother Teresa.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. CON. RES. 26

Whereas Mother Teresa of Calcutta has greatly enhanced the lives of people in all walks of life in every corner of the world through her faith, her love, and her selfless dedication to humanity and charitable works for nearly 70 years;

Whereas Mother Teresa founded the Missionaries of Charity, which includes more than 3,000 members in 25 countries who devote their lives to serving the poor, without accepting any material reward in return;

Whereas Mother Teresa has been recognized as an outstanding humanitarian around the world and has been honored by: the first Pope John XXIII Peace Prize (1971); the Jawaharal Nehru Award for International Understanding (1972); the Nobel Peace Prize (1979); and the Presidential Medal of Freedom (1985).

Whereas Mother Teresa has forever enhanced the culture and history of the world; and

Whereas Mother Teresa truly leads by example and shows the people of the world the way to live by love for all humanity; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the rotunda of the Capitol is authorized to be used on June 5, 1997, for a congressional ceremony honoring Mother Teresa. Physical preparations for the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] and the gentlewoman from Michigan [Ms. KILPATRICK], each will control 20 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, Senate Concurrent Resolution 26 was approved by the Committee on House Oversight in its regularly scheduled meeting on May 14. The concurrent resolution authorizes the use of the Capitol rotunda on June 5 to allow for a celebration honoring Mother Teresa after she addresses a joint session of Congress. The Senate passed this resolution which was offered by the senior Senator from Kansas, Senator SAM BROWNBACK, on May 8.

Agnese Gonxhe Bojaxhiu, now known as Mother Teresa, was born on August 26, 1910, in Albania. She joined a Catholic Missionary order and went to India when she was 18 years old. In 1950, she founded the Missionaries of Charity.

Mother Teresa is one of those names known the world over. More important than being recognized, she has been honored the world over:

She was honored with the first Pope John XXIII Peace Prize in 1971. The Jawaharal Nehru Award for International Understanding was given to her in 1972. The Nobel Peace Prize in 1979, the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1985 from President Reagan. And in 1996, Mother Teresa became the fifth person in the world to be conferred honorary citizenship from the United States by President Clinton.

For historical purposes, the first was Winston Churchill by President Kennedy in 1963, Raoul Wallenberg by President Reagan in 1981, and William and Hannah Penn by President Reagan in 1984.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we live in an age that is sometimes easy to dismiss as selfish, self-absorbed, cynical, and cruel. Mother Teresa and her selfless dedication to the world's least fortunate serve as a powerful reminder of our age which still includes shining symbols, as Mother Teresa is, for goodness and compassion.

At our schools, wherever she takes us, she is always rededicating herself to the least of these. Permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol of the United States for a congressional ceremony to honor Mother Teresa and her life's work is something that I am proud to stand here today and be in full support of.

We will be focusing the attention of all Americans, whatever their faiths, on a symbol that can serve them well in our everyday lives. As we know, Mother Teresa was born in 1910 in Albania. She received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1979.

She is known as the Saint of the Gutter, where she spent tireless hours giving of herself, educating, providing people with hope who have no hope. I had occasion to meet Mother Teresa when she visited the city of Detroit a few years back. The aura that is instilled in her is there for anyone to see. She is a saint. And she is a person whom we all can take a look at and honor because she has given much of her life so that people have the hope that God has intended each of us to have.

Mr. Speaker, the Missionaries of Charity has branches in 50 Indian cities and about 30 other countries around the world. It numbers more than 3,000 members who have decided to follow Mother Teresa's example and dedicate their lives by serving the world's poor.

Mother Teresa is special to me personally. I am happy this Congress is going to have a dedication ceremony for her.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN].

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] for his assistance in getting this piece of legislation to the floor so quickly. This came up on rather short notice, and we appreciate all his hard work and the work of the staff to expedite this bill.

The passage of this resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 26, authorizes the use of the Capitol rotunda for a congressional ceremony honoring Mother Teresa. This ceremony will take place on June 5. We are looking forward to hearing her comments and honoring her life.

It is during this time that we will present her with the Congressional Gold Medal as a small tribute for her lifelong dedication of service to those who are less fortunate, impoverished, ill, homeless, and destitute.

As we have heard already some of her awards and accomplishments, they go on and on. They are very numerous awards that she has achieved throughout her life. But I think the one thing that Mother Teresa stands out for is that, no matter who is the person she meets, she loves everybody. I think that she has followed the example that Christ laid down in that she loves her brother and her sister.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 26.

The question was taken.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on Senate Concurrent Resolution 26.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING PRESIDENT TO AWARD CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO MOTHER TERESA

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1650) to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Mother Teresa of Calcutta in recognition of her outstanding and enduring contributions through humanitarian and charitable activities, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1650

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) Mother Teresa of Calcutta has greatly impacted the lives of people in all walks of life in every corner of the world through love and her selfless dedication to humanity and charitable works for nearly 70 years;

(2) Mother Teresa has expanded her personal dedication by founding the Missionaries of Charity, which include well over 3,000 members in 25 countries, who devote their entire lives to serving the poor without accepting any material reward in return;

(3) Mother Teresa has been recognized as a humanitarian around the world and has been recognized in the form of—

(A) the first Pope John XXIII Peace Prize (1971);

(B) the Jawaharal Nehru Award for International Understanding (1972);

(C) the Nobel Peace Prize (1979); and

(D) the Presidential Medal of Freedom (1985);

(4) Mother Teresa is a tool of God;

(5) God's love flowing through Mother Teresa has forever impacted the culture and history of the world; and

(6) Mother Teresa truly leads by example and shows the people of the world the way to live by love for mankind.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) PRESENTATION AUTHORIZED.—The President is authorized to present, on behalf of the Congress, a gold medal of appropriate design to Mother Teresa of Calcutta in recognition of her outstanding and enduring contributions to humanitarian and charitable activities.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For the purpose of the presentation referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter in this Act referred to as the ''Secretary'') shall strike a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, to be determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 3. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

The Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck pursuant to section 2 under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, and at a price sufficient to cover the costs thereof, including labor, materials, dies, and use of machinery, overhead expenses, and the cost of the gold medal.

SEC. 4. NATIONAL MEDALS.

The medals struck pursuant to this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; PROCEEDS OF SALE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is hereby authorized to be charged against the Numismatic Public Enterprise Fund an amount not to exceed $30,000 to pay for the cost of the medal authorized by this Act.

(b) PROCEEDS OF SALE.—Amounts received from the sales of duplicate bronze medals under section 3 shall be deposited in the Numismatic Public Enterprise Fund.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FLAKE], each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

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

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I rise in support of H.R. 1650, the bill to award a

Congressional Gold Medal to Mother Teresa, a woman who is perhaps as close to sainthood as anyone this Congress is likely to meet.

Mother Teresa of Calcutta has set a standard of selfless dedication to humanity and charitable works for nearly 70 years. She founded the order, the Missionaries of Charity, which now includes over 3,000 members in 25 countries who devote their lives to serving the poor with no material recompense for their sacrifice. Among many other humanitarian awards, Mother Teresa has received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1979 and the Presidential Medal of Freedom 1985.

Mother Teresa of Calcutta is most renowned for devoting her life to the sick and dying, the poorest of the poor. She lives with them and ministers to their physical and spiritual necessities, seeking to influence the rest of us by setting an example and defining charity. This example must cause us all to reevaluate our lives in the light of her wholly admirable life. Mr. Speaker, the standard for a Congressional Gold Medal is the recipient must be someone one who has performed an achievement that has an impact on American history and culture that is likely to be recognized as a major achievement in the recipient's field long after the achievement itself. Mother Teresa's career embodying the principle of charity clearly meets and exceeds this standard.

H.R. 1650 complies with Committee on Banking and Financial Services rules regarding the authorization of congressional gold medals. Although a committee markup was not held, a majority of both committee and subcommittee members are cosponsors. There is no known opposition from Members of Congress or the U.S. Mint.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation may have set a record for the attraction of 325 cosponsors in a matter of hours. I understand that the sense of urgency is due to the desire of the House to present some tangible representation of this award during Mother Teresa's visit to the Capitol in a few weeks. The Congressional Gold Medal is the appropriate award, since it is the highest civilian honor this Congress can bestow.

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

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 1650, urge the House to unanimously extend the Congressional Gold Medal to Mother Teresa. Mother Teresa has captured the loving spirit of charity and exemplifies the moral obligation we all have toward a global community.

As she once said, the world today is hungry, not only for bread but hungry for love, hungry to be wanted, and hungry to be loved. She has indeed loved the most needy in the world since 1928. Born in Yugoslavia in 1910, she was raised in a comfortable environment. Comfort, however, did not mute her call to a higher purpose. Following her convictions, she became a nun in 1928, and eventually joined the Loreto Convent in India. Subsequently, in 1931, she took the name of Teresa in honor of St. Teresa of Avila, a 16th century Spanish nun.

While teaching in Calcutta in 1929, Mother Teresa took note of streets crowded with beggars, lepers, and homeless persons. She was in a city where unwanted infants were regularly left to die in the streets or in garbage bins. After 17 years of teaching, Mother Teresa felt the need to abandon her position as a teacher and instead began to care for the needy in the slums of Calcutta.

Mother Teresa became a citizen of India in 1948 and soon founded the Missionaries of Charity. She focused her work on poor children in the streets and in 1949 began enlisting recruits to join her in her order. The core principle of her order became one of lifetime commitment to serving the poor without accepting any material reward in return.

In the 1950's, Mother Teresa began the work that would gain her worldwide acclaim. She established a leper colony called the Town of Peace. For this the Indian Government awarded her The Magnificent Lotus Award in 1962. Pope Paul the 6th, that same year, placed Missionaries of Charity directly under the control of the papacy. In doing so, he allowed Mother Teresa to expand her order outside of India. Centers for lepers, the blind, the aged and the dying were soon opened all around the world.

The love, the concern and samaritanship so evident in Mother Teresa was honored by the Pope in 1971 when he awarded her the first Pope John the 23d Peace Prize. She received her greatest award in 1979 when she received the Nobel Peace Prize. As with other awards, Mother Teresa accepted the prize on behalf of the poor and used the monetary gifts to fund her centers. Today there are over 3,000 nuns in her order, and Missionaries of Charity centers in over 25 countries.

Mr. Speaker, these deeds and her consistent hard work on behalf of the needy have made Mother Teresa a paragon of charity. She has indeed left an indelible mark on our society. We should do nothing less than to follow her advice to make our homes centers of compassion and forgiveness endlessly.

☐ 1315

Believing in this advice will make us all a better people.

I close by again advising this House to give support to the bill. It is a small gesture for our Nation to honor a larger than life human being. But as Mother Teresa has said, ''We can do no great things, only small things with great love.''

I believe that every Member voting for this particular legislation today will express to Mother Teresa not only our love but the love of the people of this Nation as we reach out to one who has always reached out to others.

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

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN].

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank some of the people who helped in bringing this legislation to the floor.

When Senator BROWNBACK initially approached me with the idea of introducing this legislation on the House side just a month ago, I was not sure that we could get the needed 290 cosponsors in time for Mother Teresa's visit next month. As of today, we have 327 cosponsors.

That is why I want to thank the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. ZACH WAMP, and the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. STUPAK, and the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. BRYANT, and the gentleman from Nevada, Mr. ENSIGN, and the gentlewoman from Missouri, Mrs. EMERSON, for obtaining the necessary number of signatures and cosponsors because literally this was a team effort.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE], for helping expedite this bill through, as well as the gentleman from New York [Mr. FLAKE].

The cosponsor on this bill is my friend, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. JESSE JACKSON. He and his staff have worked hard on this bill. They have helped work the issue on both sides, and I think it is a neat opportunity when two Members from the two different parties can work together in a bipartisan fashion and work together for the good of the country and for a cause that we all believe in.

On June 5, a woman who has made it her lifelong mission to serve others will visit this Congress. This woman can be recognized by all as the most important self-sacrificing heroine of our time. For this reason, my colleagues and I would like to grant Mother Teresa the Congressional Gold Medal.

Mother Teresa has spent the majority of her 87 years reaching out to the poorest of the poor and providing comfort to individuals who face nothing but hopelessness and despair. Her personal commitment to the sick and dying demonstrate her unceasing love and selfless devotion to mankind, serving as a true model for the world to follow.

She has proven repeatedly that no matter how indigent an individual has become, simple acts of love and tenderness can once again help them discover the true sense of dignity, humanity, and at least momentary peace. Her inspirational work will live forever and can be multiplied through the Missionaries of Charity, which now resides in every continent, even in Russia, where her sisters continue their service to the poor and neglected.

Today the Missionaries of Charity have more than 4,000 nuns who run over 5,517 orphanages, housing the impoverished, the ill, the homeless, and the dying. In a world that sometimes seems so impersonal and unaffected by the suffering of others, Mother Teresa has provided hope and encouragement through her endearing spirit. She has an exceptional character and has sacrificed the greater part of her daily life for others.

Mother Teresa is visibly perceived by many as a living saint. Her love and compassion for humanity will always serve as a constant reminder that no matter what age, gender, or faith one may be that every human being has the ability to make an impression on mankind. Her tradition of spirituality and compassion has made her one of the greatest humanitarians of all time.

Recently, a poll was taken here in the United States and of all the people that the United States said they respected the most, Mother Teresa was voted No. 1. Though weakened by a chronic heart ailment and other heart problems, Mother Teresa's deep hope and abiding faith in God will live on forever.

In closing, I would like to share some of Mother Teresa's wisdom by quoting her. She once said, ''If we pray, we will believe. If we believe, we will love. If we love, we will serve. We can do no great things, only small things with great love.''

That quote reminds me of Matthew 22 that talks about the greatest commandment of loving others. Mother Teresa has embodied what Christ called the greatest commandment, and the second greatest commandment was like the first.

I urge the immediate adoption of H.R. 1650 in a bipartisan fashion, and I thank the Members that have worked so hard in bringing this to the floor.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Chicago, IL, Mr. JESSE JACKSON, Jr., the cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 1650, and I would like to thank the gentleman from Delaware, Chairman CASTLE, and the gentleman from New York, Mr. FLAKE, the ranking member, for the opportunity to address this important piece of legislation commending and honoring the work of Mother Teresa. Mother Teresa has been referred to as a moral leader, a Nobel laureate who has also been regularly referred to as a living saint among us.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to take this opportunity to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN] for providing me with the opportunity to cosponsor this worthy endeavor. When the gentleman initially approached me about the legislation, there was no equivocation whatsoever about my willingness to support and work on this side of the aisle to seek Democratic cosponsors of such a worthy piece of legislation. I think that the thoughtfulness of the gentleman from Nebraska on this particular piece of legislation is certainly an example of the kind of spirit that he has brought to this Congress, and it is indeed an honor to have the privilege of being a cosponsor with the gentleman on this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, with this Congressional Gold Medal we honor Mother Teresa of Calcutta upon her retirement as superior general of the Missionaries of Charity, the order she founded in 1947 to care for the dying and destitute of Calcutta, India. This moral and spiritual leader, known to the world as the ''Saint of the Gutters'' for her lifelong work caring for the third world's poorest of the poor, continues her struggle for humanity despite her own physical frailty.

After suffering from malaria, from pneumonia, a heart attack, and after undergoing three heart surgeries just last year, the 86-year-old Mother Teresa has announced that she hopes that she is able to set up a base in China as her next project. Imagine that, 86, after having suffered from malaria, from pneumonia, a heart attack and three different surgeries, Mother Teresa keeps on giving and she never ceases to keep on giving.

The Albanian-born Mother Teresa, who bravely combats her physical weakness, lacks no internal moral strength or outward vision. She is motivated by the depth of her faith and spirituality. Through her direct humanitarian acts, carried out by the Missionaries of Charity, she has transformed millions of lives one by one in the order's AIDS hospices, soup kitchens, homes for unwed mothers, clinics, schools, and homes for the lepers, the sick, and the terminally ill in 25 nations across this world.

The sisters of her order literally go out into the streets and physically lift the starving terminally ill, drawing them into these homes to provide them with shelter and medicine free of charge. Most importantly, the sisters offer the least of these, our world's most vulnerable, who have so tragically been cast aside by society, the dignity and the respect of which all human beings are deserving.

It is this spirit, the spirit of Mother Teresa, that I believe was probably best engendered in recent times in our Nation by the volunteer summit that took place in Philadelphia, where we saw Americans attempting to give back beyond themselves, beyond their class, beyond their race, and even beyond their own value system, to give of themselves, and no other person in our world for such a time as this has provided that as the gentlewoman from Calcutta.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we can all learn and embrace her example. She is motivated by her faith to do good. She feeds the poor because they are hungry; she houses the homeless because they lack shelter; she treats the sick because they are ill. Her love and her care is not conditional. Her service to humanity is based upon her deep seated belief that we are all members of one human family.

She treats people of all races and ethnicities, of all social stratum, equally, regardless of their relative wealth or poverty. In essence, this is what her deep sense of spirituality and religion compel her to do. Her righteous and selfless example is one from which we can all find inspiration and take guidance and direction.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor today to sponsor this bill to bestow the Congressional Medal of Honor to Mother Teresa when she graces us with her presence on June 5. I thank my colleagues for the overwhelming support for this tribute to a truly remarkable member of the world community.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and solely to thank those who were the sponsors of this legislation. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN] referenced this, but they did an extraordinary job of getting more signatures in this Congress in support of something than maybe anybody in the history of the Congress, for all I know, in a remarkably short time. So I congratulate them both on that. Obviously, the cause was extremely justifiable, which we have all learned here today, and we appreciate that, too.

I also want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. FLAKE] who continues to be a wonderful ranking member to work with on this committee. Hopefully, we will have some success again today as we have before.

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that, indeed, it is a joy to work with the gentleman from Delaware, and I am overwhelmed by the number of supporters that spoke on this bill and actually signed on in such short order.

I think that makes the ultimate statement of the value of this particular piece of legislation, and would hope that all of our colleagues would join us, for I think this expresses all that is a part of what our life ought to be, and that is loving our neighbors as we love ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to encourage everyone to support this. We will be asking for rollcall votes so people will have an opportunity to vote for it.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1650. At the same time, I rise in total support of, and with complete respect for, the work of Mother Teresa, the Missionaries of Charity organization, and each of

Mother Teresa's Nobel Peace Prize-winning humanitarian efforts. I oppose the Gold Medal for Mother Teresa Act because appropriating $30,000 of taxpayer money is neither constitutional nor, in the spirit of Mother Teresa who dedicated here entire life to voluntary, charitable work, particularly humanitarian.

Because of my continuing and uncompromising opposition to appropriations not authorized within the enumerated powers of the Constitution, several of my colleagues found it amusing to question me personally as to whether, on this issue, I would maintain my resolve and commitment of the Constitution—a Constitution, which only months ago, each Member of Congress, swore to uphold. In each of these instances, I offered to do a little more than uphold my constitutional oath.

In fact, as a means of demonstrating my personal regard and enthusiasm for the work of Mother Teresa, I invited each of these colleagues to match my private, personal contribution of $100 which, if accepted by the 435 Members of the House of Representatives, would more than satisfy the $30,000 cost necessary to mint and award a gold medal to the well-deserving Mother Teresa. To me, it seemed a particularly good opportunity to demonstrate one's genuine convictions by spending one's own money rather than that of the taxpayers who remain free to contribute, at their own discretion, to the work of Mother Teresa and have consistently done so. For the record, not a single Representative who solicited my support for spending taxpayer's money, was willing to contribute their own money to demonstrate the courage of their so-called convictions and generosity.

It is, of course, very easy to be generous with other people's money.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1650.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof)——

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1650.

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

There was no objection.

SENSE OF THE HOUSE THAT HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SHOULD PARTICIPATE IN AND SUPPORT ACTIVITIES TO PROVIDE DECENT HOMES FOR PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 147) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the House of Representatives should participate in and support activities to provide decent homes for the people of the United States, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 147

Whereas the United States promotes and encourages the creation and revitalization of sustainable and strong neighborhoods in partnership with States, cities, and local communities and in conjunction with the independent and collective actions of private citizens and organizations;

Whereas establishing a housing infrastructure strengthens neighborhoods and local economies and nurtures the families who reside in them;

Whereas an integral element of a strong community is a sufficient supply of affordable housing;

Whereas such housing can be provided in tradional and nontraditional forms, including apartment buildings, transitional and temporary homes, condominiums, cooperatives, and single family homes;

Whereas for many families a home is not merely shelter, but also provides an opportunity for growth, prosperity, and security;

Whereas homeownership is a cornerstone of the national economy because it spurs the production and sale of goods and services, generates new jobs, encourages savings and investment, promotes economic and civic responsibility, and enhances the financial security of all people in the United States;

Whereas the United States is the first country in the world to make owning a home a reality for a vast majority of its families; however, more than one-third of the families in the United States are not homeowners;

Whereas a disproportionate percentage of non-homeowning families in the United States are low-income families;

Whereas the National Partners in Homeownership, a public-private partnership comprised of 63 national organizations under the leadership of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, has established a goal of reaching an all-time high homeownership level in the United States by the end of the 20th century;

Whereas there are many other nonprofit and for-profit organizations that, in partnership with the Federal Government and local governments, strive to make the American dream of homeownership a reality for low-income families;

Whereas national organizations such as the Fannie Mae Foundation, Freddie Mac, the Local Initiatives Support Corporation, the Enterprise Foundation, the Housing Assistance Council, and the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, in conjunction with local organizations, have developed thousands of homes each year for low-income families and have, in the process, reduced urban decay and blight and fostered business activity;

Whereas the community building activities of neighborhood-based nonprofit organizations empower individuals to improve their lives and make communities safer and healthier for families;

Whereas one of the best known nonprofit housing organizations is Habitat for Humanity, which builds simple but adequate housing for less fortunate families and symbolizes the self-help approach to homeownership;

Whereas Habitat for Humanity provides opportunities for people from every segment of society to volunteer to help make the American dream a reality for families who otherwise would not own a home; and

Whereas the second week of June 1997 is National Homeownership Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) it is a goal of our Nation that all citizens have safe, clean, and healthy housing;

(2) the Members of the House of Representatives should demonstrate the importance of volunteerism and community service;

(3) the Members of the House of Representatives and Habitat for Humanity, with support from the National Partners in Homeownership, should sponsor and construct, commencing on June 5, 1997, two homes in the Anacostia neighborhood of the District of Columbia, each to be known as a ''House That Congress Built'';

(4) each ''House That Congress Built'' should be constructed primarily by Members of the House of Representatives and their families and staffs, involving and symbolizing the partnership of the public, private, and nonprofit sectors of society;

(5) each ''House That Congress Built'' should be constructed with the participation of the family that will own the home;

(6) upon completion and initial occupancy of the homes in the fall of 1997, the Members of the House of Representatives, their families and staffs, and local and national leaders from the public and private nonprofit sectors of society should participate, together with each family that will own a ''House That Congress Built'', in an event to celebrate the occasion;

(7) in the future, the Members of the House of Representatives and their families and staff should participate in similar house building activities of Habitat for Humanity in their own districts as part of National Homeownership Week; and

(8) these occasions should be used to emphasize and focus on the importance of providing safe, clean, and healthy homes for all of the people in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FLAKE] each will control 20 minutes.

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

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by congratulating and thanking my colleague and friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], for this concept and for his introduction of this legislation.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. STOKES, the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. GEPHARDT, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. GINGRICH, the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from New York, Mr. FLAKE, and certainly the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, Ms. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, for their cooperation and collaboration to celebrate what I think is one of the more outstanding programs that we have in America, the creation of a synergy where people in the public sector and the community itself, businesses and the private sector, and the not-for-profit sector which have come together to contribute their time and resources and effort to give to their fellow neighbor one of the greatest gifts that one can imagine, and that is receiving the gift of home ownership, of obtaining the American dream.

□ 1330

This is through the Habitat for Humanity Program. We are about to begin a celebration in June, the second week in June, of self-help housing programs and in particular the Habitat Program.

This model builds upon an act that took place last year, where, for the first time, Congress acted to contribute about $25 million to ensure that thousands of Americans would be able to live the dream of homeownership through the Habitat Program.

I am looking forward to having my colleague from California, [Mr. LEWIS], explain in further detail what as a group we are going to do in a bipartisan way to help rebuild two homes in the Anacostia area.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to relate to the House that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has been delayed because of air travel, and therefore I stand on his behalf, am happy to stand and speak on behalf of House Resolution 147, which is supported by Members from both sides of the aisle.

The resolution both recognizes the need to increase homeownership throughout the Nation and expresses the House's commitment to the building of two homes with the Habitat for Humanity here in Washington on June 5. I think Habitat for Humanity has demonstrated excellence in its ability to garner support from numbers of people in numbers of trades who have come together to volunteer their time and have demonstrated the means by which we might resolve some of the issues related to housing in this Nation.

This undertaking today is due to the leadership of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], whose creativity and commitment to affordable housing will unite the membership of this House with housing organizations like Habitat for Humanity in making homeownership a reality for the two families here in this Nation's Capital and, hopefully, will represent what can be done by sweat and by the equity of persons who are willing to invest of themselves to help to build homeownership in this Nation.

I appreciate the efforts of the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], and share in his commitment to improving housing conditions for all of the families in this Nation. It is my hope that we can work together in taking this effort well beyond the boundaries of Washington, DC and make them available to so many other people in this Nation.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate my colleague yielding. I want to express my deep appreciation to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. STOKES], who has worked with me on this issue, and my colleague, the gentlewoman from Washington, DC, [Ms. NORTON], my local Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday Ms. NORTON and I came to this floor to speak to a very important need facing the citizens of the District of Columbia and indeed the entire Nation. The need is simple: Decent, affordable homes for the working families of the United States.

The gentlewoman from Washington, DC, [Ms. NORTON], Speaker of the House NEWT GINGRICH, the gentleman from Missouri, the House minority leader, [Mr. GEPHARDT], the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. STOKES], the gentleman from New York, [Mr. LAZIO], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] joined me in introducing this bipartisan legislation expressing the sense of the House that Members of Congress can do more than just talk about providing homes for our citizens and neighbors. Indeed, it is time for action.

On that very same day, the Speaker, Ms. NORTON, Mr. STOKES, the founder and president of Habitat for Humanity, Millard Fuller, and two very special families gathered together to celebrate an important milestone in the history of the Congress and the District of Columbia. These bipartisan leaders gathered to announce ''The House that Congress Built,'' a unique partnership involving Congress, HUD Secretary Andrew Cuomo, leaders of the National Partners in Homeownership, and others.

On June 5, these leaders will begin construction of two Habitat for Humanity homes in Southeast Washington, DC. ''The House that Congress Built'' is a powerful symbol demonstrating the commitment of a bipartisan Congress and numerous organizations toward one common goal, providing a decent and affordable home for every American family. It is also an appropriate way to kick off National Homeownership Week, the week of June 7 through 14, a campaign to emphasize local and national efforts to make the American dream a reality.

This unique effort is supported by the National Partners in Homeownership, an unprecedented public-private partnership working to dramatically increase homeownership in America. Presently, this membership consists of 63 members representing real estate professionals, home builders, nonprofit housing providers, as well as local, State, and Federal levels of government.

The goal of this partnership is to achieve an all-time high rate of homeownership, 67 percent of all American households, by the end of year 2000. There is still very much work to be done. This effort is only possible because of the inspiring work of Millard Fuller, the founder and president of Habitat for Humanity International, who has built a worldwide Christian housing ministry over a period of 20 years.

Since its creation in 1976, Habitat for Humanity and its volunteers have built homes with 50,000 families in need in more than 1,300 cities and 50 countries. As a result of Fuller's vision, more than 250,000 people across the globe now have safe, decent, affordable homes.

In Philadelphia recently, President Clinton, President Bush, retired Gen. Colin Powell and others gathered to salute the spirit of volunteer service that exists in this country. No other organization better illustrates this spirit than Habitat for Humanity. Habitat is an organization that brings people together. Its volunteers are as diverse as the people who live in these United States.

Most importantly, Habitat for Humanity promotes what Millard Fuller describes as the theology of the hammer, namely, putting faith and love into action to serve others. In this case, the theology of the hammer is being applied to assist two very special soon-to-be homeowners, Marlene Hunter and her family and Mary Collins and her family. Even before the first nail has been driven, Members of Congress, corporate sponsors and these families have made a commitment that will be fulfilled as these two homes are built this summer entirely by Members of Congress and their staff.

Let me assure my colleagues that this is only just the beginning. Next year we hope to continue this bipartisan effort by having every Member of the Congress make a commitment to build a Habitat home in his or her own congressional district. That is a commitment that will provide a home for 435 working families. Imagine an additional 435 first-time home buyers because of the hands-on work of every Member of this body. It is a first step, but an important beginning, nonetheless.

I want to thank my colleagues, Speaker NEWT GINGRICH, Minority Leader DICK GEPHARDT, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, Ms. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. LOU STOKES, the gentleman from New York, Mr. RICK LAZIO, and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. JOE KENNEDY, for their commitment to this unique effort and for joining me in passing this bipartisan resolution

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, there is a popular song by R. Kelly that says, ''I believe I can fly.''

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has flown and arrived, so I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as the good Congressman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FLAKE], who would rather be known as a reverend, understands, only he is capable of flying through this Chamber.

But I do want to, first of all, commend my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS]) for the fine work that he has done on this bill. My colleague has been very, very, I think, diligent not only in his efforts to try and I hope continue funding for all housing programs, which is going to be a major issue in the course of the next few months, but also has been a strong advocate of volunteerism.

I think Habitat is one of these unique programs that comes along that blends both the needs for housing for the very poor people of this country that so desperately need shelter and mixing that with the spirit of volunteerism. I think the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] ought to be commended by everyone in this Chamber and people around the country for his efforts on behalf of Habitat for Humanity.

I also want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH], who had both sponsored some legislation last year in the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity which was controversial because of the nature of some of the funding supports for Habitat and, specifically, that was going to one congressional district down in Georgia.

But, in any event, the truth is that regardless of their efforts to target that funding to that particular congressional district that happened to be in the Speaker's domain, the truth is that we want to make certain that everybody understands the tremendous support that I think exists around this country for Habitat and the recognition of the fine work that it does in many communities in many States throughout the country.

I just want to briefly say that the work of Habitat is a wonderful and unique organization. The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has sponsored an initiative to get many of us in the Government to go and work on an initiative, I believe it is June 5, that I am looking forward to. I am hoping I do not bang too many fingers when I try to hit a nail.

The fundamental truth is that there are a number of different organizations around the country that blend together a sense of volunteerism with building homes for people in need. Habitat is one of the finest of that series of organizations, and I am delighted to see that we are supporting them in the fashion that we are here today. I again want to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

I do want to suggest that, in terms of the overall housing needs of our country, that I am very concerned that the budget that we are going to be voting on in a few hours here on the House floor is not going to be providing enough funding for the housing needs of our country's poor.

We have already seen a vast reduction in the amount of funding that we spend on homeless Americans. We see even greater reductions in terms of the funding levels for everything from assisted housing to the public housing concerns of our country. And while efforts have been made to reform those needs, the truth of the matter is that if you are going to cut 25 or 30 percent of the funding levels, you can reform it all you want but you still are not going to be providing enough housing for the poor and the vulnerable people of our country.

So when the American people here that look on our city streets or in their neighborhoods and see homeless Americans, we cannot provide solutions to our housing problems by simply walking around pointing to antiquated public housing and saying, ''Look at this great, terrible monstrosity,'' and our answer to the problems with public housing is to simply cut the budget.

This is not going to solve our housing needs. That is the solution that has been advocated. I am here today to salute those that want to support housing and support Habitat for Humanity's efforts to deal with the housing shortage that exists in this country.

Mr. Speaker, after spending 7 days on the House floor debating H.R. 2, the veto-bait bill which makes draconian reforms to our Nation's public and assisted housing programs, it gives me great pleasure to support this bipartisan resolution. Not only does the resolution acknowledge the need to increase home ownership throughout this Nation, it also expresses this body's resolve to assist two families in achieving home ownership. Our assistance does not entail the creation of a new program or the appropriation of new funds, instead it merely requires our time and energy and a little physical coordination. As outlined in the resolution, on June 5, myself and several other Members will leave our suits at home in exchange for hardhats and nail guns to join Habitat for Humanity and other dedicated housing organizations in building the first ''House that Congress Built.'' Throughout that weekend, it is our intent to put two Washington families into two different homes.

While this effort will be an unprecedented achievement, I must say—it is not enough. There are numerous families in each of our congressional districts that could use equivalent assistance in achieving home ownership. And Habitat for Humanity cannot do it all alone. So it is our hope that Members will bring the ''House that Congress Built'' to their congressional districts in the future. Not only to bring the dream of home ownership to a fortunate family, but also to bring to the public's consciousness the benefits of providing affordable housing to all families—rich or poor.

There are 5.3 million families—just like the two families we are placing in these two homes—who live in severe conditions. And even if Members of the House built two homes every weekend for the rest of my life, we still would not meet those families needs. We must do more.

With that said, I look forward to working with the cosponsors of this legislation—Speaker GINGRICH, Minority Leader GEPHARDT, Chairman LEWIS, Ranking Member STOKES, and Chairman LAZIO—on June 5, and also in the future as we work toward bringing home ownership to more and more families in America.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, again this is about the creation of a partnership with Members of Congress in the community of Washington, DC.

Many Members of Congress live in the District. I am one of those who, when I am down here on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays, is a proud resident of the District of Columbia. It is appropriate that we give back not just in terms of our service in Congress but as part of the community.

The Habitat Program and other self-help housing groups across the country are gems in terms of their ability to bring people together and to build a better sense of community. For those people who are not familiar with the work that Habitat does, over 1,400 affiliates across the entire Nation, it is a program that brings neighbors together to help build a home for another neighbor who does not have the resources to construct a home themselves. We have business people donate doors and windows.

In last year's legislation, the Federal Government has begun to provide some small amount of funding that would help with those areas that are not easily donated, for example, roads and sewers and infrastructure costs that will help thousands of Americans obtain the dream of home ownership in the best of ways by bringing your neighbors together, their community together.

I just had the pleasure of being at a Habitat construction site in my own home district in Bayshore, where members of the public sector and businesses and the community leaders were all there swinging hammers, using saws, hauling around lumber, men and women of all ages feeling very good about the fact that they were giving to another neighbor.

□ 1345

It is one of the greatest gifts, as I said before, that a neighbor can give to another neighbor. We ought to feel very, very good about the fact that we have a program here where Members of Congress are going to be joining in to celebrate sort of self-help week in housing in June and that it will result in bringing to two families in the District that great feeling of pride of living under one's own roof in home ownership in one of the areas in which we have unfortunately been witnessing a decline in home ownership in the Anacostia area.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], the ranking member of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for yielding me this time, and I rise to commend the gentleman from

Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FLAKE] for bringing House Resolution 147 to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill, it is one that I can support, and I am very pleased to be able to join with my distinguished friend from California [Mr. LEWIS], the author of this legislation. I really want to commend him because he and I work together very closely on the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations. I know his interest in providing decent housing in a suitable living environment for every American. This bill manifests that type of interest and concern he has in that respect.

In fact, I would like to just call the attention of the House to the fact that a few days ago, I was privileged to attend a press conference conducted by the gentleman from California where the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], the Speaker of the House, spoke and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] spoke and both the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] and myself were in attendance. Along with the Habitat for Humanity organizational people were two families here who reside in the District of Columbia for whom these homes are going to be built. They were two lovely families, very decent people, and if my colleagues could have seen the expressions on their faces and the joy in their faces at the knowledge that Members of Congress cared enough about them that they were going to come out and actually build a home for them. They even put up with our taunting one another about the fact that we lacked the ability to build a house, but we were determined that we were going to come out and do our best to build this home for them.

When I mention Habitat for Humanity, I do not know of any organization in America that does more to try and provide simple but adequate housing for the less fortunate in this country. Their approach is to build an attitude of self-help in these people, provide housing for them in safe communities, in safe neighborhoods. They have done such an outstanding job all over the country. In my own city, in the city of Cleveland, I have seen the results of the housing that they have built for people who are less fortunate in the community which I represent here in the Congress.

I am reminded at this time, too, that for many, many years, a former President, President Jimmy Carter, has been a man who has gone all over the country for Habitat for Humanity and helped to build houses. I just think at a time like this, I want to recognize his great contribution.

I think the beauty of this particular legislation is the fact that it has been so bipartisan. Members on both sides of the aisle have taken great pride in joining together with the realization that, working together, we can do something very special for the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, what I would really like to say, I think, is that while we are looking forward to joining with the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] in this effort to build these two homes for these people here in the District, I think that we ought to really look at this as not one shot. Each Member ought to be thinking of how we can expand this effort that we are going to participate in here in the District of Columbia all across the country. I think that ought to be the real purpose of this legislation, for us to carry forth the whereas clauses throughout this resolution in which we speak of a decent home and a decent neighborhood for every American. I think the way to do that is to not just build it here in the District of Columbia but to help do that all over America.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I appreciate the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] yielding.

It occurred to me earlier that it is no accident that the very day that we will go out in a bipartisan manner together attempting to make a difference in the lives of these two families here in Washington, DC, that Mother Teresa will be receiving a gold medal on behalf of the Congress. To say the least, the confluence of people serving people that both those activities reflect is very much a part of the spirit that I have found and brought back from Hershey, PA, where as the gentleman remembers when we were there together, there were 220 Members, Democrats and Republicans, who committed themselves to a new kind of dialogue in the House, moving away from this confrontation for the sake of confrontation. Indeed if this resolution ends up being a reflection of continuing that spirit, then all the better. I want my colleague to know I very much appreciate his assistance and his friendship.

Mr. STOKES. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

Mr. LEACH. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to stress that this is a bill made for commendation. The leadership of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO], the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], the gentleman from New York [Mr. FLAKE], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and, of course, President Carter has been very significant.

Habitat for Humanity is a wonderful program. It is not a substitute for all public programs. This side understands that very well. In fact, with all the rancor of the debate the last 3 or 4 weeks in housing programs, it should be stressed that this House last week passed 100 percent of the President's recommended budget for public housing.

Indeed, in the budget agreement, fully one-half of the new nondefense discretionary funding will go for housing programs, about $35 billion out of $70 billion over the next 5 years. This Congress has committed this year and in subsequent years in effect to increase support for public housing. This should be very well understood.

Just because the issue was raised, I would stress that the bill last year that was critiqued a minute ago by one of the speakers had been endorsed by Secretary Cisneros and pushed strongly by President Carter. I am sorry that there was apprehension on the other side about prior Habitat programs. But the main point I would like to make is not to defend public housing programs, which have many problems and also important opportunities, but today to emphasize certain private sector efforts. Most, it should be stressed, are not extended by political figures but by committed people in many communities around the country, at the community level. Here, though, I think it is important that we also express our thanks to institutions that we have respect for in the private sector, particularly in this case Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, the National Reinvestment Corporation, and the National Association of Homebuilders for their support.

In any regard, I think this is a time for thanks to be extended on all sides and to set a sense of perspective that this is a program that is very important, that is very symbolic. It does not replace other kinds of programs but is certainly a wonderful additional complement to them.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], the district in which the homes are to be built.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I very much thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

As a recipient of the largesse of this resolution, I come to the floor this afternoon to thank especially the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], the gentleman from New York [Mr. FLAKE], the Speaker and the minority leader for their initiative on this wonderful idea.

I have very special thanks to give to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], however, for it is not only a wonderful idea, it was his bright idea, and I think it a bright idea not only, may I say, because my district will be the first recipient of this generosity of

Members but because in a very real sense, the spirit of Hershey, of which he spoke so eloquently, may have found its best mode of expression. We have every right to ask, what in the world is the spirit of Hershey? How can one make the good feelings of that weekend live and last? It is very difficult to do. We do not often meet like that. We cannot meet like that very often. But we will be meeting like that on June 5. We will be meeting like that, making Hershey live in a way that I think we all have been searching for.

Partisanship is natural to the process of the House of Representatives and necessary to the process here. We represent different districts and different points of view. We come together as we do on many bills. But the fact is that bipartisanship on some issues is an absolute necessity.

Surely if there is to be bipartisanship on any issue, it is the future of the capital of the United States. To be sure, this Congress holds the capital in its hands because of its unique constitutional responsibility and because it has to vote for a small amount for the capital every year. But when the House builds its own house in the District, it reaches out to the people I represent in a way that is especially appreciated. The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has said this will be the house that Congress built. It will certainly be the house that the House built. It will be remembered that way, and it will be built in the Anacostia community, named for the river my colleagues have to cross to reach there, named for the place where many of the poorest Washingtonians live.

Those who will receive the generosity of the House during this initiative were there when it was announced by the Speaker. The HUD Secretary is on board, both sides of the aisle are on board and, of course, we are doing it through Habitat for Humanity which has done many good works in the District and which, of course, is the natural leader of this work here in the District.

May I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO] who had spent numerous hours trying to find an appropriate project. We had found one and then we tossed that one out and another one was tossed out, and here comes the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] with just the right project. The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MANZULLO, and the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, who had been working together after Hershey will be working on this project as well.

This project has a larger goal: that by the year 2000, fully two-thirds of the American people will own their own home. We have done wonderfully in this country since World War II in encouraging and in achieving home ownership by Americans. What this project metaphorically says is that we are in this for everybody.

To show that we are in it for everybody, we are building a house for the poorest Americans and we are going to carry this concept everywhere. We are going to ask Members to take the concept back to their own districts. My colleagues will find that the Habitat habit is catching. When they see that colleagues are helping to build a house in their district, they are going to say, ''Me, too,'' to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO], they are going to say to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], ''We want one here. We want Habitat to come here and do what you did in the District of Columbia.''

My colleagues are going to start something in the District and it is going to spread. It is going to spread its good feeling, it is going to spread to the housing industry, and it is going to help make affordable housing something other than an oxymoron. Thanks for helping in the District. Make sure that it is your district next.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the gentlewoman yielding.

I just wanted to rise and say to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], I very much appreciate the collegiality and the friendship she has extended to me. The symbolism that is the house that Congress built is just beginning. I think the gentlewoman already knows that any number of private partners have begun to contribute not just material but funds as well to make sure that the dollars are available to complete this facility. The gentlewoman has mentioned that this will go on from here.

☐ 1400

Indeed I know that the gentlewoman and I will be working together in the year before us to encourage Members not just along with their staffs to complete these two homes in Washington, DC, but then, just think, next year as Members start looking to their district and working with Habitat and talking about the wonderful theology of the hammer and the effect that it can have upon this place. I have for some time now been most disconcerted by reactions in my own district where people are saying:

''Why don't you people ever work together? Why this partisanship almost for the sake of it?''

And indeed the gentlewoman and I have talked a lot about that. There is little doubt that this is a turning point in the Congress, and being able to work with the gentlewoman is a great privilege for me, and I appreciate her collegiality and friendship, and I thank her for her help.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] not only for his kind words here this afternoon, but for this effort, this idea that so many have embraced and, may I say, for the collegiality and generosity he has shown the District of Columbia ever since I have been in the Congress.

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

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just say in conclusion that I am very proud to cosponsor this resolution drafted by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS]. The House That Congress Built; what a wonderful name for legislation that will begin a process of having Members of Congress work with neighbors to help to build homes in the District.

I would also say that it ought not to stop here. We ought to be looking for new ways in which we can build on this community service, build on partnerships, build on helping one another, ensuring that people achieve the dream of home ownership, perhaps one of the greatest of American dreams, and restoring the sense of neighborhood that so many communities are lacking. The best way to do that is for us to pitch in and begin the process of creating the type of neighborhood partnership, the sense of being in it together, of a sense of helping those that need a helping hand, and this event, these two events of building these two homes in the District and Anacostia, are a very substantial step, although more than symbolism, a very substantial step in showing that this Congress cares about the self-help housing program and that we intend to use resources where we can find them to help augment a very important program, the Habitat for Humanity Program, and other self-help housing programs throughout the country so that other communities and neighborhoods throughout our great Nation can enjoy the fruits of this program, and the greatest fruit, in my opinion, is not the fact that we are constructing a home and enabling a family to have a roof over their head that they can own. The greatest pleasure of it all is that we bring neighbors together to do for another neighbor what they might not be able to do themselves.

So it is a high point certainly for us to be discussing this and then to be acting upon this on June 5, and I congratulate my friends on both sides of the aisle for their part in all this, and I urge passage.

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

Mr. Speaker, perhaps many who wonder what the big deal is about, Members of Congress and Habitat joining together to build two homes in the District of Columbia; I think all of us realize that there is a critical housing shortage in America, and those of us who are not only Members of the Congress, but persons like myself who does housing development, particularly in low- and moderate-income communities, we realize that this is an important step. I do not think anyone has done as much as President Jimmy Carter in terms of lifting the concerns of homelessness in the way that he has done since he left the White House to a level whereby we all know that it is a critical problem and that we can make a difference, and we make that difference not only by asking for Government dollars to rebuild communities, but make that difference by making the kind of individual investments of time, energy, resources to try to make this a better country for all of us to live in.

There is also another thing I think we ought to be concerned about, and that is, in addition to building housing, how to build the necessary support services. As my colleagues know, in many communities many of the commercial strips are devastated, people do not have access to basic services because they have been left behind, communities have not been invested in, in many instances between insurance companies and banks. There has been a redlining process that has negated the possibility of these communities being as strong as they could be.

So it is my hope that what we do today sends the message that not only will we be building houses, we will be rebuilding commercial strips, and of course all of this means that we will rebuild the lives of people, rebuild the quality of life for all Americans, and in so doing I think this Congress will make the greatest of all statements.

I would like to thank all of those who have participated in helping to bring this piece of legislation to the floor and all of those who will participate not only in assuring that these two people will have homes, but also that all of America will be housed.

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

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to acknowledge finally two great Americans that have had outstanding contributions to the Habitat Program besides, of course, Millard Fuller, who is the president of Habitat and the hundreds and thousands, actually, of leaders involved in the affiliates throughout the country; our President Jimmy Carter, who has contributed so much of his time to provide a role model, and his involvement in the Habitat Program is well known throughout the country and is respected by both sides of the aisle, and the Speaker of the House, NEWT GINGRICH, for without his leadership last year we certainly would not be able to move out of our committee and onto the floor for passage and finally for signature on the President's desk the first major public partnership between the Federal Government and Habitat for Humanity that will bring that dream of home ownership to thousands of Americans.

So my hat is off to two great Americans, President Jimmy Carter and Speaker of the House, NEWT GINGRICH for their bipartisan support for a wonderful program, the Habitat for Humanity Program.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 147, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof)——

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 408, INTERNATIONAL DOLPHIN CONSERVATION PROGRAM ACT

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105–103) on the resolution (H. Res. 153) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 408) to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to support the International Dolphin Conservation Program in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 84, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 152 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 152

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 84) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1990, 2000, 2001, and 2002. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against the concurrent resolution and against its consideration are waived. General debate shall be confined to the congressional budget and shall not exceed five hours and twenty minutes (including one hour on the subject of economic goals and policies), with five hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget and twenty minutes controlled by Representative Minge of Minnesota or his designee. After general debate 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 the amendments in the nature of substitutes designated in section 2 of this resolution, if printed in the portion of the Congressional Record, designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Each amendment may be offered only in the order designated, may be offered only by a Member designated, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for twenty minutes (except as otherwise provided in section 2) 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. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of question shall be fifteen minutes. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendments 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) the amendment numbered 1, which shall be debatable for one hour;

(2) the amendment numbered 2;

(3) the amendment numbered 3;

(4) the amendment numbered 4; and

(5) the amendment numbered 5.

SEC. 3, Rule XLIX shall not apply with respect to the adoption by the Congress of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). 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 Texas [Mr. FROST], pending which I yield myself such time as I might consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 152 is a modified closed rule providing for consideration of a historic document, House Concurrent Resolution 84, the budget resolution for fiscal year 1998, which incorporates the balanced budget agreement reached recently between the President and the congressional leadership on both sides of the aisle.

The rule is very similar to rules for the budget resolution in the recent past. The rule, not unlike the budget resolution itself, is the product of bipartisan negotiations and adequately reflects the spirit of fairness and cooperation in which those negotiations were carried out.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 152 provides 5 hours of general debate, including 1 hour on the subject of economic goals and policies, or the so-called Humphrey-Hawkins debate. The rule also provides for an additional period of 20 minutes of debate to be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE]. The rule then provides for consideration of five substitute amendments representing various contrasting points of view on budget priorities for the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, this is the third year in which the Committee on Rules has required Members filing substitute amendments to ensure that their amendment achieves balance by the year 2002. In other words, we are staying on this glidepath to a balanced budget, and whatever is adopted here today will guarantee that.

Members are entitled to devise substitutes reflecting different priorities where a common goal should be a balanced Federal budget by the year 2002.

The substitute amendments shall be considered in the order specified in the rule, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to further amendment and waives points of order against them. The substitutes were also printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 19, Monday, and are therefore available in Members' offices today.

The substitutes shall be considered in the following order and are debatable for the following specified times:

☐ 1415

The gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] for 60 minutes; the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] for 20 minutes; the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] for 20 minutes; the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for 20 minutes; and the last substitute will be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] and will be debated for 20 minutes as well.

Mr. Speaker, this rule also follows the precedent of the 104th Congress and provides that if anyone's substitute amendment is adopted in the Committee of the Whole, that action shall bring the House to an immediate vote on final passage of the resolution, as amended. What that means, Mr. Speaker and Members back in their offices, quite simply is that there are no free votes here today.

The amendment process for these substitutes is not king of the Hill, it is not queen of the Hill, most votes wins, or any other creation; it is the traditional, old-fashioned amendment process in the Committee of the Whole. If any substitute passes, let me repeat this one more time, the debate will immediately cease and the House will proceed directly to a vote on final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, the rule before the House also suspends the application of House rule 49, the so-called Gephardt rule on the debt limit. A separate consideration of the debt limit issue is contemplated by the balanced budget agreement with the White House in the context of a reconciliation bill. For the third year in a row, we have squarely addressed the challenging issue of the debt limit and suspended this House rule which allows Members to avoid accountability.

Mr. Speaker, the rule allows for consideration of many of the various alternatives to this historic agreement that exists in this body. The rule will allow for a full day of deliberation and votes on these differing blueprints of our Nation's fiscal priorities.

Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson, in a letter to a friend of his in 1816, gave the following charge. He said: To preserve people's independence we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt.

That was way back in 1816.

He went on to say: We must make our election between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude.

Today, the House of Representatives, in a bipartisan manner, will act upon Jefferson's advice back in 1816. Let it be recognized that at the end of this day, the House will pass a bipartisanly supported balanced budget, something I admit that I never thought would happen in my 20 years here. This dramatic shift in the fiscal direction of our country is in large part due to the steadfast leadership and the committed drive of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and the bipartisan members of that Committee on the Budget. They, and others who worked with them, deserve our commendation here today.

Now with respect to the actual budget before us, I would like to make a few observations. First, this balanced budget agreement does not reflect the complete priorities of any one Member. In fact, I can say with certainty that every Member in this House would probably have written this differently if he or she were the only one making the decisions. I know that if I were writing this budget, I would have had much deeper spending cuts, much more tax cuts, more entitlement reform, and more spending for defense. Those are all my priorities.

However, it is important to point out again that the nature of a democracy rests on the art of compromise, a compromise not in principle but in approach and process. That is what Ronald Reagan spent years trying to teach me, and it took a long time to sink in, because I see the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] sitting over there, and we all think that our infinite wisdom is the best and that everybody ought to do exactly what we think.

This compromise is epitomized in the leadership of the Committee on the Budget in crafting a bipartisan agreement that reflects the principles of balanced budgets, lower taxes, lower spending, and a smaller Federal Government. Indeed, this budget reflects the charge of Jefferson enduring more economy and more liberty.

Second, on balance, I think this is a good budget, it is built upon permanent spending savings and permanent tax cuts; not temporary, permanent. These are specific changes written into the law, something radically different from the procedural spending caps and deficit targets included in previous budget agreements, such as Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. We all know what happened with those, because there were no permanent spending cuts and there were no permanent tax cuts.

Last night up in the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] elaborated on just how far we have come. I think my colleagues ought to listen to these facts. First, this agreement balances the budget for the first time in 30 years, and for only the second time in the last 40 years. Then we wonder how we got ourselves into this deficit mess we are in today. Government spending will be less, listen to this, less than 20 percent of the gross domestic product for the first time since 1974. That is 22 years ago. America will save, and my colleagues ought to listen to this, some conservatives who are like me, America will save $600 billion over the next 5 years in entitlement spending.

That means entitlement reform, I say to my colleagues, the fastest-growing portion of this budget. Nondefense discretionary spending will grow at a rate of one-half of one percent a year over the next 5 years. How is that different? Because over the last 5 years, it has grown by 6 percent.

Now, the next 5 years it is going to grow by less than half of one percent, and contrary to what some have asserted, this budget is built on conservative assumptions that the economy will grow at 2.1 percent over the next 5 years, that unemployment will rise to 6 percent, and that the consumer price index will continue to go up. However, the economy has actually been growing stronger, reaching 5.6 percent in the last quarter, so we can see the differences here. The unemployment rate has remained below 4.9 percent, not 6 percent, as is projected in this budget agreement. So those mean real, real changes. The CPI may actually be going down.

Mr. Speaker, this budget is built on sound economic assumptions as well as a strong and vibrant national economy. Furthermore, the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Alan Greenspan, has stated that balancing the budget will further improve the performance of the economy, which will make these figures even more important. This is not a budget of rosy scenarios and numbers games, this is an honest fiscal blueprint, and if this fiscal conservative is standing here telling you this, I think you can believe it.

Mr. Speaker and Members, this budget resolution, and the reconciliation bills that follow it, are perhaps the most important bills we will pass this Congress, important in the sense that they will directly benefit every single

American family in this country. We owe it to those families to pass this budget today, and once that is done, we face the difficult task of summoning the courage to vote yes on the enabling authorization and appropriation measures that will cut spending, cut taxes, and cut the deficits that are bankrupting future generations of America and turning this country into nothing more than a debtor Nation.

I, for one, stand here today and pledge right now that I will vote for every one of those spending cuts that is going to live up to this very, very difficult agreement. This budget is a victory for America's children, and I believe something this Congress and even this President should be proud to support. I urge my colleagues to follow Thomas Jefferson's instructions, to improve independence, to preserve independence, and maximize liberty by supporting this rule and supporting this balanced budget agreement today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, before I begin my formal remarks, I have a question for the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

The question is, is this rule a moving target? There evidently is some controversy on your side, continuing controversy on your side, as to whether the Minge amendment should be made in order. It is not currently made in order under the rule, and I would ask the gentleman whether he contemplates asking the House to amend the rule to make the Minge amendment in order.

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

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my good friend from Texas, [Mr. FROST], that we have that under consideration. As the gentleman knows, there has been evidently a misunderstanding as far as the Minge substitute, which is the better-known blue dog substitute, whether that was supposed to have been made in order or not. As the gentleman knows, there were 20 minutes of debate set aside during the general debate time for the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE] and his associates.

There are conversations going on now with the Republican leadership, the Democrat leadership, to find out how we might remedy the misunderstanding. Unfortunately, we probably will not know that for another 15 or 20 minutes, but I would hope to receive some direction in the next 10 or 15 minutes and I will be glad to enlighten the gentleman as soon as I am enlightened myself.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, so it is possible that the gentleman will seek to amend the rule, either by unanimous consent or by motion, at some point during this hour?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, there is that possibility, but again negotiations and communications are going on, on both sides of the aisle, and I will let the gentleman know as soon as possible.

Mr. FROST. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out, again, as the gentleman knows, that the Members on my side of the aisle moved in the Committee on Rules last night that the Minge amendment be made in order and that that was rejected on a straight party line vote. It would be helpful, Mr. Speaker, for us to have some degree of notice as to what the rule really is. This really handicaps debate, not knowing what we are debating.

So I would urge the disagreement on the Republican side, between one group of Republicans and the other group of Republicans, to be resolved as quickly as possible, so that we may know what rule we are dealing with.

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

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman points out that all disagreement is on this side, but I would just inform the gentleman, or recall to him that the President of the United States does not support the Minge amendment, and has asked for no amendments in effect to have been made in order to pass on this floor, so it is not just the Republicans, it is the Republicans and Democrats that are trying to work out this problem to make sure that we do not break this agreement. It is terribly important we keep the agreement together.

The gentleman knows I happen to support the Minge amendment and would like to see it made in order, and hopefully we can do that but we will have to wait and see.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the disagreement between one group of Republicans and the other can be resolved as quickly as possible so that we can know what rule we are debating.

Mr. Speaker, the rule before us gives Members of the House the opportunity to make a choice on how best to balance the Federal budget in the next 5 years. In addition to the text of the budget resolution reported by the Committee on the Budget, the rule makes in order five substitutes which address different budgeting priorities. Each substitute offers an alternative to the agreement negotiated between the Republican leadership and the President.

I would like to point out, however, that the rule does not, as I just mentioned, does not make in order a substitute which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE], brought to the committee on behalf of the coalition. During our consideration of this resolution in the Committee on Rules last night, I offered an amendment to the rule which would have allowed the coalition substitute to be considered today. That amendment was defeated on a straight party-line vote.

While the rule does give the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE] 20 minutes of debate time in order to explain the coalition's position, it is indeed unfortunate that the Republican majority did not make his substitute in order last night.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, the rule does make five substitutes in order. The first, which will be offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] is an alternative budget offered by the Congressional Black Caucus. This substitute provides for no tax cuts until after the year 2002, and meanwhile, provides increased funding for domestic discretionary programs as well as fewer cuts in Medicaid or Medicare.

The second substitute offered by the gentleman from California takes the opposite tack of the Waters substitute. This proposal reduces nondefense discretionary spending by an additional $109 billion over the 5 years and uses those freed-up funds for additional tax cuts.

☐ 1430

The third alternative will be offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN]. The Brown substitute increases nondefense discretionary outlays and makes no provision for tax cuts until after the year 2002. The focus of the Brown substitute is on investment spending for economic growth in such areas as research and development, transportation, and education and training.

The fourth alternative, which will be offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], cuts less from Medicare and spends more on domestic discretionary programs than does the Committee on the Budget recommendation. The Kennedy substitute provides $100 billion more for health, education, transportation, research and development, economic development programs, than does the budget agreement. The Kennedy substitute provides $60 billion in tax cuts over the 5 years compared with the $85 billion recommended in the committee resolution.

The fifth and final alternative, to be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], increases spending on transportation programs by $12 billion over the amount provided in the budget agreement. These increases are offset by across-the-board reductions in discretionary spending, both defense and nondefense, as well as by a reduction in the tax cuts provided in the committee resolution.

As Members can see, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House have offered distinct alternatives to the budget agreement. Each provides a different means of achieving the goal of a balanced budget by the year 2002. But all Members should take careful note of how this rule is structured. If any of these alternatives is adopted, then the House will have finally spoken and no other alternative will be voted on, nor will the committee resolution be voted on.

In other words, if, for instance, the Brown substitute receives a majority vote, then the House will never vote on either the Kennedy or Shuster substitute or the committee bill.

I urge my colleagues to listen very carefully to the debate over the course of the next few hours. The decisions we make here today will affect every man, woman, and child in this great country of ours. The votes we cast today are, however, only the first step toward implementing a plan to balance the budget. The really hard votes are yet to come.

Mr. Speaker, even if we pass a plan tonight or sometime early tomorrow, all we have done is establish a framework. No Member is obligated to support legislation implementing this plan if he or she ultimately considers it unfair or ill-conceived. Members will need to examine the reconciliation package that emerges from the committees of the House later this summer very carefully to ensure that their provisions do not unfairly affect one segment of our population in order to provide gain or benefit to a few.

Mr. Speaker, no matter what decision the House reaches today, let us be sure that in the coming weeks and months that the decisions we make in implementing a balanced budget plan are fair and equitable and benefit all Americans.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Westchester, OH [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here and share my views about this important rule. Let me congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and the members of the Committee on Rules for putting together a rule that will provide for a fair and open debate from many different viewpoints on this issue of the budget.

Today really is another historic day in this Congress, another milestone in the 33 months that Republicans have controlled this House. Last year, we passed historic reforms like welfare reform, trying to bring dignity back to American families and encourage those on welfare to help them become more productive members of our society. We passed illegal immigration reform, health care reform. We eliminated some 300 Federal Government programs and reduced spending by $53 billion over those 2 years.

Today is another step in the direction of a smaller, less costly, less intrusive government here in Washington, when we pass a resolution to balance the Federal budget over the next 5 years. Balancing the Federal budget will bring fiscal responsibility to Washington and begin the process of saving the future for our children.

As part of this agreement Members will see us provide permanent tax relief for American families. Our $500-per-child tax credit, capital gains tax cuts for all Americans, and in my district for farmers and small business people, this will be a huge benefit to them.

Members also see us work in this agreement to save Medicare. Medicare, as we all know, is going broke. It is an important program for our senior citizens. We need to protect and preserve Medicare. That will be part of this agreement. It will not solve the problem long term, but it will provide 10 years of solvency to the Medicare trust fund.

Is there a lot more to do? You bet. But I have to tell the Members, as one who has been here for just 6 years, this is another giant step for this Congress. The real winners in this agreement are not Republicans and not Democrats, but the American people and our children and their children who will benefit because they will have the shot at the American dream that today is in jeopardy for them.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the rule does provide for a reasonable amount of debate, but it is a flawed process. In the first place, it is simply wrong for us to be debating on such short notice such a comprehensive piece of legislation. There simply has not been time, and no one can begin to argue that there has been, since the deal was cut last week, for there to be any thorough airing of this.

This process disserves democracy, Mr. Speaker. People talk about the American people, but apparently do not have enough confidence in them, Mr. Speaker, to let them make the decisions through the normal democratic process.

I reject the notion that the democratic process has broken down. Through the normal democratic process in the 1993 budget agreement that I voted for, as did many on this side, we have brought the deficit down. We have brought the deficit down unusually, unlike during the Reagan years, at a time when we are stimulating the economy.

Indeed, the Federal Reserve is in a meeting now, and I do not know whether they decided to try and slow it down again, I hope not, but the economy in fact we are told by the Federal Reserve is growing too quickly. We are beginning to make progress. That does not mean we can rest on our laurels. It does mean that there is no argument for short-circuiting democracy, for having a comprehensive budget deal, arrived at in private meetings, voted on within a couple of days, and to preempt decisions that the voters ought to make.

How can we decide today what the breakdown between military and nonmilitary spending ought to be 3 and 4 years from now? How can we today decide that we are going to put limits on health research, limits on community development? How do we make those decisions today, and why? What is the matter with letting democracy function? Why should we not allow, in the 1998 and 2000 elections, this country decide?

We should be getting the deficit to zero. We are making progress, and indeed, we will have made more progress in terms of reducing the deficit in dollar terms over the last couple of years without this deal than we are going to make in the next couple of years with this deal.

The first impact of this deal will be to slow down the progress. Instead, we ought to slow down the deal.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

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

Mr. Speaker, the budget is that one piece of legislation where we really set forth priorities for America. We decide what is important to us, what our values are, and in effect, we put a price tag on them. In the Shuster-Oberstar-Petri-Rahall substitute provided for in this rule later tonight, Members will have an opportunity to make a choice for the future of America. We will offer Members the opportunity on behalf of all Americans to make an investment in America's transportation needs in $1 trillion of our $6 trillion national economy, which is what transportation accounts for.

What we will do in this substitute is equally cut across-the-board, one-third of 1 percent over 5 years reduction in domestic discretionary, defense discretionary spending, and the tax reduction will be one-third of 1 percent less than proposed, in order to put back into transportation the tax dollars we pay at the gas pump.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, we are dealing this afternoon and this evening with one of the more dramatic and far-reaching budget resolutions that has been considered in Congress in recent memory. We have a bipartisan resolution that is designed and calculated to use Congressional Budget Office forecasting and eliminate this deficit by the year 2002.

At the same time, we are dramatically reducing taxes and we are expanding programs. I think for many of us this seems too good to be true. Some of us are pinching ourselves and saying, is it possible that it cannot be true? How can we ensure that we achieve the results that we expect?

Several, in fact, over 60 in this body signed a letter that went to the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget saying that we need to have enforcement language in the budget resolution, representing the sense of Congress, as to what our goals are, and we were not able to get that language into the resolution in the committee.

We were told in the committee that we would have an opportunity to present that in a substitute budget on the floor. Unfortunately, the rule does not allow that substitute to be considered. For this reason, I must rise and strongly, strongly oppose the rule that is before us this afternoon, and say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, a bipartisan effort to include significant strong enforcement language has been undermined by the machinations of staff or someone in this institution.

I think it is deeply regrettable that this bipartisan undertaking, which would have been historic, will not be allowed to proceed, and I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote against the previous question and against the resolution.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Columbus, OH [Ms. PRYCE], a very distinguished member of the committee.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in strong support of the rule and the resolution of the Committee on the Budget. After years of deficit spending, we can begin laying the groundwork today for an honest balanced budget, while at the same time providing permanent tax relief, reforming Medicare, achieving significant entitlement savings, investing in domestic priorities, and making sure that the Government lives within its means.

Unlike the budgets of the past, this resolution is based on steadily declining deficits every year until 2002, when we can expect a budget surplus. Imagine that, Mr. Speaker, a surplus is actually within reach. I know it is hard to believe, especially when we consider that the Federal Government has not balanced the budget in nearly a generation.

That is simply a crime, Mr. Speaker, a crime against our children and our grandchildren who deserve a sound financial future. We have to stop robbing them of the opportunities and prosperity that they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I have been an advocate for victims of crime almost my entire professional life. I think it is time to consider another kind of victims' rights, the right of future generations who will be crippled by higher taxes and a crushing debt unless we commit ourselves today to a balanced budget.

Getting to where we are has not been easy. The political rhetoric and demagoguing has been almost overwhelming at times. But we listened to the American people and we persevered. I congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. JOHN KASICH, for his years and years of hard work, for his commitment to the good of the country, and for his determination in working to make this a bipartisan agreement.

Nobody would say that this is perfect. All of us could improve upon it. However, it gives us so much. So, to paraphrase an old friend of all of ours, Bob Michel, let us not kill this good product with 1,000 points of spite. Let us not let the perfect become the enemy of the good.

Under the terms of this fair and balanced rule we will debate a variety of budget proposals, each reflecting its own goals and spending priorities. The different sponsors deserve credit for their hard work, but let me caution the Members, under this rule there are no free votes. There is no room for political cover. Every vote counts, because whichever measure passes here will be the one we must all live with. Let us not undermine the hard work of the House and the Senate and the administration, the weeks of negotiation that have produced this very delicate win-win agreement. The country deserves no less.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this responsible rule. They should make their vote count today and support the fine work of the Committee on the Budget. Let us give the next generation of Americans the kind of future they deserve.

□ 1445

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I gather that the various factions on the other side of the aisle have now come to a resolution and have decided that the Minge amendment will not be made in order under this rule. So we are now proceeding to the consideration of the rule as originally presented to this body.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I share the commitment of many here today to achieve a balanced budget, but it is not just enough to balance the budget for a nanosecond. It is a question of whether or not we have a plan that will balance the budget and keep it balanced.

Over the last few weeks, and certainly I know that will be true throughout the rest of today, there is a lot of backslapping. There is a debate about who is the greatest statesman for putting this agreement together. A lot of popping of champagne corks; I believe I am going to hold my champagne until the budget is actually in balance, because there is nothing very new about people promising to balance the budget.

And as my colleague from Texas just pointed out, one of the problems that we have here today with what has essentially been a budget agreement where until the last few days we did not have any of the blanks filled in and it was based on the theme song from the Caribbean, do not worry, be happy, about this budget, I am happy about having a balanced budget agreement. But I am a little worried about whether the promise of that balanced budget is ever going to be achieved.

The best way to achieve it is not in listening to one person extol the great virtues of another but in having a meaningful enforcement mechanism. What the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] just pointed out is that today the Republicans have rejected any kind of effective enforcement mechanism. One was offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE] and the so-called blue dog Democrats. Another was offered by myself. It is very simple, one paragraph, a sunset provision, using the sunset approach that we have implemented in Texas to say, we will limit the authorization for any of this new entitlement spending that President Clinton wanted and we will limit the tax reductions that the Republicans and President Clinton wanted also to a 5-year period.

If we are balancing the budget, if we are getting the deficit under control, there will be nothing easier than for this Congress to reauthorize them. But to move forward with this budget resolution without an effective enforcement mechanism does not ensure the American people a true balanced budget. It only ensures more talk of a balanced budget that may or may not achieve the eventual objective. This sunset provision was described by Republicans in the committee as prudent, as reasonable, and it ought to be adopted today.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, just to briefly respond.

The gentleman states that Members that are supporting this historic document before us which does balance the budget are somehow extolling our own personal virtues. I do not think it is we that are extolling our own personal virtues. I think it is the American people, because the American people spoke very strongly in wanting this Congress to get along with each other and wanting this Congress to get along with the President.

I have to commend the President for sitting down and working, I think sincerely, in trying to bring an agreement to this floor. Certainly it is not what I like. It is not what the left wing likes. But it is an agreement. It is probably the only agreement that we could ever reach because we had to bring both ends together in middle and that is always very difficult. That is why we ought to be supporting this agreement here today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], distinguished vice chairman of the Committee on Rules. He is going to talk about something that is near and dear to my heart and to the heart of the American people who have worked hard all their lives to save and invest their money.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. KINGSTON]. The Chair would advise that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] had 13 minutes remaining, before yielding to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] has 14½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend from Glens Falls for yielding me the time and for his kind remarks about a very important part of this budget package. I believe that in large part, due to the efforts of Democrats and Republicans in this House who cosponsored H.R. 14, which we introduced on the opening day of the 105th Congress, to take the top rate on capital gains from 28-to-14 percent, due to the fact that we have bipartisan support, I believe we have been able to successfully get President Clinton in this agreement to come on board finally in support of a broad-based, across-the-board reduction in capital gains. We are hoping very much that we will be able to see it at 14 percent. I am happy that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] is trying to pursue that direction of reducing that top rate as low as we can get it. Many of us believe that the top rate on capital gains should be zero, there should be no tax on it whatsoever.

This is the single most important part of this tax package. Why? Because the argument that we have so often heard in the past, that a capital gains tax rate reduction is nothing but a tax cut for the rich, is totally false. I am happy to say that Democrats are finally joining Republicans in recognizing that. Why is that no longer the case? Well, we have done a study that shows that, if we had around a 14-or-15 percent top tax on capital gains taxes, we would in fact increase the average take-home pay for the working, average working family by $1,500 per year.

We also know that, of the 90 million-some-odd families in this country, as my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH], who is a cosponsor of H.R. 14, has said repeatedly, 63 million own mutual funds. So we have many people who have investments. We have literally $8 trillion that is locked in today, $8 trillion that is locked in because that tax is so high. What we need to also look at is the fact that 40 percent of those realized gains are held by people with incomes of less than $50,000 a year.

Our goal with this budget is of course to balance the budget. There is no better way to boost the flow of revenues to the Treasury than to cut the top rate on capital gains. In fact, we found in our study that over a 7-year period we could boost revenues by $211 billion. There is a lot of talk about that so-called windfall that came from the CBO letter with that $125 billion that came in. Quite frankly, reducing the top rate on capital would spur economic growth. It is great that we are pushing at well over 5 percent now. But these assumptions are based on a 2.1-percent growth rate. If we reduce the top rate on capital significantly, we can see a growth rate that is even stronger than that.

While we hear about uncertainty in the future economically, this cut in the capital gains tax rate could in fact play a role in ensuring that we do not go into economic recession. So I rise in strong support of the rule and in support of this package. Then we are going to work hard in a bipartisan way to cut the tax on capital gains.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to defeat the previous question. I will include for the RECORD the amendment I would offer to the rule if the previous question is defeated.

The amendment would make in order two additional amendments to the budget agreement, by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT]. Both these amendments are attempts to ensure that a balanced budget plan actually achieves balance. The Minge substitute includes enforcement provisions to force the Congress to stay on course over the next 5 years. The Doggett amendment precludes enactment of tax cuts before the budget is actually in balance. The House should be given the opportunity to vote on these amendments. If we defeat the previous question, the House will ensure that we will have full and fair debate on the balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to defeat the previous question.

I include for the RECORD the amendment I would offer to the rule if the previous question is defeated. The amendment would make in order two additional amendments to the budget agreement by Representatives MINGE and DOGGETT. Both these amendments are attempts to ensure that a balanced budget plan actually achieves balance. The Minge substitute includes enforcement provisions to force the Congress to stay on course over the next 5 years. The Doggett amendment precludes enactment of tax cuts before the budget is actually in balance. The House should be given the opportunity to vote on these amendments. If we defeat the previous question, the House will ensure that we will have full and fair debate on the balanced budget.

The amendment referred to is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 152

On page 2, line 21, after ''XXIII'' strike ''.'' and insert '', and the amendments designated in section 4 of this resolution.''

On page 3, line 2, after ''2'' insert ''and section 4''.

On page 4, after line 11, insert the following:

''SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this resolution, it shall be in order to consider the following amendments:

(1) an amendment in the nature of a substitute to be offered by Representative Minge.

(2) an amendment to be offered by Representative Doggett.

MINGE AMENDMENT NO. 1

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999 through 2002 are hereby set forth.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 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 1998: $1,198,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,241,859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,285,559,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,343,591,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,407,564,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $7,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $11,083,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: −$21,969,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: −$22,821,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: −$19,871,000,000.

(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 1998: $1,385,086,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,440,027,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,486,314,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,520,340,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,551,837,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $1,371,887,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,424,231,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,468,751,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,500,952,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,516,298,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $172,908,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $182,372,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $183,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $157,361,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $108,734,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $5,592,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $5,834,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $6,081,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $6,298,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,474,400,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $33,829,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $33,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $34,775,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $36,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $37,099,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $315,472,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $324,749,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $328,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $332,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $335,141,000,000.

SEC. 102. 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 1998 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $268,197,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $265,978,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $588,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $270,784,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,771,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $757,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $274,802,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,418,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $281,305,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $270,110,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $289,092,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $272,571,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.
(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $15,909,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,558,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,966,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $12,751,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $14,918,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,569,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,021,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $13,093,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $15,782,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,981,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,077,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $13,434,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,114,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,751,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,122,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $13,826,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,353,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,812,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,178,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $14,217,000,000.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $16,237,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,882,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $16,203,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,528,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $15,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,013,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $15,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,862,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $15,604,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,668,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $3,123,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,247,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,050,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $3,469,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,446,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,078,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $3,186,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,293,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,109,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $2,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,048,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,141,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $2,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,867,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,171,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $23,877,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,405,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $23,227,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,702,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $32,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $22,570,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,963,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $32,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $22,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,720,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $34,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $22,086,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,313,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $34,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $13,133,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,892,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $9,620,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,790,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,294,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,047,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,436,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,215,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,664,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,071,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,509,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,978,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,494,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,960,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,583,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $10,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,108,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,965,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,660,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $6,607,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $920,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,739,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $245,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $11,082,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,299,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,887,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $253,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $15,183,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,821,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,238,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $255,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,078,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,133,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,574,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $257,989,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,678,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,541,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,680,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $259,897,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $44,574,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,933,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $155,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $46,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,256,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $135,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $47,114,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,357,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $48,135,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,303,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $49,184,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,247,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $8,768,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $10,387,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,867,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,385,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $8,489,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $10,902,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,943,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,406,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $7,810,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $10,986,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,020,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,429,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $7,764,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $11,350,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,098,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,452,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $7,790,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $8,429,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,180,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,475,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $60,020,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $56,062,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $12,328,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $20,665,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $60,450,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $59,335,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,092,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $21,899,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $61,703,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $60,728,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,926,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $23,263,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $62,959,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $61,931,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $14,701,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $24,517,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $63,339,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $62,316,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,426,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,676,000,000.

(11) Health (550):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $137,836,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $137,804,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $85,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $144,939,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $144,915,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $154,019,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $153,898,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $163,413,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $163,136,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $172,136,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $171,692,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

(12) Medicare (570):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $201,620,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $201,764,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $212,073,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $211,548,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $225,540,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $225,537,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $239,636,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $238,781,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $251,548,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $250,769,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

(13) Income Security (600):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $239,032,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $247,758,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $45,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $254,090,000,000.

(B) Outlays $258,064,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $75,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $269,566,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $268,161,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $110,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $275,145,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $277,264,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $145,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $286,945,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $285,239,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $170,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.

(14) Social Security (650):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $11,424,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $11,524,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $12,060,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $12,196,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $12,792,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $12,866,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $13,022,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $13,043,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $14,383,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $14,398,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $40,545,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $41,337,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,029,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $27,096,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $41,715,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $41,949,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,068,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $26,671,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

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

(B) Outlays, $42,168,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,177,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $26,202,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $42,364,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $42,486,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,249,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,609,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $42,565,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $42,719,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,277,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,129,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $24,765,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $22,609,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $25,120,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $24,976,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $25,178,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $25,240,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $24,354,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $25,901,000,0000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $24,883,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $24,879,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $14,711,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $13,959,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $14,444,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $14,363,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $13,977,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $14,727,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $13,675,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $14,131,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $13,105,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $13,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $296,549,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $296,549,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $304,567,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $304,567,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $304,867,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $304,867,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $303,659,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $303,659,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $303,754,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $303,754,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

(19) Allowances (920):

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 1998:

(A) New budget authority, −$41,841,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$41,841,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, −$36,949,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$36,949,000.000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, −$36,937,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$36,937,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, −$39,151,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$39,151,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, −$51,124,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$51,124,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to provide for two separate reconciliation bills: the first for entitlement reforms and the second for tax relief. In the event Senate procedures preclude the consideration of two separate bills, this section would permit the consideration of one omnibus reconciliation bill.

(b) SUBMISSIONS.—

(1) ENTITLEMENT REFORMS.—Not later than June 12, 1997, the House committees named in subsection (c) 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.

(2) TAX RELIEF AND MISCELLANEOUS REFORMS.—Not later than June 13, 1997, the House committees named in subsection (d) 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.

(c) INSTRUCTIONS RELATING TO ENTITLEMENT REFORMS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture 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: $34,571,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $37,008,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $211,443,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(2) COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES.—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: −$8,435,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, −$5,091,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and −$50,306,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(3) 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: $393,770,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $507,315,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,619,820,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(4) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce 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: $17,718,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $18,167,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $106,050,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(5) 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: $68,975,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $81,896,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $443,061,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 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: $214,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, $621,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, and $1,829,000,000 in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(6) 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: $18,287,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $17,483,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $107,615,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(7) 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: $22,444,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $24,845,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $140,197,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(8) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $397,463,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $506,377,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,621,195,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 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: $1,172,136,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1998, $1,382,679,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2002, and $7,493,796,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(d) INSTRUCTIONS RELATING TO TAX RELIEF AND MISCELLANEOUS REFORMS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture 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: $34,571,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $37,008,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $211,443,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(2) 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: −$8,435,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, −$5,091,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and −$50,306,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(3) 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: $393,770,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $507,315,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,619,820,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(4) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce 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: $17,718,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $18,167,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $106,050,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(5) 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: $68,975,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $81,896,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $443,061,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 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: $214,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, $621,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $1,829,000,000 in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(6) 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: $18,287,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $17,483,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $107,615,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(7) 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: $22,444,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $24,845,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $140,197,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(8) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $397,463,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $506,377,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,621,195,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 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: $1,164,736,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1998, $1,362,179,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2002, and $7,408,796,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

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

(f) FLEXIBILITY IN CARRYING OUT CHILDREN'S HEALTH INITIATIVE.—If the Committees on Commerce and Ways and Means report recommendations pursuant to their reconciliation instructions that provide an initiative for children's health that would increase the deficit by more than $2.3 billion for fiscal year 1998, by more than $3.9 billion for fiscal year 2002, and by more than $16 billion for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002, the committees shall be deemed to not have complied with their reconciliation instructions pursuant to section 310(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to adjust the appropriate budgetary levels to accommodate legislation increasing spending from the highway trust fund on surface transportation and highway safety above the levels assumed in this resolution if such legislation is deficit neutral.

(b) DEFICIT NEUTRALITY REQUIREMENT.—(1) In order to receive the adjustments specified in subsection (c), a bill reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure that provides new budget authority above the levels assumed in this resolution for programs authorized out of the highway trust fund must be deficit neutral.

(2) A deficit-neutral bill must meet the following conditions:

(A) The amount of new budget authority provided for programs authorized out of the highway trust fund must be in excess of $25.949 billion in new budget authority for fiscal year 1998, $25.464 billion in new budget authority for fiscal year 2002, and $127.973 billion in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The outlays estimated to flow from the excess new budget authority set forth in subparagraph (A) must be offset for fiscal year 1998, fiscal year 2002, and for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002. For the sole purpose of estimating the amount of outlays flowing from excess new budget authority under this section, it shall be assumed that such excess new budget authority would have an obligation limitation sufficient to accommodate that new budget authority.

(C) The outlays estimated to flow from the excess new budget authority must be offset by (i) other direct spending or revenue provisions within that transportation bill, (ii) the net reduction in other direct spending and revenue legislation that is enacted during this Congress after the date of adoption of this resolution and before such transportation bill is reported (in excess of the levels assumed in this resolution), or (iii) a combination of the offsets specified in clauses (i) and (ii).

(D) As used in 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.

(c) REVISED LEVELS.—(1) When the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reports a bill (or when a conference report thereon is filed) meeting the conditions set forth in subsection (b)(2), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall increase the allocation of new budget authority to that committee by the amount of new budget authority provided in that bill (and that is above the levels set forth in subsection (b)(2)(A)) for programs authorized out of the highway trust fund.

(2) After the enactment of the transportation bill described in paragraph (1) and upon the reporting of a general, supplemental or continuing resolution making appropriations by the Committee on Appropriations (or upon the filing of a conference report thereon) establishing an obligation limitation above the levels specified in subsection (b)(2)(A) (at a level sufficient to obligate some or all of the budget authority specified in paragraph (1)), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall increase the allocation and aggregate levels of outlays to that committee for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 by the appropriate amount.

(d) REVISIONS.—Allocations and aggregates revised pursuant to this section shall be considered for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(e) REVERSALS.—If any legislation referred to in this section is not enacted into law, then the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall, as soon as practicable, reverse adjustments made under this section for such legislation and have such adjustments published in the Congressional Record.

(f) DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY LEVELS.—For the purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the House Committee on the Budget.

(g) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term ''highway trust fund'' refers to the following budget accounts (or any successor accounts):

(1) 69-8083-0-7-401 (Federal-Aid Highways).

(2) 69-8191-0-7-401 (Mass Transit Capital Fund).

(3) 69-8350-0-7-401 (Mass Transit Formula Grants).

(4) 69-8016-0-7-401 (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration-Operations and Research).

(5) 69-8020-0-7-401 (Highway Traffic Safety Grants).

(6) 69-8048-0-7-401 (National Motor Carrier Safety Program).

SEC. 302. SALE OF GOVERNMENT ASSETS.

(a) BUDGETARY TREATMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose of any concurrent resolution on the budget and the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, no amounts realized from the sale of an asset shall be scored with respect to the level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues if such sale would cause an increase in the deficit as calculated pursuant to paragraph (2).

(2) CALCULATION OF NET PRESENT VALUE.—The deficit estimate of an asset sale shall be the net present value of the cash flow from—

(A) proceeds from the asset sale;

(B) future receipts that would be expected from continued ownership of the asset by the Government; and

(C) expected future spending by the Government at a level necessary to continue to operate and maintain the asset to generate the receipts estimated pursuant to subparagraph (B).

(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 the 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.

(d) DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY LEVELS.—For the purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the House Committee on the Budget.

SEC. 303. ENVIRONMENTAL RESERVE FUND.

(a) COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS.—In the House, after the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure report a bill (or a conference report thereon is filed) to reform the Superfund program to facilitate the cleanup of hazardous waste sites, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall submit revised allocations and budget aggregates to carry out this section by an amount not to exceed the excess subject to the limitation. These revisions shall be considered for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as the allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The adjustments made under this section shall not exceed—

(1) $200 million in budget authority for fiscal year 1998 and the estimated outlays flowing therefrom.

(2) $200 million in budget authority for fiscal year 2002 and the estimated outlays flowing therefrom.

(3) $1 billion in budget authority for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002 and the estimated outlays flowing therefrom.

(c) READJUSTMENTS.—In the House, any adjustments made under this section for any appropriation measure may be readjusted if that measure is not enacted into law.

SEC. 304. SEPARATE ALLOCATION FOR LAND ACQUISITIONS AND EXCHANGES.

(a) ALLOCATION BY CHAIRMAN.—In the House, upon the reporting of a bill by the Committee on Appropriations (or upon the filing of a conference report thereon) providing up to $165 million in outlays for Federal land acquisitions and to finalize priority Federal land exchanges for fiscal year 1998 (assuming $700 million in outlays over 5 fiscal years), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall allocate that amount of outlays and the corresponding amount of budget authority.

(b) TREATMENT OF ALLOCATIONS IN THE HOUSE.—In the House, for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, allocations made under subsection (a) shall be deemed to be made pursuant to section 602(a)(1) of that Act and shall be deemed to be a separate suballocation for purposes of the application of section 302(f) of that Act as modified by section 602(c) of that Act.

TITLE IV—SENSE OF CONGRESS PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON BASELINES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The 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 portrayed 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 and executive accountability for Federal spending.

SEC. 402. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON REPAYMENT OF THE FEDERAL DEBT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

(1) The Congress and the President have a basic moral and ethical responsibility to future generations to repay the Federal debt, including the money borrowed from the Social Security Trust Fund.

(2) The Congress and the President should enact a law which creates a regimen for paying off the Federal debt within 30 years.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PRESIDENT'S SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that:

(1) The President's annual budget submission to Congress should include a plan for repayment of Federal debt beyond the year 2002, including the money borrowed from the Social Security Trust Fund.

(2) The plan should specifically explain how the President would cap spending growth at a level one percentage point lower than projected growth in revenues.

(3) If spending growth were held to a level one percentage point lower than projected growth in revenues, then the Federal debt could be repaid within 30 years.

SEC. 403. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON COMMISSION ON LONG-TERM BUDGETARY PROBLEMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) achieving a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002 is only the first step necessary to restore our Nation's economic prosperity;

(2) the imminent retirement of the baby-boom generation will greatly increase the demand for government services;

(3) this burden will be borne by a relatively smaller work force resulting in an unprecedented intergenerational transfer of financial resources;

(4) the rising demand for retirement and medical benefits will quickly jeopardize the solvency of the medicare, social security, and Federal retirement trust funds; and

(5) the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that marginal tax rates would have to increase by 50 percent over the next 5 years to cover the long-term projected costs of retirement and health benefits.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be enacted to create a commission to assess long-term budgetary problems, their implications for both the baby-boom generation and tomorrow's workforce, and make such recommendations as it deems appropriate to ensure our Nation's future prosperity.

SEC. 404. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CORPORATE WELFARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that the functional levels and aggregates in this budget resolution assume that—

(1) the Federal Government supports profit-making enterprises and industries through billions of dollars in payments, benefits, and programs;

(2) many of these subsidies do not serve a clear and compelling public interest;

(3) corporate subsidies frequently provide unfair competitive advantages to certain industries and industry segments; and

(4) at a time when millions of Americans are being asked to sacrifice in order to balance the budget, the corporate sector should bear its share of the burden.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be enacted to—

(1) eliminate the most egregious corporate subsidies; and

(2) create a commission to recommend the elimination of Federal payments, benefits, and programs which predominantly benefit a particular industry or segment of an industry, rather than provide a clear and compelling public benefit, and include a fast-track process for the consideration of those recommendations.

SEC. 405. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING BALANCED BUDGET ENFORCEMENT.

It is the sense of Congress that reconciliation legislation considered pursuant to this legislation must include enforcement procedures to ensure that the Budget of the United States Government does reach balance by 2002 and remain in balance thereafter. Such language should—

(1) set nominal targets for spending, revenues, and deficits for each year of the next 10 years;

(2) require that the President propose a budget that complies with the spending, revenue, and deficit targets in each year or propose to change the targets, and require that any budget resolution considered by the House of Representatives and the Senate comply with the spending, revenue, and deficit targets in each year or recommend changes to those targets;

(3) include all portions of the budget and apply such enforcement proportionally to the specific parts of the budget that caused the deficit to exceed the target in any year. This should be accomplished through a combination of—

(A) extension of the caps for discretionary spending enforced by sequestration through fiscal year 2002;

(B) global caps for total entitlement spending and specific caps within the global caps for large entitlement programs, with sequestration applied to those programs or categories that caused outlays to exceed the caps;

(C) a requirement that tax cuts be phased in contingent on meeting the revenue targets in the agreement;

(4) allow adjustments to spending caps and revenue and deficit targets for changes in actual economic conditions to avoid forcing policy changes due directly and exclusively to changes in economic conditions;

(5) prevent the use of emergencies to evade the enforcement mechanism by establishing procedures to budget for and control emergency spending; and

(6) if the actual deficit is below the target in any year, lock in such budget savings for deficit and debt reduction.

AMENDMENT TO H. CON. RES. 84 OFFERED BY MESSRS. DOGGETT AND WEYGAND

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

SEC. . PROTECTION OF BALANCED BUDGET.

It is the sense of the Congress that, to assure that neither the tax cuts nor the spending increases in this resolution explode in cost, endangering the balanced budget promised by 2002 or the ability to maintain balance thereafter, any provision of law affecting revenues or authorizing spending for new entitlement initiatives assumed in this resolution should sunset and cease to be effective within five years, unless subsequently reauthorized by law.

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT

The amendment addresses the possibility that exploding tax cuts and new spending in the agreement could jeopardize the balanced budget by stating the ''sense of Congress'' that any tax-law changes and new entitlement spending enacted pursuant to the agreement should sunset and cease to be effective for only five years, unless subsequently reauthorized by Congress.

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) describes 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 to 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 had 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 the one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda to offer an alternative plan.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding this time to me.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

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

We all should continue to be concerned about the debt of the Federal Government. We continue to increase the debt subject to the debt limit, and I would just remind Members that in 1979, when we started the so-called rule 49, the Gephardt rule, that says we are automatically going to increase the debt when we pass the budget resolution, at that time we had a debt of $829 billion, which was 33 percent of GDP, of gross domestic product. Today the debt is $5.2 trillion, almost 70 percent of GDP.

When we brag about being the shining knight on the white horse that is bringing the deficit down, I would just like to call to the attention of my colleagues what has really brought the deficit down. We had huge tax increases in 1990 and again in 1993, but an economic system that surged ahead. Our free enterprise capitalistic system continued to expand revenues while spending continued to increase faster than inflation. But in the process, the deficit has gone down.

This budget proposal, I would have written to have tax decreases that spur economic growth and job creation more than we do in this proposal. But I thank the committee for including in this proposal the waiving of rule 49, the so-called Gephardt rule, so that we can have an up or down vote on the debt limit that is so important to our economic future.

I thank the Rules Committee for supporting my House Resolution 30 at least temporarily dispensing with rule 49 in this rule. Now House rule 49 will not apply to the spending in this budget resolution.

House rule 49, the so-called Gephardt rule was passed in 1979 in order to allow Members to avoid a separate embarrassing vote to raise the debt ceiling.

During the debate, those in favor of the Gephardt rule argued that spending determined the need for borrowing and therefore a separate vote was not needed.

Opponents, however, argued that a separate vote on the debt ceiling was still needed because it was the only time the House took to reflect on the increasing national debt and its impact on future generations.

Since the imposition of the Gephardt rule, the debt has increased. The arguments against the rule are stronger than ever because of the increasing national debt.

Fiscal year	Gross Federal debt	Debt as percentage of GDP
1979	$829.47 billion	33.2 percent
1996	5.182 trillion	69.2 percent

The Gephardt rule treats Congress' constitutional power to borrow as intermixed with its power to spend. This violates the spirit of the constitution which lists these powers as separate and distinct. As a result of the Gephardt rule, Federal borrowing is no longer seen as an emergency power for times of depression or war, but just another, natural part of the Federal budget process.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I also want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for his persistence and commitment to a balanced budget. I think I can say that he is one of the true taxpayer heroes in this body, and we would not be here today if it had not been for his valiant efforts and some of his earlier authorship of some very important budget work, which I was pleased to join with.

Two and a half years ago at the start of the 104th Congress, a new majority went to work to balance the budget and provide real tax relief for the American people. Our new majority pledged to save the Medicare Program, rein in out-of-control spending and, in a nutshell, bring fiscal sanity back to our Nation.

The naysayers scoffed and the big government liberals said, you cannot do that. They laughed in derision, they called it a radical idea that could not be done without starving the children and slashing Social Security. Our President not only refused to endorse the balanced budget, he repudiated it through his own budget request. Despite this hostile opposition, we remained steadfast in our commitment and pushed forward to get the job done.

What a difference a few years makes. This budget resolution locks in the President and the Congress to a real balanced budget in 5 years. Like most compromises, it is not perfect. As a member of the Kerrey commission, I am concerned that we rely on reductions to health care providers, rather than expanding choice and competition, and going after the cost drivers in our effort to save Medicare.

I am also anxious about the lack of eliminations in the discretionary portion of the budget. We cannot be satisfied with trimming back on wasteful spending here and there. We must insist on ripping out bad programs by the roots. I intend to continue my efforts to eliminate these wasteful programs as they are identified during the appropriations process. In the past few years I have offered a list of specifics cutting hundreds of billions, and I will do so again this year.

But I have always felt that we cannot afford to make the perfect the enemy of the good. And for those who would still say that we have not made significant progress, I would encourage them to leaf through this document, the fiscal year 1996 budget of the United States Government. This is the President's budget request for 1996, just 2 years ago. The President's vision then, $200 billion a year deficits as far as the eye could see into the future. That is the best they could do.

Now, let us move fast forward to today's budget resolution. Not only have we agreed to a balanced budget, we have provided overdue relief for millions of American taxpayers. We have offered another vision for America, one where we pay our own bills, we live within our means and we reduce the tax burden on our producers. Now, thankfully, the President has joined us and endorsed that vision.

I urge support for this fair and appropriate rule and for the balanced budget amendment. America is ready and waiting. This is good news.

☐ 1500

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and since the gentleman from Texas has yielded back all of his time, I will be extremely brief.

Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat taken by some of the statements from the other side of the aisle in opposing this vital piece of legislation that is on the floor today. As I said earlier, this agreement, this budget agreement, this historic budget agreement, is going to save $600 billion. That is not $600 million, Mr. Speaker, that is $600 billion over the next 5 years.

There is going to be discretionary spending cuts in various programs that is going to be substantial; and, in addition to that, there is going to be meaningful tax cuts, especially a capital gains tax cut, that will benefit people like a couple I know that have worked all their lives for Sears Roebuck.

They work at a nominal salary, Sears Roebuck does not pay huge salaries, but these people have stock options. They have saved their money and saved their stock all of these years, for 35 years, and now their total equity is tied up in this stock and all of the increased value that stock has today. Those people should be able to sell that stock and they should be able to do it without giving the Government half of the money.

That is why we are going to reduce the tax rate on capital gains in this country. We are going to reduce the estate tax for people that have worked all their lives, that have saved for their children and, now, if they are going to pass on, they ought to be able to give that estate to their children without the Government taking half of that money. I mean what is America all about, if it is not to reward those of us that have worked hard all of our lives?

That is what this debate is all about here today. So I will ask all my colleagues to come over here and vote for the previous question, vote for the rule, and then vote for this agreement, which is a good agreement for the American people and American families in this country.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). 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.

Without objection, each of the postponed votes on the motions to suspend the rules will be 5-minute votes immediately after disposition of this rule.

There was no objection.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 200, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No 140]

YEAS—220

Aderholt	Gilman	Parker
Archer	Goodlatte	Paul
Armey	Goodling	Paxon
Bachus	Goss	Pease
Baker	Graham	Peterson (PA)
Ballenger	Granger	Petri
Barr	Greenwood	Pickering
Barrett (NE)	Gutknecht	Pitts
Bartlett	Hall (OH)	Pombo
Bass	Hansen	Porter
Bateman	Hastings (WA)	Portman
Bereuter	Hayworth	Pryce (OH)
Bilirakis	Hefley	Quinn
Bliley	Herger	Radanovich
Blunt	Hilleary	Ramstad
Boehlert	Hobson	Redmond
Boehner	Hoekstra	Regula
Bonilla	Horn	Riggs
Bono	Hostettler	Riley
Brady	Houghton	Rogan
Bryant	Hulshof	Rogers
Bunning	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Burr	Hutchinson	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton	Hyde	Roukema
Buyer	Inglis	Royce
Callahan	Istook	Ryun
Calvert	Jenkins	Salmon
Camp	Johnson (CT)	Sanford
Canady	Johnson, Sam	Saxton
Cannon	Jones	Scarborough
Castle	Kasich	Schaefer, Dan
Chabot	Kelly	Sensenbrenner
Chambliss	Kim	Sessions
Chenoweth	King (NY)	Shadegg
Christensen	Kingston	Shaw
Coble	Klug	Shays
Coburn	Knollenberg	Shimkus
Collins	Kolbe	Shuster
Combest	LaHood	Skeen
Cook	Largent	Smith (MI)
Cooksey	Latham	Smith (NJ)
Cox	LaTourette	Smith (OR)
Crane	Lazio	Smith (TX)
Crapo	Leach	Smith, Linda
Cubin	Lewis (CA)	Snowbarger
Cunningham	Lewis (KY)	Solomon
Davis (VA)	Linder	Souder
Deal	Livingston	Spence
DeLay	LoBiondo	Stearns
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Stump
Dickey	Manzullo	Sununu
Doolittle	McCollum	Talent
Dreier	McCrery	Tauzin
Duncan	McDade	Taylor (NC)
Dunn	McHugh	Thomas
Ehlers	McInnis	Thornberry
Ehrlich	McIntosh	Thune
Emerson	McKeon	Tiahrt
English	Metcalf	Traficant
Ensign	Mica	Upton
Everett	Miller (FL)	Walsh
Ewing	Molinari	Wamp
Fawell	Moran (KS)	Watkins
Foley	Morella	Watts (OK)
Forbes	Myrick	Weldon (FL)
Fox	Nethercutt	Weldon (PA)
Franks (NJ)	Neumann	Weller
Frelinghuysen	Ney	Whitfield
Gallegly	Northup	Wicker
Ganske	Norwood	Wolf
Gekas	Nussle	Young (AK)
Gibbons	Oxley	Young (FL)
Gilchrest	Packard	
Gillmor	Pappas	

NAYS—200

Abercrombie	Barton	Blumenauer
Allen	Becerra	Bonior
Andrews	Bentsen	Borski
Baesler	Berman	Boswell
Baldacci	Berry	Boucher
Barcia	Bishop	Boyd
Barrett (WI)	Blagojevich	Brown (CA)

Brown (OH)	Hooley	Pallone
Campbell	Hoyer	Pascrell
Capps	Jackson (IL)	Pastor
Cardin	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Payne
Carson	John	Pelosi
Clay	Johnson (WI)	Peterson (MN)
Clayton	Johnson, E. B.	Pickett
Clement	Kanjorski	Pomeroy
Clyburn	Kaptur	Poshard
Condit	Kennedy (MA)	Price (NC)
Conyers	Kennedy (RI)	Rahall
Costello	Kennelly	Rangel
Coyne	Kildee	Reyes
Cramer	Kilpatrick	Rivers
Cummings	Kind (WI)	Rodriguez
Danner	Kleczka	Roemer
Davis (FL)	Klink	Rothman
Davis (IL)	Kucinich	Roybal-Allard
DeFazio	LaFalce	Rush
DeGette	Lampson	Sabo
Delahunt	Lantos	Sanchez
DeLauro	Levin	Sandlin
Dellums	Lewis (GA)	Sawyer
Deutsch	Lipinski	Schaffer, Bob
Dicks	Lofgren	Scott
Dingell	Lowey	Serrano
Dixon	Luther	Sherman
Doggett	Maloney (CT)	Sisisky
Dooley	Maloney (NY)	Skaggs
Doyle	Manton	Skelton
Edwards	Markey	Slaughter
Engel	Martinez	Smith, Adam
Eshoo	Mascara	Snyder
Etheridge	Matsui	Spratt
Evans	McCarthy (MO)	Stabenow
Farr	McCarthy (NY)	Stark
Fattah	McDermott	Stenholm
Fazio	McGovern	Stokes
Filner	McHale	Strickland
Flake	McIntyre	Stupak
Foglietta	McKinney	Tanner
Ford	McNulty	Tauscher
Frank (MA)	Meehan	Taylor (MS)
Frost	Meek	Thompson
Furse	Menendez	Thurman
Gejdenson	Millender-McDonald	Tierney
Gephardt	Miller (CA)	Torres
Gonzalez	Minge	Towns
Goode	Mink	Turner
Gordon	Moakley	Velazquez
Green	Mollohan	Vento
Gutierrez	Murtha	Visclosky
Hall (TX)	Nadler	Waters
Hamilton	Neal	Watt (NC)
Harman	Oberstar	Wexler
Hastings (FL)	Obey	Weygand
Hefner	Olver	Wise
Hill	Ortiz	Wynn
Hilliard	Owens	Yates
Hinojosa		
Holden		

NOT VOTING—14

Ackerman	Hinchey	Schumer
Bilbray	Jefferson	Waxman
Brown (FL)	Moran (VA)	White
Fowler	Sanders	Woolsey
Hastert	Schiff	

☐ 1524

Ms. ESHOO, and Messrs. SHERMAN, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, MOAKLEY, and SPRATT changed their vote from ‘‘yea’’ to ‘‘nay.’’

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut and Mrs. CUBIN changed their 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. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 278, nays 142, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]

YEAS—278

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Dellums
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
Mascara
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Oberstar
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riley
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Vento
Walsh
Waters
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—142

Allen
Baesler
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Edwards
Engel
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gephardt
Goode
Gordon
Green
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hilliard
Hinojosa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E.B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lantos
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McDermott
McHale
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Miller (CA)
Minge
Nadler
Neal
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Owens
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reyes
Riggs
Rivers
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Velazquez
Visclosky
Wamp
Watt (NC)
Wexler
Yates

NOT VOTING—14

Ackerman
Bilbray
Brown (FL)
Coburn
Fowler
Hastert
Hinchey
Jefferson
Jenkins
Sanders
Schiff
Waxman
White
Woolsey

□ 1533

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD changed her vote from ‘‘yea’’ to ‘‘nay.’’

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1122. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to ban partial-birth abortions.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 711(b)(2) of Public Law 104–293, the Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, appoints the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] as a member of the Commission to Assess the Organization of the Federal Government to Combat the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 26, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1650, by the yeas and nays; and

House Resolution 147, by the yeas and nays.

Under the previous order of today, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for each vote by electronic device in this series.

PERMITTING USE OF CAPITOL ROTUNDA FOR CONGRESSIONAL CEREMONY HONORING MOTHER TERESA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and concurring in the Senate concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 26.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 26, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 0, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 142]

YEAS—415

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo

Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wise
Wolf
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—19

Ackerman
Barr
Barton
Bilbray
Brown (FL)
Burton
Frank (MA)
Granger
Hastert
Hinchey
Jefferson
Sanders
Schiff
Spratt
Waters
Waxman
White
Wicker
Woolsey

□ 1543

Mr. WISE changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PRESIDENT TO AWARD CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO MOTHER TERESA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1650.

The clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1650, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

□ 1545

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. KINGSTON). Members will be advised that voting machines are not working and that voting will proceed with Members casting their vote in writing in the well.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will be advised that the machines apparently are working now. Vote cautiously. The machines are now working.

Members are encouraged to vote by machine rather than in the well.

□ 1600

VACATING ORDERING OF YEAS AND NAYS ON H.R. 1650, AUTHORIZING PRESIDENT TO AWARD CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO MOTHER TERESA

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings whereby the yeas and nays were ordered on H.R. 1650 and the electronic vote begun.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would inquire of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] exactly what vote it is that we will not be taking, and will there be another vote that we will not take after this one.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unanimous-consent request covers the pending record vote on H.R. 1650, the motion of the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, to answer the gentleman's question, it is for the Gold Medal for Mother Teresa.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the voice vote taken earlier, which was not objected to for lack of a quorum, on the motion offered by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1650, the Chair announced that two-thirds had voted in favor thereof, and so the rules are suspended and the bill is passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VACATING ORDERING OF YEAS AND NAYS ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 147, SENSE OF THE HOUSE THAT HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SHOULD PARTICIPATE IN AND SUPPORT ACTIVITIES TO PROVIDE DECENT HOMES FOR PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the ordering of the yeas and nays on House Resolution 147.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the voice vote taken earlier today on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 147, as amended, which was not objected to for lack of a quorum, the Chair announced that two-thirds had voted in favor thereof, and so the rules are suspended and the resolution is agreed to.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: ''A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the House of Representatives should participate in and support activities to provide safe, clean, and healthy homes for the people of the United States, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 152 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 84.

☐ 1610

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 84) establishing the Congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, with Mr. BOEHNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution is considered read the first time.

General debate shall be confined to the congressional budget and shall not exceed 5 hours and 20 minutes, including 1 hour on the subject of economic goals and policies, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], and 20 minutes controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, there is 20 minutes that has been allocated to my portion of this general debate. Is it correct to understand that it will be 20 minutes at the end of the general debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will consult with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE], and the chairman of the committee to determine at what point that debate would occur.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, when will we have such consultation?

The CHAIRMAN. As soon as the gentleman and the chairman of the committee can approach the Chair and have that discussion.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that, out of the time allocated to me, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT] be yielded 25 minutes and that he be allowed to control that time; that the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK] on behalf of the Joint Economic Committee be yielded 10 minutes and that he be allowed to control that time; that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE] be yielded 20 minutes and that he be allowed to control that time; that the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] be yielded 30 minutes and that she be allowed to control that time; and finally, that I would reserve the remaining 35 minutes to myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

☐ 1615

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

Mr. Chairman, this is a moment that many of us have been waiting for for a long time. The fact is, several years ago I suggested that the time would arrive when Republicans and Democrats could come together; that we could, in fact, put the good of the country and the good of our children ahead of our own basic desires, to pass a bill that would balance the budget, would give tax relief to the American people, would strengthen the American family, and would be a giant first step towards solving many of the problems that have confounded us for many years.

The President came to this Chamber about at the beginning of the year and he declared the era of big Government at an end. The Republicans and the Democrats have worked together, and frankly, that rhetoric now is going to be underlaid by a budget program that in fact does declare the end to the era of big Government.

This agreement is predicated and founded on very conservative economics, predicting a 2.1-percent growth in this economy, the economy growing far in excess of 5 percent. For those that did not know this, it may come as a surprise for some, but we really believe that a 2.1-percent growth rate over the life of this document, which means at some point the economy will grow faster and at other points in time the economy will grow slower, is an excellent conclusion to draw. And in fact, a 2.1 percent growth rate that underlies this agreement is far more conservative than all the blue chip economic estimates that we have heard across this country.

Second, in the area of savings, over the course of the next decade under this agreement, in the programs of entitlements that have eroded our ability to control our wage growth, in order to give us faster wage growth, our inability to be able to give our children a chance, it is not the end-all, but boy, is it a giant first step, with $600 billion in entitlement savings over the course of the next decade, including extending the life of Medicare for up to 10 years and being able to accomplish what the Republicans set out to accomplish in 1995.

It is not just about numbers. There in fact are structural reforms to this Medicare Program, including prospective payments for skilled nursing facilities and home health care, the fastest growing items in the Medicare budget; the creation of physician networks, so physicians can compete with the insurance companies to offer people more opportunity, more choice, more benefits; the fact that we are going to have an adjustment in the reimbursements to the managed care operations by letting rural America have more incentives to offer more choice to people in rural America; the fact that we moved the home health care and made sure that part of those costs were going to be included in the premium, and phased in over a period of time. As Members will see, there are structural changes in this Medicare Program.

Are there going to be more changes needed in the future? There is no question that as the baby boomers begin to retire we have a huge challenge. That is precisely why I authored a provision that calls for the creation of a baby boomer study program to figure out how to deal with the major problems of Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid.

There will be a big challenge, but let us not let that challenge take away from what we have been able to accomplish in this agreement today. Make no mistake about it, never before in the history of the U.S. Congress have we saved more money in entitlements than in this agreement.

In the area of the programs that run the Government of the United States, some people say we have not saved enough. As far as I am concerned, when it comes to the taxpayers' money we always have to be working at saving more. But let me just put it in perspective.

Nondefense discretionary, the programs that operate the government of the United States, will grow over the next 5 years at an average of one-half percent a year. Do Members get that? They will grow at one-half percent a year. Over the last 10 years they have grown at 10 percent. So to take the growth in those programs from 10 percent over the last 10 years to a half a percent over the next 5 years is a very, very significant accomplishment.

Will we come back at some point and try to do more to defang the Government, to defang those parts of the Government that have harassed people? Not suggesting that all of it does, but in those areas where Government has put a burden on the shoulders of the people as they have tried to heal their communities and heal their families, of course that should be our role, to set the people free in this country. So what we have in this budget is good fiscal restraint, $600 billion in entitlement savings and only one-half percent a year growth in the programs that run the Government.

Coupled with that, of course, is the first balanced budget in over 30 years, which will result in the year 2002 in only the second balanced budget over the course of the last 40 years. Also included in this document, and we should all be aware of this, is something that many people said could not be done. That is to give the people power by letting them keep more of what they earn. Included in this document is $135 billion in tax cuts over 5 years, and at least $350 billion in tax cuts over the next 10 years.

That will be enough. It will be enough to give the American people something we have been promising for many years now. It will give them a capital gains tax cut, so that in America we will reward risk-taking, and we will give the American people the tools with which to compete and win in the international job market.

Let me just suggest to the Members that to improve the reasons to risk take and the incentives to risk take, and to give people a reason to invest in America, will mean that the infrastructure of America will be able to accommodate faster economic growth without inflation.

There are many other things we need to do to improve the infrastructure of America so our country can grow faster and reward more people from one end of this country to the other, but we believe that the capital gains tax cut is one of those elements, coupled with a balanced budget, that results in lower interest rates and more investment and more productivity and more wealth for every single American.

Included in here is the family tax credit, because we believe the best Department of Health, Education and Welfare in the United States is the American family. Is it not going to be great, I say to the gentleman from Tennessee, when this Sunday he goes to church and he sees a man and his wife leave the church with three young kids, and they get into that old Chevrolet and you can actually see the car kind of go down and up as they get in, and maybe on the back of the bumper is an old Billy Graham bumper sticker left over from a rally 3 years ago, and he knows in his soul that under a child tax credit the American family is going to have more, some money for their college, some money for new clothes, some money to help the family.

Of course, there will be estate relief in here, too, so when you die and you have worked a lifetime to build something, to pass it on to your family, the Government is not going to take it all away. Let me just suggest, whether it is a small business or the family farm, we do not want the people to not just have death but death and taxes to the max. We do not solve the whole problem of the estate, this overtaxation of estates in this, but we are making a good first step.

The President got one of his priorities in the area of education. Let me just suggest, for those mothers and fathers who have had to take that second job to help their kid get a college education, this program has some help for them. They need help.

But let me ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to start aggressively asking the higher education officials in this country why their costs are racing out of control. Let me ask the moms and dads and the students to start asking the same question. But in the meantime, we are going to help.

What do we get here at the end of the day? First, the first balanced budget in over 30 years; real tax relief that we think will improve the lives of America's workers; real tax relief that we believe will improve the lives of the American family; real tax relief that will give a reward to people for working hard for a lifetime; help for people to realize the American dream through education; and at the same time, the most significant savings in entitlements in the history of this country, and controlling the growth to a half a percent a year of those programs that run the Federal Government, and a giant first step toward moving into the next century by stabilizing the fiscal policies of the United States of America.

It has been a long road. It has been very difficult. I want to compliment the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARTIN SABO], maybe the most forgotten man today in the Chamber, but not by me, because MARTIN worked hard in 1995, in 1993, and in 1994 and in 1995 and in 1996; a total class gentleman. Over the course of the last 2 years we have worked closely together to try to figure out how we could narrow most of our differences.

It is a tremendous pleasure to have worked with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. JOHN SPRATT]. He has had a very difficult time trying to make sure that he could keep his caucus together and listen to his leader who at times he had to represent, and other parts of the caucus who he had to represent. Hats off to JOHN SPRATT; and to John Hilley, my great friend down at the White House, to Franklin Raines and Gene Sperling, it was the best, to be able to put aside the partisan bickering and reach an agreement; and to the President, to the President who did not have to really do this. He decided that he wanted to move forward and reach agreement. He sent his trusted aide, Erskine Bowles, to the Hill. With PETE DOMINICI and the gentleman from Georgia. [Mr. NEWT GINGRICH] and TRENT LOTT and this big team, we were able to put it together.

No one should think for a second that this is the end of the game. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, this is just the beginning, but a very great beginning and a very big step toward providing a more prosperous, toward providing a more confident, toward providing a more secure America, and convincing the American people that when we put the politics aside and we listen to them and their calls for so many years for this body to get control of the spending of this country and to return some of their power, when we listen to them, at the end of the day Republicans and Democrats came together to reach agreement on something that I believe the American people will look at and say, for once you have done well. For once you have put the politics aside and you have agreed to work together and serve America.

Let us support this great budget resolution today.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the minority leader.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise reluctantly this afternoon to state that I will not vote for this budget, but before giving Members the reasons for that, I want to commend the Members on both sides of the aisle. I especially want to commend the gentleman from South Carolina, [Mr. JOHN SPRATT], and I want to commend the President for working so hard to bring about this agreement, which is an important achievement for our country. Having done this in 1990 and again in 1993, I know how hard it is.

☐ 1630

I know how many compromises have to be made and how many decisions have to be made to make something like this come together. But at the end of it, it is a decision on this budget that each of us must make for what is best for our constituents, the 500,000 people that each of us represents and what in our hearts and minds is best for them and best for the country.

I would like to start with a little history of why we are where we are. This all started, in my view, back in 1981. Congress then, in a bipartisan way, made a decision on a budget that had certain increases in spending and tax cuts, which many of us said at the time would create large deficits out in the future. The prediction was that there would be deficits of $100 and $200 and $300 billion. And unfortunately those predictions came true. It has taken us 17 years from that basic decision in 1981 to get on the threshold of being able to balance the budget.

In 1990, we entered into a bipartisan budget agreement, much like has been done now, and at the time we raised taxes and we cut spending in a bipartisan way, and we made a big step, about a $500 billion deficit reduction. We did that again in 1993; I might add, at that time, with all Democratic votes, not one vote from the other side of the aisle. At the time many Republican leaders said they believed that budget we passed in 1993 would wreck the economy and would cause higher unemployment and higher deficits.

I want to point out that because of the interaction of what we do on the deficit and what it does with the economy, that indeed those forecasts were wrong, that even with tax increases and spending cuts, we have had a remarkable economic performance in the last 4 or 5 years.

In fact, in 1993, the prediction was the deficit for this year would be $300 billion. A year ago the prediction was the deficit would be $169 billion. In January of this year, we thought the deficit for this year would be $124 billion. Just last week CBO said it is down to $67 billion.

There is an interaction, there is an inextricable link between the deficit and what we do and how we get rid of the deficit and what happens in the economy. And I believe that the investments we made in education and in capital investment and in health care that we made in the deficit reduction act of 1993 were an integral part of helping the private sector economy grow over the last 5 years so that we have had real economic growth and more revenue coming into the government.

So the question then and now is not whether to do this, it is how we do it. It is how we do it. What are the myriad of decisions, what are the texture of the decisions we put together to try to get the budget into order.

In my view, this budget agreement is a budget of many deficits: a deficit of principle, a deficit of fairness, a deficit of tax justice, and worst of all, a deficit of dollars.

First, I think it is unfair. I think that when we have done these budgets, we have always tried to have shared sacrifice. We have said to the American people in the highest sense of patriotism that everybody has to sacrifice in order to get the budget straightened out. That is what we did in 1990. That is what we did in 1993. That is not what this budget does.

Recently I was going door to door in my district. I met a young couple who had just bought a house. They were happy because the wife had just gotten pregnant and they were expecting this new family. I asked them what their concerns were. They said their concern was that between them they have 5 jobs, 5 jobs. That is kind of the way the economy is working for ordinary Americans today. In order to make ends meet, people have to work more jobs and more hours.

And the woman said to me, ''You know, our concern is that when the baby comes, I would like to stay home and raise the child for 2 or 3 years, but with 5 jobs, I have got to quit two of those jobs to do it. And if we do that, we cannot make our house payment.''

That is reality 1997.

On another door-to-door trip in my district I met a woman who was on Social Security and Medicare. She said, ''You know, I do not want to be a whiner, and I do not want to complain, but I only get $450 a month. And I have got to buy a lot of prescription drugs to stay going. I just want you to know, I cannot pay my water bill now, and I do not have hot water. And if I have cuts along the way in Medicare or Social Security, I may lose the apartment I am staying in''. That is reality 1997.

This budget could have done better by either of those people I have talked about. We could have done more in this budget on Head Start, on after school programs for that family I am talking about. We could have done better for that senior citizen so she could get by better. But in this budget there is structured a tax cut. And if I am reading the agreement between the parties correctly, that tax cut will necessarily result in the top 1 percent of taxpayers in this country getting a tax reduction of about $6,000. And when I talk about the top 1 percent, I am talking about folks making an average of $650,000 a year.

Is it shared sacrifice to say to them, you get a huge tax cut every year, $6,000, but the young family who is trying to make ends meet, we cannot help them enough? We cannot give them a larger tax cut. We cannot give them the kind of help that they need getting through their life every day.

It is not fair. I wish it were fairer.

Second, I think it fails to invest in the future. What do I mean by that?

We are in a tough global competition. We have got our work cut out for us. We have to really be good. I agree, we need tax cuts, but they ought to go to the people who need them, desperately need them. And they ought to go to the people who are working hard every day to compete in that global economy. But we also need investments in this budget. Let me just name three to take examples.

First, education. Everybody knows we have got to have better educated people to compete in the global economy, to get productivity increases, to get growth increases. Early on in the budget talks we talked about repairing school buildings and putting money into the structures in which our children learn. That was thrown out of the budget. We did not have enough money to do that.

We talked endlessly in this Chamber about Head Start, about investing in the smallest, youngest children. We talked about Head Start zero to three. We just had a conference in the White House where we find that late mental research proves that the more you can do with young, young, young children, the better the result will be. But this budget does not fully fund Head Start and does not even make a beginning on Head Start zero to three.

Let us talk about children's health, a very good part of this budget, $15 billion, to try to get half the children who do not have health care to have health care. But in the very same budget there is about an equal cut in Medicaid in what is called disproportionate share, a fancy name for trying to give money to hospitals that have a disproportionate share of poverty folks coming there to get help. Guess which hospitals get the lion's share of disproportionate share? The children's hospitals.

We give with one hand; we take away with another. It is not good enough.

Third, investment in the capital investments. We hear about capital gains. What about capital structures? Billions of dollars come into this budget every year from the gasoline tax to the Federal highway trust fund and every year we spend moneys for these needed structures, but we never spend what comes in. And this budget does not either.

In my district of St. Louis, our city fathers and mothers got together and said, what does this region need? They came up with $20 billion worth of needs in St. Louis for capital investment alone. They have no idea where it is going to come from. We can do better in investing in our future.

Third, this budget does not come into balance. I believe with all my heart that the people who worked on it want it to come into balance. And I hope it does, but let me say something. If we have exploding tax cuts that are put into law and they are not met with spending cuts that will be designed to reach them, then the numbers are not going to work.

Remember 1981 and what happened. The last thing we need to do is to advertise this as a deficit reduction plan that will reduce the deficit and then we do not get there. The coalition members wanted to go to the floor this afternoon and have an amendment that had an enforcement process that said, if the numbers do not work for any reason, because the economy does not work or something else, that we will start cutting across the board both spending programs and tax programs in order to see that we really get the balance that we want and that we have advertised. That is not going to be allowed to even be voted on.

In conclusion, I do not believe this budget is fair. I do not believe it invests properly in the future of our country and our economy and our people. I do not believe the numbers will work, and I do not think there is a system in place to make sure that they do.

Let me say this final word. This is a decision and it is a hard decision that all of us have to make. For me, as I cast this vote, I have one thing in my mind and one thing only, and that is the people that I represent in the third District of Missouri. I have in my mind that young family who is working hard, real hard every day and wants to make ends meet and wants to have a future. I have in my mind that senior citizen who wants to stay out of the nursing home and stay in her home and live the life of independence that she wants. I have in mind the children, the children who are the future and the strength and the greatest resource of this country.

Each of us in our own way, as we go through this debate and vote tonight, has to ask ourselves, what is the right thing for my constituents and for my country? Nothing else is asked. That is the question we have to answer.

This is not politics. This is not some election. This is about the future of the country and what in our conscience, our heart and our mind is the best and right thing to do. I will vote against this budget. I think we can do better.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I do want to commend the minority leader on his speech and would like to say to him that I can respect a vision of government that is entirely different than mine and entirely different than the majority in the House. But he should know that in the addendum, point 9 in the reconciliation process, if it is determined that the target of a balanced budget cannot be achieved, all parties to the agreement commit to seek additional savings necessary to achieve balance.

Furthermore, of course, we believe that the tax cuts in fact will provide us with higher economic growth but, beyond that, having an economic plan underlaid by a 2.1 percent growth rate over the course of this agreement is about as conservative an estimate as we can find among any of the groups.

I would not only challenge the gentleman's vision of what builds America, which is not more government spending and more government programs, but in addition, though, severely challenge the fact that somehow we have exploding deficits that will not allow us or exploding tax cuts that will not allow us to get in balance. That is simply not true and will not occur.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I commend the chairman of this committee and also the ranking minority member from the other side of the aisle, this is great work. It is great for the future of this country. I would agree with the comments of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] that this is really about the future of America. We just have a very different vision of who it is that can best spend money in this country, we here in Washington or the people themselves.

I have a presentation but I want to start talking about a family in my district. It is a middle income family. It is a family with three kids. They are about to start college. It is a family whose parents both get up and go to work every single day of the week.

□ 1645

I talked to this family about this budget plan, too, and, frankly, they did not understand billions and trillions very well, and they did not understand CBO and OMB and all that stuff, but what they did understand is how this budget plan was going to impact them directly out in Janesville, WI. Because this middle income family that gets up every morning to go to work understood perfectly well what it meant when we said for every child that is still at home they will receive a $500 credit. They understood perfectly well on their $40,000-a-year income what $1,000 meant coming into their house.

Not only that, they understood, when they talked about their oldest son going off to college, they understood what a $1,500 tax credit meant to them for a total of, maybe we will not get all $2,500 to them, but over $2,000 coming back to this family. That is what it means to the hard-working families, the middle income families who get up every morning to go to work.

And it does have a real impact on them. I guess the difference of opinion here is who it is who can best spend the money, the family out in Janesville keeping the money in their own house, or the people in Washington investing it in the future. My opinion is those families out in Janesville, WI can do a pretty good job of taking care of their own money.

I do have a presentation I want to give, because I strongly support this agreement. This agreement balances the budget for the first time in a generation. We have our families who pay $500 every month to do nothing but to pay the interest on the Federal debt, and certainly it is time we allow those families to keep more of their own money.

It does balance. Starting with 1998 forward, the deficit goes down every year. It restores Medicaid for at least a decade and probably longer as the tax cuts take effect and the economy booms.

The tax cuts. Letting the American people keep more of their own money. It is in here, $500 per child. We are looking at a reduction of capital gains tax, reforming the death tax, and a college tax tuition credit of some sort.

There is no congressionally mandated CPI adjustment. That is to say to our senior citizens, there is nothing in this plan that would adjust their cost-of-living adjustments in Social Security next year. It has been taken out. It was talked about briefly but is not in the plan. It was taken out. We heard the seniors and we heard their concerns.

The plan also includes in the language, at the end of it, a sense of Congress that would allow us to not only balance the budget by 2002 but also pay off the Federal debt between now and the year 2023, so that we can pass this Nation on to our children debt free.

Think of that dream in America: a Nation that we pass on to our children not burdened with debt but debt free. So instead of paying $500 a month in interest into Washington to do nothing but pay the interest on the debt, families can keep that $500 a month and do as they see fit with the money.

As we pay off the Federal debt, another very important thing happens: The money that has been taken out of the Social Security trust fund is put back. And that is very, very significant as we look at the solvency of the Social Security system.

To understand how good this budget is, I think we have to look at where we have come from. I brought a chart from way back in 1991, when I first started running for office. This chart shows the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings plan of 1985, and it shows the green line here is their plan to get to a balanced budget. The red line shows what actually happened, and we can notice they never got to a balanced budget. They never even hit their targets.

In 1987 they revised Gramm-Rudman-Hollings and, again, the green line shows their plan to get to a balanced budget, and the red line shows what actually happened. They never hit their targets, period.

What is happening out here since 1995? This is somewhat staggering. When I went back to put this together I was somewhat shocked to see what was actually happening out here since 1995. The picture is so different than 1985 and 1987 that we almost have to see it to understand how real this thing is.

In 1995, we promised the American people that we would have deficits, as in the red columns on here, $154 billion in 1996. The blue on this thing, the blue columns, those are what is actually happening. And we can notice we not only hit our projection, but we are ahead of schedule.

Think how far we have come since 1985 and 1987. We not only hit the target, we are ahead of schedule in 1996. We are over $100 billion ahead of schedule in 1997. And each year, under this plan, we stay ahead of that promise to the American people that we made in 1995. Our promise is being fulfilled.

The reason that this is happening is because we are curtailing the growth of spending in this great Nation we live in. Spending that was going up rapidly, as we see in the red column, is not going up as fast anymore. It is still going up faster than I would like to see but not as fast as it was. Nondefense discretionary spending was going up.

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

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

Mr. KASICH. And, Mr. Chairman, I will give the gentleman a little more time to put that chart back up there.

Let us take a look at what the fiscal year 1996 to 2002 plan is.

Mr. NEUMANN. It was going up by 5.2 percent a year in the 7 years before we got here. Under this plan, and the first 2 years since 1995, it is now going up by 3.2 percent.

Let us put that in inflation-adjusted dollars. It was going up 1.8; it is now going up 0.6. The growth of Government has been reduced by two-thirds.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, let me just say that under this plan that is currently on the table, those increases will drop to 0.5 percent. This will be the lowest increase in the programs that run the Government of the United States in history.

Someone has told me, and we are still trying to check these numbers, less than half of the growth in spending in nondefense discretionary under President Ronald Reagan. So I think it was a significant accomplishment to be able to slow it to that degree, and I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. NEUMANN. Well, Mr. Chairman, I also think we should talk about nondefense discretionary spending. That is the part of the budget we have the most control over. That was rising by 6.7 percent annually before we took over, in the 7 years before we got here. It is now going up less than 1 percent a year. And in inflation-adjusted dollars, it was going up by 3.2. It is now actually shrinking by 1.5 percent.

I will say that again. In inflation-adjusted dollars, the nondefense discretionary spending, the part of the budget we have the most control over, is actually shrinking.

I will wrap up my part of this presentation with something that is pretty special here. This chart shows what would have happened in 1995 if there had been no changes in the law. This line shows where the deficit was headed in 1995. This yellow line in the chart shows what happened in the first 12 months, how much progress was made during the year of 1995.

Then we put this plan into place, as to what we hoped could happen. That is the green line. And I brought a marker with me today, because a year ago we produced this chart and we said we were ahead of schedule. Notice that our deficit is actually below the green line. And people said, yeah, yeah, yeah, that is 1 year.

I want to conclude my part of this presentation by drawing in where we are now in our second year on this plan to reach a balanced budget. We are way down here. And we can notice that we are not only ahead of schedule for the first year, we are ahead of schedule for the second year. And when we pass this plan, we will stay ahead of schedule for each and every year from now through the year 2002.

What that means for our children in this country is that we will have a balanced budget, we can start paying down the debt, and our children can once again look forward to the opportunity to have a chance at living the American dream in this great Nation that we live in.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 minutes.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, for the first time in 15 years, in the 15 years I have served in this House, we are within reach of a balanced budget.

Last September 30, 1996, when we closed the books on fiscal 1996, the deficit stood at $107.8 billion. And now that we have gotten the revenues on April 15 from this year's tax payments, CBO and OMB both believe that the deficit this year will drop to $70 billion or below—$70 billion or less. We can finish the job. We can balance the budget. But only if we have a plan, for without one the deficit will start drifting back upward again.

We have before us today a hard wrought compromise of a plan. When I say hard wrought, I mean it. It was produced through nearly 4 months of negotiations. Hard fought negotiations. But throughout they were civil and cordial, and I commend my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JOHN KASICH] who worked with us in complete cooperation and good faith throughout the negotiations to bring it to this end, which is a genuine compromise.

Before turning to that plan, I would like to just pause a minute and talk about what brings us to this point. I want to go back to a particular date, January 13, 1993, 1 week before George Bush left office. He sent us that day his economic report of the President, and in it Michael Boskin, his chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, predicted that the deficit for that year, fiscal 1993, would be $332 billion. This was the deficit that President Clinton found on the doorstep awaiting him when we arrived at the White House 1 week later.

On February 17, the President laid on the doorstep of the Congress a plan for cutting that deficit roughly by half over the next 5 years. It was not a popular plan. It was certainly not a painless plan. It cost my party dearly for supporting it. It passed the Congress only by the skin of its teeth.

The critics claimed this budget would cut off the economy at its knees. But the financial markets were impressed, so much so that long bond rates came down by 100 to 120 basis points. And when the books were closed on fiscal 1993, that first fiscal year, the deficit was not $332 billion as Boskin predicted, it was $255 billion.

A year later, the first full year under that budget plan, the deficit was $203 billion. At year end 1995, it was down again to $164 billion. And as I said, last September it was $107.8 billion.

The deficit has been cut now for 5 years in a row. That is not smoke and mirrors, that is not sleight of hand, that is a matter of record. As Yogi Berra liked to say, ''You can look it up.'' The deficit has been cut by 65 percent. And at 1.4 percent of our GDP, it is at its lowest level since the early 1970's. That is progress by anybody's yardstick.

That is why we are within reach, credibly, of a balanced budget. That is why we are here today, to finish a job, because it would be a shame not to try. And that is why it is important that we do it right and not blow this opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, if it were left to me alone, I would do a budget along the lines my good friends, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] and the Blue Dogs laid out last year, for which I voted, which had no net tax cuts at all, none at least until we had our goal firmly in grasp. That would not mean no tax cuts, just no net tax cuts.

But this is a divided government, and to do a deal, none of us gets to do it alone. We have a choice between gridlock and compromise. And what we have before us is just that, it is a compromise. It is not a perfect solution. It is the art of the possible. But if we let the perfect be the enemy of the good, we will not get anything good done on the deficit this year.

This compromise differs from most compromises by design, by conscious design, because what we sought in negotiating it was to let each party claim some clear victory. Rather than come out with just gray results, compromise to the point that they lost their identity and pleased nobody, this package allows the Republicans a clear victory. It allows them the chance to do significant tax cuts. It allows Democrats, my party, the chance to do initiatives in children's health care, the chance to do initiatives in education that we could not do if we tried to do it alone.

That is why I say this budget is balanced in two senses. If the economy stays stable, this budget should take us to a balanced budget by the year 2002. But in the meantime, this resolution is not so fixated on the deficit that it forgets this country has other problems too that need to be addressed.

Hard-working families are worried about how they are going to pay for the cost of their children's education. Tuition is soaring. This resolution promises more help than anything that has been passed in this Congress in the past 25 years.

There are 10 million children, mostly in working families, who have no health insurance. This resolution sets aside $16 billion to come up with ways to cover at least half of those children within the next 5 years.

To those in my party, my fellow Democrats, who are still summing up the pluses and the minuses in this budget resolution, I urge them to keep initiatives like these in mind and ask themselves if we could have achieved this, if we could have done this if we went it alone as a minority, by ourselves. I ask them to look at NDD, nondefense discretionary spending. It goes from $548 to $562 billion. We should ask ourselves, measured against last year's budget resolution, if we could have done this well if we did it alone.

Look at what we have done with Medicare and preventive care, with Medicaid and moderating the reductions. Throughout this budget the Democratic stamp is firmly and clearly in place. I do not think we could have done this well by going it alone, and that is why I say we should support it. That is why this resolution is a good deal for us but, more importantly, it is a good deal for this country.

It is a balanced plan to balance the budget. I say let us finish what we started in 1993. Let us adopt this House Concurrent Resolution 84. Let us balance the budget by the year 2002, and let us take the credit we deserve as Democrats for this accomplishment.

☐ 1700

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to clarify for the Members the unanimous-consent request from the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] who broke up his time throughout the remainder of the evening.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] has 25 minutes remaining on his time. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT] will have 25 minutes. Joint Economic Committee members will have 10 minutes. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE] will have 40 minutes, 20 minutes under the rule and 20 minutes of additional time as requested by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT]. The Congressional Black Caucus will have 30 minutes. And then the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] will have 30 minutes and have the right to close on his side of the aisle.

The Chair would encourage Members controlling time under this consent arrangement to use their time in the blocks that have been allocated, if at all possible.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, would the Chair just explain how much time has been consumed? I understand that when the majority leader was yielded 5 minutes, he spoke for 13; and that is our process, but he was allocated 5 minutes against the time. How much time has been consumed by both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] has 24 minutes remaining of the 30 minutes in his block under his unanimous-consent arrangement. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] has 2 hours and 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. SHAYS. That is not all that helpful, Mr. Chairman. Of the total amount of time on each side, how much has been allocated?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not understand the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to know how much time has been consumed on both sides. That is the question. I did not ask how much is remaining. How much is consumed?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] has used 11 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, how much time have we used on this side?

The CHAIRMAN. On the other side of the aisle, 19 minutes have been consumed.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. PARKER].

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the bipartisan budget agreement before us today. This budget resolution has particular significance for me. I am the only Member of this body who has worked with the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], from both sides of the aisle.

For 5 years, I served on the Committee on the Budget as the Democratic member, struggling to produce such a document. While we never succeeded, I think it is appropriate at this time to remember the commitment of colleagues, some of whom are no longer in this body, who worked for such an agreement.

Specifically, I want to express appreciation to Tim Penny, whose work I believe laid the foundation for the success that our chairman has brought to fruition. Also, both Leon Panetta and the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. MARTIN SABO, in my opinion, worked to produce the most fiscally conservative resolutions possible in their eras. I hope each realizes his contribution to this long process.

My last year as a Democratic member of the committee was spent working on the other side of the aisle to demonstrate that bipartisanship was possible but, more importantly, necessary to success. Unfortunately, it was not viable at the time.

Now, in my first year as a Republican member of this committee, it is with great pleasure that I endorse a truly bipartisan agreement. The fiscal year 1998 budget resolution was reported by the Committee on the Budget on a 31 to 7 vote. It was supported by 11 Democrats on the committee. The ranking member of the committee, who deserves a tremendous amount of credit, was a major player in its development. This document is bipartisan and it is a culminating moment in my service in the House.

I know that some of my fellow conservatives may be disappointed in this agreement. It does not go as far as we would like for it to go in reforming the role of government in our lives. But you must realize that we have colleagues on the opposite end of the political spectrum who are perhaps even more distressed with some of the contents of this resolution.

Some will call this resolution compromise, as if it were something foul or distasteful. Others will call this capitulation and will revel in debating who recapitulated, the President or the Congress. But I do not refer to this budget by either of those terms. To me it is a realistic achievement. It is what is doable. It is the product of something known as the Democratic process. It is called governing.

Unless any of us forget, let me remind you that less than 3 years ago we did not even debate budget resolutions that reached balance at any point in the future. Today, we are debating a budget that reaches balance in 2002, provides real savings in entitlement programs, creates no new entitlements and provides for a permanent reduction in taxes. We are doing this in a bipartisan fashion which greatly enhances the chances of making these efforts actual law.

This debate today is not nearly the final word on the issue. We must now move forward in the legislative process. Every committee in this body will make a significant contribution on producing at least one, hopefully two, reconciliation bills which we will debate later in the summer. We must also produce and pass 13 appropriation bills, none of which will be easy.

We will have this and other debates many times over as we proceed. We will each see victories and we will each see defeats. That is the nature of American-style democracy. It is not particularly pretty to watch, but it will work.

But today what is crucially important to recognize is that for the first time in a very long time, we are considering a bipartisan balanced budget proposal. This is historical. This is a victory for all Americans. More importantly, it is a celebration of our system of government and of our future generations.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], the former chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding. Let me say a special word of gratitude and thanks to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] for their great job in bringing this compromise budget proposal to us today. It is not easy, but it is a job well done and the country is well served by your efforts.

By passing this budget agreement today, we will be entering the final stages of a 7-year effort to get this country's fiscal house in order. The effort began in 1990 with the budget agreement between President Bush and congressional Democrats. It took another giant step forward in 1993, when President Clinton and congressional Democrats passed the largest deficit reduction package in history. And today, by passing this budget resolution, we will move toward finishing the job of balancing the budget.

When all is said and done, the record will show that the only people to have voted for all three of these budgets will be congressional Democrats. And, in fact, most of the people who will have voted for two out of three will be congressional Democrats.

Before the 1993 deficit reduction package was passed, the deficit stood at $290 billion. But congressional Democrats acted to change that and the country has reaped the benefits ever since. Thanks to that 5-year plan, the deficit is now expected to fall for a fifth straight year to its lowest level since 1979. By the end of 1997, the 1993 plan will have cut almost $700 billion in projected deficits. Indeed, without that success, we would not be in a position to consider balancing the budget by the year 2002.

The economy has also responded to the 1993 plan by creating more than 12 million new jobs, raising wages, lowering unemployment, and keeping inflation in check. Most of us cannot remember a time when our economy was stronger and more likely to provide a better future for our citizens. I firmly believe this would not have happened if we had not acted to reduce the deficit significantly.

The budget before us continues the fiscal discipline of the last 7 years. At the same time, it gives us the opportunity to correct some of the excesses of last year's welfare bill. It will help restore fairness for legal immigrants who had benefits taken away from them unfairly. It will provide the opportunity to restore food stamps for people unable to find jobs. This is a good resolution. Let us pass it.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING].

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

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 84, the balanced budget agreement of 1997. When Babe Ruth retired in 1935, a lot of folks thought no one would ever break his record of 714 home runs. But in 1974, Hank Aaron hit number 715. And a lot of folks thought no one would ever break Lou Gehrig's consecutive game streak of 2,130 games. But in 1995, Cal Ripken broke that record, and he is still going strong.

A lot of folks were beginning to think that Congress would never break its record of deficit spending year after year, and for 27 years they were right. But today, we have a chance to break that dismal record. Today, we have a chance to end our 27-year losing streak of deficit spending.

This alone is enough reason to merit support for this budget agreement. But this agreement does much more than just break the deficit streak. It helps preserve Medicare and keep it solvent for the next 10 years, it provides tax relief for the American family by providing a $500 child tax credit and educational tax credits, it helps small businesses and farmers by providing relief from the death tax, which causes so many family farms and family businesses to be sold instead of being handed down to the next generation, it provides more incentives for savings by allowing us to expand the individual retirement account, and it will help create jobs by providing much needed capital gains tax relief.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to take advantage of this historical moment, this bipartisan agreement, and break this dismal record of deficit spending that started in 1969. Vote "yes" on this historical document. This is a record breaking day for the U.S. Congress.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY], the vice chair of the Democratic Caucus.

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, as a supporter of the controversial 1990 Bush budget and a supporter of the budget resolution of the equally controversial budget of 1993, I rise tonight to support this budget resolution, hoping it has the same end.

CBO recently announced that, in fact, the deficit for this year would be below $70 billion, the lowest in 16 years, a 77-percent reduction in deficit since President Clinton became President. This is tremendous progress.

☐ 1715

This is tremendous progress. But it would not have happened if it was not for the decisions made by those in 1990 and 1993.

I support this resolution because I want to see the job finished. I want to see the budget balanced. But we must say tonight again and again, the hard work has just begun. We must draft implementing legislation that keeps the promise of a balanced budget in the years following 2002. We must insist that the Committee on Ways and Means craft a package that provides needed tax relief to American families. This will be no easy task. In particular, the tax package needs to be crafted in a way that makes it possible to provide the promised tax cuts while at the same time actually measuring in the correct way the cost of these tax cuts. It would be tragic indeed if after years of work the tax cuts were drafted in such a manner that the revenue losses drive up the deficit after 2008. I think we should agree in a bipartisan fashion that such an outcome is not in the interest of the Nation.

I stand here tonight and the rancor is not the same as it was in 1990, and it certainly is not the same as it was in 1993. I do not miss the rancor, but, Mr. Chairman, I will say I would rather have the rancor and the commitment to reduce the deficit. I certainly hope tonight that in this budget resolution I am going to vote for, that promises are kept, please, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], the majority whip and a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this resolution, and I commend everyone on both sides of the aisle for their hard work in putting it together.

Today we are faced with another historic decision. We can move forward by passing this resolution or we can stumble backwards by defeating it. This budget resolution accomplishes two very important things: First, it balances the budget; second, it cuts taxes for working families in America. Together these two priorities comprise the cornerstone of the Republican agenda. To characterize this as anything less than a victory for commonsense conservatism, I think, is an exercise in fantasy. I would remind my colleagues that this is not the end of the beginning nor is it the beginning of the end. Instead it is the first step in a very long process to preserve and protect the future fiscal health of this Nation. Like the 12-step program of Alcoholics Anonymous, the first step is the most important step, but each step on the way is equally important. We have a long way to go until we swear off wasteful Washington spending for good.

Critics have found much to criticize in this budget. They have picked it apart with complaints as diverse as the people who make up this country. Some have said that spending is too high. Others have said that spending is too low. Some complain that our tax cuts are too generous. Others condemn them as inefficient. In a perfect world, if I were king, this would be a different budget. I am certain that if the minority whip, the gentleman from Michigan, were king, he could construct a budget far different from mine. But this is not a monarchy. Neither the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] nor I are kings. This agreement is the best we can get with the situation that we find ourselves in. It cuts taxes, it saves Medicare, it slows spending, and it balances the budget.

In my view this budget resolution is kind of like Tiger Woods and his tee shot. It is not too far to the right nor is it too far to the left and it takes us a lot further than we previously thought we could go before.

A cynic, Oscar Wilde once said, is a man who knows the price of everything and the value of nothing. Cynics who condemn this budget miss its true value. For the first time in modern memory, the President of one party and a Congress controlled by the other party have agreed to balance the budget and to cut taxes in a very specific budget resolution. I call that a victory for the American people.

To those Democrats who support this resolution, let me just simply say, welcome to the fight and we greatly appreciate your support. And to those few Republicans who may oppose this budget, let me just say, do not grasp defeat from the jaws of victory. To those Americans who have lost faith in the political process, let me just say, every once in a while the process works. This is one of those times.

Vote for this resolution and together let us move on to the next step of balancing the budget and cutting taxes for the American people.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI].

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I would first of all like to commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and certainly the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] and certainly the President and his staff for putting together this agreement. I would call it a historic agreement, and it is. If, in fact, it is implemented as it is agreed to, then it will be a very good budget because it will carry out the priorities of both sides. It will have a modest tax cut and at the same time it will provide relief for legal immigrants that was taken away in 1996, it will provide new initiatives for children's health care, and certainly it will provide more resources for education in the form of Pell grants and increases of 25 percent in many of the areas of education.

On the other hand, I must point out that I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] for saying that many Democrats will be joining him, but for the last 7 years, in 1990, and 1993, it was the Democrats that basically carried deficit reduction. In 1990, as my colleagues recall when President Bush was President we reduced the deficit by some $600 billion. In 1993, with President Clinton, we reduced it by some $490 billion. That is why we are here today with a $67 billion deficit and on our way to balance. But I will say I am a little concerned, and I want to make one caveat. This is just a piece of paper. It has no force of law. The President does not even have to sign it. The real test will be the 13 appropriations bills and the reconciliation bill and also the reconciliation bills on the tax cut.

Bear in mind, 1981, when Ronald Reagan said, ''We're going to balance the budget, we're going to cut taxes and we're going to increase defense.'' He said he was going to balance the budget by 1984. My colleagues know that did not happen.

I just heard some of my friends on the other side of the aisle talking about the tax cuts, the capital gains tax cuts, the cuts in the estate tax, the child credit of $500, and also the IRA's. If we add all those up as introduced in the Contract With America, we are talking about 600 billion dollars' worth of tax cuts over the next 10 years. We will find ourselves in the same mess we did in the 1980's unless we are willing to implement this agreement as it was agreed upon by all the parties.

I reserve the right, I think with my colleagues, that on the individual appropriations and individual reconciliation, we certainly will be in a position to examine those very closely.

Mr. SPRATT. 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 thank the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] for yielding me this time and congratulate the gentleman on a job very well done.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this budget resolution as the next step to balancing the Federal budget. Considered in light of the CBO deficit projections just 4 years ago, this accomplishment is nothing short of miraculous. Four years ago, the deficit was actually $290 billion. The projection for 1997 that year was that the deficit would be $319 billion. But for the courageous action of President Clinton and the Members of this House and Senate, the other body, we were able to pass a bill that, in fact, brought the deficit in much, much lower than that. We have now a controllable deficit thanks to the action that we took in 1993.

I would like to speak for a moment about the tax and revenue portions of the agreement. The concern has been raised that we must not repeat the mistakes that we made in 1981. I was not a Member of this House in 1981, but I reviewed the action of that year. The tax cuts proposed by President Reagan and approved by the Congress were estimated at that time to reduce Federal revenues by $863 billion over 5 years. Let me say that again. The tax cut of 1981 totaled $863 billion over 5 years. That was with 1981 dollars. The tax cuts provided under the agreement embodied in this resolution are limited to $85 billion over 5 years, which is less than 10 percent of the size of the 1981 tax cuts. It is a far more cautious and responsible tax package than the 1981 legislation.

Another key provision of this agreement is the treatment of Medicare. The budget resolution we consider today provides for real Medicare reform that will lower the cost to our seniors and provide quality care for our Nation's seniors. Chief among the improvements is a preventive health care package that will help our seniors with their health care needs. We also solve other real problems in providing health benefits for children. We provide needs for students. This is a good budget agreement that puts together ways of improving our economy. I hope my colleagues will support the agreement.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this budget resolution as a next important step along the way to balancing the Federal Government's books for the first time in a third of a century. I share the view of those, including the President, who have said that this budget balances the budget while also balancing our priorities and our values.

The budget we have before us today is truly a bipartisan work product. With a Democratic President and a Republican-controlled Congress, only a bipartisan budget plan could succeed. Both parties had to be willing to work through their strong disagreements and find compromise, without abandoning principle. Because they were, we have a chance today to take another step forward on the road to a balanced budget.

Mr. Chairman, just as today's action by this House will not mark the end of the work needed to balance the budget, neither does it mark the beginning. The Congressional Budget Office has recently indicated that it now estimates the budget deficit for the current fiscal year will be less than $70 billion. Considered in the light of CBO deficit projections of just 4 years ago, this accomplishment is nothing short of miraculous.

Four years ago, prior to the passage of the 1993 deficit reduction act, the Federal budget deficit was $290 billion. At that time, CBO projected that the deficit for this year, fiscal year 1997, would be $319 billion. By its courageous action in following President Clinton's leadership and passing the 1993 legislation, the 103d Congress brought uncontrollable deficits down to controllable levels. Without that action, we would not today be in a position to finish the job and balance the budget.

After a decade and a half in which the United States was the most fiscally irresponsible member of the G–7, today we are again the healthiest and most vibrant economy in the world. Our fiscal health is also the strongest of our major trading allies.

Today it is up to us to take the next step by approving this balanced budget agreement. As we do so, a few words of caution are in order.

Passage of this budget resolution will not, of course, balance the budget. We must still do the hard work of cutting spending and enforcing the terms of the agreement.

I would like to speak for a moment about the tax and revenue portions of this agreement. Some critics of the agreement, concerned about the tax cuts, have compared this agreement to the early 1980's. At that time, the 97th Congress approved the largest tax cuts in our country's history, which created the nightmare deficits that have plagued us since.

The concern has been raised that we must not repeat the mistakes of 1981. I was not a Member of this House in 1981. But I have reviewed the actions of that year. The tax cuts proposed by President Reagan approved by Congress that year were estimated at the time to reduce Federal revenues by $863 billion over 5 years. Let me say that again. The tax cuts of 1981 totaled $863 billion over 5 years. Let me point out that figure is in 1981 dollars.

The tax cuts provided under the agreement embodied in this resolution are limited to $85 billion over 5 years, which is less than 10 percent of the size of the 1981 tax cuts. It is a far more cautious and responsible tax package than the 1981 legislation.

No aspect of this agreement is more important than constraining the size of the tax cuts. We must be especially careful that revenue losses associated with the tax cuts do not exceed the tight limits that all parties have agreed to. Those of us on the taxwriting committee must work to prevent tax cuts from driving the deficit back up after 2002. Once we have balanced the budget, we must keep it balanced.

Another key to this agreement is the treatment of Medicare. Unlike 2 years ago, when the preservation of health benefits for seniors divided the parties, this year we are together on Medicare.

In the last Congress, so-called Medicare reform was all about slashing spending and forcing seniors into managed care plans where they would face higher costs and decreased choice. This year, the Medicare debate has turned around. The budget resolution that we are considering today is real Medicare reform. It makes programmatic changes that will lower costs and improve quality of care in the long run for our Nation's seniors.

Chief among these improvements is the addition of new preventive benefits in Medicare. On the first day of this session of Congress, I joined with my colleagues Chairman BILL THOMAS of the Ways and Means Health Subcommittee and Chairman MIKE BILIRAKIS of the Commerce Health Subcommittee to introduce H.R. 15, the Medicare Preventive Benefits Improvement Act. The budget resolution Includes these new benefits: Yearly mammographies for women over 50, with the deductible waived; colon cancer screening; prostate cancer screening; diabetes self-management and training services and payment for blood glucose monitoring strips; yearly pap smear screening and pelvic exams for women of childbearing age or with high risk of developing cervical cancer, with the deductible waived.

These Medicare modernizations will go far toward improving the quality of life for our Nation's seniors. And, as prevention becomes the norm of care for seniors, the Medicare Program will realize substantial savings as well.

Medicare is also thee source of funding for our Nation's graduate medical education system. This budget resolution includes provisions that make some improvements to that system. During the budget reconciliation process, I plan to build on this commitment to ensure that our graduate medical education system remains No. 1 in the world.

Despite the strengths of this agreement, there are parts of this budget resolution that I do not agree with and that I believe take our country in the wrong direction.

I strongly oppose a provision in the budget resolution that calls for the repeal of the Boren amendment. The Boren amendment is a protection in the Medicaid Program that simply states that payment rates for hospitals and nursing facilities must be ''reasonable and adequate to meet the costs of efficiently and economically operated facilities.'' This provision is a vitally important Medicaid component because it helps assure access to quality health care for our Nation's poor mothers, children, and seniors.

We created the Boren amendment in 1981 at the request of our Nation's Governors who were concerned that they would no longer be able to provide quality health care to their nursing home residents and poor mothers and children because of the downward spiral of Medicaid reimbursements. What was a problem in 1981 would become a problem again today if we repeal the Boren amendment. The proposed repeal of the Boren amendment creates a problem where none now exists.

Fortunately, there are other provisions of this agreement that solve real problems. The agreement contains important changes in last year's welfare reform legislation, easing some of the excesses of that initiative. The bill commits us to addressing the health care needs to the millions of American children who have no health care coverage. It provides the largest increase ever in Pell grants, making post-secondary education more affordable for millions of American young people.

Mr. Chairman, since 1969, the promise of a balanced budget has eluded this country. Now, with the adoption of this budget resolution, we have the chance to bring that promise closer to reality. Over all, the pluses in this package far outweigh the minuses. It will allow us to finish the job we began in 1993 and balance the Federal budget, and it does so in a way that is consistent with the values and priorities of the American people.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to correct an impression left by the previous speaker that even though the estimates in 1981 were that we would lose revenues, real life happened after those estimates. The estimates turned out to be wrong and revenues doubled during the 1980's as a result of the economic growth package enacted in 1981.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PASCRELL].

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this great budget agreement. I think we have come a long way and it has taken us a long time. This budget proposal is real. For the first time in 28 years, we have the opportunity to pass a truly balanced budget. I hope the Members of this House will consider later on this evening the Shuster-Oberstar amendment in terms of transportation and investment into our infrastructure. I think it is important. This is a balanced budget that protects our commitments to working families, the elderly and children and one that puts our economy on the right path as we enter the next century.

The interest payment on the debt is currently the third largest portion of the Federal budget. That is money that could otherwise be invested in education, in job training, and infrastructure, or could simply be given back to the taxpayers to spend as they see fit.

This budget proposal allows for tax credits for our young people and allows for expanded Pell grants. It is the right vote tonight, later on this evening, that we support this budget agreement. I commend both sides for a job well done.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this budget agreement. The agreement before us represents at least procedurally the hardest thing this body ever tries to do, compromise differences, accept less than what each party wants, and tolerate aspects of the agreement each party would not include if it were simply a matter of writing its own package.

Throughout the history of this place, this Chamber is mostly a matter of winner-take-all, the party of the majority passes the bills they want, and that is the end of it. In times of divided government, that often means a Presidential veto and the legislative initiative dies in the partisan standoff. Such was the fate of the balanced budget drive in the last Congress and it very well could have happened to the balanced budget effort this Congress, but the American people deserve better and the President and the leaders of Congress, both House and Senate, both majority and minority, have worked to give them better. This budget agreement accomplishes that difficult task.

Back where I come from and across the country, Americans wanted the parties to work together to iron out the most difficult problems facing this country. They wanted a balanced budget. They have to do it as individual families. Collectively they wanted to do it on behalf of the country. But they also wanted our values reflected. Those values include protecting the health care that our seniors depend upon, committing to a bright educational opportunity for our young people, and the opportunity for people at a midcareer track to go back and get the skills training they need to compete in the work force today. It also means working and middle-income families find it just a little easier to make ends meet.

☐ 1730

Now I believe the agreement before us accomplishes all of this in a reasonable but not perfect fashion. Most importantly, it reaches a balanced budget and does so in a way that I think fairly reflects those values.

Mr. Chairman, as a 5-year member of the Committee on the Budget, I am extremely pleased to say I am supporting this agreement, and I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHERMAN].

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the budget agreement. It is just that, an agreement, a compromise. As my colleague from North Carolina pointed out, it is not what our party would have wanted, but it is better than deadlock, division and a Government shutdown a few months from now.

My colleague from California argued that we did a better job in 1981 and told us that revenues went up. They did only because we had such massive inflation as a result of the 1981 tax bill that everything cost more and everything involved more dollars. This, I hope, will be a much better agreement. That agreement in 1981 caused income taxes to decline sharply as a percentage of gross domestic product. This agreement will lead us to a balanced budget.

Just a few years ago we were headed toward a hundred trillion dollar deficit. Now, after tough votes in 1993 and the tough votes that we will make here today, we will be headed toward a balanced budget, a budget that I think will do more to encourage business than any 10 Republican business incentive programs or tax cuts and a balanced budget that will do more to help the poor than any 10 Great Society programs, because a balanced budget means a decline in interest rates, an increase in business activity, an increase in jobs.

On the Committee on the Budget my focus has been to focus on the environment and our need to buy more environmentally sensitive lands. I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] for working with me on an amendment that we adopted last Friday, an amendment that clarifies the agreement reached in the White House and indicates that we will have $700 million to spend next year on acquiring environmentally important lands. I think that it is important when we talk about taking care of our children to give them not only a healthy economy but to preserve this land for them, and that is an excellent aspect of this budget agreement.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, balancing the budget is important for this country and for its people, but balancing our national priorities and being fair to our citizens is equally important. This budget deal, some say, gives us the best opportunity to balance the budget in the next 5 years, but who are the winners and who are the losers?

This budget is indeed good for education, a national priority: $35 billion of investment in education, $300 in Pell grant increase, the largest expansion in Head Start; all of this leads toward our national priority.

But this budget is not fair to poor people. It fails to correct the very harsh provisions that allows hundreds of people access to food stamps only 3 months out of 3 years.

This budget does provide for a few more work slots and makes a feeble attempt to provide some assistance to States of 15 percent, but it does nothing about shelter caps or nothing about a reasonable value of vehicles.

This budget will help to develop healthy children, and indeed that is important. It expands health coverage for 5 million uncovered children while again, on the other side, it does not expand health coverage for another 5 million children.

Additionally, it finds that it is additional hardship of those rural hospitals because of the disproportionate share.

This budget is charitable for working families. It gives a $500 child tax credit, the welfare-to-work credit and the establishment of additional empowerment zones, enterprise communities. It will help local economies. But this budget is bad for those who want to work and cannot find a job.

This budget treats some legal immigrants fairly and, Mr. Chairman, that is a move in the right direction. It restores the civility and health benefits for legal immigrants as well as Medicaid coverage for poor legal immigrants' children. But it does not restore food stamps for legal immigrants, and when one comes to this country, whether they are legal or not, one knows indeed the benefits were not provided.

Mr. Chairman, we must, those of us who are considering to vote for this budget deal, must be honest with ourselves. There are winners and losers, and we must be fair to all of our citizens.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH].

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, today is a historic moment for America. We have the opportunity to vote on a budget that will be in balance by the year 2002 to begin the process of returning the Federal Government to a policy of fiscal responsibility.

Last week the Committee on the Budget had a chance to look at this budget agreement, and I am proud to say that we reported it out of committee by a wide bipartisan margin, 31 to 7.

This budget stands for commonsense values. It means permanent tax relief for hard-working families, genuine entitlement reform that preserves Medicare, and smaller, less intrusive Washington bureaucracy that lives within its means. This is something American families have been doing all along. It is about time we reward them for it with a balanced budget of our own.

With this budget American families will receive a much needed break from excessive taxes that have reached an unprecedented level of unfairness. This means that middle-class Americans like David Witt of Fresno, CA, and Kelley Gentry of Three Rivers, CA, both in the great Central Valley, will get capital gains tax cuts. Others will receive relief from the death tax, which destroys the hope of passing on the fruits of one's labor to their children, and they will also receive tax relief if they send their child to college. These tax reductions will allow workers to keep more of what they earn and gives them the freedom to live their lives as they choose, not as Washington dictates.

Mr. Chairman, we have the chance today to reduce taxes by $135 billion over 5 years, save Medicare for the next 10 years and provide 600 to 700 dollars' worth of entitlement savings over a 10-year period.

I urge my colleagues to support final passage of House Concurrent Resolution 84, a Balanced Budget Act that is good for America.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I believe that like the rest of the country we do some of our best work when we come together and try to look very carefully at what we have in common and how we can work together towards the common goal, and such is the strength of the budget resolution today that has as its primary emphasis balancing the Federal budget. This in my mind is the glue that has put this agreement together and the glue that will hold this agreement together, including between Democrats and Republicans.

Let us not forget that the amount of interest that we are paying annually on the Federal debt more than exceeds the annual amount of income tax paid by every individual living west of the Mississippi in the United States, an average of about $3,000 a taxpayer. This is a compelling debt we cannot allow our children and grandchildren to inherit.

What further gives this budget resolution integrity is it strikes the appropriate balance between preserving our priorities, Medicare, Medicaid and, in particular, education while balancing the budget. This is a major distinction between the budget of the Congress passed last year that the President thankfully vetoed that would have devastated States like Florida, where I come from, in terms of the impact of a very sudden and massive reduction in Medicaid. The proper balance has been struck here.

And with respect to the tax cuts let me say this: I think one of the best tax cuts that we can provide to the public is to reduce the incredible deficit that this country faces, to minimize its huge interest payment, to enjoy the favorable impact that would tend to have on interest rates, and, as we begin this process and as we debate these tax cuts, let us be open and honest with the American public as to how much these tax cuts are going to cost, where the money is going to come from to pay for it, and to make absolutely certain that the tax cuts that we do enact here are paid for and do not in any way undermine what should be our principal goal, which should be to balance our Federal debt.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the ranking member on the Committee Budget for, one, letting me speak this afternoon; and, two, for all the work he has done to make this balance and possible for many of us to vote for.

Mr. Chairman, I voted for this budget resolution in committee, and I will vote for it here on the House floor, not because it is perfect, but because it takes important strides to invest in our kids, our families, and balances at the same time our budget in 5 years.

But voting for a good budget resolution is just the first step. Next we must take steps to implement the promises contained in this budget. In particular, I will be watching to make sure that we enact the President's education initiatives and that we fully fund WIC.

The only way we can move this Nation forward is by giving every single American access to quality education and training. That is why Congress must fund the President's education initiatives and make higher education more accessible and more affordable. Americans who are educated can get jobs that pay a livable wage. When we make education more accessible, we prevent families from going on welfare. We reduce crime, and we reduce violence, and we increase respect, respect for our health, respect for our environment and respect for each other and our differences.

Scientific research proves what every mother already knows. Babies who are born healthy and babies who are nurtured in the early years have the best chance of growing into productive adults. That is why Congress must fully fund WIC, so that every eligible pregnant woman has access to prenatal care and proper nutrition for herself during her pregnancy and while she is nursing and for her baby following birth.

Mr. Chairman, I will be voting for this budget resolution, but I will be watching closely to make sure that the promises made to our kids and families are within this budget act.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PITTS].

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the balanced budget agreement of 1997. This is a bipartisan compromise which is necessary in this day of divided government which demonstrates an ability to govern even with the President of one party and Congress of the other. The passage of the balanced budget resolution will be a solid first step toward the goals of balancing our budget, providing permanent tax relief for American families and reducing the size and scope of the Federal Government while improving the fiscal health of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, after months of negotiations, the Republican leadership and President Clinton have found enough common ground to draft a budget which will come to real balance by no later than 2002.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that American families deserve a break, a tax break, and this bipartisan plan will give American families the tax relief they deserve. This plan will give Americans $135 billion in tax relief over the next 5 years, and for the next 10 years the Americans will get a tax break of $250 billion. The tax relief package in this budget insures that every American wins. It is a permanent win. It is not a temporary tax cut. With it we can provide relief for families with children with a per child tax credit, the opportunity for people to keep their family farms and businesses with death tax relief, incentives for job creation and economic growth with capital gains tax relief, incentives for savings and investment with IRA expansion, relief for families who send their kids to college with the education tax credit.

Mr. Chairman, with our bipartisan plan we save Medicare, we increase Medicare spending, provide seniors with better choices. While liberals hold onto bureaucracy, we have chosen ways to preserve, protect, and strengthen Medicare for the sake of our seniors.

And finally this budget will decrease the size and scope of our Federal Government. In current dollars Washington will spend less over the next 5 years in nondefense discretionary spending than it has since 1969.

☐ 1745

That is the last time Washington balanced its books.

This bipartisan plan will save the taxpayers $961 billion over the next 10 years in spending. Without this agreement, we would be spending almost $1 trillion in higher spending; and guess who foots the bill for this extra $1 trillion? American families.

Mr. Chairman, compromise is essential with a divided government. There are components of this budget which are not perfect. There are even some components which some of us would change, if we could. However, the President has veto power. The Republicans have a slim majority of 10 seats, and we cannot override a Presidential veto. If we send the President the spending reduction and tax relief we did in the last Congress, the President would veto again, and the deficit will continue to grow indefinitely.

So, Mr. Chairman, we agree that this is a bipartisan agreement. If my colleagues would take a look at this chart, this is what the average American family spends on taxes today: $21,883. It is more than what they spend on food, shelter, clothing, and transportation combined, and this is the level of taxation that families will continue to endure if we do not pass this bipartisan plan.

The American family needs this bipartisan plan. It will mean lower taxes, lower interest rates, economic, domestic expansion and a healthy economy. Mr. Chairman, for the first time in 40 years we have this bipartisan agreement. I urge my colleagues to vote for this bipartisan balanced budget resolution.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, on balance, this is a good plan. Certainly it is much better than this House passed in 1995 and 1996, and fortunately the President vetoed those plans. If it works and the economy stays strong, it will balance the budget for the first time since 1969, which was the year that I was 10 years old.

Increasing education and environmental funding is what this budget does and it is a good thing. It begins to address the national disgrace of the 10 million uninsured children in this country, including more than 2.5 million in Texas, and it increases access to college by increasing Pell grants and making tuition deductible.

There are some points that I think the committees need to look at. With respect to Medicare and Medicaid, the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Commerce need to make sure that we have stable funding for medical education in the context of the Medicare changes that are made, ensuring that low-income seniors are protected from premium increases due to the shift of home health care, ensuring that there is Medigap protection so that we give seniors a real choice between fee-for-service and managed care, and ensuring that the disproportionate share that is used by the States continues to have the flexibility, so that it covers not just high Medicaid populations, but also unreimbursed charity care as well.

Let me speak with respect to the tax cuts. Many are appealing, and I support many of them. However, I do have some real concerns as to how they are being paid for.

A large part of this budget is predicated upon very, very optimistic economic assumptions. If we look at the numbers, we assume that inflation will be 2-percent less than historical average, that interest rates will be 3-percent less than historical average and that unemployment will be 1-percent less than recent historical average, spectrum sales will bring in more than they have in the past.

This is a great risk, a risk that we can manage, but I urge my colleagues that we need to be cautious as we go forward with this plan, not get us back into the trap we saw after the 1981 budget and 1982 and 1983, where we had resulting deficits from tax reductions and then put pressure on mandatory spending such as Medicare and Medicaid.

In balance, as I said, this is a good deal, I will support it, but it will take a lot of work over the next 5 years to ensure that we do in fact get in balance.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this budget resolution as a good start toward the first balanced budget since 1969. It is by no means a perfect agreement; few are. But it is a bipartisan agreement that sets us on a path to balance and, if properly implemented, will help restore the confidence of the American people that their elected leaders can work together to confront the challenges facing our Nation.

I am especially pleased that this agreement places such a high priority on the education and health of our children. We must expand access to college because more and better education is needed to succeed in the information age economy. This agreement does include the largest increase in education investment in 30 years. It will help low- and middle-income families afford college tuition by expanding Pell grants and providing tax deductions for college costs.

This agreement will also help end the national shame that 10 million children lack health insurance and access to basic health services such as immunizations and regular checkups. My State of Texas leads the Nation in the number of uninsured children—2.6 million Texas children have lacked health insurance for at least a month over the past 2 years. This agreement will go a long way toward helping these children and their families. These are the right investments to make even as we move toward a balanced budget.

However, this resolution, as we all know, is only a roadmap to a balanced budget. Now it will be up to the various authorizing committees and the Appropriations Committee to fill in the details, and I reserve judgment on the final product until we see those details. I want to outline my concerns about this agreement, especially with regard to the changes in Medicare and Medicaid and the potential cost of the tax cuts that could lead either to new deficits or deep cuts in mandatory spending such as Medicare, Medicaid, and education.

The Medicare changes should be fair to senior citizens and maintain our investment in graduate medical education at the Nation's teaching hospitals. The Ways and Means and Commerce Committees should consider four issues in preparing their reconciliation bills.

First, we must ensure stable, guaranteed funding for teaching hospitals, which are linchpins of our entire health care system. They train future physicians and other health care professionals; they conduct clinical research that helps keep America first in the world in medical research and technological development; and they often bear the responsibility of treating patients who lack health insurance and cannot find care anywhere else. Through traditional Medicare plans, the Federal Government provides a subsidy to these institutions based upon the number of traditional Medicare patients they treat. However, as the number of Medicare patients enrolled in managed care has grown steadily and these patients have been sent to other locations, there has been a steady erosion in this Federal subsidy.

I believe that the Medicare reforms enacted as part of the reconciliation bill should address this problem and establish stable, mandatory funding for graduate medical education. This legislation could include the option recommended by the administration's fiscal year 1997 budget, which is similar to legislation I have introduced, H.R. 106, to establish a trust fund by recapturing a portion of the per capita costs paid to Medicare managed care plans. This approach would not increase Federal spending; rather it would recapture funds from the current Medicare managed care reimbursement formula so that all Medicare plans help pay for the cost of graduate medical education.

The Medicare reforms also need to include sufficient protections for senior citizens. We must ensure that senior citizens have a real choice of doctors and health plans by reforming Medigap regulations. Seniors who transfer into a managed care plan should be guaranteed the right to buy Medigap if they decide to return to traditional Medicare. Seniors currently lack this right, and this is a tremendous obstacle to real choice in Medicare. We must also ensure that, as we move home health care from Medicare part A to Medicare part B and phase these costs into the premium calculations, we protect low-income seniors from the premium increases. This agreement includes $1.5 billion under Medicaid to help low-income seniors pay these premiums. That is the minimum that should be included in the implementing legislation. The reconciliation bill should be clear in authorizing an increase in Specified Low-income Medicare Beneficiary [SLMB] coverage.

This budget agreement also recommends $13.6 billion in net savings for the Medicaid Program. Most of these savings would come from reducing Medicaid's payments to hospitals serving a disproportionate share of Medicaid and low-income families. I will work to ensure that these reforms to the Disproportionate Share Hospital [SDH] Program are fair and reasonable. Texas has a high number of SDH-eligible facilities because it has the highest percentage of uninsured patients in the Nation and serves a large number of Medicaid patients as well. Any reforms to the DSH Program must protect these patients and those facilities which serve them. In particular, we should ensure that States retain flexibility to include both Medicaid and non-Medicaid charity care in determining DSH eligibility.

I am also concerned that this agreement meet the goal of balancing the budget. It is assumed that the tax cuts will be contained and not result in excessive revenue losses in the future. It is also assumed that the net tax cuts are being paid for by revenue offsets, spectrum sales, and positive economic assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office. Should such assumptions change, revenue losses due to tax cuts would increase the deficit and create pressure for further cuts in mandatory spending such as Medicare and Medicaid. That is why I offered an amendment in the Budget Committee to ensure that any excess losses from the tax bill be offset not by additional cuts in mandatory spending, but rather from the revenue side of the ledger. I believe this is within the scope of the original agreement, but unfortunately the committee failed to accept this enforcement mechanism.

We must remember the lesson of the early 1980's when tax cuts did explode in cost and resulted in the huge deficits we are still dealing with today. I believe there is a possibility that history will repeat itself. There are two temptations that we must avoid—the first is to use overly optimistic economic assumptions and the second is to structure the tax cuts so that they initially appear to be limited in cost, but then explode in the out years. There is a very real risk that this resolution is making both mistakes. That is not to say we cannot manage risk. We can and we should.

First, let me discuss the economic estimates. Yes, our economy has demonstrated remarkable resiliency and strength. But we have not repealed the business cycle and a downturn is inevitable. However, the economic assumptions in this resolution do not leave much room for the inevitable. It assumes $225 billion in new revenue that the Congressional Budget Office suddenly found at the last minute. It assumes $15 billion from a reduction in the Consumer Price Index that may or may not happen. It projects $26 billion in revenues from spectrum auctions despite the fact recent auctions have fallen well short of expectations. And it forecasts $77 billion in savings from stronger economic growth. For example, these estimates are premised on unemployment averaging a full percentage point lower than it has since 1980; a CPI almost 2 percentage points lower than the 15-year average; and interest rates on 3-month Treasury bills more than 3 percent lower than that average. While a far cry from the rosy scenarios of the early 1980's, these estimates nevertheless appear somewhat optimistic.

So on the one hand, there is this temptation to overestimate projected revenue during the period of this agreement. On the other hand, there is a tremendous temptation to underestimate the revenue loss from the tax cuts. This agreement calls for net tax cuts of $85 billion over 5 years and $250 billion over 10 years. However, the Joint Tax Committee estimates that the full cost of all the tax cuts still on the table—both the President's tuition tax deductions and the various Republican leadership proposals—would be $221 billion over 5 years and $560 billion over 10 years. Fitting all these proposals into the constraints of this agreement will require very difficult choices. I am concerned that some backloading of tax cuts has already crept into this budget resolution. The revenue flow from the tax cuts shows a bubble of $2 billion more in revenue in 2002. What policy assumptions generate this extra revenue, and what will be the consequences later?

This, is on balance, a good agreement. Like all transactions, there are many moving parts which must be worked out. We are benefiting from strong and stable economic growth and previous deficit reduction measures. Nonetheless, there is a risk that economic conditions will change or that revenue loss assumptions will prove incorrect. We should manage such risk if we are to make this deal work.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] for leading the fight to protect Democratic priorities in the deliberations of the Committee on the Budget.

I intend to vote for the balanced budget resolution today, but the final product of our deliberations must reflect the Democrats' families first priorities in order to gain my support further down the road. Those priorities include significant investment in education, a children's health care initiative to provide coverage to as many of the 10 million uninsured children as possible, and strong environmental protection and enforcement.

Mr. Chairman, it is my fear that the Republican right will highjack the budget process as it continues towards reconciliation and the details begin to be worked out. The Democrats will not support tax cuts that primarily benefit the wealthy at the expense of the average American family.

Concerning the children's health care initiative, the Democratic health care task force has worked hard over the last year to develop a proposal that will cover the greatest number of uninsured children. Our families first plan includes enhanced outreach to those 3 million children already eligible, but not enrolled in Medicaid, increase Federal help to expand Medicaid, State flexibility which allows children to remain eligible for Medicaid for a full year after eligibility is determined, and grants to States to assist with providing public or private health insurance.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say, I believe that this family first kids' health initiative can be contained within this balanced budget resolution. I know that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has assumed the specifics of our Democrats' Family First health care initiative within his substitute and he calls for spending $32 billion for the proposal. I would say, whether it is $32 billion or $16 billion, as in the Committee on the Budget's proposal, it is important to recognize that Democrats will fight to ensure that the sum set aside for children's health care truly benefits most, if not all, of the 10 million uninsured children.

I feel very strongly that this is the beginning of the process. We should support it at this point, but we have to make sure as we move along that we contain and we include as many of the 10 million uninsured children as possible.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. NUSSLE].

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I wanted to start by giving credit where credit is due for the reason why we are here today. Mr. Chairman, the big shots get to sit in the room and negotiate and get everything done, but there is a reason why we are here. Here comes one of the big shots now. I congratulate the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, but the real big shots and the reason why we are here today is the American people. They demanded it, they said we want real entitlement reform, we want to save Medicare, we want to stop all of these increases in taxes, we want to balance the budget and we want to do it now, we do not want any phoney gimmicks, we do not want a phoney plan, we want our Representatives to get in there, work together.

We know there are differences, we know there are people who are going to disagree and find all sorts of reasons to vote against it, but we want you to get the job done. So because of the American people, because they did not fall asleep at the switch, we are here today, and this is what we have:

We have a budget that balances by the year 2002, and we begin at that point to begin paying off the national debt. It provides $250 billion in tax relief to small business, to farmers, to families, for job creation, for education costs, and getting, starting to get rid of that awful death tax. It ensures Medicare solvency for 10 years. My two grandmothers, in their 90's, thankfully now do not have to worry as much as they had to when the Medicare trust fund report came out just last month. It does not touch Social Security benefits, and reduces total government spending to 18.9 percent of gross domestic product in 2002. That is the first time since the first year I started high school that Federal spending will be less than 20 percent of gross domestic product.

Now let me tell my colleagues, for those people who are skeptics, why this is real and why it is important. For the first time, and part of the reason why I ran for Congress was because I was so sick and tired of all of these Gramm–Rudmans this and Gramm–Rudmans that, did not know who they were; they are gentlemen, of course, but their plans did not work, and the reason why their plans did not work is an historical fact that has been argued here today many times and I am not going to go over it, except to say there are a lot of people who would flunk history if they were to take a test here today.

The point is that the plans were never real. I think the way we base our decision on whether a plan is real, the same way we go in and we talk to a banker, the banker wants to see progress if one is trying to get out of debt. If one is a farmer, that is what they have got to prove, or if one is a small businessman.

So let us look at the progress. In 1996 we said we were going to have a deficit of $154 billion. Where were we? $107 billion. That is progress. In 1997 we were going to have a deficit of $174 billion. Where are we? We are at $67 billion. That is progress. In the 1980's, in the 1990's, before all of this came to be, we saw the blue line way above the red line. It had never worked. We are finally showing progress and we are finally ahead of plan with regard to getting our deficit in balance.

Let me just say that if I was a farmer and I came into a banker with this kind of a plan, chances are the banker would say, it is time to let you get back out there and keep doing what you are doing. But the only way, the only way this stays on track is if the American people do not fall asleep. Because this is just a plan. It is just a guidepost. We have done some of the work, yes, we are agreeing here today, and I think the plan is going to work. But the only way it is going to stay on track is if the American people do not fall asleep. I say to the American people, keep an eye on this, keep an eye on this, and this will get done.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the previous unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think those of us who are going to vote for this budget resolution, and I am not, are going to have to accept two assumptions. One is that we are going to have 10 years of the economy going up. Now, I have not heard that they have repealed the law of gravity in economics. The fact that this budget is based on 10 years of unending going up at $45 billion a year is simply unbelievable.

Second, we have to believe that the Committee on Ways and Means is going to restrain itself in tax giveaways and cutting entitlements.

Now, in this budget agreement there is about $16 billion cut from a program called DISH. That is a disproportionate share. It goes to hospitals that take care of people who cannot pay for it. Many of those hospitals are children's hospitals.

I say to my colleagues to ask themselves about their children's hospital. They get 40 to 70 percent of their money from this DISH money, and when we cut that out of this budget, how can we say to ourselves, well, are we not wonderful? We are giving health care to another 5 million kids when we are taking the guts out of the budget of our local children's hospital.

Let us talk about the fact that there is no protection against the Committee on Ways and Means on the issue of the earned income tax credit, on low-income housing tax credits. I called Seattle today because I wanted to know what the facts are today. If one is low income in this country in Seattle, and it is a good city, there is a 3-year waiting list to get in. If one is a senior citizen in the citizen program that has 1,300 houses, there are 1,000 names on the list. That means everybody who is in senior citizen housing has to die if one is going to get into the program if one registered today. How long will that take? And we say this is the budget that we can begin giving great tax breaks to people when we have enormous problems.

The minority leader was right. We can do better. None of us, there is not anybody on this floor who does not want to balance the budget. It is an argument about how it is balanced.

This is an unfair balancing, and it takes our belief in the tooth fairy to believe it.

□ 1800

Members have to believe that we are not going to do again in 1997 what we did in 1991. It took us 16 years to get back. If we put in exploding tax cuts, and I really think this budget will balance for about 20 minutes in 2002, it will be like one of those touch-and-go landings with a 747, where they hit the runway and go right back up in the air.

When this comes we are going to have real problems. I urge Members to vote against this.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the budget resolution that is before us this evening. This is truly a historic occasion to be able to vote for our budget, something that will go to balance in 5 short years. We have voted for budgets that will balance, but this one will actually balance because the President will sign the appropriate appropriation bills and reconciliation bills that will get us to that point.

When I first ran for Congress in 1992 I had never been in politics before. I ran as a fiscal conservative, one who felt there was fiscal irresponsibility here in Washington, who believed we needed to reduce the size and scope of the Government, that Government was too big and spent too much money. I was fortunate to be able to be on the Committee on the Budget in my first term in 1993, and worked with the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. JOHN KASICH, a great committee chairman.

I was proud to be able to participate in that first budget that the Republicans developed because it was called ''cut spending first,'' because we realized that to balance the budget we cannot just raise taxes and talk about it, we have to control spending. That is exactly what the budget that Republicans proposed in 1993 did.

The budget that was passed by the Democratic Party, without a Republican vote, raised taxes and increased spending. But after the 1994 election things changed around here. The rhetoric changed dramatically, because now everyone is for a balanced budget. Even my colleague who just spoke a few minutes earlier said, ''I am for a balanced budget.''

Now we have a chance to do a real balanced budget. In the last session of Congress we made some great strides forward. We reformed welfare, and for the first time we ended an entitlement. We started to get control of discretionary spending. That is very important to get to a balanced budget. But the most important thing that this budget does that we did not do last time is start controlling entitlement spending. This budget will have $600 billion in savings on entitlements over the next 10 years.

Let me talk about one entitlement specifically. That is Medicare. Medicare is a very, very important program to me. My congressional district in

Florida has more senior citizens than any other congressional district, so it is important to the seniors in my district. But it is the biggest jobs program in my district, taking care of the health care of senior citizens for the working people in my district. I have an 87-year-old mother who is on Medicare, so it is personally important.

We need to do something about Medicare, because we all know it is going bankrupt. In 4 short years it is going to be bankrupt. This is stated by the trustees, and there is no dispute about the fact that Medicare is bankrupt in the year 2001, so we need to do something about it. We need to do it in a bipartisan fashion. Fortunately, that is the positive thing about this bill today, it is bipartisan, and we are going to be able to address the Medicare situation.

I have to congratulate the President on this. The President has come forward. After the Democrats and the President demagogued Republicans on their Medicare proposal last year, they are coming forward to accept, in effect, the same proposal that we had last year. What did we do last year?

Mr. Chairman, last year what we proposed was to increase spending every year, just slow the rate of growth in spending. What is happening with the spending in Medicare, it is going to be from $5,480 to $6,911 per person on Medicare over the next 5 years. That is the same number almost that we were at last time and it was vetoed.

So I commend the President for saying we are going to save Medicare and agreeing to this proposal that raises the spending at the same approximate rate that was proposed last year. I am excited about getting to a balanced budget and saving Medicare at the same time.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. WEYGAND].

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

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking Member, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], who I think did an excellent job in trying to bring to this Congress and to the people of America a balanced budget that reflected truly well-intended views. Unfortunately, I think this budget is very much like that TV program, ''Rich Man, Poor Man.'' It gives to the rich, takes away from the working poor families of America.

I represent Rhode Island, a very modest-income State. We represent working families, children, senior citizens, and small businesses. They are not helped by this budget. They are in fact hurt by this budget. Average Americans are being ignored. Let me tell the Members, that is what we should be working toward is improving the life, the quality of life, of average Americans.

If we take a look at this budget, it is totally void of providing monies for early childhood development, an issue that everyone says if we are going to change our educational system we must address. We do not. We do not support small businesses in this budget; we in fact provide a number of enhancements for big businesses. We do not protect our senior citizens. In fact, we add more costs to their Medicare. We add price and pain to part B. For our senior citizens, we make sure that they are going to pay more money in part B of their Medicare than ever before.

Mr. Chairman, just on the line a little while ago on the Internet there was a poll that was just finished and conducted. It asked, do you believe more in the balanced budget deal or in Santa Claus? Thirty-two percent of the people believed in the budget deal as being balanced, and 52 percent believe in Santa Claus.

I can tell the Members, I know Santa Claus told me that he lives right in Rhode Island, and he does not believe in this budget deal. This deal in fact is bad for average Americans, average families, average citizens, average children, average seniors. I implore our colleagues to vote against this. We can do better. We must do better.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my friend, the gentleman from Washington State, for yielding me this time. I am pleased to be able to be able to follow my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. WEYGAND], in his approach to this budget resolution and how unfair this budget resolution really is.

Mr. Chairman, everyone should just stop for a moment and think about how we arrived at this budget resolution. Remember, there was a breakdown because we did not agree on the Consumer Price Index, because it was going to affect working families and it was going to gouge the cost of living adjustment for our senior citizens? Remember when we were talking about even severer cuts to Medicare, and emasculating programs of veterans' benefits, all the while because we knew the majority party had to preserve their big tax cuts for the rich?

Then, miraculously, $250 billion found. It was on the front page of the Washington Post. Remember, oh, my God, all of our problems are solved. Capitol Hill negotiators see a quick resolution to the budget impasse, and $45 billion a year in estimated revenues have now been disclosed by the Congressional Budget Office as new revenues. Thank God. Just in time.

What the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. WEYGAND] was talking about, what the minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] was talking about, what the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT] is talking about, is that when the train crashes, guess who is going to get hurt? It is going to be the veterans, it is going to be the senior citizens, it is going to be the immigrants.

Members can tell us all they want how this budget is fair, how it restores money to legal immigrants, how it helps early education, but we know this is blue smoke and mirrors. Because when it comes down to making the cuts that need to be made, and that CBO estimate that the majority party has cooked up with added revenues does not come true, guess who it is not going to come true for? The people who are going to get hurt are the people that always get hurt. That is the poor working people that I represent in my State and that all of my colleagues represent around this country.

Reject this budget resolution. It is not fair to the American people.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON].

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

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, in a town famous for saying one thing and doing another, Congress is finally doing what it promised. The balanced budget amendment that Congress reached with the President delivers on the promises that we have made to the American people. The resolution puts that agreement into action. It balances the budget, saves Medicare, lets American families keep more of what they earn, and reforms entitlement programs. Certainly that is different than previous Congresses have done under previous controls.

Under the balanced budget resolution deficits will be a thing of the past, and like every American family and American business, the Government will live within its means for the first time since 1969.

If the budget resolution did nothing else but eliminate the deficit, it would still be a huge victory for the American people. But frankly, it does more. The balanced budget resolution saves Medicare from bankruptcy and gives seniors new health care choices. By changing the Medicare structure, it will protect its solvency for another decade while expanding benefits to cover mammography, diabetes self-management, immunizations, and special cancer screening.

If this resolution just balanced the budget and saved Medicare, yes, that would be historic, but it goes even further than that. Over the next 10 years this budget will reduce tax burdens on American families by $250 billion, including reductions in capital gains, death taxes, a tax credit for families with children, an expanded IRA to encourage savings for retirement, and tax relief to help families send their children to college.

To help make sure that the tax burden stays lower, we are going to change the entitlement programs that have put the real pressure on our budget year after year. Let us think about it: a balanced budget, a sound Medicare program, tax relief for families, entitlement reform, and I frankly am very proud of this budget resolution. I am proud of the people in the House and Senate who helped forge it.

Special thanks go to the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Ohio Mr. JOHN KASICH, and the ranking member, the gentleman from South Carolina Mr. JOHN SPRATT, for helping move this bill through committee, and the committee staff under Rick May deserves our thanks for all their hard work over the years, and especially this year.

We are doing something real and permanent here with this budget resolution. We are being responsible and we are heading off a fiscal crisis before it happens. This commonsense approach helped win strong bipartisan support for the budget in committee, where it passed 31 to 7.

I encourage my colleagues to support the resolution, get involved in the process of enacting it into law. As an indication of the support the budget is already winning back home, I am submitting for the RECORD an editorial from my hometown paper that praises the bipartisan spirit in which the budget agreement was reached. Let us move on. Let us move on for the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD the editorial previously referred to.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

[From the Springfield, OH, News-Sun, May 12, 1997]

BUDGET A RESULT OF SERIOUS WORK

Considering the bad blood between the Clinton White House and congressional Republicans, their agreement to balance the federal budget in 2002 is extremely gratifying. The work negotiators from both sides put into this accord is precisely the serious, public-spirited give-and-take Americans expect of their national leadership.

On many substantive questions, negotiators kept their partisan instincts in check. They reached surprisingly easy compromises to curb domestic spending, to achieve Medicare savings at modest cost to beneficiaries and to check Social Security cost-of-living increases. They also restored benefits to legal immigrants—benefits which should never have been taken away.

But what got this budget deal moving was the dynamism of an economy now whirring along at a phenomenal 5.6 percent annual growth rate and producing bulging tax revenues for Uncle Sam.

In fact, budget negotiators were told at the last minute the Treasury was likely to take in $200 billion to $225 billion more than previously expected over the next five years. And this good news came during the same week that the Treasury announced it would be able to make a $65 billion payment against America's $5 trillion national debt, the first such payoff in 16 years.

The budget deal does have its flaws—such as the increase in defense spending—but the major disappointment is the $135 billion in tax reductions. With the next few budgets still projected to be in the red, it is not time to start rewarding taxpayers for their sacrifices.

Only one of these tax breaks can be defended as wise social policy: Clinton's tuition tax credits. No public investment is so vital to maintain this country's edge in technology and the world economy as educating Americans, both our youth and adults, for tomorrow's jobs.

How much better for all of America it would have been if the billions of dollars in tax relief had been added instead to that $65 billion payoff on the national debt.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio, like the chairman, have both said that they are restructuring Medicare. The chairman said in the committee, "The ultimate answer is moving toward a voucher program." Senior citizens, beware of what they have in mind for you.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI].

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

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I do not take the floor very often, but I wanted to get these 2 minutes. I have listened to the minority leader, and I have thought about this proposal over the last several weeks as the negotiations unfolded.

I have to say that one of the prior Members who spoke on the Republican side talked about the reason he came to Congress. It was to straighten out the fiscal responsibility of the United States. That is the reason I came here, and I think probably the reason most of us came here.

When I came to Congress in the 1980's the Congress was suffering from delusion: magicians, smoke and mirrors. We were saying that you could raise defense spending and you could balance the budget at the same time, after you cut taxes. That was 1981.

We went through 1981 to 1986, and finally Bill Bradley in the Senate and Dan Rostenkowski in the House put together a tax bill that went to real supply and demand, instead of tax credits for tax credits' sake. In 1986 we took away false choices. We went to a closer economic picture.

Then in 1991 some of us sweat blood here on two or three occasions after we had a special summit over there in Virginia. We stopped and forced the President of the United States to reverse his speech promises of "read my lips, no new taxes." He adopted taxes, we passed it, and we started a trend to contain deficits in the United States.

In 1993, William Jefferson Clinton began his service as President and had the guts to increase taxes and to deal with necessities in the administration, while all my friends on the Republican side said that the sky had now fallen. It was no longer illusion. It was that we on our side were suffering from delusion.

Now we come to 1997, and truly know what delusion is. We found that $225 billion in the attic that the majority party in 1996, in 1995, closed this Government down twice not to accept those figures of OMB, but did accept them in the wee hours of the night to arrive at this agreement.

The American people should not be fooled by illusion or delusion. The American people ought to sit back tonight and listen to these great speeches. If all of this is true, I ask why in 1993 not one of our friends on the other side put their seat on the line to raise taxes and to cut the deficit that has put us in the economic picture.

Let me tell the Members what they have to believe. After 74 months of economic prosperity, the second longest in the history of the United States, the longest being 106 months, we have only 32 months possibly to go to be the longest recovery period in the history of the United States. That means in 2½ years this budget agreement will fail miserably as a result of the recession that will occur. Vote "no" on this agreement.

□ 1815

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds, just to point out to the gentleman the reason why Republicans did not support the 1993 agreement. It contained tax increases and very little spending cuts. The reason why we have seen continued growth in the reduction of the deficit in the last 2 years has been because we have made only spending cuts.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS].

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this great budget plan. I had the opportunity a few minutes ago to listen to the distinguished minority leader express his opposition to this plan. In the course of his discussion, he exhorted us to look out for the future of our children and to think about our children. And that, Mr. Chairman, is exactly why we need to adopt this plan, because this plan will get us on track to balancing the budget and reducing the debt that we are passing onto our children and our grandchildren.

I came here 3 years ago to change the culture of Washington. As a new member of the Committee on the Budget, I was greeted with an administration plan, a 5-year plan that contained $150 billion deficits for all 5 years.

If we add up the deficits for all of the 5 years of the plan we have before us tonight, it does not equal the deficit that we had in one fiscal year in 1992. Indeed we have before us a plan that will reduce overall spending by over almost a trillion dollars over the next decade, save Medicare, which we have been talking about now for 2 years, save this program for the next generation and implement permanent tax relief for working families and small business people, the folks I represent in the Second Congressional District.

What appeared to be all but hopeless just a few years ago is now within our grasp, thanks to the undaunted efforts of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], our chairman, and others who have been here longer than myself. We faced $250 billion tax increases and deficits in excess of $300 billion a year, and now we are well on the way to solving that problem.

Not only will the plan we have today restore fiscal discipline for our Federal budget but it will do so using conservative economic principles: 2.1 percent rate of growth each year by the Congressional Budget Office is a tenth of a percent lower than the forecast of our budget plan a year ago.

Mr. Chairman, this budget plan is the type of plan that all responsible Members of this body should support. It puts us on a track to a balanced budget by the year 2002. That is why I came to Washington in 1994.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have rarely heard Members lavish on themselves more undeserved credit.

The budget deficit has gone from $292 billion a year in 1992 to $67 billion. That is a reduction of about $225 billion in 5 years. Those were the 5 terrible years.

Now, over the next 5 years, we are going to go from 67 billion to zero. And Members who have denigrated a reduction from $292 to $67 billion in 5 years are endangering their own chest bones by beating them so hard in praise of getting it down that last $67 billion over 5 years.

How are they doing this small part of the job? By making America less fair. If Members vote for this budget, they vote to say an old woman or an old man, an 80-year-old living on $12,000 or $13,000 a year will contribute to deficit reduction by getting a reduction in his or her Social Security through the Consumer Price Index from what otherwise would be the case, but do not worry because while your Social Security Consumer Price Index will go down, your Medicare will go up. So maybe that is some kind of equality. If you are making $13,000 a year, the CPI will be reduced and the Medicare will go up.

We began, in 1993, to bring some fairness to the Tax Code. This reverses it. We are being told we must give a degree of tax relief and some of the tax relief is, it seems to me, relevant for people who need to send their kids to school. But a lot of it will go on capital gains to wealthier people.

Why must we give the wealthy tax relief when we are going to be cutting lower income fuel assistance from what the law now requires, cutting community development block grants, cutting things that help people coping with economic difficulty? To stimulate the economy. But it is an economy which the Federal Reserve has acted as if it was already too stimulated.

We have got significant economic growth and, unlike growth during the Reagan years, we have seen growth while the deficit was going down.

Finally, we continue the pattern of being very generous to western Europe and Japan. This military budget will include for 5 years, it is locked in, if we believe this budget, a level of subsidy to Western European and Japanese allies that will be paid for by severe caps on important domestic programs. We will probably, under this budget, not be able to continue the funds we have sent to local communities so they can pay to keep the cops on the street. We gave them money for 3 years to keep cops on the street. They may not get Federal money to keep those cops on the street, but do not worry, we will lavish some more money on Eastern Europe. And those Americans who were afraid that Belgium might be invaded can take comfort in this budget because we have continued the practice of protecting Belgium and the Netherlands from their nonexistent enemies.

But if you live in an American city and you are worried about police not being there when you need them, this budget goes in the opposite direction.

To summarize, and I thank the gentleman for his continued leadership here, to summarize, we got the budget deficit from $292 to $67 billion. We should get it the rest of the way. But let us not accept the argument that we need to reverse a trend towards fairness, that we need to say, if you are making $12,000 or $13,000 a year and you are elderly, that your Medicare will go up while your CPI will go down.

And finally, let me talk about one of the silliest things in this agreement. If you are a legal immigrant and you are 82-years-old, we cut you off last year. The Republicans are very proud of that bill that cut people off. They have finally admitted they made a mistake. So what do they say in this bill? If you are 82-years-old and disabled, we will restore your money. But if you are 82-years-old and able-bodied, we will not.

Do the Republicans contemplate and the others who support this deal, because we are not restoring the money, as I understand it, for elderly legal immigrants, only for disabled legal immigrants, do we really contemplate a flood of legal immigrants in their 70's and 80's joining the work force?

This budget removes fairness to the extent that we have had it and cloaks itself inaccurately in an argument that you need to do it to reduce the deficit, when it will do less deficit reduction over the next 5 years than we have done over the past 5 years.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds, to point out that while some are contemplating a legislative change in the CPI, there is no change in the CPI in this budget.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this does not legislate a cut in the CPI, but it assumes one. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has been under a lot of pressure, and this budget assumes that the CPI will be downgraded by the Bureau of Labor Statistics so that elderly people will get less of a cost of living as a result of what they assume the CPI will have happen to them.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds.

This budget does not make any legislative change in the CPI. The Bureau of Labor Statistics is totally independent.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA].

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

In listening to the dialog, this budget does not do everything that we would like it to do, but it is an important next step in the process. It moves us forward. It moves us towards fiscal responsibility and it does so in a very positive framework.

It keeps us moving not towards balance, I do not think we will ever have a balanced budget. What it does is it moves us to surplus. We will actually have a surplus, hopefully, before the year 2002 but probably no later than the year 2002. It begins reform of entitlements. It slows the growth of Federal spending. Yes, it does return some tax dollars back to the American taxpayers.

That is a solid framework for which this Congress can be proud, and it is a bipartisan step forward. We now need to build on this agreement. In the next 45 days, we need to pass the legislation that puts in place the actual entitlement reforms, and we need to put in place the legislation that actually reduces the tax burden on the American taxpayers.

I think in another way this agreement is a very positive agreement, because now for a period of time there will no longer be a debate about the size of the Washington bureaucracy and the size of Washington government. We now can do and go back and perform a very important congressional responsibility, which is oversight.

We have talked about public housing. I am not sure that pouring more money into the same public housing framework is the best way to spend our dollars. We can probably get more bang for our dollar.

I wanted to talk a little bit about the work that we have been doing in education. There are some that are saying, and this agreement allows for more spending on education, but before we put more money into the current education framework, Congress needs to step back and say, what are we getting for the current dollars that we are spending? How does Washington define education? Washington defines education in a framework like this. It is a fairly complicated chart because the education system in Washington is fairly complex.

We have the red boxes signifying the number of different Federal agencies that are involved in education. We have over 40 different agencies that are concerned about education in America. They operate over 7,820 different programs, and they spend over $100 billion per year to educate and train people in America. Rather than pouring more money in this, in debating whether it should get bigger or smaller, we have now agreed on what the education spending will be for the next few years.

We can now step back and say, is this the best way to educate our children, to train America's workers. Let us step back, let us take a look at what is working and let us reform the education process in a bipartisan way. We need to do the same thing with improving the work force climate in America. How do we increase our international competitiveness? How do we improve the quality of life for America's working people?

How do we ensure that they are the highest quality, the best trained and the most productive so that they are the highest paid workers in America? That is now what this budget framework will allow us to do, to step back from arguing about the size of government to take a look at increasing its effectiveness and efficiency.

Let us use this budget agreement to move forward. We agree with the President on education. The President said in March 27, 1996, we cannot ask the American people to spend more on education until we do a better job with the money we have got now.

Let us have that debate now that we have put the debate about the size of government behind us for a period of time.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to this budget resolution. Although Democratic negotiators have succeeded in improving this budget over some previous proposals, I believe it is still bad policy for the Nation. The centerpiece of this budget is that in order to pay for tax cuts, the lion's share of which will go to the very wealthiest of Americans, we will constrain government spending on the things government should and must be doing.

This budget calls for a 10-percent real reduction in nondefense discretionary spending. We will be investing less in housing. We have a zero budget for new affordable housing units. Zero. And apparently, according to this, we should have a zero budget for affordable housing units, for new affordable housing units for the next 10 years.

We should cut spending in education, infrastructure, health care, Medicare by $115 billion, and on and on, all in the interest of a tax cut, mostly for the very wealthiest people in our country.

When President Clinton ran for election in 1992, he said we had to deal with four deficits. He said we had to get the budget deficit under control. And we have gotten it under control, reducing it from almost $300 to $67 billion.

He said we have to get the infrastructure investment deficit under control. We are investing in public infrastructure at the rate of one-twelfth of our competitors in Germany and Europe and Japan. And this does not do that. And if we do not solve that problem, we will not have a competitive economy.

We have to invest in research and development. We have cut research and development investment in the private and public sector. If we want to have a competitive economy in products we can sell abroad and at home a dozen years from now, we had better deal with that deficit.

And we have to invest in human capital so we have an educated work force and so our people are healthy and educated and can hold down decent jobs.

But in the name of balancing the budget and giving a tax cut to the wealthiest people in our country, we are abandoning these goals. And we have no assurance that the permanent tax cuts enacted with this proposal will not explode after 2002 or 2008.

In 2008 there will be $400 and $500 billion a year in less revenue just at the time that the baby boom is retiring, and we are told we are going to need huge amounts of extra money for Social Security and for Medicare. Sure, the Republicans have assured us this will not happen. But Ronald Reagan assured us that the 1981 tax cut would not lead to the biggest deficits in history and, of course, they did.

What this budget really says to America is for the next 10 years we are going to abandon investment in our Nation and in our people and, instead, we will devote our valuable resources to pay for unnecessary tax cuts skewed to the richest in our country.

Government, Mr. Chairman, should be guided by policy and not symbolism and shortsightedness. We should not constrain investment in our future. And I hope, I hope, we have the courage, the intelligence and the farsightedness to vote against this resolution.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, would you tell us how much time we have left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT] has 7¾ minutes remaining under his unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. And the other side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] has 1 hour, 37 minutes, and 30 seconds.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes and 45 seconds to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for leading this effort to say no to this budget.

With the greatest respect for all those who have worked so hard to bring this budget to the floor, on balance I think the appropriate vote for me, representing my constituents, is no.

I frankly can understand why my Republican colleagues would support a budget that gives a tax break to the highest end individuals while putting the burden of this budget on the less fortunate in our country. I am concerned why it is appealing to my Democratic colleagues. However, I respect their decision .

I do not think either vote is a good or bad vote on this. I do think, though, that we should make a statement about who wins and who losses in this budget bill.

First, let me say that I believe we are here today because of actions taken on two previous occasions by this Congress. One was in 1993, when the Democrats and only the Democrats voted to support President Clinton's bill that year for deficit reduction and balancing the budget. That took us down a path of deficit reduction, stimulated our economy, and took us down a path toward success, and that puts us in position to have a balanced budget in the very near future.

We do not have a balanced budget now, though, because of a vote that was taken many years ago, in 1981, the Reagan tax cut bill. Because of that tax cut bill, which produced huge deficits and increased our national debt enormously, we have to pay so much of our national budget for service on that debt. In fact, absent the service on that debt, the interest that we have to pay on our national debt, we would have a Federal budget and a Federal Government that would be operating in surplus, Mr. Chairman. In surplus.

In think it is a real tribute to the Clinton administration that ever since the President has been in office he has had an operating surplus, except for the interest on the debt, which came to us courtesy of the Reagan tax bill of 1981.

So, Mr. Chairman, in my remaining seconds I wish to say I oppose this budget because I believe that a budget should be a statement of our national values. I do not see that here.

I see, when we talk about providing health care for poor children in America, that we are paying for it out of Medicaid, cuts in Medicaid, and yet, and yet, without any pain, this package will give a tax break to the wealthiest people in our country without any cost to them.

So I see the losers being the usual, the people who need more opportunity in our society, and the winners being the usual, the wealthiest people in our society with the loudest and the largest voices to impact the actions of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I want to yield back the balance of my time because of the small amount of time given to the ''no'' side, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and I again thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Today marks a singular turning point in how the U.S. Congress carries out the will of the American people. For too many years our Government has failed to heed the word of those who sent us here. For too many years taxes went up, spending went up, and the size and power of Government went up. It seemed that the bigger Washington got, the further removed Congress became from the wishes and needs of the people it served.

Since I came to Congress in 1971, 11 major tax increases have been enacted into law. That is almost one major tax hike for every 2 years that I have been here. Some were even agreed to by Republican Presidents. Until recently, it seemed that the answer to every problem was to raise someone's taxes. We would not have been wrong if we said that until now the Congress never met a tax it did not hike. That is why this agreement marks an important turning point. For the first time in 16 years the American people will get a tax cut.

And I have listened to previous speakers here today. They cannot get away from the wornout rhetoric that they used before to adjust it to changing conditions. They have not even seen the tax bill, but already it will be tax relief only for the very, very rich. That is certainly not true and that will not be what is part of this tax bill. But they will keep saying it because it is locked into their mind. They do not know anything else.

This budget agreement may not be the best, it may not be the end-all, but it shows that we can balance the budget without raising taxes. It makes clear that Washington should tax less so that the American people can do more. It reaffirms our central premise that the hopes and dreams of a free people are handled best at home and in America's communities, not left to an externally expanding Federal Government located many, many miles away.

For some, today's agreement may seem to open the way to big government with a balanced budget. I pray we do not come to that. For balancing the budget is not just a matter of accounting, it is about the role that we expect the central government to play in our lives. It is about downsizing the power and the scope of the Federal Government and upsizing the power, the responsibilities, and the opportunities of individual Americans, free to achieve the fruits of their labor in the world's freest and most successful Nation.

That is why I will never, ever yield in my desire to reduce taxes on the American people, even after this agreement is completed. The secret of American success always has been and always will be our willingness to invest unparalleled trust and freedom in the hands of our voters. By letting them keep more of the money they make, they in turn will do more, do more for themselves, do more for the needy and more for the fibers of the individual communities that bind us together as one great Nation. By letting businesses grow, make money and succeed, we empower capitalism to be a force for good in this world, a force that has made our citizens the freest and richest people on Earth.

We are the economic envy of the world and we should be proud of that. It is these ideas that make us great. It is these ideas that separate us from the redistributionist societies that mean well always but fail always.

It is these principles that drive the upward mobility, that has proudly been the hallmark of American life. It is these principles that let individual Americans express their compassion and their willingness to help their fellow countrymen in need rather than ask a government to do it for them.

We all know that Washington's big government solutions exploded the deficit and failed to live up to the noble and high minded expectations that were previously set. Governments can do some things well, and we must put the appropriate powers of the Federal Government to good use, but Washington governs best when it has governed wisely, and it has governed wisely when it lives within its means.

That is what makes today's agreement a turning point and that is why I am for it. This agreement does not do everything and much work remains ahead. I would have liked to cut spending more. I would have liked to lower taxes more. But this agreement marks a departure from the old Washington ways and ushers in a new way, a new way based on lower taxes, less spending, and more freedom.

Mr. Chairman, I have every confidence that today's agreement will come to be seen as a crucial turning point in America's experiment with democracy. It will usher in an era of balanced budgets, less spending, and increased responsibilities and opportunities for the American people, and it will bring about a total overhaul of our unfair, complicated Tax Code, which will follow.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of the Members to vote for this budget agreement. Let us get started. Watch us go.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY].

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, this budget deal is based on a series of assumptions that would make a house of cards look like a sturdy fortress. In their economic assumptions, my colleagues, they project that this year's economy will grow at a rate of 2.1 percent. Unfortunately, the first quarter was 3.9 percent and the second quarter was 5.6 percent. So we will have to have negative growth for the last two quarters in order for this particular projection to be accurate.

In fact, what has happened with the Republicans is that they have grown so cautious since they were so wrong in 1993, that is projecting that that deficit reduction was going to be a failure, that since the deficit has gone from $300 down to $60 billion, in other words, from the end zone all the way to the other 20-yard line, there is only 20 yards left to go. Now they check in at $65 billion left to go in balancing the budget.

My own personal belief is that if we did nothing, the budget would balance itself over the next year. It has gone down steadily for 5 years. It will continue to go down steadily. The economy is roaring.

But what the Republicans do is, instead of taking this 5.6-percent growth that is in the economy, the sigh of relief that Alan Greenspan and the Fed is not going to increase interest rates, they translate it into a slowdown of the economy: 2.1 to 2.2 percent over the next 5 years they project. Even this year. That is just wrong.

As a consequence of that, they are forced to ask for deep cuts in programs that should not be touched, and tax breaks that, in fact, are going to fuel economic growth and perhaps cause the Fed to increase interest rates to slow down the economy that could be fueled by their tax policies.

☐ 1845

Moreover, what they have in here is something which is called a chain weights measure correction, meaning that they believe that the economy is going to go much slower under this chain weights analysis. It reminds me a lot of Marley's ghost that was forced to bear the chain weights dragged around throughout the entire story of Scrooge. Here the chain weights must be borne by those that will have to have their programs cut even as we cut taxes for the wealthiest in our society.

Other assumptions in this which are crazy, that the spectrum auctions will bring in $26 billion over the next 5 years. A fantasy, ladies and gentlemen. Perhaps we should tie this assumption to the ability to give capital gains tax breaks, if they are so confident about it. We will link the two provisions together. Usually the budgeters know the price of everything and the value of nothing. In this budget, the budget folks know neither price nor value of the airwaves or this budget proposal.

SPECTRUM ISSUES IN THE BUDGET

BACKGROUND

The Budget Resolution contains assumptions that $26.3 Billion can be raised over five years through various auctions of frequency spectrum.

Here is the breakdown of where the $$$ comes from:

[In billions of dollars]

Auction of returned ''analog'' TV broadcast spectrum	$5.4
Auction of spectrum currently allocated to channels 60–69	2.5
Auction of ''vanity'' toll free 888 numbers	0.7
Broaden & Extend FCC auction authority	15.7
Spectrum Flexibility fees	2.0

There are multiple problems with what the ''budgeteers'' have concocted.

First, the recent FCC decision on Digital TV sets a target date for the return of the analog TV spectrum in 2006. The budget proposal would take this target date and make it a mandated return date for the purposes of auctioning the returned spectrum. TV stations, however, that are not within the top 30 markets have up to 5 years to build out their digital TV facilities. Consumers in such markets, therefore, may only have 3 years to purchase new sets or digital converter boxes before their old ones become obsolete and these stations go dark.

Second, the proposal to ''broaden and extend'' the FCC auction authority ($15.7 Billion) requires the Commission to sell an additional 120 Megahertz (20 of which will come from NTIA). It is unclear where the rest will come from. The Commission had an extremely difficult time identifying 25 MHz to auction as mandated in last year's Appropriations Act. When they finally did, it raised only $13 million instead of the $1.8 Billion it was expected to.

Third, the proposal to auction 888 toll free vanity numbers ($700 million) runs into a number (no pun intended) of problems. First, does American Express, user of ''1–800–The-Card'', have a right to first refusal for ''1–888–The-Card'' in order to limit customer confusion? What do citizens of Canada do who use our same numbering system—pay the American FCC for use of a telephone number in Toronto?

It is clear that the budget wonks are trying to balance the budget by creating money out of thin air.

Telecommunications issues should be looked at through the prism of telecommunications policy, not budget policy. I used to say that the budgeteers are people who knew the price of everything and the value of nothing. But since this proposal won't raise the money that they score it to raise, my opinion now is that the budget folks don't know either the price or the value of what they plan to sell.

These spectrum issues are anti-consumer: the broadcast industry will not be ready in each and every market, in all states, in rural hamlets, to turn off their TV signals because consumers will not have made the switch to the new equipment.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, while there are many important policy matters addressed in the budget agreement before us today, I would like to take this opportunity to comment on the provisions concerning natural resources, native Americans and the environment.

I am encouraged that the resolution includes several vital functions of the Department of the Interior in the category of protected domestic discretionary priorities. Specifically, the National Park Service, operations of national park system, land acquisition, and State assistance, Everglades restoration, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and tribal priority allocations are funded at levels proposed in the President's fiscal year 1998 budget.

In addition, I am pleased that the resolution provides for $143 million in fiscal year 1998 to implement the California Bay-Delta Environmental Enhancement Act and $700 million for priority Federal land acquisitions, such as the Headwaters Redwoods Forest in California and the New World Mine Property bordering Yellowstone National Park.

These are highly justifiable and appropriate uses of public funds. In fact, these priorities adopted in the budget agreement were also identified in the budget views and estimates of Resource Committee Democrats.

Let me briefly address the priority items.

Of critical importance to California is the commitment to provide $143 million in funds requested by the President for the California Bay-Delta ecosystem restoration initiative. Federal financial support for bay-delta restoration was authorized by Congress in 1996. By voter initiative, California has set aside nearly $1 billion for bay-delta water restoration programs, guaranteeing that the State will pay its fair share of the costs. There is widespread, bipartisan support for the bay-delta ecosystem restoration effort and it deserves full support from Congress.

Mr. Chairman, if there was any doubt whatsoever about the importance of our national parks, the public outcry and harm to local economies during the Government shutdown last Congress made it clear that national parks are among this country's most value assets. Unfortunately, while we in Congress have created a system of national parks on par with any in the world, we have not been very good stewards of that public trust.

The Park Service would be the first to admit that the June 1997 edition of Consumer Reports is right on target: Visitor facilities in many national parks are in terrible shape and getting worse. There is an estimated $5.6 billion backlog in maintenance and repair needs.

Although the budget agreement incorporates the President's request for a 6-percent increase in fiscal year 1998 park funding, more needs to be done. Congress should continue to seek sources of funding, from park fees, concessions reform, and other initiatives, in order to deal with the repair and maintenance backlog and to continue to provide for the use and enjoyment of these vital national assets.

Mr. Chairman, we also have a special trust responsibility for American Indians and the budget resolution seeks to meet that responsibility by including the Bureau of Indian Affairs and tribal priority allocations as protected domestic discretionary priorities.

The $1.73 billion requested for BIA programs in the President's fiscal year 1998 budget is equal to the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1995. But considering that the funding for Indian programs has been cut significantly by Congress in each of the last 2 fiscal years, the budget agreement at least stops the backsliding. The needs for these funds are great: Economic, medical, educational, and social conditions on most Indian reservations are bleak. Of the 1.8 million native Americans in the U.S., 603,000 live below the poverty line and unemployment exceeds 40 percent.

Mr. Chairman, no other area more visibly demonstrates the progress in this budget agreement than does the funding provided for land acquisition for conservation purposes. The budget provides funding at the levels requested by the President in fiscal year 1998 for land and water conservation fund acquisition and the Everglades restoration initiative. Moreover, the resolution makes an additional $700 million available over the President's request, for priority land acquisition. This is in stark contrast to the budget resolution adopted last Congress which eliminated all funds for land acquisition. Land and water fund appropriations for the last 2 fiscal years which have fallen below fiscal year 1995 levels, despite efforts by myself and Representative FARR in offering amendments to restore funding.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act dedicates revenues from the leasing of offshore oil and gas resources to a trust for the permanent protection of conservation lands. The act intends that these funds are to be used to purchase lands from willing sellers as additions to national parks, national wildlife refuges, national forests, and Bureau of Land Management Lands. The annual income to the land and water trust fund has been steady at $900 million, resulting in an unexpected balance in the trust of over $12 billion in fiscal year 1998.

The price of not using the land and water conservation fund for its intended purposes is paid by increasing threats and in diminishing opportunities to protect and enhance our parks, refuges, forests, and public lands. Using the land and water conservation trust for deficit reduction, rather than for its intended acquisition purposes, is not only committing a fraud on the American people, it is short-sighted because it will increase the long-run costs to the taxpayers for protecting the environment and providing recreational opportunities.

Let me cite one example to illustrate the point: The City of New York is faced with the choice of spending $600 million to protect its watershed by purchasing forested land in the Catskills which is threatened by development or alternatively spending $4 billion on a water treatment system to provide clean drinking water.

In large part because of the difficulty in getting Congress to appropriate land and water conservation funds, the administration has resorted to proposing exchanges of Federal assets in an attempt to acquire the Headwaters Forest in California and the New World Mine outside Yellowstone Park.

But the $700 million provided in the budget agreement for acquisitions provides much better alternative to asset swaps which raise environmental and complicated valuation problems. This is an important step forward in using the assets of land and water conservation fund as the act intends.

I commend Chairman KASICH, Ranking Member SPRATT and others involved in the budget negotiations for their leadership on these critical issues.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. GIL GUTKNECHT.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, in his immortal poem, ''The People, Yes,'' Carl Sandberg said essentially, ''The will of the people will prevail.'' For many years, and I remember when I was in the State legislature, we would send petitions to the Congress asking them to balance the budget. Finally, we are reaching a point where it is within our grasp, and I think it is a historic and important night.

I was interested, in listening to this debate, some of our more liberal friends on this side continue to talk about winners and losers. But I am intrigued because there was a President from Massachusetts a few years ago, and he said that a rising tide lifts all boats. That is what this budget is about. It is not about winners and losers. It is about everybody winning.

Under a balanced budget, we will see lower interest rates, we will see stronger economic growth. It is about rising tides for all boats.

We talked about projections earlier, and the CBO was wrong. Frankly, they have been wrong more often than they have been right. But the most important thing is, we are ahead of our goal, we are under budget, we are moving in the right direction, and the American people are happy about it. Why? Because they are the biggest winners. The American people understand that. They understand who the winners are; they are, because the size and scope of the Federal Government is going to shrink.

I do not know why some of my colleagues on the right, and I have got some more friends over here who say, well, they do not know if they can support it because it does not do enough. Well, ladies and gentlemen, it does a lot. Maybe it is not perfect. This is not a perfect solution. I know some of my colleagues think we should not do this or we should not do that. But this is a compromise, and that is what makes this place work. That is the other reason the American people are happy, because for the first time in a long time we have the Congress and the President working together to balance the budget, to give them permanent tax relief.

And they understand this, and our chairman talked about that earlier, that family with three kids that is going to church and they have got the Billy Graham bumper sticker on the back of their car, they are going to be better off under this, and they can figure that out. That family that has got two kids in college or one in college and one about ready to go to college, they are big winners under this.

Real entitlement reform. Anyone who has studied the budget for the last 5 years understands that you cannot balance the Federal budget unless you get control of entitlements like welfare and Medicare and Medicaid. With the passage of this budget, we are well down that road.

Finally and most importantly, and I think this is a generational equity budget, we save Medicare from bankruptcy for at least 10 years.

So, is this budget perfect? No. Is it a giant step in the right direction? Absolutely yes. And the big winners are the American people, American families, but most importantly, American children. Because we begin to lay the foundations in this budget of not only balancing the budget, in my opinion, before the year 2002, but absolutely beginning to pay down the national debt as we go into the next generation.

The real winners are the American people, because Government spending as a percentage of the gross domestic product drops from 22½ percent to 18.9 percent. What does that mean? It means there is going to be more money in the private economy, it means a stronger economy, it means a rising tide.

If the American people continue to apply pressure to this Congress, we will stay the course, we will balance the budget, we will allow families to keep more of their money, and most important, we will lay the foundations for actually paying off the national debt.

No, this is not the end of the great debate about balancing the budget. It is, however, a historic and very important beginning.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I went to Wheaton College, where Billy Graham went to school, so I am glad that having a Billy Graham bumper strip on my car is going to get me tax relief. It sounds like that is what is being promised out here, that all those folks who go to the Billy Graham revivals will get a tax cut.

What about the rest of the folks? As I look at the two proposals we have on the table, and the reason we keep talking about tax cuts is because all we know that is what the Republicans put on the table last year and what Senator ROTH, the Member of the other body, put on this year, and three-quarters of the money that comes in tax breaks in both those proposals went to people making more than $100,000. I am glad that all those people going to Billy Graham's revivals are making $100,000 or more, because if they are not, they are not going to get anything out of this tax break.

The estate taxes. Now, we are all going to die. That is pretty sure. Taxes and death we know. And when you die, if you are in the 1.6 percent at the very top of the economy, you are going to take advantage of that little old tax break. Nobody else is. That estate tax business is simply for the people at the very top of the economy.

Now, we could have crafted a very careful use of the estate tax, if it is family farms you want to keep together or small businesses. But nobody will talk specifics. What this budget agreement does is say, buy a pig in a poke, send this tax break over to the Committee on Ways and Means and trust Chairman ARCHER and the members to do a very skilled, very careful, very fiscally conservative proposal.

Now, if you believe that, go back and look and see what happened in 1981 and 1986. They got in a bidding war. It was us. It was not Republicans, it was Democrats. I was not here, but I know who did it. There is no clean side here. It is not good or bad on either side of the aisle. But the fact was, the committee ran away. And it will happen again, you watch.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the previous unanimous-consent agreement, the Joint Economic Committee on the Democrat side will control the next 10 minutes of time.

The gentleman from California [Mr. STARK] will control that 10 minutes.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK] for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, when President Clinton took office, the deficit was out of control and the economy was reeling. In 1993, we took bold steps to restore fiscal responsibility by cutting the deficit from $290 billion to less than $100 billion today, and from close to 5 percent of the GDP to just 1½ percent. As a result, unemployment is at a 24-year low and inflation has stayed below 3 percent a year.

Economic growth has been expanding. Today, the Federal Reserve appears to have voted in support of this budget by not raising interest rates. This is a good beginning based on a strong economy. As we fill in the details, we must make sure that this budget invests in education according to the President's plan, expands child health care, protects Medicare and Medicaid, and provides tax relief for all working Americans.

I am especially pleased that this budget includes my bipartisan bill to allow for annual mammograms for women over 65 in Medicare. Who would have thought in 1992 that today we would be on a trend toward a balanced budget in 2002? This is about raising living standards for American workers. This is a victory for President Clinton, a victory for bipartisanship, and, most importantly, a victory for the American people.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and to congratulate the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget for completing their work in a timely fashion and doing it with a minimum amount of rancor and a lot of hard work. They are to be congratulated for achieving balance.

But I would like to suggest that balancing a budget is not an end to itself, as is being suggested by so many speakers tonight. There is too much left undone. While we can celebrate the economy, it is very difficult to celebrate when literally hundreds of millions of Americans are not going to participate. They just do not have a boat to get on as the tide rises.

The key question before us tonight is, Does this budget represent our priorities? Does it contribute to raising the standard of living for American workers and their families? Does it educate our children and train them to participate in all this wondrous economic success that is planned for the years ahead? Does it maintain our technological lead over our competitors? And, most of all, who will benefit from these tax cuts?

The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means is wrong. These tax cuts go to the richest American families in our country, and he knows it, and I am sure that most of the people hearing this debate know it. That may not be bad if you are rich, but it does not do much for you if you are below

$40,000 a year in income and trying to support a family.

I cannot support this budget resolution because of the priorities it funds and those that it fails to fund. It calls for over $5 billion a year in manned space flight, for instance, yet it leaves 5 million children without health insurance. That is not a choice I can make. It ignores the health needs of asthmatic children who are not covered. It ignores the health needs of children with hearing loss. Those 5 million children do not get health care. And you are turning your back on them as you gaze at some missile in space which may or may not be as important to you. You have to make that decision when you vote.

This budget wastes half a billion dollars a year on star wars and lets our NATO allies off the hook for true burden sharing. This money could be spent to provide day care. It could be spent to help working families in need of long-term care assistance for their seniors, in need of job training, community resources to cut crime, and it is not.

It is a great budget resolution for those who favor increasing defense spending and tax cuts for the wealthy while ignoring working families and their children, while ignoring middle and low-income seniors and the less fortunate members of our society.

☐ 1900

Without the star wars spending that is in this budget, we would have the resources to fund health coverage for all our children. Is that a decision my colleagues want to make? If you want to fund star wars and cut 5 million kids out of health insurance, vote for the budget, my Republican friends. You will get your wish.

Without the tax cuts, we would have the ability to extend the life of Medicare 4 or 5 years more. Do you need those tax cuts or would you like to extend Medicare for a longer time?

There are a lot of things this budget does not do. We know from listening to our Republican friends that it gives huge tax cuts to the rich and somehow strangles Government services, not for the rich but for the middle- and low-income families.

They are gloating over the fact that they cut the President's proposal to increase welfare benefits in half. The rich do not care about that. They got their tax cut. The people who are sleeping under bridges, let them stay there.

They rejected the President's entitlement for school construction. Let the schools fall down, that with the earthquake problems put your children at risk. They do not care about the children, they care about tax cuts for the rich.

They rejected the President's program for intervention in health insurance for workers. They really do not care about that.

They cut food stamp spending in half again, a life support system for the low-income families on whom the Republicans have turned their back in favor of tax cuts for the very rich.

They say that it makes the President face up to the realities, by cutting another $35 billion out of Medicare. Are they not proud? They cut back expansions on Medicare benefits to help those with family members with Alzheimer's. It cuts back on helping stop the outrageous overcharge on outpatient copayments by many of the greedy hospitals in this country. They are proud of it. They are bragging about it. Because they need the money to give the tax cuts to the rich.

They rejected the President's program to fund Superfund to help clean up the environment. Why? Because if you are rich enough, you can clean up your own backyard and you do not have to rely on Superfund. Energy conservation, the weatherization program is gone. The rich can afford to insulate their houses. National Endowment for the Arts, National Endowment for the Humanities. I know that they can buy their box at the opera if you are a rich Republican and they rather think that somehow the arts and humanities are for left-leaning liberals. They are smart. They know how to make money. They may not be able to spell or understand art and history and they do not care if their children do, so they want to cut out the Endowment for the Arts and Humanities.

WIC program for women, infants, and children. That has been denied its preservation. What do they care about helping poor women and children get decent nutrition? Student financial assistance has been denied its survival. The National Institute of Health has been denied its survival. The Center for Disease Control, substance abuse and mental health services, the administration drug treatment, all of them, denied their protection.

Here is one. The Bureau of Reclamation, California Bay Delta area, where we come from, help the rich farmers in central California who farm cotton with billion-dollar subsidies for free water from the Federal Government but do not clean up the Bay Delta. Cut out OSHA. Who cares if the workers who work for the rich are protected as long as the rich get their tax cuts? The National Science Foundation, the Commission on Civil Rights, mass transit, all go by the boards under the rubric of saying, we will be a better country if the rich get a big tax cut and the poor fend for themselves as best they can and we, by the way, will have balanced the budget. They balanced it on the backs of the poor, on the backs of children who do not have health insurance. They have ignored over 40 million Americans who do not have health insurance. Not one word has come out of the Republican camp about what are we going to do to provide health insurance for 40 million Americans who do not have it? I have not heard a peep. They do not care. I suppose they do not understand that if an adult does not have health insurance, they do not get medical care.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the budget unless you want to help the rich and continue to turn your back on the poor and needy in our country.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GANSKE].

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

Mr. Chairman, I reject the class warfare comments of my colleague from California.

Mr. Chairman, I hate to splash cold water on this budget because I know how hard the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the chairman, and others have worked for it. Mr. Chairman, I just want my colleagues to think about this. Let us imagine that I owe $80 billion on this Visa credit card and I pay for that by transferring the $80 billion to this Mastercard. Do I still owe $80 billion, Mr. Chairman? The answer, of course, is yes.

My point of this is that in this budget agreement, we are transferring $80 billion from part A of Medicare home health care to part B. That is very creative accounting.

Let me explain it in just a little different way, Mr. Chairman. Let us assume that we have part A represented by this cup and we have home health care by this ball. The table represents the Federal budget. I am going to put home health care in part A. Now because it is growing so fast, what I am going to do is I am going to take the ball and I am going to put it into part B. Mr. Chairman, are they still not on the Federal budget table? What this does is it just transfers $80 billion into the general account. That is smoke and mirrors, that is creative budgeting, that is a shell game, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to search their hearts and their computers. When President Clinton first proposed this budget, many of my colleagues criticized the home health care switch as a gimmick. I urge them to remember their comments and vote against this shell game.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute, to point out that the insurance fund is losing approximately $12 billion this year, a $35 million daily loss. Next year if we do not save the trust fund, it will lose $55 million each day; the year after that, $78 million and $103 million each day the year after that. In 2001, when the fund will go totally bankrupt, the trust fund will lose $133.9 billion each day.

Our plan saves the trust fund to the year 2007. Instead of having a debt of $612 billion, there will still be $75 billion in the fund. It is true that one service, home health care, is taken out of the part A trust fund and put into part B. But it is not smoke and mirrors because the taxpayers will be paying 75 percent of the cost and the premium holders 25 percent of the cost.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes and 20 seconds to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SUNUNU].

Mr. SUNUNU. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this resolution, not for any Washington Beltway reasons, not for reasons of scoring or even specific numbers or whether it does or it does not change a particular accounting measure, but for two very fundamental reasons. First, because it enables us to meet some broad commitments that many of us in this House made to our constituents during our election cycle. Second, because of the fundamental difference it is going to make in moving power away from Washington and back into the pocketbooks of American people in cities and towns all across this country.

Like many who were elected to this Chamber, I campaigned on the themes of balancing our Federal budget by the year 2000, providing substantive and meaningful tax relief to working families, and preserving and protecting Medicare.

Only 3 years ago, many people, our own President included, thought that balancing the budget in this way by the year 2002 was simply impossible. He said maybe we could do it in 10 years and then maybe 9 years. It was looked at as a radical concept. But the American people stood by us as we said time and again, we can do it, we do have the discipline and we do have the will to balance our budget by the year 2002 in a meaningful way.

With this budget proposal, we have the opportunity to meet that commitment on balancing the budget, meet that commitment on tax relief, and on preserving and protecting Medicare.

I see three fundamental areas where this is going to make a difference to the pocketbook and to the livelihood of working families that I want to take a moment to emphasize. First with the tax relief measure, a $500-per-child tax credit. That makes a difference to every working man and woman in this country that has a young dependent child. Certainly the educational tax support is going to put more money back in the pocketbook of a typical working family.

The second area that this is going to make a big difference for American families is in the economic growth and the job opportunities that will be created as we reduce the tax burden on capital gains or on estate tax, create that working opportunity, create incentives for savings and investment, and the following economic growth.

It is not a tax cut for any wealthy individual. When we cut the tax burden on a small business or a family business, we help everyone that works for that business across the board, and when 60 percent of American people work for a small business we are doing them a favor, not just today but for the rest of their lives, and for their children as well.

Finally, by balancing the budget, we reduce interest cost, 1 to 2 percent, across the board. For everyone that has a home mortgage or a student loan or an automobile loan, we are talking about $100 or $500. In the case of a home mortgage, an average-price home, $20,000 to $30,000 over the life of that mortgage. That is money in their pocket, enabling them to invest it in a way that they see fit, to improve their standard of living, save for their children's education and make a difference for their families. Meeting our commitments and making a difference by taking power away from Washington, meeting our commitments that we have made as individuals, and by taking money and with it power away from Washington and putting it back in local cities and towns across America, we make Washington less important, we make the individual more important. That is where this country needs to go.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to allocate that time.

Mr. Chairman, I would just point out that the Joint Economic Committee looks at spending, taxing, and regulatory policy as well as the policy of the Federal Reserve and determines its effect on the economy.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, may I just ask a point of parliamentary inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I am not clear at this point on whether we will alternate time with the other side of the aisle or whether this is a straight half hour. I do not care one way or the other. I would just like a clarification.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman is correct. We will continue to alternate.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to compliment the negotiators both from the House and from the administration for arriving at a bipartisan agreement that will bring the budget into balance by the year 2002. I think it is extremely important for the American taxpayer and I think it is equally important for the continued economic expansion that we have seen since the second quarter of 1991, making it an extremely long and productive period of time for the American worker, due in no small part to what has gone on here in this House and in the other House as well as in the administration for the last decade or more.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to put this in perspective, however, in that the current business cycle expansion is entering, as I said, this long period of time, entering actually its seventh year. The upswing got under way in the second quarter of 1991 and has brought sustained economic and employment growth throughout that period of time. In the last two quarters, the rate of growth has picked up, pushing the unemployment rate down to 4.9 percent. The positive economic climate makes fiscal restraint more palatable and clearly facilitated the achievement of the balanced budget agreement.

However, Mr. Chairman, while some in Washington would like to lay claim and take political credit for the business cycle expansion, the credit really belongs to the many millions of American workers and entrepreneurs and savers and investors whose activities made the economy grow.

☐ 1915

Fortunately, they were afforded that opportunity by our system, and the current business cycle expansion is the result.

To the extent that Washington policy is relevant to this expansion, the Fed's; the Federal Reserve that is, anti-inflation policies have lowered interest rates, improved the operation of the economy and sustained the expansion. The Federal Reserve's decision today to refrain from raising interest rates is certainly a welcome decision which I wholeheartedly endorse. The only suggestion I would make is that if the Fed could explain its policy decisions more fully, now and in the future, so that people who are taking part in our free enterprise system can understand why decisions are made from time to time.

In fact, today's decision was announced in two words; that is right, two words: No increase.

One of the benefits that this expansion brings is an improvement in the budget situation. As the economy continues to grow, the Federal revenues increase while Federal spending is restrained. The surge of revenue supplied from the business cycle has sharply lowered budget deficits, and as I pointed out some time ago, it now appears that this revenue surge from economic growth will reduce the 1997 deficit to below $70 billion.

Although the economy has performed well, improvement in the economy is still possible. The bias in our current tax system against savings and investment undermines economic growth. Reduction in capital gains tax rates and death taxes and expansion of individual retirement accounts will add to growth in the years ahead. I endorse each of those features.

Once the budget agreement is implemented, Congress can turn its consideration to ways to limit the many counterproductive features of the current income tax system.

Just to complete, let me finish this thought, that aggressive further expansion of IRA's should be high on our list of future tax improvements.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, we have labored long and hard in this body to find a solution to the deficit problems that confront our Nation. The Committee on the Budget last Friday adopted a resolution by a bipartisan vote. It was historic. It has been years since we have had a bipartisan vote in support of a budget resolution that is now headed to the floor, is on the floor and is expected to pass by a wide margin. Many of us have focused on what we feel are the critical parts of a successful effort to balance the budget. We have established standards. We would like to see a glidepath; that is, we would like to see the deficit reduced steadily rather than having the task of the heavy lifting backloaded in the last year or two and have such an amount that it is unrealistic to expect that we would actually be able to balance that budget in the last year or two.

Mr. Chairman, we have talked about having realistic projections, conservative projections as to how the economy will perform, realistic projections as to what it will cost to run government, to support the programs that we have established: Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, environmental programs, conservation programs, agriculture, consumer protection and hundreds of others. We do not think it is realistic to expect to balance the budget by dramatically cutting programs in the outyears that we know are popular, where there will not be the political will to actually impose or implement those cuts.

We have also said that we cannot use smoke and mirrors, we cannot be looking for some sort of a magic solution in numbers where we have unrealistic projections and where we have so-called triggers where things will be implemented based upon some unrealistic forecast in the future or where programs will be sunsetted. Certainly we recognize if we have popular programs, new programs that millions of Americans immediately identify as being critical, that to think that we will eliminate those programs in the outyears is politically unrealistic.

We also think it is unrealistic to expect to eliminate programs when we have a different administration or a different Congress. We are not going to make decisions that bind that administration or bind that Congress. So that is another standard that we look for in whether or not we actually have a deficit reduction program that will work.

By the same token, we are looking for real cuts. We are looking for a slowing in the rate of growth in programs. We are looking for scaling back existing operations to make government operations not only leaner, but also more efficient and more effective in delivering the services that are so important.

We think it is important to maintain an investment in priorities, maintain an investment in education, our Nation's future, in the infrastructure that is so important, and transportation. We will hear a great deal about transportation as the evening goes on. These are priority areas that it is unrealistic to expect us to simply zero out.

We also recognize that we will not be able to balance this budget unless we recognize the problems that we face with entitlement programs. Entitlement programs are becoming increasingly a major portion, or the major portion of this Nation's budget, and if we do not find a way to constrain our spending in that area or limit our spending, we will not be successful in the long run in balancing this Nation's budget and keeping it in balance.

And probably no program presents a greater challenge then Social Security. All of us know that we pay into Social Security, we expect certain benefits back. It is virtually a contract arrangement. But we also know that we do not have a Social Security trust fund that is actuarially sound, that will be there in the long term for our children and our grandchildren at the current rates at which it is being drawn down and the current rates of contribution. Changes need to be made.

There has been a great deal of discussion of the Consumer Price Index and its accuracy, and we feel that one of the characteristics of trying to come up with a balanced budget is to recognize any inaccuracies that exist in the Consumer Price Index and to forthrightly correct those inaccuracies, and it is possible to make dramatic improvements in the prospects for the Social Security trust fund if, indeed, we do correct those inaccuracies, and there are a couple of ways that this can be implemented.

First, if we adjust the Consumer Price Index as reported from the Bureau of Labor Statistics to make it more accurate, we will reduce incrementally the payouts from the Social Security trust fund, and that reduction becomes billions and hundreds of billions of dollars over the years. This can extend the life of the Social Security trust fund for between 5 and 15 years, depending on what the correction might be that we would make to the Consumer Price Index. At the same time, by slowing the rate of growth of other programs we reduce the need to borrow from the Consumer Price Index.

This is positive, and I think that we need to recognize that taking the Social Security trust fund off budget is the goal that many of us share and ought to be a goal of this Congress. We recognize that if we make adjustments in entitlement programs like Social Security, that there are certain individuals that depend upon Social Security for virtually all of their income, and they may have a modest level of benefits, and we have advocated a flat cost of living adjustment for that reason.

So whether one is the person that does the cleaning or the person that is the president of the company, whether they work in the mailroom or they are the chief financial officer, their Social Security increase is the same flat dollar amount from year to year. That is what we mean by a flat cost of living adjustment or a flat COLA. And in a combination of an adjustment for accuracy and a flat COLA we will find that the folks that are at the low-income level will not be disadvantaged, but in fact would see their Social Security benefits increase modestly over what they would be with no cost of living adjustment.

Mr. Chairman, these are all characteristics that I believe are important if we are going to actually balance our budget and keep it balanced.

Now I have used the term ''we'' at several points here, and when I say ''we,'' I have been talking about an approach that has been taken by the coalition or group that has been known generally as the blue dog coalition. We have developed a budget that we hope is credible, and the commentators, the critics and other Members of Congress have recognized it as probably the most credible budget that has been presented to this institution this year. But we also recognize that a budget that was adopted by the Committee on the Budget is not the same as our budget, and we wish to lend support to a budget that we think will ultimately pass and, as a consequence, we are not here in an attempt to defeat the budget resolution that has been reported out, but instead to draw some contrasts and to point out some areas where we need to improve, perhaps next year or the year after, so that we can constantly make progress in our efforts to eliminate the deficit in this country.

One of the areas where we feel that dramatic improvement is needed is enforcement, because we cannot expect to in the long term have a balanced budget unless we have credible, strong, effective enforcement mechanisms in that budget.

So this evening what we will be doing with the time that has been allotted to us is emphasizing some of the enforcement features that we think are important to include in a budget and certainly in the reconciliation bills and also emphasizing some of these features that we feel are important if we are going to be successful in the long term in keeping our deficit at bay. This is a bipartisan effort, and I will be recognizing and yielding to individuals on both sides of the aisle.

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

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time and will then subsequently yield more of my time to others in the Chamber.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out that the gentleman who just spoke who spoke on the Consumer Price Index adjustment was either speaking for himself or some other budget. The CPI adjustment is not mandated or contained in any way in the committee budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY].

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I want to focus my time on a part of the budget that is not all that big in terms of its relative size, but it is very big in terms of what we believe in and what we stand for and what we want to encourage in this country.

The budget agreement with the President and this budget includes some relief on death taxes, otherwise known as inheritance, or estate taxes. Benjamin Franklin said that nothing is certain but death and taxes, and as tough as each of these things are when they come, to have them to come together at the same time is virtually unbearable. Farmers, ranchers, small business folks of all varieties in my area have felt the sting and effects of this tax, but the truth is the consequences affect all of us.

I want to make three key points on why it is so important to do something in this area of death taxes.

□ 1930

No. 1 is that of all of the money coming to the Federal Government, only about 1 percent comes in the form of estate or death taxes. It is about $15 billion a year. Yet Congress has received testimony that administration and litigation costs eat up more than half of that amount, so that it is a very expensive and very cumbersome tax for the Government to administer.

However, one member of President Clinton's Council of Economic Advisors has found that it costs taxpayers as much to comply with this tax as all of the money that they pay in in the form of tax. Now, if we have a tax that it costs as much to comply with as the tax itself, something needs to be reevaluated.

Second, this tax is a drag on the economy. Professor Wagner's study has found that, if we abolish the inheritance tax altogether, that within 8 years we will have created 250,000 new jobs; we will have added $80 billion to the gross domestic product, and we will have increased the amount of capital by about $640 billion. That is money that can go to create jobs and expand the economy and improve the standard of living for everyone.

There have been other studies that have reached other conclusions. But the bottom line is our society is spending a tremendous amount of money just trying to avoid these taxes, and if people did not have to play these games, it would be good for everybody.

In other countries they have already reached this conclusion. Mexico, Canada, and Australia have no death taxes. As a matter of fact, only Japan has a higher rate of taxes once you die than the United States.

I think it is as important as anything, however, in looking at this part of the budget agreement, that it goes against the American dream. What we want to encourage people to do is to work hard, to save, to build up something so that we can have something to pass along to our children and hopefully they can have a better quality of life to pass along to their children.

It is human nature for us to work and build and create something and to leave it to our children for a better future, and we should want to encourage that. But instead, this tax works to discourage savings. What it encourages is immediate gratification. That is not in the long-term best interests of this country, and it is not what we want to encourage as a government.

If we look at the numbers, 60 percent of family-owned businesses already do not make it to the second generation; 87 percent do not make it to the third generation. If we look at the numbers for minority-owned small businesses, it affects them particularly hard.

So the bottom line is that, rather than encourage more opportunities, which is what we want to do to have a better standard of living for all of our people, this tax punishes those things that create those opportunities to begin with. It goes in exactly the wrong direction, and all of us are affected by it in one way or another.

This budget agreement is not the complete answer. It does not go as far as I would like it to go. When the tax bill comes up from Ways and Means, it will not go as far as I would hope we could go; but it is a small step in the right direction. And it is a small step in the right direction that has big consequences for all of us and says a lot about where we want to go as a society and what we want to encourage in this country.

So among the many positive things in this budget agreement, it will do something for the first time in a long time on death taxes, and I think that is a significant factor that we should all be encouraged by.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, many Members have called this a historic day. I slightly disagree. Today has the potential to be a historic day but only if we are willing to do much more heavy lifting than we have been willing to do thus far.

I am disappointed that the agreement missed the opportunity to make real reforms in long-term costs of entitlements. The failure of this budget to deal with the long-term problems with the growth of entitlement spending guarantees that this budget agreement will not end our budget problems. Sooner or later, we will have to come back and deal with entitlements.

The gentleman from New Jersey was exactly right. Nothing in this budget agreement that I will support tonight deals with the CPI. That is a mistake. That is a weakness, not a strength. It is irresponsible for us to continue to place an unnecessary drain on the Social Security system by providing COLA's that virtually everyone acknowledges are inaccurate. A small adjustment to provide accurate COLA's would be a major step in strengthening the Social Security system. A 0.8-percent adjustment would extend the trust fund by 13 years and allow us to take it off budget honestly by 2005.

I am disappointed that symbolic political arguments succeeded in blocking an agreement in the provision from the Coalition budget to require upper-income Medicare beneficiaries to contribute more for their Medicare coverage.

Reaching an agreement to balance the budget by 2002 does not guarantee that the budget will actually be balanced in 2002. The 1981 budget projected balance by 1984. Gramm–Rudman–Hollings I promised a balanced budget by 1991. Gramm–Rudman–Hollings II promised a balanced budget by 1993. The 1990 budget agreement projected a balanced budget by 2002. Only the 1993 balanced budget agreement met and exceeded the promises on this floor.

All six of these plans, though, failed to reach the promised land of a balanced budget because we did not follow through to make sure the plan succeeded, and today the Coalition was denied the opportunity to even vote for a meaningful enforcement mechanism for this budget.

In order to avoid a repeat of the failures of past budget agreements, legislation implementing this resolution must include a strong enforcement mechanism to force Congress and the President to take action if the budget falls off of the path.

The Coalition budget proposed strong budget enforcement to lock in the deficit reduction through hard deficit targets enforced by sequestration. If the deficit fell off the glidepath toward balance and exceeded the deficit target for any year, Congress and the President would be required to take action to put the deficit back on the glidepath toward balance. If Congress and the President failed to take corrective action, there would be sequestration targeted to the part of the budget that caused the problem. The enforcement provisions that we have proposed to avoid the problems in past enforcement efforts were denied an opportunity to be voted on today.

Two lessons from Gramm–Rudman–Hollings: One, exempting any area of the budget from enforcement will encourage certain groups to sit on the sidelines while balanced budget plans unravel. It is critical that an enforcement mechanism include all portions of the budget, spending and revenues, without exception, to ensure that everyone has a stake in keeping the deficit on a declining path. Enforcement cannot be a substitute, though, for making tough choices. Our proposal is designed to complement the reforms that are in this plan to make sure they achieve the savings they were intended to achieve.

The 1990 agreement demonstrated that enforcement provisions can control new spending in taxes, but failed because it did not control existing programs or taxes. An enforcement mechanism must require Congress to control existing programs and taxes. Our proposal would set targets for the total deficit, all spending and all revenues.

This resolution is simply the beginning of the process. The real test will come with reconciliation and appropriation bills implementing this resolution.

I look forward to working with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], the administration, and others in improving this blueprint or plan or laying of the foundation tonight.

I would like to see us improve the glidepath. I do not like to see the deficit going up temporarily for any reason. I think we should build on the success of the last 5 years, 5 consecutive years of a declining deficit. We should have built on that to, say, 6, 7 and 8. Instead, currently this plan suggests that the deficit go back up again for 2 or 3 years to get a running start on getting it balanced by 2002.

I will support this resolution today to keep the process moving forward. However, I will find it extremely difficult to support reconciliation legislation that does not improve the credibility of this budget. This budget agreement—and I believe that many of my colleagues who share my concern for serious deficit reduction share this concern; but for tonight, this is the best we could do in a bipartisan way, working with a divided House, a divided Senate, and a divided Congress, and administration. I encourage my colleagues to support it but look forward to improving it as we build on this foundation.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me take this opportunity to address a point which I think is very, very important, and that is the matter involving the consumer price index and the fact that it is not contained in the Committee on the Budget's proposal that we will vote on later tonight.

It is true that a recent commission known as the Boskin commission reported that the CPI overestimates inflation by better than 1 percentage point. While that is true, I would like to say to all of the gentlemen and gentlewoman who are here in this Chamber that neither they nor I have the ability, objective as we might try to be, to arrive at an accurate figure through the legislative process.

It is extremely difficult to be accurate with regard to the CPI, and inasmuch as family taxes to a large degree are impacted by CPI adjustments, and on the other hand, Social Security benefits are impacted by CPI adjustments, it seems to me that those people who have the expertise to bring together the facts about our economy that relate to price stability and increases or decreases in inflation, should be the people to make those judgments. Therefore, I worked extremely hard over the last month or 6 weeks to convey to the members of the Committee on the Budget and the leadership on both sides of the aisle how difficult it is to arrive at this CPI in any accurate measure.

As a matter of fact, as long ago as 1928, a very famous economist by the name of Ludwig Vaughn Mises, who may be familiar to some of my colleagues, was a very important guy back in the 1920's, when he predicted the collapse of the Soviet Union as an economy. He did that because he had great insight. One of the minor things that he did, which today is rather important, is that he predicted and said that it would always be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to arrive at a truly accurate measure of price stability. That is true, and that is why this House, in my humble opinion and why I have worked so hard for the last 6 weeks to avoid that measure being adjusted in this budget document, that is why it is extremely difficult to arrive at an accurate measure.

So I wanted to be sure that everyone who is here who will be voting tonight understands that CPI is simply not part of this budget, and that is why.

Let me turn to another part of the subject here and talk a little bit about why I think this is a good budget. Another reason that I think we should all vote for this budget is that it obviously, over time, provides that our government will consume a smaller and smaller part of our gross domestic product. Now, this is extremely important because, if government consumes more and more of GDP, government becomes less and less efficient. And as government becomes less and less efficient, operating with more and more of the money in our economy, it tends to dampen economic growth.

We did several major studies of this. If I may just refer to this little chart, this, I must admit, is a rather strange looking chart, but it tells a great story. The great story that it tells is that as the economy grows and consumes a larger and larger part of GDP, this is how the economy grows. As the economy grows, and it reaches an optimum point of producing economic activity, my colleagues have all heard, we have all heard the suggestion that the economy can be stimulated by government. Well, that is true, to a certain point. We believe that through our studies on the Joint Economic Committee that, once we reach about 17 percent, that we have maxed out the effect on the economy of government spending. And once we move beyond 17 percent into all of the other kinds of activities that government involves itself in as it gets large, we get a dampening effect on the economy. So we get good growth during the time that we spend the first 17 percent of GDP; and today, I say to my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, we are at 21 percent of GDP, expenditures through the Federal Government.

Now, this has all kinds of consequences. It means bigger government, it means more regulation. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON], who has fought so hard to reform the regulatory process, is here with us. And all of those activities have negative effects which we all want to avoid.

So congratulations to the budgeteers who have recognized that, as spending increases and government gets bigger, it represents a more difficult time for our economy to expand.

☐ 1945

Let me just show one or two other examples.

This is something that our Speaker, who just entered the room, spoke about not long ago in a press conference which I saw on C-Span. It is something called Tax Freedom Day. The size of government has a direct effect on this.

Today Tax Freedom Day is the latest it has ever been. Americans pay taxes to support some level of government until May 9. Imagine that, January, February, March, April, and 9 days in May that we send money to Washington, our government, our State Capitol, and our local government to support government activities. That is a direct result of growing government.

Again, congratulations to the budgeteers, who have recognized this fact and have provided us with an opportunity here tonight to vote for a budget that reduces the growth in government, and will begin to shrink the period of time that we Americans have to work each year to support government. This year it is May 9. Hopefully next year it will be back toward May 1, and hopefully the year after that it will be back into April. That should be our goal.

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

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON].

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, we are here this evening not on an historic occasion, but on an important occasion. I had hoped that I would be a part of the affirmative process to try to improve the agreement that was reached with the President and the leadership of the House and Senate. I have worked in a bipartisan fashion since that agreement was announced in principle to come up with some mechanisms to actually make the goal of a balanced budget a reality.

With the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] and others of the Blue Dog Coalition, I helped put together a group of conservative Congressmen who wanted to actually put some enforcement mechanisms into this agreement.

What we did was come up with the radical idea that we would take the budget agreement that came out of the Committee on the Budget and add to that some structural reforms like entitlement caps. The discretionary spending caps that were part of the 1991 agreement have actually worked. Since entitlements are 53 percent of this year's budget and are growing to be approximately 60 percent of the budget in the year 2002, we thought, let us extend that principle of capping not just to discretionary spending but to entitlement spending.

We looked at the sequestration process that was used in GRAMM–Rudman and decided to modify it so we had sequestration by program. The programs that were within their caps would not be sequestered but those that were growing more rapidly than the caps would be. To make sure it was a bipartisan solution, we decided to make the tax cuts, the $85 billion net tax cuts over 5 years, contingent on meeting the revenue targets.

In sum, what we did was take $85 billion worth of tax cuts and say that we are going to make those subject to meeting the revenue estimates in this budget; take $5 trillion, $5 trillion of entitlement spending and cap it within the existing agreement; and say, now, let us use these enforcement mechanisms to make sure we get the budget balanced in the year 2002.

Because that idea is so powerful, of having some spending restraint on entitlements with some contingency on tax cuts, that there was a possibility that a bipartisan coalition might actually come together on the floor this evening and improve the budget agreement, for whatever reason our amendment was not made in order. It was made in order to have an increase in spending through the Black Caucus, an increase in tax cuts through the Conservative Action Team on the Republican side, but the one truly bipartisan effort to improve this agreement was not made in order.

So I will not be voting for the budget agreement later this evening, Mr. Chairman, but luckily, this is not the end of the process. It is the beginning of the process. The real heavy lifting is going to come later this summer when we do what is called reconciliation. At that point in time this bipartisan coalition that has come together to demand some structural reform through the enforcement mechanisms I think will be heard and will be successful.

I want to commend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] for working in a bipartisan fashion. I think we have a good framework. I am sure that at the appropriate time we will be given an opportunity to have our vote here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LATHAM].

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey, my very good friend, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bipartisan Congress, and today we are considering the budget framework that will put our Nation's finances in order by the year 2002. Republicans and Democrats alike have often stated this goal. Today we all have an opportunity to literally put our money where our mouth is and support this budget resolution.

Within this budget agreement is language that specifically addresses one of my greatest concerns. I know I am not alone in this view. I want to ensure that seniors in rural northwest Iowa are going to enjoy Medicare benefits not just in the next couple of years, but for the next generation and beyond.

Our seniors have paid into the Medicare system and have every right to expect efficient health care coverage. However, the current Medicare system has always comparatively overcompensated urban areas in regard to the Medicare reimbursement rate at the expense of rural States like Iowa. By efficiently utilizing our health services in the past, the current Medicare law punishes Iowa seniors through low reimbursement rates. Some urban areas receive 2½ times the reimbursement rate per person than rural areas like northwest Iowa do.

What does this current Medicare inequity do for Iowa's seniors? It means a lack of choice in the Medicare plans. No managed care organization could even afford to do business in Iowa to serve my constituents. I have been working for the past 3 years with other Members of Congress, both Republican and Democrat, to help cure this inequity. I am proud to report that this budget resolution includes a simple directive to Congress in reforming the Medicare program as this budget is enacted in further legislation.

The final budget resolution mandates that we ''Reform managed care payment methodology to address geographic disparities.'' This simple and understandable directive will work to correct the urban-rural gap in Medicare reimbursement rates. I am proud of having this priority included in the budget resolution, but more importantly, I am proud that the residents in rural Iowa will soon enjoy the Medicare benefits currently available to those in more populous areas in the United States.

So along with this change and the tax relief that we are going to see in this bill as far as the reduction on the death tax, reduction on the tax on savings, investment, and job creation, there is the family tax credit, something we have worked for in the 2½ years that I have been here. I am certainly going to support this budget agreement, and I would encourage all Members to do so also.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. TAUSCHER], one of our new and outstanding Members.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the budget resolution for fiscal year 1998. As a member of the Blue Dog Coalition and in support of the Blue Dog budget, I am particularly pleased that this deal includes many of our recommendations. In particular, the foundation of this budget is firm because of the economic assumptions it employs.

For the past couple of years Congress has debated whether to use Congressional Budget Office or Office of Management and Budget estimates in calculating economic projections. The Blue Dog Coalition has been consistent in its support of CBO numbers because we believe they tended to be more conservative. In the past, deficit reduction plans have failed because of incorrect assumptions relating to spending and revenue levels.

We have learned that for a plan to be successful, it must use economic forecasts that do not overstate revenue projections or assume unrealistic levels of spending cuts. Use of conservative budget numbers is added insurance against unexpected downturns in economic productivity or unrealized revenue collections. If the assumptions turn out to be too pessimistic, the budget would simply balance earlier than anticipated. Would that not be nice?

The budget agreement is an important bipartisan accomplishment. For the first time in years we have a plan to restore fiscal responsibility to our budget process, return accountability to our political system, and hopefully regain the confidence of the American people.

As someone who campaigned on balancing the budget and has worked with the Blue Dog Coalition in support of a balanced budget, I am very pleased, and encourage my colleagues to vote for this budget resolution.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BOYD], one of several new Members of outstanding experience and ability the Blue Dog Coalition has been fortunate in having.

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

Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to rise with some reservation in support of the budget resolution which we will have an opportunity to vote on tonight. I have those reservations because of frontloading the tax cuts and new spending while backloading the spending cuts. Many of us came here as freshmen with a mandate to put our fiscal house in order, and delay any new spending programs or tax cuts until we can pay for them with something besides borrowed money and increased Federal debt.

My concern as I look at this budget resolution is that we are doing the easy things first, and save the heavy lifting for later. I think it is very evident now that actually the glide path goes the opposite way that many of us would like to see it go. It goes up until the year 2001, and then falls off significantly to come into balance by the year 2002.

I think most of us recognize that that is the case because we have had some very good years here, and particularly this year, and our deficit is lower than it was expected to be. But nevertheless, that gave us a wonderful opportunity to move this glide path quickly into balance, and then we could begin our tax cuts and our new programs after we put our fiscal house in order.

But that has not happened. I think it has not happened because many of us are realists, and we realize to get something that would work that we have to have some compromise. So maybe that is the reason some of us support it, with reservations, is because there has been some compromise, so that we have something we can pass off the floor of the Congress.

A group of us, in recognizing that we did not get everything we wanted, just took the budget that we agreed upon, that we could compromise and support, and said, let us put some enforcement mechanisms in it. Therefore, I find tonight that the major problem I have is the lack of any enforcement language in the resolution.

Yesterday in the Committee on Rules I joined several of my colleagues in supporting a budget resolution that is exactly the same as the one reported out of the Committee on the Budget, with one important addition. It contains strong enforcement language that would ensure we meet our deficit targets every year.

Unfortunately, this alternative was not ruled in order. This troubles me greatly, because of the assumptions included in this agreement. The only reason we are standing here today is because the CBO found $225 billion in assumptions which allowed the negotiators the room to satisfy everyone's needs and concerns. If these assumptions turn out to be inaccurate, what measures are included in this budget resolution to make sure we actually reach balance by the year 2002? The answer is there are none.

While I was not here in 1990, Congress and the President reached a very similar historic budget agreement that would balance the budget in 5 years. Yet we are here today, again, with another balanced budget proposal. Why? Because the 1990 agreement did not have enforcement mechanisms for entitlement programs or revenue.

My fear is that we will reach 2000, the year 2000, and we will be nowhere near the glide path that is outlined in this agreement. This budget resolution has no enforcement mechanism to correct this problem. Not only will this result in larger budget deficits than projected, it will also mean another broken promise to the American people.

So Mr. Chairman, that is why I urge Members, even though we can all support this budget agreement, that we need to have strong enforcement language and work with the coalition to make sure that that language is present in the budget reconciliation.

☐ 2000

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP].

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

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I want to open with some kudos to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH]. There is always one warrior that is out there with faith when there is little hope; and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], our distinguished Committee on the Budget chairman, was that individual. He stayed with this and persevered months and even years to bring us to this point.

What is this about? It is about the average American wanting Washington, D.C. to balance its checkbook the way they have to balance their checkbooks or be penalized the way they are penalized. But as with many other things in this city, potentially the devil is in the details.

I am going to vote for this budget resolution, but I share the concerns of the coalition Blue Dog Democrats about potentially the details of this agreement. They are called enforcement provisions. They are simply the teeth in the agreement, when we finish this work weeks from now, that allows us to follow through on the commitments that we make today and tomorrow. Back home on the Tennessee River we have a lock at the Chickamauga dam in Chattanooga. As the water rises before boats pass through that dam, there is a floating mechanism on the lock itself and, as the water rises, the lock rises and it floats up and down.

That would be the enforcement provisions. To give Members an analogy of an agreement such as this, so that if the assumptions, the projections, the revenues that we are basing this long-range forecast on hold up, we are okay. But it would actually be a floating provision.

We heard earlier today that there is a $26 billion savings from spectrum sales. Frankly, I think that is overstated. If in fact the spectrum sales do not generate 26 billion, where are those dollars going to come from in order to keep us on the glide path to a balanced Federal budget? Well, the enforcement provisions would be details as to exactly what would give or have to give in the agreement in order for the deficit not to rise. That is what we are here in a bipartisan way to support today, is the basic provisions that allows this agreement to succeed over time, not just today, not just this summer but 2 years from now, 4 years from now, 5 years from now.

Some Republicans want to make sure that tax cuts are not given up, and we understand that. The Democrats have heartburn every time we talk about capping entitlements, but the fact is this agreement has to have the flexibility based on revenue projections and the economy to have this float built in. You cannot have your cake and eat it, too, unless you are willing to have the discipline to exercise every day. Then maybe you can have your cake and eat it, too. So we are going to have our cake and eat it, too, but we need enforcement provision, which is that daily regimen of exercise necessary to burn those calories if you want to have your cake and eat it, too.

Mr. Chairman, this is good for America. It is a good agreement if we make sure between now and the end of June we put enforcement provisions in the agreement.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. JOHN], another member of the Blue Dog coalition.

Mr. JOHN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. I want to say a few words about why we are here today.

Only twice in the last 40 years, just twice, in 1960, the year I was born, and in 1969, have we balanced our budget. I believe that today we stand here on the brink of a new millennium but also the brink of a very historic moment for the United States Congress and the people of America.

Forty years ago, which was 1957, was a long time. Through those 40 years, we have accrued over $5 trillion of debt. Therein lies the problem. It is not the balanced budget as much as it is the debt. How do we address the debt? We stop adding to it. That is as simple as I can put it.

We spend $241 billion to pay our interest on our debt; 15 percent of our budget, 15 percent of our budget we spend paying interest on the debt because of fiscal irresponsibility in the past.

That is more than our whole Medicare budget, more than our whole Medicaid budget, almost as much as our national defense budget. It is a lot of money. But we stand here today, and I want to commend the ranking member, the gentleman from South Carolina. And I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], chairman of the Committee on the Budget, for working very hard in times that were somewhat and sometimes very difficult.

But we, along with a lot of other Members, came up here, elected in November of 1996, with a very clear message. I believe the American people want us to stop fighting and start getting down to business. I think the American people sent us here to work in a bipartisan way to do one thing that I heard over and over and over again: Balance our budget. Do it for our kids. Do it for our grandkids.

I believe it is incumbent on this Congress, the 105th, to do that. It is not a perfect resolution to the problem. There are some Republican victories with some tax cuts, a lot of which I embrace. There are some Democratic victories, 5 million more kids with health insurance. It extends the solvency to 2007 of the Medicare trust fund. It corrects some unfair backlashes about the welfare reform program that was passed last year. But it balances the budget in 5 years. I think that is the most significant piece of legislation. I believe that this Congress will not face any more important issue in this Congress. I urge Members to support the bipartisan agreement and support this balanced budget that brings it to balance in the year 2002.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TURNER], a member of the coalition and another new Member of this body.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I have been a strong supporter of a bipartisan budget agreement. I am among those on both sides of the aisle who believe that the Federal Government must start living within its means, just as every household in this country must do every month. Republicans and Democrats have joined together to make a commitment to balancing the budget, and we are determined to finish the job. We have come a long way in the last few weeks, and that is what makes it so important that we follow through and finish the job that we have started.

Reaching an agreement is only the first step. Enforcing the agreement, making it stick, is the real challenge we face.

I join tonight with Members on both sides of the aisle who believe that we must work to ensure that necessary enforcement provisions are enacted into law to ensure the promise of a balanced budget. If everything goes well, we will have a balanced budget by 2002, but Murphy's law says that, if something can go wrong, it will go wrong. And that is certainly true with the budget process. Reality has a way of confounding our expectations. And this Congress does not have the ability to repeal Murphy's law.

And if the guesses that we have made and assumptions we have made in this budget agreement turn out to be incorrect, the consequences for the budget will be dramatic. Even small variations in economic growth projections could derail our efforts to balance the budget.

As an example, consider the fact that we assume a 7-percent growth rate for Medicaid costs. Just a few years ago those costs were escalating at 14 percent, twice the rate that we have assumed. If the ratings go up again, we could end up with billions of dollars in additional expenditures. The budget agreement as it stands has no way of dealing with this kind of unexpected circumstance.

We are relying on predictions about what the economy will do in the next 5 years. But we all know a lot can happen in 5 years. We will have a different President, a different Congress and we will be dealing with problems in a new century.

History shows us that we need an insurance policy and we are proposing some commonsense steps that will give us that insurance policy so that if our assumptions and our projections are wrong, we can still arrive at a balanced budget in 2002. The American people are overwhelmingly in support of a bipartisan budget agreement, but they are skeptical about our ability to follow through. They have heard the promise of a balanced budget before, and with public trust and confidence in government at an all-time low, we cannot afford to fail. We must show the American people that we can come together and adopt a realistic, enforceable budget that will bring us to balance in 2002. We must not just promise; we must produce.

America has much at stake in what we do here. Our ability to preserve the American dream for all our children depends on our ability to balance the budget in an enforceable way.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY].

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to reiterate my commitment to balancing the budget of this country and to announce my reserved support for the resolution.

I support the resolution because I wish to move the budget process along, but I also feel compelled to enumerate a serious concern I have regarding the pending resolution. The targets outlined today should be enforceable and they are not. Why should they be enforceable? Let us look at the historical record.

Under the 1982 budget resolution shown on the chart to my right we were told that the budget would be balanced in 1984. The green lines are targets. The red lines are the truth. The budget was not balanced. In 1985, under Gramm–Rudman 1, we were told that the budget would be balanced in 1991. It was not.

In 1987, under Gramm–Rudman 2, we were told that the budget would be balanced in 1993, and it was not. In 1990, under the Budget Enforcement Act, we were told that finally the budget would be balanced in 1994, and, again, all of those green targets show a balanced budget. All of the red lines show the historical record.

Today the last lines I will draw attention to would be the 1997 deal that does not even give the pretext that in the immediate future the deficit will go down. The red line shows the March CBO baseline.

What do all of these budgets have in common? None contain enforcement mechanisms and never was the budget balanced. That is why earlier this year I introduced the budget enforcement act of 1997, which was cosponsored by my colleagues, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], and the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLEY]. That is why I joined with 59 of my colleagues in sending a bipartisan letter to the Committee on the Budget requesting that tough enforcement language similar to that contained in the balanced budget enforcement act be included in tonight's resolution.

When the Committee on the Budget did not include comprehensive enforcement language, an effort was made in the Committee on Rules to give the entire House the opportunity to approve or reject enforcement procedures as part of the budget resolution approved by the committee. Unfortunately, the Committee on Rules rebuffed this request.

This is a serious flaw and one reason why I and other supporters of the conservative coalition budget will work hard to overcome the experience of history and keep the pressure on all parties involved to make sure that the targets set today are finally met tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to reaffirm my support for a balanced budget.

Since coming to the Congress in 1985, I have been committed to balancing the Federal budget for the future of our children and our children's children. That is why I am an original cosponsor and strong supporter of the Blue Dog Coalition budget. The coalition's budget sets a benchmark for balancing the Federal budget in a manner that is both a fair and responsible.

First, the coalition budget sets a smooth and steady glidepath to a balanced budget. It reduces the deficit by a roughly equal amount each year for the next 5 years, achieving 38 percent of its deficit reduction in the first 3 years. One of the reasons that the coalition budget contains such a steady glidepath is because it postpones tax cuts until we complete the tough work of balancing the budget. I do not oppose tax cuts, but I do believe that our first priority should be to put our fiscal house in order. By delaying tax cuts, the coalition budget is able to avoid adding billions to the Federal debt and will save additional billions by not paying interest on that debt.

Because it resists the temptation to grant expensive tax cuts before the budget is balanced, the coalition budget is able to address many of the long-term financial problems faced by entitlement programs. The coalition budget plan makes important structural reforms to Medicare and Medicaid, and extends the life of the Social Security to the year 2043. The coalition budget deals with these issues so effectively that it balances the budget without relying on the Social Security trust fund surplus by the year 2005, and would not rely on any trust fund surplus by 2007.

The lessons of previous budget resolutions, is that reaching an agreement to balance the budget does not guarantee that the budget will actually be balanced. We need only look to the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings experiences of the past decade to be reminded how easily a balanced budget agreement can fall off track. The coalition budget addresses this reality by including strong enforcement provisions based on legislation that I have introduced along with our colleagues Representatives STENHOLM, MINGE, and DOOLEY. This bill, the Balanced Budget Enforcement Act, H.R. 898, would reform the budget process by locking in deficit reduction through hard deficit targets, which would be enforced by across-the-board sequestration if the targets are not met. Without meaningful enforcement mechanisms like this one, we run the risk of passing a budget resolution that amounts to nothing more than Gramm-Rudman III.

In many ways, the coalition budget represents the perfect world.

Unfortunately, we don't live in a perfect world, and as such, I have reached a point where I am willing to put the ideals of the coalition budget aside and support a bill that will get us to a balanced budget despite its flaws.

First and foremost, I am concerned that the tax cuts contained in the committee-approved budget resolution will sabotage our efforts to achieve a balanced budget by 2002 and keep it balanced thereafter. We have repeatedly been assured that the tax cuts in this bill have been structured in such a way that they will not prevent us from balancing the budget by 2002. Despite these assurances, there is overwhelming evidence to suggest that the cost of many of these tax cuts will rise substantially after 2002, when they are fully phased in. For instance, the Joint Committee on Taxation has estimated that, in the 5 years after 2002, the tax cuts outlined in this bill will cost an additional $165 billion, almost twice as much as in the preceding 5 years. It would be a cruel hoax on the American people if we enact tax cuts this year, only to have these same cuts cause the deficit to explode again after 2002.

I am also concerned that the specific nature of the tax cuts contained in the resolution will benefit the wealthiest in our society, while those who really need tax relief will be left out in the cold. Clearly, if we are going to enact tax relief this year, we should do so in a way so that the cuts we approve are targeted to people on Main Street, not Wall Street.

I am also disappointed that this budget does not follow a steady glidepath to balance. While the coalition budget reduced the deficit smoothly from 1998 to 2002, the committee-approved budget resolution actually causes the deficit to increase in the first several years before from an estimated $67 billion in fiscal year 1997 to $90 billion in fiscal year 1998, where it will hold nearly steady until the painful cuts kick in and the deficit falls to $53 billion in the year 2001, eventually achieving a $1 billion surplus in the year 2002. In fact, more than two-thirds of the deficit reduction occurs in the final 2 years of the plan. This is an approach that was tested—and failed—in the early 1980's under President Ronald Reagan. When it came time to make the difficult cuts, they did not materialize, and the deficit skyrocketed. One has to wonder how much money could be saved in interest on the Federal debt if we began chipping away at the deficit earlier, rather than later, in the process.

Concerns about the exploding nature of the tax cuts makes enforcement of this budget resolution even more important. That's why on May 13, I joined 59 of our House colleagues in sending a bipartisan letter to Budget Committee Chairman KASICH and ranking member SPRATT, requesting that tough enforcement language, similar to that contained in the Balanced Budget Enforcement Act, be included in the budget resolution. When the Budget Committee did not include comprehensive enforcement language, an effort was made in the Rules Committee to give the entire House the opportunity to approve or reject enforcement procedures as part of the budget resolution approved by the committee. Unfortunately, the Rules Committee rebuffed this request, and the House will not have the opportunity to vote on a resolution that contains strict enforcement mechanisms.

Finally, I am concerned that the budget resolution before us puts off many of the difficult decisions on entitlement programs. As we all know, many of these programs, which primarily serve the elderly, disabled, and children, will be in serious financial jeopardy when the baby boomers start retiring in the next 10 years. While this budget resolution extends the life of the Medicare part A trust fund by 10 years, it shies away from tackling the long-term problems faced by Medicare and other entitlement programs.

In closing, I believe that balancing the budget is our moral responsibility as Members of Congress. I have always supported a balanced budget, and the responsibility to achieve this goal is not one that I take lightly. For the first time in more than a generation, we have a realistic chance to pass a budget that will actually achieve balance in 5 years. Although I would much prefer to see an enforceable budget resolution, where the deficit decreases every year and tax cuts don't threaten to undo our efforts after 2002, the time has come to put the future of our children and grandchildren first by voting for this balanced budget resolution.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], very fine chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, let me make it perfectly clear that there is, in fact, tough enforcement in this balanced budget agreement. We continue to have spending caps. If the discretionary spending, the programs that run the Federal Government, would exceed the caps we set, there would be automatic cuts across the board.

☐ 2015

Second, no new programs can be created unless they are, in fact, paid for by reducing other government programs. Now, I think that is very good enforcement.

Furthermore, we will have additional hearings throughout this year to see if there are other mechanisms, an additional budget process reform that we think will help the process. But no one should be confused. If in fact spending goes above the ceilings that we have set, there will be automatic across-the-board cuts. No new programs can be created unless they are paid for by cutting other governmental programs.

Let me make clear my position. I am not in favor of raising taxes. I am not in favor of allowing the tax cuts we have in any way to be repealed, triggered in, triggered on. I am for permanent tax cuts for the American people.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas, [Ms. GRANGER].

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, today we will consider a number of proposals to balance the budget by 2002. We will debate these proposals, but I think we should step back just for a minute and consider the historic importance of this day.

Today is historic because for the first time in a generation, the leaders of Congress and the President are both committed to a specific plan to balance the budget.

We are fond of saying that the Federal budget was balanced in the year Neil Armstrong walked on the moon. I happen to remember it differently. 1969 was the year my first child was born. Two days ago, I watched proudly as that young man walked down the aisle to receive his doctor of jurisprudence. My oldest son has not seen a balanced budget since the year he was born. My twins, my son and daughter, have never seen a balanced budget in their lifetimes.

My children do not remember a balanced budget, so they do not know how good it will be for them, and they are not alone. Millions of Americans have forgotten how important a balanced budget will be to their lives, so I want to remind them of the importance of a balanced budget to all Americans.

I have had different jobs in my life and my positions have taught me why this opportunity to finally produce a balanced budget is so important. I was a mayor, and I learned that local communities need more power and less mandates from Washington. I gave up the job as mayor to come to Washington, to produce a balanced budget and to return power and money and decisions back to families and to local communities.

As a small business owner, I know that jobs and opportunities can only be created with a growing economy. By forcing the government to balance its books, a balanced budget will yield more than 4 million new jobs over 10 years and raise incomes by 16 percent.

And this balanced budget includes a capital gains tax cut to unleash a rising tide of new jobs and higher incomes and raised hopes. The capital gains tax reduction in this balanced budget will make the American dream come true for some who missed it the first time.

I was also a public school teacher, and I learned there is nothing more important than education. By eliminating the deficit, a balanced budget will lower the cost of a typical student loan by nearly $9,000 and college education will be more affordable to young men and women like the ones in this room today.

Most importantly, the job that convinced me that a balanced budget is so very critical, the most important job I ever had, was as the mother of three children. By reforming entitlements and providing a per-child tax credit, this balanced budget will make sure that America looks toward the future.

For 26 years, the lifetime of my children, politicians have promised a balanced budget, but the red ink has continued to rise and we have raised taxes again and again. Today we replace false hopes with an historic vote to balance the budget. I urge my colleagues to join in supporting a balanced budget today. It is simply the right thing to do for America.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine, Mr. [BALDACCI].

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

We have an opportunity before us, Mr. Chairman, to achieve the first balanced budget in a generation. We would not have been at this point if it had not been for the President's 1993 economic plan, which reduced the deficit by 77 percent, from $290 billion in 1992 to a projected $67 billion this year.

As a result of the fiscal discipline imposed by that 5-year economic plan, we have achieved the highest economic growth in a decade, the lowest unemployment in 24 years, and the lowest inflation in 30 years. We have created 12 million new jobs. Had that plan not been in place, it would have been much more difficult and painful to balance the budget. We simply would not have had the same options available to us today.

Mr. Chairman, there is little doubt in my mind that every one of us in this Chamber could point to elements in this budget that we would find distasteful. Each of us would have written it differently, but compromise requires give and take. We have to reach common ground and gain the support needed to pass such an ambitious plan. Each of us has to agree to give up some things in order to reach our goal of balancing the Federal budget and getting our fiscal House in order.

I am very pleased that the agreement balances the budget in a way which is consistent with our values. It maintains the fundamental commitments to our parents, to working families and to children. It ensures that the budget is not balanced on the backs of those who can least afford it.

With a robust economy and declining deficits, we have the best opportunity in years to balance the budget. We must strike while the iron is hot. Passage of this budget resolution is an important first step towards restoring fiscal sanity to our government.

I urge my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, to support this resolution, and look forward to working with them to implement the plan that is being laid out before us today.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Saxton] has 4¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE] has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time to talk about a couple of aspects of this budget which I think are extremely important.

One of the things that we try to do to encourage economic growth is to encourage what we refer to as capital formation. In other words, we encourage Americans to save and invest. One of the ways to do that is to reduce the burden imposed by the capital gains tax.

Now, there are a couple of ways to do that. Obviously, we congratulate the chairman of the Committee on the Budget for his foresight in proposing to reduce the rate of taxation on capital gains. But there is another reason. That reason is that capital gains today can accurately be referred to as a tax on inflation.

Let me explain. This chart depicts capital gains realizations from investments that may have been purchased in 1955 all the way through 1994. The red and green lines together represent the entire amount upon which capital gains is paid. The green lines represent that part of the gain that is due strictly to inflation. That is why we need to index capital gains taxes.

In other words, if we paid taxes, capital gains taxes, on that part represented by the red bars, we can see how much less of a saver's and an investor's money would be taken away from them than if we do not index capital gains. It seems quite ludicrous to me to try to encourage young people, middle class people, investors to invest in those assets which will increase in value, upon which they will have to pay capital gains, if we tax inflation. So I commend the chairman for his foresight in bringing about that change or proposing to bring about that change.

Let me also talk about deficit reduction and economic growth. Let me point out quickly that between fiscal years 1992 and 1997 the deficit has fallen by a wonderful $290 billion, I mean it is wonderful that it fell that much, to an estimated amount of less than $70 billion in the upcoming year. Part of these savings are the result of spending restraint by the Congress in 1995 and 1996, for which Congress should be commended, but by far, by far, the most important factor is the cyclical business expansion that began in 1991.

That expansion continues today and shows no signs of slowing down. Unemployment is now below 5 percent. That is great, and I think that we should learn from what we have begun in terms of encouraging economic growth. The lesson to be learned here is that when the economy is healthy and people are working, the government naturally takes in more revenue and it makes our budgeteers' job just that much easier. Indeed, a strong economic growth represents the most pain-free path to a balanced budget. This fact alone should serve as a reminder that it is our number one deficit reduction tool that we have to make use of.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to urge my colleagues to keep in mind the role the economy plays in deficit reduction. The job of balancing the budget is made immensely easier when we have economic growth.

The issues that we have talked about today, a recognition of the role of the Fed, a recognition that tax policy tends to increase or decrease economic growth, a recognition that when government expands to a size of more than 17 percent of GDP, and a recognition of the role of taxes and the tax on inflation imposed in our current system's capital gains, are all issues that have an important part to play in deficit reduction and in economic growth.

So I will close, Mr. Chairman, by commending the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. KASICH], and the other members of the Committee on the Budget and the negotiators who took part in these negotiations with the administration for the very fine document they have brought us, and I look forward to taking part in further discussions relative to these measures as we implement them in the appropriations process.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to allocate time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

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

I find it very interesting that the previous speaker has referred to the tax on inflation, and I think that is an important point, but I just hope that as the Committee on Ways and Means considers the problems of inflation and investment, they also recognize that those of us that simply put our money in the bank also experience a tax on inflation because the interest rates have to reflect the inflation in this economy. I think that we should treat those of us that put our money in the bank or in savings in a parallel way to those that put money into equity investments.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. BISHOP], who is also a member of the Blue Dog Coalition.

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

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

I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 84, the balanced budget resolution for 1998. This is an historic agreement which reflects a spirit of bipartisanship and a spirit of cooperation.

Today, we have an opportunity to pass a resolution which strikes a workable balance between keeping the budget balanced and sustaining and investing in our most essential domestic and defense priorities.

This bill attempts to balance the budget in a way that is fiscally sound and fair. It represents a commonsense approach, a middle ground that all sides should be able to support. Once we enact this agreement, we can begin the implementation of a balanced budget plan that will put money back into the pockets of working Americans.

Like all of my colleagues, I am committed to providing a higher better quality of life for my constituents. This means supporting policies for stimulating job growth, a stronger, a more diversified economy, a better educated population, safe and secure communities that are free from crime and drugs, a clean environment, affordable health care, and a strong national defense, but all within the context of a balanced budget. The resolution up for consideration today establishes a good framework for achieving these goals.

I want to commend both parties for their diligent work in crafting an agreement which moves toward eliminating deficits, expands health care coverage for our most vulnerable citizens, keeps Medicaid and Medicare solvent while preserving essential care, intensifies our efforts to protect the environment, provides persons with the necessary tools to move from welfare to work, gives a boost to education and provides equitable tax relief, including capital gains and inheritance tax reductions, for the American people and it preserves a strong defense, which has already been cut enough.

□ 2030

I doubt if anyone regards this bill as perfect. With a measure this far-reaching, there is no way to reach perfection. From everyone's point of view, there are provisions in the bill that I do not like and have fought against all along, including those to increase the retirement share made by civil service workers and that assume that cost-of-living adjustments for veterans compensation will be rounded down to the nearest whole dollar. I do not like these.

Our veterans and our civil service workers are carrying their share of the budget reduction burden already and will continue to try to change provisions such as these. Additionally, I will work with my coalition colleagues for enforcement measures to ensure that the deficit indeed remains on the glide path to balance in the next 5 years. It is extremely important that we do this so that we can reach our deficit targets each year.

But on balance, Mr. Speaker, this agreement may be our last best hope to finally achieve a balanced budget and save our country from an economic calamity, which is sure to occur if budget deficits and the national debt continue to run amuck. Our choice is clear, our mandate strong. Pass this resolution.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MCINTYRE], a new Member of this institution and a member of the Blue Dog Coalition.

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

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Chairman, just as each of us expect to balance the budget of our own personal checkbooks or our family's checkbooks or our small business's checkbooks, we should never expect any less from the Federal Government.

When I ran for this office, it was because of that very concern for our working families and our small business owners. We realize that in States like mine, in North Carolina, we are required to balance the budget and we meet that mandate every year. We should expect no less of our own national government. This is a chance for us to give working families an opportunity to see that we are stewards of their trust, that our government is accountable for every penny it takes in and every penny it puts out.

An old proverb once says that the longest journey begins with the single step. Although this is not perfect, it is a way to take that first step to make our government move towards the balanced budget responsibility that it should have.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to inquire of the Chair as to how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota has 12 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to close by just recognizing some of the positive and problematic situations that we face. As we have an opportunity here to eliminate the deficit, I think it is important to remember that we are enjoying prosperity in our Nation, relative prosperity, because we know that economic cycles come and go and that we are going to face a downturn at some point in the future.

It is prudent for us to plan for that and not to assume that the full employment and the good, strong economic growth that we have today is going to survive indefinitely. Therefore, I think it behooves us to practice fiscal responsibility now and to put money aside, if at all possible, for the rainy day.

I think, at the same time, it is important to know that we are talking about the difference quite often between the debt and the deficit. Yet, the American people quite often are confused. They think when we say we are going to eliminate the deficit it means we are going to eliminate that $20,000 per capita debt. That could not be further from the truth. The debt will still be there, $20,000 for each man, woman, and child in this country, interest running at the rate of close to $250 billion a year.

Those of us in the Blue Dog coalition have supported tax cuts. We think tax cuts are important. We think new programs are important. But on the other hand, we think that our first and most immediate responsibility is to eliminate this deficit. And, therefore, we have stood for the proposition that let us work for and plan for tax cuts, but that is the dessert, that is the reward that we should achieve after we have accomplished this heavy lifting of balancing the budget.

I would also like to emphasize and reemphasize that we have looked for and hoped for strong enforcement mechanisms in our budget resolution and in the reconciliation bills. That is extremely important to us. We must, as the reconciliation bills are drafted, include in them the caps, the pay-go provisions, the sequestration and other provisions that are so necessary to safeguard what we have worked long and hard for in this body this spring.

Mr. Chairman, we appreciate the opportunity to present these views.

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

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

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, from Seattle to Miami, from California to Maine, all across America, our infrastructure is crumbling. Thirty percent of our interstate system needs to be rebuilt; 25 percent of our bridges are structurally deficient. There are 41,000 people killed on our highways every year. And we are told that 30 percent of those deaths are caused by inadequate construction of the highways; and if we can wave a magic wand and correct those highways with investment, we could save up to 12,000 lives a year.

Congestion in our 50 largest cities costs $51 billion a year. Right here we need not look beyond the Nation's Capital and the metropolitan area. The Washington Post recently reported that the Capital Beltway already operates well above capacity, and in sections of it they expect a 43 percent increase in the next 20 years. The Metro chief here in Washington, Richard White, said, and I quote, ''I thought we are two or three years away from a crisis with Metro, but I was wrong. It is closer than that.''

Twenty-four hours after the budget resolution was released, 49 Governors signed a letter and sent it to us saying they were disappointed in the transportation funding and they urged us to increase transportation funding. We have letters from the mayors urging increased funding for transportation, letters from the counties, letters from the building trades unions, from the Teamsters, from the Chambers of Commerce, and from the environmentalists, all saying we need to spend more money in transportation.

In inner-state repair projects alone, we have over 30 projects, each of which costs over a billion dollars apiece. One hundred cities need new transit projects. Amtrak is on its way to bankruptcy. Our airports are clogged. Our air traffic control system is failing. And yet, this should be a positive problem because it represents the vibrant growth of our country.

While we have an increase in population, travel is increasing at three times the rate of our increase in population. In aviation we are moving from 230 million passengers a year to over a billion passengers a year as we moved into the first decade of the next century.

Truck traffic is projected to increase on our highways by 30 percent in the next 7 years. Our global competitors are building for the future. In Japan they are spending $30 billion U.S. in one airport, the Kansai airport. In Shanghai, get this, 17 percent of all the world's construction cranes are in Shanghai. It looks like a city over which pterodactyls are hovering.

In Hong Kong they not only have the most modern container port in the world, but they are building the largest airport in the world at a cost of $22 billion U.S. with 288 ticket counters. Now, that is the kind of infrastructure building that is going on in Asia, where we have fierce competition and can expect even fiercer competition in the next century.

Our needs. Well, we need $16 billion a year more in highways and bridges just to keep up. We need $13 billion to improve transit, $10 billion for airports and aviation. And what does this budget resolution do with regard to transportation? Well, the $33 billion balances in the four transportation trust funds, if this budget resolution is implemented without change, will increase to $65 billion in the next 5 years. Now those are not my numbers. Those are CBO numbers. CBO says we will increase the balances in the transportation trust funds from $33 to $65 billion in the next 5 years.

Beyond that, this budget resolution provides for $125 billion over the 5 years in outlays for transit and highways. They say it is an $8 billion increase over the 5 years. That is not really accurate, because there is $3 billion that is not counted in the baseline on the projects that were in ISTEA. We have to subtract $3 billion, and we are down to a $5 billion increase.

But there is also $2½ billion in budget authority which is not reflected in outlays, so perhaps this is another $2½ billion we have to subtract. And beyond all that, the so-called $8 billion increase, which is more like $1 or $2 billion, is not simply for highways or transit; this is function 400, all the transportation programs. That includes the Coast Guard, rail, pipelines, all the various transportation projects.

We are told that the revenue that is coming into the trust fund is going to be spent. That is not true. CBO has confirmed that it is not true. In fact, my good friend the chairman of the Budget Committee also confirmed that at a Republican conference last week. We are told that, if we really count the general fund spending on transportation, that equals all the revenue coming in. Well, the general fund spending reflects spending in military bases, reflects spending on CDBG grant which have nothing to do with our Federal aid highway system and, most importantly, historically reflects the spending out of the general fund on transit before we set up a transit account within the trust fund.

So, indeed, many of the things that we are hearing are not quite accurate. But beyond that, what does our modest perfecting amendment do? We simply increase outlays over 5 years by $12 billion from $125 to $137 billion. And next year, in the budget resolution, we do not make any reductions to pay for that, but rather, over the 5 years, we have a one-third of 1 percent across-the-board cut on discretionary programs and the tax cuts, about as modest as we can get.

Let me again emphasize, there are no reductions in the fiscal 1998 budget which we are reflecting in this amendment. We adopt the numbers of the Budget Committee, and it is in those outyears. Further, we provide safeguards that transportation trust fund money will be used for intended purposes, and we modify the transportation reserve fund to give priority to the restoration of spending and transportation cut offsets if it turns out that more are available. As we are told, this is so conservative that more funds may well be available. And, indeed, we are also told that this might break the budget deal.

I would respectfully suggest that insults the intelligence of the Members to say that a one-third of 1 percent cut over 5 years is going to break this deal when the bottom line remains the same. What are we, potted plants? Can we not, as Members of Congress, make a very modest adjustment so long as the bottom line numbers stay the same? That is all we are doing here. And indeed, I believe we have every right as duly elected Members of Congress to make such a modest perfecting amendment.

Now is the time for Members to implement their previous votes where they so strongly expressed support for transportation infrastructure.

☐ 2045

Last year, we had a vote to take trust funds off budget. That vote passed by a 2 to 1 margin. Seventy percent of the Republicans in the House voted in favor of it. Sixty-four percent of the Democrats voted in favor of it. A majority of the Republican cardinals on the Committee on Appropriations voted in favor of it. A majority of the Republicans on the Committee on Ways and Means voted in favor of it. Were these serious-minded votes or were they not? Now is the time to address this issue. So far this year, we have 239 cosponsors of taking the trust funds off budget. We passed it out of committee unanimously in early February, but the leadership has blocked us from bringing it to the floor to get an honest up-or-down vote. The moment of truth is here. This later tonight will be the single most important transportation and infrastructure vote we cast not only in this Congress but for the next 6 years, because it will determine the funding that is available for ISTEA.

What does that mean? It means if we pass this modest amendment, we can begin adequate funding for infrastructure, we can address the donor-donee formula problem. We can find funds to begin trade corridors and border infrastructure. We can address transit and clean air needs in urban areas. We can save lives with safer highways and bridges. We can reconstruct the interstate system. We can address the other many high priority needs that have been brought to us. And we can create thousands of good jobs, for every $1 billion spent in transportation means 42,000 jobs.

Tonight is the moment of truth for transportation and infrastructure. Support the Shuster-Oberstar-Petri-Rahall amendment and help build America and save lives.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL], the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee.

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

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, trust. An interesting term, that word. Trust. Webster defines it as an assured reliance on the character, ability, strength or truth of someone or something. That is why we call it the highway trust fund. Not the highway fund, but we call it the highway trust fund. To the American people, we have said, pay your motor fuel taxes. In return, you will receive those funds back in the form of better roads, highways, and bridges. That is a sacred trust that we entered into with the American people 41 years ago when the Congress established the highway trust fund. Yet today we find that that trust has been broken. It lays shattered at our feet.

Over $24 billion in unspent funds has accumulated in the highway trust fund. There is no trust in that. At the same time, 4.3 cents per gallon in Federal motor fuel taxes is not even being deposited into the highway trust fund. There is no trust in that, either. In this budget resolution, this budget resolution will not even allow us to spend the amount of motor fuel tax receipts that are anticipated to be paid into the highway trust fund over the next 5 years.

Crumbs for a crumbling infrastructure. That is all this current budget resolution gives us, is crumbs for a crumbling infrastructure. When it comes to highway spending, many of my colleagues have talked the talk. Almost 240 of our colleagues have cosponsored H.R. 4 to take the transportation trust funds off budget. A vast majority of my colleagues have requests pending before the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for specific highway or transit projects.

Those of my colleagues listening, just think of how many of those requests are pending. My colleagues may have talked the talk, but now it is time to walk the walk, to show what you are made of; to stand up for America, not to sit down on it; to build America, not tear it down; to promote America, not demote America; to expand America, not contract it; to do what is right, what is fair, what keeps faith with the people.

Mr. Chairman, this is a battle for the heart and soul of America. This amendment is not just about asphalt and concrete. It is about safety. It is about saving lives. It is about our economy, about our competitiveness. It is about our jobs. It is about our standard of living. It is about the type of legacy that we will leave to our future generations.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues, it is time to walk the walk. Vote ''yes'' on the Shuster-Oberstar-Petri-Rahall amendment.

I commend the distinguished chairman for this initiative.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM], distinguished chairman of one of our subcommittees.

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

Mr. KIM. Mr. Chairman, I found this brochure today. It is kind of disturbing to me. I rise in strong opposition to the budget resolution because of this. This is deceptive, in my opinion, cleverly devised propaganda which is totally untrue. This says who pays for transportation increases? Then it says, education, $980 million. Now, come on. All we are asking is, do not gut our transportation trust fund. We are not cutting any programs like this.

Every time that American motorists fill up their gasoline tank, they pay 18.3 cents per gallon of gasoline tax. Of that money, almost one-third goes to the deficit reduction program, but the remaining 14 cents is supposed to go to highway programs. It is not. We have not been honest with the American people. The truth is we have not actually used the whole 14 cents for transportation at all. Instead, every year we gut the transportation trust fund money and spend it on other nontransportation programs. I am tired of this.

Even this budget agreement that we are discussing tonight continues that deception. This budget agreement takes $13 billion in gas tax revenue and diverts them to other nontransportation programs, Mr. Chairman. That is $13 billion that we promised to spend on roadways, highways and mass transit. Now we are going to turn around and spend it elsewhere.

At a time when our national infrastructure is deteriorating, this breach of trust is totally unacceptable to us. We should be spending more to maintain and improve our infrastructure, not diverting money to wasteful Government programs. In fact, the recent studies show that the Federal Government should be spending almost $20 billion more a year than it does today to meet the transportation needs of the next decade. Instead, we are dishonest in diverting this $13 billion to other Government programs. Shame on us.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCGOVERN].

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight to express my very, very strong support for the Shuster-Oberstar-Petri-Rahall amendment as a path to ensure that the transportation needs of our Nation are addressed. If we are to compete with the growing economies of the Pacific Rim and Europe, transportation must be America's economic development priority for the 21st century.

This budget as it now stands simply does not meet those needs. This agreement falls woefully short of allowing us to merely maintain our aging highway and transit systems, let alone make greatly needed repairs. Transportation funds in this budget are insufficient. Every Governor in this Nation has emphasized that transportation is a priority and that this additional funding is absolutely critical to meeting America's vast infrastructure needs. This amendment is a sensible bipartisan effort to address this shortfall and increase transportation funding to the minimum acceptable level.

Mr. Chairman, I am strongly committed to balancing the Federal budget, but let us do it in a way that is honest and honors our commitment to the American people and guarantees a strong economy. I ask my colleagues to be bold, to be daring and to invest in our Nation's economic security and our future.

Mr. Chairman, if my colleagues truly believe that transportation is a priority for their States, they have an obligation to support this amendment. I want to thank my chairman for his extraordinary leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following material for the RECORD:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF TRANSPORTATION AND CONSTRUCTION,
Boston, MA, May 19, 1997.

Hon. JAMES P. MCGOVERN,
U.S. House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCGOVERN: As you prepare to cast votes on the balanced budget agreement, I want to express my concern over the agreement's level of funding for transportation and ask you to support the Shuster-Oberstar-Petri-Rahall Amendment which will be offered during debate.

The budget agreement sets transportation levels at $125 billion over the five year period, $13 billion shy of the Highway Trust Funds (HTF) expected receipts. This under investment in our infrastructure would cause the HTF balance to increase to at least $37 billion and our nations infrastructure needs to remain unmet. To accentuate this point, the Federal Highway Administration estimates that it will taken an investment of $16 billion more per year just to maintain the conditions of our highways and bridges.

Furthermore, at this funding level it is likely that the Commonwealth's transportation funding needs would be in peril. For example, a worst case scenario would present us with a 5 year loss of $1.4 billion. Therefore, I ask for your support of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committees bipartisan amendment to increase the funding level by a reasonable $12 billion. This increase, which will not draw on the $24 billion HTF balance or capture the 4.3 cents going to deficit reduction, will help the Committee to reach a balance among its many competing concerns.

I thank you for your consideration. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you should have any questions or need any further information.

Sincerely,

JAMES J. KERASIOTES,
Secretary.

THE NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL,
Boston, MA, May 20, 1997.

Hon. JAMES MCGOVERN,
U.S. House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MCGOVERN: On behalf of the hundreds of businesses and non-profit organizations that comprise The New England Council, I am writing to urge you to support a bipartisan amendment to the Budget Resolution that will increase funding for projects under the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA).

The Budget Agreement reached by the Clinton Administration and Congressional leadership provides inadequate funding levels for surface transportation projects in New England and across the nation. The amendment, offered by the bipartisan leadership of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, seeks to rectify this situation. It mandates increased Highway Trust Fund spending so that outlays for the next five years would rise $12 billion from the $125 billion stipulated by the Budget Agreement.

Strong economic growth depends on viable and advanced highway and transportation systems. Without the significant investment in our transportation infrastructure that the amendment calls for, we are placing the nation and our long-term economic prosperity at risk.

I urge you to support an increase in transportation funding when the House votes on the Budget Resolution. A vote for this increase is a vote for New England's future.

Sincerely,

JAMES T. BRETT,
President and CEO.

HOUSE AMENDMENT IS ''MAKE OR BREAK'' FOR HIGHWAY FUNDING

Transportation leaders in Congress will offer an amendment to the Budget Resolution increasing transportation spending over the next five years, while still achieving a balanced budget by 2002.

Currently in the Budget Resolution, highways and transit would receive $124 billion over the five year period, equating to a $1–2 billion increase for highways per year. This funding level would not even spend the revenue going into the Highway Trust Fund each year, let alone the exisiting $13 billion cash balance in the fund.

The Shuster-Oberstar-Petri—Rahall amendment would increase transportation spending to the amount of revenue deposited in the Highway Trust Fund, $137 billion over five years or $13 billion more than the Budget Resolution currently provides. To offset the increased transportation funding, the amendment would reduce other spending accounts (except entitlement programs) and the tax cut package by 0.44%. That is an across-the-board cut in other government programs (except entitlements) of less than one-half of one percent.

This amendment is extremely important to Massachusetts and our industry.

Balancing the federal budget is very important, but should not be done with taxes paid by highway users that were intended to make highways safer. Inadequate roads and bridges are a factor in traffic accidents that result in over 12,000 highway deaths each year.

If the total pie currently available for highway construction is not increased significantly, Massachusetts may lose a substantial amount of funding when ISTEA is reauthorized later this year. The funding provided in the Budget Resolution is insufficient to take care of the donor-donee problem.

The Highway Trust Fund can support a $26 billion annual highway program through 2002 with current income (no new taxes). The Budget Resolution would only allow for a highway program averaging about $22 billion per year. If held to that low funding level, the cash balance in the HTF will continue to grow until it reaches more than $40 billion in 2002.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I salute the efforts of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the chairman, and the leadership of both sides of the aisle in working with the administration to achieve a balanced budget agreement. It is a good agreement but we can make it better, and that is why I am supporting the bipartisan Shuster-Oberstar-Petri-Rahall substitute.

To put it simply, this substitute restores trust to the highway trust fund, ensuring that revenues into the fund are spent out of the fund to support needed highway transit improvements around the country.

This investment is desperately needed. There is a multibillion dollar backlog of transportation projects across the country, investments that we must make if we are able to compete in the global marketplace. The Shuster substitute boosts funding for transportation and includes offsets to keep the budget on a glide path to balance by 2002. It is fiscally responsible and fulfills our responsibility to invest in our aging infrastructure.

Passage of this substitute will help us to craft an ISTEA reauthorization bill that will resolve the donor versus donee State controversy. If the issue is important to my colleagues, I hope they will join me in supporting the Shuster-Oberstar-Petri-Rahall substitute.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. CLYBURN].

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank our distinguished chairman for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, the highway trust fund is one of the things that we use to endear our relationship with those who are all about making the future for all of our citizenry what it ought to be.

The $12 billion that we are requesting in this amendment is something that we think is fair and it is balanced. We think that if we take a look at the facts, only a one-third of 1 percent reduction in domestic spending and the tax cuts over the next 5 years is a fair way to approach our permanent infrastructure. I think our roads and our bridges are in dire need of repair. We know from every study that has ever been developed that for each $1 billion we spend, we create a 42,000 jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I will support this amendment and I call upon my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Shuster-Oberstar budget amendment. It provides needed transportation funding to repair and rebuild our roads and bridges and to provide funding for public transit, Amtrak, local passenger trains, subways, and buses.

This amendment helps the environment. It provides jobs. It improves safety for motorists and commuters. Fifty-one Governors, Mr. Chairman, have endorsed the Shuster-Oberstar transportation funding amendment. It does not interfere with the balancing of our budget. It does not change any annual deficit targets. It does not make cuts to entitlement programs. It does not draw down highway trust fund balances. It does not spend any of the 4.3 cents of the gas tax. It is the most pro-people bill. We must pass this legislation. It is going to help all of our citizens in every single State. I urge strong support of the Shuster-Oberstar budget amendment.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. BLUMENAUER].

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman, for his courtesies and for his eloquence a moment ago when he explained to America what this measure is about. We are talking about American economic competitiveness. We know that the Japanese are spending trillions of dollars, and we are debating here on the floor whether or not we are going to add $12 billion in order to meet our current priorities. It is a question of whether or not we are going to support our communities in terms of their livability agenda. It is an opportunity for us to think forward when others are looking back. This budget resolution amendment, if passed, will enable us to look forward as opposed to ducking issues that we know if we avoid are going to be worse 10 years from now.

□ 2100

And I find a little incongruous people talking about the cost of this proposal because this is an investment in our future that will provide a half million additional jobs. I am absolutely convinced it will be self-financing, and if we do not, it will be self-destructing.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his courtesy, and I strongly urge the approval of this amendment.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment, and I would like to make it very clear why I support it. The people of America pay a great deal of money in Federal gasoline taxes, and the people of America have every right to expect that this money be spent for transportation purposes. We do not spend anywhere near the amount raised for transportation purposes.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will help adjust that inequity, and I think we should support it, and I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] for his efforts in this area.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PASCRELL].

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] for giving me this time. What my colleagues have proposed and what many have joined them with is not a breach of any kind of any agreement. We will decide the agreement in this House. That is the only agreement that we are concerned about. Forty-nine Governors, 89 senators, 239 Members of this House are on record supporting the transportation spending level proposed in this amendment.

What we have done is not any different than what we did with veterans. We collect fees, and then we put those fees back in the general fund rather than spend them on veterans. What we are doing here is a collection agency, $20 billion that goes back into the general budget rather than being spent on the infrastructure, on economic development in this Nation.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] is right on target. We are going to win this fight tonight. It is an important one for America. It is just as important as our balanced budget.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BOSWELL].

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

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chairman, I am very impressed by the bold leadership that is being taken with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] on this subject. Just stop and think about it, my colleagues. I think about some of the products come out of the Midwest, out of our part of the country, farm products and so on. It has got to travel on a system, and that system is broken down at times when we cannot move grain from Iowa and we have got sales to go to the Ukraine or wherever, and this is unacceptable. We can make many, many examples of that, and a time has come to realize that we are collecting this for the purpose, we have a need, that the needs of the country are at stake. The competition with the Pacific rim and the European Union are real. They are going on, and they are making the investment. We have got to do no less, and I hope that my colleagues are paying attention tonight.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN].

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], which directly addresses the issue of truth and honesty in the transportation budget.

In President Clinton's State of the Union message he talks about building a bridge to the future and to the 21st century. Well, I got news for my colleagues. They cannot build a bridge without money for transportation and infrastructure needs. Thirty percent of American urban highways are congested. This damaged air quality, increased travel time and cost travelers in the largest city more than $43 billion in delays and excess fuel consumption area.

The future of this country is intermodal. Our economy is not based on Florida competing against Georgia or even California. It is a global marketplace, and we are competing with countries like Japan and Germany. These countries have a highly developed transportation and infrastructure system to move goods, people, and service.

Mr. Chairman, I support the President's commitment too, 100 percent. Let us build the bridges to the 21st century and let us make sure everyone can travel it safely.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Mrs. TAUSCHER].

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Shuster-Oberstar amendment. While I am supportive of the budget agreement overall, it is sorely lacking in funding for important transportation needs.

The Shuster-Oberstar amendment will make a modest adjustment to the resolution by adding roughly $12 billion over 5 years for transportation. This amendment does not address the issue of taking the transportation funds off budget, nor does it attempt to recapture the 4.3 cents in gas tax revenue that currently is directed to deficit reduction. Instead, it simply asserts that the money collected by the Highway Trust Fund in the next 5 years will be spent on highway and transit needs.

The Shuster-Oberstar amendment is a good investment for America. The amendment would retain the balanced budget target, but would better provide for our Nation's transportation needs.

I urge my colleagues to improve this budget resolution by adopting the Shuster-Oberstar amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me emphasize just how modest this is. There are several things we would like to have done. We would like to have taken the transportation trust funds off budget. After all, we had a 2-to-1 vote, an enormous victory in this House last year to do just that. This year we have 237 Members, a majority of Republicans I might add, who have cosponsored H.R. 4 to take those transportation trust funds off budget. But we do not do that in this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have been blocked from bringing that to the floor even though that bill passed unanimously out of our committee.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I must say that it insults the intelligence of our Members to somehow suggest that this modest proposal could hurt the deal to take one-third of 1 percent of the overall discretionary spending in taxes, a minuscule amount over 5 years, and indeed to have no reductions, I emphasize no reductions, in the first year, which means we will be back here again with another budget resolution next year, as we are every year, to have no reductions, and to be certain that this is CBO scored so that the bottom line, indeed, is consistent with the overall deal between the White House and the budgeteers, and to somehow suggest that that hurts the deal, Members certainly have every right to express themselves on this modest amendment.

I must also say, Mr. Chairman, I am very much moved by the extraordinary support that we are receiving for this modest perfecting amendment. We thought it was going to be a very uphill battle. Indeed, we felt it was a matter of fighting the battle as a matter of principle even though we recognized that it was, we thought, quite a long shot, and now, as we stand here tonight, as we have received expressions of support from Members in all philosophical positions in this House, Republicans, Democrats, liberals, conservatives, they are reflecting the views of the American people who say we need to build more infrastructure for America, we need to save lives and we need to keep faith with the American people.

There is so much cynicism about Government today, and one of the reasons for that cynicism is when we tell the American people, ''You pay your gasoline tax, you pay your aviation ticket tax; we're going to spend that money to improve transportation,'' and then we do a flimflam on them. We do not spend the money. Instead, we use it to mask the size of the general fund deficit to the extent that, as we stand here today, there are $33 billion of balances in those trust funds, legal obligations of the United States of America, and what is even worse, if we adopt this budget resolution without this perfecting amendment, those balances in those transportation trust funds will rise from $33 billion today to $65 billion in 5 years. It is just wrong.

Forty-nine Governors have sent a letter to us saying to spend more on transportation. When the vote comes tonight, vote in favor of this amendment to build America for the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] has expired.

Under the unanimous consent agreement entered into earlier today, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is with great pride that I rise on behalf of myself, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. THOMPSON] and the entire Congressional Black Caucus, first to thank those who have worked to present this House with a budget and, without spending time to discuss why the negotiated budget deal misses the mark, I would like to discuss another approach, another vision for America embodied in the CBC budget.

The CBC budget alternative that will be offered later on this evening reaches budget balance by the year 2001, Mr. Chairman, not 2002, as the budget deal does. Each year between now and then our deficit is lower than that projected by the so-called budget deal.

This Congressional Black Caucus alternative is a fiscally conservative budget. This budget, scored by CBO, reduces the deficit immediately and smoothly. This budget does not backload savings. The budget does not include tax cuts. This budget does not raise any tax rates, not on individuals, not on businesses. The CBC budget alternative achieves its savings through a balanced combination of military spending reductions, nondefense discretionary spending cuts, reductions in corporate welfare and modest reforms in Medicare and no increased premiums for seniors.

Our budget makes the Medicare trust fund solvent into the future, as does the budget deal. The CBC budget alternative does this while staying within the overall domestic discretionary spending levels agreed to by the budget deal.

This budget accomplishes balance in the following ways: We make $189.9 billion in military budget savings. Our budget presumes in the post-cold War period this country can rationally reduce military spending while protecting military families and investing in economically viable alternatives through economic conversion.

Our budget saves nearly $20 billion in nondefense discretionary spending programs. By reducing Government subsidies to corporations in various parts of the budget the CBC alternative cuts billions in wasteful, unnecessary spending. Our budget closes $195.5 billion in corporate welfare loopholes over 5 years. This represents less than $40 billion in savings from corporate welfare per year. Surely, as this country embarks on its course to produce a balanced budget, multinational and other large corporations can and should pay their fair share.

And finally, we would enact entitlement reform through a $25.5 billion in savings from Medicare. By eliminating waste and abuse from the program, we would not increase premiums or reduce Medicare benefits, but protect the trust fund and Medicare recipients. This is a modest fair approach to budget savings.

Our spending cuts facilitate real increases in other areas of the budget, all the while staying within the budget caps imposed by law and assumed in the budget deal. Our budget invests in programs which empower individuals, enhance community development, and expand economic growth.

Mr. Chairman, our budget works within every budget guideline that exists. It balances the budget on a true glidepath. It achieves balance by 2001, a full year earlier than the budget deal. Through our savings, we invest an additional $99.7 billion in programs for people. We pay for our spending increases, and we prioritize.

This budget is fair, responsible, and balanced.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, let me first compliment the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS], the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, for this leadership in this budget effort, but this evening I rise in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus fiscal year 1998 alternative budget.

□ 2115

It is the only budget that balances a year earlier and shares the burden equally. This alternative budget offers a vision of America for all people, regardless of race, color or creed or economic status. It is our obligation to present a budget which promotes the general welfare and advances the interests of the caring majority of our Nation. The majority of Americans believe that the power and wealth of our country should be utilized for the benefit of all people.

The Congressional Black Caucus views the military and other defense programs funded in a defense function as just one element of the three in a comprehensive national security strategy.

The second leg of the triad is an engaged and effective foreign policy strategy to bring about conditions of regional and international security.

The third leg of that triad includes domestic involvement in education, research and development, community and economic infrastructure, and individual well-being that are so critical to maintaining safe and cohesive communities.

Mr. Chairman, this budget reflects a caring and sharing majority, not one that is business as usual.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes 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, we call this the Congressional Black Caucus budget, but the only thing that we have in common is that our constituents have the same dreams, the same aspirations and the same hopes to participate in this ever-growing economy that we have today. As we take a look at those of us that support it, the President's budget, which had a tax increase in it before, we see that without any Republican support it passed, and we found economic growth except for one group of people, and that is those people that did not have the tools to access, or the education, the jobs or the training to participate in this growth.

Now that we are moving forward into the next century where trade and technology is going to lead, what we have tried to do in our budget is not to stress how much money we need for drug rehabilitation and how much we need for cops and jails, but to concentrate on how we can make the best investment, not just by reducing taxes, but by investing in people, giving our kids a chance to get an education similar to the GI bill so that they can participate, be productive, and have a society where we do not have to have welfare programs, but just decide what jobs are best for certain people that are trained for them.

We want to make certain that the budget is balanced, not as just economists, because we cannot afford to have the interest on the debt really be further than just the interest that we have in our students. We would think that this great Nation would not want to see every State capital investing more in our prisons and in our jails when we have over 1 million people walking around, unproductive, not producing anything; where what we are saying is, put some human investment in our schools and we will find that the youngsters are dreaming about jobs and hopes and not dealing with crime and drugs.

So we clearly have an alternative for those people that have a similar type of community, but even better than that, to make certain that towns like we have in New York where we have detention of children who make mistakes, we pay $84,000 a year to keep a kid in jail, and yet the unions are fighting with the mayors to see whether or not we can spend $7,000 to keep a kid in school.

So it seems to me that even though the President had to pull together a bipartisan popular budget, that a courageous thing for all of us to do is to say that we should start cutting the taxes when we have no deficit, we cut the taxes when we are satisfied that we have made the investments in our teaching institutions so that we can effectively compete with our trading partners.

For those people that may have to vote on more than one, I would suggest to my colleagues that the Congressional Black Caucus budget is one that one would not be politically ashamed.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus budget is a balanced budget. It balances our national priority and it is fair to its people.

Mr. Chairman, if we have policies that truly promote shared sacrifices, there is enough that no one in this affluent country should go hungry. Nutrition programs are essential, and I am pleased to note for my colleagues' consideration that the Congressional Black Caucus does not forget the hungry.

Nutritional programs are essential to the well-being of millions of our citizens who are disadvantaged children, the elderly and the disabled. Nutritional programs in many cases provide the only nutritional food that millions of our Nation's poor receive on a daily basis.

Why then, we may ask, are there those of us who would deny them a chance; a chance to eat, a chance to feed their family? Perhaps it is because we do not see them, we do not know who they are, we have an image of them that in most cases is in error. But who are these people who now face hunger? They are people we do not see and we do not know, so we forget them.

Under the welfare reform bill, called the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1996, able-bodied adults now have a limited time to participate in the food stamp program, and legal immigrants are restricted from participation all together. There are 27 million persons who participate in the food stamp program, but there are only 1.3 million who are able-bodied. That is less than 5 percent.

Who, then, are these able-bodied persons? The popular misconception is that they are young males who are shiftless, who depend on other persons doing their work. They live off the worth of others. Some persons fit that description, but Mr. Chairman, many, many more do not.

According to the Mathematica study, 40 percent of the able-bodied persons are women. As many as 59 percent of the able-bodied adults have a high school education. They are not derelicts, they are not vagabonds. Many of these are responsible persons who have fallen on hard times.

Who are these persons we do not see? Forty-one percent of the able-bodied adults have no income whatsoever, and when they do have income it is as low as $225. Mr. Chairman, we should care about the hungry. This budget responds to that vital goal.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget.

I want to commend the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. THOMPSON] for their leadership in developing this budget.

This substitute firmly supports the fact that the budget can be fairly balanced while responsibly addressing the needs of the American people, especially the needs of our Nation's most vulnerable populations: seniors and children, in the areas of education, health, housing, and human services. The CBC budget fully funds the Head Start Program to help prepare our Nation's children to achieve their highest developmental and academic potential. Over 2 million children would be served. Currently, no more than 40 percent of all eligible 3- to 5-year-olds participate in Head Start.

Our substitute also fully funds section 8 housing to help ensure that needy citizens have a roof over their heads, it fully funds chapter 1 to ensure that children in need of assistance in basic reading and math receive the help they need, and fully funds summer jobs to help prepare our Nation's young people to enter the work force.

The bill protects and improves the health of the poor and the elderly by ensuring funding and Medicaid and Medicare. The $25.5 billion in Medicare savings will begin to ensure the program's solvency. The measure also restores funding for the Nation's health professions training program. These programs are actually essential to help ensure access to health care services for all Americans. For the TRIO programs, the budget provides $625 million to ensure that disadvantaged students not only have the opportunity to attend college, but most important, they graduate.

The bill provides adequate funding for basic quality of life necessities, including meals for the elderly, energy assistance for low-income families, and with respect to AIDS/HIV, the bill addresses the needs of communities across this country by fully funding Ryan White and providing critical funding for AIDS research, outreach, and public education.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support the CBC substitute bill.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan [Ms. KILPATRICK].

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I first want to thank our chairperson, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] for her fine leadership, as well as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. THOMPSON] as our lead budget person for the Congressional Black Caucus.

I rise to support the alternative budget for the Congressional Black Caucus. Unlike the budget deal before us, it takes care of America's children and America's families. The Congressional Black Caucus budget balances it in 2001, just 4 short years from now, a year ahead of projections for the other budget. It has no tax increases and no tax cuts until the budget is balanced.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget makes an investment in our cities and in our families. As was said before, it fully funds the WIC Program, fully funds Head Start, offers assistance for section 8 housing program, and chapter 1 for our children's education. Additionally, it provides for summer jobs for our youth who are most in need in America today.

Infrastructure needs of our public school system. Unfortunately, in this current budget deal before us, there is no money for infrastructure for our schools, for our children's education. Unless we now invest in our children and provide for them the resources that they need to become competent, capable young men and women, America will not be successful as we move to the new millennium. The Congressional Black Caucus budget is the budget before us tonight that meets those needs. We must support it. We must vote for it, and we must take care of our families and children.

As we move forward tonight and we will be here, we have been debating this, much of this, all night long and we will continue, let us not forget the least of these. We, the Members of the Congressional Black Caucus, know that this budget can be balanced and can be balanced in an even approach. It is not necessary to put stress on families who cannot afford it. It is not yet necessary to not invest in our children. This is the richest country in the world, the land of the free, the home of the brave. Let us act like it. Let us support the one budget that has the resources in it, that takes care of America's children.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the first order of business is to thank the chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. THOMPSON] for recognizing that America, albeit diverse, is of one mind, and that is a mind of equality and fairness and opportunity.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget amendment is not an amendment for African-Americans. It is an amendment, however, for Americans. It stands for those who are least able to stand for themselves. Particularly let me say, do any of my colleagues have a grandmother or a mother? Have any of my colleagues ever known a single parent that has worked long and hard to bring about an opportunity for their child? Do any of my colleagues know anything about immigration, coming from the bottom belly of a slave boat, or maybe crossing over the Rio Grande River?

☐ 2130

This particular amendment responds to full funding for Medicaid. It is remembering the history of our elderly, our senior citizens who paved the way for us, and yes, it remembers 10 million uninsured children.

At the same time, the CBC budget looks to the future and provides $5 billion over the 1998 to 2002 period to stimulate new construction and renovation projects in school districts with severe deficiencies in their facilities.

Have Members ever been to a PTA meeting when we have discussed over and over again the leaking roofs, the bathroom that does not work, parents who work every day, and children who are educated in buildings that are crumbling? This budget stands for those children. Can we do any less?

Yes, the 21st century is a century of science. In this budget funds for elementary and secondary math and science programs are included in the CBC budget via full funding for the National Science Foundation.

Do Members know what that means? It makes prekindergarten to grade 12 competitive with the world market in science. It increases literacy in computers. It establishes computer learning centers. These math and science programs accelerate progress toward meeting the national educational goals in science and mathematics.

As I stated before, this is not a budget for one group versus the other. This is a budget for Americans. Join us and stand for those who are least able to stand for themselves, and walk into the 21st century with the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, again, the Congressional Black Caucus budget has demonstrated that we can balance the budget, and we can balance it without pain. Our budget shows how we can cut more corporate welfare and balance the budget without cutting Medicare and Medicaid. We can balance the budget and still increase funding for education.

One of the big problems with this budget is that the deal that was made has taken out some vital parts. One of the parts taken out was the construction initiative that the President proposed for schools. The construction initiative is very important. It is a pivotal kingpin issue with respect to the improvement of education.

We cannot go forward and really improve education unless we have safe places for children to sit, unless we take care of the enormous amount of disrepair that has taken place over the years in our schools. We cannot have telecommunications going forward if we cannot wire the schools properly because they are too old to take the proper wiring. We cannot institute a national curriculum and national tests if we do not provide safe places for children to sit or conducive places for them to study.

None of the education improvements are going to prevail if they do not have a conducive setting in which to operate; construction is very important.

Early in the discussion the Republican majority introduced the controversy of Davis-Bacon with respect to its impact on school construction. That was false, a red herring. The issue was raised to divert attention away from the real issue of the need for construction.

Davis-Bacon is not a problem. Where Davis-Bacon prevails, where prevailing wages are paid, schools are built at a lower cost than in States which do not have a State prevailing wage and where there is no utilization of the prevailing wage of Davis-Bacon.

The Sheet Metal and Air-Conditioning Contractors National Association has sent me a copy of a study that was done. They can prove step-by-step, State by State, that it is cheaper to build schools under the prevailing wage requirements of Davis-Bacon. That is not at issue.

We should go forward with school construction. This is a fight we should not give up, despite the fact that it is not in the present agreement.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the budget agreement has over a 5-year period 135 billion dollars' worth of tax cuts. Eighty-five percent of those tax cuts go to the 5 percent of the richest people in America. How can we give $135 billion in tax cuts when there are children who cannot read; when there are children who are going to school hungry and we are not fully funding the WIC Program; when there are people sleeping on the street and we are not putting any money into the housing programs; when there are children who cannot read when they enter the first, second, third, fourth grade, and we are cutting the Title I reading program; when unemployment is rampant in our communities, in some places 17, 18, 19 percent unemployment in our communities, and we are cutting the summer jobs program?

How can we give tax cuts to the richest people in America when the schools are falling down around our students in our public schools? Yet, it is the Congressional Black Caucus budget which is the only budget that addresses all of these needs. This is the budget that has its priorities in order.

It should be the priorities of America. Yet, the agreement says let us cut taxes while our children go hungry. Let us cut taxes while our children cannot read. Let us cut taxes while people sleep on the street.

We can be a better America. Support the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes 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 thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me, and for her leadership, and the other Members, including the gentleman from Mississippi, for his leadership in preparing this budget.

Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of budgets on the floor today. What budgets do is reflect the Nation's priorities. I rise in support of the Black Caucus budget because I think it can best be described as an opportunity budget.

A lot of people want to talk about more spending and this and that, and we have lower taxes. The issue is how we visualize America. We visualize it as a country of opportunity. We want to make sure that that opportunity becomes a reality as reflected in this budget.

First, I like this budget because it talks about empowerment zones and enterprise communities. We do not have an urban policy in America. We do not have a rural policy in America. We do not have a policy to address the problems of poverty in America. We talk about it a lot, but we do very little.

This budget provides $100 million for a second round of empowerment zones in enterprise communities. It will enable us to provide tax credits to encourage investments into both poor urban communities and poor rural communities, and other communities around the country in between that have pockets of poverty. I think that is very important.

This is an opportunity budget because it talks about education. It provides funds for school construction. One-third of the schools in this country are in need of repair. This budget will provide educational opportunity by providing a basis upon which those schools can be repaired.

We look across our country and we see our young people falling through the cracks. This budget addresses that problem by expanding opportunities in Head Start, a fundamental program that gives every child, regardless of its origins, a good start in life. I like the budget because it provides opportunities for young people.

Summer youth employment programs, this budget also provides funds of over $2 billion for summer youth programs. We talk about what has happened with our teenagers, we talk about juvenile crime. The real solution is providing jobs. An important component of that is summer jobs. This budget enables us to do it.

Finally in terms of opportunity, it provides educational opportunity by helping young people attend college. I think that is a good thing. I think it reflects America's values. I support the Black Caucus budget.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY].

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Waters-Thompson amendment, which is a real alternative budget that promises to restore some balance to our society while balancing the Federal budget in the year 2001. The CBC budget alternative cuts $187.5 billion in corporate welfare. It cuts $25 billion from Medicare, ensuring that Part A remains solvent, with no cut in services to beneficiaries.

The budget cuts $189 billion from defense over the next 4 years and ensures that the U.S. defense policies reflect the changes in the international arena that have occurred since the end of the cold war. This budget cuts another $28 billion from domestic programs while fully funding basic human needs programs.

Mr. Chairman, the budget alternative offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. THOMPSON] fulfills our society's moral obligation to provide a safety net to meet basic human needs. This budget alternative fully funds Head Start. The CBC budget alternative fully funds the WIC Program. It fully funds section 8 housing programs. It fully funds Chapter I education, and it fully funds the summer jobs for youth program. It also eliminates the 3-month COLA delay for Federal civil service retirees. This budget alternative funds these critical programs and stays within discretionary spending caps.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to consider the needs of the poor and to consider the needs of the elderly, veterans, and working families. The Congressional Black Caucus budget makes no tax cuts until the Federal budget is balanced. This budget distributes budget cuts in a compassionate and fair manner. Unlike the so-called deal, the CBC budget does not seek a balanced budget on the backs of our Nation's neediest families.

I urge my colleagues to support this budget.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from California, Ms. MAXINE WATERS, the chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus, and my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. BENNIE THOMPSON, for bringing this budget before us.

The CBC budget, Mr. Chairman, is the right budget. It is the budget to prepare us as we enter the 21st century. It is the budget that will look out for the needs of all of our people, that segment of the population that has been left out and left behind.

This budget is a fair budget. It provides education for our children. It takes care of our seniors. It protects the environment. This budget says over and over again that all of our people have a right to know what is in the water we drink, what is in the food we eat, and what is in the air we breathe.

I urge all Members to vote to support the CBC budget because we have a mission, a mandate, and a moral obligation to help our people help themselves.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FATTAH].

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the bold and brilliant leadership of the chairwoman of the CBC, and my colleague from the great State of Mississippi, for offering to this Congress an opportunity to proceed along a rational budget process, a process in which those who are deficit hawks can have deficit reduction and a balance 1 year ahead of all other alternatives.

For those of us interested in investment and opportunity, we can have more schools and better education, rather than more jails and more social problems. This is a budget that puts before the Congress some very clear decisions in terms of what our priorities ought to be.

Let us not just have a balanced budget that is fiscally balanced. Let us have one that is also morally correct, and faces the real tough issues that we have to face as a country.

I would offer to my colleagues that they seriously consider and cast a vote, not just to whisper quietly their support for the CBC alternative, but stand up and cast a vote on behalf of what is a reasonable fiscal policy for our country, in keeping with American priorities and with the promise of the next century that we should govern our votes by this evening.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD].

☐ 2145

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding me the time. I say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that this Congressional Black Caucus budget, Mr. Chairman, is a humane budget. It is a budget that recognizes our priorities. It is a budget that invests in our future. It is a budget that invests in our children, for America has laid claim to the 20th century like no other Nation in the world.

One of the reasons we are able to do that is because of our commitment in our people and our resources in human capital. I say, Mr. Chairman, this budget does that and much more. This Congress, Democrats and Republicans, ought to show that by supporting this chairwoman and this caucus.

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

I am so proud of the members of the Congressional Black Caucus, who have worked very hard to put together a budget that answers the concerns of the people of this country. Our CBC alternative budget is the budget deal the American people would negotiate. This is the real budget deal. Our budget not only balances finances, it balances values. I believe this is the budget that would win a vote of the American people. The CBC alternative budget will be presented in detail later on this evening.

We have taken part in this part of the debate in order to introduce the vision, in order to talk about what is possible, in order to help the American people understand that we do not have to posture, we do not have to pretend, we do not have to put our hand in the wind and figure out which way the wind is blowing, that we can, indeed, fashion a budget that deals with the concerns of the American people in a real way. This budget that I am so proud of is a budget that would protect the elderly, reach out to the children, embrace the families, and it would do it without cutting taxes or increasing taxes.

We could not have a more sensible, a budget that is put together any better than this one. Again, Mr. Chairman, we will present the details of this budget later on this evening, but I am pleased and proud that the Congressional Black Caucus was able to share this vision in this portion of the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] has 30 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] has 22¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] has the right to close the debate.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, first of all let me say how much I admire the gentleman from South Carolina and the work that he has done on this budget. While I think he has done yeoman's work in terms of some of the values that I know that he and the Democratic Party have pledged to, I think that it falls, this budget agreement falls far short of the standards that I believe are part and parcel of standing up for the needs of working people and the poor, the senior citizens of this country, the necessary investments that we have in our children and in education and health care and transportation and research and development and economic development.

I had proposed an alternative budget which will come up later this evening. Under the Kennedy balanced budget proposal, we will have investments of $100 billion more than the budget agreement in health, education, transportation, research and development and economic development. We continue to provide $60 billion in targeted tax cuts for the middle class and for small businesses. We will provide $32 billion, exactly the amount necessary to meet the needs of the 10 million currently uninsured children.

We will maintain the kind of commitment to the Medicare fund and put $18 billion more into the Medicare fund than the coalition and the President's budget calls for. We will completely fund the Medicaid without any cuts to that program whatsoever. We will fund Pell grants by $1000 a year increases. We will have full funding for the new school construction plan which also includes $9 billion for the critical Federal education programs and an additional $15 billion for ISTEA, $3 billion more than the Shuster amendment coming up later today calls for. Included in this proposal would be the elimination of the cuts in the VA loan programs and 100 percent fulfillment of our promise to our veterans.

I would just like to state that I believe that it is fundamentally important for this country for our party, for Members on both sides of the aisle to stand up for the needs of working Americans. We do not need to have a budget that lines the pockets of the wealthiest people in this country. We need to have a budget that comes into balance. I have called for a balanced budget. I have voted for a balanced budget amendment. This budget brings us into balance but maintains our investments in the critical areas of economic growth that I think will protect the American people's interests and create the kind of long-term economic development that is critical to the future of this country. I urge support for the Kennedy balanced budget resolution later this evening.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the budget resolution, but I do so with disappointment that the President and Congress have not offered a vision for this country beyond balancing the budget. Our country is faced with great challenges, but there is no evidence that this resolution aspires to setting new direction for our Nation. Balancing the budget is an important priority and this budget represents our best hope for a balanced budget. I will vote for it, but we must begin a bigger debate about our future.

In order for me to continue to support this budget, the legislation to carry it out must meet several vital conditions:

One, tax cuts must benefit the middle class not just the wealthiest Americans. Too many parents are struggling to provide for their families, raise their children and send them to college. The President's HOPE scholarships and education tax cuts are a critical part of investing our economic future. And if capital gains tax cuts, which benefits the rich, are made retroactive, then tax cuts for the middle class should be too.

Second, tax cuts cannot explode in the outyears.

As much as we all want to pay lower taxes, we must not give away breaks that we cannot afford. It is irresponsible to enact tax cuts whose costs balloon in 6 or 10 years. I will oppose any tax package which does that.

Third, the budget must invest in children and in education and in our future. Whether it is educating future leaders or providing health coverage for children, building economic infrastructure, protecting our environment, domestic spending is an important investment in our Nation's future. If our budget projections are wrong and less money comes in than we anticipate, cuts should not be made solely in education, health and economic development. Tax cuts must also be reduced to help keep the budget on line to balance if our projections fall short.

Under Democratic leadership, we have made important strides toward balancing the budget while protecting vital priorities. We must continue our vigilance to ensure that our hard-won progress is not undermined as we move through the budget process.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROTHMAN].

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, for too long Congress has been our national example of promises made and promises broken. But today's vote is a promise kept.

As a freshman, the people of New Jersey's Ninth District sent me here to work on a bipartisan basis to balance the budget, but not at the expense of our children or the environment.

I support this budget because it delivers on the very promises I made when I ran for Congress. There are aspects of the plan which I think need more work, but this is a good first step that will put our Nation on the road to fiscal responsibility.

From helping preschoolers in Head Start to providing Pell grants to needy college students, this budget agreement invests in education. It expands health coverage to 5 million uninsured American children. It strengthens environmental protection, and it preserves the Medicare trust fund for at least another decade.

Mr. Chairman, that is why I am proud to cast my vote in favor of this balanced budget agreement, a budget with a vision, a budget that offers a promise for a better America, a stronger America for all Americans.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I urge this body to vote for the budget agreement as worked out between the leaders of our parties and the President of our country.

The alternative to this budget agreement is not the ideal from the Democrats' perspective nor the ideal from the Republicans' perspective. The alternative is to go on fighting, to go on fighting every single appropriation bill, every single tax measure, to reach no resolution, to have the President veto many of them, to struggle over whether or not they will be overridden, and with every showdown will come the threat of another shutdown. That is not what we want, and I know it is not what the country wants.

The Republicans wanted $220 billion of tax cuts over 5 years. What they got was $135 billion, half of that, and $35 billion of that amount has to go in to education tax credits and deductions, which was a Democratic priority.

The Democrats wanted a lot more money for nondefense domestic discretionary spending. They did not get it, but they got $189 billion more than was included in the Republican budget resolution of last year. That is a substantial increase.

Politics has got to be the art of compromise. Neither of us is going to get everything we want. But what the country wants is us to start working together in their interest. They want the Democrats to realize that it is not our money but their money over which we have stewardship. And they want the Republicans to understand that there is a responsible role for government in our lives, that government should be maintained, but that we should ensure that it is held accountable to be as efficient and as effective as possible.

This budget accomplishes those objectives. I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman from Virginia, I would like to align myself with his comments.

I think some of us have different philosophies of what should be included in the fine points of this agreement. Just think for a minute where we were 3 years ago.

Three years ago we had half of this Chamber saying that it is reasonable to borrow more money for ''investment spending.'' It is reasonable to increase taxes to assure Government services.

What has happened in the last 3 years is we have totally reframed the debate here in Washington, DC. Almost everybody now is saying, yes, it is reasonable to stop borrowing, to stop spending the money that our kids and our grandkids have not even earned yet. It was only 2 years and four months ago that the President sent us a budget that had a $200 billion deficit, not only for the next year but as far into the future as we could see.

I think we all need to remind ourselves what our real goals are—not reelection, not popularity, but what is going to be good for the working men and women and the families of America.

But I think when some start suggesting that the tax increase of 1993 is the reason the deficit has gone down, it is misleading the American people and it is going against most economic philosophy. In spite of that tax increase that deters economic expansion, the businesses of this country have forged ahead and, anticipating the Republican effort to balance the budget have driven ahead to expand economic activity and, ultimately, to expand the revenues coming into this country.

Just for a moment look at this chart. The blue line represents increased revenues from an expanding economy. The red line represents spending outlays. It is obvious we have not been as frugal as we should have been in cutting down on spending and cutting down on waste in the Federal Government. The blue line is inflation. So, Mr. Chairman, let us rejoice in this step forward of this budget resolution, in doing what is good for the American working family.

☐ 2200

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this budget resolution and I want to commend the gentleman from South Carolina, [Mr. SPRATT], for his strong leadership on our side of the aisle for bipartisanship.

In Shakespeare there is a very interesting and intriguing exchange between Glendower and Hotspur. Glendower says, and braggingly so, ''I can call spirits from the vastly deep.'' And Hotspur replies, ''Well, so can I, and so can any man, but will those spirits come when you call for them?''

The American people have been calling for a similar spirit, a spirit of bipartisanship to balance the budget with fair values and with priorities on our families and our children.

That is the historic agreement that we achieve tonight with this balanced budget. We will borrow $906 billion less under this agreement and balance by the year 2002. That is important. We will create a brand new health care initiative for our children. Five million children that are not covered today will be covered under this agreement. That is important. We have brand new initiatives for children in education, and we will spend more on education than at any time since the Great Society in the 1960's. That is important. We will get more for Pell grants for college students than ever before. That is important.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to say this is not ultimate perfection, but it is definitely progress, progress for our children, progress for deficit reduction, progress for the right values and the right priorities for this country at this critical time.

Let us now move forward to begin to define where we go in the future and, hopefully, it will be on a brand new initiative for children between zero and 6, it will be to work even harder for Pell grants, and it will be to help our middle class families. I thank the body for the bipartisan cooperation here tonight on this historic agreement.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his hard work on this budget. I rise in support of this budget. It is not a perfect budget, but I do believe we need to pass a balanced budget to stimulate economic growth in America.

This is not a perfect budget. The Black Caucus makes what I consider to be better investments. I am disappointed we were not able to provide money in this budget for school construction, and I think the tax cuts go too much to the wealthiest in America. But we cannot let the perfect be the enemy of the good and there are many good things in this budget: $35 billion in tuition tax credits, and tax deductions to help working families send their kids to college is a very good thing. Increasing Pell grants by $300 for over 300,000 additional young people is a very good thing. Coverage for 5 million uninsured children who do not have health insurance now is a very good thing. Improvements in last year's welfare reform bill to take care of some of the problems of our immigrant population is a good thing.

This is not a perfect budget, it is a compromise. And as I say, neither side is completely happy. Maybe that means it is a good deal. I support the compromise budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington, Mr. ADAM SMITH.

Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I too rise in support of the budget resolution before us today. While there are many reasons that I support it, there are two that stand out; it represents fiscal responsibility and bipartisan cooperation.

The two things my constituents told me that they wanted during the course of my above campaign were anything else bipartisan cooperation and fiscal responsibility. They feel both of those things are desperately needed back here in Congress. I feel this resolution is the first step toward delivering on those requests and strongly support it.

Now, it is not perfect and I do not think any one person in this body would have drafted it exactly as it came out, but that is the nature of compromise. Compromise does not mean we get the other side to do what we want; compromise means we find middle ground we can all live with in order to make progress on difficult issues.

As strongly as I support this budget resolution for its fiscal responsibility and bipartisan cooperation, it is but the first step. There is more work to be done by this Congress and by future Congresses if we are going to maintain the fiscal responsibility we need to balance the budget. I urge my colleagues' support.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATKINS].

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

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, first I want to thank the leadership on the majority side, the Republican side, and also I want to express my thanks to the Democrats, the minority, for working out a bipartisan budget.

I want to express to my colleagues in my 15 years this is the best budget that I have seen based on credible economic assumptions. It is the best budget in order to balance the budget. That is No. 1, and something we have to address quickly.

But second, it is the best budget for economic growth as we enter the 21st century and a globally competitive world to build a future for our children and grandchildren. We must not be overtaxed or overregulated to compete in a global economy.

When I say based on sound economic assumptions, I want to address this to my colleagues on the majority side. This budget, by far, is better than Reaganomics. It is a lot better. It is based on sound economic assumptions. The budget David Stockman put together in 1980–81 was based on erroneous figures. He confessed to that in the Atlantic Monthly of December 1981.

Let me give my colleagues some figures. In 1981, under Reaganomics, the GDP was at 1.1 percent growth at the time. They projected the GDP in 5 years to be 5.2 percent. It could not be done. Ours is based on a budget of conservative 2.1 percent. Right now it is 5.4 percent. We can see that we have conservative figures. They are credible figures.

The same way when we look at inflation. The budget in 1981 was at 11.1 percent inflation. They said it would go down to 4.7. This budget is based on 2.7 percent, and right now inflation is approximately 2 percent. That means a great deal as to whether we have a credible budget that is going to withstand the test of time to have a truly balanced budget.

The same thing with unemployment today at 4.9 percent. The unemployment is estimated at 6 percent in the outyears, a sound and credible figure. The interest rates, with this balanced budget, will go down which will stimulate stronger overall economic growth. We will see the economic growth that this country must have if our children and grandchildren will have jobs in the United States.

We saw a chart a second ago where it illustrates that economic growth is the reason we have the money to leave a balanced budget. I request and ask of my various colleagues on both sides of the aisle to let us have a budget passed tonight that will give us the economic growth to allow our children the opportunity to compete in a global competitive economy. I thank my colleagues for listening, and their support for the budget committee bill to balance the budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 90 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, this budget agreement has potential for much good. It also has the potential for considerable ill.

In the decades of the 1990s, we started on the path toward fiscal responsibility after a decade of fiscal recklessness. This resolution has the promise of moving us ahead further, but whether it fulfills that promise will depend mostly on its implementation, much of which will occur within the Committee on Ways and Means, on which I sit.

Our committee will take the first crack as to whether the tax package is fiscally responsible or will blow the budget, thereby threatening continued economic growth; whether the tax package will be aimed at those who stood still or slipped back these last two decades, or at those who have stood on the top rungs of the economic ladder; whether action now is a stepping stone toward still more difficult decisions or an excuse for long-term inaction.

I will be especially vigilant from the outset about the implementation of the budget agreement. How it is written will determine my vote on the ultimate product, the reconciliation bill.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to congratulate all those who worked on this budget agreement. Having said that, I do not think this is an agreement that people ought to feel puffy about. I think it is a maintenance budget.

Four years ago we confronted ballooning deficits of some $300 billion. We had some tough choices to make and we made those choices without one single Republican supporting the budget reduction bill of 1993.

Some of my colleagues across the aisle said our plan would lead to economic ruin. Well, 4 years later let us look at the results. The deficit dropped in 1993, it dropped in 1994, it dropped in 1995 and it dropped in 1996. And for the fifth year in a row we have declining deficits, something that has not happened in 50 years, and American families are reaping the benefits.

Unemployment is down, inflation is down, American businesses are buying new equipment and companies are boosting their inventories and this year's deficit will be the lowest in 20 years. So the bottom line is we had a balanced budget program and we adopted it in 1993 and it worked.

The question is can we maintain it? I maintain that the real deficit problem that we have in this country today is the trade deficit, and it is getting worse and worse, and we will have that debate in the coming months.

But 4 years ago Democrats came to this well and cast what for many of us was the toughest votes of our careers. Four years ago the Democrats did the heavy lifting to balance the budget. Today we are called upon to cast another budget vote, and for many of us this is also a difficult decision. In the end, each of us must search our own conscience and make a judgment about what is best for our constituents and our country.

There are different blueprints we could choose today to balance the budget. The budget agreement is not my first choice. The proposal of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] does a better job investing in education. The proposal of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] does a better job cutting corporate welfare and all the other things that I think it encompasses in terms of progressively moving this country forward, and I will vote for both of them. But I also will vote for this budget agreement. I believe it is an important step to reaffirm the commitment that we made in 1993 to balance the budget.

The details in this budget are still unclear. It is still just an outline, and whatever the House decides today, the debate has just begun. In the weeks ahead we will be asking some tough questions. Will this budget really eliminate the deficit or will it undermine, even erase all the gains we have made these past 4 years? Will this budget target tax breaks to America's working families or will it turn into another giveaway for the wealthiest that sends the deficit soaring again? Will this budget provide educational opportunities for our children or will it shortchange their future?

I am not just talking about opportunities for the wealthy and the college bound, I am talking about opportunities for the poor, for the working folks of this country, for the middle class children who need that 13th and 14th year of education for higher pay and higher job skills.

Will this budget really provide our children with health insurance or will it become yet another vague promise that is never fulfilled?

I will vote for the balanced budget agreement today, and I am prepared to fight in the weeks and months to come on these important questions of tax policies helping working families in dealing with the questions of education that are so important to investing in America's future.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, today Congress is considering an historic plan that will balance the budget in 5 years. This is the final milestone in our effort to balance the budget since the deficit grew at such an explosive rate during the 1980's. I feel it only proper to consider historically why and how we got here.

Economists will argue the finer points of the economic policies of the 1980's, like the supply-side tax cut imposed at the outset of the Reagan administration, but the facts speak for themselves. In 1979, the deficit was only $40 billion. In 1982, the first Reagan fiscal year, it was $128 billion. And it finally reached an astounding $290 billion in 1992.

In 1993, Congress and the new President Clinton embarked on an ambitious plan to cut the deficit.

☐ 2215

Then and now, this President has had the discipline to bring focus back to where it should be, setting priorities about where these precious taxpayer dollars should be going. I believe we need to first and foremost raise the educational level of our citizens so we have a reliable work force and a strong economic base. In addition, we must maintain and expand access to adequate health care, nutrition, and housing, and, of course, protect Medicare and Social Security for future generations.

The 1993 Democratic plan brought the deficit from $290 billion down to just $65 billion. No Republicans voted for the Clinton deficit reduction plan. Not a single Republican was willing to support the measure that has brought us to this day. Their empty partisan rhetoric that almost crushed this effort rings in the ears of those of us who have been committed to reducing the deficit and balancing the budget for years. The prominent Republicans predicted that the plan would lead to ''higher deficits, a higher national debt, deficits running $350 billion a year'' and that ''this plan will destroy more than one million jobs over the next several years.''

But what is the reality today? The economy is strong. The stock market has attained record levels. Home ownership is the highest in 15 years. And the combined rates of unemployment, inflation, and mortgage interest are lower compared to any time since the early 1960's. Twelve million jobs have been created. And most important, real family wages are finally on the rise. And by the way, the deficit is at a 20-year low.

We said we were going to reduce the deficit, and we did it. We kept our word, and the economy has responded. It makes me so proud to vote for this budget resolution after voting for the deficit reduction that made this day possible back in 1993. Others will take credit for bringing us this day, but most will not deserve it.

Those who worked tirelessly to defeat the 1993 Democratic budget plan will today vote for a balanced budget and claim victory. Those of us who courageously voted for the Clinton budget plan can vote for this balanced budget armed with the full knowledge that we laid the groundwork to make it possible.

So I urge my Democratic colleagues to vote yes to finish the job Democrats started 4 years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] has 11¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] has 13¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Connecticut has the right to close.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH].

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Chairman, I also want to add my voice of congratulations to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] and particularly the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], my chairman of the House Budget Committee.

We hear lots of talk and rhetoric and numbers here tonight. I am sure the American public at home is looking at their TV saying, what is going on there? I would just like to direct my minute and a half here to one aspect of this bipartisan budget agreement, which is tax relief, because I become frustrated when I hear all the rhetoric about tax relief.

The American public is familiar with the numbers, $135 billion in gross tax relief and $85 billion in net tax relief. But what is included in that $85 billion, Mr. Chairman? Tax relief for families, for working families, families with children, incentives for savings and investment, cutting capital gains, not for the rich but for farmers, for small business people, the people that work in this country, the producers in this country, the people who pay the penalty for the disincentives in our Tax Code and who create the jobs and who are about economic growth, incentives for economic growth like capital gains tax relief and the education costs, as other speakers have discussed.

Mr. Chairman, this budget agreement is not perfect. If I were king, it would not look the way it does. But when it comes to taxes, it represents a significant step in the right direction. It is a significant step toward an opportunity society, which we all believe in. It is a significant step away from class warfare, which I hope everybody is real tired of hearing about. It is a significant step away from penalizing the producers and successful people in this country who really do create the jobs and take the risks in this private economy. And it is a significant step toward our goal of, really, honest to God, we mean it this time, even in Washington, DC, even on Capitol Hill, of ending the era of big government. It is not perfect, but it is not bad, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to vote for a balanced budget amendment tonight, but I cannot do it in all good conscience should the Shuster substitute pass. I suppose in speaking for a balanced budget, on the one hand, and against the Shuster substitute, I could bring to the attention of this body how it cuts into education, those young people that are the hope of the future, how it cuts into the fight against crime, how it cuts veterans and those people who are now reaching the age where they need veterans' help in hospitals, and how it cuts into agriculture, which is the very heart of the district that I represent. Mr. Chairman, it cuts drastically into the national security of our country; $5.65 billion. That is over a billion dollars a year; that is the equivalent of 50,000 troops cut per year.

So, Mr. Chairman, I speak on the subject this evening that has been avoided in this debate, and that is of national security and of that lone soldier who is out there standing on top of the hill in Bosnia because his Commander in Chief sent him there. We want to encourage him. We want to keep him trained. We want to take care of his family. And when he returns, we do not want him to have to go back on additional unnecessary deployments because of the lack of fellow soldiers.

Cutting into national defense is cutting into the basic insurance policy of America. We cannot allow that to happen. We must think of where we are in this world. We are the superpower in this world. If we are to have diplomacy that is to be credible, we must have it backed by strong national defense. We cannot allow ourselves to become a second-rate military. If we become a second-rate military, we become a second-rate power.

This is a step in the wrong direction should the Shuster substitute pass. Should it pass, I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote against the bill because we would not then have a balanced, balanced budget amendment.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] and members of the committee, I was here in 1981 when we took arguably the most fiscally irresponsible act that I have seen us take in 17 years of service in this body. As a result of that act, it inevitably led to high deficits, high unemployment in the short term, and escalating deficits up until 1993.

Happily, I was here in 1993 as well, and I had the opportunity to vote for a budget that began what we will continue tonight, and that is the uninterrupted reduction of the budget deficit and the energizing of the American economy.

Others have said it on this floor tonight; yes, we are proud, we are proud because we stood, 218 of us, Democrats all, and said it is time to have the courage to move to reduce this deficit that is strangling America and is threatening the next generation. Two hundred eighteen Democrats.

Some of those Democrats are not here today. Majorie Margolies-Mezvinski, she paid the price of her seat in this House because she had the courage to say, I believe this is good for America. How many of my colleagues stood on this floor and said, if this budget passes, high unemployment, inflation, depression will occur? How wrong my colleagues were. How glad I know that my colleagues are that they were wrong.

But the fact of the matter is, today I stand for this budget offered by that same President, who, in 1993, had the courage to stand up and say, let us address the real problems with real solutions. He has done so again. Yes, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the chairman; yes, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. JOHN SPRATT]; yes, those of us who vote for this budget; but it is the President's leadership that has brought us to a day and night when we will vote for a balanced budget not just in fiscal terms. It is easy to do that, but it is not enough, because it must also be balanced in terms of the investment in our children, in our families, in health care, in basic biomedical research, and all of the things that make us a healthy, wealthy, great, and just Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise for this budget. And like my colleague who spoke before me, I will be disappointed if we adopt the Shuster alternative, which cuts across the board without thinking of what is a priority and what is not. I am for transportation funding, but I am not for simply funding one objective by cutting all the rest, irrespective of their importance. I hope all my colleagues will join me in supporting this budget agreement.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. HOOLEY].

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the budget resolution today. Although not a perfect plan, and we have heard that many times before, the heart of this agreement is in the right place. Balancing the budget without making massive cuts to Medicare or Medicaid is a good thing. Crossing party lines and working together is a good thing. Providing $35 billion in education tax relief is a good thing. And that is what this agreement is all about.

I agree with my colleagues who have expressed concerns about some of the tax cut packages. But what is the appropriate response to that concern? I think we should embrace this budget framework with cautious optimism, work with our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure that the tax bills provide relief for the people who really need it, support tuition tax deductions for working families, and target estate tax relief for family farmers and small business owners. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this budget agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] has 13¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] has 7¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CAPPS].

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

□ 2230

Mr. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, others have spoken about voting in 1990 and in 1993. This is the first time that I have had an opportunity to vote for the budget resolution. On balance, I am going to vote for it. As others have said, I do not think it is a perfect bill by any means, but I think it is a victory for fiscal responsibility. It offers sensible tax relief. It increases our commitment to education, to health and environmental protection. What I like about the provision is that it provides tax cut provisions to help families, small businesses and farmers throughout the country. It provides the strongest Federal support for education in 30 years. It provides health insurance for half of our Nation's 10 million uninsured children. It increases financial security for VA hospitals. It restores benefits for disabled legal immigrants, callously cut off during welfare reform.

There are parts of the resolution I do not agree with. The amount of savings in Medicare could harm hospitals and affect the quality of health care that our seniors receive. But on balance, Mr. Chairman, I am for this, and I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ].

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, the last 2 years have been too partisan, too antagonistic and too disrespectful of diverse views and problems. Too often ideological perfection has been the enemy of the general good. But the budget resolution is a step toward the general good. It has transcended bipartisan bickering and found grounds where rational individuals can agree. I am mindful that this budget agreement was built on the tough decisions that were made in 1993 by Democrats alone. Many of our former colleagues paid a high price in 1994 to get us on the right track that has led us to today's agreement.

There are plenty of things in the agreement with which I do not agree, but it represents a balanced budget without the dismemberment of vital Federal programs. In education we expand Pell grants. In protecting the environment we double the pace of Superfund cleanups. In health care we help manage diabetes and detect breast and colon cancer earlier. We strengthen Medicare and Medicaid. We move people from welfare to work and begin to treat legal residents fairly. We enable every willing and able 18-year-old to go to college. An additional 5 million children will have medical insurance. For the first time in a generation, there is a balanced budget while investing in our people and giving families in America tax relief. We have balanced the budget not only on the numbers but on our principles. We will do this only if we proceed in true faith to the agreement brought to us today. Theodore Roosevelt said, ''If we are to be a really great people, we must strive to play a great part in the world. We cannot avoid meeting great issues. All that we can determine is whether we shall meet them well or ill.''

This budget agreement is well met and deserves our support.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we will shortly have before us for a vote the so-called Shuster-Oberstar substitute. I would like to take just a minute to explain to everyone in the House exactly what the consequences of that amendment would be.

Starting in 1999, if that were to become the will of the House, if that substitute were to carry, it would cut discretionary spending government wide on a pro rata basis and reduce the tax cuts to increase transportation funding by $19 billion in budget authority, $12 billion in outlays. The reduction to defense would be $5.65 billion according to the best estimation of the Committee on the Budget, and $5.8 billion would come out of nondefense discretionary spending, across the board.

Of the $12 billion increase in transportation spending, 94 percent would be offset by decreased discretionary spending, 6 percent would be offset by reduced tax cuts. What would be the consequences? The first consequence would be that this agreement, hard wrought, negotiated over 3 months, would be severely undercut.

Second, the offset to pay the $12 billion would require, as I said, across-the-board reductions, so these carefully allocated cuts, these programs that have been protected as priorities, Head Start, for example, would be cut along with everything else. The good, the bad, the indifferent, everything would be cut. These would not be just skims across the top. These would be deep, disruptive programmatic reductions in programs that are important to the people of this country. Transportation is, too, but I think it should be borne in mind by the Members of the House that the current budget agreement does a lot for transportation. Under this agreement, we have provided an additional $8.5 billion in outlays above the CBO scoring of the President's budget, $8.5 billion in additional outlays for the Nation's transportation infrastructure. Under the agreement, this budget agreement, the fiscal year 1998 obligation for highways would be $22.2 billion. That is 6 percent over the fiscal year 1997 level of $20.9 billion provided for already in this agreement without the Shuster substitute. House Concurrent Resolution 84 provides sufficient funding over the 5-year period, in fact, so that the spending from the trust funds will be consistent with the so-called Chafee-Bond proposal. In other words, it will permit obligations out of the highway trust fund roughly equal to the receipts that will be deposited within the trust fund from gasoline taxes over the next 5 years.

The budget resolution, the base bill, assumes total transportation outlays of $40.9 billion. That is not small change. That is a significant commitment to transportation infrastructure. In 1998 alone, $40.9 billion for total transportation, and $206.1 billion over 5 years. That means that discretionary outlays provided for in this House Concurrent Resolution 84 are $8.8 billion above a freeze over the next 5 years, $8.2 billion above the President's request, and in terms of budget authority, $20 billion over the President's request for the next 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members who, like me, would like to see more money spent on transportation, particularly in their own districts, in their own jurisdictions, to look carefully at the costs that will be exacted by this particular substitute. The budget resolution provides the mechanism whereby if we can identify discretely offsets in the future, there is a separate account created herein, in this budget resolution, which will allow for increased spending on transportation. But to do it with across-the-board cuts, to eviscerate defense, $5.65 billion, to cut another $5.5 billion out of nondefense discretionary, is not the way to go.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the budget resolution before us tonight. It has been interesting listening to the debate for the past several hours, because some of the arguments from the other side of the aisle are really making a defining definition of the difference between what we believe in a budget resolution and budget resolutions that have been proposed by the Democrats in the past. The key part of it is taxes.

Many Members on the other side of the aisle have risen to support this particular budget but they are upset with the fact that we are going to cut taxes. We have an $85 billion net tax cut over 5 years. We are talking about $9 trillion of spending. We are not talking about giant tax cuts. Most of it is going to help the working Americans in this country.

Another thing I keep hearing from the other side of the aisle is we are proud of raising taxes in 1993. We are proud of raising taxes in 1990. I think the American people are tired of paying taxes. They are paying too much in taxes already. It is not that they are taxed too little. The problem is we spend too much. The key to our particular budget is the fact that we are controlling spending. We started it in the last Congress and we are continuing it in this Congress.

Let me go back to what this tax cut is about. There are $85 billion in net tax cuts. First of all there is a $500 per child tax cut for working Americans. Then we are talking about $35 billion in education tax cuts, helping families with kids go to college or higher education. That is helping the working Americans. Capital gains, we are going to make money on capital gains. The past 2 times we have cut capital gains in this country, we got more money flowing into the Federal Government than we did for cutting the taxes. That is a moneymaker for us. And then death taxes, who likes the idea of death taxes? We should dramatically increase the exemption for death taxes. That is what we are talking about, making the IRAs more available for more Americans, helping families take care of their kids. This is good for America. It is the right way to balance a budget by reducing taxes and controlling spending.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. I thank the gentleman on the Committee on the Budget for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the budget resolution in front of us. It captures an agreement that is truly historic in nature. It leads us to a balanced budget. It does so with the give-and-take that has occurred between both political parties and a mutual resolution that this is a reasonable deal to get to the balanced budget and preserve the priorities that we feel are critical to this country. Because I favor this resolution and feel so strongly about the give-and-take in the agreement that brought us here, I must speak against the Shuster-Oberstar amendment that would break up this deal on the floor before the resolution can even be adopted.

There are a number of reasons to oppose the Shuster amendment and none of them terribly easy. Obviously transportation and infrastructure is critical. But there are many, many critical priorities captured in this budget agreement. Mr. Chairman, a deal is a deal, and this deal represents a compromise that has been painstakingly cobbled over weeks and weeks; terribly difficult decisions reflecting in my view a balanced outcome leading us to this balanced budget.

Let us take a look at some of the tradeoffs, because one of the things about the Shuster amendment is you just focus on one thing. You do not really focus on what you have to give up if the Shuster amendment should be adopted. Right off the top, a $5.4 billion hit to defense. The Secretary of Defense announced just yesterday he wants two additional base closure rounds to try and fit within the budget he is trying to live with. This would take an additional $5.4 billion out of defense. Also, $5.8 billion in nondefense discretionary, cutting programs like education, like housing, like our support to the efforts to fight crime. A deal is a deal. Support the resolution. Do not unravel the deal on the floor tonight by supporting the Shuster amendment.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. POSHARD].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 84, not because it represents a perfect agreement but because it is a bipartisan solution to what I consider the greatest problem facing our Nation. We simply cannot continue to postpone the difficult choices inherent in this process. When I came to Congress 8 years ago, I made balancing the Federal budget my highest priority. During the last 4 years, we have made tremendous progress toward this goal. We have reduced the deficit by over 60 percent, finally turning rhetoric into action, and giving the American people a glimpse of a brighter fiscal future. Given the acrimonious tone in the budget debate of the last 2 years, I am not prepared to reject what I feel is a workable compromise. In the past, I have endorsed the concept of balancing the budget first and developing a plan for tax cuts second. I wish this budget would have reflected more of those priorities.

☐ 2245

At the same time, however, if we fail to capitalize on this long awaited opportunity, the burden we place on our children will continue to grow, and the future economic health of the Nation will be threatened. There is no secret to the fact that the choices before us are not easy ones to make, but that is why we are here. While I hope we will work together to soften the impact on our neediest citizens, I am ready to take this important yet difficult step.

There is certainly positive aspects of this budget: increased access to health care for uninsured children, education spending that will allow a new generation of students to attend college and an extension of supplemental security income for many disabled legal immigrants. Most importantly, this agreement erects a significant milestone on our political landscape. It moves beyond gridlock and the fear of compromise and seeks to solve a problem that is desperate for resolution.

It is not perfect, but the time for excuses is past. It is time to honor our promise to balance the budget of this Nation.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY].

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, the problem that I have with this budget is its total lack of optimism. The deficit has been reduced from $300 billion down to $60 billion over the last 4 years, and it is going to continue to be reduced whether we do anything on the floor tonight or not.

In fact, today Alan Greenspan in his decision not to increase interest rates has reflected the reality that our economy is growing at an over 4-percent rate of growth with negligible inflation. There is a very high probability, in other words, my colleagues, that the budget is already balanced this year, 1997, not the year 2002; that the final $60 billion, in other words, is going to be found this year before the end of the fiscal year.

So I just wish that we all reflected that more optimistic view of America. The American people have done it. They are working hard. They are producing the revenues. We should not be engaging in this root canal politics of cutting valuable programs so that we can hand over tax breaks to those who do not need them, thereby spurring interest rate increases which are sure to follow by the Fed.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, could we be informed of how much time each side has remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] has 6¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] is prepared to close, I would yield him some additional time. I yield the gentleman 2¾ minutes.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized then for 3¼ minutes.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, more than I bargained for, and I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, when I opened this argument I noted to the House that the budget resolution before us is a product of nearly 3 months of negotiation. This is a hard wrought agreement, and I speak to my colleagues, in particular on this side of the aisle, Democrats, when I say that in this agreement there are a number of initiatives which we could not have accomplished on our own as the minority party in this House and in this Congress, hard wrought concessions that make this an agreement that is a balanced plan to balance the budget over the next 5 years. The Shuster-Oberstar amendment will undercut some of the gains that we have made, some of the priorities that we have protected, some of the things that we were able to put into this budget agreement that gives it a stamp that is peculiar and particular to our party and our constituents and what we believe in.

Shown there in the well of the House is a handout that has been prepared by the Committee on the Budget which takes us account by account through the budget and shows us where the money will come from to plus up transportation spending. Basically the Shuster amendment seeks to add $11 to $12 billion in outlays. To achieve that much in outlays we need about $19 billion in budget authority. So we are not talking about small change or minor skimming cuts. We are talking about deep and disruptive cuts here.

And here they are individually, and I ask my colleagues, particularly those on my side of the aisle, to bear these reductions in mind and to keep in mind how much we have expended in effort and negotiation in order to achieve these gains in this agreement:

National defense. We have held national defense to a level that I think is barely sufficient. I would like to see more there. I do not like the quadrennial review. I am perhaps in a minority in my own party in that respect, but I certainly do not want to go any lower in what we have allocated for defense in this budget.

The Shuster amendment will take us lower, $5.65 billion, and most of that comes in the outyears, 1999 and 1998 and 2000, when we will be stepping up to the plate to buy some important systems that will modernize our force structure; $5.65 billion, whack, right out of defense.

Education. Now here is one area where we had a clear win as Democrats in this agreement. We have got tuition tax credits, we have got tuition tax deductibility, we have got a literacy project, we have got the biggest increase in Pell grants since the origination of the program; $980 million will be taken out of education by these across-the-board cuts.

Section 8 housing, LIHEAP and WIC. All of these important priority programs are protected as such in this agreement. We went to great endeavors in these negotiations to see that section 8 was adequately funded over the next 5 years just at a level to maintain the existing housing stock of subsidized housing. But this will take us below that level. It will take section 8, LIHEAP and WIC down by $860 million over 5 years, and that is not small change. That is a big hit in these programs.

Health research at NIH. There are Members on both sides of the aisle who are pushing right now a bill that would plus up significant funding for health research and funding for the National Institutes of Health. This would take those accounts down by $520 million.

Criminal justice. Now this is something that normally unites the House. We want to put more money into criminal justice. We are sometimes divided about the means, but I think we are all usually united about the ends. It takes $510 million out of criminal justice.

Veterans benefits. The veterans already are displeased with this agreement because we have not fully funded what it will take to maintain the veterans' benefit programs, the veterans' medical care program. We have said instead that the Veterans' Administration will be able to keep the resources they collect from collateral sources from health insurance, and we anticipate that that $600 million will make up the difference. This budget, however, takes another $400 million out of veterans' programs.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues, I encourage my colleagues before they vote, to read this handout, look at this list and see who pays for the transportation increases proposed by the Shuster amendment.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, it is my distinct privilege to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], the Speaker of the House, to close debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Speaker of the House is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] for yielding this time to me, and I want to commend the distinguished ranking member from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT]. I think we are in the middle of a truly historic process, and that is really the point I want to drive home here as we close this debate.

This is a historic process, I believe, in two very different ways. It is a historic process in the substance of what we are doing, reforming entitlements, saving a trillion, $100 billion, over the next 10 years, reducing taxes for the first time in 16 years with a $250 billion tax cut over the next 10 years, creating more opportunities for job creation and for small business so that as welfare reform goes into effect people can leave welfare and find work, because if we do not have work, we cannot reform welfare.

So, these are steps that are exactly right.

All these things are important, and the substance of what we are doing is important, and people will look back on this as, I think, a historic vote. But there is something equally important happening, which is the process, and that is why I wanted to come to the floor to close this debate.

Mr. Chairman, we live under an unusual constitutional system. The Founding Fathers were afraid of dictatorship. They thought of themselves as engineers, and they consciously tried to design a machine so inefficient that no dictator could force it to work, and they succeeded.

Some of the power is down at the White House, some of the power is in the House, some of the power is in the Senate, some of the power is across the street in the Supreme Court. All other powers are reserved to the States and to the people thereof.

And this machine is so inefficient that even as volunteers we find it hard to get it to work, and the Founding Fathers will all, I think, look down on us and be happy because the frustration of freedom is the safeguard of freedom. If this system could work quickly, it could become a dictatorship.

So we found ourselves after this last election with a Republican congressional majority, the first we elected in 60 years, which would learn the hard way, I would venture to say, in 1995 and 1996, that no matter how excited a majority is in the legislative branch, by itself we cannot legislate unless the majority is large enough to override vetoes, and we did not have that majority.

I suspect our friends who have been in the majority under Reagan and Bush could have probably taught us some of this if we would have been a little more open to listen, but we learned it the hard way.

On the other hand, the newly reelected President, the first Democrat to win reelection since Franklin Delano Roosevelt, looked up the hill and realized that under our system he could not govern in a positive way for 4 years if he could not get something out of the Congress, that the veto is a powerful tool to stop things, but it does not start anything.

And we were faced with a choice: 4 years of deadlock, 4 years of the American people growing even more cynical of the news media covering us even more negatively, of all of us in our wonderful system of government decaying in public esteem, or something which, frankly, we did not do enough of last time. Get in a room, lay out what we really want and really need, and then listen to the other side and try to find a common ground that is not perfect.

Mr. Chairman, every liberal could write a budget that is better than this by their values: less defense, fewer tax cuts, more domestic spending. Every conservative can write a budget that is better than this: more tax cuts, more defense, less domestic spending. They do not happen to fit. The President does not want everything in this agreement, and we do not want everything in this agreement, neither our friends on the Democratic side, nor those of us on the Republican side. But together, through months of hard work, we have fashioned an agreement which inside our constitutional system meets the necessary balance. It can pass the House, it can pass the Senate, and the President is willing to sign it.

Now tonight we are going to have several very good opportunities to offer a different way of solving the problem. The President is opposed to every one of those opportunities. He is opposed to the liberal versions and the conservative versions. And I am here to say on behalf of our leadership I am opposed to every one of those opportunities. I am opposed to the liberal version, and I am opposed to the conservative version. We have forged a balance which is not brilliant, it is not perfect, but it is a huge positive step for our children and our grandchildren. It will rebuild faith in this country and these institutions. It is going to be followed by hard negotiating and hard legislating because that is the way this system works, and it is no more wrong for us to collide and try to write something in creative conflict than it is for NBA players to collide under the boards as long as it is done within the rules.

Mr. Chairman, that is the creative process that leads to good legislation. But tonight we have a simple choice.

☐ 2300

We can pass one of the substitutes, and this agreement will have been crippled, and it will not pass the Senate and it will not be signed by the President; or we can say to our liberal friends and our conservative friends, yes, we have good ideas and on another day we want to visit with you again, but for this evening at this time with this agreement, the best thing for our country under this constitutional process is to pass the agreement that the congressional leadership and the President made together.

That is the right bipartisan thing to do. It is the right thing to do for America. So I urge all of my colleagues to vote no on every substitute, vote yes on final passage; let us move this agreement one step closer to giving the American people a balanced budget with lower taxes, with real reforms, and with a chance to create a better future for our children.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 84, the fiscal year 1998 Budget Resolution

Mr. Chairman, in my years of service in this august body, I have found myself in this position too many times. I appreciate the fact that compromise is necessary to do the peoples' business when the executive branch is controlled by one party and the legislative body is controlled by another. Congress and the President over the years have negotiated for long hours behind closed doors, and, after heated debate, much ballyhooed budget deals were announced. In recent years, these budget deals have all attempted to reduce the size of the budget deficit and the federal debt. Unfortunately, they did not accomplish their desired goals.

In 1990, President Bush caved in to the Democrat-controlled Congress to reduce the budget deficit by raising taxes on the American people. Joining my colleagues who now comprise our House Leadership, I opposed our Republican President and his tax increases. The American people expressed their opinion of this deal by electing a new President in 1992.

In 1993, although Democrats controlled both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue, the much-heralded budget again tried to slow our runaway deficits by enacting the largest tax increase in the history of our Republic. Ironically, in my statement of May 27, 1993 opposing the budget, I reminded my colleagues that the budget deals are usually too good to be true. In that statement, I recited the promises of the 1990 budget deal which were never fulfilled.

This year's budget deal is also too good to be true. Although House Concurrent Resolution 84 projects a budget surplus in 2002, I have more faith that my grandchildren will see their Social Security benefits than I have faith that, based on these assumptions, we will balance the budget in five years. This year, our budget deficit is expected to be roughly $67 billion. Under the budget resolution, the deficit will jump to $90 billion in fiscal year 1998 and will remain in excess of $80 billion until 2001, when the deficit will fall some $30 billion. Then to achieve a balanced budget, the deficit will have to be cut another $54 billion to achieve the projected $1.3 billion surplus in 2002.

History has again repeated itself. The failing of the 1990 and 1993 budget deals was that Congress refused to cut spending to balance the budget, always putting the hard choices off to a future Congress. This budget resolution also contains no substantial spending reductions to realistically balance our budget. While the spending increases take effect next year, spending cuts are put off until 2001 and 2002.

In short, President Clinton appears to have won the budget debate. He secured the spending increases he desired in exchange for spending cuts which will take place, if they ever do, after he leaves office. Republicans won modest tax cuts of between $85 and $135 billion in exchange for spending $18 billion more than the President requested in his fiscal year 1998 budget!

Just two years ago, the Republican Congress proposed a tax cut package of $345 billion. After negotiations with the other body, the tax relief package that went to the President shrunk to $226 billion. President Clinton prevented that tax relief from reaching the American people by using his veto pen. Now we are willing to abandon any hope of enacting spending cuts in return for a relatively modest tax relief bill. The justification for this small amount of tax relief is that Congress cannot ''afford'' more money for this purpose. How much longer will this continue? Big government supporters in Washington are generally not concerned whether taxpayers can afford to be the most heavily taxed generation in American history.

I argued earlier this year that the budget deficit is only a symptom of a disease, not the disease itself. The disease afflicting our great nation is a federal government that has grown to a size and scope that would be incomprehensible to our Founding Fathers. Our federal debt has not resulted from Americans being taxed too little, it is because our government has spent too much money. Balancing the federal budget is not a worthy goal unless we are simultaneously reducing the size of the behemoth government.

To gain my support for a budget resolution, I would challenge my colleagues in this way—instead of waiting until 2002 to enact $54 billion in deficit reduction, we should make the necessary cuts in fiscal year 1998 to cut the deficit by that figure. This would establish a natural glide-path to balance in 2002, rather than shirking our responsibility onto future Congresses.

I appreciate the hard work put in by our Republican leadership in the budget negotiations. The propensity of this President to simultaneously take both sides of an argument makes negotiating very difficult. Unfortunately, I cannot accept this agreement as the best the American people can expect from a Republican-controlled Congress. I urge my colleagues to reject this budget resolution so that we may return with a budget along the lines of the conservative substitute that I supported. Even with minor modifications, we can cut the excess spending increases in order to allow the American people to keep more of their own money. We can show our constituents that we are serious about fulfilling the promise of ending the era of big government.

The American people deserve no less from us.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 84, the fiscal year 1998 Budget Resolution. With the passage of this resolution, we are one step closer to the first balanced budget in 30 years.

I support this balanced budget agreement because it controls the growth of federal spending by reducing the size and scope of the federal government, uses real numbers, provides tax relief for hard working families and reforms entitlement programs.

This plan is a blueprint for ensuring America's long-term economic health by lowering interest rates and reducing the tax burden.

Is this a perfect agreement? No. We still need to make fundamental, long-term reforms to ensure the continued financial stability of vital government programs like Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security. And, I'm concerned about the new spending on Presidential pet projects in this plan. But, it is a lot better than the alternative: more deficit spending and less economic opportunity for all Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I support House Concurrent Resolution 84 and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of balancing the budget. That is why I will offer my mild support to this resolution. It is, by my view, flawed in many respects. I will not, however, see fit to impede further movement toward a balanced budget.

The budget agreement is a product of compromise which is the hallmark of our great democracy.

I cannot help but remember 1993, when the Democrats, without the support of a single Republican, passed the budget plan which cut the deficit and provided a solid framework for the economic expansion we currently enjoy. While we would have appreciated some Republican support, I recognize the need to move past malevolent politics and engage constructively with my colleagues in a bipartisan effort to solve a national problem.

We have it backward. We've had our ice cream and cake but its time to eat the spinach. I fear that we do not remain wise and diligent, we are doomed to repeat the same failure of the 1981 Reagan voodoo budget agreement. I am concerned that the tax cuts should be fully paid for up front, and this agreement backloads the tough budget cuts. I also have serious reservations about a proposal to index the capital gains tax cut which has the potential to empty the U.S. Treasury. Soon after this we will have to work through the reconciliation process to ensure that we move in a fair and equitable way to accomplish our purpose of a balanced budget.

I will be voting in favor of the budget resolution because I believe it is with all its flaws, the best tool to achieve a balanced budget. As in any compromise, there are aspects which I support and some which I do not. I can only hope that the good will and bipartisanship will finally deliver us a total final package for which I can more enthusiastically cast my vote. We will wait and see what the future brings. I hope the process will bring us votes which I can support at every stage, including the last one.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this budget resolution as the blueprint to the goal we all want to achieve—a balanced federal budget in 2002. For months now, negotiations have been taking place between Congressional leaders and the Administration on how best to reach that goal. I want to state that this budget resolution is not perfect, but a ''perfect'' budget resolution is unattainable. With 435 members of this body, nearly every member would offer their own unique solution for achieving a balanced budget. Therefore, compromise is a necessity; yet, this body did not compromise the goal we all share, which is a balanced budget in five years.

I have supported a Balanced Budget Amendment since being elected to Congress in 1988 and have consistently voted for a Constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget. I am pleased that the current budget efforts focus on balancing the budget in 2002. Enacting a balanced budget will ensure that as we begin the 21st Century, we rid our country of its deficit and move in the direction of national growth and prosperity—growth and prosperity which have been impeded over the last part of this century because of our federal debt and the interest payments on it.

This package provides some much-needed middle-income tax relief. The package proposes $500 per child tax deductions and additional tax cuts for tuition costs. Education initiatives are a driving force of this agreement. The maximum Pell Grant award is increased in fiscal year 1998 by $300, from $2,700 to $3,000. This is the largest increase in two decades. While the package calls for some Medicare cuts, there are many positive changes in Medicare. There is expanded coverage for such health services as mammography services, diabetes self-management, immunizations and colorectal cancer screening.

There are a few areas of concern about the agreement which I wish to address. The first is transportation spending. While I was pleased to hear that this budget resolution would include funding for transportation above the President's proposed level, I still have some very strong concerns that this budget does not allow for adequate resources for our transportation and infrastructure needs. We can ill-afford to continue to neglect our crumbling infrastructure. The current level of assumed spending is insufficient to deal with the increasing needs of our transportation infrastructure. I am supporting both the Kennedy and Schuster-Oberstar substitutes because they address this need by increasing transportation spending by $15 billion and $12 billion respectively over the five year period.

The Kennedy substitute offers smaller cuts in Medicare than the agreement. By achieving cuts in the administrative area, the substitute proposes an additional $8.6 billion for preventive care benefits in such areas as Alzheimers Disease and osteoporosis. The Kennedy Substitute also provides improved Medicare protections for low-income seniors. I also support this substitute because it recognizes the President's proposal to invest in renovations and construction in needy school systems throughout the country.

This agreement builds on the 1993 Deficit Reduction Act, which has reduced the deficit from $250 billion to $75 billion over the last five years. I support this agreement because I feel it is the last opportunity we have to balance this budget once and for all. I do not want my children and grandchildren to be deprived of opportunity because of the interest payment on our federal debt. This plan is not perfect, but it is the best and only plan we have to make a balanced federal budget a reality. I urge my colleagues to support this budget resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the budget resolution before the House is historic: for the first time in 32 years, the budget balances.

That is real progress.

Nevertheless, this budget—conceived in a strong economy—is one only a mother could love.

How does one explain priorities that over the next 10 years set aside only $3 billion to get people—including legal immigrants—off welfare and into jobs but more than $16 billion for additional entitlement benefits for non-citizens?

How does one explain that over the next 5 years $13 billion in Medicaid savings are mostly offset by $10 billion in additional benefits for non-citizens?

That $10 billion funds additional benefits for non-citizens, many of whom are financially self-sufficient, most of whom entered the country on the promises of their sponsors to financially provide for them.

The mandatory added spending over the next 5 years for benefits for non-citizens—individual's whose sponsor's average income is $38,000 a year—is four times greater than that for defense, twice that for natural resource and environment programs, and six times greater than that for community and regional development.

Explain these priorities to overtaxed, middle-income Americans trying to buy a house and educate their children, Americans who worked until May 9 this year to pay taxes to fund these priorities.

I will support this budget resolution because it balances.

That will help families.

But its priorities are not those of hard-working Americans or hard-working legal immigrants.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, when I was elected to Congress in 1992, my overriding priority was to promote an agenda of important investments for our Nation's future and the urgent need to reduce and eliminate our enormous deficit. Today, we come to a budget resolution that promise a balanced budget by 2002 and we have come to it because of the tough 1993 Budget vote only Democrats cast. The deficit has been reduced from a quarter of a trillion dollars to $67 billion. Now we can move on to finish our tough task for America.

The agreement reached between the President and congressional leaders 2 weeks ago is not a perfect one. In fact, I expressed my deep concerns that we not take the country back to the deficits of the 1980s and allow the deficit to explode in the out years of the plan.

While some concerns remain, I believe the resolution before the House today represents an important step toward bringing our Nation's budget into balance. Much work remains to be done to hammer out the specifics of it.

Mr. Chairman, there is much to support in this compromise budget resolution. It represents the largest increase in 30 years for higher education. It adds important preventive benefits to Medicare such as annual mammograms, colorectal cancer screening, and diabetes management. It adds important resources to protect our environment. It provides funding for healthcare for five million of our Nation's children who have no insurance coverage at all. It restores our promise to legal immigrants that came to our country expecting to be treated equally under the law while they labor to add to the greatness of our Nation. It recognizes the need for tax relief for America's families.

I support the resolution and look forward to working in the weeks ahead to fulfill the best of its promises for the betterment of all Americans.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, to say that I am happy to be here speaking on a budget plan that will lead to a balanced budget is an understatement. Mr. Chairman, this is a good day for the American people. I am pleased to be a Member of the 105th Congress which is about to achieve something for which many of us have fought for a very, very long time. I salute Chairman KASICH and Chairman DOMENICI and all those involved in these very difficult negotiations.

This plan will first and foremost allow for tax relief for all taxpayers in America. There is no doubt that our citizens pay too much for government and keep too little of their earnings for themselves. Hard working people should be allowed to make their own choices about how to spend their hard earned dollars instead of giving them to Federal bureaucrats to spend. I know that the Ways and Means Committee will be working out the details of that tax relief in the next month or so, but I am very optimistic that there will be real capital gains tax reform and estate tax reform. These two taxes are onerous and counter productive. Relief in these areas will create economic growth which will mean more good jobs and less reliance on government programs. And I am equally pleased that we will be able to improve the lives of families with children by allowing them a $500 per child tax credit. That $500 for each child will mean a lot to families who have many, many uses for that money which they won't have to send to the IRS.

Securing Medicare for the next several years is another very important step for the citizens of southern Arizona. This important medical insurance program for senior citizens is on the brink of bankruptcy. With the reforms contained in this plan, we can be sure that Medicare will be kept solvent and available to our parents and grandparents and maybe even to some of us.

Mr. Chairman, is this a perfect plan? Quite honestly, it is not.

Would I have preferred more tax relief for our citizens? Yes, I certainly would have. Families without children could use tax relief. Small businesses could use tax relief. Everyone could benefit from lower taxes.

Would I have preferred more savings in many programs? I definitely believe there are ways we could have held down discretionary spending levels. But we will have an opportunity to work out some of these differences as we take the steps necessary to turn this plan into legislative reality.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is a big step for a Congress and a President that only a short time ago shut down the Government about our disagreements over these issues. Let's take this step and use the accrued benefits as a foundation for future efforts. For future efforts will be needed.

As good as this budget plan is, it will not solve the problem in the long term. We already know that in a very few years we will find ourselves in another very difficult situation when we deal with the reality of a Social Security Trust Fund emptying as baby boomers begin to retire. All the revenues from FICA taxes and the trust fund itself will actually be spent for Social Security recipients instead of masking the deficit as it does today. And the Medicare Trust Fund also will need further work as these new recipients start drawing benefits.

Mr. Chairman, the problems we will inevitably face in the years ahead are just some of the reasons I urge my colleagues to support the budget resolution reported by the Budget Committee. This is an excellent opportunity to help the people we represent get out from under the burden of over-taxation and overspending. We need the foundation we are building now for the work we must do later. We must not let the excellent slip away while we await the perfect.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the bipartisan budget resolution which is before the House today. When I was elected in 1992 to change the priorities of our Government in Washington, I knew that one part of stopping business as usual was getting our fiscal house in order. In order to stop mortgaging our children's future, it was imperative to take bold steps to reduce and ultimately eliminate the budget deficit. I'm proud of my vote in favor of the 1993 Budget Agreement which forced our budget deficit in the right direction—downward—and truly made balancing the budget a possibility.

There are a number of a provisions in this budget resolution which make it a good agreement, aside from the important fact that it will indeed balance the overall budget. First, I am pleased that House Concurrent Resolution 84 includes improved Medicare coverage of diabetes education and supplies in a new self-management benefit. As Co-Chair of the Congressional Diabetes Caucus, I have worked for 4 years to make these important changes. Earlier this year, in conjunction with my friend, Mr. NETHERCUTT, I was proud to sponsor H.R. 58 to improve Medicare coverage for people with diabetes. Currently our bill has 265 Members cosponsors. I want to thank both the administration and Speaker GINGRICH for their commitment to this issue, as well as the authors of H.R. 15, the Medicare Preventive Benefit Improvement Act: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. THOMAS, and Mr. CARDIN. I am going to work vigilantly to make sure these benefits stay in the budget agreement and are enacted into law.

This budget resolution also acknowledges the importance of education in helping our families enjoy a secure future. Unlike last year's balanced budget plan which made students pay more and was correctly vetoed by the President, this resolution includes $35 billion over 5 years for postsecondary education tax cuts and the largest Pell Grant expansion in 20 years. There are over 38,000 students in Oregon who rely on Pell Grants; this resolution will expand the number of eligible students and increase the maximum grant to $3,000. Education is a vital national security issue and is critical to helping everyone fulfill their potential

I am also pleased that this resolution maintains Medicaid as an entitlement and contains very modest cuts. Earlier this year I authored a letter to the President, signed by the entire Oregon delegation, expressing our opposition to a per capita cap proposal in Medicaid. I am pleased that this resolution rejects the per capita cap proposal which would have seriously jeopardized the Oregon Health Plan. When Medicaid reform comes before the Commerce Health Subcommittee, of which I am a member, I will work to ensure that any proposal protects and preserves the Oregon Health Plan.

There are also a number of other important initiatives in this bill. After passage of last year's welfare reform legislation, I pledged to work with the administration to restore benefits for legal immigrants and am pleased this provision is included in House Concurrent Resolution 84. As the author of the Children's Health Insurance Access Amendments, I am pleased that this resolution includes a $16 billion initiative to help the 10 million children who are without health care coverage. Lastly, I am pleased that this resolution emphasizes the importance of our environment, with improvements in funding for Superfund, the brownsfield initiative, land acquisition, national parks, and EPA enforcement.

As most people have acknowledged, and I do so as well, this is not a perfect agreement. As I stated earlier, I was elected to Congress in 1992 to change the way we do business in Washington. In some respects, this agreement continues the same bad priorities of spending far too much on the Pentagon. As I've often said, we should spend every penny we need on a sound national defense and not a penny more. This agreement perpetuates the trend of spending more than half of our discretionary dollar on the military. Our true national security depends on more than just weapons systems. A recent poll by Celinda Lake cites that 74 percent of people disagree with the fact that we spend more on building and maintaining nuclear weapons than we do on the funding of Head Start, fighting illiteracy, and providing college tuition combined.

In addition, I am very concerned about the re-emergence of firewalls between defense discretionary and non-defense discretionary funding. I want to give credit to my colleague from Oregon, Senator WYDEN, for his work on the Senate Budget Committee to eliminate the firewalls that this bill resurrects for 2 years. While Senator WYDEN was unsuccessful, he knows that firewalls only limit the ability of Congress to meet the pressing needs of our Nation's families. It is my hope that the Conference Committee will reconsider the utility of firewalls in the context of a balanced budget and eliminate them from any final agreement.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has a long way to go to fully implement the recommendations of this budget resolution. While I do have a few reservations and concerns about this legislation, I am cautiously optimistic and urge my colleagues to support this compromise balanced budget resolution.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the budget resolution reported out of the Budget Committee. This resolution builds upon the past success of deficit reduction agreements made by Congress and outlines a plan to lead to a balanced budget by the year 2002. Each of us could and would change the priorities and adjust the way we arrange our priorities and the tax expenditures, but how do we find common ground. This measure does so in a means that will be accepted and implemented in the next 2 years.

The deficit this year is estimated to reach a low of $67 billion through September 30, 1997, the lowest annual deficit since 1969. While a strong economy has helped budget numbers, the low deficit is also in large part a result of major work done by the Democratic majority in Congress in 1993. Ironically, that year we passed a deficit reduction package with close to $500 billion in deficit reduction, more than double the amount we are talking about today. Not one Republican voted for that package, but the improved budget numbers we are working with now in 1997 are principally a result of those tough choices we made in 1993. The current budget resolution builds upon this substantial 1993 budget action. And importantly none of it is being repealed or greatly modified in the agreement being offered as a solution today.

We have made progress in the deficit, and we can continue to make progress without extreme actions. This budget agreement shows that we can pursue fiscal balance without creating social imbalance. It protects initiatives which help American working families and seniors gain access to affordable health care, a clean environment, and quality education. If we were operating without the need of a majority vote, each of us no doubt would substantially change this budget. For example, I believe most of the tax breaks should wait, much as Congressman MINGE outlined in the measure that he was precluded from offering by the House rule. But we must examine and judge this budget based on what is possible politically and practically, against for example the backdrop of 1995–96, when polarization and shutdown of the Federal Government were the means employed unsuccessfully to achieve the ends that the majority in Congress sought.

This 1998–2002 budget resolution is a major improvement over the plan put forth by the Republican majority in the last Congress which would have created a serious human deficit all in the name of deficit reduction. Questionable deficit reduction, I would add. That budget plan of the past Congress, which I voted against, included $288 billion in Medicare cuts, $187 billion in Medicaid cuts in the 7-year period, a complete repeal of Federal entitlements to important programs such as Medicaid and school lunches, and an attack on natural resources programs with deep funding cuts and a gutting of important environmental protections. And, of course, the initial Republican House budget plan would have irresponsibly added $353 billion to the deficit within 7 years through wild tax cuts and breaks—a budget that was at the expense of the poor and for the benefit of the wealthy in America, unfair and unworkable.

We fought those extreme GOP proposals in the last Congress and our effort and positions have been vindicated. The numbers and policy recommendations in today's resolution reflect the fact that our country does not need to renege on the basic commitments to the American people in order to reduce the deficit. We can invest in our Nation's future through health care, education, infrastructure, and the environment and still achieve sound budget goals. This agreement extends the Medicare trust fund, even while adding crucial preventive benefits to Medicare, preserves the Federal guarantee to Medicaid, strengthens environmental protection and enforcement, expands health coverage to 5 million uninsured children currently without health care, and increases our investment in education, including increasing the amount and number of Pell Grants, increases for Head Start, and key targeted tax breaks for higher education investments.

This budget agreement serves as a fair outline for an economic agenda over the next 5 years. Of course, it is only an outline, and the real budget work is just beginning. No doubt some adjustments and modification of the priorities will be made as we correct for economic and political reality and attempt to reprioritize in the months and years ahead. It will be important for us to protect and reexamine the priorities important to the American people as we work to craft the bills to implement the goals inherent in the budget resolution both in the near future and for the long term. We will have to ensure that the tax cuts will benefit working Americans, not just corporations and affluent individuals.

On the questions of environmental policy, I am pleased that oil drilling in the pristine coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge has not been added as a potential source of revenue. There are a number of other more environmentally sound ways to recover taxpayer money and I urge my colleagues to avoid the exploitation of this important caribou calving grounds on Alaska's Arctic plain as we move forward to implement budgets today and in the future. Importantly, this budget provides for an unprecedented cleanup of brownfield sites at President Clinton's initiative. Congress will also need to develop a comprehensive solution to the problems legal immigrants face under the 1996 welfare reform law. Although I am pleased that benefits to legal immigrants have been partially restored, this is not enough, especially in regard to refugees and asylees. The provisions addressing treatment of refugees and asylees are a quick fix to a much larger problem. Extending the eligibility period for refugees from 5 to 7 years is not an adequate approach. The only way to restore fairness back into the treatment of refugees and asylees is for Congress and the administration to set in place permanent eligibility for such categories of individuals. Anything less means that some will fall between the cracks and lose benefits and their chance to meet their needs.

Overall, this budget agreement is a positive step, the product of compromise, which is necessary in today's political climate. The budget builds on our past success in deficit reduction, finishing the job in a reasonable, if not an ideal manner. Now we must ensure that the actual budget bills that we consider follow through on this outline. I fully intend to reserve judgment on the individual spending measures and the tax policy packages. If these actions fall short of the promises and commitments inherent in today's agreement, they would merit defeat. If they retreat from these compromises, they should be defeated. I certainly will support some of the substitutes being offered today. In fact, while the substitutes will not likely prevail, but will importantly demonstrate in graphic terms that fiscal stability and a balanced budget can be achieved on a different basis. But the political symmetry of this Congress doesn't permit such policy path and achievement today. At the end of the day, my vote for this budget resolution is a vote for Congress to move forward and do what is possible in the next 18 months to achieve a socially and fiscally sound Federal Government.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight to oppose House Concurrent Resolution 84, the so-called bipartisan budget resolution agreement. This budget resolution fails to adequately protect millions of disenfranchised and disadvantaged Americans, both those who are unemployed, and those who work, but cannot rise out of poverty.

I cannot support a budget resolution that calls for tax cuts of $85 billion that include cuts in capital gains and estate tax relief that will benefit the richest 5 percent of our country. Speaker NEWT GINGRICH has made it clear that this budget is another step in the Contract on America—which is a Contract on Poor People. According to the New York Times, which obtained a copy of a May 16 memo from Mr. GINGRICH to Republicans, Speaker, GINGRICH makes it clear that the Republican's top priority is giving tax breaks to the rich. And the Speaker minces no words in saying that ''there is no limit on the size of the capital gains and estate tax relief'' in the budget resolution.

I cannot support this budget when unemployment in some communities in the First District of Illinois exceed 20 percent, especially for African-American youth. Instead, I am proud tonight to support the Congressional Black Caucus budget. This budget is truly a budget for the people. And I thank my colleagues, Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS from California, and Congressman BENNIE THOMPSON, for leading the caucus in forging this more socially and fiscally responsible framework.

In contrast to the budget deal, the CBC budget balances the budget 1 year earlier—in 2001. And it does so by making no tax cuts until the budget is balanced. In distributing tax cuts, the CBC budget does this in a fair manner. The CBC budget includes $187.5 billion in cuts for corporate welfare.

The CBC budget invests in vital social programs. In contrast to the budget resolution, the CBC budget fully funds proactive programs that ensure the future of our youth and communities. These include Head Start, WIC, section 8 housing, chapter I education, and summer jobs. This latter is particularly important. Just last week, this Congress passed a job training bill that eliminates distinct funding for the summer youth employment program.

And while the bipartisan budget resolution does include new, significant initiatives such as coverage for 5 million uninsured children, the CBC budget goes further. The CBC budget proposes a child health initiative that would cover 10 million uninsured children.

The CBC budget is the only budget alternative that offers the promise of protecting future generations. This budget proposes to restore the safety net that welfare reform dismantled. It assures that millions of Americans who are struggling to make the transition from welfare to work have that chance. I am proud to cast my vote tonight for the CBC budget.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my concerns about House Concurrent Resolution 84, the House budget resolution. I commend the administration and the Republican leadership for their hard work in negotiating this balanced budget agreement. I believe this speaks well to the bipartisan commitment to a balanced budget and a healthy future for our economy that has permeated this body. However, I do not believe that true success is found merely in the doing of the thing, but in the way that it is done. And it is here that I believe that the budget resolution fails.

I am disappointed in the budget resolution because I do not believe that it provides adequate investment in our Nation's future. America's future depends on that of her young people—in providing them adequate resources and opportunities to become our future leaders, including providing them education and access to adequate health care.

The budget resolution provides inadequate resources for the education of our young people. I firmly believe that we must focus our attention and our energy on one of the most important challenges facing our country today—revitalizing our education system. Strengthening education must be one of our top priorities both to raise the standard of living of the American family and to ensure America's preeminence in the global economy.

We must provide our children access to a superior education at all ages from their very young years, until their graduate years. Recent studies emphasize the importance of early education to a child's future development. In fact, I was honored to attend a recent conference at the White House highlighting this fact. And yet, despite these studies, the budget resolution still inadequately funds programs that would provide for programs targeting children in their earliest years.

Further, we need to open the door of educational opportunity to all American children in their later years. It has been well documented that the better educated a person is, the more he or she is likely to earn. The cost of a college education, however, is prohibitive. Many of our Nation's families cannot afford to send a child to college. Many families go deeply into debt financing this step for their child's future.

The Congressional Black Caucus will offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute that promises to provide for our Nation's future—to provide for all the people of our Nation. Just like the budget resolution, the CBC substitute balances the budget, and it does this by fiscal year 2001, 1 year earlier than the budget resolution. The CBC substitute calls for appropriations of $74.9 billion in fiscal year 1998 for education, training, and development. This is $28.2 billion, or 60 percent, more than the budget resolution provides. The CBC substitute will fund college tuition scholarships and allows for a gradual increase in Pell grant awards. In addition, the CBC substitute fully funds a child health initiative to cover all of the 10 million of America's children who are uninsured.

I urge my colleagues to think carefully when they cast their votes this evening. We have before us a number of proposals each of which will assure us a balanced budget within 5 years. It is critical, however, that we achieve the goal of a balanced budget in a manner that is compassionate, fair—and very importantly—is intelligent. In balancing the budget, we must be sure not to provide inadequate resources to the very areas that will assure America a strong and healthy future.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 84, the concurrent bipartisan balanced budget agreement.

Balancing the budget brings practical benefits to every American, in the form of lower interest payments, stronger economic growth, lower taxes, and less Government spending. It is not the budget I would write on my own. Nor is it the budget that the President would write on his own. I am concerned that it does not provide sufficiently for our national security, reduce spending enough, save Medicare for future generations, or return as much money to hard-working American taxpayers as it should. But it is a real, balanced budget, with less Government spending and real tax cuts for American families, that Republicans, Democrats, and the President have agreed upon.

For my children, and for everyone's children, it means less of their future earnings will be taken just to pay interest on the debt. Interest on the debt, which today costs over $1 billion every business day, cannot be invested in education, or transportation, or returned to the taxpayers. However, under this budget, we will stop adding to the debt. It represents a beginning so that we can develop a plan to pay down the debt, and free the next generation from its heavy and immoral burden.

For my mother, and for everyone who is or is kin to a ''chronologically gifted'' American, this budget means she can count on the good health of her Medicare for the next decade. We still have work to do here. We have to work together to save Medicare for the next generation. But we have made a real and substantial start.

For every family, this budget means the Federal Government will take less of their money in taxes, so they can invest more in their children, and in their children's education. Despite the good intentions of people in Government, the best chance a young person has to achieve the American Dream is to have a mom and a dad that love and care for them. And under this budget, many moms and dads that have to earn two incomes today—one to pay the bills, and the other to pay the taxes—may find that through lower taxes and lower interest payments, they may be able to prosper on the income of one family member.

For everyone who saves or invests, or wants to save or invest, or wants to keep or create a job, or owns a home, this budget insures a reduction in the capital gains tax.

Let me for a moment focus on how far we have come.

In 1994, liberal congressional leadership had reigned for 40 years. The Clinton administration had levied the largest tax increase in American history and attempted total Government control of people's health care. The deficit was headed skyward, a classic case of the Federal Government leaving an immoral and untenable legacy to our children.

And the American people responded by electing a Republican House and Senate.

We began working the people's will. We enacted historic welfare reform legislation, restored credibility to our borders and our immigration laws, and revitalized telecommunications for the information age. We attempted to enact a balanced budget amendment and a real balanced budget that saved Medicare and cut taxes. But on those matters, our work was vetoed or otherwise blocked by the President.

And so the American people reelected the Republican Congress in 1996—and reelected a President of the opposite party.

Now we have before us a real balanced budget, representing the commonsense conservative values that Americans have long demanded, and never really had reflected in their Government, until now. We can and should pass this budget, knowing that the hard work remains ahead. We have to enact appropriations bills that limit the growth of spending. We have to enact real tax cuts for the American people. We have to enact this budget into law, and the President has to sign it.

Mr. Chairman, a journey of a thousand miles begins with one step. The journey to balancing the budget begins with this step. Let us step out boldly now. Let us do what is best for America and for Americans, and pass the budget resolution.

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Chairman and colleagues, I rise in support of the budget resolution and the underlying budget agreement. Members on both sides of the aisle including Chairman JOHN KASICH and JOHN SPRATT from the Budget Committee; the bipartisan leadership of the Congress; and President Clinton and senior members of the Administration deserve our thanks and gratitude for working together in a bipartisan way to develop the balanced budget plan that is before us today.

Mr. Chairman, this is a historic day. For over a generation—nearly thirty years—the federal budget has been in deficit. During this same period, the gross national debt of the country has increased from $360 billion to $5.6 trillion. Without this budget agreement, annual budget deficits continue and the national debt will skyrocket to nearly $10 trillion early next decade. That is a trend we cannot allow to continue.

The budget resolution before us today provides for nearly $1 trillion of spending reduction over the next ten years including $115 billion in Medicare savings that will add ten years to the life of the Part A hospital trust fund. The resolution also provides for a decrease in total projected discretionary spending, while providing for increases in funding for high priority programs like education and training, research and development, the nation's defense needs, transportation and infrastructure, and health care programs. On the entitlement side of our budget—which consumes over fifty percent of outlays and is where the real growth in spending has occurred—spending is cut over $600 billion over the next decade.

At the same time spending is curtailed, the agreement provides for modest tax relief including a reduction in capital gains and estate taxes, a $500 per child tax credit, and education tax deductions and credits.

Overall, this is a solid agreement. The real work is ahead of us, however, as we move to implement this budget resolution. The Blue Dog Democrat coalition will continue to work with the bipartisan leadership and the President to ensure that the final reconciliation bills fairly and honestly implements this resolution.

Mr. Chairman and colleagues, a final reconciliation bill should maximize deficit reduction each year, provide structural reforms in entitlement programs consistent with the reductions in those programs, and not explode spending or the deficit in the out-years. The final reconciliation measure must also have a strong and effective budget enforcement mechanism to ensure that the reductions and reforms in spending we contemplate today will in fact take place. Budget enforcement must extend the discretionary caps that expire this year, renew the PAYGO system, and should also extend sequestration to new revenue and spending programs and exempt few or no programs from any future sequestration process. My Blue Dog colleagues and many others on both sides of the aisle will be working together in the next few weeks on budget enforcement and other issues of mutual concern.

Mr. Chairman and colleagues, today is indeed a historic day. To be sure, the road ahead will be bumpy and difficult, but we should remember that what we do today will bring real and lasting economic benefits to our children and grandchildren and is worth the toil.

Mr. Chairman, the budget resolution today deserves our strong bipartisan support and I urge its passage.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by commending the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the Committee on the Budget, the House leadership, and our colleagues in the Senate for the good job they have done in keeping us headed down the road toward balancing the budget by 2002.

I am pleased that the Administration and Congress have reached a compromise. While the agreement is certainly not perfect in all its respects—in particular because of the unwillingness of the Administration to address the need for comprehensive reform of entitlement spending—it does represent a sincere effort to reduce the budget deficit, and it is therefore deserving of our support.

It is important to recognize that the budget process is just that—a process. And the budget resolution represents not the end of that process, but rather the first step and one that is necessary in order for the authorizing committees to proceed to implement their reconciliation directives and the the appropriations committee to move forward with the thirteen funding bills for fiscal year 1998.

Since the Republican party took control of the House in 1995, the budget process is one that has been refocused on making tough choices and setting priorities. This is as it should be. Congress today is responding to the demand of the American people that we review every department, every agency and every program in the government and determine which of these activities provide relatively poor returns or paybacks and should not be continued, which are more appropriately the responsibility of local or state governments or the private sector, and which can be made to work better. In addition, in this process, the Congress has worked to identify those things that are true national priorities and that should be provided with additional resources. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have been proud to participate in this effort and I look forward to continuing in this direction in the coming year.

As for the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education, which I am privileged to chair, the budget resolution that we have before us will again require that difficult decisions be made. My subcommittee faces many demands from many constituencies for limited funds. The failure of the President to regard the need for such things as life-saving assistance of those suffering from AIDS, for a health care workforce capable of reaching the medically underserved, and for expanded biomedical research to develop new treatments and cures for disease as priorities at least on a par with—if not superior to—his interest in creating new education programs and untested initiatives, will not make the process of drafting FY98 funding legislation an easy one. Fortunately, the budget resolution does provide sufficient flexibility for the Appropriations Committee to meet the needs of the American people by adequately supporting those activities—like biomedical research—that are true national priorities. This is certainly the outcome that I will push for in the coming months as we move to implement the broad spending and revenue framework contained in this budget blueprint.

Mr. Chairman, budget deficits are simply intolerable in a time of strong economic growth. They represent a decision to spend for the present and leave to our children and grandchildren the responsibility to pay for our profligacy. Such behavior is simply unacceptable and I am pleased that we here today have the opportunity to take a major step forward in the effort to put an end to such irresponsible behavior. I urge all members to support this resolution.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, today, this chamber continues the important progress first begun in 1993 to reduce the Federal deficit and reach a balanced budget by the year 2002. The 1993 budget was one of the most difficult votes I have cast, yet for 5 straight years, its effect has been to cut the deficit. The deficit is now at its lowest level in more than 20 years.

This bipartisan balanced budget resolution keeps the momentum moving forward. It is based on realistic economic and policy assumptions that will sustain economic growth. But while the outline of the balanced budget before us is historic, let us not disguise the difficult steps ahead to translate that outline into specific legislative language.

The resolution continues important investments in our society. It assumes extension of health insurance coverage to 5 million low-income children, the largest investment in education in more than 30 years, restoration of SSI eligibility to the elderly and disabled legal immigrants cut off last year, and maintenance of a strong national defense. Lastly, the resolution assumes enactment of needed tax changes for families and investors that will be paid for.

The resolution sets forth a glidepath for reducing spending at a relatively constant rate for the next 5 years. Unlike previous budget plans, it does not postpone the most difficult cuts to the later years. In addition, the resolution calls for a two-track reconciliation process, thus requiring separate votes on the legislative proposals enacting savings and the proposals making tax changes. This will assure that deficit cutting precedes tax cuts.

I am disappointed that the Rules Committee did not make in order the amendment proposed by my colleagues DAVID MINGE and CHARLIE STENHOLM to include enforcement provisions to the budget resolution. Such enforcement provisions are critical to ensure that the deficit remains on the glidepath to balance by the year 2002 and beyond.

None of us wants a repeat of past deficit reductions efforts that failed to live up to their promises. Indeed, without enforcement mechanisms, future deficit reduction efforts become less credible as they become harder to make. That's why, in particular, all portions of the budget—both spending and revenues—have to be included in the enforcement mechanism. All members and interest groups have to have a stake in maintaining the glidepath to a balanced budget. That means, as well, that future tax cuts must be contingent on meeting the revenue targets in the agreement.

Despite these imperfections, the balanced budget resolution is the result of hard-fought compromise by all involved. I want to congratulate President Clinton and my Congressional colleagues, particularly the ranking member, Mr. SPRATT, and the chairman, Mr. KASICH, who were directly involved in these difficult negotiations.

I also congratulate my colleagues with whom I helped fashion the Blue Dog balanced budget plan. The Blue Dogs showed it could be done. The American people are the beneficiaries.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 84, the budget resolution for fiscal year 1998.

In 1993, when faced with a record $290 billion deficit, Democrats passed a tough budget plan that contained real deficit reduction and restored tax fairness. And the results are clear, Mr. Speaker. The deficit has fallen by a whopping 63 percent—from $290 billion in 1992, to $107 billion in 1996. The tough decisions Democrats made in 1993 have produced the best economy in decades and put our Nation on the doorstep of balancing the budget. All that needs to be done is to take the final step.

I am pleased at the progress we have made toward achieving a balanced budget, but I am concerned about the priorities that this resolution sets forth. While we must reach a balanced budget, we must also create the educational opportunities our children deserve, provide the financial relief that working Americans need, and protect the benefits our senior citizens have earned. Unfortunately, this budget resolution falls short of those goals.

There are, however, many positive aspects of this budget. I applaud the inclusion of funding for several programs that are important to middle-class families.

For example, the budget resolution for fiscal year 1998 calls for a 10-percent increase in funding for education, training, and social services programs. The budget increases the maximum Pell grant award $300, from $2,700 to $3,000, the largest Pell grant increase in over two decades, which will help more of America's youth to be able to afford a college education.

The budget also calls for the creation of many of the educational initiatives that have been proposed by the Democratic leadership over the last few years. The budget agreement provides for the creation of the HOPE Scholarship, a 2-year, $1,500 per student tax credit for college tuition—enough to pay for the tuition costs for a typical community college. It provides for the ability of working Americans to withdraw the costs of an education, tax-free from expanded, individual IRA accounts. In addition, the budget provides funding for the President's America Reads Challenge Program, which is intended to help children learn to read well and independently by the end of the third grade. While I am not able to support the final budget agreement, I look forward to working with my Republican colleagues in the future to bring these important educational initiatives proposed by the Democratic leadership into being.

Mr. Chairman, I am also heartened by the allocation of $16 billion over the next 5 years to provide health insurance for up to 5 million children who are currently uninsured. While I am pleased that the budget recognizes the plight of our Nation's uninsured children, with no specific offsets to pay for these additional benefits, I am concerned where the funding for this expanded, program will come.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the budget agreement attempts to depoliticize any adjustment in the Consumer Price Index [CPI] by providing that any necessary change be taken by the Bureau of Labor Statistics [BLS], the agency created to address these matters and not be held hostage to create a slush-fund for tax breaks. However, at the same time, I am deeply concerned that this budget agreement makes assumptions that the CPI will be reduced by 0.3 percent, resulting in a decrease in the monthly cost of living adjustment [COLA] of our Nation's seniors to pay for the tax breaks to the wealthy.

But, every budget plan has winners and losers. Under this plan, the winners would be the wealthiest 5 percent of Americans. Over half of the proposed tax cuts would go to households making over $100,000 per year. That means that most of the hard-working men and women of my district won't be able to take advantage of cuts in the capital gains and estate taxes. Most of the families in my district won't see the benefit of expanded IRA's.

No, Mr. Chairman, my district would be the loser in this deal. The senior citizens and working families of my district would bear the brunt of the cuts in spending. Hospitals in my district would shoulder the burden of Medicaid savings. And Philadelphia would suffer the loss of jobs and revenue as a result of this budgets priorities.

This budget asks seniors to pay more for Medicare, while telling them that they will get less in Social Security COLA's. By 2005, seniors will have $150 less in their pockets due to COLA reductions, while being forced to pay over $500 in Medicare premium increases. In fact, the only way this budget plan will ever reach a balance is if seniors COLAs are cut—the money is already spend somewhere else.

In addition, the hospitals that serve the neediest children and families will take an enormous hit. The $13.6 billion in Medicaid cuts that this budget calls for would come primarily from disproportionate share hospital payments [DSH]. These cuts would hurt only those hospitals who serve the sickest and neediest among us. The obvious result would be a decline in the quality of care, inevitable job losses and—possibly—the closing of hospitals in my district. Since nearly 15 percent of my region's economy depends directly on providing health care, these cuts would have a ripple effect that would be felt in every sector of the local economy.

Mr. Chairman, I represent the 20th oldest district in America. Well over half of all the hospital admissions in my district are dependant on either Medicare or Medicaid. Clearly, these substantial cuts to these important programs would have a profound impact on the hospitals' ability to provide quality care to my constituents.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot, in good conscience, vote for a budget that asks for sacrifices from senior citizens, ignores the needs of middleclass families, and turns its back on the uninsured. As the late Vice President Hubert Humphrey said, ''the moral test of a society is how that society treats those who are in the dawn of life—the children; those who are in the twilight of life—the elderly; and those who are in the shadow of life—the sick, the needy, and the handicapped.'' Because of these cuts to Medicare and Medicaid, this budget does not pass that test for the Third Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, in a town famous for saying one thing and doing another, Congress is doing what it promised.

The balanced budget agreement that Congress reached with the President delivers on the promises we made to the American people. The resolution puts that agreement into action. It balances the budget, saves Medicare, lets American families keep more of what they earn, and reforms entitlement programs.

Under the budget resolution, deficits will be a thing of the past, and like every American family and American business, the Government will live within its means for the first time since 1969.

If the budget resolution did nothing else but eliminate the deficit, it still would be a huge victory for the American people. But it does more.

The budget resolution saves Medicare from bankruptcy and gives seniors new health care choices. By changing Medicare's structure we will protect its solvency for another decade, while expanding benefits to cover mammography, diabetes self-management, immunizations, and special cancer screenings.

If this resolution just balanced the budget and saved Medicare it would still be historic, but goes further.

Over the next 10 years, this budget will reduce tax burdens on American families by $250 billion, including reductions to capital gains taxes, death taxes, a tax credit for families with children, an expanded IRA to encourage savings for retirement, and tax relief to help families send their children to college.

And to help make sure the tax burden stays lower, we're going to change the entitlement programs that have put the real pressures on our budget year after year: A balanced budget; a sound Medicare Program; tax relief for families; and entitlement reform.

I'm very proud of this budget resolution, and I'm proud of the people in the House and the Senate who helped forge it. Special thanks goes to Budget Committee Chairman JOHN KASICH and Ranking Member JOHN SPRATT for helping move this bill through committee last week, and the committee staff under Rick May deserves our thanks for all their hard work getting the resolution ready for consideration.

We're doing something real and permanent here with this budget resolution. We're being responsible and we're heading off a fiscal crisis before it happens. This commonsense approach helped win strong bipartisan support for the budget in committee where it passed by 31 to 7. I encourage my colleagues to support the resolution and get involved in the process of enacting it into law.

As an indication of the support the budget is already winning back home, I'm submitting for the RECORD an editorial from my hometown newspaper that praises the bipartisan spirit in which the budget agreement was reached.

[From the Springfield (OH) News-Sun, May 12, 1997]

BUDGET A RESULT OF SERIOUS WORK

Considering the bad blood between the Clinton White House and congressional Republicans, their agreement to balance the federal budget in 2002 is extremely gratifying. The work negotiators from both sides put into this accord is precisely the serious, public-spirited give-and-take Americans expect of their national leadership.

On many substantive questions, negotiators kept their partisan instincts in check. They reached surprisingly easy compromises to curb domestic spending, to achieve Medicare savings at modest cost to beneficiaries and to check Social Security cost-of-living increases. They also restored benefits to legal immigrants—benefits which should never have been taken away.

But what got this budget deal moving was the dynamism of an economy now whirring along at a phenomenal 5.6 percent annual growth rate and producing bulging tax revenues for Uncle Sam.

In fact, budget negotiators were told at the last minute the Treasury was likely to take in $200 billion to $225 billion more than previously expected over the next five years. And this good news came during the same week that the Treasury announced it would be able to make a $65 billion payment against America's $5 trillion national debt, the first such payoff in 16 years.

The budget deal does have its flaws—such as the increase in defense spending—but the major disappointment is the $135 billion in tax reductions. With the next few budgets still projected to be in the red, it is not time to start rewarding taxpayers for their sacrifices.

Only one of these tax breaks can be defended as wise social policy: Clinton's tuition tax credits. No public investment is so vital to maintain this country's edge in technology and the world economy as educating Americans, both our youth and adults, for tomorrow's jobs.

How much better for all of America it would have been if the billions of dollars in tax relief had been added instead to that $65 billion payoff on the national debt.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, although I plan to vote for House Concurrent Resolution 84, which contains the balanced budget agreement of 1997, I want to express a few concerns with it and the other budget options.

I believe the major short comings in the budget which was negotiated between congressional leaders and the White House are: The spending increases, which will cause the deficit to rise until 2001 at which time it will fall below the 1997 level of $67 billion; the savings are back loaded, so that they will not be realized until near the end of the agreement; the Clinton funding priorities which amount to an expansion of the Federal Government; and the net tax cuts of $85 billion amount to less than 1 percent of expected total tax collections of $9 trillion. Specifically, on the tax front, the latest predictions are that the budget agreement will result in a reduction of the Federal capital gains tax rate from the current 28 percent to as high as 21 percent, which may be targeted to a limited number of investments.

My concerns over the small tax cuts which are to be expected from the budget agreement are the primary reason I also will support the budget substitute being offered by a Republican group, the Conservative Action Team [CAT's], to which I belong. This budget would freeze spending at the current levels while transferring the $109.3 billion this would save in nondefense, nontransportation discretionary spending to greater tax relief. Although the CAT's budget is not expected to receive the votes of a majority of the House, I believe it represents the best alternative if we are truly committed to a smaller Federal Government and returning to every American more of their hard-earned tax dollars.

I want to touch briefly on the other four substitute budgets. While the Congressional Black Caucus [CBC] is a serious participant in the budget debate, I cannot support the CBC's substitute primarily because it does not include any tax cuts, effectively delaying this debate until the budget is balanced in 2002, and cuts defense spending by $189.9 billion. The Brown of California substitute not only postpones tax relief and reduces defense spending, it increases total spending over 5 years by $25 billion more than House Concurrent Resolution 84. The Kennedy of Massachusetts budget substitute essentially abandons broad-based tax relief in favor of additional funding for health programs, while dismantling the Medicare compromise in House Concurrent Resolution 84. The budget substitute proposed by the bipartisan leadership of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee seeks to allocate an additional $12 billion for transportation priorities. It offsets this funding by across-the-board reductions of just over one-third of 1 percent in all discretionary spending and proposed tax relief. Regardless of the size of the proposed across-the-board cuts included in this substitute, I fundamentally oppose the assumption that all discretionary spending in the Federal budget should be treated equally. Particularly disturbing is the cumulative size of the cuts which would fall on our Nation's military, and the suggestion that there is room in the limited tax relief for a proportional burden.

Therefore, I will vote for House Concurrent Resolution 84 with reservation and hope that it will bring us to a balanced budget on schedule in 2002, once and for all.

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bipartisan budget. In particular, I want to point out that this Budget will bring American families significant tax relief for the first time in 16 years.

We've tinkered around with the Tax Code in the past. But that was mostly just redistributing who pays the tax.

This Budget will lead to tax cuts—$85 billion over 5 years. This will be tax relief on capital gains that provides incentives for economic growth.

We will have relief from the death tax.

We will have relief from the high costs of college education.

And most importantly, we will have tax relief for families with children.

Further, this agreement preserves Medicare. There are no cuts in Medicare in this budget. Medicare spending continues to grow. All we are trying to do is to slow the growth in Medicare spending to ensure that it will be available not just for our current elderly citizens, but future generations as well.

It does that while continuing to increase spending on each beneficiary in each of the 5 years.

Federal spending per beneficiary which is $5,480 this year will rise to over $6,900 in the year 2002.

Total spending on Medicare also rises from $209 billion this year to $280 billion in 2002.

This budget estimates taxpayers will save $115 billion through these efforts to control the growth of Medicare spending.

I'm glad that the President has decided to support this Budget which will preserve Medicare for the future.

I do want to note that while this package, that the President supports, saves $115 billion, it is almost identical in savings to the $118 billion in savings over 5 years that would have been achieved had the President decided not to veto the Balanced Budget Act in 1995.

I applaud the President for now agreeing to preserve Medicare by now supporting virtually the same Medicare preservation package he derided just 2 years ago.

I urge all my colleagues to support the bipartisan budget resolution House Concurrent Resolution 84 and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, today we are debating a historic budget agreement which would balance the budget by 2002. The resolution we are voting on today just locks the numbers in place. There are still many details that have to be worked out before we vote on omnibus budget reconciliation legislation.

This debate reminds me of the old saying ''the devil is in the detail.'' It is these details which could ruin the historic agreement. The resolution calls for $135 billion in gross tax cuts and $85 billion in net tax cuts over 5 years. There is no firm agreement on the design of the tax package. The elements to be included in the package are education tax provisions, capital gains estate taxes, a $500 family credit, and expanded IRAs. $35 billion of the tax cuts are geared towards education.

We do not want a repeat of tax legislation which passed this House during the 104th Congress. Only 8 percent of the population realizes capital gains in any given year. Capital gains relief should be targeted and geared towards individuals. Indexing of capital gains will be a source of substantial complexity for taxpayers and open up loopholes in the tax code. New types of tax shelters could be created. Last Congress's capital gains relief was skewered to the wealthy. Seventy-six percent of the capital gains tax cut would have gone to taxpayers with income of $100,000 or more.

Citizens for Tax Justice's analysis of last Congress's tax cuts found that 52.3 percent of the tax cuts go to 5.6 percent of Americans with income greater than $100,000 a year. Proportionally, middle-income families would benefit little from the proposed tax cuts. In fact 75 percent of all American families earn $75,000 of less per year. This group would have only benefited from one-fifth of the total tax cuts. Individuals making more than $200,000 annually would have received tax cuts averaging $12,600 a year.

We cannot have these type of tax cuts. As we all remember, the President vetoed last years budget and part of this was due to the tax cuts. I do support tax cuts and they have to be targeted and benefit the middle class. The distribution of the tax cuts need to be balanced.

The tax cuts cannot come at the expense of valuable tax expenditures. The earned income tax credit [EITC] should not be cut to pay for any provision of this budget agreement. It is our most valuable anti-provety program. It provides incentives which work to move individuals from welfare to work. I support compliance provisions recommend by the Treasury Department, but not a reduction in benefits.

As the Mayor of the City of Springfield, I saw the benefits of the low income housing tax credit. I supported the President's efforts to make this permanent in 1993 and we cannot sunset such a valuable program.

For a minute, let us remember how things were at the beginning of the Clinton administration. We were faced with an outrageous deficit of $290 billion. President Clinton pushed his economic package and it passed without one Republican vote. This package worked. The deficit is now at $67 billion and this is a 77 percent reduction. We have to build on what we did in 1993.

We have to continue on our path of deficit reduction. We must stay on this path and we will not if we enact tax cuts that balloon after the year 2002. Let us work together in a bipartisan manner to pass a fair tax package that includes no budget gimmicks. We need to keep the devil out of the details.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, nearly three decades of federal budget deficits have taken their toll on our nation's economy and America's working families. But today, we continue our efforts to produce a balanced budget.

Rarely do compromises produce all the results or protect all the causes that one side would champion. This plan does not. However, it is a good step forward. It will control the size and scope of the federal government and provide necessary services while at the same time allowing our children to look to their future instead of looking back at our debt.

One way or another, this Congress has been determined to have a budget agreement enacted that will eliminate the national debt, reduce wasteful spending, provide a smaller federal government, and reduce the burden of taxation and regulation that have had a strangle-hold on this nation's households and businesses. We must continue to work towards a government that is more responsible, more effective, and a better manager of the people's money. However, for the first time since 1969, we will not ask if we will balance the budget, but answer when we will balance the budget

If we are successful in our endeavor to balance the budget, we will be handing our children and our grandchildren the American dream, not the American debt. And for today's working families, this balanced budget plan will help ensure a strong economy, more jobs, lower interest rates and badly needed tax relief. This tax relief will directly benefit families through a $500 per child tax credit, expanded individual retirement accounts, and reductions in the estate or ''death'' tax.

Furthermore, economists predict that a balanced budget will reduce interest rates between 1 and 2 percent. A 2 percent reduction in interest rates would: Equate to a reduction of $15 billion in annual interest payments made by farmers; save students (and their parents) in my district at the University of Illinois and Illinois State University approximately $9,000 over the course of a typical 10-year student loan for a four-year college; save homeowners in Pontiac or Monticello with a typical 30-year, $80,000 home mortgage, $107 each month and $36,653 over the life of the mortgage; and save car buyers in Danville or Paris $676 on a typical 4-year new car loan.

The hope for America held out by this agreement will take our dedication and faithfulness to achieve. The stakes are very high, but so are the rewards if we are successful.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 84. As a Member of Congress who has consistently voted over the last 16 years for fiscally responsible budgets, I would like very much to vote for legislation that would balance the Federal budget by the year 2002. I have concluded after careful consideration, however, that I cannot support this legislation. I understand that this legislation will undoubtedly pass today, and I would like to take this opportunity to lay out my reasons for opposing House Concurrent Resolution 84.

We have all accepted the goal of balancing the Federal budget by the year 2002. According to CBO, this budget achieves that goal. The bill has other positive features as well. It would expand health care coverage to uninsured children in low-income families. It would provide additional Federal assistance for education. It would ensure the Medicare trust fund's solvency for the next 10 years. And it would restore some of the cuts that were enacted as part of the welfare reform bill last year.

The resolution falls short on other, very serious grounds, however.

The budget agreement may balance the budget in the year 2002, but the budget will not remain balanced in subsequent years. A number of the provisions contained in the budget agreement that forms the basis of this resolution are likely to explode the deficit in the out years. Moreover, there are serious grounds for concern that the $85 billion in tax cuts called for in this budget resolution will be back-loaded so that the real impact of these cuts will not be felt within the 5-year window between 1998 and 2002. The tax cuts that have been proposed would reduce anticipated revenues by $85 billion over the next 5 years, but they are estimated to lose twice that much in the subsequent 5 years—and depending on the actual provisions contained in the reconciliation bill, the revenue loss could be even greater.

This is no time for tax cuts. We all know that policymakers will confront a tremendous challenge after the year 2002. In the coming decades, the budget will face additional pressures as the baby boom generation begins to retire. Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid spending will increase dramatically as the baby boomers retire. This budget agreement not only fails to address this coming crisis; it exacerbates it by including tax cuts that produce massive revenue losses in the next decade—just when entitlement spending will also be expanding significantly. We should postpone major tax cuts until we have addressed such long-term budget concerns.

The budget cuts contained in the agreement also reflect a set of priorities that no longer reflect the challenges facing this country. During World War II and the cold war, the greatest threat facing this country was the military threat posed by first, the Axis nations, and then, the Soviet Union. That threat has now passed, and while the world is and will always be a dangerous place, the greatest threat facing our Nation today is an economic threat, not a military one. Just as many generals prepare for the last war rather than the next war, this budget spends too much money on our armed forces—and not enough on the infrastructure and the work force that will determine the winners and losers in the coming global economic competition. The budget resolution we adopt today should spend less on our military forces and more on investment in our physical and intellectual capital.

The budget resolution before us falls terribly short in terms of investment. Under this budget resolution non-defense discretionary spending would suffer inflation-adjusted cuts of roughly 10 percent. That almost inevitably means deep cuts in federally funded scientific and biomedical research, serious cuts in community and regional development programs, inadequate investment in highways, mass transit, and other critical public infrastructure, and unwise cuts in job training funding and elementary and secondary education.

Finally, given that there is an agreement to cut taxes by $85 billion, I have grave concerns about the distribution of the tax relief that the agreement would provide. The family tax credit that has been proposed would not be refundable. That means that it would provide little or no assistance to the families that need it most—the working poor. Conversely, the capital gains tax rate cuts and the increases in the estate tax exemption which have been proposed will benefit only the wealthiest households in our country. If we are going to provide tax relief to hard-working American families, we should provide tax cuts to the families who need it most—not the wealthy Americans who need it least.

And so, Mr. Chairman, for the reasons I mentioned, I oppose this legislation. It may be the best that we can do, but it is not good enough—not by a long shot. I will vote against this resolution.

I will continue to be an active, conservative participant in the budget process, however. The budget resolution is only the first step in the annual budget process. I will work with my colleagues in the coming weeks and months to shape the appropriations and reconciliation bills called for in this resolution. I will work with my colleagues to correct or ameliorate the flaws that I believe exist in this budget agreement. It is my sincere hope that, working together, Congress can produce appropriations and reconciliation legislation that I can support.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, today we are considering a plan which balances the Federal budget by the year 2002. We should be proud that Democrats and Republicans have been able to work together to create this plan, but it is important that we review the facts and understand how we got ourselves in a position to balance the budget in 5 years, while protecting Medicare, Medicaid, investing in education, the environment and health care for children.

When President Clinton arrived in Washington in 1993, he inherited a $290 billion budget deficit—the largest deficit in our nation's history. Job growth was stagnant, and unemployment was over 7 percent, and Washington was unable to find a solution to the exploding deficits and sluggish economy.

But in 1993, President Clinton proposed a budget plan which included $500 billion in savings over 5 years. The plan was criticized by many of our Republican colleagues, who argued that deficits would explode, jobs would be killed, and our economy would crash if we adopted the President's budget plan.

In fact, not a single Republican—in the House or the Senate—voted for the 1993 budget plan.

But today, 4 years later, the plan has worked, and has put us in a position to balance the budget in 5 years. Today our deficit is just $67 billion—the lowest amount since 1979. The budget deficit today makes up just 0.9 of 1 percent of the gross domestic product [GDP]—the lowest level since 1974. Since 1993, 12 million new jobs have been created and our unemployment rate—at 4.9 percent—is at its lowest level since 1974.

Democrats know what it takes to balance the budget. We made the tough choices in 1993, and made the tough votes. Today we have the opportunity to vote on a resolution which will bring our deficit to zero in just 5 more years.

We have assembled a budget plan that is smart—we haven't lost our values and goals in the budget cutting process. The budget resolution includes $16 billion to insure 5 million children who have no health care coverage giving working families the opportunity to make their families healthy and more secure. We are investing in education by funding the $1,500 tax credit for the first 2 years of college and the $10,000 tax deduction for all post-secondary education and training, and by increasing the Pell grants from $2,700 to $3,000, making 350,000 more students eligible for Pell grants.

We are tightening our belts, but we are committed to protecting Medicare and Medicaid. We are investing in education for our kids. We are building a system to give uninsured children health coverage. And we balance the budget by the year 2002.

Mr. Chairman, I support this budget plan because it preserves the programs and efforts that are important to working and middle-income Americans: Medicare, Medicaid, education, environmental protections, and child health. It does all these things and still balances the budget in 5 years. Mr. Chairman, this plan is smart and it is fair, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the resolution this evening.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Clinton-Congress budget proposal.

But before I explain the reasons that compel me to oppose it, let me thank the members of the Committee for their hard work, and especially Chairman KASICH for the energy and effort he has expended in bringing this thorough work product to the floor for our consideration.

It is not for lack of hard work, and good intentions, that this budget proposal falls short.

The problem with this budget is that it will expand the federal government when we should be shrinking it.

Under the Clinton-Congress budget proposal, federal spending will grow from $1.6 trillion in fiscal 1997 to nearly $1.9 trillion in 2002. That is a 16 percent increase.

Next year, under the Clinton-Congress budget deal, our federal government will spend even more than President Clinton asked for in his own 1998 budget. The very first year under the budget deal, Washington will spend nearly a quarter trillion dollars more than it did in 1994, when the new Republican majority was elected to turn the tide.

This continues an unbroken pattern of government growth that has been unstoppable through boom and bust, recession and recovery, since the 1960's.

The accumulated result of that consistent expansion of the size and cost of the federal government has been nothing short of phenomenal.

In 1974, when I was 21 years old and just graduated from college, the federal government spent $269 billion. Today, the Clinton-Congress budget proposes a federal government that is 700 percent larger than that.

By the end of the Carter Administration, in fiscal 1981, the federal budget had more than doubled its spending. But Jimmy Carter's and Tip O'Neill's remarkably fat federal government—which cost over two-thirds of a trillion dollars—is as nothing compared to the one contemplated in this proposed budget. Just the add-ons, on top of present spending levels, in the Clinton-Congress budget deal will cost far more than two-thirds of a trillion dollars.

Today, in 1997, I am a 44-year-old father with a wife and two kids. Our federal government is now nine times bigger than when I was in high school. Compared to just last year, federal spending in fiscal 1997 is up 4.9 percent—a higher rate of growth than any time in the last 5 years. Our current rate of spending growth is even faster than during each of the last 3 budget years of the old tax-and-spend Democratic Congresses.

The Clinton-Congress budget is not historic. It is a continuation of a pattern of unabated government growth established during uninterrupted decades of Democratic Congresses. Consider the facts:

GROWTH IN ANNUAL FEDERAL SPENDING—10-YEAR COMPARISON REFLECTING CLINTON-CONGRESS 1997 BUDGET AGREEMENT

	Total Spending (Billions)	Increase in Spending (%)
Democratic Congresses:		
FY 1993	1,409.414	2.01
FY 1994	1,461.731	3.71
FY 1995	1,515.729	3.69
104th Congress:		
FY 1996	1,560.330	2.94
FY 1997 (est.)	1,635.000	4.79
This Budget Year (FY 1998)	1,692.000	[1] 3.49
FY 1999	1,754.000	3.66
Budget ''Out Years'':		
FY 2000	1,811.000	3.25
FY 2001	1,858.000	2.60
FY 2002	1,889.000	1.67

[1] By comparison, President Clinton's FY 1998 budget, submitted in February 1997, called for $1.687 trillion in FY spending, a 3.2% increase.

It doesn't have to be this way. We can say ''no'' to ever-expanding government. I vote ''no.''

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to speak on a matter of importance.

The addendum to the bipartisan plan to balance the budget, negotiated by congressional leaders and the Clinton administration, assumes that Congress will increase appropriations for the Land and Water Conservation Fund [LWCF] by $700 million. Of that money, $315 million is intended for the acquisition other Headwaters Forest, located in my congressional district, and the New World Mine site, situated near Yellowstone National Park.

From the onset of this agreement, I have had very serious concerns. It goes without saying that the acquisition of the Headwaters Forest will have a significant effect upon the local tax base and reduce revenue for the local government to provide basic social services to its citizens and the surrounding communities. This is in addition to significant costs that Humboldt County, CA, has already borne on account of increased law enforcement to deal with recent protests. Suffering from the residual effects of President Clinton's Northwest forest plan, northern California counties are nearly bankrupt. Therefore, it is imperative that any congressional appropriation of Federal taxpayer funds for the acquisition of the Headwaters Forest must also include compensation for Humboldt County. This is necessary to mitigate the direct loss of tax payer receipts and other economic revenue resulting from the removal from the tax base land zoned specifically for timber harvest/production.

An additional concern I have is the need for the Department of Interior and the Fish and Wildlife Service to work in good faith with the Pacific Lumber Co. [PALCO], the owner of the Headwaters Forest acreage, to approve a wildlife habitat conservation plan [HCP] and other necessary Federal permits that will allow PALCO to selectively harvest the remainder of its privately owned forest lands. Plagued by years of protests, court injunctions, and civil disruptions, PALCO should be given the opportunity to operate without interruption so long as it satisfies Federal and State environmental protection statutes. An HCP will provide the company with enough stability to ensure continued production and peace of mind for its workers.

Both of these conditions were implicit in last fall's Headwaters Forest Agreement, committing the Federal Government and the State of California to the acquisition and protection of 7,500 acres of forest land situated in Humboldt County. I have insisted on the first condition throughout the Headwaters Forest deliberations. My support as a signatory to last fall's agreement outlining and memorializing the Federal and State plan to acquire Headwaters Forest was contingent upon a commensurate economic mitigation package for Humboldt County.

Now as we begin to implement the balanced budget agreement and proceed into the appropriations process, I must reiterate to all parties involved that my support for this proposal remains contingent upon Federal compensation for Humboldt County.

I look forward in working with my colleagues and the administration on this very important issue in the coming months.

U.S. CONGRESS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 19, 1997.

President WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As you know, the addendum to the bipartisan plan to balance the budget, negotiated by Congressional leaders and your Administration, assumes that Congress will increase appropriations for the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) by $700 million. Of that money, $315 million is intended for the acquisition of the Headwaters Forest, located in my Congressional District, and the New World Mine site, situated near Yellowstone National Park.

While I support the general principles of the balanced budget agreement and the addendum, my support for increased appropriations to the LWCF for acquisition of the Headwaters Forest, is contingent upon satisfaction of the following conditions:

1. Pacific Lumber Company, the owner of the Headwaters Forest acreage, must receive approval of a wildlife habitat conservation plan (HCP) and other necessary federal permits, to selectively harvest the remainder of their privately-owned forest lands; and

2. Any Congressional authorization/appropriation of federal taxpayer funds for the acquisition of the Headwaters Forest must also include compensation for Humboldt County, California. This is necessary to mitigate the loss of tax payer receipts and other economic revenue resulting from the removal of land zoned specifically for timber harvest/production, from the taxable land base and assessment rolls of the County.

Both of these conditions were implicit in last Fall's Headwaters Forest Agreement committing the Federal Government and the State of California to the acquisition and protection of 7,500 acres of forest land situated in Humboldt County. I have insisted on the latter condition throughout the Headwaters Forest deliberations. My support as a signatory to last Fall's agreement outlining and memorializing the Federal and State plan to acquire Headwaters Forest was contingent upon a commensurate economic mitigation package for Humboldt County.

Now that the balanced budget agreement and the joint House-Senate Budget resolution contemplates the acquisition of the Headwater's Forest through federal appropriations, I must reiterate to all parties involved that my support for this proposal remains contingent upon Federal compensation for Humboldt County.

I would be happy to discuss the scope and details of the mitigation package for Humboldt County and to facilitate discussions between representatives of the County Government and the Federal Government.

Again, I wish to stress that I will vigorously oppose any Congressional legislation expressly authorizing and appropriating funds for the exchange of the Headwaters Forest if the conditions I have raised herein are not addressed satisfactorily.

I look forward in working with you on this very important issue in the coming months.

Very truly yours,

FRANK D. RIGGS,
Member of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 152, the concurrent resolution is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 84 is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 84

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

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999 through 2002 are hereby set forth.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 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 1998: $1,198,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,241,859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,285,559,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,343,591,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,407,564,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: −$7,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: −$11,083,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: −$21,969,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: −$22,821,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: −$19,871,000,000.

(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 1998: $1,386,875,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,439,798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,486,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,520,242,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,551,563,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $1,371,848,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,424,002,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,468,748,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,500,854,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,516,024,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $172,869,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $182,143,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $183,189,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $157,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $108,460,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $5,593,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $5,836,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $6,082,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $6,301,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,473,200,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $33,829,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $33,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $34,775,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $36,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $37,099,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $315,472,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $324,749,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $328,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $332,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $335,141,000,000.

SEC. 102. 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 1998 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $268,197,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,978,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $588,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $270,784,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,771,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $757,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $274,802,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,418,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $281,305,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $270,110,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $289,092,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $272,571,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $15,909,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,558,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,966,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $12,751,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $14,918,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,569,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,021,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $13,093,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $15,782,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,981,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,077,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $13,434,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,114,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,751,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,122,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $13,826,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,353,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,812,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,178,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $14,217,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $16,237,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,882,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $16,203,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,528,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $15,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,013,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $15,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,862,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $15,604,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,668,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $3,123,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,247,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,050,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $3,469,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,446,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,078,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $3,186,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,293,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,109,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $2,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,048,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,141,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $2,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,867,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,174,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $23,877,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,405,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $30,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $23,227,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,702,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $32,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $22,570,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,963,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $32,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $22,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,720,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $34,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $22,086,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,313,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $34,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $13,133,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,892,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $9,620,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,790,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,294,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,047,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,436,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,215,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,664,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,071,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,509,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,978,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,494,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,960,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,583,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $10,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,108,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,965,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,660,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $6,607,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$920,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,739,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $245,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $11,082,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,299,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,887,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $253,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $15,183,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,821,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,238,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $255,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,078,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,133,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,574,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $257,989,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,678,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,541,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,680,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $259,897,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $46,402,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,933,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $155,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $46,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,256,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $135,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $47,114,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,357,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $48,135,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,303,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $49,184,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,247,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $8,768,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,387,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,867,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $8,489,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,902,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,943,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,406,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $7,810,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,986,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,020,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $7,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,350,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,098,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,452,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $7,790,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,429,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,180,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,475,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $60,020,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,062,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $12,328,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $60,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,335,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,092,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $21,899,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $61,703,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,728,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,926,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $23,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $62,959,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,931,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $14,701,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $24,517,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $63,339,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,316,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,426,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,676,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $137,799,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $137,767,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $85,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $144,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $144,944,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $154,068,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $153,947,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $163,412,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $163,135,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $172,171,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $171,727,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $210,620,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $201,764,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $212,073,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $211,548,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $225,540,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $225,537,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $239,636,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $238,781,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $251,548,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $250,769,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $239,032,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $247,758,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $45,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $254,090,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $258,064,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $75,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $269,566,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,161,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $110,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $275,145,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $277,264,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $145,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $286,945,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $285,239,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $170,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $11,424,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,524,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,060,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,196,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,866,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,022,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,043,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,383,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,398,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $40,545,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,337,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,029,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $27,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $41,466,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,068,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $26,671,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $41,740,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,908,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,177,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $26,202,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $42,093,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,215,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,249,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $42,282,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,436,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,277,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,129,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $24,765,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,609,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $25,120,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,476,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $24,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,240,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $24,354,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,901,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $24,883,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,879,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $14,711,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,959,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $14,444,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,363,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $13,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,727,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,675,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,131,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $13,105,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $296,547,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $296,547,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $304,558,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $304,558,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $305,075,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $305,075,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $303,833,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $303,833,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $303,728,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $303,728,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(19) Allowances (920):
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 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,841,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, −$36,949,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$36,949,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, −$36,937,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$36,937,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, −$39,151,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$39,151,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, −$51,124,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$51,124,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to provide for two separate reconciliation bills: the first for entitlement reforms and the second for tax relief. In the event Senate procedures preclude the consideration of two separate bills, this section would permit the consideration of one omnibus reconciliation bill.

(b) SUBMISSIONS.—

(1) ENTITLEMENT REFORMS.—Not later than June 12, 1997, the House committees named in subsection (c) 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.

(2) TAX RELIEF AND MISCELLANEOUS REFORMS.—Not later than June 13, 1997, the House committees named in subsection (d) 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.

(c) INSTRUCTIONS RELATING TO ENTITLEMENT REFORMS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture 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: $34,571,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $37,008,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $211,443,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(2) COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES.—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: −$8,435,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, −$5,091,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and −$50,306,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(3) 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: $393,533,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $506,791,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,617,528,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(4) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce 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: $17,222,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $17,673,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $103,109,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(5) 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: $68,975,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $81,896,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $443,061,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 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: $0 in fiscal year 1998, $621,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, and $1,829,000,000 in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(6) 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: $18,087,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $17,283,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $106,615,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(7) 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: $22,444,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $24,563,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $139,134,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(8) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $397,546,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $506,442,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,621,578,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 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: $1,176,253,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1998, $1,386,546,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2002, and $7,517,939,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(d) INSTRUCTIONS RELATING TO TAX RELIEF AND MISCELLANEOUS REFORMS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture 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: $34,571,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $37,008,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $211,443,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(2) COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES.—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: −$8,435,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, −$5,091,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and −$50,306,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(3) 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: $393,533,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $506,791,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,617,528,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(4) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce 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: $17,222,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $17,673,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $103,109,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(5) 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: $68,975,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $81,896,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $443,061,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 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: $0 in fiscal year 1998, $621,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $1,829,000,000 in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(6) 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: $18,087,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $17,283,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $106,615,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(7) 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: $22,444,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $24,563,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $139,134,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(8) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $397,546,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $506,442,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,621,578,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 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: $1,168,853,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1998, $1,366,046,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2002, and $7,432,939,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

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

(f) CHILDREN'S HEALTH INITIATIVE.—If the Committees on Commerce and Ways and Means report recommendations pursuant to their reconciliation instructions that, combined, provide an initiative for children's health that would increase the deficit by more than $2.3 billion for fiscal year 1998, by more than $3.9 billion for fiscal year 2002, and by more than $16 billion for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002, the committees shall be deemed to not have complied with their reconciliation instructions pursuant to section 310(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to adjust the appropriate budgetary levels to accommodate legislation increasing spending from the highway trust fund on surface transportation and highway safety above the levels assumed in this resolution if such legislation is deficit neutral.

(b) DEFICIT NEUTRALITY REQUIREMENT.—(1) In order to receive the adjustments specified in subsection (c), a bill reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure that provides new budget authority above the levels assumed in this resolution for programs authorized out of the highway trust fund must be deficit neutral.

(2) A deficit-neutral bill must meet the following conditions:

(A) The amount of new budget authority provided for programs authorized out of the highway trust fund must be in excess of $25.949 billion in new budget authority for fiscal year 1998, $25.464 billion in new budget authority for fiscal year 2002, and $127.973 billion in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The outlays estimated to flow from the excess new budget authority set forth in subparagraph (A) must be offset for fiscal year 1998, fiscal year 2002, and for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002. For the sole purpose of estimating the amount of outlays flowing from excess new budget authority under this section, it shall be assumed that such excess new budget authority would have an obligation limitation sufficient to accommodate that new budget authority.

(C) The outlays estimated to flow from the excess new budget authority must be offset by (i) other direct spending or revenue provisions within that transportation bill, (ii) the net reduction in other direct spending and revenue legislation that is enacted during this Congress after the date of adoption of this resolution and before such transportation bill is reported (in excess of the levels assumed in this resolution), or (iii) a combination of the offsets specified in clauses (i) and (ii).

(D) As used in 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.

(c) REVISED LEVELS.—(1) When the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reports a bill (or when a conference report thereon is filed) meeting the conditions set forth in subsection (b)(2), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall increase the allocation of new budget authority to that committee by the amount of new budget authority provided in that bill (and that is above the levels set forth in subsection (b)(2)(A)) for programs authorized out of the highway trust fund.

(2) After the enactment of the transportation bill described in paragraph (1) and upon the reporting of a general, supplemental or continuing resolution making appropriations by the Committee on Appropriations (or upon the filing of a conference report thereon) establishing an obligation limitation above the levels specified in subsection (b)(2)(A) (at a level sufficient to obligate some or all of the budget authority specified in paragraph (1)), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall increase the allocation and aggregate levels of outlays to that committee for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 by the appropriate amount.

(d) REVISIONS.—Allocations and aggregates revised pursuant to this section shall be considered for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(e) REVERSALS.—If any legislation referred to in this section is not enacted into law, then the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall, as soon as practicable, reverse adjustments made under this section for such legislation and have such adjustments published in the Congressional Record.

(f) DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY LEVELS.—For the purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the House Committee on the Budget.

(g) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term ''highway trust fund'' refers to the following budget accounts (or any successor accounts):

(1) 69–8083–0–7–401 (Federal-Aid Highways).

(2) 69–8191–0–7–401 (Mass Transit Capital Fund).

(3) 69–8350–0–7–401 (Mass Transit Formula Grants).

(4) 69–8016–0–7–401 (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration-Operations and Research).

(5) 69–8020–0–7–401 (Highway Traffic Safety Grants).

(6) 69–8048–0–7–401 (National Motor Carrier Safety Program).

SEC. 302. SALE OF GOVERNMENT ASSETS.

(a) BUDGETARY TREATMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose of any concurrent resolution on the budget and the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, no amounts realized from the sale of an asset shall be scored with respect to the level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues if such sale would cause an increase in the deficit as calculated pursuant to paragraph (2).

(2) CALCULATION OF NET PRESENT VALUE.—The deficit estimate of an asset sale shall be the net present value of the cash flow from—

(A) proceeds from the asset sale;

(B) future receipts that would be expected from continued ownership of the asset by the Government; and

(C) expected future spending by the Government at a level necessary to continue to operate and maintain the asset to generate the receipts estimated pursuant to subparagraph (B).

(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 the 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.

(d) DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY LEVELS.—For the purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the House Committee on the Budget.

SEC. 303. ENVIRONMENTAL RESERVE FUND.

(a) COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS.—In the House, after the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure report a bill (or a conference report thereon is filed) to reform the Superfund program to facilitate the cleanup of hazardous waste sites, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall submit revised allocations and budget aggregates to carry out this section by an amount not to exceed the excess subject to the limitation. These revisions shall be considered for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as the allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The adjustments made under this section shall not exceed:

(1) $200 million in budget authority for fiscal year 1998 and the estimated outlays flowing therefrom.

(2) $200 million in budget authority for fiscal year 2002 and the estimated outlays flowing therefrom.

(3) $1 billion in budget authority for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002 and the estimated outlays flowing therefrom.

(c) READJUSTMENTS.—In the House, any adjustments made under this section for any appropriation measure may be readjusted if that measure is not enacted into law.

SEC. 304. SEPARATE ALLOCATION FOR LAND ACQUISITIONS AND EXCHANGES.

(a) ALLOCATION BY CHAIRMAN.—In the House, upon the reporting of a bill by the Committee on Appropriations (or upon the filing of a conference report thereon) providing $700 million in budget authority for fiscal year 1998 for Federal land acquisitions and to finalize priority Federal land exchanges, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall allocate that amount of budget authority and the corresponding amount of outlays.

(b) TREATMENT OF ALLOCATIONS IN THE HOUSE.—In the House, for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, allocations made under subsection (a) shall be deemed to be made pursuant to section 602(a)(1) of that Act and shall be deemed to be a separate suballocation for purposes of the application of section 302(f) of that Act as modified by section 602(c) of that Act.

TITLE IV—SENSE OF CONGRESS PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON BASELINES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The 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 portrayed 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 and executive accountability for Federal spending.

SEC. 402. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON REPAYMENT OF THE FEDERAL DEBT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

(1) The Congress and the President have a basic moral and ethical responsibility to future generations to repay the Federal debt, including the money borrowed from the Social Security Trust Fund.

(2) The Congress and the President should enact a law which creates a regimen for paying off the Federal debt within 30 years.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PRESIDENT'S SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that:

(1) The President's annual budget submission to Congress should include a plan for repayment of Federal debt beyond the year 2002, including the money borrowed from the Social Security Trust Fund.

(2) The plan should specifically explain how the President would cap spending growth at a level one percentage point lower than projected growth in revenues.

(3) If spending growth were held to a level one percentage point lower than projected growth in revenues, then the Federal debt could be repaid within 30 years.

SEC. 403. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON COMMISSION ON LONG-TERM BUDGETARY PROBLEMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) achieving a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002 is only the first step necessary to restore our Nation's economic prosperity;

(2) the imminent retirement of the baby-boom generation will greatly increase the demand for government services;

(3) this burden will be borne by a relatively smaller work force resulting in an unprecedented intergenerational transfer of financial resources;

(4) the rising demand for retirement and medical benefits will quickly jeopardize the solvency of the medicare, social security, and Federal retirement trust funds; and

(5) the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that marginal tax rates would have to increase by 50 percent over the next 5 years to cover the long-term projected costs of retirement and health benefits.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be enacted to create a commission to assess long-term budgetary problems, their implications for both the baby-boom generation and tomorrow's workforce, and make such recommendations as it deems appropriate to ensure our Nation's future prosperity.

SEC. 404. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CORPORATE WELFARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that the functional levels and aggregates in this budget resolution assume that—

(1) the Federal Government supports profit-making enterprises and industries through billions of dollars in payments, benefits, and programs;

(2) many of these subsidies do not serve a clear and compelling public interest;

(3) corporate subsidies frequently provide unfair competitive advantages to certain industries and industry segments; and

(4) at a time when millions of Americans are being asked to sacrifice in order to balance the budget, the corporate sector should bear its share of the burden.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be enacted to—

(1) eliminate the most egregious corporate subsidies; and

(2) create a commission to recommend the elimination of Federal payments, benefits, and programs which predominantly benefit a particular industry or segment of an industry, rather than provide a clear and compelling public benefit, and include a fast-track process for the consideration of those recommendations.

SEC. 405. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON FAMILY VIOLENCE OPTION CLARIFYING AMENDMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

(1) Domestic violence is the leading cause of physical injury to women. The Department of Justice estimates that over 1,000,000 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, Illinois, document, for the first time, the interrelationship between domestic violence and welfare by showing that from 34 percent to 65 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.

(6) The restructuring of 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.

(7) In recognition of this finding, the House Committee on the Budget unanimously passed a sense of Congress amendment on domestic violence and Federal assistance to the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution. Subsequently, Congress passed the family violence option amendment to last year's welfare reform reconciliation bill.

(8) The family violence option gives States the flexibility to grant temporary waivers from time limits and work requirements for domestic violence victims who would suffer extreme hardship from the application of these provisions. These waivers were not intended to be included as part of the permanent 20 percent hardship exemption.

(9) The Department of Health and Human Services has been slow to issue regulations regarding this provision. As a result, States are hesitant to fully implement the family violence option fearing it will interfere with the 20 percent hardship exemption.

(10) Currently 15 States have opted to include the family violence option in their welfare plans, and 13 other States have included some type of domestic violence provisions in their plans.

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

(1) States should not be subject to any numerical limits in granting domestic violence good cause waivers to individuals receiving assistance for all requirements where compliance with such requirements would make it more difficult for individuals receiving assistance to escape domestic violence; and

(2) any individuals granted a domestic violence good cause waiver by States should not be included in the States' 20 percent hardship exemption.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendments are in order except the amendments in the nature of a substitute designated in section 2 of the resolution, if printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Each amendment shall be considered only in the order designated, may be offered only by the Member designated, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes, except as otherwise provided in section 2, 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 shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall not be less than 15 minutes.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 designated in paragraph 1 of section 2 of House Resolution 152.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MS. WATERS

Ms. WATERS. 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 No. 1 in the nature of a substitute offered by Ms. WATERS:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999 through 2002 are hereby set forth.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 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 1998: $1,241,721,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,295,692,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,358,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,421,796,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,466,331,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $36,142,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $44,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $54,953,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $60,198,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $45,352,000,000.

(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 1998: $1,390,471,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,460,826,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,505,659,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,544,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,591,266,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $1,377,266,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,445,118,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,495,407,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,517,370,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,564,726,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $135,545,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $147,426,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $137,215,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $95,534,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $98,395,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $5,556,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $5,803,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $6,037,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $6,241,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,466,700,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $33,829,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $33,378,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: $34,775,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $36,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $37,099,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $315,472,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $324,749,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $328,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $332,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $336,141,000,000.

SEC. 102. 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 1998 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $237,067,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $245,233,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $588,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $233,589,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $233,746,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $757,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $233,861,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $232,174,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $235,829,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $227,453,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $224,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $221,137,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $21,545,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,726,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,966,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $12,751,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $17,533,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,510,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,021,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,093,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $18,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,376,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,077,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,434,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $18,759,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,166,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,122,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,826,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $18,696,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,001,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,178,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,217,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $16,522,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,042,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $16,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,745,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $16,322,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,314,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,311,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,271,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,302,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,291,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $2,550,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,731,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,050,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $3,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,078,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $2,725,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,822,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,109,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $2,425,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,484,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,141,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $2,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,312,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,174,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $22,765,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,352,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $30,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $22,214,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,550,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $32,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $21,495,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,780,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $32,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $21,974,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,362,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $34,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $22,614,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,767,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $34,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $12,757,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,465,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $7,620,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,365,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,061,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,543,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,047,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,436,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $11,637,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,069,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,071,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,509,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,444,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,937,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,960,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,583,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $10,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,720,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,965,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,660,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $6,724,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $828,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,739,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $245,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $11,117,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,357,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,887,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $253,450,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $15,216,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,820,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,238,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $255,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,226,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,264,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,574,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $257,989,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,642,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,481,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,680,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $259,897,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $43,663,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,261,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $155,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $45,737,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,652,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $135,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $45,422,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,640,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $46,698,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,022,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $48,098,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,665,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $11,550,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,567,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,867,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $8,818,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,803,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,943,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,406,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $8,366,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,352,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,020,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $8,537,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,606,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,098,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,452,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $8,707,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,165,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,180,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,415,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $87,088,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,799,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $12,328,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $20,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $91,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $88,488,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,032,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $21,898,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $95,876,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,114,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,926,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $23,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $95,876,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,114,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $14,701,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $24,517,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $99,897,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,336,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,426,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,676,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $138,580,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $138,347,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $85,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $152,463,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $152,307,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $112,258,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $162,025,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $172,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $172,314,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $184,519,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $183,955,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $205,685,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $205,808,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $225,366,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $224,825,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $241,420,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $245,382,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $261,614,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $256,765,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $283,933,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $283,140,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $245,866,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $255,468,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $45,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $260,828,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,255,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $75,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $277,750,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $279,066,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $110,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $284,544,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $254,127,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $145,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $298,580,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $297,014,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $170,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $11,472,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,547,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,111,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,231,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,858,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,918,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,115,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,116,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,513,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,513,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $41,235,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,885,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,029,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $27,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $42,047,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,184,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,068,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $26,671,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $42,477,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,312,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,177,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $26,201,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $42,855,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,105,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,249,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $43,301,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,361,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,277,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,129,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $26,165,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,009,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $26,161,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,378,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $25,573,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,541,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $25,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,042,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $25,576,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,451,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $14,898,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,040,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $14,639,001,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,490,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,222,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,625,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $14,014,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,405,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,122,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,060,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $295,593,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $295,593,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $301,972,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $301,972,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $300,590,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $300,590,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $297,107,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $297,107,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $295,816,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $295,816,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$11,864,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,369,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,093,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,734,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$3,935,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,672,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,370,000,000.
(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 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,244,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,244,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, −$32,858,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$32,858,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$36,516,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$36,516,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$38,845,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$38,845,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,331,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,331,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION.

(a) SUBMISSIONS.—Not later than August 1, 1997, 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) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(1) 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: $396,058,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $592,292,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,724,790,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(2) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $397,268,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $535,924,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,692,944,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase revenues as follows: by $36,142,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1998, by $45,352,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2002, and by $240,895,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1998 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 gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, at this time should I acknowledge that I am in opposition to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] opposed?

Mr. SHAYS. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] will control 30 minutes as a Member opposed.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I take this moment not to introduce my friend, the gentleman from the great State of Mississippi, Mr. BENNIE THOMPSON, but, rather, I take this moment to thank him and to say to him all of the Members of the Congressional Black Caucus are extremely appreciative for the work that he has put in on helping to bring about this Congressional Black Caucus budget. The gentleman met with the Blue Dogs and he met with every Member of the Congressional Black Caucus and others in an effort to get input. He met early in the morning, he met late at night. He worked very hard to put together the kind of document that we could be proud of; and indeed, we are very proud of the product that he has produced.

This budget represents our hopes, our desires, our dreams, our aspirations. It is everything that we could have asked for.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi, the person who is our senior member representing us on the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. BENNIE THOMPSON.

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

Mr. Chairman, for the record, let me start by reemphasizing the fundamental principles upon which Members of Congress, both Democrat and Republican, already agree. First, we must balance the budget. Second, we must responsibly protect the budget priorities of the American people: education, the environment, the social safety net, Medicare and Medicaid; and most important, we must apply deficit reduction fairly and ask Americans who are the most able to shoulder their portion of our shared economic burden.

Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus's budget alternative accomplishes all of these goals. It is balanced, it is fair, it is responsible. By all accounts, Mr. Chairman, if we hold the Republicans true to their word, then they should love this budget. Our alternative contains no tax increases on individuals or businesses. It cuts domestic spending by $23 billion, and the Congressional Budget Office says our budget will balance a year before the Republican budget will.

For the last 3 years, my esteemed colleagues on the other side of the aisle have focused budget debate here in the House on obtaining a budget that is certified by the Congressional Budget Office as being balanced by the year 2002.

The Congressional Black Caucus's alternative budget does better than that. We balanced the budget by the year 2001, a whole year before any of the budgets introduced by the Republicans. While they are trying to figure out how to squeeze the last few billion dollars out of our children, seniors, and the poor to reach a balance by 2002, under our budget, America will already have a $7 billion surplus. And we managed to do all of this and all the other things while maintaining an effective social net, by fully funding Head Start, the WIC Program, section 8 housing, and Chapter 1 education.

Mr. Chairman, there are no tax cuts in our budget. That is because the CBC believes America cannot afford them. We should balance the budget first.

It makes no sense to force the poorest Americans to go without food stamps, school lunches, and baby formula in order to balance the budget and then turn around and give wealthy campaign contributors, people who can afford to pay $25,000 to have dinner with the Republican leadership in the Library of Congress, a huge tax cut. No American should benefit from another American's suffering.

I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of the Congressional Black Caucus alternative. Unlike the budget resolution we will be voting on later tonight, this budget was forged in the light of day. What my colleagues see in our budget is exactly what they get. It is balanced, it is fair, it is responsible.

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

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

I just want to say that this is a balanced budget, it is certainly legitimate in terms of its Members, but we oppose it for a variety of very important reasons.

First, it provides no tax relief for American families. Again, let me say, it provides no tax relief for American families. In fact, in our reading of the legislation, it increases taxes, demanding $300 billion more from American taxpayers over the next 5 years than the bipartisan budget agreement, which cuts taxes. It extends the solvency of Medicare by only 4 years at best, and 1 year at worst. And many on our side of the aisle strongly oppose the fact that it will be cutting defense appropriations by $183 billion below the level of this bipartisan budget agreement over the next 5 years.

The fact is that under this plan, the era of big government is not over, it increases. And importantly, and it just cannot be understated, this budget would clearly be an agreement-breaker. In other words, the bipartisan agreement between the White House and Congress would not be respected by passage of this caucus budget.

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

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ 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. Chairman, I want to thank the members of the Congressional Black Caucus, our wonderful chairperson, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS], and our very stalwart Mississippian who chaired the Committee on the Budget of our caucus.

I served on the Committee on the Budget during the 104th Congress, but I have never been prouder of the Congressional Black Caucus' budget as I am this year, because of the fact that the Congressional Black Caucus' budget this year is doing what no other budget has done.

Last year there was quite a bit of incivility when it came to decisions in the Committee on the Budget. I understand that this year there has been much more civility, but we still must come together on what will make America proud.

This reconciliation bill that balanced the budget last year was one that I voted against, and I voted against it because it balances the budgets on the backs of the poor and the disenfranchised. The Congressional Black Caucus' budget is an excellent alternative to that. We did not seek to balance the budget on that. We did not seek to cut taxes just for the sake of cutting taxes. We did not believe in the pious platitudes that are floating around Congress at this point, that is on a glidepath to the year 2000, being able to balance the budget. All of those, in my opinion, are pious platitudes if they do not show where they are helping the people who need the help more.

I wonder why we are rushing to complete this work on this 5-year straightjacket? The Congressional Black Caucus looked at this and when they looked at it they said, this straightjacket needs some changes. My colleagues took in their budget in the Congressional Black Caucus the first steps toward cutting Medicare, at least the President's budget and the Republican budget, by $115 billion and it cut Medicaid by $14 billion over 4 years.

I do not have enough time to talk about the goodness of this budget. I can only say it is balanced, it is fair, it does what no other budget has done. And I want to say those of my colleagues who think about what is good about this country will vote for the Congressional Black Caucus' budget. I thank my colleagues for their eloquence and their good decision for putting this budget together. I am proud of the Congressional Black Caucus. My colleagues better believe it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON], the cochair of the CBC budget caucus.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I also want to congratulate the chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus and the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus Committee on the Budget for his efforts.

This amendment is a perfecting amendment. It allows us to do the best we can. It is not necessarily the winning one, but nevertheless, it is a perfecting one. It is the one that allows us to balance the budget, balance the national priorities, and not to allow so much suffering. It is the ideal of a shared sacrifice. It makes provisions for those who are left out in other amendments, and certainly those who are left out in the budget agreement.

I just want to raise two areas, particularly out of rural America and that of the minority farmers. The Congressional Black Caucus allows for funds to speak to years of deprivation and discrimination that have gone on now for almost 30 years, three decades, since the early 1960's. Just recently we have had three substantial reports, a GAO report, an IG report, as well as an extensive civil rights report, detailing the discrimination both denying farmers as well as employees from the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

This budget provides $30 million to provide for resources to make the adjudication where appropriate to make sure we make those farmers whole. Also, it provides $12 million in additional funds for the historically black college, again, to make a commitment that we have made before, authorization, but never fully funded.

In addition to that, rural America funds provide another $10 million for everyone, not just for minorities, but to make sure rural opportunities are provided as they are in other areas.

☐ 2315

This particular amendment is indeed the most ideal. I commend it to the Members, and urge all of us, if we want to do the best that America can have, vote for the Waters and Thompson amendment.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas, [Ms. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. THOMPSON] and the chairwoman of this caucus for an amendment to this budget, substitute budget, that really answers the questions of the previous speaker.

There was reference made to a conservative budget or a liberal budget, and the fact that we do not have the time to have those budgets presented. What we do not have the time for is to leave millions of Americans outside of the circle.

I am very proud that the Congressional Black Caucus has another attribute that has not been mentioned tonight. This is the deal, or the deficit reduction, red and very loud. This is the CBC reduction of the deficit, as Members can see, by the year 2002.

Mr. and Mrs. America, look at this very carefully. This is not an African-American budget or a Hispanic budget or an Anglo budget or an Asian budget, it is a budget that reflects the principles of the quality of life.

Let me very quickly speak to those quality of life issues. One, we have already heard that Chairman Greenspan has indicated that he is not going to raise the interest rates, so we can do more creative things with our budget. The Congressional Black Caucus responds to our concerns about Medicare, and does not raise the premium $1.50 per month on seniors least able to do it.

It also, as I have said, brings down the deficit, but it reinforces very strong principles, one of investment, which increases the Community Reinvestment Act so our urban and rural communities can be improved and have money reinvested in housing, and housing built. Education, it rebuilds our schools, so crumbling schools will not be part of our children's history. Veterans, it preserves the benefits for veterans. Health, it increases the Ryan White treatment dollars, and it provides monies for our public hospital systems, who serve the most indigent of ours.

As well, it does something unique: It takes us into the 21st century with science, in math and science, in NASA funding, in National Science Foundation funding, in funding for traditionally black colleges, allowing them to be prepared for the 21st century; and yes, computer learning centers.

This is a budget for Americans that should not be left out. The deficit reduction is part of this budget. I ask my colleagues to be bipartisan in their support for the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, let me repeat what the Speaker said earlier. This amendment and each of the amendments that we will be debating this evening are agreement-breakers. If any one of them passes, it is going to violate the agreement that we have between the budget committees. The resolution was passed by both budget committees in the House and Senate, and the administration. So it is essential that we work together, Democrats and Republicans, to defeat this amendment.

Let me remind everybody what our budget resolution is all about. First of all, it balances in 5 years. In 5 years, without any gimmicks, without any smoke and mirrors, we are going to balance it. It does not have the trigger that was talked about in previous budgets by the President, that would automatically change tax cuts or change spending.

It is a real budget with real numbers, with conservative estimates on economic growth of 2.1 percent a year. We are growing at a much faster rate than that. I think in all probability we are going to balance the budget in fewer than 5 years. But with conservative economic projections, we are going to have a true, honest balanced budget by the year 2002.

This budget that was passed by the Committee on the Budget has permanent tax relief for America's families. When we talk about tax relief, as I talked about earlier, it is a real defining issue, I think, between many of the Members of the Democratic side and the Republican side.

We on the Republican side believe that the American people are taxed too much already, that we need to reduce taxes. We believe that people back home are better able to spend their money than to send it to Washington for them to tell us how to spend it. The less money that is sent to Washington, it allows us to reduce the size and scope of the government, it allows us to shift power and money and influence back to the States, and put the power back with the people rather than with the bureaucracy here in Washington. This has permanent tax cuts.

We are talking about $85 billion in tax cuts, net tax cuts over 5 years. And we are talking about $9 trillion in Government spending? This is not any giant tax cut, but it is the right thing because it is for America's families: A $500 tax credit for children; tax credits for college or going for vocational skills; capital gains, which actually, we call it a tax cut, but it makes money for the Federal Government, and we are talking about the help with IRA's and death taxes. It makes no sense.

We have permanent tax relief provided for these. The key to balancing the budget is controlling spending. Two-thirds of our budget is in the mandatory side. Half of it, actually, is in the entitlement side. This budget resolution has $600 billion of reductions in entitlement spending over the next 10 years, $600 billion in controlling entitlement spending. That is the key to balancing the budget.

We cannot balance the budget by just raising taxes, and we cannot just do it with discretionary spending because that is only one-third out of budget. We have to talk about serious entitlement reforms, and that is what we have in this budget.

And we save Medicare from bankruptcy. Medicare is one of our largest entitlements. It is going bankrupt. It is going to be bankrupt in 4 short years. We have to do something about it. Unfortunately, it was used as a political issue last year on the elections, but the thing is, we agree.

This is where I commend President Clinton for stepping forward and saying, yes; we need to reform Medicare, we need to change it, we need to have structural changes in the Medicare program, and we are going to save $115 billion. But to save $115 billion we are going to increase spending every year per person on Medicare. We are going to extend it for 10 years.

We still have a crisis in Medicare, it is only a 10-year solution, and the real crisis comes when the baby boomers start to retire. But at least we are making a step to get us moving in the direction of saving Medicare from going bankrupt. We are going to increase spending by 6 percent per year per person on Medicare.

The way we solve Medicare problems is opening it up to the marketplace, slow down the rate of growth, get a little competition in. It is happening in the private sector for big businesses and small businesses, and gives some choices. Allow groups to have provider service organizations, which are where local hospitals and doctors can provide a program in their community.

Back in my hometown of Bradenton, a local hospital can go together with the local doctors and provide health care to people in Bradenton; or in Sarasota, the local Sarasota hospital can go together with their doctors and offer a program.

We are going to give an opportunity to create a little competition in the community and offer better service, rather than big insurance companies totally controlling what is happening. We believe it is going to make it a better Medicare Program by giving people a right to choose. They do not have to take any of these plans, but the thing is they have a right to choose, because they do not have a choice right now.

As a Federal employee all of us get to choose a plan every year. We get the same insurance plan, pay the same costs as somebody who works for the Department of the Treasury or the Department of Agriculture, so we are in the same plan they are in, but we get a right to choose. Why can our seniors not have the same type of plan that we have? We believe having a plan like that, slowing the rate of growth in spending by the market pressures will save that plan.

So this budget resolution that we are going to be voting on this evening or the early hours of tomorrow morning is the right thing for America. It is the right thing for our families and kids, because it is so exciting to be at this stage today. We are going to be able to say that we are balancing the budget because we are doing it for the children of today and the children of the future.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands, Ms. DONNA CHRISTIAN-GREEN.

Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. THOMPSON] for yielding me this time, and our chairwoman, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Mr. Chairman, I rise with pride and in full support of the alternate budget presented by the Congressional Black Caucus. This caucus has once again demonstrated its leadership as the representative of the majority of Americans who would otherwise have no advocate for their interests.

This budget puts realistic spending into education and repair of our schools to ensure that no one is left behind as this country builds its bridge and prepares to cross over into the 21st century. It is a budget that seeks to keep our children, families, and communities whole, and increases the funding for crime and violence prevention programs.

Our budget remembers those who have fallen to drug addiction and AIDS, and places over $400 million more in research and treatment for these devastating illnesses. Mr. Chairman, it is a budget that is serious about jobs and opportunity for all, which are the keys to the future of this great country.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for the CBC budget, a budget that puts people first, that advocates a better quality of life for all Americans, and that balances the budget by 2001. I thank the chairman, and I commend my distinguished chairwoman, the gentlewoman from California, Ms. MAXINE WATERS, and my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. BENNIE THOMPSON, for their leadership on this amendment.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California, Mr. GEORGE BROWN.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, as some Members may be aware, I have a budget of my own. They may wonder why I am speaking here on behalf of the Black Caucus budget. There is only one reason: it is a better budget than mine. I was afraid to offer such a good budget because I did not think it would get enough votes, so I have compromised. We all do that around here. We rationalize it in one way or another. But this is a budget which I have consistently voted for, and its predecessor budgets, over a number of years, because I felt that it really did reflect the values of America.

The other side talks about a budget which has no smoke and mirrors and solves a lot of problems. There is a difference of opinion on that. I remember the Reagan budget of 1981, in which we had this feeding frenzy to see who could cut the budget the most, either the Democrats or the Republicans, and it has left its mark on this country for the next 18 years. I had been in Congress about 18 years at that time. I voted against those tax cuts, and I am going to vote against the tax cuts in this budget, and for the Black Caucus.

I urge Members' support for it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentlewoman from California for their hard work in developing this budget.

I rise tonight to echo my colleagues' support for the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget, and to speak briefly on the judiciary elements of that budget. The CBC alternative balances the budget, reduces crime, and invests in our future economic and social well-being, and it does so by better utilizing our scarce resources.

For example, Mr. Chairman, we believe that the $711 million allocated for the building of new prisons and jails in the committee budget could be put to better use by stressing the treatment and prevention programs. The CBC budget increases our investment in more local community prevention programs, such as mentoring, parental training, truancy prevention, gang intervention, and comprehensive educational services for at-risk youth, so fewer of our children will become involved in the juvenile justice system in the first place, and fewer crimes, fewer victims, and a decrease in taxpayer money spent on prisons will be the direct result.

The CBC budget also includes an increase in the budget for the Legal Services Corporation, which will allow equal access to justice for all Americans, not just those who can independently afford it.

The CBC alternative also addresses understaffing at the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, which requires increased Federal funding to eliminate its backlog in order to make employment opportunities accessible to countless more American men and women who lose those opportunities because of illegal discrimination.

☐ 2330

By passing the CBC alternative, we can look forward to the day when this Nation meets and surpasses the goals of full opportunities for all of its citizens to participate in the American dream.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentlewoman from California for their hard work.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN].

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in favor of the Congressional Black Caucus budget and against the proposed budget resolution. I am so disappointed with this proposed budget. I think we should rename it the fudge it budget resolution.

All this resolution does is fudge numbers here and there and paint a rosy colored picture of a balanced budget with a surplus by the year 2002. What it really does is to continue what I call reverse Robin Hood, robbing from the poor and working people to give a tax break to the rich. Look at what this proposal will do to Medicaid disproportionate share hospital payments in my home State of Florida.

These payments go to hospitals in my district that greatly assist the poor and needy who cannot afford health insurance. But under the fudge it budget resolution, we will cut payments by $548 million over 5 years, a 42-percent reduction in what Florida has received over the past 5 years. Florida already ranks 42d in the Nation for Medicaid costs per recipient. This budget proposal will only make the situation worse.

But on the other hand, the Congressional Black Caucus budget takes other things into consideration and it is really the American people's budget. It supports children, seniors, and veterans.

Let me give my colleagues two or three ideas about some of the proposals in the Congressional Black Caucus budget: Pell grants, $2,700 to $5,000 per student; eliminates the COLA delay for Federal Civil Service workers; makes no, let me emphasize this, makes no cuts to Medicaid and fully funds a child health initiative to cover 10 million uninsured children; fully funds Head Start and the WIC Program; includes an additional $591 million than the so-called budget deal to ensure that veterans will receive additional benefits.

Mr. Chairman, let us not fudge it. Let us vote for the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BISHOP].

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

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the Congressional Black Caucus for crafting an alternative budget to ensure that all Americans share the burden of balancing the budget. Year after year the caucus steps up to produce an alternative budget, one that is consistent with the values of America. This plan reflects the compassion of the caucus and, as the conscience of the Congress, the caucus continues to be a voice for the voiceless and power for the powerless.

More importantly, the caucus remains at the forefront fighting for issues affecting our country's most vulnerable citizens.

This alternative budget has many good points. It makes a firm commitment to our Nation's domestic priorities. It provides funding for a $1,500 HOPE scholarship. It protects the solvency of Medicare and Medicaid. It includes full funding of health insurance for our Nation's 10 million uninsured children. It eliminates the 3-month COLA delay for Federal retirees and expresses the caucus' commitment to increased funding for veterans and crime prevention programs to move our young people through the difficult years of childhood and adolescence to a positive and promising future. It ensures funding for adequate housing for the most needy.

While I support the noble goals of this alternative budget, I must respectfully disagree with the cuts to defense. As a Member who represents three military bases where thousands of military and civilian workers proudly carry out the mission of our country's national defense, I cannot vote to cut another $189.9 billion from defense. I must act in the best interest of my constituents. I must act in the best interest of our national security. Because I believe that defense has already cut the fat and cut the muscle needed to assure a strong defense, I cannot cut the bone at the expense of our service members and their families.

Yet this CBC budget is compelling. It is compassionate, and it is courageous. I congratulate our Chair, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS], and I congratulate the architect of this budget, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. THOMPSON], and the other members of the CBC for their hard work. And I congratulate their staffs.

While I cannot, because of the needs of my district, vote for it, Mr. Chairman, I cannot in good conscience vote against it. It is, indeed, a worthy alternative.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the people who are supporting the underlying budget have too little faith in the private market. I mean this quite seriously. The private market does not need as much help as they think.

We have a private sector economy that is capable of providing for most of us the wealth that will enable us to improve our quality of life. But it will do it especially today, with technology and world trade being the driving engines, in a way that will stay the increasing equality.

Large numbers of people will prosper, but some will be left behind unless we intervene. And this is the budget, the budget before us today brought forward by our colleagues in the Black Caucus, that shows concern for those who are left behind. It does not in any way, shape or form retard our economy.

Indeed, by sensibly reducing military spending, it frees up resources for constructive use. But this is the vehicle for compassion. Reject this and vote for the underlying budget and what you will do will be to condemn the poorest among us to a worsening of their conditions while the rest of us prosper.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON].

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the CBC budget. We know it is an alternative budget. The so-called budget deal is not the only budget, however, that should receive consideration in this body. The CBC alternative budget balances the budget a year sooner than the deal. It applies deficit reduction fairly and preserves the fundamental budget priorities of the American people. The CBC budget does several things which contrast it from the deal, which few Members have really actually been able to see and which imposes deficit reduction on many of the most vulnerable populations in this country.

The budget alternative would not impose undue cuts on programs serving the elderly, veterans, working families or the poor. Wealthy corporations would bear their share of the deficit. The budget would fund education programs at levels beyond those proposed by President Clinton while incorporating his priorities.

The budget would fund child health initiatives, which cover the 10 million children who do not receive health care coverage at this time. The budget would institute a real program of welfare reform, reinstating cuts in food stamps, immigrant services and SSI which simply went too far in the deal.

In short, the Congressional Black Caucus budget alternative is the most reflective of the values and priorities of the American people that Members will have an opportunity to support. A vote for this budget will be a vote for jobs. A vote for this budget would be a vote for welfare reform. A vote for this budget will be an opportunity to give the wealthy and large corporations an opportunity to assist in deficit reduction. A vote for this budget would be a vote for keeping Medicare trust fund solvent. A vote for this budget would be a vote for protecting social investments which help our economy grow.

I urge all of us to consider that we do represent real people. Let us vote for the real people and support this budget.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, let me add my accolades to the gentlewoman from California, our dynamic leader, and to the gentleman from Mississippi who has crafted such a delightful document.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to express support for this budget amendment because it is one that is balanced, fair, responsive, responsible and speaks to the needs of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, this budget, the Congressional Black Caucus budget, is worth fighting for. It is designed to invest in the people of America. It helps to cut the deficit, to grow the economy, to reduce corporate welfare. And it helps those most in need of vital programs such as Head Start, WIC, drug treatment, section 8 housing, special education, and summer jobs for youth. This budget highlights and places special emphasis upon the needs of small businesses, minority-owned businesses and women-owned businesses.

The budget includes a million and a half dollars more than the President's request for community development through financial institutions and recommends expansion of the community reinvestment guidelines to make it easier for financial institutions to reinvest in low-income communities.

This budget provides $10 million for the Office of Women's Ownership. It provides $100 million for round 2 of the empowerment zone and empowerment communities. This budget recognizes that Government must act as a catalyst and help people to be in a position to help themselves.

The Government must give rise to hope and generate faith. This budget is a good budget. It is one that represents the people. It is one that deserves support. I urge, Mr. Chairman, all of my colleagues, even those who would talk about compromise, even those who would recognize that sometimes we come together, but I just do not believe that we can compromise on the backs of the poor. I do not believe that we can compromise on those who have no food and no shelter.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this CBC budget. This is a budget that balances the budget sooner and spends less than the budget resolution. Not only is this budget responsible, it offers an added bonus to the budget process: It is fair. The CBC budget does not gut the Medicaid Program and it would not cause Medicare recipients to pay more for less services.

This budget does not ask the poor to bear the burden for tax cuts for the wealthy. This budget does ask corporations to give up many of the tax breaks that they have unfairly enjoyed for too long.

Mr. Chairman, we must ask ourselves what the American people really want. Do they want to pay for huge tax cuts for the rich and for big corporations? Do they want to pay for huge outlays in defense? I do not think so. Or do the American people want a budget that provides fairness to working families? Do they want a budget that protects Medicare and Medicaid? Do they want a budget that has its priorities straight? I think so. Support the CBC alternative.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, in 1 minute I can only summarize the essence of Function 500, the education and job training component of the CBC budget. It continues the tradition of assigning the highest priority to education. We applaud the fact that the President has also saw fit to assign the highest priority toward education. Speaker GINGRICH and Republicans in the House as well as the Republicans in the Senate have seen fit to emphasize education, but they are making a great mistake by not continuing to press for the construction initiative.

At the heart of the opportunity to learn is a safe place to sit, conducive to learning. We do not have that in most of our inner-city schools. New York has 300 schools that still burn coal in their boilers, and they pollute the air in addition to providing other kinds of problems for children in those schools. I urge that we get back on track and really go to the core of providing opportunities to learn. We want to have a national curriculum. We want to have national testing. We need national standards in terms of the opportunity to learn.

At the heart of the opportunity to learn is a safe place to sit, conducive to learning. We need a construction initiative. This Congressional Black Caucus budget insists on adopting a construction initiative.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in overwhelming support of a budget that genuinely reflects the vision and hope of the Caring Majority: The Congressional Black Caucus Fiscal Year 1998 Budget Proposal. This is the first budget resolution of the 105th Congress (fashioned by the President and Members of the House and Senate) and is nowhere near the mean-spirited, devastating cuts proposed in past budget resolutions (in the 104th Congress). Despite its improvements, the budget agreement still fails to acknowledge the role of the United States as an indispensable nation capable of adequately providing for all Americans, especially the most vulnerable. In 1997, we are making decisions which will have monumental effects on the generations of the 21st century. Accordingly, we must accept the pivotal role that this generation plays. With courage, compassion and sound fiscal policy, the CBC embraces this challenging role and pledges the nation's abundant resources to invest in America.

In Function 500 (Education, Training and Social Services), the CBC Budget ensures that every child from Head Start to College and beyond will be sufficiently prepared to compete in the world. In fiscal year 1998, funding for education and training programs would amount to a $28.2 BILLION increase (compared to FY97 levels) over the White House-Republican budget agreement's increase of $4 billion. Similar to the priorities outlined in the agreement, the CBC Budget includes the President's America Reads Challenge, Hope Scholarship Initiative ($1,500 tax credit to college students), and increases in funding for significant job training programs, including Job Corps.

However, the CBC Budget represents an all-out, comprehensive and determinative effort to prepare the next generation for 21st century learning. By the year 2002, America's students will be empowered by several milestones: 100 percent of those children eligible for Title I compensatory education will be able to receive it; every single eligible 14 to 21 year old who desires work and is unable to find a summer job will gain employment through the Summer Youth Employment Program; all 2 million 3–5 year olds currently eligible for Head Start will be able to participate in the program; 100 percent of the 3 million children classified as limited English proficient students would be served by bilingual education; and low-income college students will be eligible for a maximum Pell Grant of $5,000, the amount that the grant would be if it kept pace with inflation.

Unlike the White House-Republican budget agreement, the CBC Budget does not abandon the much needed emergency School Construction Initiative. Undoubtedly, learning will not take place when the schools that our children attend are literally collapsing around them. The CBC Budget provides $5 billion in interest subsidies over a 5-year period to stimulate new construction and renovation projects in school districts with severe facilities deficiencies. In addition, the CBC Budget provides an additional $20 billion (over a 5-year period) for the Education Infrastructure Act (P.L. 103–382) which was never funded. This would provide emergency grants for the repair, renovation, alteration, and construction of public schools, school libraries and media centers. It has been well documented that over 60 percent of schools in the U.S. need major repairs. Approximately 25 percent of schools are too small and suffer from severe overcrowding. And 40 percent of all schools, especially those in the inner cities with a large minority student body, cannot moderately accommodate science labs or technology such as computers and cable. Finally, the CBC Budget would fund a $20 million new program to establish at least 200 Community Computer Centers for families in both rural and urban economically depressed areas.

The CBC Budget recognizes that school construction initiatives and telecommunications initiatives must be implemented in tandem. These programs should not be treated as bargaining chips that are mutually exclusive and subject to sacrifice. In fact, rumors are being mounted which state that labor protections such as the prevailing-wage requirements of the Davis-Bacon Act may result in a ballooning of costs to renovate and construct the nation's schools. The Sheet Metal and Air Conditioning Contractors' National Association (SMACNA) has submitted evidence showing that school construction costs in prevailing wage States were lower per square foot than in States without prevailing wage statutes. We must dispel the myths that deviously seek to derail policies that help America's children.

Recently, we applauded the Federal Communications Commission's (FCC) decision to grant discounts to schools and libraries for telecommunications services, Internet access, and internal connections. At a cost of more than $2 billion per year to implement the universal service provisions of the Communications Act of 1996, public and private schools could qualify for discounts ranging from 20 percent to 90 percent. Although media outlets did not grant the FCC's decision recognition and much fanfare, it represents a monumental achievement. Yet, without the school-construction initiative, many schools will not realize the benefits of this Federal action. Schools across the country still suffer from asbestos problems. One third of the schools in New York City still burn coal for heating. Many schools across the country are more than 100 years old. Pentium computers, high-speed modems, and fancy satellite hookups will be stockpiled in many school basements because their buildings are too old and incapable of accommodating the technology necessary for 21st century learning.

Opponents of the CBC Budget, deficit hawks and fiscal conservatives, will undoubtedly argue that the accomplishments outlined in our budget are too good to be true. On the contrary, the CBC budget is a realistic budget that turns the myth that America is on the brink of bankruptcy on its head. The CBC Budget rids the nation of billions of dollars in wasteful spending: corporate tax loopholes, and unnecessary defense expenditures.

The White House-Republican budget agreement increases revenues to the U.S. Treasury by extending the airline tax, phasing in increases to contributions to the Civil Retirement and Disability Trust Fund, guarding against fraudulent Earned Income Tax Credit claims, and auctioning spectrum. On the other hand, the CBC Budget is the budget which would abandon the Federal Government's guaranteed annual payments to corporate coffers which allows businesses and wealthy individuals to enjoy more than $70 billion a year in corporate subsidies and loopholes. This alternative budget cuts $195 billion in corporate pork that is clogging the arteries of America's future. Revenue options in the CBC budget call for an enforcement of sections 531–537 of the Internal Revenue Service Tax Code that prohibit corporations from accumulating illegal profits and then buying large amounts of their own stock to avoid paying out dividends, thus, avoiding the payment of taxes by shareholders. It is estimated that enforcement of this section of the code will generate at least $70 billion for the United States.

Other revenue options include the elimination of the largest of all corporate tax loopholes: the accelerated depreciation allowance enabling companies to write off the costs of their machinery and buildings faster than they actually wear out. This allowance is worth over $100 billion over a five-year period. Reforming the taxation of income of multinational corporations is another example of a revenue option. At a cost of approximately $70 billion (over a 5-year period), foreign-owned corporations doing business in the United States typically pay far less in income taxes than do purely American firms. These practices must be stopped.

Instead of attacking corporate welfare, the White House-Republican budget agreement simply encourages the creation of a Corporate Welfare Commission and expresses the sense of Congress that the ''corporate sector should bear its share of the burden.'' To add insult to injury, the budget agreement includes tax cuts that would benefit the richest few, including a capital gains tax cut. It is estimated that more than ⅓ of the net tax cut of $85 billion during the next five years as proposed in the agreement would benefit the top 1 percent of all households (those with annual incomes of more than $350,000). Moreover, 50 percent of the tax cut would benefit the top 5 percent of households (those with annual incomes of more than $100,000). At this pivotal time, America does not need another Commission to study corporate welfare. Our children, our sick, our poor, our women, and our families need an assault on corporate welfare today.

Yes, the White House-Republican budget agreement represents an historic agreement that moves in the right direction toward promoting the country's values and priorities; restoring lost benefits to certain disabled legal immigrants; establishing additional empowerment zones and enterprise communities, and funding the Jobs Challenge to move millions of people from welfare to work. However, as the pivotal generation building that bridge to the 21st century, our work is far from being realized in the White House-Republican budget agreement. The CBC Budget recognizes that the United States is the richest nation in the world, the indispensable nation. We can provide health insurance to all 10 million children who are without health insurance, replace substandard and deteriorated public housing units; increase funding for crime prevention initiatives; and fully invest in our children's future. I challenge my colleagues to dispel the myth of the economy that compels us to oppress the neediest in our society. America can afford to assign a high priority to the funding for vital social programs and still preserve the free enterprise that this country so proudly praises. Vote "yes" on the CBC Caring Majority Budget Proposal.

□ 2345

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, some people will say that this is the Black Caucus budget, but the truth of the matter is, this is the America budget.

The Black Caucus is the only organization which has stepped up to the plate and met the challenge of balancing the budget not in the year 2002 but in the year 2001. As we can see from this chart, in every single year between now and 2001, under the Black Caucus budget, our deficit is substantially less than any other budget that is on the table for consideration.

The reason is that under every other budget proposal they are decreasing taxes, and that is like going on a diet by gaining weight in the beginning. One cannot lose weight by gaining weight first and then going on a diet. One just cannot do it.

We go directly to a balanced budget in the year 2001. This is the budget that America should support. This is the budget that my colleagues should support.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume, and then we will allow the gentleman from California to conclude.

Mr. Chairman, we need to make it very clear that we oppose this budget, however well intended. It is an honest budget, but it is a budget that provides no tax relief for American families. In fact, it increases taxes, demanding another $300 billion more from the American taxpayers in 5 years. And, regretfully, it extends the solvency of Medicare by only 4 years at best and 1 year at worst.

Many on our side of the aisle are concerned that it reduces defense spending a significant amount of $183 billion below the budget that is being presented before us tonight, the base budget.

This budget is, in fact, an agreement breaker. It would kill the agreement. And it is clear that under this budget the era of big government is not over, it is extended.

Mr. Chairman, we have three primary objectives in this Congress. One is to get our country's financial house in order and balance the Federal budget. The second is to save our trust funds, particularly Medicare, not just for future generations but for present generations as well. And the third is to transform our caretaking society into a caring society.

Much of the well-intended social effort that has been involved in our government in the last 30 years, while well-intended, has just simply perpetuated the very things we are trying to end. We not only want to end social welfare and put mothers back in a situation where they have job training and an opportunity to work, and experience the same opportunities that most Americans have, we are looking to end the assistance to corporations that some would refer to as corporate welfare, but to reduce, to the extent possible, reliance of business on government.

And we, obviously, have been successful in reducing some of the benefits that have gone to the farming community that, frankly, in some instances, may turn out to be like a welfare program. With the passage of the Freedom to Farm Bill, we have ended 50 percent of the subsidies to farmers. We have made tremendous strides there.

This budget moves us in a direction of bringing back the power and the money and influence from Washington back home to our local communities.

Regretfully, because we did not have an agreement with the White House 2 years ago, right now, as we speak, the trust fund, Medicare trust fund, is losing $35 million each and every day. Next year, if we do not come to an agreement, it will lose $55 million each day; and the year after that, $78 million each day.

The fund, without correction, the Medicare trust fund by the 10th year will have a debt of $612 billion and go bankrupt by the year 2001. And by the year 2007, 10 years from now, there will be a debt in the fund of $612 billion.

Under our plan, we extend the Medicare trust fund not for 4 years, not for 5, for 10. And in the 10th year, rather than having a debt of $612 billion, it will have $75 billion in the fund.

We do not cut Medicare. Only in Washington when we spend 34 percent more would people call it a cut. We are going to go from $208 billion to $279 billion. That is an average increase each year of 6 percent. On a per-person basis, Medicare will grow from $5,480. In the 5th year of the budget agreement it will go to $6,911. Only in Washington, when we have an increase of 26 percent in the per-beneficiary benefit, would someone call it a cut.

And the same thing with Medicaid. Medicaid under our plan will grow by 40 percent. It will grow from $98 billion to $137 billion. On a per-beneficiary basis it will grow form $22 billion to $29 billion.

What we have done is we have allowed these programs to grow at a rate that we can afford, providing better programs in each instance.

Mr. Chairman, I know the intentions of the Black Caucus are high and well-intended, but the bottom line is that rather than helping our country, in our judgment, if this budget were to pass, it would do the exact opposite and hurt our country. I urge the Members to vote against it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 6½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], the caucus' final speaker. I do not encourage the gentleman to use all that time, but he can use as much of it as he wants.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], has 9 minutes.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished colleagues for their generosity in yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, let me assure everyone that I plan to use every bit of the 9 minutes, because I think it is important to challenge the assertion in a very profound and serious way that this budget would hurt the American people.

Mr. Chairman, let me begin with the daunting responsibility of closing the debate. In assuming my responsibilities in closing the debate, I would like to first focus my colleagues on the notion that I have made each year that I have served in the United States Congress: that the most compelling and important responsibility that we have as public people is to establish the national budget.

I would assert here, very straightforward and very aggressively, that how a Nation chooses to spend its money is a profound statement about a Nation's principles, its values and its priorities. And in that regard I am extremely proud to raise my voice in support of the budget offered by the Congressional Black Caucus. It is a budget that accepted the daunting responsibility of balancing the budget. It did so in 4 years, 1 year earlier than is required by the Congress, which is to achieve a balanced budget in 5 years.

Beyond that, I would assert, Mr. Chairman, that this budget is a thoughtful and, in this gentleman's opinion, extremely historical budget; historical not because it is a bipartisan deal, historical because it is the first post-Cold War budget that attempts to frame a new debate in these chambers and in this country. And that is in the context of a post-Cold War world that we establish a new comprehensive national security strategy that includes three interrelated elements.

Interrelated element number one. For a new comprehensive national security strategy. A healthy, vibrant economy within a well educated, well informed, well trained citizenry, capable of engaging its economy and engaging its civic and political affairs. And the Congressional Black Caucus budget does that.

That has implications for Federal investment. Federal investment in the education of its people, training and retraining of its people, research and development to enhance the quality of human life. The Congressional Black Caucus budget does just that, Mr. Chairman. It has implications, Mr. Chairman, for investments in health, in housing, in the environment. The Congressional Black Caucus budget does that.

I would offer this question. If we have the most powerful, awesome military that our minds could comprehend, and our society is deteriorating behind us culturally, politically, economically and educationally, what are we defending? Therefore, a vibrant economy and an investment in an informed and well-educated and well-trained citizenry is a vital and integral part of our national security strategy.

Second, an engaged foreign policy. Martin Luther King probably said it best and most eloquently; that peace is not simply the absence of war, it is the absence of conditions that give rise to war. And an engaged foreign policy that invests in economic development, economic stability, regional stability, commitment to human rights, democratic freedom, is how we prevent war.

So engaging the world is extraordinarily important. Preventing war, I would assert to my colleagues, is not expensive, it is the most fundamentally economic way to do it; to commit ourselves to arms control, to commit ourselves to nonviolent conflict resolution in the world. I continue to believe that peace is a superior idea. An engaged foreign policy is the second and most integral part of our national security strategy.

Mr. Chairman, the third and important point in our national security strategy is an appropriately sized, properly trained, properly equipped military to meet the challenges of the 21st century, and we need to have that debate in this country. To assert we are for a strong defense, intellectually, what are we saying? But if we are saying we are committed to a properly sized, properly trained, properly equipped military, then let us have the debate on what that is.

☐ 0000

I would assert that we can achieve the kind of savings that are in the Congressional Black Caucus not by some radical point of departure. But Mr. Chairman, for example, if we move beyond the commitment of the Bottom-up Review, which says we must fight two regional contingencies alone and quickly, that is counter-intuitive to everything we know.

Rhetorical question: Where are we going to go in the world that we must fight alone. That is counter-intuitive to everything we are doing. We fight with and we move with and we deploy with allies. And if we change this quickness from being on station in 72 hours, that has incredible implications for the savings of billions of dollars.

If we relax the time limits for meeting a crisis, we can meter our forces into a theater in a way that dramatically reduces our force structure, readiness, and procurement requirements. We can reduce active force structure, push some into reserves in light of these new time lines. We can achieve operation and maintenance savings through further tiered readiness of our forces. If we do not have to be there in 72 hours, everyone does not have to be at this high level of readiness, we can tier our readiness, we save billions of dollars.

We must avoid or abandon acquisition programs that are whetted to weapons systems that were dreamed up and conjured up in the context of the Cold War that had a Cold War objective. We are now beyond that, billions of dollars. Reduce our nuclear forces and infrastructure and the supplies and arsenals that goes with it.

Mr. Chairman, we have a congressional mandate that says we cannot fall below START I. We ought to be moving unilaterally in START II. We ought to be negotiating START III. We save billions of dollars. Who in these chambers really believes that someone is going to trigger a nuclear device to challenge America's nuclear at this particular moment?

Billions of dollars of implications if we change the level of our readiness requirements of our naval forces around the world. We only need an 8 carrier task force to carry out a 2 regional contingency scenario. If you want to argue, I will give you 10. Why do we have 12? Billions of dollars in implications by changing our present requirements, we can afford to reduce the fleet, reduce OPTEMPO and PURSTEMPO stress that is presently the reality of our forces. We all in these chambers know that we can achieve savings in our intelligence accounts. We cannot talk about it on the floor. Believe me, we can do it.

Finally, we can achieve procurement savings because of lower force structure and reduced training and wear and tear. That just makes sense. We can come to this. My point, Mr. Chairman, is that we need to have a new debate in this country. We understand the need to balance the budget. The caucus stepped up to it. But we are more than accountants. We were elected here to care about people. Therefore, balancing that budget must take place in some human context. And we state that that human context ought to be the search for a new national security strategy that incorporates a vibrant economy, a healthy, well-educated people, and engage foreign policy and appropriately sized, properly trained, properly equipped military to meet the 21st century.

Now finally, let me reiterate a view that the savings that I am talking about are in one of the three national security accounts, funds that can be urgently spent from those savings in two of our other accounts that have been historically underfunded, foreign assistance and domestic programs, critical to our well-being and health as a Nation. For, without strong, healthy cities to defend, Mr. Chairman, cohesive communities and educated citizenry to run our economy and our political institutions, we will wither and decline socially, politically, economically and culturally.

We are way past making these investments in these accounts, and we fail to do so at our peril. The time is right and the opportunity exists to transfer this scale of resources, and we should not fail to do so as we think about the type of society we choose to achieve for our children and our children's children. Support the budget that is before the House at this time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, we have no further speakers, and we yield back the balance of our time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time under the rule has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 72, noes 358, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 143]

AYES—72

Barrett (WI)	Foglietta	McGovern
Becerra	Ford	McKinney
Bonior	Frank (MA)	Meek
Brown (CA)	Furse	Millender-McDonald
Brown (FL)	Gonzalez	Miller (CA)
Carson	Gutierrez	Mink
Clay	Hastings (FL)	Moakley
Clayton	Hilliard	Moran (VA)
Clyburn	Hinchey	Nadler
Coyne	Jackson (IL)	Oberstar
Cummings	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Olver
Davis (IL)	Johnson, E. B.	Owens
Delahunt	Kilpatrick	Pastor
Dellums	Lewis (GA)	Payne
Dixon	Lipinski	Pelosi
Engel	Markey	Rangel
Fattah	Martinez	Roybal-Allard
Filner	McDermott	Rush
Flake		

Sanders
Scott
Serrano
Slaughter
Stark
Stokes
Thompson
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Velazquez
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Woolsey
Wynn

NOES—358

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Bishop

NOT VOTING—4

Conyers
Jefferson
Schiff
Yates

☐ 0025

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. GONZALEZ 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.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. DOOLITTLE

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the House Conservative Action Team, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the committee budget resolution.

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 No. 2 offered by Mr. DOOLITTLE:

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

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999 through 2002 are hereby set forth.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 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 1998: $1,198,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,241,859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,285,559,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,343,591,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,407,564,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: −$11,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: −$25,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: −$43,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: −$56,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: −$55,900,000,000.

(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 1998: $1,378,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,430,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,475,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,509,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,530,100,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $1,368,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,409,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,446,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,468,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,480,100,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $172,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $182,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $183,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $157,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $108,500,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $5,592,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $5,834,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $6,081,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $6,298,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,474,400,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $33,829,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $33,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $34,775,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $36,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $37,099,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $315,472,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $324,749,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $328,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $332,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $335,141,000,000.

SEC. 102. 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 1998 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $268,197,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,978,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $588,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $270,784,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,771,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $757,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $274,802,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,418,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $281,305,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $270,110,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $289,092,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $272,571,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,050,000,000.
(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $15,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,966,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $12,751,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $14,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,021,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,093,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,077,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,434,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,122,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,826,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $17,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,178,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,217,000,000.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $16,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $15,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $15,800,000,000. (same)
(B) Outlays, $15,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $17,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $3,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,050,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $3,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,078,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $3,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,109,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $3,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,141,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $4,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,171,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $22,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $21,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $32,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $21,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $32,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $22,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $34,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $23,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $34,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $13,133,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,872,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $9,620,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,047,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,436,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $11,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,071,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,509,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,960,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,583,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $10,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,965,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,660,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $6,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,739,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $245,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $11,000,000.000.
(B) Outlays, $4,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,887,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $253,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,238,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $255,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,574,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $257,989,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $17,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,680,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $259,897,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $46,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $155,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $50,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $135,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $53,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $55,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $54,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $9,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,867,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $8,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,943,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,406,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $7,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,020,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $8,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,098,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,452,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $9,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,180,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,475,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $56,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $12,328,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $20,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $57,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,092,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $21,899,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $56,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,926,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $23,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $61,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $14,701,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $24,517,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $62,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,426,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $25,676,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $136,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $137,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $85,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $143,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $143,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $151,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $151,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $162,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $161,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $173,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $171,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $201,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $201,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $212,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $211,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $225,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $225,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $239,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $238,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $251,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $251,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $238,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $244,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $45,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $251,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $252,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $75,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $264,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $261,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $110,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $271,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $270,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $145,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $286,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $282,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $170,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $11,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,900,000,000.
(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, $14,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $39,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,029,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $27,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $39,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,068,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $26,671,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $38,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,177,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $26,202,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $40,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,249,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $43,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,277,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,129,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $24,400,000,000.
(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, $25,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $25,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $24,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $23,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $14,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $14,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $296,549,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $296,549,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $304,567,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $304,567,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $304,867,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $304,867,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $303,659,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $303,659,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $303,754,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $303,754,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(19) Allowances (920):
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, −$12,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$16,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$36,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$36,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$48,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$48,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, −$44,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$44,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$46,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$46,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$50,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$50,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$64,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$64,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to provide for two separate reconciliation bills: the first for entitlement reforms and the second for tax relief. In the event Senate procedures preclude the consideration of two separate bills, this section would permit the consideration of one omnibus reconciliation bill.

(b) SUBMISSIONS.—

(1) ENTITLEMENT REFORMS.—Not later than June 12, 1997, the House committees named in subsection (c) 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.

(2) TAX RELIEF AND MISCELLANEOUS REFORMS.—Not later than June 13, 1997, the House committees named in subsection (d) 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.

(c) INSTRUCTIONS RELATING TO ENTITLEMENT REFORMS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture 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: $34,571,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $37,008,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $211,443,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(2) COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES.—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: $8,435,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $5,091,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $50,306,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(3) 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: $393,770,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $507,315,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,619,820,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(4) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce 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: $17,718,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $18,167,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $106,050,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(5) 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: $68,975,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $81,896,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $443,061,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 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: $214,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, $621,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, and $1,829,000,000 in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(6) 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: $18,287,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $17,483,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $107,615,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(7) 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: $22,444,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $24,845,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $140,197,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(8) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $397,463,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $506,377,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,621,195,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 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: $1,168,336,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1998, $1,346,679,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2002, and $7,384,496,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(d) INSTRUCTIONS RELATING TO TAX RELIEF AND MISCELLANEOUS REFORMS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture 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: $34,571,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $37,008,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $211,443,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(2) 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: $8,435,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $5,091,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $50,306,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(3) 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: $393,770,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $507,315,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,619,820,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(4) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce 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: $17,718,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $18,167,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $106,050,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(5) 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: $68,975,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $81,896,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $443,061,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 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: $214,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, $621,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $1,829,000,000 in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(6) 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: $18,287,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $17,483,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $107,615,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(7) 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: $22,444,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $24,845,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $140,197,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(8) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $397,463,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $506,377,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,621,195,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 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: $1,160,936,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1998, $1,326,179,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2002, and $7,299,496,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

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

(f) FLEXIBILITY IN CARRYING OUT CHILDREN'S HEALTH INITIATIVE.—If the Committees on Commerce and Ways and Means report recommendations pursuant to their reconciliation instructions that provide an initiative for children's health that would increase the deficit by more than $2.3 billion for fiscal year 1998, by more than $3.9 billion for fiscal year 2002, and by more than $16 billion for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002, the committees shall be deemed to not have complied with their reconciliation instructions pursuant to section 310(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to adjust the appropriate budgetary levels to accommodate legislation increasing spending from the highway trust fund on surface transportation and highway safety above the levels assumed in this resolution if such legislation is deficit neutral.

(b) DEFICIT NEUTRALITY REQUIREMENT.—(1) In order to receive the adjustments specified in subsection (c), a bill reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure that provides new budget authority above the levels assumed in this resolution for programs authorized out of the highway trust fund must be deficit neutral.

(2) A deficit-neutral bill must meet the following conditions:

(A) The amount of new budget authority provided for programs authorized out of the highway trust fund must be in excess of $25.949 billion in new budget authority for fiscal year 1998, $25.464 billion in new budget authority for fiscal year 2002, and $127.973 billion in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The outlays estimated to flow from the excess new budget authority set forth in subparagraph (A) must be offset for fiscal year 1998, fiscal year 2002, and for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002. For the sole purpose of estimating the amount of outlays flowing from excess new budget authority under this section, it shall be assumed that such excess new budget authority would have an obligation limitation sufficient to accommodate that new budget authority.

(C) The outlays estimated to flow from the excess new budget authority must be offset by (i) other direct spending or revenue provisions within that transportation bill, (ii) the net reduction in other direct spending and revenue legislation that is enacted during this Congress after the date of adoption of this resolution and before such transportation bill is reported (in excess of the levels assumed in this resolution), or (iii) a combination of the offsets specified in clauses (i) and (ii).

(D) As used in 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.

(c) REVISED LEVELS.—(1) When the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reports a bill (or when a conference report thereon is filed) meeting the conditions set forth in subsection (b)(2), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall increase the allocation of new budget authority to that committee by the amount of new budget authority provided in that bill (and that is above the levels set forth in subsection (b)(2)(A)) for programs authorized out of the highway trust fund.

(2) After the enactment of the transportation bill described in paragraph (1) and upon the reporting of a general, supplemental or continuing resolution making appropriations by the Committee on Appropriations (or upon the filing of a conference report thereon) establishing an obligation limitation above the levels specified in subsection (b)(2)(A) (at a level sufficient to obligate some or all of the budget authority specified in paragraph (1)), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall increase the allocation and aggregate levels of outlays to that committee for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 by the appropriate amount.

(d) REVISIONS.—Allocations and aggregates revised pursuant to this section shall be considered for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(e) REVERSALS.—If any legislation referred to in this section is not enacted into law, then the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall, as soon as practicable, reverse adjustments made under this section for such legislation and have such adjustments published in the Congressional Record.

(f) DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY LEVELS.—For the purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the House Committee on the Budget.

(g) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term ''highway trust fund'' refers to the following budget accounts (or any successor accounts):

(1) 69–8083–0–7–401 (Federal-Aid Highways).

(2) 69–8191–0–7–401 (Mass Transit Capital Fund).

(3) 69–8350–0–7–401 (Mass Transit Formula Grants).

(4) 69–8016–0–7–401 (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration-Operations and Research).

(5) 69–8020–0–7–401 (Highway Traffic Safety Grants).

(6) 69–8048–0–7–401 (National Motor Carrier Safety Program).

SEC. 302. SALE OF GOVERNMENT ASSETS.

(a) BUDGETARY TREATMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose of any concurrent resolution on the budget and the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, no amounts realized from the sale of an asset shall be scored with respect to the level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues if such sale would cause an increase in the deficit as calculated pursuant to paragraph (2).

(2) CALCULATION OF NET PRESENT VALUE.—The deficit estimate of an asset sale shall be the net present value of the cash flow from—

(A) proceeds from the asset sale;

(B) future receipts that would be expected from continued ownership of the asset by the Government; and

(C) expected future spending by the Government at a level necessary to continue to operate and maintain the asset to generate the receipts estimated pursuant to subparagraph (B).

(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 the 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.

(d) DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY LEVELS.—For the purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the House Committee on the Budget.

SEC. 303. ENVIRONMENTAL RESERVE FUND.

(a) COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS.—In the House, after the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure report a bill (or a conference report thereon is filed) to reform the Superfund program to facilitate the cleanup of hazardous waste sites, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall submit revised allocations and budget aggregates to carry out this section by an amount not to exceed the excess subject to the limitation. These revisions shall be considered for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as the allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The adjustments made under this section shall not exceed—

(1) $200 million in budget authority for fiscal year 1998 and the estimated outlays flowing therefrom.

(2) $200 million in budget authority for fiscal year 2002 and the estimated outlays flowing therefrom.

(3) $1 billion in budget authority for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002 and the estimated outlays flowing therefrom.

(c) READJUSTMENTS.—In the House, any adjustments made under this section for any appropriation measure may be readjusted if that measure is not enacted into law.

SEC. 304. SEPARATE ALLOCATION FOR LAND ACQUISITIONS AND EXCHANGES.

(a) ALLOCATION BY CHAIRMAN.—In the House, upon the reporting of a bill by the Committee on Appropriations (or upon the filing of a conference report thereon) providing up to $165 million in outlays for Federal land acquisitions and to finalize priority Federal land exchanges for fiscal year 1998 (assuming $700 million in outlays over 5 fiscal years, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall allocate that amount of outlays and the corresponding amount of budget authority.

(b) TREATMENT OF ALLOCATIONS IN THE HOUSE.—In the House, for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, allocations made under subsection (a) shall be deemed to be made pursuant to section 602(a)(1) of that Act and shall be deemed to be a separate suballocation for purposes of the application of section 302(f) of that Act as modified by section 602(c) of that Act.

SEC. 305. BALANCED BUDGET REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget (or amendment or motion thereto, or conference report thereon) or any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would cause—

(1) total outlays for fiscal year 2002 or any fiscal year thereafter to exceed total receipts for that fiscal year, unless three-fifths of the whole number of each House of Congress provide for a specific excess of outlays over receipts by a rollcall vote;

(2) an increase in the limit on the debt of the United States held by the public, unless three-fifths of the whole number of each House provide for such an increase by a rollcall vote; or

(3) an increase in revenues unless approved by a majority of the whole number of each House by a rollcall vote.

(b) WAIVER.—The Congress may waive the provisions of this section for any fiscal year in which a declaration of war is in effect. The provisions of this section may be waived for any fiscal year in which the United States is engaged in military conflict which causes an imminent and serious military threat to national security and is so declared by a joint resolution, adopted by a majority of the whole number of each House, which becomes law.

(c) DEFINITION.—Total receipts shall include all receipts of the United States Government except those derived from borrowing. Total outlays shall include all outlays of the United States Government except for those for repayment of debt principal.

TITLE IV—SENSE OF CONGRESS PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON BASELINES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The 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 portrayed 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 and executive accountability for Federal spending.

SEC. 402. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON REPAYMENT OF THE FEDERAL DEBT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

(1) The Congress and the President have a basic moral and ethical responsibility to future generations to repay the Federal debt, including the money borrowed from the Social Security Trust Fund.

(2) The Congress and the President should enact a law which creates a regimen for paying off the Federal debt within 30 years.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PRESIDENT'S SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that:

(1) The President's annual budget submission to Congress should include a plan for repayment of Federal debt beyond the year 2002, including the money borrowed from the Social Security Trust Fund.

(2) The plan should specifically explain how the President would cap spending growth at a level one percentage point lower than projected growth in revenues.

(3) If spending growth were held to a level one percentage point lower than projected growth in revenues, then the Federal debt could be repaid within 30 years.

SEC. 403. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON COMMISSION ON LONG-TERM BUDGETARY PROBLEMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) achieving a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002 is only the first step necessary to restore our Nation's economic prosperity;

(2) the imminent retirement of the baby-boom generation will greatly increase the demand for government services;

(3) the burden will be borne by a relatively smaller work force resulting in an unprecedented intergovernmental transfer of financial resources;

(4) the rising demand for retirement and medical benefits will quickly jeopardize the solvency of the medicare, social security, and Federal retirement trust funds; and

(5) the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that marginal tax rates would have to increase by 50 percent over the next 5 years to cover the long-term projected costs of retirement and health benefits.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be enacted to create a commission to assess long-term budgetary problems. Their implications for both the baby-boom generation and tomorrow's workforce, and make such recommendation as it deems appropriate to ensure our Nation's future prosperity.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on the Budget, I oppose this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] will control the other 10 minutes.

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, while CATS appreciates the hard work of the Committee on the Budget and especially its chairman, we feel that more can and should be done to reduce the size of Government, lessen the tax burden on American families, and stimulate economic growth. Like the committee resolution, the CATS substitute balances the budget by 2002 while protecting national defense and transportation spending. Our substitute improves upon the committee budget, however, by cutting an additional $109 billion in discretionary spending and returning those savings to American families through lower taxes.

☐ 0030

Unlike the committee budget, the CAT substitute contains sufficient tax relief to fully fund the $500 per child tax credit, a 50-percent reduction in the capital gains tax rate, real inheritance tax relief, and expanded IRA's. The CATS budget pays for these tax cuts by simply reducing discretionary spending to the level set out in President Clinton's fiscal year 1997 budget.

The choice tonight is not whether we should balance the budget, Mr. Chairman; we have won that debate. The real question is whether we think we can find enough wasteful Washington spending to cut so that, as we balance the budget, we can allow American families to keep a little more of what they earn. We think we can.

I urge an ''aye'' vote.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] to the budget agreement for a variety of reasons. I do so with the knowledge that this represents the position of many on my side of the aisle if we did not have a Democrat President. But this last election we elected a Democrat President and a Republican Congress, and this amendment, if it were to pass, would in fact kill the budget agreement made between Republicans and Democrats in the House and Senate with the President of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment in spite of the fact that they believe it is somewhat seductive and point out that in this budget agreement we have with the White House Republicans took a very strong position that we should control the growth in entitlements and get our country's financial house in order. This budget agreement controls the growth of entitlements.

We also said that we wanted tax cuts. This budget agreement provides for $135 billion of tax cuts.

That is what Republicans got out of this budget agreement. What the President wanted was more domestic spending, and that is, in fact, what he received in this budget negotiation. While many on our side of the aisle would like to reduce domestic spending and do not agree with the President of the United States, the fact is this is an agreement we have in order to have a tax cut of $135 billion in order to control the growth of entitlements.

So, Mr. Chairman, I rise with some reluctance but with conviction that this amendment needs to be defeated.

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this is not going to tear up the budget. The CAT substitute has a simple message: Americans' taxes are too high because the government spends too much.

Americans want, need and deserve to keep more of their own money, so support this amendment and give all Americans a better life. If my colleagues think the government has grown too big, then vote for this substitute because it cuts spending.

Now is the time for Washington to get off the backs of the hard-working taxpayers of this country. We have got to stop spending Americans' money on big government programs and let them have the money to raise a family, buy a house, send their children to school, maybe even get a much needed vacation.

The CAT substitute does the right thing. It balances the budget, reduces the size and scope of government and, most importantly, gives families more relief from high taxes.

Vote for this substitute, cut spending, cut taxes. Do it for America.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN].

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I remember hearing the words ''Penny-Kasich.'' I remember hearing the words ''Gramm-Rudman.'' They were promises. We look at the budget resolution that is put before us, and nearly 75 percent of the savings come in the last 2 years of this 5-year program.

The National Taxpayers Union has scored this vote on this CAT substitute, and what they have said is the 300,000-member National Taxpayers Union strongly supports the substitute to the 1998 budget resolution because it proposes better control of discretionary spending and larger tax cuts.

A vote for the budget resolution will be a plus on the National Taxpayers Union score card, but it will be a plus for American families. It will be rated three times as heavy if my colleagues vote for the CATS budget.

Remember Gramm-Rudman, remember Penny-Kasich. Vote for this budget.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK].

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute being offered by the conservative action team and against the underlying bill. If the budget is not going to be balanced until 2002, why in the world would we want more money to be in the hands of government when it could be in the hands of families, it could be in the hands of those to stimulate the economy and create jobs by having greater tax cuts?

That is what this substitute does. If my colleagues vote for the underlying bill, what they are saying is they want to throw away the progress that we have been making for years.

If we look, Mr. Chairman, since 1992, every year the deficit has been coming down $40 to $50 billion a year, and suddenly, realizing that we will have the budget balanced within 2 years from now, people say, no, let us have one last spending spree, let us start spending more, let us wipe out the progress and not start making spending cuts or getting serious for another 3 years, until after President Clinton finishes his term.

Mr. Chairman, we should not delay. Finish balancing the budget. Do not put it off. Do not have a last spending spree.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER].

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

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, tonight this Congress is making history as we finally face the responsibility that previous Congresses ducked for a generation, balancing the Federal budget. On that we all agree. Where we disagree and what we are truly debating before the American people tonight is the path to that agreed upon target.

Mr. Chairman, I support the CAT substitute budget as the best path, the best route to a balanced budget among the many before us tonight. It offers the deepest tax cuts, best curtails the burdensome bureaucracy by reducing discretionary spending and saves Medicare for the next decade.

Other paths presented here tonight are good, but this is the best route to prosperity at home and peace abroad as America puts her financial house in order so the Federal Government is less of a burden on the homes of hard-working Americans.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, as both sides explained at the outset of this debate, what we have before us tonight in the base bill, House Concurrent Resolution 84, is a compromise, hard fought, hard wrought, carefully balanced compromise. I explained in my earlier comments that the design of this compromise intentionally was to allow each side to have a few victories it could claim as clearly its own. The Republicans would get some in the way of tax reduction; Democrats would get some in the way of children's health care and education and social initiatives, like that.

One of the victories allocated to us as Democrats as part of this compromise comes in the area of NDD, nondefense discretionary spending. In this particular budget resolution discretionary spending increases in outlay terms from $538 billion this year, FY 1997, to all of $562 billion 5 years from now. It goes up by $14 billion over a 5-year period of time. Half of the increase goes to defense, half to nondefense. So what we have achieved as a victory is to save discretionary spending from deep devastating cuts. Even so, it goes up by only a half a percent. It is still 9 percent below inflation.

We consider this a victory because we at least allowed enough to keep most of the programs that we consider priorities relatively fully funded, but everybody would have to agree that is not amply funded by any means.

This particular substitute would take that hard wrought compromise, take $109 billion more out over 5 years out of discretionary spending and put it into tax increases. So it would take this carefully balanced agreement and tilt it to one side, it would destroy the compromise. It has no chance of being passed by the Senate, no chance of being signed by the President.

Mr. Chairman, it would be a dreadful waste of time. We need to go on with what is possible, pass the resolution that we have carefully prepared and not get off on a side track like this.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SESSIONS].

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I rise as a member of the conservative action team to point out what we are for, what we have talked about, and that is that we believe that there should be more tax cuts that are available from this bill. What we are standing up tonight to say is that we believe that we should fully fund a capital gains tax cut to zero, we believe that we should do away with death taxes, and we believe we should fully support a $500 per child tax credit.

Mr. Chairman, this is the direction that America needs to go, and this is what we intended to do.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT].

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the conservative budget alternative. Why? Because the American people are overtaxed, and they deserve tax relief, and they deserve that tax relief sooner rather than later.

The thing all of us in Washington should always keep in mind is that the money we spend up here does not belong to us, it belongs to the American people. Let us let the American people keep more of their hard-earned money, let us support the conservative budget alternative, let us cut taxes and do it sooner rather than later.

☐ 0045

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG].

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, tonight is indeed an historic night. Tonight we get a chance to vote on balancing the budget. Tonight we get a chance to fulfill some of the promises we have made to the American people. While the committee budget does a tremendous job in moving in the right direction, we can do better, and indeed we have an obligation to do better.

The American people want change in the way Washington works. They want a smaller, more efficient Federal Government, and that can be achieved through the conservative alternative budget. This chart shows it plain and simple. We made a promise to the American people to deliver tax relief, tax relief for the average family. Regrettably, the sad truth is that the committee budget cannot deliver all of that relief, but the conservative alternative budget can.

The fundamental question is, are we going to keep our promise to the American people? Are we going to deliver for them? Do we recognize that they can spend their money better than we can spend it? I think the answer to that question is yes. We should fully fund the tax cuts that we have promised the American people and keep our word.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the conservative alternative budget.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH].

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, in closing the arguments for this amendment tonight for the conservative budget substitute, let me be clear: We support the effort that the Committee on the Budget has made and applaud them in that effort. Some of us will be voting for it, some of us will not, but the debate is not about the merits of their hard work and it has been tremendously hard work.

The debate tonight is about families and whether, as their representatives, we will increase the family budget or increase the Washington budget. As this chart shows, that my colleague from Arizona pointed out, our conservative budget alternative takes $109 billion from Washington's budget and gives it to families in their budget.

Now, while some people say that the economy is growing, the reality is that families in America are struggling just to get by. Some are spending more on food, clothing and shelter and transportation combined, they pay more in taxes than what they do in their budget for those necessities.

This amendment is necessary for two reasons. As this chart shows, the President drove a good bargain for Washington in his budget deal, because for every $1 of tax cuts, we have $10 of increased government spending over the next 5 years.

The conservative budget would reduce that, $1 of tax cuts for $4 of spending. Now, that is not the ideal, I would like to have it $1 for $1, but this goes a long way towards balancing our priorities.

The second reason that this amendment is necessary is that we have promised a lot of tax cuts to the American people; a full $500 tax credit, cutting the tax on investment in half, relief on the death taxes and expanded IRA's. But the fact of the matter is that $83 billion in taxes are not enough to deliver on those promises, so we need the conservative budget in order to be able to fulfill those promises for the American people.

Now, let us ensure that this golden moment as we balance the budget is one of selflessness and not selfishness for Washington. I think of a family in my district, the Lindleys and their two children. That $500 tax credit will let them buy clothes for their kids, 435 gallons of gas in the car, and another bag of groceries. That family, the Lindleys and their two children, from that $500 tax credit will be able to buy another bag of groceries each week as they keep more of their paycheck.

So in closing, Mr. Chairman, let me urge all of my colleagues on the Republican and the Democratic side of the aisle to join us in voting for this conservative alternative budget, because it is time that we stop putting Washington's budget first and start putting the family budget first.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, this is an opportunity to more than double the tax cut that will go to every person in the Nation. This is a chance to say no to Washington bureaucrats, yes to families, yes to economic growth. Vote yes on this substitute.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, to end the debate, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH].

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Chairman, I am an unlikely person to close this debate. I was about to walk back to my office and a friend of mine asked me to close, and I agreed to because I think something important needs to be said.

Some of my best friends in this House have just spoken. I love this plan. Some of the closest friends I have in politics are Members of the CATS group. I would love to vote for this plan. I believe in tax cuts. I think that the capital gains tax cut break should be zero. However, I am not king. I get handed this: National Taxpayers Union, great group. They rate us, lots of groups rate us. The CATS substitute will be scored as one of the most heavily-weighted taxpayer votes in our 1997 rating of Congress.

I do not want to vote against this plan, because I like when people like me, because I run for public office. But I say to my colleagues, sometimes in public life, in the legislature, even in the national legislature, we have to do what is right and we cannot vote on the basis of score cards or interest groups or what people are going to think about us.

The reality of it is, that gentleman over here, and various Members of the leadership on the Republican side and on the Democrat side with whom I have significant philosophical differences, have negotiated a deal. For my part on this side, if those folks cannot maintain their credibility with respect to any of these amendments, an awful lot of good people have wasted an awful lot of time and wasted an historic opportunity to do what, at least part of the reason I came to Washington, which was to deliver significant and total reform to the American people, some tax cuts, and begin to question why the welfare state always grows.

That is the bottom line; that is the reason I am an unlikely closer here, Mr. Chairman. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, if we believe in credibility, particularly credibility with respect to our leaders, I ask for a nay vote on this.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 119, noes 313, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 144]

AYES—119

Aderholt	Forbes	Pappas
Bachus	Fowler	Paul
Ballenger	Gekas	Paxon
Barr	Gibbons	Pease
Bartlett	Gillmor	Peterson (PA)
Barton	Goode	Petri
Blunt	Goodlatte	Pickering
Boehner	Goss	Pitts
Bonilla	Graham	Pombo
Brady	Hall (TX)	Redmond
Bryant	Hansen	Riley
Burr	Hastings (WA)	Rohrabacher
Burton	Hayworth	Royce
Buyer	Hefley	Ryun
Callahan	Herger	Salmon
Calvert	Hill	Scarborough
Camp	Hilleary	Schaefer, Dan
Canady	Hoekstra	Schaffer, Bob
Cannon	Hostettler	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Hunter	Sessions
Chenoweth	Hutchinson	Shadegg
Christensen	Inglis	Shuster
Coble	Istook	Smith (MI)
Coburn	Johnson, Sam	Smith (TX)
Combest	Jones	Snowbarger
Cox	Kingston	Solomon
Crane	Largent	Souder
Crapo	Lewis (CA)	Stearns
Cubin	Lewis (KY)	Stump
Cunningham	Manzullo	Talent
Deal	McCollum	Taylor (NC)
Dickey	McIntosh	Thornberry
Doolittle	McKeon	Thune
Dreier	Mica	Tiahrt
Duncan	Miller (FL)	Upton
Dunn	Moran (KS)	Wamp
Ensign	Myrick	Watts (OK)
Everett	Nethercutt	Whitfield
Ewing	Neumann	Young (AK)
Foley	Norwood	

NOES—313

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bunning
Campbell
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Collins
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gingrich
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hyde
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E.B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snyder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Sununu
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thomas
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—3

Jefferson
Schiff
Yates

☐ 0112

Mrs. EMERSON changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina and Mr. REDMOND changed their 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.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 3, the investment budget.

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 No. 3 offered by Mr. BROWN of California:

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

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998.

The Congress determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999 through 2002 are hereby set forth.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 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 1998: $1,206,035,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,251,843,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,303,638,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,361,895,000,000.
Fiscal year 2202: $1,421,072,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $10,419,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $15,212,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $16,589,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $16,807,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $18,133,000,000.

(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 1998: $1,392,730,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,448,751,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,500,328,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,535,090,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,582,693,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $1,358,584,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,422,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,480,134,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,495,092,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,544,270,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $142,130,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $155,939,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $159,907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $116,390,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $105,065,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $5,686,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $5,954,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $6,230,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $6,488,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,752,800,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $35,050,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $34,901,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $36,649,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $38,249,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $39,415,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $315,472,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $324,749,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $328,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $332,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $335,141,000,000.

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 1998 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $262,267,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $259,255,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $588,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $262,354,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $261,353,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $757,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $262,505,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,423,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $262,528,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $257,287,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $262,552,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $259,471,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,050,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $18,471,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,207,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,966,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $12,751,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $15,317,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,795,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,021,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,093,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $16,360,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,343,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,077,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,434,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,603,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,991,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,122,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,826,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,920,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,073,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,178,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,217,000,000.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $17,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,587,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $18,364,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,147,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $19,281,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,713,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $20,244,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,687,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $21,254,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,715,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $3,287,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,468,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,050,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $3,537,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,543,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,078,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $3,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,814,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,109,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $3,857,000,000.
Outlays, $2,916,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,141,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $4,115,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,097,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,174,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $23,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,899,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $30,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $23,253,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,604,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $32,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $23,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,253,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $32,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $23,449,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,518,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $34,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $23,540,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,527,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $34,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $13,319,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,990,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $9,620,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $13,066,000,000.
(B) Outlays $11,516,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,047,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,436,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,567,000,000.
(B) Outlays $10,978,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,071,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,509,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $11,429,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,899,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,960,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,583,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $11,232,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,630,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,965,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,660,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $6,824,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$728,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,960,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $245,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $11,317,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,507,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,410,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $253,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $15,488,000,000.
(B) Outlays $10,092,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,112,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $255,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,326,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,364,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,784,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $257,989,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,942,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,781,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,996,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $259,897,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New Budget authority, $50,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,962,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $155,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $54,715,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,317,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $135,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $56,172,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,600,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $57,373,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,552,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $58,598,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,130,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $17,269,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,417,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,867,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $8,678,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,997,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,943,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,406,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $8,108,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,670,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,020,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $8,114,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,717,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,098,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,452,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $8,215,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,845,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,180,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,475,000,000
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $60,011,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,273,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $12,328,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,665,000,000
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $61,143,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,848,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,092,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $21,899,000,000
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $62,508,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,352,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,926,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $23,263,000,000
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $64,090,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,780,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $14,701,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $24,517,000,000
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $65,603,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,401,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,426,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $25,676,000,000
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $135,308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $135,055,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $85,000,000
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $144,365,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $143,871,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $154,728,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $153,938,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $165,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $164,816,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $177,877,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $176,816,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $205,310,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $200,350,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $219,430,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $212,640,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $232,828,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $225,857,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $249,027,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $234,765,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $265,828,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $254,365,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $236,956,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $246,922,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $45,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $254,293,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $257,304,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $75,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $270,810,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $272,008,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $110,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $277,236,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $276,973,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $145,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $290,973,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $289,943,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $170,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $8,179,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,179,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $8,865,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,865,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $9,622,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,622,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $9,879,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,879,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $11,272,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,272,000.
(C) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $40,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,112,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,029,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $27,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $41,918,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $42,055,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,068,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $26,671,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $42,385,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,220,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,177,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $26,202,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $42,826,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,076,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,249,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $43,289,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,349,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,277,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,129,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750);
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $22,360,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,620,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $22,325,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,834,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $24,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,058,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $25,060,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,656,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $25,708,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,322,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $13,089,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,151,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $13,121,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,108,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $13,162,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,206,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $13,277,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,036,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $295,741,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $295,741,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $302,183,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $302,183,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $301,113,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $301,113,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $298,020,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $298,020,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $296,583,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $296,583,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(19) Allowances (920):
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 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,244,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,244,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, −$32,858,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$232,858,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$32,516,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$32,516,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$33,143,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$33,143,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$34,327,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$34,327,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

SEC. 4. INVESTMENTS.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for Federal investments for fiscal years 1998 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050)—for subfunction 051 for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation:
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $35,934,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $36,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $35,044,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $35,152,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $35,044,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $34,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $35,044,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $34,738,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $35,044,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $34,950,000,000.

(2) General Science, Space, and Technology (250)—for subfunctions 251 and 252 for General Science, Space and Technology programs:
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $17,460,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $17,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $18,333,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $17,838,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $19,250,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays $18,599,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $20,213,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $19,512,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $21,223,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $20,534,000,000.

(3) Energy (270)—for subfunction 271 for Energy Supply Research and Development, and subfunction 272 for Energy Conservation—
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $3,937,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $4,148,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $4,134,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $4,180,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $4,340,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $4,328,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $4,557,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $4,464,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $4,785,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $4,655,000,000.

(4) Natural Resources and Environment (300)—for subfunction 304 for Regulatory, Enforcement, and Research Programs and Hazardous Substance Superfund, and subfunction 306 Other Natural Resources:
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $10,538,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $9,527,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $10,742,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $10,013,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $10,816,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $10,533,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,859,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $10,825,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $10,943,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $10,889,000,000.

(5) Agriculture (350)—for subfunction 352 for Research Programs:
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $1,339,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,351,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $1,406,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,449,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $1,476,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,506,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $1,550,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,556,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $1,627,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,603,000,000.

(6) Commerce and Housing Credit (370)—for subfunction 376 for Science and Technology:
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $720,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $680,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $762,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $703,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $752,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $851,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $787,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $818,000,000.

(7) Transportation (400)—for subfunction 401 Ground Transportation, subfunction 402 for Air Transportation, and subfunction 403 for Water Transportation:
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $44,491,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,419,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $48,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,641,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $48,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,211,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $49,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $49,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,078,000,000.

(8) Community and Regional Development (450)—for subfunction 452 for Rural Development and Economic Development Assistance:
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $1,279,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,259,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $1,276,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,222,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $1,276,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,205,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $1,276,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,253,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $1,276,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,258,000,000.

(9) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500)—for subfunctions 501, 502, 503, 504, and 506 National Service Initiative, Rehabilitation Services, and Children and Families Services Program:
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $44,059,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,656,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $45,067,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,314,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $46,112,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,295,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $47,124,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,206,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $48,007,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,196,000,000.

(10) Health (550)—for subfunction 552 for Health Research and Training:

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $13,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $13,299,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $14,175,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $13,771,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $14,884,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $14,371,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $15,628,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $15,043,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $16,409,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $15,783,000,000.

(11) Income Security (600)—for subfunction 605 for Food and Nutrition Assistance:

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $4,618,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $4,506,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $4,636,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $4,627,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $4,734,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $4,727,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $4,834,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $4,827,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $4,948,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $4,940,000,000.

SEC. 5. RECONCILIATION.

(a) SUBMISSIONS.—No later than June 30, 1997, the House committees named in subsections (b) and (c) 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) HOUSE COMMITTEES.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays as follows: $7,900,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $36,500,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $115,700,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(2) 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 sufficient to reduce outlays as follows: $7,900,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $36,500,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $115,700,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 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 increased by: $10,419,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1998, $18,133,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2002, and $77,160,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(c) INVESTMENT TRUST FUND.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide for the establishment of a separate account in the Treasury known as the ''Investment Trust Fund'' into which shall be transferred revenues realized by the acution of spectrum allocations by the Federal Communications Commission and, further, provide that amounts in that fund shall be used exclusively for programs assumed under section 4.

(d) 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. 6. COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS.

Upon the adoption of this resolution, the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall each make separate allocations to the appropriate committees of its House of Congress of total new budget authority and total budget outlays for each fiscal year covered by this resolution to carry out section 4. For all purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, those allocations shall be deemed to be made pursuant to section 302(a) and section 602(a) of that Act, as applicable.

SEC. 7. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING BUDGET TRENDS.

It is the sense of Congress that the increasing portion of the Federal budget absorbed by interest payments and consumption programs, particularly health spending, has led to a declining level of domestically financed investment and may adversely impact the ability of the economy to grow at the levels needed to provide for future generations.

SEC. 8. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE NEED TO MAINTAIN FEDERAL INVESTMENTS.

It is the sense of Congress that a balanced program to improve the economy should be based on the concurrent goals of eliminating the deficit and maintaining Federal investment in programs that enhance long-term productivity such as research and development, education and training, and physical infrastructure improvements.

SEC. 9. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE TREATMENT OF FEDERAL INVESTMENTS WITHIN THE BUDGET.

It is the sense of Congress that the current budget structure focuses primarily on short-term spending and does not highlight for decision making purposes the differences between Federal spending for long-term investment and that for current consumption. In order to restructure Federal budget to make such a distinction, it is necessary to identify an investment component in the Federal budget and establish specific budgetary targets for such investments.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] and a Member opposed will each control 10 minutes.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] rise?

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] will be recognized 10 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

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

☐ 0115

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is not possible to enter into an all-encompassing discussion of what this investment budget does, but let me start off by defining investment budget. Both the OMB and the GAO have categorized certain investments or expenditures of the Federal Government as investments. These are described in a GAO report that came out yesterday prepared at my request and the request of Senator LAUTENBERG, the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on the Budget, or the Committee on the Budget of the other House.

The salient thing that I wish to point out first is that this chart, which is labeled nondefense investments, has shown a steady decline for the last 15 years. I have spent most of that 15 years trying to prevent that decline unsuccessfully, but what that reflects is we have continued to uninvest in most things which contribute to the increased productive of the private sector. That includes transportation investments, research and development investments, worker productivity investments, education and training, and so on, and a few other things. This has not reached the critical stage. In this budget we have a chance to begin to remedy that situation.

The budget before us does not. As a matter of fact, it continues this decline, much to my chagrin and unhappiness. Let me point out one other thing about the investment budget.

This is a comparison of annual deficits of the investment budget versus the underlying budget that we are going to be asked to vote on. By a strange coincidence, for the next 3 years the budget deficit goes up. And I know that Members are not going to like that, but this is what they are being asked to vote for.

By an equally strange coincidence, the amount of those increased deficits over my investment budget is approximately $85 billion. And by an even stranger coincidence, the amount of the tax cuts that both sides have agreed to is approximately $85 billion.

So what is before us is a situation contained in the budget that we are going to be asked to approve where we are financing $85 billion in tax cuts with $85 billion in additional borrowing over the next 3 years. And then we have this gullible idea that in the last 2 years of this budget resolution, where the major cuts have to be made, President Gore and the 107th Congress are going to agree to make those drastic cuts that my colleagues refuse to make. That is touching faith, like in the tooth fairy. I commend all of my colleagues who have that faith and are therefore going to vote for the budget that is before them.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, let me yield myself 2 minutes.

Let me first of all give some credit to the gentleman from California. I want to give him some credit because, frankly, it is not easy to put a program together, a comprehensive budget. I hope the gentleman does as well as I did in my first budget. I think I got 30 votes. I do not mind if we do a little better than that. But we obviously have to rise and oppose this for a couple reasons. I do not think we need to spend a lot of time.

There is no tax relief in this proposal. We think that the level of defense reductions are, frankly, too high. And let us get to the bottom line on it. It stands in stark violation to an agreement that could be approved. My colleagues are not going to get many votes, probably no votes on our side of the aisle. And while I want to commend the gentleman for his hard work, his commitment to science, it just is really not in balance and does not favor what we think is a new direction in this country, and that is a very limited Federal Government and more power and more money and more influence being shifted from this city back to people across the country.

It is not with joy that I have to rise against the gentleman from California, but certainly I feel compelled to do it, to represent those people who were a party to this agreement and particularly the Republican Members who really do not share this view. I ask that the membership reject the Brown amendment.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from California for his hard work in developing this substitute. I rise in support of the Brown investment substitute because it moves us to a balanced budget in a believable and reasonable way and because it protects our veterans, secures our future by investing in our children, our families and our economy.

Mr. Chairman, under the committee, in the committee budget resolution, the deficit goes up the first 3 years to pay for tax cuts. That is right. Under the committee bill, the deficit 3 years from now will be worse than it is today. The Brown investment substitute, however, eliminates the deficit and balances the budget in a logical, believable and gradual way. It invests in our children, strengthens our families, protects our veterans, stimulates and strengthens our economy and improves our future.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members of the House to vote for the Brown investment substitute.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the spirit in which our colleague from California offers his amendment. But it again points out some fundamental differences in philosophy. For as my colleague from Virginia just pointed out, if we believe that tax hikes and constantly paying more and more taxes is the best form of investment in this country, then we should vote for the Brown amendment. But if on the other hand, we believe, as many of us on both sides of the aisle do now, that the American people and working families need to hang onto more of their own money and send less of it to Washington, DC, that it is possible to rein in spending and at the same time offer the American people much needed tax relief, we will vote no on the Brown amendment.

I would also note, Mr. Chairman, that I listened with great interest to the ranking member of the Committee on Science as he outlined what he thought might happen in the 107th Congress. He mentioned, Mr. Chairman, if I am not mistaken, President GORE. I just wonder if he checked that with the minority leader because I believe he might have another idea, judging from what I have read in the press recently. But whatever happens, we, of course for our money, believe it would be a conservative majority and a conservative President in the White House.

We are taking important steps now to balance this budget, to allow working families to have tax relief, to properly weigh our priorities, and that is why I rise in opposition to the Brown amendment. Let us allow working families to hold onto more of their hard-earned money. Let us vote for a responsible budget plan.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, this is not a debate about the scope, the size of government, and there are no tax hikes in this substitute. This is about the role of investment, and it does not matter whether we want a bigger budget or a smaller budget. What the gentleman from California is forcing us all to do in this budget is to look at what role investment plays in the economy.

It is possible to balance the budget on paper and totally unbalance an economy. We can cut ourselves right down to nothing but, if we do not invest in those things that help the economy grow, not government grow, the economy grow, then what have we done, what have we produced? What the gentleman does is actually put together an investment budget similar to what the General Accounting Office has recommended.

To some of my friends who support capital budgeting, I am a big fan of that, this is not capital budgeting. Capital budgeting is not in this proposal. Nor does it take anything off budget. But what it does do in accordance with GAO recommendations is it puts aside a part of the budget as an investment budget. It separates for the first time in a meaningful way in the Federal budget what a dollar does. Does a dollar buy a dollar's worth of pencils for the courthouse or a dollar's worth of gasoline for a Federal vehicle or does a dollar buy a mile of road or does a dollar buy research or does a dollar buy infrastructure that actually helps the economy grow. I think most of us would acknowledge that we need more growth in this economy and we need more investment. So I think that is what the gentleman's budget does.

Also he does it without tax cuts until the budget is balanced, I think a very sound principle as well. So if Members believe that education and research and development and infrastructure development, and incidentally this has the same dollar figure in it for infrastructure development as in the Shuster-Oberstar substitute to come, then I think they want to be involved in this. In recognizing that according to the GAO we have seen investment as a percentage of our gross domestic product shrink from 2.6 percent to 1.5 percent, if we want to fuel productivity and growth, we have to vote for this budget.

Mr. BROWN of California. Would the Chair kindly tell us how much time remains on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has 6½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BARCIA].

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Brown substitute, and I would like to congratulate my ranking member on his excellent effort.

Using CBO scoring, the Brown substitute cuts $220 billion over 5 years, actually reaching surplus by the year 2002. These cuts provide for an overall increase in research and development, including basic science research, energy research, health, space, agricultural research and defense research of $30 billion over the President's request for the next 5 years.

This work has had an enormous impact on present technology development and application. Entire industries have developed from Nobel Prize winning research in magnetic resonance, superconductivity, lasers, antibiotics, and transistor action.

However, both industrial and governmental basic research spending has steadily declined throughout the 1990s, resulting in a loss of ground in many key areas for U.S. research. If the United States is to remain the dominant economic force, we must not only recognize but employ the vision of the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Brown substitute, and I would like to congratulate my ranking member on his excellent effort.

As a member of both the Science and Transportation Committees, I understand the need for adequate investment in our economy. We no longer compete in the labor intensive economy of the sixties. Rather, we are struggling to maintain our dominance of an ever changing, technologically sensitive, information intensive global economy. The Brown substitute not only provides the necessary framework to compete, but will ensure our economic success through increased investment in Research and Development, education, and training.

Using CBO scoring,the Brown substitute provides a budgetary surplus by 202 through spending cuts of $220 billion over 5 years.

Such cuts provide for an overall increase in Research and Development, including basic research, energy research, health, space, agricultural research, and defense research of $30 billion over the President's request over the next 5 years.

Further, the Brown substitute increases funding for the National Institute of Standards and Technology which will enable NIST to maintain its core scientific research programs and to expand its technology and manufacturing partnership programs. Steady growth in the advanced technology program will promote industrial alliances and lead to the direct creation of new, well paying jobs. Sustaining funding for the manufacturing extension partnership will provide the necessary technical and business assistance to ensure the competitiveness of U.S. manufacturers.

Scientific discoveries resulting from basic research have had an enormous impact on technology development and application. Entire industries have developed from Nobel Prize-winning research in such fields as magnetic resonance, superconductivity, lasers, antibiotics, and transistor action.

However, both industrial and governmental basic-research spending have steadily declined throughout the 1990's, resulting in a loss of ground in many key areas for U.S. research. If the United States is to remain dominant economic force, we must not only recognize, but employ the vision of Mr. BROWN.

Again, I applaud Mr. BROWN's fine efforts on his budget, and, more importantly, his vision for maintaining our long term economic vitality.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished woman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member of the Committee on Science for yielding me the time, and I thank him for his leadership on this issue.

With all due respect to esteemed chairman of the Committee on the Budget the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], let me say that I think this particular amendment is going to get more than the number of votes that he thinks that it would not get. Why is that? There are three reasons: research, education, and infrastructure.

This is an investment amendment. This is a competitive amendment. This is an amendment that balances the budget by 2002, $220 billion of cuts in spending, but it creates jobs.

□ 0130

Mr. Chairman, when a recent newspaper article said that most all of the college graduates would be seeking employment this 1997, it characterized for us what makes America great; that is competitiveness and jobs.

This amendment invests in jobs and research and cures in various diseases. This is a good budget amendment because it creates the opportunity for the 21st century in science, it creates jobs for both inner city, rural and all parts of America. This is the kind of amendment that reinforces America as a world competitor.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the support of the Brown amendment.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to rise in congratulation of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

I spoke on the budget resolution, which I will vote for and strongly support. I do want to rise and say some nice things about the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], and his budget, however.

If we are going to invest in educating our children, if we are going to solve problems such as cancer and AIDS, if we are going to develop new technologies for the Internet and high-speed rail and a host of other things with supercomputers, we must invest in R&D efforts and in education, and that is what the Brown budget does.

According to the Wall Street Journal, a poll done, polling 1500 economists, 43 percent of those economists said the best investments we can make to stimulate economic growth are in education and R&D.

So with that, I want to applaud the gentleman for his hard work and that of his staff putting this budget together.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER], a distinguished member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I want to commend the gentleman from California for this creative blueprint for maintaining American preeminence in science and technology.

The Brown budget proves that we can balance the budget and, at the same time, invest in the future. Indeed, what is the use of a balanced budget if we are left to second-rate technology and American science in retreat? The Brown budget enables us to have first-rate technology with first-rate jobs, ensures America will remain preeminent in scientific fields crucial to the economy, and to the public health and our environment.

Industries such as computers and software, telecommunications and biotechnology offer high wage jobs that are the result of a strong Federal commitment to research and development. This budget stands for jobs yet to be created, jobs yet to be imagined, and so I urge my colleagues to support the vision of the substitute offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to voice my support for the investment budget, sponsored by Representative GEORGE BROWN. I strongly believe that the budget must be balanced in 5 years, but I also believe it is crucial that we look beyond this limited time frame. The Brown substitute is a far-sighted plan which is both fiscally and socially responsible. It balances the budget in 5 years, and it provides a blue print for economic growth and development for decades to come.

It is clear that the Nation's economy is undergoing considerable change. In today's market place, it is essential that businesses and workers be equipped to take advantage of advancements in science and technology. Workers must be better trained, and goods and services must be produced and delivered more efficiently than ever. If we are going to prosper in the context of the economy of the future, it is crucial that we make investments today that will continue to pay dividends well into the next century.

However, it is equally important that we do not ignore our current responsibilities. The investment budget continues our commitments to, among other things, our Nation's senior citizens, veterans, and distressed communities. It protects seniors by extending the life of the Medicare trust fund and providing coverage for preventive services. In addition, it preserves our obligations to our veterans by not seeking any budget savings through reductions in the commitment we have made to those who have served our Nation.

Similarly, the Brown substitute contains ample economic development funding, which will help to revitalize distressed communities. Initiatives such as the Community Development Block Grant program will be protected, so that we can continue to rebuild infrastructure, improve housing, establish parks, and revitalize commercial opportunities, thereby creating jobs and raising the standard of living in the localities where they are implemented. By providing cities and towns with the tools they need to rebuild themselves, we help people help themselves and we increase our Nation's potential for future growth.

We hear a lot of talk in this Chamber about how Congress should conduct itself like the average American family. We hear that the House and Senate should, like a family, sit down around some sort of kitchen table and balance our budget. I suppose that is what we are doing this evening. But when a family sits down to balance the checkbook and put its finances in order, it also plans for the future. Families devise investment plans for the future that will enable them to contend with expenses such as college, replacing durable goods, housing, or purchasing a new automobile. The Brown substitute is a prudent investment plan for our entire Nation's future. In addition to finally putting our financial house in order, it will provide help of the country's education, research and development, infrastructure, community development, and transportation.

Mr. Speaker, I plan to support House Concurrent Resolution 84 if the investment budget is not approved. I believe that the budget agreement, drafted by the White House and congressional leadership may be the only measure that can attract the diverse support that is needed to produce a balanced budget. It is certainly a substantial improvement over the budget plans offered by the Republican congressional leadership in 1995 and 1996. However, the Brown substitute most accurately represents the priorities of my constituents in western Pennsylvania. It provides greater safeguards for fiscal responsibility by postponing tax cuts until after the deficit is eliminated and providing a steady glide path to balance. In addition, as I have outlined, it makes prudent, far-sighted investments in our Nation's future. Even if it is not adopted by the House, I urge my colleagues to examine the priorities advanced by the Brown substitute and to consider them as we move through the reconciliation process.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, all time has expired.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 91, noes 339, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 145]

AYES—91

Barcia	Green	Nadler
Barrett (WI)	Hamilton	Oberstar
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Obey
Berman	Hefner	Olver
Blagojevich	Hilliard	Owens
Blumenauer	Hinchey	Pastor
Bonior	Jackson (IL)	Payne
Brown (CA)	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Pelosi
Brown (FL)		Rangel
Carson	Johnson, E. B.	Rivers
Clay	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Clayton	Kilpatrick	Rush
Clyburn	Kind (WI)	Sanders
Conyers	Klink	Scott
Coyne	LaFalce	Serrano
Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Skaggs
Davis (IL)	Lofgren	Slaughter
Dellums	Markey	Stark
Dixon	Martinez	Stokes
Doggett	Matsui	Thompson
Doyle	McDermott	Tierney
Engel	McGovern	Torres
Etheridge	McKinney	Towns
Farr	McNulty	Velazquez
Fattah	Meek	Vento
Filner	Millender-McDonald	Waters
Foglietta		Watt (NC)
Ford	Miller (CA)	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Mink	Wise
Furse	Moakley	Woolsey
Gephardt	Moran (VA)	Wynn

NOES—339

Abercrombie	Borski	Cook
Ackerman	Boswell	Cooksey
Aderholt	Boucher	Costello
Allen	Boyd	Cox
Andrews	Brady	Cramer
Archer	Brown (OH)	Crane
Armey	Bryant	Crapo
Bachus	Bunning	Cubin
Baesler	Burr	Cunningham
Baker	Burton	Danner
Baldacci	Buyer	Davis (FL)
Ballenger	Callahan	Davis (VA)
Barr	Calvert	Deal
Barrett (NE)	Camp	DeFazio
Bartlett	Campbell	DeGette
Barton	Canady	Delahunt
Bass	Cannon	DeLauro
Bateman	Capps	DeLay
Bentsen	Cardin	Deutsch
Bereuter	Castle	Diaz-Balart
Berry	Chabot	Dickey
Bilbray	Chambliss	Dicks
Bilirakis	Chenoweth	Dingell
Bishop	Christensen	Dooley
Bliley	Clement	Doolittle
Blunt	Coble	Dreier
Boehlert	Coburn	Duncan
Boehner	Collins	Dunn
Bonilla	Combest	Edwards
Bono	Condit	Ehlers
Ehrlich	Kolbe	Reyes
Emerson	Kucinich	Riggs
English	LaHood	Riley
Ensign	Lampson	Rodriguez
Eshoo	Lantos	Roemer
Evans	Largent	Rogan
Everett	Latham	Rogers
Ewing	LaTourette	Rohrabacher
Fawell	Lazio	Ros-Lehtinen
Fazio	Leach	Rothman
Flake	Levin	Roukema
Foley	Lewis (CA)	Royce
Forbes	Lewis (KY)	Ryun
Fowler	Linder	Sabo
Fox	Lipinski	Salmon
Franks (NJ)	Livingston	Sanchez
Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo	Sandlin
Frost	Lowey	Sanford
Gallegly	Lucas	Sawyer
Ganske	Luther	Saxton
Gejdenson	Maloney (CT)	Scarborough
Gekas	Maloney (NY)	Schaefer, Dan
Gibbons	Manton	Schaffer, Bob
Gilchrest	Manzullo	Schumer
Gillmor	Mascara	Sensenbrenner
Gilman	McCarthy (MO)	Sessions
Gingrich	McCarthy (NY)	Shadegg
Gonzalez	McCollum	Shaw
Goode	McCrery	Shays
Goodlatte	McDade	Sherman
Goodling	McHale	Shimkus
Gordon	McHugh	Shuster
Goss	McInnis	Sisisky
Graham	McIntosh	Skeen
Granger	McIntyre	Skelton
Greenwood	McKeon	Smith (MI)
Gutierrez	Menendez	Smith (NJ)
Gutknecht	Metcalf	Smith (OR)
Hall (OH)	Mica	Smith (TX)
Hall (TX)	Miller (FL)	Smith, Adam
Hansen	Minge	Smith, Linda
Harman	Molinari	Snowbarger
Hastert	Mollohan	Snyder
Hastings (WA)	Moran (KS)	Solomon
Hayworth	Morella	Souder
Hefley	Murtha	Spence
Herger	Myrick	Spratt
Hill	Neal	Stabenow
Hilleary	Nethercutt	Stearns
Hinojosa	Neumann	Stenholm
Hobson	Ney	Strickland
Hoekstra	Northup	Stump
Holden	Norwood	Stupak
Hooley	Nussle	Sununu
Horn	Ortiz	Tanner
Hostettler	Oxley	Tauscher
Houghton	Packard	Tauzin
Hoyer	Pallone	Taylor (MS)
Hulshof	Pappas	Taylor (NC)
Hunter	Parker	Thomas
Hutchinson	Pascrell	Thornberry
Hyde	Paul	Thune
Inglis	Paxon	Thurman
Istook	Pease	Tiahrt
Jenkins	Peterson (MN)	Traficant
John	Peterson (PA)	Turner
Johnson (CT)	Petri	Upton
Johnson (WI)	Pickering	Visclosky
Johnson, Sam	Pickett	Walsh
Jones	Pitts	Wamp
Kaptur	Pombo	Watkins
Kasich	Pomeroy	Watts (OK)
Kelly	Porter	Weldon (FL)
Kennedy (MA)	Portman	Weldon (PA)
Kennedy (RI)	Poshard	Weller
Kennelly	Price (NC)	Wexler
Kildee	Pryce (OH)	Weygand
Kim	Quinn	White
King (NY)	Radanovich	Whitfield
Kingston	Rahall	Wicker
Kleczka	Ramstad	Wolf
Klug	Redmond	Young (AK)
Knollenberg	Regula	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—5

Jefferson	Schiff	Yates
Meehan	Talent	

□ 0152

Mr. SALMON changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. McKINNEY changed her 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.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. 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. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999 through 2002 are hereby set forth.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 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 1998: $1,206,379,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,252,942,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,307,528,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,366,412,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,427,435,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $0.
Fiscal year 1999: $0.
Fiscal year 2000: $0.
Fiscal year 2001: $0.
Fiscal year 2002: $0.

(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 1998: $1,399,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,447,879,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,495,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,526,178,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,552,378,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $1,383,432,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,440,016,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,489,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,516,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,535,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $177,053,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $187,074,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $181,612,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $150,254,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $107,565,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $5,596,684,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $5,844,015,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $6,088,538,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $6,298,829,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,474,034,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $33,829,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $33,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $34,775,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $36,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $37,099,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $315,472,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $324,749,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $328,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $332,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $335,141,000,000.

SEC. 102. 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 1998 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $266,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $264,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $588,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $266,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $264,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $757,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $267,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $267,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $267,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $261,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $267,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $264,400,000,0000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $15,909,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,558,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,966,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $12,751,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $14,918,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,569,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,021,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,093,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $15,782,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,981,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,077,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,434,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,114,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,751,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,122,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,826,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,353,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,812,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,178,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,217,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $16,437,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,082,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $16,403,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,728,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $16,147,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,213,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,062,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $15,804,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,868,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $3,123,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,247,000,000
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,050,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $3,469,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,446,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,078,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $3,186,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,293,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,109,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $2,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,048,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,141,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $2,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,867,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,171,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $23,877,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,405,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $23,227,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,702,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $32,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $22,570,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,963,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $32,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $22,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,720,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $34,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $22,086,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,313,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $34,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $13,133,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,892,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $9,620,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,365,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,790,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,294,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,047,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,436,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,215,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,664,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,071,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,509,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,978,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,494,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,960,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,583,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $10,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,108,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,965,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,660,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $6,607,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$920,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,739,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $245,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $11,082,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,299,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,887,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $253,450,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $15,183,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,821,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,238,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $255,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,078,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,133,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,574,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $257,989,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,678,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,541,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,689,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $259,897,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $46,402,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,933,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $155,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $* * * To Be Supplied.
(B) Outlays, $* * * To Be Supplied.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $* * * To Be Supplied.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $* * * To Be Supplied.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $* * * To Be Supplied.
(B) Outlays, $* * * To Be Supplied.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $* * * To Be Supplied.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $* * * To Be Supplied.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $* * * To Be Supplied.
(B) Outlays, $* * * To Be Supplied.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $* * * To Be Supplied.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $* * * To Be Supplied.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $49,184,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,247,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $9,068,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,687,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,867,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $8,839,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,252,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,943,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,406,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $8,210,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,386,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,020,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $8,214,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,098,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,452,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $8,290,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,929,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,180,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,475,000,000.
(A) New budget authority, $46,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,256,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $135,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $47,114,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,357,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $48,135,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,303,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $67,320,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,362,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $12,328,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $20,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $63,750,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,885,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,092,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $21,899,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $65,903,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,178,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,926,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $23,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $67,759,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,981,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $14,701,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $24,517,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $68,739,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,966,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,426,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,676,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $140,599,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $140,567,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $85,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $149,418,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $149,394,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $159,868,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $159,747,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $170,662,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $170,385,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $181,571,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $181,127,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $203,820,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $203,964,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $214,673,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $214,148,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $229,340,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $229,337,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $244,036,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $243,181,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $256,548,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $255,769,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $240,160,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,861,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $45,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $255,375,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $259,346,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $75,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $271,084,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $269,669,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $110,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $276,898,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $279,007,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $145,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $288,937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $287,221,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $170,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $37,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $11,424,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,524,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,060,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,196,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,866,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,022,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,043,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,383,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,398,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $40,579,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,371,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,029,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $27,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $41,745,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,979,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,068,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $26,671,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $42,015,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,223,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,177,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $26,202,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $42,418,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,540,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,249,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $25,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $42,629,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,783,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,277,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $25,129,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $25,165,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,209,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $25,320,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,476,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $25,578,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,840,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $25,054,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,701,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $25,183,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,879,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $14,711,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,959,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $14,444,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,363,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $13,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,727,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,675,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,131,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $13,105,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $296,672,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $296,672,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $304,932,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $304,932,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $305,512,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $305,512,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $304,037,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $304,037,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $303,796,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $303,796,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(19) Allowances (920):
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 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $41,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,841,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, −$36,949,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$36,949,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$36,937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$36,937,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$39,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$39,151,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$51,124,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$51,124,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION.

(a) SUBMISSIONS.—Not later than August 1, 1997, 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) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture 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: $34,571,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $37,008,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $211,443,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(2) COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES.—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: $8,435,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $5,091,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $50,306,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(3) 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: $395,150,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $513,615,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,638,120,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(4) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce 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: $17,718,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $18,167,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $106,050,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(5) 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: $68,975,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $81,896,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $443,061,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 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: $0 in fiscal year 1998, $621,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, and $1,829,000,000 in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(6) 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: $18,287,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $17,483,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $107,615,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(7) 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: $22,478,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $25,192,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $141,497,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(8) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $399,663,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $511,377,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,639,195,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to decrease revenues as follows: by $8,000,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1998, by $16,000,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2002, and by $60,000,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(C) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase revenues as follows: by $8,000,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1998, by $16,000,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2002, and by $60,000,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1998 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.

(d) CHILDREN'S HEALTH INITIATIVE.—If the Committees on Commerce and Ways and Means report recommendations pursuant to their reconciliation instructions that, combined, provide an initiative for children's health that would increase the deficit by more than $4.6 billion for fiscal year 1998, by more than $8.0 billion for fiscal year 2002, and by more than $32 billion for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002, the committees shall be deemed to not have complied with their reconciliation instructions pursuant to section 310(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

TITLE III—SENSE OF CONGRESS PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON MIDDLE INCOME TAX RELIEF.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) Tax reductions in tax bills enacted in the 1980's predominately benefited Americans with higher incomes.

(2) Increases in the social security payroll tax over this period has resulted in a net increase in the tax burden on middle income Americans.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Congress should enact legislation providing targeted tax relief, with an emphasis on alleviating the tax burden on middle income Americans, by enacting the following provisions:

(1) Higher education initiatives, including the President's $1,500 HOPE scholarship tax credit and deductibility of up to $10,000 for higher education tuition and fees.

(2) Expansion of the child care tax credit, with increases in the amount of allowable expenses, the percentage of allowable expenses, and the income phase-down levels.

(3) Homeownership provisions, including up to a $500,000 capital gains exclusion for home sales, and permitting tax and penalty-free borrowing from an IRA account or a parent's IRA account for a down payment on a first-time home purchase.

(4) Savings provisions, including an increase in the annual limit for deductible IRA contributions from $2,000 to $2,500 per year.

SEC. 302. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON SMALL BUSINESS TAX RELIEF.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Small businesses are the source of most new jobs created in this country.

(2) Small businesses have a more difficult time than large corporations in raising capital covering health care costs for employees, and coping with estate taxes.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Congress should enact legislation providing tax incentives and tax relief for small businesses, including:

(1) Incentives for long-term investments in small businesses, including capital gains relief, deferral of gains on any small business investments rolled over into another small business investment, and a tripling of the amount of declarable losses on investments in small businesses.

(2) Estate tax relief for family-owned small businesses and farms, and an increase in small businesses eligibility for 10-year installment payments of estate taxes.

(3) 100 percent deductibility of health care costs for the self-employed.

(4) Extension of the 5 percent Foreign Sales Credit (FSC) to software exporters.

SEC. 303. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON REVENUE NEUTRALITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Large tax cuts in the 1980's led to an unprecedented explosion in the level of debt owed by American taxpayers.

(2) Tax cuts without revenue offsets increase the level of spending cuts required to balance the budget, in vital areas like education, health care, transportation, and research and development.

(3) It is a priority to balance the budget first, and to defer tax cuts which reduce revenues until the budget is actually in balance.

(4) Targeted tax cuts for higher education, child care, homeownership, increased savings, and small businesses can be enacted without reducing the net level of revenues.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that all tax cuts should be fully offset by revenue increases, through reinstatement of expiring excise taxes and the closing of corporate tax loopholes.

SEC. 304. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CHILDREN'S HEALTH.

It is the sense of Congress that sufficient funding be provided to insure all currently uninsured children in America, through health care grants to the States and an expansion of medicaid in a total amount of at least $32,000,000,000 over the next 5 years.

SEC. 305. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON MEDICARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Medicare Part A Trust Fund will go bankrupt by the year 2000 without congressional action.

(2) Some 40,000,000 senior citizens rely on medicare for affordable, quality health care.

(3) Many low-income senior citizens are unable to afford projected increases in medicare premiums.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Congress should enact legislation to extend the solvency of the Medicare Trust Fund for the next 10 years, using policies which:

(1) Maintain part B premiums at 25 percent, with a phase-in of home health care changes.

(2) Provide new preventive and other health care benefits, including expanded mammography coverage, coverage for colorectal screenings, coverage for diabetes screening, 72 hours of respite care of Alzheimers patients, bone mass measurements for osteoporosis care, prostate cancer screening, cancer clinic benefits, and immunosuppressant drugs.

(3) Include sustainable reductions in reimbursements for hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, and other health care providers.

(4) Provide full funding for teaching hospitals through the Graduate Medical Education program.

(5) Increase health care choices among seniors, without restricting access to fee-for-service health care.

SEC. 306. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON MEDICAID.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Hospitals and other health care providers are already seriously underreimbursed for the actual cost of providing medicaid services.

(2) Medicaid is the primary source of health care coverage for the uninsured, including poor children, indigent mothers, and low-income senior citizens in nursing homes.

(3) Medicaid provides critical funding for medicare premiums for low-income seniors.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that medicaid legislation should increase coverage for low-income adults and seniors, and uninsured children, by providing that:

(1) Any reductions in medicaid reimbursements to health care providers should be used to expand coverage for children's health care, legal immigrants, and low-income Americans.

(2) Spending reductions should not include either a block grant or a per capita cap.

(3) Medicaid should extend its program to pay medicare premiums for low-income senior citizens, protecting them from increases caused by home health care shifts.

(4) States should be given more flexibility in managing the medicaid program, through managed care options, and elimination of unnecessary regulations, while fully protecting the quality and availability of health care for medicaid recipients.

SEC. 307. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON DOMESTIC DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.

It is the sense of Congress that sufficient funding be provided for domestic discretionary spending to allow for full inflationary increases over the period from 1998 through 2002, to fully fund priority areas like education, health care, transportation, research and development, community development, crime, and housing.

SEC. 308. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PELL GRANT LIMITS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The spiraling cost of higher education tuition and fees threatens to put the cost of college out of reach for millions of Americans.

(2) Pell Grants are an effective way to make college affordable for low-income students.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Congress should increase the annual limit on Pell Grants from $2,700 to $3,700.

SEC. 309. SENSE OF CONGRESS IN SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Children cannot achieve their full educational potential, if the school buildings they are educated in are falling apart.

(2) The General Accounting Office (GAO) has determined that it will require $112,000,000,000 to repair and improve our Nation's schools.

(3) Many communities are unable to afford the full cost of making such needed repairs.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Congress should enact the President's school construction initiative, to provide $5,000,000,000 to leverage the repair and construction of elementary and secondary schools.

SEC. 310. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING EDUCATION.

It is the sense of Congress that funding should be substantially increased in a number of programs which increase educational opportunities, including:

(1) Title I grants, to help the disadvantaged develop basic educational skills.

(2) The Technology Literacy Challenge Fund, to provide computers, software, and technology training to elementary and secondary schools.

(3) Special education IDEA grants, to provide services to children with disabilities.

(4) Adult education grants, to provide adult literacy and other educational programs.

(5) The Federal work study program, to provide needy students with part-time work.

SEC. 311. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON TRANSPORTATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Our continued economic growth is dependent on maintaining and expanding our basic infrastructure, especially with respect to roads and bridges.

(2) In many sections of our country, our transportation infrastructure suffers from a lack of adequate funding and neglect of maintenance.

(3) For many years, Congress has failed to use funds collected under the Federal gas tax to pay for essential road and related transportation needs.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that all new funds collected in the transportation trust fund should be fully spent on transportation improvements.

SEC. 312. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Adequate nutrition, quality health care, educational opportunities, and high quality child care for children between birth and the age of 3 are scientifically shown to play a critical role in later childhood and adult development.

(2) Public spending on health, nutrition, education, and child care at the stage of early childhood development has proven to be a sound long-term investment in human resources.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that sufficient funding should be provided in the following programs to meet the needs of infants and toddlers:

(1) WIC (the supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children).

(2) Head Start.

(3) Healthy Start.

(4) Programs for infants and toddlers with disabilities under part H of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

(5) Programs under the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act.

SEC. 313. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON HEALTH RESEARCH.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The National Institutes of Health (NIH) is the world's leading biomedical research institution.

(2) The National Institutes of Health accomplishes its mission of discovering new medical knowledge that will lead to better health for everyone through supervising, funding, and conducting biomedical and behavioral research to help prevent, detect, diagnose, and treat disease and disability in humans.

(3) The Federal investment in the National Institutes of Health should be sufficient to keep up with the pace of biomedical inflation and public health needs.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that funding for the National Institutes of Health should be at least equal to the Institute's annual professional judgment, which is the best and most reliable estimate of the minimum level of funding needed to sustain the high standard of scientific achievement attained by the National Institutes of Health.

SEC. 314. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Federal support of research and development has led to numerous advances in science and technology that have greatly enhanced the lives of all Americans.

(2) Technological innovation has spurred almost half of the economic development of the past century.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that full funding should be provided for Federal research and development programs, including the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the solar and renewable energies programs of the Department of Energy.

SEC. 315. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CRIME.

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Crime continues to threaten residential and commercial neighborhoods through the Nation.

(2) Juvenile crime continues to grow at a faster rate than other categories of crime in this Nation.

(3) Intervention and prevention programs have been shown to successfully turn the tide of violent crime.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that funding for crime intervention, prevention, and domestic violence programs should be increased over current levels.

SEC. 316. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON VETERANS.

It is the sense of Congress that funding should not be cut for veterans' COLA or for housing benefits.

SEC. 317. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON HOUSING.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) According to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, 13,000,000 Americans have ''acute housing needs''.

(2) Current funding for rental housing assistance for the elderly, disabled, working poor, and mothers making the transition from welfare to work is inadequate.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that funding for housing assistance should be increased by providing—

(1) full funding for operating subsidies for public housing authorities, as determined by the Performance Funding System;

(2) additional funding for capital grants for public housing authorities, to repair and maintain existing public housing units; and

(3) sufficient funding to create 50,000 new section 8 vouchers each year for the next 5 years.

SEC. 318. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON DEFENSE.

It is the sense of Congress that defense spending should be maintained at current levels, and that priority should be given to defense readiness and full funding for personnel salaries and supplies, as opposed to continued expansions of large weapons systems.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Committee on the Budget, we oppose this amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we are all here tonight to vote for a resolution which will finally balance the Federal budget. I have long been a supporter of a balanced budget. I respect the work of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH) and others.

The gentleman from Texas, [Mr. CHARLIE STENHOLM] and so many people in this Chamber have worked very hard to achieve a balanced budget, and this is the culmination of a year's worth of effort. I salute those who have come to this agreement. But while we have in this agreement achieved a zero deficit over a period of 10 years, we have also achieved a very unbalanced budget.

This is a budget which is fundamentally unbalanced in terms of who it hurts and who it helps. This resolution, as we will vote on it in the next hour or so in this Chamber, I think will do great harm to a great many people in our country. If we look at the kinds of hurts that this will do, we just have to look at the kinds of cuts that are going to come about. We see enormous reductions in terms of the programs that will affect Medicare and Medicaid, education and transportation, research and development, and community development.

My amendment will provide a fully inflationary adjustment for domestic discretionary spending through 2002.

Some might say, how can you possibly increase Pell grants by $1,000? How can you double the amount of funding for children's health to complete all $32 billion for children's health?

Mr. Chairman, the KENNEDY balanced budget substitute gets it right. This balanced budget substitute reinvests $100 billion more than the budget agreement in important domestic programs like Medicare and Medicaid, education and transportation, research and development, and community development. It provides a fully inflationary adjustment for domestic discretionary spending through 2002.

Some might say, how can you increase a Pell grant limit by $1,000? How can you double the amount of children's health funding? How can you provide an additional $15 billion for the ISTEA program? How can you fully fund programs like WIC and NIH and the National Science Foundation, and increase funding for programs like the veterans programs, or legal immigrants, or the fuel assistance program, or crime prevention and domestic violence programs and housing? How can you restore cuts to hospitals and skilled nursing facilities and provide $9 billion more in Medicaid prevention programs?

Well, the answer is simple. Rather than providing a huge $135 billion tax cut, with over 50 percent of those tax cuts going to the wealthiest 5 percent of the American people, we provide a modest $60 billion tax cut targeted at the middle class and fully paid for with tax offsets. Rather than giving 15 or $20 billion worth of estate tax breaks which only go to the wealthiest 1¼ percent of the American population, we give a modest, targeted estate tax break to the small businesses and family farmers that really need it.

The Kennedy substitute targets tax cuts to the middle class and small businesses through the President's college tuition credits and deductions program, the expansion of the child care tax credit, capital gains for home sales, an increase in the IRA savings limit, capital gains incentives for investments in small businesses, estate tax relief for family businesses and family farms, and full health care deductibility for the self-employed. And it fully pays for all these tax cuts with revenue offsets.

For all of my colleagues on the Democratic side who are disappointed with the budget agreement, I say this budget will fully and completely represent the values of the Democratic Party, and the Kennedy substitute allows my colleagues to vote for a balanced budget and protects their priorities.

And, too, those Republicans that are in the Abraham Lincoln and Nelson Rockefeller tradition, this gives them the sense of standing ''yes'' for tax cuts but ''no'' for just lining the pockets of the wealthy. And for my colleagues who will be voting for the budget agreement, perhaps grudgingly, I call upon them to also vote for this substitute. Do not confuse the best deal possible with the best possible deal. Vote for the Kennedy amendment.

☐ 0200

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Kennedy amendment, because once again we stand at a historic juncture where we can make a very clear choice. Because quite the contrary what my colleague from Massachusetts has said, when we offer broad-based tax relief to working families, we are not lining the pockets of the rich. Quite the contrary. We are allowing working families to save, spend and invest more of their hard-earned money as they see fit. Sadly, the Kennedy amendment offers no net tax relief for the American people. That is the reality of the Kennedy amendment.

Now, it is true if there are those in this Chamber who believe that the era of big government should continue, they should support the Kennedy amendment. However, we have a broad-based agreement which says that we should frame our priorities properly, we should allow almost every American to hold on to more of his hard-earned money and send less of it here to Washington.

We have worked out agreements and fashioned in the spirit of compromise a reasonable approach to fund priorities on both sides of the aisle, and that is why we must oppose the Kennedy amendment. Because the fact is, even though we can have disagreements about the course of government, once we have hammered out this type of agreement to lead to a balanced budget and, most importantly, offer broad-based tax relief that does not punish people for succeeding nor does it ask working families to continue to give more and more and more of their hard-earned money to Washington, we have the basis for, in fact, bringing this budget into balance, we have the basis for changing the psychology of government as well as the reality of government, and so it is for compassionate reasons that we rise in opposition to the Kennedy amendment, it is precisely because we believe that the era of big government should in fact be over. For those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I oppose the Kennedy amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Connecticut has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Connecticut want to yield to one of his speakers?

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, it is now 2 o'clock. We are going to reserve the balance of our time and the gentleman is free to continue.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to respond to the gentleman from Arizona.

First of all I would just say yama-yama-yama, here we go again. The fact of the matter is that we have got $60 billion worth of tax reductions scored by CBO in this budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. How does that go, yama-yama-yama?

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's substitute is perhaps the best balanced approach that we have had on the floor tonight. I am going to support it. For those who are interested in investments in health and education, we have a chance here to provide the school construction money that we talked about that did not make it into this plan. We have a chance to not have to worry about choosing which 5 million kids get health insurance and which 5 million do not of the 10 million who do not have health insurance in this country, because the Kennedy proposal supports both of them.

We also have in this proposal an increase in Pell grants for those who need it the most. It targets the relief both on the spending side and the tax side, $60 billion I might tell my friend from Arizona in tax relief, and some capital gains tax relief for small businesses. If Members are interested in the whole question of full health care deductibility for people who are self-employed, it is here. If Members are interested in education tax cuts, they are here.

This is the best balanced approach I think we will have on the floor tonight, I hope my colleagues will support it, and I commend my friend from Massachusetts for his work.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kennedy substitute budget. This alternative budget contains a number of key improvements to the bipartisan budget agreement and one of them includes money to fix our crumbling schools. School construction funding should have been part of the budget agreement. The Republican leadership's opposition to this program is seriously misguided. The need is real. Today all over America our schools are inadequate, overcrowded and literally falling down. A GAO report released last summer confirmed the worst. Record numbers of school buildings across America are in disrepair. One-third of our schools serving 14 million students need extensive repairs. About 60 percent of schools need to have their roofs, walls and floors fixed and with school enrollment skyrocketing the problem will only get worse. The state of our schools is a national disgrace. We simply cannot prepare America's children for the 21st century in 19th century schools. Students cannot learn when the walls of the classrooms are crumbling down. This amendment makes a big difference in school construction and we are going to keep fighting until we win because our children deserve nothing less.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I was surprised to hear my friend from Connecticut refer to the fact that it was 2 o'clock in the morning, as if that was a reason not to debate. That is because his leadership decided this. That is because his leadership was in such a hurry to get this thing through before people looked at it that we are here at 2 o'clock in the morning. This is really a case of blaming the victim. Stay here all night, rush the debate through and then use that as an excuse to not fully debate.

We are here again with a budget which is a significant improvement because it preserves the balancing of the budget. I want to remind Members of what I said before. From 1992 when we had a $292 billion deficit until this year, we reduced it $230 billion in 5 years. Now we are going the next $60 billion in another 5 years. We are nearly drowning in self-congratulation for those who are going to bring it down $65 billion in 5 years, who denigrated having brought it down $230 billion in the previous 5. Not only are they doing that, they are doing it by making things less fair. They are doing it by saying if you are poor, we will make it harder on you. If you are wealthy, we will give you more of a tax break because we think that is the way to get you to work.

If you think that this country needs to continue to subsidize the defense budgets of western Europe and Japan, then the underlying budget is a great one because it builds in all of that subsidy, but if you think we ought to be doing more about education here in this country, it does very little. The gentleman from Massachusetts continues the march towards balancing the budget, but he recognizes that we are in an economy today where the market works well to produce wealth, it certainly does. The market through technological change, through global interaction, is working well, but some people are being left behind.

What the underlying budget does, with a few exceptions, and I give the President credit for getting a few exceptions, but the essential task of the underlying budget is to look at those who are being left behind and wave good-bye as the rest of us move forward, to give tax relief of an unfair sort, unlike the gentleman's balanced tax relief, and essentially take one more step away from fairness in this country.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman from Connecticut going to yield to anyone on his side?

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, we will be closing the debate as is our right. We have one speaker.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not about big government. It is about good government and fair government. This amendment as far as I am concerned is far superior than that brought forth by the committee. It does more in deficit reduction. It does a much better job of guaranteeing investments that we need to grow in the 21st century. It provides dramatic rather than token increases in student aid. It does a better job for transportation. It does a better job of targeting tax cuts to the people who need it rather than the people who lust for it. It gives the tax cuts to people who are hardworking, working people, not the richest 5 percent of people in the country. It does a far better job for children's health, for Medicare, for veterans, it is more disciplined on defense, it targets tax cuts to small farmers and small businessmen, and it provides basic health care opportunities for farmers that they have not seen in many a year in this country.

It is far superior, it is far more just, and it is far more fiscally responsible. I commend the gentleman for offering it.

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

Mr. Chairman, we are under no orders tonight or yesterday or tomorrow. It is just that I remember the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] in this Chamber in 1989 offering an amendment to finally get our country's financial house in order. There were only 30 people who supported him, and our deficits just got bigger and bigger and our national debt just kept growing and growing.

The perfect amendment, it appears on that side of the aisle, is the Kennedy substitute, and I respect that. Many on our side felt the perfect amendment was offered by the conservative coalition, the CATS. So we had our perfect amendment and you have your perfect amendment and what we are trying to do is to find something that we both can agree on.

I am hoping that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] and others are right, that we can come to an agreement on a package that does some of what we want, some of what the Democrats want, and will be ultimately signed by the President.

We wanted to see controlling the growth of entitlements, allowing entitlements to grow at 6 and 7 percent a year instead of at 10 percent a year, we wanted to deal with the trust fund that is literally going bankrupt, and we also on this side of the aisle wanted tax cuts. That is true. The other side does not. We accept that. On the other side of the aisle they wanted more spending on discretionary spending. We did not. But ultimately the President won that battle.

So we have an agreement, more discretionary spending that that side of the aisle wants, controlling the growth of entitlements and tax cuts which our side wants. It is an agreement. It is basically the best we seem to be able to do with a Democrat President and Republican Congress. That is why we oppose this amendment.

We support something that is very different than what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] brought forward. I know the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] wants something very different from what we brought forward. But in the end we have an agreement, and I hope and pray that not only we defeat this amendment but that we defeat the transportation amendment that will follow this debate here, vote out this agreement, and then work in the next 2 years to make this agreement work.

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 123, noes 306, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 146]

AYES—123

Ackerman
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Blagojevich
Bonior
Borski
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Clayton
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dixon
Engel
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Green
Gutierrez
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hinchey
Holden
Hooley
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sanders
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Skaggs
Slaughter
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn

NOES—306

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fazio
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger

Hill	McKeon	Scarborough
Hilleary	Meek	Schaefer, Dan
Hilliard	Metcalf	Schaffer, Bob
Hinojosa	Mica	Sensenbrenner
Hobson	Miller (FL)	Sessions
Hoekstra	Minge	Shadegg
Horn	Molinari	Shaw
Hostettler	Moran (KS)	Shays
Houghton	Morella	Sherman
Hoyer	Murtha	Shimkus
Hulshof	Myrick	Shuster
Hunter	Nethercutt	Sisisky
Hutchinson	Neumann	Skeen
Hyde	Ney	Skelton
Inglis	Northup	Smith (MI)
Istook	Norwood	Smith (NJ)
Jenkins	Nussle	Smith (OR)
John	Ortiz	Smith (TX)
Johnson (CT)	Oxley	Smith, Adam
Johnson, Sam	Packard	Smith, Linda
Jones	Pappas	Snowbarger
Kasich	Parker	Snyder
Kelly	Pascrell	Solomon
Kildee	Paul	Souder
Kilpatrick	Paxon	Spence
Kim	Pease	Spratt
Kind (WI)	Peterson (MN)	Stabenow
King (NY)	Peterson (PA)	Stearns
Kingston	Petri	Stenholm
Kleczka	Pickering	Stump
Klug	Pickett	Sununu
Knollenberg	Pitts	Tanner
Kolbe	Pombo	Tauscher
Kucinich	Porter	Tauzin
LaHood	Portman	Taylor (MS)
Lampson	Price (NC)	Taylor (NC)
Largent	Pryce (OH)	Thomas
Latham	Quinn	Thompson
LaTourette	Radanovich	Thornberry
Lazio	Ramstad	Thune
Leach	Redmond	Tiahrt
Levin	Regula	Traficant
Lewis (CA)	Reyes	Turner
Lewis (KY)	Riggs	Upton
Linder	Riley	Visclosky
Livingston	Roemer	Walsh
LoBiondo	Rogan	Wamp
Lucas	Rogers	Waters
Luther	Rohrabacher	Watkins
Maloney (CT)	Ros-Lehtinen	Watts (OK)
Manzullo	Roukema	Weldon (FL)
McCarthy (MO)	Royce	Weldon (PA)
McCollum	Ryun	Weller
McCrery	Sabo	White
McDade	Salmon	Whitfield
McHale	Sanchez	Wicker
McHugh	Sandlin	Wolf
McInnis	Sanford	Young (AK)
McIntyre	Saxton	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Jefferson	Pomeroy	Talent
McIntosh	Schiff	Yates

☐ 0230

Ms. WATERS, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. CUMMINGS 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. SHUSTER

Mr. SHUSTER. 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 No. 5 in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. SHUSTER:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999 through 2002 are hereby set forth.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 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 1998: $1,198,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,241,859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,285,559,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,343,591,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,407,564,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: −$7,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: −$11,083,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: −$21,969,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: −$22,821,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: −$19,871,000,000.

(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 1998: $1,386,875,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,439,798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,486,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,520,242,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,551,563,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $1,371,848,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,424,002,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,468,748,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,500,854,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,516,024,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $172,869,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $182,143,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $183,189,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $157,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $108,460,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $5,593,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $5,836,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $6,082,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $6,301,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,473,200,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $33,829,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $33,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $34,775,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $36,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $37,099,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: $315,472,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $324,749,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $328,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $332,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $335,141,000,000.

SEC. 102. 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 1998 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $268,197,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,978,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $588,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $270,784,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,771,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $757,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $274,802,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,418,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $281,305,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $270,110,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $289,092,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $272,571,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $15,909,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,558,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,966,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $12,751,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $14,918,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,569,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,021,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $13,093,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $15,782,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,981,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,077,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $13,434,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,114,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,751,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,122,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $13,826,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,353,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,812,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,178,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $14,217,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $16,237,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,882,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $16,203,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,528,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $15,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,013,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $15,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,862,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $15,604,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,668,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $3,123,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,247,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,050,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $3,469,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,446,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,078,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $3,186,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,293,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,109,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $2,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,048,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,141,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $2,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,867,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,174,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $23,877,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,405,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $30,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $23,227,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,702,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $32,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $22,570,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,963,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $32,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $22,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,720,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $34,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $22,086,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,313,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $34,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $13,133,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,892,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $9,620,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,790,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,294,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,047,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,436,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,215,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,664,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,071,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,509,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,978,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,494,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,960,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,583,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $10,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,108,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,965,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,660,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $6,607,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$920,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,739,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $245,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $11,082,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,299,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,887,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $253,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $15,183,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,821,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,238,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $255,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,078,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,133,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,574,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $257,989,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,678,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,541,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,680,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $259,897,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $46,402,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,933,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $155,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $46,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,256,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $135,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $47,114,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,357,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $48,135,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,303,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $49,184,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,247,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $8,768,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,387,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,867,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $8,489,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,902,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,943,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,406,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $7,810,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,986,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,020,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $7,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,350,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,098,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,452,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $7,790,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,429,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,180,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,475,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $60,020,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,062,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $12,328,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $20,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $60,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,335,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,092,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $21,899,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $61,703,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,728,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,926,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $23,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $62,959,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,931,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $14,701,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $24,517,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $63,339,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,316,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,426,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $25,676,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $137,799,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $137,767,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $85,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $144,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $144,944,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $154,068,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $153,947,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $163,412,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $163,135,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $172,171,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $171,727,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $201,620,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $201,764,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $212,073,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $211,548,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $225,540,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $225,537,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $239,636,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $238,781,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $251,548,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $250,769,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $239,032,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $247,758,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $45,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $254,090,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $258,064,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $75,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $269,566,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,161,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $110,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $275,145,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $277,264,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $145,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $286,945,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $285,239,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $170,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $37,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $11,424,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,524,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,060,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,196,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,866,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,022,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,043,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,383,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,398,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $40,545,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,337,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,029,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $27,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $41,466,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,068,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $26,671,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $41,740,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,908,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,177,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $26,202,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $42,093,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,215,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,249,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $42,282,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,436,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,277,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,129,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $24,765,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,609,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $25,120,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,476,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $24,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,240,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $24,354,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,901,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $24,883,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,879,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $14,711,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,959,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $14,444,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,363,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $13,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,727,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,675,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,131,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $13,105,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $296,547,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $296,547,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $304,558,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $304,558,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $305,075,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $305,075,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $303,833,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $303,833,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $303,728,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $303,728,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(19) Allowances (920):
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 1998:
(A) New budget authority, -$41,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$41,841,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, -$36,949,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$36,949,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, -$36,937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$36,937,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, -$39,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$39,151,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, -$51,124,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$51,124,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to provide for two separate reconciliation bills: the first for entitlement reforms and the second for tax relief. In the event Senate procedures preclude the consideration of two separate bills, this section would permit the consideration of one omnibus reconciliation bill.

(b) SUBMISSIONS.—

(1) ENTITLEMENT REFORMS.—Not later than June 12, 1997, the House committees named in subsection (c) 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.

(2) TAX RELIEF AND MISCELLANEOUS REFORMS.—Not later than June 13, 1997, the House committees named in subsection (d) 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.

(c) INSTRUCTIONS RELATING TO ENTITLEMENT REFORMS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture 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: $34,571,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $37,008,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $211,443,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(2) COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES.—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: −$8,435,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, −$5,091,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and −$50,306,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(3) 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: $393,533,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $506,791,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,617,528,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(4) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce 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: $17,222,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $17,673,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $103,109,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(5) 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: $68,975,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $81,896,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $443,061,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 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: $0 in fiscal year 1998, $621,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, and $1,829,000,000 in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(6) 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: $18,087,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $17,283,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $106,615,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(7) 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: $22,444,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $24,563,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $139,134,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(8) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $397,546,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $506,442,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,621,578,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 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: $1,176,253,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1998, $1,386,546,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2002, and $7,517,939,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(d) INSTRUCTIONS RELATING TO TAX RELIEF AND MISCELLANEOUS REFORMS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture 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: $34,571,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $37,008,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $211,443,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(2) COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES.—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: −$8,435,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, −$5,091,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and −$50,306,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(3) 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: $393,533,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $506,791,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,617,528,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(4) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce 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: $17,222,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $17,673,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $103,109,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(5) 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: $68,975,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $81,896,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $443,061,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 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: $0 in fiscal year 1998 $621,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $1,829,000,000 in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(6) 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: $18,087,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $17,283,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $106,615,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(7) 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: $22,444,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $24,563,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $139,134,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(8) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $397,546,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $506,442,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,621,578,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 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: $1,168,853,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1998, $1,366,046,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2002, and $7,432,939,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

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

(f) CHILDREN'S HEALTH INITIATIVE.—If the Committees on Commerce and Ways and

Means report recommendations pursuant to their reconciliation instructions that, combined, provide an initiative for children's health that would increase the deficit by more than $2.3 billion for fiscal year 1998, by more than $3.9 billion for fiscal year 2002, and by more than $16 billion for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002, the committees shall be deemed to not have complied with their reconciliation instructions pursuant to section 310(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to adjust the appropriate budgetary levels to accommodate legislation increasing spending from the highway trust fund on surface transportation and highway safety above the levels assumed in this resolution if such legislation is deficit neutral.

(b) DEFICIT NEUTRALITY REQUIREMENT.—(1) In order to receive the adjustments specified in subsection (c), a bill reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure that provides new budget authority above the levels assumed in this resolution for programs authorized out of the highway trust fund must be deficit neutral.

(2) A deficit-neutral bill must meet the following conditions:

(A) The amount of new budget authority provided for programs authorized out of the highway trust fund must be in excess of $25.949 billion in new budget authority for fiscal year 1998, $25.464 billion in new budget authority for fiscal year 2002, and $127.973 billion in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The outlays estimated to flow from the excess new budget authority set forth in subparagraph (A) must be offset for fiscal year 1998, fiscal year 2002, and for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002. For the sole purpose of estimating the amount of outlays flowing from excess new budget authority under this section, it shall be assumed that such excess new budget authority would have an obligation limitation sufficient to accommodate that new budget authority.

(C) The outlays estimated to flow from the excess new budget authority must be offset by (i) other direct spending or revenue provisions within that transportation bill, (ii) the net reduction in other direct spending and revenue legislation that is enacted during this Congress after the date of adoption of this resolution and before such transportation bill is reported (in excess of the levels assumed in this resolution), or (iii) a combination of the offsets specified in clauses (i) and (ii).

(D) As used in 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.

(c) REVISED LEVELS.—(1) When the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reports a bill (or when a conference report thereon is filed) meeting the conditions set forth in subsection (b)(2), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall increase the allocation of new budget authority to that committee by the amount of new budget authority provided in that bill (and that is above the levels set forth in subsection (b)(2)(A)) for programs authorized out of the highway trust fund.

(2) After the enactment of the transportation bill described in paragraph (1) and upon the reporting of a general, supplemental or continuing resolution making appropriations by the Committee on Appropriations (or upon the filing of a conference report thereon) establishing an obligation limitation above the levels specified in subsection (b)(2)(A) (at a level sufficient to obligate some or all of the budget authority specified in paragraph (1)), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall increase the allocation and aggregate levels of outlays to that committee for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 by the appropriate amount.

(d) REVISIONS.—Allocations and aggregates revised pursuant to this section shall be considered for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(e) REVERSALS.—If any legislation referred to in this section is not enacted into law, then the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall, as soon as practicable, reverse adjustments made under this section for such legislation and have such adjustments published in the Congressional Record.

(f) DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY LEVELS.—For the purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the House Committee on the Budget.

(g) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term ''highway trust fund'' refers to the following budget accounts (or any successor accounts):

(1) 69–8083–0–7–401 (Federal-Aid Highways).

(2) 69–8191–0–7–401 (Mass Transit Capital Fund).

(3) 69–8350–0–7–401 (Mass Transit Formula Grants).

(4) 69-8016-0-7-401 (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration-Operations and Research).

(5) 69-8020-0-7-401 (Highway Traffic Safety Grants).

(6) 69-8048-0-7-401 (National Motor Carrier Safety Program).

SEC. 302. SALE OF GOVERNMENT ASSETS.

(a) BUDGETARY TREATMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose of any concurrent resolution on the budget and the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, no amounts realized from the sale of an asset shall be scored with respect to the level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues if such sale would cause an increase in the deficit as calculated pursuant to paragraph (2).

(2) CALCULATION OF NET PRESENT VALUE.—The deficit estimate of an asset sale shall be the net present value of the cash flow from—

(A) proceeds from the asset sale;

(B) future receipts that would be expected from continued ownership of the asset by the Government; and

(C) expected future spending by the Government at a level necessary to continue to operate and maintain the asset to generate the receipts estimated pursuant to subparagraph (B).

(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 the 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.

(d) DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY LEVELS.—For the purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the House Committee on the Budget.

SEC. 303. ENVIRONMENTAL RESERVE FUND.

(a) COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS.—In the House, after the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure report a bill (or a conference report thereon is filed) to reform the Superfund program to facilitate the cleanup of hazardous waste sites, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall submit revised allocations and budget aggregates to carry out this section by an amount not to exceed the excess subject to the limitation. These revisions shall be considered for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as the allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The adjustments made under this section shall not exceed—

(1) $200 million in budget authority for fiscal year 1998 and the estimated outlays flowing therefrom.

(2) $200 million in budget authority for fiscal year 2002 and the estimated outlays flowing therefrom.

(3) $1 billion in budget authority for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002 and the estimated outlays flowing therefrom.

(c) READJUSTMENTS.—In the House, any adjustments made under this section for any appropriation measure may be readjusted if that measure is not enacted into law.

SEC. 304. SEPARATE ALLOCATION FOR LAND ACQUISITIONS AND EXCHANGES.

(a) ALLOCATION BY CHAIRMAN.—In the House, upon the reporting of a bill by the Committee on Appropriations (or upon the filing of a conference report thereon) providing $700 million in budget authority for fiscal year 1998 for Federal land acquisitions and to finalize priority Federal land exchanges, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall allocate that amount of budget authority and the corresponding amount of outlays.

(b) TREATMENT OF ALLOCATIONS IN THE HOUSE.—In the House, for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, allocations made under subsection (a) shall be deemed to be made pursuant to section 602(a)(1) of that Act and shall be deemed to be a separate suballocation for purposes of the application of section 302(f) of that Act as modified by section 602(c) of that Act.

TITLE IV—SENSE OF CONGRESS PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON BASELINES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The 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 portrayed 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 and executive accountability for Federal spending.

SEC. 402. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON REPAYMENT OF THE FEDERAL DEBT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

(1) The Congress and the President have a basic moral and ethical responsibility to future generations to repay the Federal debt, including the money borrowed from the Social Security Trust Fund.

(2) The Congress and the President should enact a law which creates a regimen for paying off the Federal debt within 30 years.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PRESIDENT'S SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that:

(1) The President's annual budget submission to Congress should include a plan for repayment of Federal debt beyond the year

2002, including the money borrowed from the Social Security Trust Fund.

(2) The plan should specifically explain how the President would cap spending growth at a level one percentage point lower than projected growth in revenues.

(3) If spending growth were held to a level one percentage point lower than projected growth in revenues, then the Federal debt could be repaid within 30 years.

SEC. 403. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON COMMISSION ON LONG-TERM BUDGETARY PROBLEMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) achieving a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002 is only the first step necessary to restore our Nation's economic prosperity;

(2) the imminent retirement of the baby-boom generation will greatly increase the demand for government services;

(3) this burden will be borne by a relatively smaller work force resulting in an unprecedented intergenerational transfer of financial resources;

(4) the rising demand for retirement and medical benefits will quickly jeopardize the solvency of the medicare, social security, and Federal retirement trust funds; and

(5) the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that marginal tax rates would have to increase by 50 percent over the next 5 years to cover the long-term projected costs of retirement and health benefits.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be enacted to create a commission to assess long-term budgetary problems, their implications for both the baby-boom generation and tomorrow's workforce, and make such recommendations as it deems appropriate to ensure our Nation's future prosperity.

SEC. 404. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CORPORATE WELFARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that the functional levels and aggregates in this budget resolution assume that—

(1) the Federal Government supports profit-making enterprises and industries through billions of dollars in payments, benefits, and programs;

(2) many of these subsidies do not serve a clear and compelling public interest;

(3) corporate subsidies frequently provide unfair competitive advantages to certain industries and industry segments; and

(4) at a time when millions of Americans are being asked to sacrifice in order to balance the budget, the corporate sector should bear its share of the burden.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be enacted to—

(1) eliminate the most egregious corporate subsidies; and

(2) create a commission to recommend the elimination of Federal payments, benefits, and programs which predominantly benefit a particular industry or segment of an industry, rather than provide a clear and compelling public benefit, and include a fast-track process for the consideration of those recommendations.

SEC. 405. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON FAMILY VIOLENCE OPTION CLARIFYING AMENDMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

(1) Domestic violence is the leading cause of physical injury to women. The Department of Justice estimates that over 1,000,000 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, Illinois, document, for the first time, the interrelationship between domestic violence and welfare by showing that from 34 percent to 65 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.

(6) The restructuring of 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.

(7) In recognition of this finding, the House Committee on the Budget unanimously passed a sense of Congress amendment on domestic violence and Federal assistance to the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution. Subsequently, Congress passed the family violence option amendment to last year's welfare reform reconciliation bill.

(8) The family violence option gives States the flexibility to grant temporary waivers from time limits and work requirements for domestic violence victims who would suffer extreme hardship from the application of these provisions. These waivers were not intended to be included as part of the permanent 20 percent hardship exemption.

(9) The Department of Health and Human Services has been slow to issue regulations regarding this provision. As a result, States are hesitant to fully implement the family violence option fearing it will interfere with the 20 percent hardship exemption.

(10) Currently 15 States have opted to include the family violence option in their welfare plans, and 13 other States have included some type of domestic violence provisions in their plans.

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

(1) States should not be subject to any numerical limits in granting domestic violence good cause waivers to individuals receiving assistance for all requirements where compliance with such requirements would make it more difficult for individuals receiving assistance to escape domestic violence; and

(2) any individuals granted a domestic violence good cause waiver by States should not be included in the States' 20 percent hardship exemption.

TITLE V—TRANSPORTATION REVENUES USED SOLELY FOR TRANSPORTATION

SEC. 501. READJUSTMENTS.

(a) INCREASE IN FUNCTION 400.—Levels of new budget authority and outlays set forth in function 400 in section 102 shall be increased as follows:

(1) for fiscal year 1998, by $0 in outlays and by $0 in new budget authority;

(2) for fiscal year 1999, by $770,000,000 in outlays and by $3,600,000,000 in new budget authority;

(3) for fiscal year 2000, by $2,575,000,000 in outlays and by $4,796,000,000 in new budget authority;

(4) for fiscal year 2001, by $3,765,000,000 in outlays and by $5,363,000,000 in new budget authority; and

(5) for fiscal year 2002, by $4,488,000,000 in outlays and by $5,619,000,000 in new budget authority.

(b) OFFSETS.—(1)(A) The total budget outlays for each fiscal year set forth in each functional category in section 102 shall be reduced by an amount determined through a pro rata reduction of discretionary outlays within each function necessary to achieve the following outlay reductions:

(i) for fiscal year 1998, by $0 in outlays;

(ii) for fiscal year 1999, by $746,000,000 in outlays;

(iii) for fiscal year 2000, by $2,422,000,000 in outlays;

(iv) for fiscal year 2001, by $3,532,000,000 in outlays; and

(v) for fiscal year 2002, by $4,242,000,000 in outlays;

and corresponding reductions in new budget authority shall be made in each function consistent with such pro rata reductions in outlays. Reductions in new budget authority shall be made to section 101(2) consistent with this subparagraph and subsection (a).

(B) These reductions shall not be made to the mandatory outlay portion of any function, including (but not limited to) Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security. For purposes of the application of this paragraph to function 400, the pro rata share shall be determined by using the amounts provided for function 400 prior to any adjustment made by subparagraph (A).

(2) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed as set forth in section 101(1)(B) are reduced as follows:

(A) for fiscal year 1998, by $0;

(B) for fiscal year 1999, by $24,000,000;

(C) for fiscal year 2000, by $153,000,000;

(D) for fiscal year 2001, by $233,000,000; and

(E) for fiscal year 2002, by $246,000,000.

(3) The amounts by which to appropriate levels of total budget outlays in section 101(3) are increased as follows:

(A) for fiscal year 1998, by $0;

(B) for fiscal year 1999, by $24,000,000;

(C) for fiscal year 2000, by $153,000,000;

(D) for fiscal year 2001, by $233,000,000;

(D) for fiscal year 2002, by $246,000,000.

(4) The reconciliation directives to the Committee on Ways and Means in sections 201(c)(8)(B) and 201(d)(8)(B) shall be adjusted accordingly.

SEC. 502. HIGHWAY TRUST FUND ALLOCATIONS.

(a) ALLOCATED AMOUNTS.—Of the amounts of outlays allocated to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate by the joint explanatory statement accompanying this resolution pursuant to sections 302 and 602 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the following amounts shall be used for contract authority spending out of the Highway Trust Fund—

(1) for fiscal year 1998, $22,256,000,000 in outlays;

(2) for fiscal year 1999, $24,063,000,000 in outlays;

(3) for fiscal year 2000, $26,092,000,000 in outlays;

(4) for fiscal year 2001, $27,400,000,000 in outlays; and

(5) for fiscal year 2002, $28,344,000,000 in outlays.

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—Determinations regarding points of order made under section 302(f) or 602(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall take into account subsection (a).

(c) STATUTORY IMPLEMENTATION.—As part of reauthorization of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, provisions shall be included to enact this section into permanent law.

SEC. 503. PRIORITY FOR RESTORATION OF CUTS.

Any outlays that would have been allocated for surface transportation pursuant to section 301 shall first be used to restore any cuts to discretionary spending made as a result of section 501. The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall implement section 301 consistent with this section.

SEC. 504. MATHEMATICAL CONSISTENCY.

The Chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may make technical changes consistent with this title to ensure mathematical consistency.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] and a Member opposed, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], will each control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER].

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI], the chairman of our Subcommittee on Surface Transportation.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] on behalf of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

I think as we get into this discussion, we need to take a step back, take off the green eyeshades and look at what we are trying to achieve. Instead of counting beans, we should view transportation spending as an investment in our future. I believe that this budget assumes continued positive economic performance. Well, if we are to achieve that, we need to be sure that we can have an efficient transportation network that can support that growth. In these days of lower costs due to our strict, sophisticated inventory controls, business must be able to rely on our transportation system.

Mr. Chairman, in order to move beyond the status quo and to start to meet our urgent transportation needs in the upcoming ISTEA reauthorization, we need the funding provided for in this amendment. Join the many States, cities and other public and private groups who support the goals of this amendment and vote yes for a better future for all Americans.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], the distinguished ranking minority Member of our committee, and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

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

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI].

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

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Shuster-Oberstar substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Shuster-Oberstar Substitute. As a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, well versed in the enormous needs of our country's infrastructure, I cannot in good conscience support a budget agreement that so grossly and dishonestly under funds our highway and transit programs.

When Congress established the Highway Trust Fund in 1956, it was a deliberate policy decision to impose a user fee funding mechanism and a trust fund rather than continuing to support transportation infrastructure programs out of general revenues. The Highway Trust Fund ensured that the money was collected from those benefiting from the improvements by taxing gasoline, diesel and special fuels as well as heavy trucks and tires. By creating a trust fund, Congress was presumably guaranteeing a promise to those contributing to the fund that the money would be dedicated to transportation infrastructure improvements. This promise has blatantly been ignored for far too long. The monies that are actually spent on our country's infrastructure are consistently, and substantially, less than what is collected. As a result, an enormous surplus has been allowed to accumulate in the Trust Fund, much to the delight of our Nation's bookkeepers. Though unable to spend even one dollar of these hoarded funds, this surplus, currently an inconceivable $24 billion, allows them to mask deficit spending. This practice of locking up billion of dollars in treasury notes that should rightfully be stimulating our economy has been likened to a shell game and amounts to nothing more than fraud on the taxpayer. To call this money a dedicated tax and then disregard its intended use is fraudulent. If we allow this practice to continue, we enable the perpetuation of this fraud at the expense of our Nation's infrastructure. I can tell you as a fourteen year veteran of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee that our nation's infrastructure can no longer afford to pay the price for dishonest bookkeeping.

The Department of Transportation estimates that simply maintaining current conditions on our highway, bridge, and transit systems will require annual investments of $57 billion, an increase of 41%. These conditions are indisputable unacceptable and unsafe. In my home state of Pennsylvania, for example, more than 70% of our roads were rated fair to poor. Over 40% of our bridges were deemed deficient. These statistics are not inconsequential. Inadequate roads and bridges are a factor in traffic accidents that result annually in over 12,000 highway deaths nationwide. Transit needs are at least as critical. One-third of rail maintenance yards, stations, and bridges and almost one-half of transit buildings are still in poor or fair condition. Rolling stock needs immediate replacement as the average fleet age for all classes of bus and paratransit vehicles has exceeded the useful life of the vehicles. Additionally, 51% of rural buses are overage and more than 9,000 urban buses need immediate replacement. According to the DOT, to improve the condition's of our nation's infrastructure to optimal levels would require annual investments of $80 billion. Clearly, our country has enormous needs. The Shuster-Oberstar Substitute recognizes that we cannot afford to look the other way while revenues committed to address these needs sit fallow.

The Budget Agreement provides for inadequate an dishonest transportation funding levels. Despite arguments to the contrary, CBO supplied the Budget Committee with data on May 15, demonstrating that the Agreement shortchanges infrastructure spending by $12 billion. According to CBO, the Highway Trust Fund will amass $137 billion over the five years under the Budget Agreement while total outlays only amount to $125 billion over the same time period. CBO's data clearly reveals that under the Budget Agreement gas taxes deposited into the Highway Trust Fund will NOT be spent for their intended purpose. Furthermore, under the proposed Agreement, the inaccessible Trust Fund balance will increase 55% to $37 billion by the year 2002 while our grossly under funded highway and transit programs suffer. The Shuster-Oberstar Substitute safeguards against this inappropriate practice.

The Shuster-Oberstar Substitute does not attempt to draw down on the $24 billion balance that has already been allowed to accumulate in the Highway Trust Fund, nor does it spend the existing 4.3 cents-per-gallon gas tax that was created for deficit reduction. Rather, the substitute seeks solely to restore the promise inherent in the establishment of the Trust Fund by preventing further growth in the idle balances. Highway Trust Fund spending is increased to $137 billion so that outlays equal revenues into the fund during the five-year period of the Budget Resolution. The Shuster-Oberstar Substitute would increase transit spending by $2.3 billion from the $18.9 billion proposed in the Budget Agreement to more than $21 billion. While such a proposal would provide an additional $12 billion above Budget Reconciliation assumptions, trust fund balances would remain stable. Under this Substitute, our intended system of collection and redistribution is preserved and safeguarded.

The Shuster-Oberstar Substitute provides offsets for the increased spending on a year by year basis with minor reductions in discretionary spending and the proposed tax cuts. Such offsets must accompany any proposal for increased spending within the context of a Balanced Budget Agreement. The minimal cuts, .0039 over five years, are distributed evenly across discretionary spending and tax cuts, a compromise by all that only further illustrates a bipartisan awareness of our infrastructure's critical needs. While offsets are not popular, they are an unpleasant reality and the only responsible solution. Surely it would have been preferable if those involved in formulating the Budget Agreement had fulfilled their duties and proposed legitimate offsets themselves, rather than continuing the dishonest practice of using Transportation Trust Fund revenues to mask deficit spending elsewhere. The Shuster-Oberstar Substitute accepts such responsibility, while representing the will of the House with respect to taking Transportation Trust Funds off budget, and using the available revenues for their intended use. In the 104th Congress, 284 Members voted for such a measure. An identical bill in the 105th Congress currently has 239 cosponsors.

When considering the offsets provided in the Shuster-Oberstar Substitute, it is important to recognize the enormous benefits of infrastructure investment. Studies have indicated that every $1 billion expenditure in infrastructure supports 42,000 full time jobs in highway construction and supply industries. Investment in our infrastructure does not only serve to create new jobs, it improves the productivity of those that already exist. The Department of Transportation has found that since the 1950's, industry realized production cost savings of 24 cents for each dollar of investment in highways, the costs of which are recouped through these savings after only four years. Current conditions cost our Nation dearly in lost productivity as Americans waste 1.6 million hours everyday sitting in traffic. More than 70 percent of peak-hour travel on urban interstates occurs under congested or severely congested conditions, generating costs from wasted fuel and lost productivity to the economy of $45 billion each year in our Nation's 50 largest cities alone. Perhaps most compelling is the fact that, as a result of lack of investment in infrastructure, our Nation's productivity growth rate from 1979–1990 was only 35 percent of the average of other industrialized countries. Though transportation represents a full 17 percent of America's economy, the United States continues to rank 55th in the world in infrastructure investment while Japan, Germany and Taiwan, recognizing the relationship between investment and economic vitality, continue to spend trillions of dollars to improve their infrastructure.

The only way to address our Nation's enormous infrastructure needs is to support the Shuster-Oberstar Substitute to the Budget Agreement. As a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, I know that without the ability to spend every dime that is rightfully dedicated to our infrastructure, we are left with innumerable problems and few solutions. Without full access to these excise taxes, we cannot even begin to address the Donor/Donee conflict. We will be unable to support major reconstruction of the Interstate System nor can we afford any substantial upgrading of major international trade corridors and border infrastructure. New and improved transit systems, to meet mobility and clean air needs in congested urban areas, will be forfeited. The consequences of curtailed transit service are severe, especially in our urban areas. As fares increase and construction stops, highway congestion only worsens. Without additional money, we are powerless to reverse these conditions. And, perhaps most significantly we will be left without the resources needed to adequately attend to our unsafe roads and bridges, which will claim thousands of more lives next year.

I urge my colleagues to support the Shuster-Oberstar Substitute. It is vital for our economy, imperative for our safety, and essential to restoring truth and honesty to the user fees we impose upon our citizens, and to the Highway Trust Fund we created to ensure their purpose.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER].

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Shuster substitute.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the people of California's 50th Congressional District, I rise today in strong support of the Shuster-Oberstar-Petri-Rahall Amendment.

This Amendment is important to the American economy and is critical to the economic development of my own congressional district.

My constituents sent me to Congress to represent them and their interests and to be fair and honest in doing so. Although their many priorities are as varied and diverse as the communities I represent, their concerns can best be summarized in three words: jobs, jobs, jobs.

Jobs so they can support themselves and their families.

Jobs so they can raise and educate their children.

Jobs so they can contribute to our community.

Jobs so they can enjoy their recreation.

Jobs so they can provide for their retirement.

This Amendment address their concerns in a fair and honest manner and creates these much needed jobs.

Contrary to all the hype and hysteria, this amendment is not a budget-buster—in fact it honors the commitment to a balanced budget.

And while I typically would oppose the across the board cuts this amendment proposes, I believe the increased investment in our infrastructure would more than offset the impact of these modest cuts.

America's investment in its transportation infrastructure has created the strongest economy in the history of the world. It invigorates the economy, creates new jobs and raises revenues. Investment in transportation today creates jobs today—and tomorrow.

The Shuster-Oberstar Amendment provides us with the perfect opportunity to again demonstrate this investment policy on a national scale. We cannot let this opportunity pass.

Mr. Chairman, I will vote for my constituents' interests tonight and vote for the Shuster-Oberstar-Petri-Rahall Jobs Amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Remember, it's about jobs, jobs, jobs.

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

''A deal is a deal'' intoned our colleague from North Dakota a few hours ago. ''Do not break the deal,'' says a panicked White House. ''Stick to the deal,'' says the Committee on the Budget leadership on both sides. Whose deal, I ask my colleagues? Who was a part of this deal? Not me, and not very many in this Chamber. We did not have much to say about the deal, so why are we being asked to stick with it?

There is only one deal that counts, and that is the deal that Congress made with the traveling public when we passed the gas tax in 1956 and set up the highway trust fund. That is the deal that counts, the deal we made with the traveling public of America, and the public has been paying that tax, that user fee, and getting less and less back every year, $24 billion less. That is the surplus built up in the highway trust fund being unspent, and that surplus, that less, will build up to $37 billion under the deal if we stick with it; $37 billion more in taxes we are taking out of people and not investing in what they agreed to be taxed for.

Taxes paid, benefits not received. Seventy-six thousand bridges that need to be repaired in America, 3 million miles of rural road that have been neglected over the past 10 years. Fifteen percent of the interstate that needs to be rebuilt, 9,000 transit buses that need to be replaced in America. Seventy-three percent of the transit facilities in this country that need to be rebuilt, and for the sake of the deal we would turn our backs? We would condemn America to 5 more years of neglect, to 5 more years of underinvestment, a country that now ranks 55th in the world in infrastructure investment at the very time when Japan is investing $3 trillion in their infrastructure, when Germany is investing $2 trillion in their infrastructure, when Taiwan is investing $100 billion in their infrastructure, and we are going to say, do less for the sake of the deal.

How short-sighted. We should invest the $24 billion surplus in our roads and bridges and transit systems and enhancements. We should put the 4.3 cent gas tax that we voted in this Chamber in 1993 that is going for deficit reduction and put it into the highway trust fund, but we are not asking you to do that. We are asking you to take one-third of 1 percent across the board and invest that little bit more, that $12 billion more, take that little bit of a cut out of the deal that you were not a part of and invest it in something that makes a difference in America. Invest it in the $1 trillion sector of our national economy that is represented by transportation. That makes a difference between America being a strong and vibrant economy and falling further behind.

They say, stick with the deal. I say, no taxation without investment. No taxation without investment in our roads, our bridges, our transit systems and what is good for America. This Shuster-Oberstar amendment balances the budget by the year 2002, does not change annual deficit targets, no entitlement cuts, does not specify cuts. In fact, here is what the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations says. He supports the agreement, but he will not be bound by levels specified for various discretionary programs.

So where is the deal? Our deal is with our constituents. Our deal is with America's future. Either we want to be a part of this process, either we want to be relevant in America, or spend the next 5 years with an oil can filling potholes in the roads that we refuse to rebuild, in the bridge decking that needs to be torn down and rebuilt.

The budget process is where we decide priorities for America's future. That is the right place. This is where we decide what our values are and to a large degree, put a price tag on them. We have done that all evening. We have done it every year in this budget process, and tonight, tonight with your voting card, you are going to make a choice, you are going to make a choice about the future of America. About whether we move ahead, whether that bridge to the 21st century the President talks about has some concrete and asphalt on it, whether it has some bike lanes in it, whether it has some transit buses on it, or where it is just a chimerical bridge that exists out there in nowhere. Vote for the Shuster-Oberstar amendment, vote to invest in America's future, vote to put America back on wheels again.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], the Democratic leader on the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I ask the House to bear with me, as my voice has just about worn out.

Let me first of all say, what is in this agreement? We did not ignore the Nation's transportation infrastructure in these negotiations. I would like to spend more, too. But in this agreement we have provided $8.5 billion in outlays for transportation over and above what the President's request was for fiscal year 1998, $8.15 billion over 5 years. That means that in fiscal year 1998, fiscal year 1998, obligations for highways will go up to $22.2 billion, as opposed to $20.9 billion in this year's budget. That is a 6 percent increase, not a whopping increase, but compare it to the one-half of 1 percent average increase in discretionary spending over the next 5 years and it is a handsome, favorable treatment for transportation.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] makes a powerful argument. He said, we only want to make a four-tenths of 1 percent cut across the board, but that four-tenths of 1 percent wreaks havoc with some major programs.

Let us start with defense. We barely, barely increase defense, $6 billion over the next 5 years. Pass this resolution and you will take $5.6 billion in outlays out of defense. We will have a freeze in defense spending for the next 5 years. How about that investment?

Then look down the list of other things that will be cut across the board. Education, one of the things that we want to favor, one of the initiatives that we want in this package, $980 million, section 8 housing, LIHEAP, WIC, $860 million, criminal justice, $510 million, veterans benefit, $390 million, and let me make a prediction.

If this passes and we go to conference, I would predict, given the composition of the conference committee, defense will probably be largely restored in the compromise. What will come back to us on our side of the aisle is a package bereft of these things that we fought so hard for for the last three months. Do not make that mistake on this side of the aisle. We have a good deal, let us stick with the deal, let us put it to bed and go to bed ourselves and get on with it.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, when all is said and done, I view this as a keep-the-faith with the American people amendment. The authors are asking of us to approve exactly what we said we would do, we would charge taxes and fees and we would use that money to build, repair, and maintain our Nation's infrastructure. Nothing more, nothing less. No one is suggesting a raid on any other funds earmarked for any other purpose. Rather, what the advocates of this amendment are saying is that we should level with the American people.

☐ 0245

If we ask them for money for a specific purpose, we should use that money for that specific purpose.

Let me hasten to add that approving this measure will not, it will not take all the hard work and negotiations that have led us to this historic moment and toss it out the window forcing us to start anew. Does anyone really believe that an approximate one-third of 1 percent adjustment in other spending and tax reduction programs, nothing the first year, one-tenth of 1 percent the second year and one-third overall is going to upset the apple cart? That strains credulity. Let us keep the faith with the American people. Let us support Shuster-Oberstar.

When all is said and done, I view this as a "keep the faith" with the American people amendment.

The authors are asking of us approval to do for the people exactly what we said we would do when the Congress imposed gasoline taxes and other user fees on the traveling public—take the money provided therefrom and use it to build, repair and maintain our Nation's transportation infrastructure. Nothing more, nothing less.

No one is suggesting a raid on any other funds earmarked for any other purpose. Rather, what the advocates of this amendment are saying is that we should level with the American public. If we ask them for money for a specific purpose we should use the money for that purpose. And if we don't, we should repeal these taxes and fees. Let me hasten to add that approving this measure will not—let me emphasize—will not take all the hard work and negotiations that have led us to this historic moment and toss it out the window, forcing us to start anew. Does anyone really believe that an approximate one-third of 1 percent adjustment in other spending and tax reduction programs—nothing the first year, one-tenth of 1 percent the second year and one third of a percent overall—will upset the apple cart. That strains credulity.

Let's keep this faith with the American people and support Shuster.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, this is the most important transportation infrastructure vote we will cast not only in this Congress but in the next 6 years. Why? Because this will set the level of funding for ISTEA as we reauthorize that very important piece of transportation legislation.

Make no mistake about it, if we do not have this very modest $12 billion increase, $12 billion in a $2.9-trillion budget, one-third of 1 percent, if we do not have it, we are not going to have even the beginnings of adequate funds to do the things that are so necessary such as rebuilding our interstate, rebuilding our deficient bridges, our transit systems, the projects that are so important, and changing the formulas.

If we do not increase the size of this pot, we will not be able to change the formulas so that the donor States get a fair share of their proportion. And, yes, we will not be able to address the issues of the trade corridors which have become so vital to our Nation.

We have heard about all these so-called cuts that we make. I recall when we had the Medicare debate last year, I know my Republican colleagues were incensed that our increases were called cuts. Indeed, that is what we have here now because under the Shuster-Oberstar amendment, national defense will still go up 18.9 billion, education up 17.7 billion, criminal justice 8.7 billion, veterans up 500 million. There will still be increases, but the rate of increase will not be as great. And most importantly, perhaps, there will be absolutely no reductions in the first year, next year in 1998, no reductions whatsoever.

Indeed, this modest amendment can be described as purer than Ivory Snow because Ivory Snow is only 99.44 percent pure. This amendment is 99.61 Kasich-Clinton pure. That is the only change we make. And if we cannot make that kind of modest change, we are potted plants. We are not exercising our duties to exercise our own judgment in this Congress.

So if Members care about saving lives on our highways, if they care about building infrastructure to increase productivity for America, then I urge Members to vote in favor of this amendment. Because if we do not, we simply are not going to have the funds so necessary to rebuild America as we move into the 21st century.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, I have made a number of speeches on the House floor. This is probably the most challenging. It is the most challenging because I really have got to get through to both sides of the aisle. It is not good enough for me to just get the Republicans without touching the hearts and the souls of the Democrats. See, this is not about a highway bill. This is not about highway funds.

I mean, yes, right, the amendment is about highway funds, but it could have been about education. It could have been about defense. It could have been about children. It could have been about a million different issues. This is not about roads. This is about a team.

And it is not about a deal. I am sorry, but it is not about a deal. It is really about an agreement. It is about a bunch of people who got sent by their troops to go and try to bring something back that could put us together for once in this House. We did it one other time, not long ago. It was the war, when we put aside the partisan differences and our leaders worked in agreement and we stood and we fought for it together. And many people have described that as one of the House's finest moments in modern history. I happen to agree with that.

And we sent our people in, and we spent 4 months fighting like dogs and cats. It was not about deals. It was about a lot of principles that mattered to all of us.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] went to those meetings and he stood up for his colleagues. And I went to these meetings, and I stood up for my colleagues. And I remember at one point in time, when I thought it was going to collapse, I looked at Gene Sperling and I said, Gene, you have to reach toward me, and I am reaching toward you, because we cannot walk away from this. We cannot let this fail. Our generation owes this to the country that we will stay here and we will fight and we will work it out. And we will reach an agreement, and it will be based on one thing: that it will not violate your principles and it will not violate our principles.

Mr. Chairman, what I think this is really all about is what the country wants. They elected a Democratic President by a wide margin. They elected a House and a Senate made up of the other party, and they said, put the country first, put the politics second. Pitch in and move America forward.

And that is what we did over the course of these last 4 months. And now what we cannot afford to do is, in the spirit of giving your word, and many of you have done it, you teach your children about it every day, and do you know what it is, you be part of a team. Yes, sometimes you stand up and fight, but at the end of the day, you are part of a team. That is what America teaches its children, be part of a team.

That is what this is all about tonight. Americans are asking us to reach towards one another. Americans are asking us to reach an agreement that will help families today and take a giant step towards solving the problems that our children face tomorrow.

I told you that I kind of have to touch your hearts. Look, I respect anybody that comes to this floor. That is why I have so many friends on the other side of the aisle. I have high regard for them. I would not question their commitment to this project or that road or this priority. But I think that our leadership has brought us something that represents an agreement that the country wants, the country supports, and something we can be proud of marching together, reaching across that aisle and holding onto one another and looking at our districts and saying, yes, I am here to represent the district, but the country, the country wants us tonight to look beyond our district, to look to a degree beyond our own priorities and be part of America's team. That is what this is about tonight.

I ask my colleagues, even though this is very difficult for them, let us not confuse the message. Let us not confuse the public. Let us not have them wake up tomorrow morning and say, can they just never get it right.

Let us send them a clear signal that we were able to advance the cause of our country. I ask my colleagues, before they put their card in that box, please think about the way that you want to feel about yourself and the way you want your children to feel about you after this vote is over. I think if you do, I think if you do, as difficult as it may be, based on your priorities, you can reach with all of us. We can build a better America.

Please reject the amendment. Support the agreement.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Shuster-Oberstar balanced budget substitute.

The American people want, deserve, and need a strong national system of transportation.

Almost everyone supports the interstate highway system. The only way to adequately maintain and improve our interstate highways and meet the needs of a growing population is to pass the Shuster substitute.

There are no State lines in the air. The people want and deserve and need a strong and safe aviation system. Air passenger traffic is exploding now and is going way up over the next 10 years.

The only way to improve our aviation system and make it as safe as it can and should be is to pass the Shuster-Oberstar substitute.

We should not continue the deceptive practice begun by President Johnson: using the trust funds not for their intended purposes, but to offset the deficit and thus spend highway and aviation funds for foreign aid and everything else.

I urge support for the Shuster balanced budget substitute.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 214, noes 216, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 147]

AYES—214

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Barcia
Bass
Becerra
Bereuter
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Buyer
Camp
Capps
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dickey
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green
Greenwood
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hutchinson
Jackson (IL)
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDade
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Nadler
Neal
Northup
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Riggs
Rivers
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Schaefer, Dan
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shuster
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Linda
Stabenow
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson
Thune
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOES—216

Aderholt
Allen
Archer
Armey
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentsen
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boyd
Brady
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coburn
Collins
Condit
Conyers
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehrlich
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fazio
Foglietta
Foley
Fowler
Frelinghuysen
Ganske
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kennedy (RI)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Largent
Latham
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
Lucas
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Miller (FL)

Minge
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pickering
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riley
Rodriguez
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thurman
Tiahrt
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—5

Boucher
Ensign
Jefferson
Schiff
Yates

☐ 0311

Mr. TOWNS 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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 147, I intended to vote ''yes.''

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOEHNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution, (H. Con. Res. 84) establishing the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, pursuant to House Resolution 152, he reported the concurrent resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 333 nays 99, not voting 3 as follows:

[Roll No. 148]

YEAS—333

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boswell
Boyd
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Christensen
Clayton
Clement
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cramer
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilleary
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Inglis
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Sabo
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torres
Turner
Upton
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—99

Barton
Becerra
Blumenauer
Borski
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Chenoweth
Clay
Clyburn
Coburn
Conyers
Cox
Coyne
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
Dellums
Dixon
Engel
Evans
Filner
Frank (MA)
Ganske
Gephardt
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hunter
Hyde
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Klug
Kucinich
Largent
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Markey
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntosh
McNulty
Meek
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Nadler
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pombo
Rahall
Rangel
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Scarborough
Scott
Serrano
Shadegg
Shuster
Slaughter
Stark
Stokes
Thompson
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Velazquez
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weygand

NOT VOTING—3

Jefferson
Schiff
Yates

☐ 0328

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Schiff for, with Mr. Yates against.

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

PROHIBITING NEW INVESTMENT IN BURMA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. 105–85)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States;

Pursuant to section 570(b) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1997 (Public Law 104–208) (the ''Act''), I hereby report to the Congress that I have determined and certified that the Government of Burma has, after September 30, 1996, committed large-scale repression of the democratic opposition in Burma. Further, pursuant to section 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)) (IEEPA) and section 301 of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1631), I hereby report that I have exercised my statutory authority to declare a national emergency to respond to the actions and policies of the Government of Burma and have issued an Executive order prohibiting United States persons from new investment in Burma.

The order prohibits United States persons from engaging in any of the following activities after its issuance:

—entering a contract that includes the economic development of resources located in Burma;

—entering a contract providing for the general supervision and guarantee of another person's performance of a contract that includes the economic development of resources located in Burma;

—purchasing a share of ownership, including an equity interest, in the economic development of resources located in Burma;

—entering into a contract providing for the participation in royalties, earnings, or profits in the economic development of resources located in Burma, without regard to the form of the participation;

—facilitating transactions of foreign persons that would violate any of the foregoing prohibitions if engaged in by a United States person; and

—evading or avoiding, or attempting to violate, any of the prohibitions in the order.

Consistent with the terms of section 570(b) of the Act, the order does not prohibit the entry into, performance of, or financing of most contracts for the purchase or sale of goods, services, or technology. For purposes of the order, the term ''resources'' is broadly defined to include such things as natural, agricultural, commercial, financial, industrial, and human resources. However, not-for-profit educational, health, or other humanitarian programs or activities are not considered to constitute economic development of resources located in Burma. In accordance with section 570(b), the prohibition on an activity that constitutes a new investment applies if such activity is undertaken pursuant to an agreement, or pursuant to the exercise of rights under an agreement that is entered into with the Government of Burma or a non-governmental entity in Burma, on or after the effective date of the Executive order.

My Administration will continue to consult and express our concerns about developments in Burma with the Burmese authorities as well as leaders of ASEAN, Japan, the European Union, and other countries having major political, security, trading, and investment interests in Burma and seek multilateral consensus to bring about democratic reform and improve human rights in that country. I have, accordingly, delegated to the Secretary of State the responsibilities in this regard under section 570 (c) and (d) of the Act.

The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, is authorized to issue regulations in exercise of my authorities under IEEPA and section 570(b) of the Act to implement this prohibition on new investment. All Federal agencies are also directed to take actions within their authority to carry out the provisions of the Executive order.

I have taken these steps in response to a deepening pattern of severe repression by the State Law and Order Restoration Council (SLORC) in Burma. During the past 7 months, the SLORC has arrested and detained large numbers of students and opposition supporters, sentenced dozens to long-term imprisonment, and prevented the expression of political views by the democratic opposition, including Aung San Suu Kyi and the National League for Democracy (NLD). It is my judgment that recent actions by the regime in Rangoon constitute large-scale repression of the democratic opposition committed by the Government of Burma within the meaning of section 570(b) of the Act.

The Burmese authorities also have committed serious abuses in their recent military campaign against Burma's Karen minority, forcibly conscripting civilians and compelling thousands to flee into Thailand. Moreover, Burma remains the world's leading producer of opium and heroin, with official tolerance of drug trafficking and traffickers in defiance of the views of the international community.

I believe that the actions and policies of the SLORC regime constitute an extraordinary and unusual threat to the security and stability of the region, and therefore to the national security and foreign policy of the United States.

It is in the national security and foreign policy interests of the United States to seek an end to abuses of human rights in Burma and to support efforts to achieve democratic reform. Progress on these issues would promote regional peace and stability and would be in the political, security, and economic interests of the United States.

The steps I take today demonstrate my Administration's resolve to support the people of Burma, who made clear their commitment to human rights and democracy in 1990 elections, the results of which the regime chose to disregard.

I am also pleased to note that the Administration and the Congress speak with one voice on this issue, as reflected in executive-legislative cooperation in the enactment of section 570 of the Foreign Operations Act. I look forward to continued close consultation with the Congress on efforts to promote human rights and democracy in Burma.

In conclusion, I emphasize that Burma's international isolation is not an inevitability, and that the authorities in Rangoon retain the ability to secure improvements in relations with the United States as well as with the international community. In this respect, I once again call on the SLORC to lift restriction on Aung San Suu Kyi and the political opposition, to respect the rights of free expression, assembly, and association, and to undertake a dialogue that includes leaders of the NLD and the ethnic minorities and that deals with the political future of Burma.

In the weeks and months to come, my Administration will continue to monitor and assess action on these issues, paying careful attention to the report of the U.N. Special Rapporteur appointed by the U.N. Human Rights Commission and the report of the U.N. Secretary General on the results of his good offices mandate. Thus, I urge the regime in Rangoon to cooperate fully with those two important U.N. initiatives on Burma.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive order that I have issued. The order is effective at 12:01 a.m., eastern daylight time, May 21, 1997.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 20, 1997.*

THE WOODROW WILSON BRIDGE

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

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, later today this House will vote on the biggest transportation vote of the decade. The Shuster-Oberstar-Petri-Rahall amendment takes a small slice from the tax cuts, from defense, from discretionary domestic spending so the American people can get the road and the rail improvements they have already paid for but are not included in the balanced budget agreement.

This allocates an additional $13 billion for transportation over the next 5 years. This amendment will, as the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] said earlier, save lives. Up to 12,000 a year it will save, and at the same time it promotes jobs and it builds a strong economy.

For Northern Virginia, which I represent, where we are choked in traffic, this will give us the money to help in rebuilding the Woodrow Wilson Bridge before it falls into the Potomac River. It will give Virginia our fair share of transportation dollars. We got back less than 80 cents for every dollar we spent under the previous authorization. Without the additional dollars this amendment provides, fair allocations for donor States like Virginia become next to impossible.

Let us balance the budget, let us fix the broken transportation system, let us support the Shuster-Oberstar amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER, despite the nation's highest rate of carpooling and a national ranking of third in the number of commuters that use transit, the region has the second longest mean commuting time in the country. The dollar cost of congestion in the region is the highest in the country based on wasted time and fuel—and it is getting worse. I know this hardly comes as a shock to Members that live and travel around the region, but these figures dramatize the desperate need for major transportation improvements.

No single element of the regional transportation system is more critical than the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge which crosses the Potomac River on interstate 95. Anyone that drives in this region knows that a problem at the Woodrow Wilson Bridge can create gridlock throughout the entire Washington region. This 35-year-old bridge is the only federally owned bridge in the National Highway System.

Built to carry 75,000 vehicles per day, the bridge now carries 152,000 vehicles per day and 17,000 heavy trucks each day. The heavy traffic load on the bridge has shortened the bridges useful life span to roughly 10 years. If action is not taken to replace this vital bridge, this region and every driver or trucker trying to go north or south through the Mid-Atlantic on I–95 could be affected. We are talking about rerouting truck traffic or reducing the number of lanes on the bridge to extend the life of the bridge. The traffic and economic impact on this region of reducing the already congested traffic flow on the Woodrow Wilson Bridge would be devastating.

The Federal Highway Administration has estimated that it will cost somewhere around $1.7 billion to replace this federally-owned bridge.

This is one project critical to my region. I know many Members have their own essential regional transportation projects. We need the Shuster-Oberstar-Petri-Rahall amendment to the budget resolution if we are going to get the money desperately needed to accomplish these projects of national importance. I urge all Members to support this critical amendment.

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. SHAYS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. GINGRICH, for 5 minutes, on May 21.

Mr. HANSEN, for 5 minutes, today and May 21.

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, today and May 21.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes each, day on May 21 and 22.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. MARTINEZ.
Mr. SERRANO.
Mr. LIPINSKI.
Ms. NORTON.
Mr. ACKERMAN.
Mr. MCGOVERN.
Mr. CARDIN.
Mr. HOYER.
Mr. BLUMENAUER.
Mr. PAYNE.
Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
Mrs. LOWEY.
Mr. MANTON.
Mr. ORTIZ.
Mr. FORD.
Ms. HARMAN.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. SHAYS) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. EWING.
Mr. BOEHNER.
Mrs. ROUKEMA.
Mr. HOUGHTON.
Mr. PAUL.
Mr. SMITH of Oregon.
Mr. SOLOMON.
Mr. GRAHAM.
Mr. NEY.
Mr. RADANOVICH.
Mr. GILMAN.
Mr. WOLF.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 32 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Wednesday, May 21, 1997, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the speaker's table and referred as follows:

3368. A letter from the the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of May 1, 1997, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e); (H. Doc. No. 105—84); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3369. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of Thrift Supervision, transmitting the Office's final rule—De Novo Applications for a Federal Savings Association Charter [No. 97–48] (RIN: 1550–AA76) received May 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

3370. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy Management Staff, Office of Policy, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Indirect Food Additives: Adjuvants, Production Aids, and Sanitizers [Docket No. 95F–0163] received May 16, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3371. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy Management Staff, Office of Policy, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Food Additives Permitted for Direct Addition to Food for Human Consumption; 1,3–Butylene Glycol [Docket No. 87G–0351] received May 16, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3372. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy Management Staff, Office of Policy, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Medical Devices; Establishment of a Performances Standard for Electrode Lead Wires and Patient Cables [Docket No. 94N–0078] received May 16, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3373. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Informal Small Entity Guidance [10 CFR Part 2] (RIN: 3150–AF68) received May 16, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3374. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Air Force's proposed lease of defense articles to Venezuela (Transmittal No. 18–97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

3375. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Air Force's proposed lease of defense articles to Venezuela (Transmittal No. 17–97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

3376. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Air Force's proposed lease of defense articles to France (Transmittal No. 10–97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

3377. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Air Force's proposed lease of defense articles to France (Transmittal No. 11–97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

3378. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Australia for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 97–15), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

3379. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Australia for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 97–16), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

3380. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Japan for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 97–13), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

3381. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

3382. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 1996, through March 31, 1997; and the semiannual management report for the same period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3383. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Royalty Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Resources.

3384. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Pipeline Right-Of-Way Applications and Assignment Fees; Requirement for Filing of Lease Transfers [30 CFR Part 250 and 256] (RIN: 1010–AC04) received May 16, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3385. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Operation of U.S.M.S. ''North Star'' Between Seattle, Washington, and Stations of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Other Government Agencies, Alaska (Bureau of Indian Affairs) [25 CFR Part 142] (RIN: 1076–AD66) received May 16, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3386. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Greenland Turbot in the Aleutian Islands Subarea [Docket No. 961107312–7021–02; I.D. 051297A] received May 16, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3387. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Aerospace Technologies of Australia, Nomad N22 and N24 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 95–CE–100–AD; Amdt. 39–10022; AD 97–10–10] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3388. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 777 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–NM–90–AD; Amdt. 39–10023; AD 97–10–11] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3389. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD–11 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96–NM–283–AD; Amdt. 39–10024; AD 97–10–12] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3390. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Israel Aircraft Industries (IAI), Ltd. Model 1125 Westwind Astra Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96–NM–96–AD; Amdt. 39–10018; AD 97–10–06] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3391. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Construcciones Aeronauticas, S.A. (CASA) Model CN–235 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96–NM–144–AD; Amdt. 39–10019; AD 97–10–07] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3392. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Construcciones Aeronauticas, S.A. (CASA) Model CN–235 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96–NM–138–AD; Amdt. 39–10020; AD 97–10–08] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3393. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Jetstream Model 4101 Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96–NM–168–AD; Amdt. 39–10021; AD 97–10–09] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3394. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Prohibition Against Certain Flights Within the Territory and Airspace of Afghanistan (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 27744; Special Flight Aviation Regulation (SFAR) No. 67] (RIN: 2120–AG40) received May 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3395. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Temporary Establishment of Class D Airspace; Anchorage International Airport, Alaska (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97–AAL–3] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received May 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3396. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Omaha, NE; Correction (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 96–ACE–21] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received May 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3397. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Removal of Class D and E2 Airspace; Lawrenceville, GA (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97–ASO–12] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received May 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3398. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 28904; Amdt. No. 402] (RIN: 2120–AA65) received May 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3399. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone—Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal (U.S. Coast Guard) [CGD09–97–012] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received May 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3400. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Security Zone; Coast Waters Adjacent to South Florida (U.S. Coast Guard) [CGD07–96–013] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received May 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3401. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations: Fort Meyers Beach, FL (U.S. Coast Guard) [CGD07–97–010] (RIN: 2115–AE46) received May 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

92. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, relative to House Joint Resolution 12 urging Congress to enact legislation to allow disabled military retirees concurrent receipt of full longevity retirement benefits and service-connected disability compensation; to the Committee on National Security.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

13. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Council of the District of Columbia, relative to Council Resolution 12–97, ''Sense of the Council on Amending the Charter Resolution of 1997''; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

14. Also, a petition of the Council of the District of Columbia, relative to Council Resolution 12–116, ''Memorandum of Understanding on the President's National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Plan Emergency Resolution of 1997''; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 153. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 408) to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to support the International Dolphin Conservation Program in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean, and for other purposes (Rept. 105–103). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GOODLING: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 1377. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to encourage retirement income savings; with an amendment (Rept. 105–104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURTON: Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. H.R. 956. A bill to amend the National Narcotics Leadership Act of 1988 to establish a program to support and encourage local communities that first demonstrate a comprehensive, long-term commitment to reduce substance abuse among youth, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 105–105 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 Committee on Commerce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 956 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

TIME LIMITATIONS OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 956. Referral to the Committee on Commerce extended for a period ending not later than May 20, 1997.

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. COBLE:

H.R. 1661. A bill to implement the provisions of the Trademark Law Treaty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 1662. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the treatment of effectively connected investment income of insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE:

H.R. 1663. A bill to clarify the intent of the Congress in Public Law 93–632 to require the Secretary of Agriculture to continue to provide for the maintenance of 18 concrete dams and weirs that were located in the Emigrant Wilderness at the time the wilderness area was designated as wilderness in that Public Law; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. EMERSON (for herself, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. WELLER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WISE, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. DANNER, Mr. TALENT, Mr. CLAY, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, and Mr. HULSHOF):

H.R. 1664. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, relating to the bridge discretionary program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HAYWORTH (for himself and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 1665. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the small issuer exemption from pro rata allocation of interest expenses of financial institutions to tax-exempt interest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEFLEY:

H.R. 1666. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to eliminate provisions of Federal law that provide special support for, or burdens on, the operation of Amtrak as a passenger rail carrier, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 1667. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of the dependent care credit and to allow such credit for respite care expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KASICH:

H.R. 1668. A bill to authorize the reburial in the Memorial Ampitheater at Arlington National Cemetery of an unknown American who lost his life while serving in the Union Army of the United States during the Civil War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1669. A bill to authorize the reburial in the Memorial Ampitheater at Arlington National Cemetery of two unknown Americans who lost their lives during the Civil War, one while serving in the Union Army of the United States and the other while serving in the Army of the Confederate States of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut:

H.R. 1670. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require air carriers to establish procedures for responding to in-flight medical emergencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MARTINEZ (for himself, Mr. GREEN, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and Mr. FILNER):

H.R. 1671. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide for Federal-State performance partnerships, to consolidate all nutrition programs under the act in the Department of Health and Human Services, to extend authorizations of appropriations for programs under the act through fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 1672. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit tax-free distributions of property by cooperative housing corporations to its shareholders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. FOLEY):

H.R. 1673. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an increase in update for certain hospitals with a high proportion of Medicare patients; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

H.R. 1674. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of the unified credit against estate and gift taxes and to increase the amount of estate tax deferral available to owners of small businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRATT:

H.R. 1675. A bill to require the Secretary of the Air Force to conduct a study to identify Air Force property suitable for exchange to acquire land authorized for addition to Shaw Air Force Base in the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on National Security.

H.R. 1676. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the competitive selection of lessees when a military department leases certain nonexcess personal property and to ensure that the Government obtains fair market value for the property; to the Committee on National Security.

H.R. 1677. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain chemicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1678. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Para ethyl phenol [PEP]; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GOODLING, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. KLINK, Mr. LEACH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1679. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment at the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute of a program regarding lifesaving interventions for individuals who experience cardiac arrest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WELDON of Florida:

H.R. 1680. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a separate election for each spouse under the one time election to exclude gain on the sale or exchange of a principal residence and to increase the maximum exclusion to $250,000 if both a husband and wife make the election for the same residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself and Mr. HAMILTON):

H.R. 1681. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 with respect to the activities of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1682. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an exclusion of capital gains upon the sale of a principal residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM (for himself, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. RANSTAD, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. SNOWBARGER, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 1683. A bill to clarify the standards for State sex offender registration programs under the Jacob Wetterling Crimes Against Children and Sexually Violent Offender Registration Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOUDER (for himself, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. HOSTETTLER):

H.R. 1684. A bill to increase the unified estate and gift tax credit to exempt small businesses and farmers from inheritance taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLF (for himself, Mr. PORTER, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. COOKSEY, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. WAMP):

H.R. 1685. A bill to establish an office of religious persecution monitoring, to provide for the imposition of sanctions against countries engaged in a pattern of religious persecution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Banking and Financial Services, and 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 Mr. COLLINS:

H. Res. 154. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that the Nation's children are its most valuable assets and that their protection should be the Nation's highest priority; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. SNOWBARGER introduced a bill (H.R. 1686) for the relief of Lt. Col. (retired) Robert L. Stockwell, U.S. Army; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 58: Mr. TORRES, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. HILLEARY.

H.R. 135: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CAPPS, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. DOOLEY of California.

H.R. 145: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H.R. 165: Mr. BARCIA of Michigan and Mr. BLILEY.

H.R. 306: Mr. SHAYS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 344: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 371: Mr. CONDIT, Mr. MINGE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 373: Mr. BISHOP, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 407: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BOYD, Ms. CARSON, Mr. WICKER, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 411: Ms. SANCHEZ.

H.R. 417: Mr. YATES, Mr. HORN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. CAPPS, and Ms. STABENOW.

H.R. 457: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 474: Mr. WEXLER and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

H.R. 531: Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut.

H.R. 533: Mr. KOLBE, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 534: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. CLEMENT.

H.R. 561: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 598: Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 619: Mr. FILNER, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. FAWELL, and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 622: Mr. ADERHOLT and Mr. NEY.

H.R. 633: Mr. CLEMENT.

H.R. 674: Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 676: Mr. WYNN and Mr. THOMPSON.

H.R. 683: Mr. BURR of North Carolina and Mr. CAPPS.

H.R. 695: Mr. COX of California, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington, Mr. KIND of Wisconsin, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. NEY, and Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 705: Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 766: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 789: Mr. CRAPO.

H.R. 856: Mr. HANSEN, Mr. KIND of Wisconsin, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. LAZIO of New York, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. GEPHARDT.

H.R. 857: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CANADY of Florida, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 883: Mr. CANADY of Florida.

H.R. 907: Mr. CALLAHAN.

H.R. 910: Mr. BEREUTER and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 911: Mr. UPTON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 953: Mr. CAPPS and Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 955: Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. FORD, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. NEY, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. DICKEY.

H.R. 956: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 965: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 979: Mr. RILEY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. GRAHAM.

H.R. 980: Mr. DICKEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. PEASE, and Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 992: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1053: Mr. ESHOO.

H.R. 1054: Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1069: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1070: Mr. CAPPS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1104: Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. TORRES, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1126: Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 1128: Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. FROST, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 1146: Mr. NEY.

H.R. 1159: Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 1175: Mr. MATSUI and Mr. ROGAN.

H.R. 1203: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1215: Ms. HARMAN, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1232: Mr. FILNER and Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H.R. 1260: Mr. KLINK and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 1281: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. FAZIO of California.

H.R. 1285: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1288: Mr. SNYDER and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 1311: Ms. FURSE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H.R. 1358: Mr. NEY.

H.R. 1362: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. GIBBONS, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 1375: Mr. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 1419: Mrs. Mr. NORTHUP.

H.R. 1427: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1450: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1451: Mrs. MEEK of Florida and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1496: Mr. NEY and Mr. GRAHAM.

H.R. 1503: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1505: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. LUTHER.

H.R. 1507: Mr. OLVER, Mr. FROST, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1556: Mr. SCHUMER and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1583: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. STUMP, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LAMPSON, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. POMEROY, Ms. FURSE, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. SNYDER.

H.J. Res. 65: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. CAPPS, and Mr. BONIOR.

H.J. Res. 75: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. BASS, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CAPPS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. BRADY, Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WALSH, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. GOODE, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. THOMPSON, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. LAZIO of New York, and Mr. NORWOOD.

H. Con. Res. 38: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H. Con. Res. 65: Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. WISE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. HOYER, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. MASCARA.

H. Con. Res. 75: Mr. CALVERT.

H. Res. 30: Mr. SOLOMON.

H. Res. 37: Mr. FILNER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. LAHOOD.

H. Res. 96: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FAZIO of California, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H. Res. 121: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA and Mr. MANZULLO.

H. Res. 123: Mr. LUTHER.

H. Res. 139: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, and Mr. HEFLEY.

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. 815: Mr. ROGERS.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 143 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 20, 1997 *No. 67*

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:

Gracious Lord, You know what is ahead today for us. Crucial issues await our attention. Pending decisions demand our concentration. And we know that the choices we make will affect millions in our beloved Nation.

It is with that in mind that we say with the psalmist, ''Show me Your ways, O Lord; teach me Your paths. Lead me in Your truth and teach me, for You are the God of my salvation; on You I wait all the day.''—Psalm 25:4–5.

May we prepare for the decisive decisions of this day by opening our minds to the inflow of Your spirit. We confess that we need Your divine wisdom to shine the light of discernment in the dimness of our limited understanding.

We praise You, Lord, that we can face the rest of this day with the inner peace of knowing that You will answer this prayer for guidance and give us strength and courage. In the name of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able acting majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, following morning business the Senate will hopefully resume consideration of H.R. 1122, the partial-birth abortion ban bill. It is still hoped that an agreement will be reached shortly to conduct a vote on final passage of H.R. 1122 early this afternoon. In addition, I remind all Senators, from 12:30 to 2:15, the Senate will recess for weekly policy luncheons. This afternoon it is hoped we will begin consideration of the budget resolution. Therefore, Senators can expect rollcall votes throughout the day in this session of the Senate.

As previously announced, Members who intend to offer amendments to that resolution should be prepared to offer those amendments during today's session. Also it is hoped that the two leaders will be able to reach an agreement on yielding back much of the statutory time limitation for the budget resolution, leaving 15 hours of debate on the resolution in order.

As always, all Members will be notified accordingly as any votes are ordered with respect to any of this legislation. I thank all Members for their attention.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 1122

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that no further amendments be in order to H.R. 1122 other than a technical amendment to be offered by Senator SANTORUM regarding physicians' conduct, and there be 10 minutes debate on the amendment, and following the use or yielding back of that time on the amendment, the amendment be considered agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and following the adoption of the amendment the bill be read for the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUTCHINSON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HAGEL. I now ask unanimous consent at 10 a.m. on Tuesday, May 20, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 1122, and there be 3 hours and 10 minutes of debate to be equally divided between Senators SANTORUM and BOXER or their designees, and that the vote occur on passage of H.R. 1122 at 2:15 on Tuesday, and that paragraph 4 of rule 12 be waived.

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

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the time controlled on H.R. 1122 on the Democratic side be changed to reflect that Senator DASCHLE or his designee controls the time.

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

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Lou Ann Linehan and Deb Fiddelke be permitted privilege of the floor for the duration of the debate.

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

COMMEMORATING THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONSTRUCTION AND DEDICATION OF THE VIETNAM VETERANS MEMORIAL

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 87, submitted by myself, along with my colleague Senator BOB KERREY of Nebraska and others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> A resolution (S. Res. 87) commemorating the 15th anniversary of the construction and dedication of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I rise today to submit a resolution commemorating the 15th anniversary of the construction and dedication of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, also known as ''The Wall.'' I am pleased to be joined in this effort by my distinguished colleague from Nebraska, my senior Senator, BOB KERREY, who, incidentally, is the only Member of this body who was a recipient of the Medal of Honor for his service in Vietnam. I

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

also am joined by the other Vietnam combat veterans who serve in this body. In all, 75 Senators have joined in cosponsoring this resolution.

The creation of this memorial marked the beginning of a healing process for the Nation and for veterans divided by the war. I was proud to have spoken at the 1982 groundbreaking for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, as did two of my colleagues, Senator ROBB, who then was Governor of Virginia, and Senator JOHN WARNER.

I keep in my Senate office, Mr. President, a shovel I used during the groundbreaking ceremony 15 years ago to remind me of that day. While the debate over our involvement in Vietnam and the conduct of the war will continue for years to come, the wall has united Americans in honoring those who served. It honors warriors, not the war. The Vietnam wall stands as a stirring reminder that memorials are built not to honor or glorify war. There is no glory in a war, only suffering. Memorials are built to honor the commitment and the sacrifice that men and women give to their country because they are willing to risk their lives in defense of freedom.

As we commemorate the 15th anniversary of the groundbreaking for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, it is important that we remember those brave men and brave women who fought and died for liberties we take for granted, and it is important we remember their families who also sacrificed for this Nation.

Recently I was joined in a ceremony to mark the wall's 15th anniversary by my friends and colleagues, Senators BOB KERREY of Nebraska, JOHN MCCAIN of Arizona, MAX CLELAND of Georgia, JOHN KERRY of Massachusetts, and CHUCK ROBB of Virginia. We come from different States and different parties, but despite our differences, we six U.S. Senators have a common background. We are all Vietnam combat veterans. We attended the ceremony on behalf of every man and woman who served in Vietnam, every man and woman who gave their life in Vietnam, every Vietnam veteran who is still missing in that far away land, and every family in this country who sacrificed to keep this Nation strong.

We marked the anniversary of this groundbreaking in order to remind us all that the liberties we cherish do not come without great sacrifice. One needs only to run a hand over the rough names inscribed in the smooth glossy surface of the wall to realize that freedom is not free. As we laid a wreath in honor of the 58,202 men and women whose lives are memorialized by the names, each of us realized we could easily have been present only in the memories of those who survived. We, too, could have been listed on the wall.

We also remembered and honored the more than 2,000 Americans still missing in action from this war. Mr. President, this morning I noted that our new Ambassador to Vietnam, Ambassador Pete Petersen, a Nebraska native, held as a POW in Vietnam for more than 6 years, received the remains of two of our MIA's yesterday in Vietnam.

Each year, more than 3 million people visit the Vietnam Memorial, making it the most visited monument in Washington. Many visitors are so moved they leave flowers, letters, pictures, and other mementoes to their fallen comrades, parents, relatives, friends, children, and loved ones.

Next weekend, Memorial Day weekend, the traveling Vietnam memorial will come to Omaha, NE. It is a half-scale replica of the wall that stands here in Washington. It has visited cities and States across America so Americans who may never visit the Nation's Capital can experience the healing power of the Vietnam wall.

The resolution before the Senate today is an important statement by the Senate to mark the 15th year of the wall and all that wall has meant to so many. I am proud to be a sponsor and am grateful for my colleagues' support.

Mr. President, I yield time to my distinguished colleague, friend, and fellow Vietnam veteran, Senator BOB KERREY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I yield such time as desired to the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I will take a minute to commend my two colleagues from Nebraska for introducing this particular resolution today. I was pleased to join with them a few weeks ago over at the Vietnam Memorial.

It was my privilege 15 years ago to participate in both the groundbreaking and the dedication. I have had many visits to that memorial since. I think it is very clear that it has served a purpose even beyond the expectations of those who created it and those who were initially involved in the dedication ceremonies. It has a healing effect for all of those who visit, regardless of what their personal feelings may have been about the conflict itself. They recognize that we come together to honor those warriors who gave the last full measure to their country, and the notes that are left behind are the kind of communication that I would defy anyone to read without feeling some of the emotion that is involved in it.

I commend both Senator HAGEL and Senator KERREY for this particular resolution this morning, and I commend it to all of our colleagues as an appropriate remembrance of those friends and those who wore our uniform in terms of service to our country in the conflict in Vietnam.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, along with my colleague, my good friend, Senator CHUCK HAGEL from my home State of Nebraska, we are offering the Vietnam Veterans Memorial resolution to remember this memorial, but also to remind Americans that the possibility for healing exists in this memorial. There are constant reminders that open the wounds of this war once again.

As Senator HAGEL mentioned, in today's paper we read that our first Ambassador to Vietnam since we left in 1975, Pete Petersen, is coming back to the United States of America and bringing with him the remains of men who were killed in that war, once again, opening up, for a variety of reasons, a wound that makes it difficult for people to go on with their lives.

Mr. President, this wall does a remarkable thing. It does enable an individual to begin to heal from this particular war, or for other wars, as well. On this Memorial Day we ask the Senate and we ask the American people to take a moment to reflect and remember those who served in Vietnam during this Nation's longest conflict.

I served in Vietnam with five of my Senator colleagues, Senator CHUCK ROBB, who was here a few moments ago, Senator JOHN KERRY, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, Senator MAX CLELAND, and Senator CHUCK HAGEL, and although we may argue legislation from different sides of the aisle, we share a bond beyond politics and beyond party, as do veterans of all conflicts, and are firm in the belief that we are all Americans first and foremost.

As we gather with friends and with family in observance of Memorial Day, I urge all Americans to take time to reflect upon the day's true meaning. Whether we attend a public observance, mark a grave, or simply bow our heads in quiet reflection, we should remember to honor those who, by serving, put their faith and trust in the ideals for which our Nation stands.

Mr. President, my colleague from Nebraska and I offer this resolution and feel it especially fitting because this August the Vietnam Veterans Memorial will be 15 years old, almost as old as the conflict was long. On May 24, 1997, more than 22 years after the last known United States casualty, the Vietnam Moving Memorial will pay a visit to Omaha, NE. For thousands of Vietnam veterans and their families, this memorial serves as a place of reconciliation and remembrance. It invites people to come and remember the bravery and valor of their fallen friends, family, and colleagues, while serving as well, Mr. President, as a permanent tribute to those who gave their lives.

Through this resolution, and in observation of this 15th anniversary, I hope the Senate will encourage all Americans to remember to honor the memory of the brave men and women who fought and died in service to our Nation during the Vietnam war, and indeed all conflicts.

Mr. President, at the dedication of the Bunker Hill Memorial on June 17, 1825, Daniel Webster closed his speech with these words:

Let our object be our country, our whole country and nothing but our country. And by the blessing of God may that country itself become a vast and splendid monument, not of oppression and terror, but of wisdom, peace, and of liberty, upon which the world may gaze with admiration, forever.

We honor those who have come before us not just with the memory of their efforts, but by building upon the freedom and prosperity we enjoy because of their sacrifice. The men and women we pay tribute to during this and every Memorial Day deserve nothing less.

Mr. President, as I have said, one doesn't have to look very far for reminders of the divisive nature of this war, and one doesn't have to look very far for inspiration that enables us to overcome the worst of these memories.

Indeed, I had the pleasure of sitting with the Presiding Officer and listening to his presentation to a roomful of young heroes who had been recognized for their service, and recognized in particular for their service at the community level—young men and women who saw something in their community they didn't like, saw something in their community that they thought was wrong, and decided on their own to correct that wrong.

I heard the Senator from Arkansas say that he heard a long time ago a young girl talking about what it meant to be famous; what it meant to acquire fame. She wanted in her lifetime to be a famous person. Then she came to Washington, DC, and while at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier realized that fame by no means is the only object of our lives, nor should be the only object of our lives; that one can be a hero without recognition; that one can serve God and other human beings as a consequence of just believing that something needs to be done without regard to whether or not it would be recognized in headlines, or radio commentary, or television broadcasts.

It is the most eloquent demonstration of why we as human beings are special; that we have inside of us a soul, a spirit that recognizes that at some point the greatest thing we can do is to say that somebody is more important than we are, that something is out there more important than just taking care of ourselves.

I believe strongly, Mr. President, that we are not free until in love, and recognize that until in love we are willing to give ourselves. And I hope that this remembrance of the Vietnam Memorial will not just inspire people to say that we have got to get over the Vietnam war itself but I hope it will allow Americans as individual men and women to see that now in this moment heroes are needed more than ever before.

This Nation was terribly divided in the Vietnam war, with families turning against families, sons against fathers, and neighbors against neighbors.

On this floor on August 7, 1964, the Senate, by a vote of 88 to 2, and the House unanimously, enacted what was called the Gulf of Tonkin resolution that resulted in a substantial buildup of forces, of increased drafting, of increased calls going out to young men saying, ''It is time for you to serve the cause of freedom.'' That cause deteriorated and divided this Nation in a terrible fashion, and caused Americans to say not only do we question the cause of freedom but cause us as well to say that we no longer believe our Government; we no longer trust that this is a Government of, by, and for the people. ''We feel as if we have been lied to. And the trust is broken, it has been snapped, it is permanent, and we are not going to put it back together.''

This wall, this remembrance, enables us to see that trust can be put back together, if we are willing to forgive; if we are willing to say that we forgive those with whom we disagreed; that we recognize our common bond. And on this Memorial Day not only do we pay tribute to those who have sacrificed for us, but we rededicate ourselves to the task of sacrificing for others.

Mr. President, it is a pleasure and an honor for me to share cosponsorship with my friend and colleague from Nebraska, Senator HAGEL, and all the other Members of the Senate who have joined in this resolution. I appreciate their support.

I call upon Americans not just to see this as another resolution but to see this as a Memorial Day, as an opportunity for us to rededicate ourselves to the cause of freedom.

Mr. HAGEL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I thank my colleague and friend from Nebraska for those inspirational words, and I think words that are focused exactly on the heart of who we are as a people, who we have always been, and hopefully who we will always be.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I am grateful to be an original cosponsor with my distinguished colleagues and fellow Vietnam veterans in the Senate. It is appropriate that we commemorate the 15th anniversary of the dedication of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, DC.

My fellow Vietnam veterans who are cosponsoring this resolution and I wear glasses and have more gray hair than we did when we served in Vietnam, we come from different walks of life, served in different branches of the military, and were of different ranks. However, we share the experiences of combat that only those who went to Vietnam will ever understand.

We also share—and this is harder to explain—the survivors' humility. That's a provocative statement, I know, and the nonveteran may easily mistake its meaning. I am not talking about shame. I know of no shame in surviving combat. But every combat veteran remembers those comrades whose sacrifice was eternal. Their loss taught us everything about tragedy and everything about duty.

I am grateful, as we all are, to have come home alive. I prayed daily for deliverance from war. No one of my acquaintance ever chose death over homecoming. But I witnessed some men choose death over dishonor. The memory of them, of what they bore for country and honor, helped me to see the virtue in my own humility.

It is a surpassing irony that war, for all its unspeakable horrors, provides the combatant with every conceivable human experience. Experiences that usually take a lifetime to know are all felt—and felt intensely—in one brief moment of life. Anyone who loses a loved one knows what great loss feels like. Anyone who gives life to a child knows what great joy feels like. The veteran knows what great joy and great loss feel like when they occur in the same moment, in the same experience.

For my part, I would simply affirm that the sacrifices borne by veterans deserve to be memorialized in something more lasting than marble or in the fleeting effect of a politician's speech. The veterans' valor and the devotion to duty have earned our country's abiding concern for their well-being. I am committed to honoring that debt.

I hope this small symbol of remembrance today will encourage all Americans to remember the sacrifices of our veterans.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial resolution, sponsored by my colleagues, Senator HAGEL and Senator KERREY of Nebraska. I would like to commend and congratulate them for bringing this issue before the Senate today, so that this body may take a moment to remember those who sacrificed their lives in Vietnam for our country.

Mr. President, it is not enough for us to use mere words to express our deep gratitude to the men and women who fought in Vietnam, selflessly giving their lives to protect the interests of the United States. It is not enough for us to provide for the education and well-being of the sons and daughters who have lost a parent in a country they may never see, for a people they may never know, and in a war they may never understand.

Nothing can ever be enough, because nothing can ever bring them back.

But here in the Nation's Capital, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial—a 250-foot wall of polished black granite—will help us to never forget the sacrifice of over 58,000 Americans; 58,209 Americans to be exact.

Seventeen more names have recently been added to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. Within the past 6 months, the Central Identification Laboratory in Hawaii has positively identified the remains of ten more American servicemen found in Vietnam by Department of Defense on-site search teams. And seven other American servicemen who have since died from the complications of injuries suffered during the Vietnam war. It is my hope, Mr. President—no, it is my prayer—that this will be the last time such additions are made to this memorial.

How do you thank each of these brave Americans? How do you let them know that as a nation, we are indebted to them for their bravery, their valor, and their courage in fighting a war that was never officially recognized by the country which asked them to put their lives on the line? How do you tell them that they are truly American heroes?

You do this by keeping their memories alive and by never forgetting them.

The Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall helps to keep those memorials alive, and it helps the human emotional process which includes mourning, healing, and remembrance. This visual reminder keeps their memory alive in our hearts where they will never be forgotten. And I would like to add that I know this from first-hand experience.

Mr. President, last year I took part in a trade mission to Vietnam with several of my colleagues here in the Senate. Before leaving, one of the most important things I did to prepare myself for travel to Vietnam, was to walk alone along the Vietnam Veterans' Memorial, to clear my mind of all thoughts, except for those involving the overwhelming number of American names etched upon the wall. In that moment, I knew that one of the most important reasons for my visit to Vietnam was to be a voice for those brave men and women whom I will never be able to thank.

On November 11, 1996, Veteran's Day, I was in Hanoi urging top Vietnamese officials to keep the resolution of the POW/MIA issue a top priority, and to cooperate in every way with the United States. As I met with Vietnam Party General Secretary Do Muoi, I told him about my walk along the wall, and presented him with a copy of "The Wall," a pictorial of veterans and their families who come to pay tribute at the Vietnam Veteran's Memorial. Inside the cover of that book, I inscribed: "We have shared a tragic past together. Now let us work to share a bright future together." Our discussion then centered on building our relationships as nations on the basis of mutual compassion. General Secretary Do Muoi was very animated in his response and said, "We deserve compassion, it is consistent with our history so full of blood and tears. Compassion is the key to our relationship."

Mr. President, compassion is truly the key to honoring those who paid the ultimate sacrifice for our country. I would hope that we, as a nation, never lose that compassion for our veterans, and never, ever allow their memories to be taken from our hearts.

The wall is indeed a beautiful and somber monument which will ever remind us of those painful sacrifices made by these brave men and women.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I have two final comments to make regarding this resolution commemorating the 15th anniversary of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

First, the recognition of the vision, the heart, the soul, and the leadership behind it, a remarkable man, Jan Scruggs. It was Jan Scruggs who many, many years ago came home one night after a movie, sat down with his wife, and said, "We are going to do something to recognize those who served in the Vietnam." It was a great dream, an impossible dream.

One of the collaborators with Jan Scruggs was one of our colleagues, Senator JOHN WARNER. Without Senator JOHN WARNER's leadership, and without his force, and without Jan Scruggs' vision and leadership and love, this Wall would never have been built. It is very appropriate to recognize Jan Scruggs and Senator JOHN WARNER because those two great Americans led this effort and have given us a magnificent monument and memorial.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution, Senate Resolution 87, be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 87) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, is as follows:

S. RES. 87

Whereas 1997 marks the 15th anniversary of the construction and dedication of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, D.C.;

Whereas this memorial contains the names of more than 58,000 men and women who lost their lives from 1957 to 1975 in the Vietnam combat area or are still missing in action;

Whereas every year millions of Americans come to this monument to pay their respects for those who served in the Armed Forces;

Whereas the Vietnam Veterans Memorial has been a source of comfort and healing for Vietnam veterans and the families of the men and women who died while serving their country; and

Whereas this memorial has come to represent the legacy of healing that has occurred and demonstrates the application all Americans have for those who made the ultimate sacrifice: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses its support and gratitude for all of the men and women who honorably served in the United States Armed Forces in defense of freedom and democracy during the Vietnam War;

(2) extends its sympathies to all Americans who suffered the loss of friends and family in Vietnam;

(3) encourages all Americans to remember the sacrifices of our veterans; and

(4) commemorates the 15th anniversary of the construction and dedication of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I yield the floor. Thank you, Mr. President,

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

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

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT OF 1997

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report H.R. 1122.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1122) to amend title 18, United States Code, to ban partial-birth abortions.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 290

(Purpose: To provide a procedure for determining whether a physician's conduct was necessary to save the life of the mother)

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) proposes an amendment numbered 290.

Mr. SANTORUM. 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 2, line 16, strike the semicolon and all that follows through "purpose" on line 17.

On page 3, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

"(3) As used in this section, the term 'vaginally delivers a living fetus before killing the fetus' means deliberately and intentionally delivers into the vagina a living fetus, or a substantial portion thereof, for the purpose of performing a procedure the physician knows will kill the fetus, and kills the fetus."

On page 3, between lines 21 and 22, insert the following:

"(d)(1) A defendant accused of an offense under this section may seek a hearing before the State Medical Board on whether the physician's conduct was necessary to save the life of the mother whose life was endangered by a physical disorder, illness or injury.

"(2) The findings on that issue are admissible on that issue at the trial of the defendant. Upon a motion of the defendant, the court shall delay the beginning of the trial for not more than 30 days to permit such a hearing to take place."

On page 3, line 22, strike "(d)" and insert "(e)".

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, this is an amendment that I took the floor yesterday to talk about. It is an amendment that I worked out, along with Senator FRIST and Representative CANADY in the House, and with the American Medical Association to tighten up some of the language to address some of the concerns that the physician community had about the definition of what is partial-birth abortion.

I believe it is a good amendment, whether it would have gotten the AMA endorsement or not. I think it is a good amendment because I think it is language that is much tighter, and puts in the requisite mens rea, or thought processes that the physician must have been going through at the time of doing the procedure. I think that is important for a criminal statute.

I think it would be a sad state if, in fact, we passed this legislation and overrode the President's veto, or if the President would see otherwise and decide to sign the bill, that, in fact, this bill would be thrown out for vagueness of criminality, the criminal statute itself would be considered too vague, and it would be OK on the abortion ground but not OK on the criminal statute ground. But I think what we have done is tighten up the language and have taken care of the concerns mentioned here, both on the House and Senate floors, about the vagueness of the statute.

I don't think anyone will now look at this as a vague statute. It is a very precise statute. It is a complete criminal statute now.

I am very happy that we were able to work it out, and in working with the AMA I believe we have improved the bill and improved its chances when we reach the stage of the courts which I am very hopeful that we will do because that means that we will have passed the bill and it would have been signed into law, and the President's veto would have been overridden.

Of the other two provisions in the bill, one clarifies the life of the mother exception and takes out some surplus language which we agreed to which didn't add anything, and we agreed that it was, in fact, surplus language.

The third element of the amendment deals with the issue of a medical review panel; if a medical review panel was asked by the AMA for the reason of an intermediary step between the indictment of the physician under the statute and a trial. This would be an opportunity for State medical boards to put together a panel of physicians to look at what happened in the case, to do a peer review determination of the procedures that was done by the physician being charged, and to come up with findings. Those findings would then be admissible in court.

I think that is an appropriate step. It gives the professionals in the field who license, in fact, the physician, an opportunity to make a review of what happened in the context of that as well as add medical expertise to be considered at trial. I think that is only helpful. The fact of the matter is that we are all aware that, if someone is charged under this statute, they are going to have their medical experts testify as to one set of circumstances and the prosecution will have their medical experts.

So, with having some neutral party, if you will, come up with a more objective standard of review I think helps and provides a professional review of what took place in a case.

So I think we are making a step forward.

I am not aware of any objections to this amendment. Whether you are for, or against this amendment, it is a technical amendment in most respects. It is one that hopefully will be supported by everyone.

I yield the floor at this point to determine whether anyone wants to speak against the amendment.

I understand now there is no one to speak against the amendment. So I ask unanimous consent the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement, the pending amendment is considered agreed to. The motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

The amendment (No. 290) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read a third time.

Mr. SANTORUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I now understand that we are commencing the final 3 hours of debate, that the time is going to be equally divided between the Members who are for the bill and Members who are against. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the Chair. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me first start out by indicating how important I believe the endorsement of the AMA is here as we approach final passage of this legislation. We have heard over and over and over again that the principal reason this procedure needs to be made legal is to protect the health of the mother. We have in the case of the AMA an organization that is on record as being for abortion rights. This is not the Christian Coalition. This is not the Catholic Conference of Bishops. This is an organization of physicians that is on record as being for a woman's right to choose, if you will, that has come out and said this procedure is not good medicine, this procedure is not necessary to protect the life or health of a mother. So for all of the arguments that we have heard that there is a split of opinion out there as to whether this is an appropriate procedure, I have put forward letter after letter after letter from obstetricians, from perinatologists, experts in maternal fetal medicine who have said that this procedure is never medically indicated, that in fact this procedure is more dangerous to the mother. I will discuss those things today.

Now I believe the charade is over. We have the preeminent medical authority, organization in the country saying that this procedure should be outlawed; there is no medical reason to keep this procedure legal.

That is a very powerful statement which debunks all of the arguments people might want to hide behind in saying that, yes, they agree this procedure is brutal; yes, they agree this is barbaric and should never be used, but we want to leave open the possibility that in the case of, and then they go on with the health concerns.

What we know for a fact is that 90 percent of partial-birth abortions are not done for any health-related reasons. Let me clarify that. Ron Fitzsimmons, who heads up an abortion provider organization of some 200 abortion clinics, said that 90 percent of partial-birth abortions occur in the fifth and sixth months of pregnancy on healthy mothers with healthy babies. They are for birth control purposes. This is fifth- and sixth-month abortions for birth control purposes where you take a baby out, deliver it all but the head and then take a pair of scissors and stab the baby in the base of the skull, suction its brains out and kill it for birth control purposes, not for health reasons.

Those are what we know as the facts, that information provided to us by people who oppose the bill. These are not facts people who oppose abortion are putting forward. These are people who are adamantly pro-choice who run the clinics where some of these abortions take place, providing us with the information contrary to what you have heard, statements in the Chamber that these are done for the health of the mother, that 90 percent of them are done for birth control purposes, late in pregnancy. The other percentage is done later in pregnancy, and they argue, most of the reasons you hear, because of a fetal abnormality. All of the cases that you hear described with the pictures of the family are the baby was going to die anyway or the baby had a severe defect and that we should allow abortions in those situations, this kind of brutal abortion in those situations because the baby is not perfect or may not live long.

That takes us off into another area that I think has very, very severe consequences for this country, when we start to say that we should be able to kill children because they are not perfect or that abortions should be legal up until the time of delivery; that we should be able to do this brutal procedure because the little baby may not live long or may have medical complications.

I found it absolutely ironic that the day the partial-birth abortion ban came to the floor of the Senate, minutes before we passed the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act. What is that? That is an act to guarantee civil rights, the right for disabled children to be educated so they can maximize their human potential. The very same day 30-some Senators who voted for that legislation and advocated giving rights to the disabled, those same 30-some Senators who are against the partial-birth abortion ban said we are willing to give you rights if you survive the womb, but we are not going to give you any rights as a disabled child up until the time you are born. You are eligible to be killed just because of your disability. You are different than any other child. If you are a child that is normal, then they do not believe you have a right to be killed. In fact, that is what these amendments are that we heard about. Well, if the baby is healthy and the mother is healthy, we need a health exception. If the baby is fine and the mom is fine, then we do not believe the baby should be killed. If the baby is abnormal, we can kill it.

These are the same people who believe in special civil rights for the disabled. I do not know how you legitimately can stand and argue those two points. I do not know how you draw the line there with any sense of consistency of care for the disabled. I support IDEA. I support civil rights for the disabled because I know that there are challenges out there, but there is no greater challenge to the disabled in this country today than the challenge of getting born in the first place. And I will discuss, as I have before, Donna Joy Watts and her family and how they had to overcome incredible odds and adversity beyond what you would imagine in this country just to have this little girl born and be treated because she was seen as disabled, not viable, not important to our society.

I want to talk in specific about the health issue because I think it is important, it is the remaining barrier that many Members hide behind in not supporting the partial-birth abortion bill because it does not have a ''health exception.'' Let me explain, No. 1, we have the American Medical Association on record now supporting this bill, saying there need not be a health exception to this bill, this bill takes care of all the problems that we as physicians see and that there is no health reason to do this procedure.

Let me share with you a statement from Dr. Camilla C. Hersh, who is a member of the American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology. She says, and I quote from her statement:

I think it is obvious that for the baby this is a horrible way to die, brutally and painfully killed by having one's head stabbed open and one's brains suctioned out.

But for the woman, this is a mortally dangerous and life threatening act.

Partial-birth abortion is a partially blind procedure, done by feel, thereby risking direct scissor injury to the mother's uterus and laceration of the cervix or lower uterine segment. Either the scissors or the bony shards or spickules of the baby's perforated and disrupted skull bones can roughly rip into the large blood vessels which supply the lower part of the lush pregnant uterus, resulting in immediate and massive bleeding and the threat of shock, immediate hysterectomy, blood transfusion and even death to the mother.

Portions of the baby's sharp bony skull pieces can remain embedded in the mother's cervix, setting up a complicated infection as the bony fragments decompose.

Think of the emotional agony for the woman, both immediately and for years afterward, who endures this process over a period of several days.

None of this nauseating risk is ever necessary for any reason. Obstetrician-gynecologists like myself across the U.S. regularly treat women whose unborn children suffer the same conditions as those cited by the proponents of the procedure.

Never—

I underline the word—

is the partial-birth abortion procedure necessary:

Not for polyhydramnios (an excess of amniotic fluid collecting around the baby), . . .

Not for anencephaly (an abnormality characterized by the absence of the top portion of the baby's brain and skull),

Not for hydrocephaly (excessive cerebrospinal fluid in the head).

In the case of Donna Joy Watts, I would parenthetically say she had hydrocephaly. Her parents were counseled to have an abortion. They chose not to. They had the baby delivered and she is now 5½ years old.

Sometimes, as in the case of hydrocephaly, it is first necessary to drain some of the fluid from the baby's head with a special long needle, to allow safe vaginal delivery. In some cases, when vaginal delivery is not possible, a doctor performs a Cesarean section. But in no case is it necessary or medically advisable to partially deliver an infant through the vagina and then to cruelly kill the infant.

The legislation proposed clearly distinguishes the procedure being banned from recognized standard obstetric techniques. I must point out, even for those who support abortion for elective or medical reasons at any point in pregnancy, current recognized abortion techniques would be unaffected by the proposed ban.

Any proponent of such a dangerous procedure is at the least seriously misinformed about medical reality or at worst so consumed by narrow minded ''abortion-at-any-cost'' activism to be criminally negligent.

This procedure is blatant and cruel infanticide and must be against the law.

Again, this is a statement by Camilla C. Hersh, an obstetrician-gynecologist practicing here in northern Virginia.

And other statements by other medical doctors in cases that were mentioned here on this floor as reasons that partial-birth abortion must continue to be legal. And I have this as a note. Senator FEINSTEIN brought up the case of preeclampsia, and I have a letter here from Dr. Steve Calvin, MD, who is a specialist in maternal fetal medicine.

What does that mean? A specialist in high-risk pregnancies. These are people who deal with the very difficult cases that come up in pregnancy where the mother's life and health and the baby's life and health are in jeopardy during pregnancy.

Dr. Calvin responds to Senator FEINSTEIN's claim that preeclampsia is a reason to do a partial-birth abortion.

Preeclampsia (with any number of its complications, including renal failure), cardiomyopathy, breast cancer, and lymphoma are all potential maternal medical disorders that may complicate pregnancy. In some situations the pregnancy must be ended to save the life of the mother.

The proposed ban on this destructive procedure already includes an exemption for the so far theoretical instance when it may be necessary to save a pregnant woman's life. The opponents of the ban realize that they cannot prevail on the merits of their arguments and are therefore resorting to blowing a virtual blizzard of medical terms during the debate. They hope to overwhelm the media and the public so that the fundamental points are missed. I will not try to answer them point by point on each medical condition. The importance of protecting nearly born fetal life is crucial.

Especially in light of Lori Watts' and Donna Joy Watts' story.

The fact of the matter is that it is never medically necessary, under any of these conditions, according to Dr. Calvin and dozens of others who are specialists in maternal fetal medicine. As Dr. Calvin said in another letter, none of these procedures are done by groups that specialize in high-risk pregnancies. They are not done in universities. They are not done in hospitals that specialize in these kinds of problems. They are done in abortion clinics. They are not done by experts in maternal fetal medicine, perinatologists; they are done by abortionists at abortion clinics who are not experts in high-risk pregnancies.

In fact, this procedure was developed not by an obstetrician/gynecologist, not by someone who is an expert in maternal fetal medicine who is concerned about the life and health of the mother; this was developed by a family practitioner who does abortions at an abortion clinic for the convenience of the abortionist.

So all of these claims about health are just simply a smokescreen. There is no health reason to do this procedure. In fact, as Dr. Hersh says, and hundreds of other physicians have said, obstetricians and gynecologists, including—he is not an obstetrician; that is, C. Everett Koop, the former Surgeon General of the United States, is not an obstetrician. But what is he? A pediatric surgeon who has done surgery on all these little babies who have had these disabilities and saw high-risk pregnancies firsthand, dealt with the consequences of these pregnancies, so he knows the issue well. He said, as well as hundreds of other doctors, that it is never medically necessary. I would like to read the entire quote signed by, I believe, at least a dozen experts in maternal fetal medicine, a group of almost 500 physicians, including Dr. Koop, and obstetricians who oppose partial-birth abortion:

While it may become necessary, in the second or third trimester, to end a pregnancy in order to protect the mother's life or health, abortion is never required—i.e., it is never medically necessary, in order to preserve a women's life, health or future fertility, to deliberately kill an unborn child in the second and third trimester, and certainly not by mostly delivering the child before putting him or her to death. What is required in the circumstances specified by—

Senator DASCHLE, Senator BOXER, Senator FEINSTEIN and others—

is separation of the child from the mother, not the death of the child.

Let me just put it simply, for purposes of this particular debate, while a mother may present herself in a condition that may require separation of the child from the mother, it is not necessary to kill the child in that process, to use partial-birth abortion. I don't know why any doctor who is practicing good, solid medicine would deliberately reach in and pull the baby out in the breech position to deliver the child while the mother's life is in danger, while you go through a 3-day process of dilating the cervix over 2 days, risking infection because the cervix is now dilated and the womb is exposed to infection, risking infection, No. 1; No. 2, risking an incompetent cervix, which means the inability to carry future children.

Unfortunately, one of the reasons cited by President Clinton as needing this procedure to save her health and future fertility was a woman who has had five miscarriages since that procedure was done to her. To make the argument this is necessary for that is just not true. But a woman presents herself with a health problem, and for 2 days, to say, ''Here are some pills, we're going to dilate your cervix, go home, present yourself back after 2 days,'' where you risk increased infection and increased complications, ''come back to the abortion clinic''—not a hospital, because these are not done at hospitals—''come back to the abortion clinic to have this procedure done.'' And then what happens? The baby is pulled out feet first, delivered all but the head.

Why would you, even if you decided to go through that procedure for the health of the mother, why would you, as Dr. Hersh suggests, why would you take a blunt instrument in a blind procedure and stab the baby blindly in the base of the skull, causing all of the damage that could occur, as Dr. Hersh has set forth? Why would you do that? Why wouldn't you just deliver the head and give the baby a chance to live? It may not live. But at least give it the dignity of being born and accepted into our human community without this brutality, this unwarranted, unnecessary, unhealthful, dangerous, brutal stabbing and killing of a baby who is this far away, 3 inches away, from its first breath. Yes, its first breath. Even at 20 weeks, babies live. It is considered a live birth even at 20 weeks. Babies will not be able to survive long because they don't have sufficient lung development, but that baby will be alive when it is born unless you kill it.

Why kill the baby when it is more dangerous to the mother to do that, when it presents more complications to do it? Why does that option have to be necessary that is more dangerous to her health? Why would we want to keep a procedure legal that threatens a woman's health, that is an absolutely rogue procedure, not done by specialists, not done in hospitals, developed by a nonobstetrician? Why do we want to keep this legal? What possible reason do we want to say that we need to endanger a woman's health to allow this procedure to be legal? The only reason I can think of is what Dr. Hersh said, and I will quote from her again because I think she said it very, very well:

Any proponent of such a dangerous procedure is at the least seriously misinformed about medical reality or at worst—

And I daresay that we may be looking, certainly in the case of the abortion rights advocates, we are looking at our ''at worst'' here—

at worst, so consumed by narrow minded ''abortion-at-any-cost'' activism, to be criminally negligent.

There is no health reason to do this. Anybody who stands up on the floor in the face of now the AMA, hundreds of obstetricians and gynecologists, specialists in maternal fetal medicine, who stand up in the face of overwhelming evidence that this procedure is necessary, given the characteristics of the procedure, a rogue procedure, not done in hospitals, not done by specialists, done by family practitioners or people who have no speciality at all in delivering children, just doing abortions, you are defending not the health of the mother when you argue that, you are not defending the life of the mother, you are defending, as Dr. Hersh says, abortion at any cost, any time, anywhere for any reason; that the child, no matter how late, no matter how healthy, is not to be considered.

That is not where America is. I know where the majority of the Senate is. We will find out today whether it is where 67 Senators are, because that is the magic number, 67. We need 67 votes to override the President's veto.

I want to have additional items printed in the RECORD. I know this has been printed in the RECORD before, but I want to put it in.

This is a letter from C. Everett Koop to BILL FRIST, May 13, 1997—BILL FRIST, the only doctor in the U.S. Senate, who has spoken eloquently, and will again today, on this issue.

DEAR BILL: It is never necessary to destroy a viable fetus in order to preserve the health of the mother. Although I can't think of an example, if it were deemed beneficial for the mother to be without the fetus, it would be delivered by induction—

Vaginal delivery—

or C-section. Abortion is truly more traumatic than either and exposes the mother to future problems with an incompetent cervix, miscarriage and infertility.

Let me get away from the specifics of the partial-birth issue and give you another reason why this is not healthy, and I want to share with you some statistics from the Alan Guttmacher Institute. What is that organization? This is an organization that signed letters last year with NARAL and Planned Parenthood and a whole lot of other groups—NOW, National Organization for Women—in opposition to partial-birth abortion legislation for allowing this procedure to be legal. They are an abortion advocacy group. I guess they are considered a think tank or some short of data collection folks, but they are advocates for abortion. Here is what they say, again, to the extent I can—I am using the other side's information, taking what those who oppose the bill say as fact, and even with their information, you can't defend this procedure. This is what the Guttmacher Institute says:

The risk of death associated with abortion increases with the length of pregnancy, from 1 death in every 600,000 abortions at 8 or fewer weeks to 1 per 17,000 at 16–20 weeks, and 1 per 6,000 at 21 weeks or more.

When, I might add, partial-birth abortions occur. They occur after 20 weeks, sometimes at 20 weeks.

So you are 10 times more likely, according to their numbers, to die as a result of an abortion than in the first 8 weeks of pregnancy.

You say, ''Well, OK, that's interesting, a 1-in-6,000 chance of a mother dying as the result of an abortion. But what are the chances of her dying as a result of delivering the baby by inducing or cesarean section, which would be a 'normal' delivery?'' We happen to have those numbers:

It should be noted that at 21 weeks and after, abortion is twice as risky for the woman as childbirth: The risk of maternal death is 1 in 6,000—

As you saw before—

for abortion and 1 in 13,000 for childbirth.

So let me lay it out again. Set the arguments aside for partial-birth abortion as to why that is more dangerous, and it is. Abortion, period, is more dangerous to a mother. Abortion, period, is more dangerous to a mother than delivery by inducement or by cesarean section. Now why would you get up here on the floor and say we need to keep the more dangerous option generally available, compound that with a procedure that is even more dangerous than other abortion techniques, that we need to keep that legal also? If you are truly concerned about the life and the health of the mother, you don't come to the Senate floor and argue for dangerous procedures to continue to be used that threaten health, future fertility, life and, at the same time, kill a baby that would otherwise be born alive. There is no argument here.

You will hear and see pictures of people: ''Oh, well, they needed this.'' As Dr. Hersh said and said eloquently, these people were misinformed. Look, not every doctor is a great doctor. Not every doctor knows everything, but you don't see those doctors on the record here. Where are the doctors who did all the procedures in all these cases, where have they testified that that was the only thing they could have done. They couldn't stand the light of day here. They couldn't stand the cross-examination here. They would never, never come up here and try to defend that position.

It is a sad fact that in thousands of instances every year, women are counseled, encouraged, told they have no choice but to have an abortion and do so only to find out later that some doctor either misinformed them or, frankly, was so afraid of malpractice that the doctor took the easy way out. That should never be a reason. Using bad medicine should never be a reason to keep the procedure legal. The fact that there are some doctors out there who practice bad medicine should not be a reason to keep this procedure legal.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMS). The Senator from Pennsylvania has 60 minutes remaining.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I do not want to use up all my time. I do not see anyone from the other side. I ask unanimous consent that when I ask to go into a quorum call the time be deducted from the other side's time.

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

Mr. SANTORUM. Thank you, 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. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGEL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I now yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I rise briefly to make several comments and to review a little bit some of the myth that has surrounded the debate on our attempts to ban a brutal procedure, a procedure called the partial-birth abortion.

It has been fascinating to watch where we started really about 2 years ago in the evolution of learning about this procedure, recognizing that it is performed, recognizing that it is as close to infanticide as one can possibly get in our civilization today, and to track the misinformation, the organized misinformation campaigns that have been carried out, instigated by a number of parties that have made it all the way to the Presidency of the United States of America—a misinformation campaign that I think and I hope was the reason he vetoed this ban that is so supportive in a bipartisan way by Congress, and that is clearly supported by the American people.

I give the President the benefit of the doubt because I had the opportunity—I will refer back to it shortly, some of the statements he made in his press conference and the people he brought forward. But since that time—I guess that is what I am excited about—people have come forward and said, even the people who are providing this information, it was a misinformation campaign. People said they lied through their teeth in giving that information to the American people.

But, in spite of all that, the truth has finally bubbled to the surface. It has bubbled to the surface on the floor of the U.S. Senate and in the House of Representatives, but also throughout the media. Discussions have taken place in hospitals. Discussions have taken place among the organized medical groups. We all recognize that whether it is ACOG, the group of obstetricians and gynecologists, or the American Medical Association, which represents all physicians, that none of these organizations really speak for everybody. But when you put it altogether—and it has been put together, mixed up, dissected and looked at—gradually it is beginning to crystallize in a very clear way. And I think it is worth talking about a little bit on the floor of the U.S. Senate once again.

On a momentous occasion yesterday, after 2 years of looking at the issue, the American Medical Association essentially said that restricting this procedure is something that should be done by the American people and by the U.S. Congress. Again, this is after a lot of debate, a lot of discussion, and a lot of examination of the facts within the medical community, with the American people, by ethicists and by religious communities. There is a mass movement to ban this brutal procedure which offends the sensibilities of every American, everybody in our civilization today. This procedure, when described, offends their sensibilities.

I mentioned the American Medical Association. Again, the American Medical Association, the largest physician group in the country, issued a letter yesterday that said really—let me refer to the letter. This is the letter in its entirety. It was written to Senator SANTORUM, who, obviously, has done a wonderful job, an outstanding job, in helping America understand what the significance of this ban is.

I will go through the letter. The key sentence is the last sentence. It basically says, "Thank you, for the opportunity"—remember, this is from John Seward, from the American Medical Association, representing their conclusions.

It says: "Thank you for the opportunity to work with you towards restricting a procedure we all agree is not good medicine."

I guess a sentence like that does lead me to question how the President of the United States could continually, every day, hide behind a threat of a veto talking about the health of women, because for health of women we have to look at the American Medical Association, which represents obstetricians, gynecologists, family practitioners, internists, cancer specialists, heart disease—all of these groups of people focus on their No. 1 goal, which is to promote the health of this Nation, the health of individuals.

Then to have the President stand up and hide behind this veiled threat of a veto having to do with health is a juxtaposition which I don't understand. I hope the President, after we deliver this bill to him, will recognize what health of individuals really is. I am talking about health, not just of the infant, who, in fact, is being sacrificed in this procedure, but also the health of the mother. It requires support of this ban.

The letter says:

DEAR SENATOR SANTORUM: The American Medical Association is writing to support H.R. 1122, "The Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1997," as amended * * * the AMA has supported such legislation * * *

They go on in the first paragraph to say:

Although our general policy is to oppose legislation criminalizing medical practice or procedure, the AMA has supported such legislation where the procedure was narrowly defined and not medically indicated.

Narrowly defined, which this ban is.

There was an attempt last week to take this very narrow ban, carefully proscribed—protections for the mother, protections clearly for the child, protections for the medical profession. An attempt was made last week to push that aside with a much broader issue that needs to be continually debated. But now we are back on the narrow definition.

The AMA says it is not medically indicated, not medically indicated, not just for the baby but for the mother. It is not medically indicated, according to the American Medical Association, the largest organization representing more physicians than anyone in the United States of America.

The second paragraph outlines the three principles that, after much discussion and much debate within the AMA, were agreed to:

First, the bill would allow a legitimate exception where the life of the mother was endangered, thereby preserving the physician's judgment to take any medically necessary steps to save the life of the mother.

For the life of the mother, any steps can be taken, spelled out very clearly in the bill:

Second, the bill would clearly define the prohibited procedure so that it is clear on the face of the legislation what act is to be banned.

The attempt was made last week to ban all abortions, and that needs to be debated. But this bans a very specific procedure—a procedure, I might add, that is performed quite frequently around the country but tends to be performed in abortion clinics, many times outside of peer review of other physicians, very rarely in the hospital where you have nurses around to ask questions, and when you have other physicians around or hospital administrators asking, "What is the ethics of a procedure that so brutally sacrifices an infant upon three-fourths completion of delivery?"

No, these are performed with relatively high frequency, when you are talking about hundreds or thousands of infants that are, in fact, murdered. But they are being performed outside the peer review and, I would say, the ethics of the medical profession.

In the letter from the American Medical Association endorsing the bill, supporting the ban, it said:

Finally, the bill would give any accused physician the right to have his or her conduct reviewed by the State Medical Board before a criminal trial commenced. In this manner, the bill would provide a formal role for valuable medical peer determination in any enforcement proceeding.

I think this is important to say because as a physician I have to admit before coming to the Senate the idea that this body or the Congress would pass a law to tell me what I could or could not do in terms of what I thought was in the best interest of my patient bothered me, not this particular ban but just the idea of having somebody in Washington, DC, inside the beltway telling me how to practice medicine and then making something a criminal procedure.

It is easier as a physician to say, no, I don't want any part of anything like that, and I think that is what we were hearing from some of the medical community, a fear that they would be thrown in jail for doing what they think is right for the patient, and they didn't want this to be set as a precedent. I think this letter and the bill shows that, no, that is not what is being done. Basically, we are banning a very specific procedure that is on the fringe, and you are going to have the opportunity for peer review to know what is accepted medical practice even in the event you are accused in this manner.

Then the letter goes on.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I have another 5 minutes.

Mr. SANTORUM. I yield the Senator another 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for another 5 minutes.

Mr. FRIST. Then the final sentence, again which really summarizes it, and that is why I started with it: ''Thank you for the opportunity of working with you toward restricting a procedure we all agree is not good medicine.''

I am proud that as Americans we have not lost our ability to discern what is right from what is wrong, and despite the vim of the well-worn rhetoric that we have heard broadly in the media and on the floor in the past, we now have listened to our hearts and we know that nothing can justify a procedure such as this one that is a mere 3 inches—a mere 3 inches—from criminal infanticide.

Several myths. Myth No. 1. Partial-birth abortion is necessary to preserve the health of the mother. It has been used again and again. The President of the United States continued to use it yesterday; I am sure he will say something about it today until this bill is delivered to him.

December 13, 1996. President Clinton described a hypothetical situation where without a partial-birth abortion a woman could not—and I use quotations here—''preserve the ability to have further children.'' He said that he would not, using his words again, ''tell her that I am signing a law which will prevent her from having another child. I am not going to do it,'' said the President.

That is heart wrenching. When you see just that clip, we tend to empathsize with what the President is saying. But the bottom line is partial-birth abortion is never ever necessary to preserve the health of a woman. The College of Obstetrics and Gynecology has issued a statement that said they ''could identify no circumstance under which this procedure would be the only option to save the life or preserve the health of the mother.'' There are always—always—other procedures that will preserve the health of the mother.

The AMA task force convened on this issue also concluded, ''There does not appear to be any identified situation in which intact D&X is the only appropriate procedure to induce abortion.''

Thus, even if there are health reasons—and health is defined very, very broadly—even if there are health reasons, there are other safer procedures for the mother.

Myth No. 2. It goes like this. The D&X procedure, partial-birth abortion, is a rare and difficult medical procedure. It is usually performed only in extreme cases to save the life of the woman or in cases of severe fetal abnormalities.

Well, again, it is just not true. If we look to what Ronald Fitzsimmons said, executive director of the National Coalition of Abortion Providers, Mr. Fitzsimmons, I think, has shown amazing integrity in coming forward when he said that he admits he—I am using his words—lied through his teeth when he said partial-birth abortion was rarely used or only on women whose lives were in danger.

In a recent American Medical News article he explained that he could not justify lying to the American people any longer saying—and remember, he was an advocate; he opposed the ban initially. He said, ''They are primarily done on healthy women and healthy fetuses, and it makes you feel like a dirty little abortionist with a dirty little secret.''

It is no longer a secret. It is no longer a secret. We have talked about it in the Chamber. The media understands it. The American people understand it. It is time to ban this procedure.

Dr. James McMahon, another partial-birth abortion practitioner, testified before Congress that 80 percent of the partial-birth abortions he performed were for purely elective reasons—purely elective reasons. The examples he gave: nine babies because they had a little cleft lip, which can be easily repaired today. Many others, at least 39, he said, were aborted because of the psychological and emotional health of the mother, despite the advanced gestational age and health of the child.

So we can see that if you use a health exception, you have a huge door through which you can drive a truck and continue to perform this procedure. If you throw in a so-called health exception, as good as it sounds, it really goes back to what Doe versus Bolton in 1973, the Supreme Court case defined as health. They defined health to include ''all factors—physical, emotional, psychological, familial, and the woman's age—relative to the well-being of the patient.''

That is the big door through which, if you are an abortionist, if you do not follow the ethics of the American Medical Association or the medical profession today, you can continue to do this brutal, inhumane procedure by saying, oh, it is for the health of the mother. The mother is a bit down in the dumps because she feels like this baby must be sacrificed, and therefore I can certify and say that is the health of the mother.

Again, in Doe versus Bolton, the law of the land, the Supreme Court case in 1973 included ''all factors—physical, emotional, psychological, familial, and the woman's age—relative to the well-being of the patient.'' People in the abortion industry understand that there are many late-term abortions for social reasons as well as health reasons. It is recognized; people know it.

A 1993 National Abortion Federation internal memorandum said, ''There are many reasons why women have later abortions,'' and they include, ''Lack of money or health insurance, social psychological crisis, lack of knowledge about human reproduction.''

So when you see legislation in the Chamber allowing this procedure or even putting in amendments or supposing it should be allowed for health of the mother, just recognize, if that is the case, that anybody—anybody—can continue doing this procedure at the same rate as they do today by providing this huge loophole, which again sounds like it is not a loophole but in practice is a huge loophole. One last myth.

Mr. President, can I ask for another 5 minutes?

Mr. SANTORUM. Five additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is asking for another 5. The Senator is recognized for another 5 minutes.

Mr. FRIST. One last myth goes like this. This procedure could possibly be the best procedure in a woman's situation for her health. In other words, now people realize and they didn't really a month ago or 6 months ago, and the President may not realize it today, there are a range of procedures when, for example, it is life of the mother. But there are some people who would say this is the best procedure.

Let me just say that as a physician, as one who has taken an oath to take care of that individual who comes into the office, who comes into the room, to preserve the life and the health of every patient, I find this very discomforting. I have talked to obstetricians. We have had the quotations in the Chamber. We have consulted many. They have basically told us that this is not the best procedure, that there are other alternative procedures if there is the indication, for example, of life of the mother. Many practitioners had never heard of it. The people in Tennessee, the high-risk obstetricians whom I have talked to across the State of Tennessee, they have not performed this procedure and many have not heard of this procedure.

Remember, this procedure was fashioned, described—in fact, the only article in the literature that we can really find describing it so it can be presented among other people is from Dr. Haskell, who is not an obstetrician. He is not a board certified obstetrician but, rather, a family-practice medical doctor. These procedures are being performed but not endorsed, not the procedure. Nothing from the obstetrics and gynecologic association has come out and said we support this procedure.

Now, when people say, well, it could be the best or it could not be the best, that is that noncommittal approach that some physicians have taken. And why? Because there is this great fear that big brother Government, the Federal Government is going to come down and jump into that doctor-patient relationship and tell us what we can or cannot do. That is the fear physicians have. Remember, this bill takes one brutal, unaccepted procedure in the medical profession and bans it.

Let me just recap and then I will close, Mr. President. We have a brutal, basically repulsive procedure that is specifically designed to kill a living infant outside the birth canal except for the head, specifically designed to kill a living infant outside of the birth canal with only the head remaining inside. The leading providers of women's obstetrical and gynecological services condemn it. They recommend that it not be used. They refuse to endorse it. They highlight its risks for the mother and say that there are other safe and equally effective alternatives available.

I guess I can understand some of the reasons why those practitioners, or a few of them, urge us not to ban it. They say it would be violating the sanctity of the physician-patient relationship. Mr. President, as a physician, as one who has taken the same oath to preserve the health and the life of others, and I also say as a father, I submit that any provider who performs this partial-birth abortion procedure has already violated that sanctity, that sanctity of the physician-patient relationship. The AMA, in essence, has said that when they say they appreciate the opportunity to work with us toward restricting a procedure which all agree is not good medicine. Partial-birth abortions cannot and should not be categorized with other medical procedures. They should not be allowed in a civilized country.

With the reintroduction of the partial-birth abortion ban legislation in the Senate, we have the opportunity right now to right a wrong. Now, once again, the American people are calling upon us to listen not to our political advisers, not to listen to the various interest groups that come forward but to listen to our conscience. It is going to take moral courage to stop propaganda which is going to continue to come forward. It is going to take moral courage to make sure that good information makes it all the way to the President of the United States when he has to decide whether or not to veto this piece of good legislation. But we all, including the President, have at our disposal today the information with which to do the right thing.

So for the sake of women, and I think women especially, for the sake of their children, and really for the sake of our society, our society as a future civilization, we must put a stop once and for all to partial-birth abortion. I support the ban and urge all of my colleagues today, when we vote in several hours, to support the ban, and I urge the President not to veto this very good piece of legislation.

Mr. SANTORUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Tennessee for his terrific statement, as always. He has been on the floor for the past several days debating this issue from a position of authority, I might add, as the only physician in the Senate. But I also thank him for his tremendous work in working with me and Representative CANADY and the AMA to come up with the language changes that were necessary to secure this very important endorsement of the medical community. He was right on the frontlines working to make sure that happened, and he made a great contribution to the debate on this whole issue, whether or not we get enough votes in the Senate today, of consciousness of the American public, and I thank him for that.

Mr. President, I do not have a speaker here at this point, so I ask unanimous consent again that when I suggest the absence of a quorum, the time be deducted from the Democratic side.

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. SANTORUM. 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. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act. As the recent debate on this issue illustrates, this is not simply an issue of a woman's ''right to choose'' whether or not to have a child. It is also an issue of protecting the life of an unborn child. However much we may disagree about whether life begins at conception, when it comes to late term abortions, we are clearly talking about a baby. And therefore, it is entirely reasonable to place restrictions on such abortions, especially when the procedure in question is as barbaric—and as unnecessary—as this one.

Last September 26, when the Senate was debating whether or not to override President Clinton's veto of this measure, the Wall Street Journal made the same point in this way:

> Up till now the abortion debate, if you'll pardon the metaphor, has managed to ignore the 800-pound gorilla in the room. For the first time, people are also talking about the fetus, not about women alone. A fetus may or may not be human, but on the other hand, it's not nothing. At 20 weeks of gestation, when the partial-birth abortion debate begins, a fetus is about nine inches long and is clearly becoming human.

Opponents of the effort to ban this procedure based their argument largely on claims about the relative safety and medical necessity of this procedure which we now know to be false. We all know by now about the admission by Ron Fitzsimmons, executive director of the National Coalition of Abortion Providers, that he lied through [his] teeth about the frequency of and justification for this procedure. And even the doctor who invented the procedure has admitted that 80 percent of these procedures he has performed were purely elective. In other words, they were not performed to preserve either the life or the health of the mother.

Mr. President, the majority of Americans agree that abortion on demand—at any time during pregnancy, for any reason—is wrong. Even a majority of people who describe themselves as pro-choice believe it is reasonable to restrict abortion under some circumstances. It is time we decided where to draw that line. This is certainly a good place to draw it.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, H.R. 1122 would seek to ban a particular medical procedure, the intact D&X procedure. I believe we cross a dangerous threshold when we seek to legislate which particular medical procedures may be used, and which may not be used, by physicians. Dedicated doctors and nurses, through official statements of their associations, urge us not to adopt H.R. 1122, and not to politicize this issue.

The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, an organization representing 38,000 physicians whose lives are dedicated to bringing babies into the world and keeping them and their mothers safe, issued a policy statement on January 12, 1997, relative to the bill before us which states that:

> An intact D&X may be the best or most appropriate procedure in a particular circumstance to save the life or preserve the health of a woman, and only the doctor, in

consultation with the patient, based upon the woman's particular circumstances can make this decision. The potential exists that legislation prohibiting specified medical practices, such as intact D&X, may outlaw techniques that are critical to the lives and health of American women. The intervention of legislative bodies into medical decision making is inappropriate, ill advised and dangerous.

Their position was reiterated yesterday. I ask unanimous consent that their letter dated May 19, 1997, be printed in the RECORD.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LEVIN. The president of the American Medical Women's Association, Inc., in a March 10, 1997, letter, wrote the following on behalf of more than 10,000 women physicians and medical students nationwide,

I would like to register our strong opposition to . . . [S. 6], which seek(s) to outlaw intact D&E. . . .We do not believe that the federal government should dictate the decisions of physicians and feel that passage of this legislation would in effect prescribe the medical procedures to be used by physicians rather than allow physicians to use their medical judgment in determining the most appropriate treatment for their patients. The passage of this legislation would set a dangerous precedent—undermining the ability of physicians to make medical decisions. It is medical professionals, not the President or Congress, who should determine appropriate medical options.

Their position was reiterated today. I ask unanimous consent that their letter dated May 20, 1997, be printed in the RECORD.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. LEVIN. The Executive Director of the American Nurses Association, wrote to me in November, 1995, and stated:

It is the view of the American Nurses Association that this proposal would involve an inappropriate intrusion of the federal government into a therapeutic decision that should be left in the hands of a pregnant woman and her health care provider. ANA has long supported freedom of choice and equitable access of all women to basic health services, including services related to reproductive health. This legislation would impose a significant barrier to those principles.

It is inappropriate for Congress to mandate a course of action for a woman who is already faced with an intensely personal and difficult decision. This procedure can mean the difference between life and death for a woman.

The American Nurses Association is the only full-service professional organization representing the nation's 2.2 million Registered Nurses through its 53 constituent associations. ANA advances the nursing profession by fostering high standards of nursing practice, promoting the economic and general welfare of nurses in the workplace, projecting a positive and realistic view of nursing, and by lobbying the Congress and regulatory agencies on health care issues affecting nurses and the public.

Their position was reiterated today. I ask unanimous consent that their letter dated May 20, 1997, be printed in the RECORD.

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

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. LEVIN. I have other concerns with this bill as well. For example, while banning one abortion procedure, this bill leaves legal other abortion procedures which can be used, procedures which are just as destructive to the fetus but which could be less safe for the mother.

The Supreme Court has held that States may not ban pre-viability abortions but may ban post-viability abortions except when necessary to protect a woman's life or health. The bill under consideration would ban certain pre-viability abortions, and it does not allow for an exception required by the Supreme Court to preserve a woman's health relative to post-viability abortions.

Mr. President, in summary, the bill before us ignores the strong advice of the specialists and nurses acting officially through their associations. The bill before us violates Supreme Court opinions. The bill would risk the health of a mother while not preventing one abortion. We are usurping in this bill medical judgments relative to individual women, in perhaps the most dire and tragic circumstances they will ever face. This is not the way legislators should create crimes.

EXHIBIT 1

THE AMERICAN COLLEGE OF OBSTETRICIANS AND GYNECOLOGISTS,
Washington, DC, May 19, 1997.

Hon. TRENT LOTT,
Senate Majority Leader
Washington, DC

DEAR SENATOR LOTT: In light of the slight modifications being proposed to HR 1122, the ''Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1997,'' we wanted to take this opportunity to reiterate our opposition to this legislation. Our statement on this issue is attached.

Sincerely,

RALPH W. HALE, *MD*,
Executive Director.

EXHIBIT 2

AMERICAN MEDICAL WOMEN'S ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Alexandria, VA, May 20, 1997.

Hon. RICK SANTORUM,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SANTORUM: On behalf of the American Medical Women's Association (AMWA), I would like to reiterate our opposition to H.R. 1122, the so-called ''Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1997,'' as amended. AMWA does not endorse legislation which interferes with medical decisionmaking, particularly when it fails to consider the health of the woman patient.

Our opposition to this legislation is based on the following issues. First, we are gravely concerned that this legislation does not protect a women's physical and mental health, including future fertility, or consider other pertinent issues such as fetal abnormalities. Second, this legislation would further erode physician-patient autonomy forcing physicians to always avoid legislatively prohibited procedures in medical decisionmaking, including in emergency situations when physicians and patients must base their decisions on the best available information available to them. Third, medical care decisions must be left to the judgment of a woman and her physician without fear of civil action or criminal prosecution. We do not support the levying of civil and criminal penalties for care provided in the best interest of the women patient.

AMWA remains committed to ensuring that physicians retain authority to make medical and surgical care decisions that are in the best interest of their patients given the information available to them.

Sincerely,

DEBRA R. JUDELSON, *MD*,
President.

EXHIBIT 3

AMERICAN NURSES ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, May 20, 1997.

Hon. BARBARA BOXER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BOXER: I am writing to reiterate the opposition of the American Nurses Association to H.R. 1122, the ''Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1997'', which is being considered by the Senate this week. This legislation would impose Federal criminal penalties and provide for civil actions against health care providers who perform certain late-term abortions.

* * * * *

Sincerely,

GERI MARULLO, *MSN, RN*,
Executive Director.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the Santorum bill. I oppose this bill for three reasons. First of all, it will not stop a single abortion from occurring. Second, it is unconstitutional. Finally, it does not provide any protection for a woman whose health is grievously threatened by the pregnancy.

I want to ban all post-viability abortions, not a particular procedure. I believe the only time an abortion should be allowed after the point of viability is when the woman's life is threatened or her health is at serious risk of substantial impairment.

I supported the Daschle alternative. The Daschle alternative would have meant fewer abortions. It banned all abortions once a fetus had achieved viability. In other words, once a fetus could survive outside the womb—with or without life support—a woman could not obtain an abortion.

It provided only two exceptions: first, when the woman's life was threatened by continuing the pregnancy, and second, when she was at risk of grievous injury to her health. If the Daschle alternative had been adopted there would be fewer abortions.

The bill before us bans one procedure. It does not ban one single abortion. It bans a method of abortion. It enables a doctor to choose any other abortion procedure—even ones that might cause a greater health risk to the woman. So no abortions would be stopped by this bill.

I want to support a bill that is constitutionally acceptable. The bill before us fails the test of constitutionality. The Supreme Court has always insisted that prior to the point of viability, the woman's right to abortion is constitutionally protected. This bill infringes on that right by banning a procedure even before viability.

The Supreme Court has also held that in any legislation restricting abortion, the woman's life and health must be protected. A physician must place the woman's health as the paramount concern. There can be no trade off of the woman's life and health for that of the fetus.

By refusing to include any exception for instances where the woman's health is at risk, H.R. 1122 is constitutionally unacceptable. The Daschle alternative, on the other hand, was respectful of the requirements of the Constitution. It focused only on abortion procedures after the point of viability. And it ensured that a woman's health could be protected.

I want to support legislation that provides for the health of the woman. I know that health of the woman is viewed by some as merely a loophole. But even those who hold that view must acknowledge that there are medical crises that arise during pregnancy that could cause profound harm to a woman's health.

Conditions like severe hypertension or peripartal cardiomyopathy are caused by the pregnancy itself. These can lead to organ failure or put a woman at risk of cardiac failure. Other conditions, like leukemia or breast cancer, cannot receive the aggressive treatment they require so long as the pregnancy continues.

I don't believe that anyone would argue that these are minor health problems. Yet the Santorum bill does not allow any health exception for women facing these major health threats.

The Daschle alternative, on the other hand, did provide a carefully crafted exception for the woman's health. It said that a physician could abort a viable fetus when the pregnancy would ''threaten the mother's life or risk grievous injury to her physical health.'' Grievous injury was narrowly defined to include only the most debilitating problems caused by the pregnancy itself and cases where the pregnancy caused an inability to treat a life-threatening condition. It required that such conditions be medically diagnosable, and ruled out any condition for which termination of the pregnancy was not medically indicated.

This was not loophole shopping. This was a serious, careful, intellectually rigorous effort to deal with the realities of women's health and women's lives.

I was proud to support the Daschle alternative. I was disappointed that it did not receive broader support. It would have prevented abortions. It was respectful of the Constitution. It safeguarded women's health.

I am disappointed that the American Medical Association has chosen to endorse this bill. I am particularly troubled that their decision seems to be based not on what is best for women's health but on what is best for doctors. The changes they sought in the bill were designed only to protect a physician from legal endangerment.

The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, on the other hand, endorsed the Daschle alternative. They represent 38,000 physicians who are experts in women's health and issues related to pregnancy. They endorsed the Daschle alternative because it would have provided a meaningful ban while assuring women's health is protected.

Let me say that I do not for one moment question the sincerity of those who have called and written me in support of H.R. 1122. They want to stop abortions, and I respect the depth of their convictions.

But let me also say that if this bill is enacted, it will be a hollow victory. I believe the Supreme Court will reject this bill as unconstitutional. In the end, even if it were somehow to pass constitutional muster, it will not stop a single abortion. It will merely divert physicians to other abortion procedures.

So this bill will not save lives. It will not save the lives and health of women. And it will not save the lives of fetuses. It is a hollow victory indeed.

I will oppose this measure.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, today we will vote on the legislation offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] to ban the dilation and extraction, or D&X, procedure used by doctors. I will be voting against this ban for the third time in as many years.

My reasons for opposing this legislation are many. Most have been discussed on the floor since the debate began last week. First, and most importantly I believe that this bill undermines the Supreme Court's decision in Roe versus Wade to leave these critical matters in the hands of a woman, her family, and their doctor. The pending legislation is an effort to chip away at these reproductive rights established in that 1973 decision and upheld by court cases since 1973. I understand many people disagree with my position. This issue has been contentious since I came to Congress in 1975.

Second, with the Roe decision, the Supreme Court wisely gave States the responsibility to restrict third-trimester abortions, so long as the life or health of the mother were not jeopardized. As of 1997, all but nine States have done so. To me, the rights of States to regulate abortions, when the life or health of the mother are not in danger, is an adequate safeguard. In the event the States pass unconstitutional regulations on this point, the appropriate remedy is with the courts. I realize that this policy leads to differences in law from State to State, but just as families differ, so too do States. As I said during debate on this topic in 1995:

> When the Roe versus Wade decision acknowledged a state interest in fetuses after viability, the Court wisely left restrictions on post-viability abortions up to states. There are expert professional licensing boards, accreditation councils and medical associations that guide doctors' decision-making in the complicated and difficult matters of life and death.

Nothing has changed since then. My reasons for voting against Senator DASCHLE's substitute amendment last week included this very principle: That Congress should not restrict those reproductive health decisions made by a woman and her doctor.

Third, the legislation before us would prevent doctors from using the D&X procedure where it is necessary to save the life of the mother. This clearly goes against the holding of the Supreme Court in Roe, as it required the health of the mother be safeguarded when States regulate late-term abortions. I will not vote for a bill that is neither constitutional, nor takes into account those situations where carrying a fetus to term would cause serious health risk for the mother. This is simply unacceptable. My vote in favor of the Feinstein substitute amendment underscored my commitment to safeguarding a doctor's options to protect the health of the mother in cases where a late-term procedure is necessary.

Finally, I believe that women who choose to undergo a D&X procedure do so for grave reasons. If there are women who abort to fit into their prom dress, I trust the States to regulate these incidents—if they do, in fact, occur. We have established a delicate legal framework in which to address late-term abortions and we should not shift the decisionmaking to the Federal Government.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1122, the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1997.

Mr. President, it has been nearly 2 years since I first introduced the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act in the Senate. At that time, only my distinguished colleague, Senator GRAMM of Texas, joined me as an original cosponsor. We have come a long, long way since that time. We are not there yet, but we have made tremendous progress.

When the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act first passed the Senate on December 7, 1995, it did so with the support of 54 Senators. When the Senate voted on whether to override President Clinton's veto of the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act on September 26, 1996, 57 Senators voted in favor of the bill.

Today, we believe that we have at least 62 Senators who are prepared to vote for this legislation. We remain several votes short of the 67 votes that we will need to override President Clinton's promised veto of this bill, but we are getting closer. I am hopeful that in the wake of yesterday's dramatic announcement that the American Medical Association has endorsed the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1997, we will get there.

Mr. President, one of the principal reasons why we are making so much progress in the Senate toward our goal of outlawing partial-birth abortion is that more and more Senators are realizing that the opposition to this bill in the last Congress was built on a foundation of lies. When I use the word ''lies,'' Mr. President, I am using the very word that one of the Nation's leading abortion industry lobbyists—Ron Fitzsimmons—used when he publicly admitted earlier this year that he ''lied through [his] teeth'' when he helped orchestrate the campaign against the partial-birth abortion ban legislation in the last Congress.

In an interview published in the New York Times on February 27, 1997, and in an article published in the American Medical News on March 3, 1997, Mr. Fitzsimmons made the surprisingly candid admission that he had ''lied'' when he claimed that partial-birth abortions are rare. In those same interviews, Mr. Fitzsimmons also conceded that he ''lied'' when he claimed that partial-birth abortions are performed only on women whose lives are endangered or whose unborn children are severely disabled. ''It made me physically ill,'' Mr. Fitzsimmons told his interviewer. ''I told my wife the next day, 'I can't do this again.' ''

In seeking to justify his veto of the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act last year, the New York Times points out, ''President Clinton echoed the argument of Mr. Fitzsimmons.'' In other words, in justifying his veto, Mr. Clinton relied on the same statements of ''fact'' that have now been conceded by a key leader of the abortion industry to be ''lies.''

The truth, Mr. Fitzsimmons told the New York Times, is that ''[i]n the vast majority of cases, the [partial-birth abortion] procedure is performed on a healthy mother with a healthy fetus that is 20 or more weeks along.'' And, as Mr. Fitzsimmons told the American Medical News, ''[t]he abortion-rights folks know it, the anti-abortion folks know it, and so, probably, does everybody else.'' Except, Mr. Fitzsimmons might have added, for President Clinton, who still promises to veto this bill even though the reasons he gave to justify his previous veto have turned out to be ''lies.''

Mr. President, following Mr. Fitzsimmons's startling revelations, on March 4, 1997, the Washington Post ran an unusually blunt editorial entitled ''Lies and Late-Term Abortions.'' After recounting Mr. Fitzsimmons' lies and his candid admissions that he lied, the Post editorial drew the following conclusion:

> Mr. Fitzsimmons's revelation is a sharp blow to the credibility of his allies. These late-term abortions are extremely difficult to justify, if they can be justified at all. Usually pro-choice legislators such as Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan and Representatives Richard Gephardt and Susan Molinari voted for the ban last year. Opponents of the ban fought hard, even demanding a roll call vote on their motion to ban charts describing the procedure from the House floor. They lost. And they lost by wide margins when the House and Senate voted for the ban. They probably will lose again this year when the ban is reconsidered. And this time, Mr. Clinton will be hard-pressed to justify a veto on the basis of the misinformation on which he rested his case last time.

There you have it, Mr. President. One of the abortion industry's most prominent leaders has admitted that the case against the partial-birth abortion ban was based on ''lies.'' Not my word, his word—''lies.'' The New York Times points out that in attempting to justify his veto of the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act, President Clinton ''echoed'' those lies. And the Washington Post points out, in a great understatement, that President Clinton will be ''hard-pressed'' to base another veto on Mr. Fitzsimmons's and his friends' ''misinformation.''

Pulitzer Prize-winning columnist George Will drew the following conclusion in an opinion article published on April 24, 1997, in the Washington Post:

> The accusation that President Clinton cares deeply about nothing is refuted by his tenacious and guileful battle to prevent any meaningful limits on the form of infanticide known as partial-birth abortion. However, that battle proves that his professed desire to make abortion ''rare'' applies only to the fourth trimester of pregnancies.

Mr. President, even though President Clinton seems bound and determined not to take another look at his stand on partial-birth abortion even in the face of Mr. Fitzsimmons's stunning admissions, I urge my colleagues who voted against this bill in the last Congress to do just that—take another look. Many, if not most, of you voted against this bill because you believed Mr. Fitzsimmons and his friends when they told you that partial-birth abortions are rare and they are only done on women facing grave physical threats or whose unborn children are hopelessly deformed. I urge you to take another look, reconsider your position, and on reconsideration, support us. Partial-birth abortions aren't ''rare''—they're common—and they are done, in the overwhelming majority of cases, on perfectly healthy women with perfectly healthy unborn children.

Mr. President, aside from the Fitzsimmons revelations, I believe that another reason why the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act continues to attract greater and greater support in the Senate is that Senators are coming to realize that this issue really transcends abortion. Indeed, as one Senator who did not vote for this bill the first time, but supported us on the veto override last year, Senator MOYNIHAN, put it, partial-birth abortion is ''too close to infanticide.'' That was a starkly truthful way to put it, Mr. President, and it took courage for Senator MOYNIHAN to say it. I commend him for it.

Mr. President, another Senator who did not support this bill the first time around, but who also joined us on the veto override vote, Senator SPECTER, also believes that partial-birth abortion is more like infanticide than it is abortion. Listen to what Senator SPECTER had to say on the Senate floor on September 26, 1996. ''In my legal judgment,'' Senator SPECTER said, ''the medical act or acts of commission or omission in interfering with, or not facilitating the completion of a live birth after a child is partially out of the mother's womb constitute infanticide.'' ''The line of the law is drawn, in my legal judgment,'' Senator SPECTER concluded, ''when the child is partially out of the womb of the mother. It is no longer abortion; it is infanticide.''

Once again, Mr. President, those are strong words and they are truthful words. Senator SPECTER is a pro-choice Senator, and it took courage for him to support this bill. But he did so, again, Mr. President, because he recognized that partial-birth abortion is more like infanticide than it is abortion.

So, Mr. President, we are steadily picking up more and more support in the Senate because, as I have argued here today, more and more Senators are realizing that the case against this bill was built on a foundation of what are now conceded to have been ''lies.'' We are also picking up greater and greater support because more and more Senators are realizing that this issue transcends abortion—that the tiny little human being whom we are talking about is a partially born baby who is just inches from drawing her first breath.

To those Senators who are still considering joining the ever-increasing majority of Senators who support the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act, let me address a few more comments to you. Perhaps the Nation's most respected and revered doctor—''America's Doctor''—is the former Surgeon General of the United States, C. Everett Koop. I am particularly proud of Dr. Koop because he is a part-time resident of my home State of New Hampshire.

This is what Dr. Koop has to say: ''Partial-birth abortion is never medically necessary to protect a mother's health or future fertility. On the contrary, this procedure can pose a significant threat to both her immediate health and future fertility.'' We all know that Dr. Koop is not a man who uses words lightly. On the contrary, Dr. Koop is a doctor who chooses his words with care and precision. Listen to those words again: ''Partial-birth abortion is never medically necessary to protect a mother's health or future fertility.''

Now, of course, Mr. President, as I mentioned earlier, even the American Medical Association, which is pro-choice on abortion, has endorsed the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act. So, my colleagues, if you are worried about protecting women, listen to the words of Dr. Koop and listen to the American Medical Association. They are for the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act because partial-birth abortion is never necessary to protect a woman's health.

Finally, Mr. President, I urge my colleagues who are still undecided about this bill to look at it in light of our beloved Nation's history. We all know those beautiful and majestic words that Thomas Jefferson wrote for our Declaration of Independence: ''We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of happiness.''

Mr. President, one does not have to agree with my view that human life begins at conception to see that a living baby who is in the process of being born has, in Jefferson's words, been endowed by her creator with the unalienable right to life. Can anyone seriously doubt where that great American, Thomas Jefferson, would stand on that question?

Mr. President, another of America's greatest leaders, Abraham Lincoln, made one of the most dramatic and prophetic statements of his life in a speech that he delivered on June 16, 1858. In that speech, Abraham Lincoln said ''I believe this government cannot endure permanently, half slave and half free.'' Today, Mr. President, as we debate this Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act in this great Capitol of the Union that Lincoln saved, I would say this: The moral foundation of this Government cannot endure permanently when even the half born are not free to live. Can anyone, Mr. President, really doubt where that moral giant, Abraham Lincoln, would have stood on the question before us here today?

Mr. President, let us rise to the moral level to which our Nation's history calls us. Let us recognize the unalienable, God-given right to life of the partially born. Let us protect the partially born from a brutal death. Let us be worthy of the Nation that Jefferson helped create and that Lincoln surely saved. Let us pass the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act with a two-thirds' majority in the Senate and then dare President Clinton to turn his back on the moral legacy of Jefferson and Lincoln.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, from the time that I first became involved in national politics, it has seemed to me that, for mature adults, under most circumstances, the law was not an appropriate method of determining what are ultimately moral choices for the people most intimately involved with those choices. I believe that my views probably reflect those of a majority of the American people who believe that this should be a matter of an individual woman's choice and that of close family—under most cases.

But, Mr. President, when we talk about late-term abortion and when we speak specifically about partial-birth abortion, we are not dealing with most cases. I think it is clear that the majority of the American people, as they have come increasingly to understand exactly what this procedure is, are horrified by it.

I have been disturbed by the nature of this debate, by the intentional deceit and misinformation about the frequency and necessity of this practice. Only recently, have the opponents of this ban have admitted ''lying through their teeth'' about the facts on the number of partial-birth abortions performed and grounds for this horrific procedure.

It is clear, Mr. President that this practice is not necessary. Just last week, the American Medical Association Board of Trustees said there is ''no identified situation'' that requires the use of this procedure and as of yesterday, endorsed this bill. The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists state that there are ''no circumstances under which this procedure would be the only option to save the life of the mother''.

This is a practice that is not compassionate, nor is it within the bounds of civilized or humane behavior. My colleagues have described it in detail, and I don't need to repeat that detail. But I do think that it is significant that those who oppose this bill generally speaking, talk in circumlocution, disguise the language, resist and object not only to a description of the procedure itself, but even to the title-partial-birth abortion. They speak about slippery slopes rather than the procedure itself and attempt to avoid the true brutality and extreme nature of the procedure.

It is simple, this procedure is brutal, inhumane and clearly unnecessary. This vote will be a defining issue about our own society, about our feelings for indifference to brutality, about violence, about uncivilized, inhumane behavior. For all of those reasons, Mr. President, I am convinced that we should pass the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act, and I deeply hope that a sufficient majority of my colleagues will vote to do that.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, once again we find ourselves addressing the very difficult and emotional issue of partial-birth abortion. The bill the Senate is considering today would criminalize the performance of the partial-birth abortion procedure, unless it is necessary to save the life of the mother. I still have many unanswered questions about this matter, and, as I have indicated in the past, I am extremely hesitant to thrust the Congress into the role of the physician. I am concerned that this measure seemingly ignores the Supreme Court's determinations regarding the role of the state in banning abortions pre- and post-viability and with regard to the health of the mother. I have also noted concerns that this might be the first step in a process which may lead Congress to play the role of doctor again and again and again on specific medical procedures.

As in the past, I have given this issue a great deal of thought and I have particularly considered the new information brought to light by Ron Fitzsimmons of the National Coalition of Abortion Providers. His remarks made clear that this particular procedure is performed far more often than originally thought and not just under certain extreme circumstances which severely threaten the life and the health of the mother. In addition, an endorsement of the ban by the American Medical Association (AMA), which represents a large number of our Nation's doctors, certainly allays some of my earlier concerns about this measure. In previous votes, I had opposed banning this specific procedure; however, in light of the fact that it is not as rare as some claimed and that there appear to be other alternatives, I cannot, in good conscience, continue to oppose a ban on this specific procedure.

Due to my concern about the serious health risk to the mother that can, unfortunately, occur during pregnancy, I voted in support of the alternative measure offered by Senator DASCHLE. I believe that the Daschle amendment would have been more effective in addressing warranted concerns about post-viability abortions while ensuring that severe, serious health risks to the mother are taken into account. However, that amendment was rejected by the Senate.

Like so many West Virginians and Americans who have heard about this specific procedure, I find it extremely disturbing. Mr. President, I will cast my vote in support of H.R. 1122 to ban the partial-birth abortion procedure that is done in too many questionable circumstances.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1997. Let me first begin by stating that an abundance of misinformation has characterized the debate on the partial-birth abortion procedure. I am deeply troubled at how abortion activists have misled the American public, Members of Congress, and especially the President, on the number of partial-birth abortions performed each year and the reasons for them.

The debate on this issue reminds me of a variation of the old courtroom saying: If you have the facts, then argue the facts. If you have the law, then argue the law. If you have neither the law or the facts, then don't tell the truth.

The proponents of the partial-birth abortion have neither the facts nor the law, so they argue with lies.

Ron Fitzsimmons, the executive director of the National Coalition of Abortion Providers, which represents approximately 200 independently owned abortion clinics across the country, recently admitted in February of this year, that he ''lied'' through his teeth when he said that the procedure was used rarely and only on women whose lives were in danger or whose fetuses were damaged. According to Mr. Fitzsimmons, he ''spouted the party line'' about the procedure—even though he believed his statements were wrong.

In debating a procedure as grotesque as the partial-birth abortion, the facts regarding its use and necessity are important. Because the facts about this procedure are so damaging, pro-abortionists like Mr. Fitzsimmons, have tried to distort or withhold facts from the American people. Let me highlight some of the mistruths that have surrounded this issue.

Proponents of the partial-birth abortion claim that the procedure is rare—only occurring about 500 to 600 times a year. However this is not true. The number of partial-birth abortions is closer to 4,000 to 5,000 a year. In New Jersey alone, at least 1,500 procedures are done each year.

Proponents of the partial-birth abortion also claim that the procedure is necessary to save the life or health of the mother. This is not true. According to the more than 600 doctors nationwide who make up the Physicians' Ad-hoc Coalition for Truth, it is never medically necessary to kill an unborn child in the second or third trimester of pregnancy in order to protect the life, health, or future fertility of the mother. Former Surgeon General C. Everett Koop has stated that the ''partial-birth abortion is never necessary to protect a mother's health or her future fertility.'' Even the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists has admitted that there are ''no circumstances under which this procedure would be the only option to save the life of the mother and preserve the health of the woman.''

The fact is that partial-birth abortions are elective and not performed for medical reasons. As one abortion doctor stated most of the abortions were performed on women who didn't realize, or didn't care how far along they were.

Proponents of partial-birth abortion fail to mention that the 3-day-long procedure actually increases the risk of harm to the mother. After 21 weeks, an abortion is two times as risky for the mother as childbirth.

Finally, proponents of the partial-birth abortion claim it is used only in extreme cases of fetal abnormality. This is not true. Mr. Fitzsimmons admitted that the majority of these procedures are performed on healthy fetuses and healthy mothers. In a March 3, 1997, article in American Medical News, Mr. Fitzsimmons admitted that he called around to doctors who performed the procedure. According to Mr. Fitzsimmons, ''I learned right away that this was being done for the most part in cases that did not involve those extreme circumstances.''

It is disheartening that the debate on this issue has been so clouded by misinformation. The simple truth is that partial-birth abortions are common and the majority of the procedures are performed on healthy mothers and babies.

On an issue as emotionally charged and divisive as abortion, elected officials have a heightened responsibility to carefully gather the facts and to vote their consciences.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I will vote against H.R. 1122, the so-called partial-birth abortion bill that would outlaw a particular abortion procedure, the intact dilation and extraction, sometimes called intact D&E. I do support a ban on post-viability abortions, if it contains important and constitutionally required exceptions to protect the life and health of the woman. I am disappointed that the proponents of H.R. 1122 have steadfastly refused to accept any amendment, no matter how tightly crafted, which would include provisions to protect women's health.

I have said repeatedly here on the floor of the Senate, during hearings in the Judiciary Committee, and at listening sessions held across the State of Wisconsin that I believe that a law to ban this controversial procedure could have been enacted last year with one simple addition—an exception that would allow physicians to perform the procedure on women whose health is at risk. Such an exception, in combination with the bill's existing exception to save the life of the woman, is an important and necessary provision. I am sensitive to the fears of the bill's proponents that such an exception could prove to be a major loophole, and I agree that the health exception should be narrow. But it needs to be there.

Let me remind my colleagues that the Supreme Court has clearly ruled that, although States have the right to restrict post-viability abortions, exceptions must always be made to protect the life and health of the mother. Women cannot be required to trade off their well-being in order to increase the likelihood of fetal survival.

Last Thursday, I voted for the bipartisan alternative amendment to H.R. 1122 introduced by Senator DASCHLE and others. I voted for this amendment because it took a comprehensive approach to banning abortions on viable fetuses, rather than merely banning a single procedure. In addition, Mr. President, this amendment contained the critical, constitutionally necessary exception to protect the life and health of the woman.

I believe that the health exception in the Daschle amendment was sufficiently narrow to satisfy most reasonable people's concerns about creating a loophole in the law. It would have required a physician to certify that continuation of the pregnancy would threaten the woman's life or risk grievous injury to her physical health. Grievous injury was defined in the amendment as a severely debilitating disease or impairment specifically caused by the pregnancy, or an inability to provide necessary treatment for a life threatening condition.

The other side claims that abortion is never necessary to protect a woman's health. But Mr. President, I have met women whose doctors believed differently. The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists supports them, and has stated that although the intact D&E procedure is never the only option to save a woman's life or preserve her health, it sometimes may be the best or most appropriate procedure, depending on the woman's particular circumstances.

Members on both sides of this debate can cite respected physicians who will support their positions. But precisely because I am not a doctor, I say again that it is essential to include a health exception in any bill we pass. The point is, Mr. President, that there is a dispute within the medical community about the necessity for and the risk associated with intact D&E. And that is where it should be resolved. It should be women and their doctors, not politicians, who decide which medical procedure is appropriate in those circumstances where an abortion is performed.

If some doctors believe that it is never necessary to perform an intact D & E on a viable fetus to protect a woman's health, then they would not recommend such an intervention. But for those physicians who disagree, I do not think it is the place for this Senator or any other government entity to override that judgment. A decision regarding which medical intervention is necessary is best decided on by individual women and their physicians, in light of their individual circumstances.

Another equally important aspect of the Daschle alternative amendment was its comprehensive ban on post-viability abortions. Rather than taking the approach of H.R. 1122, which would prohibit a single procedure, regardless of the stage of pregnancy, this amendment took a broader approach. It would have protected women's constitutional right to choose an abortion before the fetus is viable. But once the fetus is determined by a physician to be viable, usually around the 24th week of pregnancy, this amendment would have outlawed abortion, except in the situations I have already addressed, in which the woman's life is threatened or her health is at risk of grievous injury.

This bipartisan alternative amendment struck the right balance between protecting women's constitutional right to choose abortion and the right of the State to protect future life. It would have protected a woman's physical health throughout her pregnancy, while insisting that only grievous, medically diagnoseable conditions could justify aborting a viable fetus. Both fetal viability and women's health would have been determined by the physician's best medical judgment, as they must be. It was a sensible and responsible amendment.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, the Daschle amendment was rejected. This is particularly disappointing, because if the underlying bill were to become law, it would not prevent a single abortion. It would merely deny physicians the right to exercise their best medical judgment, and it would force women in critical health situations who would have opted to have an intact D&E to use different, and perhaps less safe, options.

Finally, Mr. President, let me address a related topic. We all know that this debate has unfortunately been characterized by a great deal of misinformation and distortion of the facts. One particular piece of misinformation has been widely circulated by the proponents of this legislation, and I frankly don't think it is helpful to a truthful debate. It involves the deliberate misinterpretation of a conversation that I had with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania last year.

During last year's floor debate over the veto override, Senator SANTORUM and I had a brief exchange on the Senate floor which proponents of this legislation have used to suggest that I support infanticide—that is, killing an infant after it has been fully delivered. Obviously, that is untrue. I was answering the question I thought I had been asked. I was addressing the issue of who should decide whether the life or health of a woman was at risk.

Let me be clear, for the record. Once a child has been born, there is no conceivable argument that would suggest a woman's life or health would be at risk any longer. The distortion of our exchange by the National Right to Life Committee and others is the kind of tactic which undermines efforts to reach an agreement that would ban late term abortions except in the most narrow of circumstances where a woman's life or health is at stake.

We are near the end of Senate debate on this issue for the time being, but I suspect that this issue will arise again when this body attempts to override another Presidential veto. As we continue to engage in this volatile and emotional debate, both on the Senate floor and in the media, I hope we will make an effort to recognize that there are strong feelings about this issue on all sides. We should respect these differences, avoid efforts to confuse or trick each other and the public, and maintain a level of debate that reflects the importance of ascertaining the truth about this issue and finding responses that are sensitive and constitutionally sound.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, we are now down to 36 minutes of debate on both sides. And I agreed with the other side that I would take up some of the time to bring down some of our time.

I want to bring up a point, discuss a point that I believe is very important for two reasons: No. 1, I think it is important that Members understand the issues of constitutionality that have been raised by some about this legislation and whether it is constitutional in light of Roe versus Wade and Doe versus Bolton and other decisions on the subject of abortion; and, No. 2, I want to put down a marker for this piece of legislation when it does, if it does, any time in the near future go before the courts.

I hope that by the actions of the Senate today, and hopefully the actions of the President later on, that he will now decide to sign this legislation in light of all the new evidence that has been presented since his initial veto.

I wanted to discuss some of the elements of constitutionality, and in so discussing, I would like to read a letter that was sent to Senator ORRIN HATCH, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, by 62 law professors from universities all over the country, to state to Senator HATCH their opinion on the constitutionality of the statute.

I will remark that this letter was written May 8, prior to the amendment that we adopted here on the bill today which I believe tightens the language up even more and makes it more impregnable to constitutional overruling by the courts.

I will read the letter sent to Senator HATCH:

DEAR SENATOR: We write to you as law professors in support of the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act. S 6. We do not write as partisans. We are both Democrats and Republicans, and we are of different minds of various aspects of the abortion issue. We are concerned, however, that baseless legal arguments are being offered to oppose a ban on partial-birth abortions, and we are unanimous in concluding that such a ban is constitutional.

We have learned that some Senators are concerned about claims that a ban on second trimester partial-birth abortions, or a ban on third trimester procedures without a "health" exception, would be unconstitutional under *Roe v. Wade* and later abortion decisions.

The destruction of human beings who are partially born is, in our judgment, entirely, outside the legal framework established in *Roe v. Wade* and *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*. No Supreme Court decision, including these, ever addressed the constitutionally of forbidding the killing of partially born children. In fact. *Roe* noted explicitly that it did not decide the constitutionality of that part of the Texas law which forbade—and still forbids—killing a child in the process of delivery.

Continuing on.

Even should a court in the future decide that a law banning the partial-birth procedure is to be evaluated within the *Roe Casey* "abortion" framework, we believe such a ban would survive legal scrutiny thereunder. The partial-birth procedure entails mechanical cervical dilation, forcing a breech delivery, and exposing a mother to severe bleeding from exposure to shards of her child's crushed skill. Before viability, an abortion restriction is unconstitutional only if it creates a "undue burden" on the judicially established right to have an abortion. A targeted ban of a single, maternal-health-endangering procedure cannot constitute such a burden.

To the extent of its constitutionally delegated authority, Congress may also ban all forms of abortion after viability, subject to the health and life interests of the mother. Under the most recent Supreme Court decision concerning abortion. *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*, there is no reason to assume that the Supreme Court would interpret a post-viability health exception to require the government to tolerate a procedure which gives zero weight to the life of a partially-born child an which itself poses severe maternal health risks. Furthermore, according to published medical testimony, including that of former Surgeon General C. Everett Koop "Partial-birth abortion is never medically necessary to protect a mother's health or future fertility. On the contrary, this procedure can pose a significant threat to both her immediate health and future fertility." Even the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists—which opposes the bill—acknolwedges that partial-birth abortion is *never* the "only option to save the life or preserve the health of the woman." Banning this procedure does not compromise a mother's health interests. It protects those interests.

In short, while individuals may have ideological or political reasons to oppose banning the partial-birth procedure, those objections should not, in good conscience, be disguised as legal or constitutional in nature.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the RECORD.

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

MAY 8, 1997.

DEAR SENATOR: We write to you as law professors in support of the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act, S. 6. We do not write as partisans. We are both Democrats and Republicans, and we are of different minds on various aspects of the abortion issue. We are concerned, however, that baseless legal arguments are being offered to oppose a ban on partial-birth abortions, and we are unanimous in concluding that such a ban is constitutional.

We have learned that some Senators are concerned about claims that a ban on second trimester partial-birth abortions, or a ban on third trimester procedures without a "health" exception, would be unconstitutional under *Roe v. Wade* and later abortion decisions.

The destruction of human beings who are partially born is, in our judgment, entirely outside the legal framework established in *Roe v. Wade* and *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*. No Supreme Court decision, including these, ever addressed the constitutionality of forbidding the killing of partially born children. In fact, *Roe* noted explicitly that it did not decide the constitutionality of that part of the Texas law which forbade—and still forbids—killing a child in the process of delivery.[1]

Even should a court in the future decide that a law banning the partial-birth procedure is to be evaluated within the *Roe/Casey* "abortion" framework, we believe such a ban would survive legal scrutiny thereunder. The partial-birth procedure entails mechanical cervical dilation, forcing a breech delivery, and exposing a mother to severe bleeding from exposure to shards of her child's crushed skull. Before viability, an abortion restriction is unconstitutional only if it creates an "undue burden" on the judicially established right to have an abortion. A targeted ban of a single, maternal-health-endangering procedure cannot constitute such a burden.

To the extent of its constitutionally delegated authority, Congress may also ban all forms of abortion after viability, subject to the health and life interests of the mother. Under the most recent Supreme Court decision concerning abortion, *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*, there is no reason to assume that the Supreme Court would interpret a post-viability health exception to require the government to tolerate a procedure

[1] 410 U.S. 113, fn. 1 (1973), citing Art. 1195, of Title 15, Chapter 9. (Presently, this law is codified at Vernon's Ann. Texas Civ. St. Art. 4512.5.) A similar ban remains in effect in Louisiana (LA. Revised Statutes 14.87.1). The Texas and Louisiana statutes are also consistent with existing case law in California. *See People v. Chavez*, 77 Cal. App. 2d 621 (1947) ("It should equally be held that a viable child in the process of being born is a human being within the meaning of the homicide statutes, whether or not the process has been fully completed."); *accord Keeler v. Superior Court*, 2 Cal. 3d 619 (1970).

which gives zero weight to the life of a partially-born child and which itself poses severe maternal health risks. Furthermore, according to published medical testimony, including that of former Surgeon General C. Everett Koop: ''Partial-birth abortion is never medically necessary to protect a mother's health or future fertility. On the contrary, this procedure can pose a significant threat to both her immediate health and future fertility.'' Even the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists—which opposes the bill—acknowledges that partial-birth abortion is never the ''only option to save the life or preserve the health of the woman.'' Banning this procedure does not compromise a mother's health interests. It protects those interests.

In short, while individuals may have ideological or political reasons to oppose banning the partial-birth procedure, those objections should not, in good conscience, be disguised as legal or constitutional in nature.

Respectfully submitted,

Rev. Robert J. Araujo, S.J., Gonzaga Law School; Thomas F. Bergin, University of Virginia School of Law; G. Robert Blakey, University of Notre Dame Law School; Gerard V. Bradley, University of Notre Dame Law School; Jay Bybee, Louisiana State University Law Center; Steven Calabresi, Northwestern University School of Law; Paolo G. Carozza, University of Notre Dame Law School; Carol Chase, Pepperdine University School of Law; Robert Cochran, Pepperdine University School of Law; Teresa Collett, South Texas College of Law.

John E. Coons, University of California, Berkeley; Byron Cooper, Associate Dean, University of Detroit Mercy School of Law; Richard Cupp, Pepperdine University School of Law; Joseph Daoust, S.J., University of Detroit Mercy School of Law; Paul R. Dean, Georgetown University Law Center; Robert A Destro, The Catholic University of America; David K. DeWolf, Gonzaga Law School; Bernard Dobranski, Dean, The Catholic University of America; Joseph Falvey, Jr., Assistant Dean, University of Detroit Mercy School of Law; Lois Fielding, University of Detroit Mercy School of Law.

David Forte, Cleveland-Marshall College of Law, Cleveland State University; Steven P. Frankino, Dean, Villanova University School of Law; Edward McGlynn Gaffney, Jr., Dean, Valparaiso University School of Law; George E. Garvey, Associate Dean, The Catholic University of America; John H. Garvey, University of Notre Dame Law School; Mary Ann Glendon, Harvard University Law School; James Gordley, University of California, Berkeley; Richard Alan Gordon, Georgetown University Law Center; Alan Gunn, University of Notre Dame Law School; Jimmy Gurule, University of Notre Dame Law School.

Jacqueline Nolan-Haley, Fordham University School of Law; Laura Hirschfeld, University of Detroit Mercy School of Law; Harry Hutchison, University of Detroit Mercy School of Law; Phillip E. Johnson, University of California, Berkeley; Patrick Keenan, University of Detroit Mercy School of Law; William K. Kelley, University of Notre Dame Law School; Douglas W. Kmiec, University of Notre Dame Law School; David Thomas Link, Dean, University of Notre Dame Law School; Leon Lysaght, University of Detroit Mercy School of Law; Raymond B. Marcin, The Catholic University of America.

Michael W. McConnell, University of Utah College of Law; Mollie Murphy, University of Detroit Mercy School of Law; Richard Myers, University of Detroit Mercy School of Law; Charles Nelson, Pepperdine University School of Law; Leonard J. Nelson, Associate Dean, Cumberland School of Law, Samford University; Michael F. Noone, The Catholic University of America; Gregory Ogden, Pepperdine University School of Law; John J. Potts, Valparaiso University School of Law; Stephen Presser, Northwestern University School of Law; Charles E. Rice, University of Notre Dame Law School.

Robert E. Rodes, Jr., University of Notre Dame Law School; Victor Rosenblum, Northwestern University School of Law; Stephen Safranek, University of Detroit Mercy School of Law; Mark Scarberry, Pepperdine University School of Law; Elizabeth R. Schiltz, University of Notre Dame Law School; Patrick J. Schiltz, University of Notre Dame Law School; Thomas L. Shaffer, University of Notre Dame Law School; Michael E. Smith, University of California, Berkeley; David Smolin, Cumberland School of Law, Samford University; Richard Stith, Valparaiso University School of Law; William J. Wagner, The Catholic University of America; Lynn D. Wardle, Brigham Young University; Fr. Reginald Whitt, O.P, University of Notre Dame School of Law.

Mr. SANTORUM. Thank you, Mr. President.

Does the Senator from Michigan seek some time?

Mr. ABRAHAM. Yes, I do.

Mr. SANTORUM. I yield the Senator from Michigan 3 minutes.

Mr. ABRAHAM. That would be fine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

I thank, again, the Senator from Pennsylvania who is doing an outstanding job to try to work with all sides on this issue. I believe the approach which he has taken has been very constructive. And now the endorsement of the American Medical Association, I think, is a further indication that this legislation is on the right course.

I just want to basically reiterate some points I made the other day when I spoke on this issue. At that time I responded to some of the arguments on the other side. Those arguments were that because Members of Congress were not themselves physicians somehow we were not the appropriate people to be addressing issues with respect to partial-birth abortion that fall within the area of medical procedures.

As I said at that time, Members of Congress—many of us are not farmers, yet we deal with agriculture issues here on this Senate floor. Virtually none of us are nuclear physicists, and yet we deal with nuclear issues pertaining to nuclear weapons and issues pertaining to the disposal of nuclear waste, a variety of other highly scientific issues. Only a few of us, such as the Presiding Officer, have served in the military in combat, and yet we are asked to be experts with regard to issues pertaining to national security.

So with this issue as well we are called upon to get the best information possible and seek to make the best decisions as a result.

However, now we actually have some additional information that comes from the experts who have been referenced in previous debates. The endorsement of the American Medical Association of the partial-birth abortion bill, combined with the endorsement and strong support of that legislation by the one Member among us who is a physician, I think buttresses better than virtually anything else said during this debate the case that this procedure is never needed for the medical reasons that its advocates have claimed to protect the health of the mother.

So in my judgment, Mr. President, we now have an overwhelming case in favor of the passage of this legislation, legislation which will I think help us move in the right direction as we consider a variety of other issues that pertain to abortion in the months and years ahead.

So I just wanted to once again come to the floor to express my support for the bill, and to thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his many efforts in furtherance of its passage.

I thank the Senator and I yield the floor.

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the Senator from Michigan for his statement and being here on the floor to add to the debate and for his terrific work that he has done on this issue in the past now 2 years. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, I do not have a speaker at this point.

I ask unanimous consent that when I suggest the absence of a quorum the time come off the other side.

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

Mr. SANTORUM. 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.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWNBACK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask what the time situation is between Senator SANTORUM's side and this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania controls 27 minutes, 13 seconds, and the Senator on the other side of this argument controls 27 minutes and 25 seconds.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I yield myself up to 20 minutes.

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

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, throughout this debate we have heard both sides accuse each other of misstatement and worse. We have heard charges and countercharges. Today, as we close down this argument, I am not going to engage in any of those charges and countercharges. I am going to talk about what both sides know to be fact.

Fact: This Santorum bill will outlaw a procedure known as an intact dilation and extraction.

Fact: This procedure is used by obstetricians and gynecologists in circumstances where they believe it is in the best interests of the woman, to save her life or to save her health.

Fact: Those very same physicians who use this procedure oppose this bill. The American College of Gynecologists and Obstetricians confirmed today that they oppose this bill.

Fact: This bill is opposed by the California Medical Association.

Fact: This bill is opposed by the American Medical Women's Association, an organization of women physicians.

Fact: This bill is opposed by the American Nurses Association.

Fact: This bill is opposed by the Society of Physicians for Reproductive Health.

Fact: The American Medical Association endorsed this bill in a 4-day reversal of opinion. Having done that, they have taken a position against the very doctors who handle these procedures.

Fact: We have a series of women who have come forward to testify, about their pain, their grief, that this procedure—that would be outlawed in the pending Santorum bill saved their lives and their health, retained their fertility in many cases, and in the opinion of their doctors was the humane procedure to use for all concerned.

Fact: Most of these women, whose photographs I have behind me, most of these women who came forward to share their stories are very religious, and many say they are opposed to all abortions, but they decided after all the facts were on the table and after consulting their families and many doctors—many went to several doctors, in many cases five or six, to try and come up with another solution to a tragedy—they decided this was their only choice after they consulted with these many doctors, with their families, with their clergy, and with their God.

Several went on to have healthy pregnancies. Coreen Costello was among them. You can see little Tucker in this photograph, who was born after Coreen underwent the procedure.

I will quote from some of the letters we have received from doctors organizations against the Santorum bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have all these letters printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN COLLEGE OF OBSTETRICIANS AND GYNECOLOGISTS,
Washington, DC, May 19, 1997.

Hon. TRENT LOTT,
Senate Majority Leader,
Capitol Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LOTT: In light of the slight modifications being proposed to HR 1122, the ''Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1997,'' we wanted to take this opportunity to reiterate our opposition to this legislation. Our statement on this issue is attached.

Sincerely,

RALPH W. HALE, MD,
Executive Director.

STATEMENT ON INTACT DILATATION AND EXTRACTION

The debate regarding legislation to prohibit a method of abortion, such as the legislation banning ''partial birth abortion,'' and ''brain sucking abortions,'' has prompted questions regarding these procedures. It is difficult to respond to these questions because the descriptions are vague and do not delineate a specific procedure recognized in the medical literature. Moreover, the definitions could be interpreted to include elements of many recognized abortion and operative obstetric techniques.

The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG) believes the intent of such legislative proposals is to prohibit a procedure referred to as ''Intact Dilatation and Extraction'' (Intact D & X). This procedure has been described as containing all of the following four elements:

(1) Deliberate dilatation of the cervix, usually over a sequence of days;

(2) Instrumental conversion of the fetus to a footling breech;

(3) Breech extraction of the body excepting the head; and

(4) Partial evacuation of the intracranial contents of a living fetus to effect vaginal delivery of a dead but otherwise intact fetus.

Becuse these elements are part of established obstetric techniques, it must be emphasized that unless all four elements are present in sequence, the procedure is not an intact D & X.

Abortion intends to terminate a pregnancy while preserving the life and health of the mother. When abortion is performed after 16 weeks, intact D & X is one method of terminating a pregnancy. The physician, in consultation with the patient, must choose the most appropriate method based upon the patient's individual circumstances.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), only 5.3% of abortions performed in the United States in 1993, the most recent data available, were performed after the 16th week of pregnancy. A preliminary figure published by the CDC for 1994 is 5.6%. The CDC does not collect data on the specific method of abortion, so it is unknown how many of these were performed using intact D & X. Other data show that second trimester transvaginal instrumental abortion is a safe procedure.

Terminating a pregnancy is performed in some circumstances to save the life or preserve the health of the mother. Intact D & X is one of the methods available in some of these situations. A select panel convened by ACOG could identify no circumstances under which this procedure, as defined above, would be the only option to save the life or preserve the health of the woman. An intact D & X, however, may be the best or most appropriate procedure in a particular circumstance to save the life or preserve the health of a woman, and only the doctor, in consultation with the patient, based upon the woman's particular circumstances can make this decision. The potential exists that legislation prohibiting specific medical practices, such as intact D & X, may outlaw techniques that are critical to the lives and health of American women. The intervention of legislative bodies into medical decision making is inappropriate, ill advised, and dangerous.

Approved by the Executive Board, January 12, 1997.

AMERICAN MEDICAL WOMEN'S ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Alexandria, VA, May 20, 1997.

Hon. RICK SANTORUM,
U.S. Senate, Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SANTORUM: On behalf of the American Medical Women's Association (AMWA), I would like to reiterate our opposition to H.R. 1122, the so-called ''Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1997,'' as amended. AMWA does not endorse legislation which interferes with medical decisionmaking, particularly when it fails to consider the health of the woman patient.

Our opposition to this legislation is based on the following issues. First, we are gravely concerned that this legislation does not protect a woman's physical and mental health, including future fertility, or consider other pertinent issues such as fetal abnormalities. Second, this legislation would further erode physician-patient autonomy forcing physicians to always avoid legislatively prohibited procedures in medical decisionmaking, including in emergency situations when physicians and patients must base their decisions on the best available information available to them. Third, medical care decisions must be left to the judgment of a woman and her physician without fear of civil action or criminal prosecution. We do not support the levying of civil and criminal penalties for care provided in the best interest of the woman patient.

AMWA remains committed to ensuring that physicians retain authority to make medical and surgical care decisions that are in the best interest of their patients given the information available to them.

Sincerely,

DEBRA R. JUDELSON, MD,
President.

AMERICAN NURSES ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, May 20, 1997.

Hon. BARBARA BOXER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BOXER: I am writing to reiterate the opposition of the American Nurses Association to H.R. 1122, the ''Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1997'', which is being considered by the Senate this week. This legislation would impose Federal criminal penalties and provide for civil actions against health care providers who perform certain late-term abortions.

It is the view of the American Nurses Association that this proposal would involve an inappropriate intrusion of the federal government into a therapeutic decision that should be left in the hands of a pregnant woman and her health care provider. ANA has long supported freedom of choice and equitable access of all women to basic health services, including services related to reproductive health. This legislation would impose a significant barrier to those principles. It is inappropriate for Congress to mandate a course of action for a woman who is already faced with an intensely personal and difficult decision.

The American Nurses Association is the only full-service professional organization representing the nation's 2.2 million Registered Nurses through its 53 constituent associations. ANA advances the nursing profession by fostering high standards of nursing practice, promoting the economic and general welfare of nurses in the workplace, projecting a positive and realistic view of nursing, and by lobbying the Congress and regulatory agencies on health care issues affecting nurses and the public.

The American Nurses Association appreciates your work in safeguarding women's access to reproductive health care and respectfully urges members of the Senate to vote against H.R. 1122.

Sincerely,

GERI MARULLO, MSN, RN,
Executive Director.

Mrs. BOXER. The American Medical Women's Association says, in part, in a letter to Senator SANTORUM, ''On behalf of the American Medical Women's Association, I would like to reiterate our opposition to H.R. 1122.'' This letter is dated today.

The organization does not endorse legislation which interferes with medical decisionmaking, particularly when it fails to consider the health of the woman patient.

Our opposition is based on the following issues. First, we are gravely concerned that this legislation does not protect a woman's physical and mental health, including future fertility, or consider other pertinent issues such as fetal abnormalities. Second, this legislation would further erode physician-patient autonomy forcing physicians to always avoid legislatively prohibited procedures in medical decisionmaking, including in emergency situations when physicians and patients must base their decisions on the best available information * * *

That is the American Medical Women's Association letter, in part.

The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, after learning of the opposition of the AMA, wrote a letter to Senator LOTT dated yesterday.

In light of the slight modifications being proposed to H.R. 1122, we wanted to take this opportunity to reiterate our opposition to this legislation.

They attach their statement in which they say:

Terminating a pregnancy is performed in such circumstances to save the life or preserve the health of the mother. Intact D&X is one of the methods available in some of these situations * * * and only the doctor, in consultation with the patient, based upon the woman's particular circumstances can make this decision.

Is it not interesting, an organization of obstetricians and gynecologists oppose this bill and have to plead the case that they are the ones who should make this decision—not Senator SANTORUM, not Senator BOXER, not Senator COATS, not Senator FEINSTEIN, not Senator HELMS. This is not our job. Our job is tough enough. We do not come close to being doctors. We have one physician in this body, but he is not an obstetrician and gynecologist.

A letter dated today from the American Nurses Association:

I am writing to reiterate the opposition of the American Nurses Association to H.R. 1122 * * *

It is the view of the American Nurses Association that this proposal would involve an inappropriate intrusion of the federal Government into a therapeutic decision that should be left in the hands of a pregnant woman and her health-care provider * * *

The American Nurses Association is the only full-service professional organization representing the Nation's 2.2 million registered nurses throughout its 53 constituent associations.

Now I want to tell you some of the real life stories that have been presented to us by some of the women who have undergone the procedure that this bill would ban. Many have heard these stories before, but they are worth repeating because not every woman who has had this procedure has come forward. These stories are representative of those women.

I talked to you about Coreen Costello pictured here with her newborn son, Tucker. She was able to have Tucker because it saved her fertility to undergo the procedure that is banned in the Santorum bill. She is a registered Republican, describes herself as very religious. She is clear that she and her family do not believe in abortion. When she was pregnant, she was rushed to the emergency room because her baby was having seizures, and found out something was seriously wrong with her baby.

She named the baby Katherine Grace. This is a woman and family who wanted that child desperately. And to hear women like this referred to as women who kill their babies to me is an absolute disgrace.

The baby had not been able to move for months—not her eyelids, tongue, nor her lips. Her chest cavity was unable to rise and fall for air, and her lungs and chest were left severely undeveloped almost to the point of nonexisting. Her vital organs were atrophied. The doctor told Coreen and her husband that the baby would not survive, and they recommended terminating the pregnancy. To Coreen and to Jim, this was not an option. Coreen wanted to go into labor naturally. She wanted her baby born on God's time and did not want to interfere. The family spent 2 weeks going from expert to expert.

Again, I have heard my colleagues on more than one occasion demean these women, saying, ''Well, if only they had checked, they would have found another option.'' There are always other options, say my colleagues who don't know anything about medicine.

Coreen and her family were told they couldn't consider inducing labor. They considered a caesarean section. But the doctors were adamant that the risks to her health and her life were too great.

Then Coreen finally said, ''There was no reason to risk leaving my two children motherless if there was no hope of saving Katherine Grace.''

My colleagues, women like Coreen Costello deserve our love and deserve our support. They don't deserve the kind of treatment they would get if this bill becomes law. They have come forward. They were saved. But they are coming forward to spare other families the tragedy they went through.

Coreen writes to us, ''The birth of Tucker would not have been possible without this procedure. Please give other women and their families this chance.

''Let us deal with our tragedies without any unnecessary interference from our Government. Leave us with our God. Leave us with our families and our trusted medical experts.''

I could go on. I will show you a picture of Vikki Stella, a mother of two. She went through a very similar case. She tried in every way to save her baby, but was told that her life was at risk if she didn't use this procedure. The surgery preserved her fertility.

Here she is shown with her son Nicholas. She calls him our darling son, Nicholas, who was born in 1995. This was after she had undergone the procedure that the Santorum bill seeks to outlaw.

So the procedure saved Vikki's life. It preserved her family. Vikki's situation was heart-wrenching.

Mothers and fathers need to be able to make medical decisions like that with their God and with their doctors, not with Senators. We don't belong in that room.

We have offered alternatives, alternatives that go to the heart of another matter, which is the decision *Roe* v. *Wade* that is the law of the land, which basically says in the early stages of a pregnancy a woman has the right to choose and the State does not have a right to interfere. But after viability, *Roe* says the State does have a right to interfere. And I agree with that.

Senator FEINSTEIN and I offered an alternative that would have said no abortion after viability. But we make two exceptions, consistent with compassion, consistent with caring, consistent with *Roe* and the Court cases. We say no abortion after viability except to preserve the life of the mother or to spare her serious adverse health consequences.

My colleagues on the other side have said, ''Senator BOXER and Senator FEINSTEIN believe in abortion on demand.'' They have misstated our position day in and day out. What we are saying is there should be absolutely no abortion after viability except to save the life and the health of the woman. That is the option that would be endorsed, I think, by the majority of the American people. The bill that is before us doesn't do anything about late-term abortion. It deals with one procedure, a procedure that in fact doctors say is necessary to save the life and the health of a woman.

I would like to read parts of an opinion piece that appeared in the Los Angeles Times written by Ellen Goodman.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Los Angeles Times]

CONGRESS CAN'T LEGISLATE MATERNAL HEROISM

(By Ellen Goodman)

You cannot hear it in the cacophony of outraged voices arguing about the so-called partial-birth abortion ban. But it is there. The theme song of the abortion controversy is being repeated, the soundtrack replayed:

Just how much are we willing to require of a woman for the sake of having a baby? Just how much can the government force a woman to sacrifice for a fetus?

The Senate debate has not really been about banning an abortion method. It's been about permitting exceptions to that ban. Senators led by Pennsylvania's Rick Santorum have refused to allow an exception even to protect the woman from serious harm to her health. President Clinton has refused to sign a bill without it.

So the push for a veto-proof majority to ban this rare procedure has drawn a line as clear as possible in this unrelenting and murky struggle. A line around a woman's health.

From the beginning abortion opponents have said that "health" is nothing but a loophole for women who would abort a pregnancy to fit into a prom dress. But pro-choice supporters have countered with real women whose bodies were at serious risk. Underlying it all has been the issue of women and sacrifice.

Last week, pro-lifer Kristi S. Hamrick argued against any exception, saying, "Any woman who has ever been pregnant can tell you that every pregnancy carries potential risk." Indeed, women once died in pregnancy and childbirth with appalling frequency.

But while the focus is on health, is it fair to ask whether the law can force pregnant women to sacrifice more for "unborn children" than it can force parents to sacrifice for those who are born?

Imagine a different bill going through Congress. This one requires mothers and fathers to give up a kidney for their child. Or maybe it just allows the government to extract bone marrow against their will for an ailing son or daughter.

If such a bill got to the Senate floor, would Santorum decry "the selfishness, the individual self-centeredness" of its opponents? Surely, we expect a parent to eagerly exchange bone marrow for a child's life. But we would not assume the state's right to go in and take it.

"No case has ever been upheld that says you can intrude on the body of a genetic parent to protect a born child," says Eileen McDonagh, who raises such matters in a provocative book, "Breaking the Abortion Deadlock." Indeed, in Illinois, a court ruled that the law could not even require a blood test to see if a relative could be a potential donor.

Can the law then require a woman to suffer "serious health effects." for the sake of a fetus? A central question in the abortion debate, says McDonagh, is: "What are the means the state can use to protect the fetus? One benchmark is to ask what the means are the state can use to protect a born child."

The issue is government intrusion: who decides. How much more serious is this decision when we are talking, not about extracting bone marrow, but about losing a uterus or a kidney? Is it up to Congress to overrule the doctor? To overrule the "selfish" woman defending her health?

An outraged Santorum screamed that this procedure "is killing a little baby that hasn't hurt anybody!" But the whole point of a vote about a health exception is that this fetus—however unintentionally, well or deformed—is hurting someone: the pregnant woman.

This is a tough-minded argument about those few pregnancies that have gone most tragically awry. Pregnancy is risky. Many women embrace heroic procedures to have children.

But the bill is not really about banning one procedure. If dilation and extraction is the first method banned without exceptions, it won't be the last. The goals of abortion opponents are unequivocal.

Not was the losing bill by Democrat Tom Daschle a true "compromise." Allowing late abortions for physical, "real" health reasons but not mental health? What would that distinction mean to a woman forced to carry an anencephalic (brainless) baby to term?

We already have compromises. The Supreme Court decisions weigh the interests of the woman with those of the developing fetus. The law allows states to severely limit abortion after viability. But at no point does it give the government the right to seriously damage a woman's health to protect a fetus.

This is at the primal heart of the matter. No Congress can be allowed to legislate a new flock of sacrificial women.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, Ellen Goodman writes:

> The Senate debate has not really been about banning an abortion method. It's been about permitting exception to that ban. Senators led by Pennsylvania's Rick Santorum have refused to allow an exception even to protect the woman from serious harm to her health. * * *
>
> Is it up to Congress to overrule the doctor? To overrule the "selfish" woman defending her health?

The bill is not really about banning a procedure. If dilation and extraction is the first method banned, without exception it won't be the last. The goals of abortion opponents are unequivocal. And, indeed, in, I thought, a good debate that the Senator from Pennsylvania and I had on Sunday, I think he was very straightforward about that. The Senators who have been speaking on the other side of the aisle on this subject all would tell you they are against all abortions from the first moment of a pregnancy.

Ellen Goodman writes:

> We already have compromises. The Supreme Court decisions weigh the interests of the woman with those of the developing fetus. The law allows states to severely limit abortion after viability. But at no point does it give the government the right to seriously damage a woman's health to protect a fetus.
>
> This is at the primal heart of the matter.

She concludes:

> No Congress can be allowed to legislate a new flock of sacrificial women.

What does she mean, sacrificial women? That is, women who will be sacrificed because of politics, because of laws that are made right here. And when abortion was illegal, women died.

There are those of us who will stand here as long as it takes to make sure we don't go back to those dark days. This bill should not be about politics, though, sadly, it might turn out to be. This bill should not be about 30-second misleading commercials, though, sadly, it might turn out to be. This bill should not be about fear, fear of doing the right thing, though, sadly, it might turn out to be.

What this should be about is at least the basic bottom line that we should keep in mind when we pass any legislation. And that bottom line should always be do no harm. Do no harm. Yet, we are told by physicians that this bill does harm. It has no exception for physicians who believe the banned procedure is in the best interests of the woman for her very survival and for her very health.

My colleagues, please do not relegate women to a status that says their life and their health do not matter. Please look inside your hearts. Ask yourself how you would feel if your daughter was told that the safest procedure in a pregnancy turned tragically wrong was an intact D&E, and, yet, the doctor fearing jail refused to use it. Look in your heart. Think about how you would feel. You would drop to your knees. You would pray to God that the doctor could use the option that was safe, that would save the life and the health of your daughter. And then, if this bill was the law, you would go to court to defend that doctor. But the rules would be stacked against him or her.

Just read this bill.

My colleagues, that is the wrong way to go. These women have been saved because this Congress didn't outlaw the procedure that was necessary to save their lives and their health.

There will be other women who look like this, who have families like this, who might be, as Ellen Goodman said, sacrificed because of politics. I say that we should save these women who are relying on us to protect them.

This isn't about them versus their babies. They wanted their babies. They desperately wanted their babies. But in circumstances that no one seemed able to predict, in rare circumstances, in tragic circumstances, they needed an intact D&E.

We are not doctors—not even close. Every speaker I have heard—I may be wrong on this—on the side of the Santorum bill has been a man. Again, I may be wrong on this. But I am 99 percent sure that every one of them would support outlawing all abortions. They do not know what it is like to find yourself in a desperate situation as a woman—as a woman. Situations like Vikki's or Coreen's or Eileen's, or any of the women who were told they needed an intact D&E to save their lives or their health.

Mr. President, I have a letter dated today from these women I have been talking about. They have listened to this debate. This is what they say:

> Please don't forget us, and the stories that brought us to Washington to meet with so many of you over the last two years. We are just a sampling of the women and families who have had very wanted pregnancies go wrong, and whose doctors have wept with us as they explained the options that could help us maintain our health and our fertility. We know the truth about the so-called "partial-birth abortions" that you debate in Washington, because we needed the surgery that doctors call intact dilation and evacuation. * * *
>
> The AMA endorsement of this legislation, and the superficial changes added today do

not change the fact that this ban still contains no provision to protect the health of women like us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter in its entirety be printed in the RECORD, along with the following letter from the California Medical Association, which says, in part, ''The California Medical Association is opposed to this bill and is saddened that the debate appeals to the emotive, rather than the reasoning, segment of America.''

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

May 20, 1997.

DEAR SENATORS: Please don't forget us, and the stories that brought us to Washington to meet with so many of you over the last two years. We are just a sampling of the women and families who have had very wanted pregnancies go wrong, and whose doctors have wept with us as they explained the options that could help us maintain our health and our fertility. We know the truth about the so-called ''partial birth abortions'' that you debate in Washington, because we needed the surgery that doctors call intact dilation and evacuation.

We and our families stood with President Clinton last year when he vetoed similar legislation that would have banned the surgery that we needed. This ban would have torn families apart, robbing us of the ability to make the most private and personal decisions about our own well-being. It would have subjected women like us to unwarranted medical risks and even greater heartbreak than the loss of our precious babies had already caused. President Clinton did the right thing when he courageously vetoed this legislation and protected our health and that of the women who come after us. These are decisions that can only be made by a woman in consultation with her family and her doctor. Congress can't begin to know what's best for us as we face our own personal tragedies.

As you consider your vote on HR1122, we hope that you will take a few moments to remember us, and to recall that this is a bill that affects real people—American women and their families. Please don't compound the tragedies of families like ours. The AMA endorsement of this legislation, and the superficial changes added today do not change the fact that this ban still contains no provision to protect the health of the women like us.

Please vote ''no'' on HR1122.

Sincerely,

CLAUDIA CROWN ADES,
COREEN COSTELLO,
MARY-DOROTHY LINE,
VIKKI STELLA,
TAMMY WATTS.

CALIFORNIA MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
Sacramento, CA, May 20, 1997.

Senator BARBARA BOXER,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BOXER: We have reviewed the amendments to HR 1122 and believe that they make no substantive changes to the legislation. While the debate over late-term abortion is painful, both within the medical community and the general citizenry, we believe these decisions must be left to physicians and patients . . . acting together.

While late-term abortions may have occurred inappropriately in some instances, they have also saved women's lives and the health and well-being of many American families. In a society where values are assaulted on every side . . . and technology often seems to replace human relationship . . . the bond between healer and patient is ever more important. Passage of HR 1122 would be one more step in eroding that relationship. The California Medical Association is opposed to this bill and is saddened the debate appeals to the emotive, rather than the reasoning, segment of America.

Sincerely,

ROLLAND C. LOWE, *M.D.*,
President.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I say that we need to listen to these women. I say that we need to listen to these doctors. I say that the doctors who work with this every day of their lives know best. And I hope we will vote against the Santorum bill.

I reserve the remainder of our time on this side.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Indiana, who has done terrific work on this issue which deals with protecting children. He has been an outstanding spokesperson for a long time in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for his kind words. The real credit goes to the Senator from Pennsylvania for his effective and unrelenting advocacy on behalf of life. The Senator has expressed in many, many ways and provided us with many, many facts that I think gives all of us pause and that has given us a reason to give great deliberation and consideration to this most fundamental of issues.

I also think it is appropriate to mention the efforts of Senator SMITH of New Hampshire who had the courage to come to this floor some time ago and introduce the Senate to a procedure none of us had ever heard of. He was vilified on this floor and in the press. He had the courage to raise an issue that many didn't want to talk about. We have come a long way since that day when Senator SMITH walked onto this floor.

We are close. And we clearly have a majority in both the House and the Senate now in favor of banning partial-birth abortion. We have more than a two-thirds majority necessary to override a Presidential veto in the House, and we are hopeful that we can achieve that level today. We will know at 2:15 this afternoon.

Mr. President, I think it is most appropriate that we are debating this issue on the Senate floor because we are talking about one of the most fundamental, if not the most fundamental, of all issues that we debate on this floor. That is the meaning of life itself. It is a right that is guaranteed or enunciated in our Declaration of Independence. It is labeled an inalienable right, meaning it is not created by government; it is not taken away by government; it is not the purview of government. It is an inalienable right, according to our Founding Fathers, the right to life being the very first enunciated, written—inalienable right, part of the very fabric of the foundation of this society, not endowed by government but endowed by the Creator. Over the 200-years-plus history of this country and of this Congress, we have had monumental civil rights debates, appropriate debates on the meaning of inclusion in the American experiment of what it means to be part of this greatest in all experiments in human history, of democracy, of being part of a system which allows each individual the dignity of being part, an equal part, of this democracy.

Great civil rights debates have taken place in this Chamber, the debates about allowing women equal opportunities, equal rights to vote, equal rights to participate in society, the rights of handicapped, reaching out and providing within the American experiment to include them, the weakest of our society, the most disadvantaged of our society. And now we come to the weakest of all, now we come to the most disadvantaged of all, those who have no voice of their own, those who have no political action committee, no caucus, no ability to march, to speak for themselves, but those who have every right to be included in this great experiment in democracy.

I do not know what the vote count is going to be this afternoon. I am obviously hoping it will exceed the 67 votes needed to overcome the President's intransigence on this issue, the President who pledged to the American people and to the Congress that he wanted abortion to be safe, legal and rare, the President who is confronted with the information that this is not a rare procedure, that this is a procedure that is done thousands and thousands of times mostly for the convenience not of the woman but of the abortionist, a procedure that is more convenient for the abortionist than it is recognizing concerns of women and certainly the rights of the child to live.

I do not know what that vote count is going to be, but win or lose, we have fundamentally altered the nature of this debate. Win or lose, we are now debating the meaning of life and the right to life in this society, and that is where the debate should have been centered and where the debate needs to be centered.

I am pleased that we have finally arrived at this point. I do not question the motives of other Members, those who vote for or those who vote against. That is why I did not question the motives of the minority leader when he stated that he thought we ought to engage in the debate on the viability of the child. It advances the debate one way or another. Some are skeptical about his efforts, about his amendment. I do not think it is an appropriate amendment because I thought the exceptions allowing the decision to be in the hands of the abortionist himself or herself was not appropriate to defining the right to life. But by placing in the Chamber the question of viability, we will now center the debate on what is the meaning of life. When does life begin? What are the rights of that life as well as the rights of the woman? So I am pleased that we have arrived at this point. As I said, win or lose, we are now focusing the debate where it ought to be.

Several years ago, Justice O'Connor made the statement that Roe versus Wade, the decision of the Court in Roe versus Wade, was on a collision course with medical science because medical science was demonstrating to us the viability of life at earlier and earlier ages. Sonograms, listening to heart beats, and the ability to perform fetal research, the protection of the infant in the mother's womb, and the rights of that infant in cases of negligence, in cases of attempted murder, in a whole number of areas of the law have demonstrated to us that there is a life with a heart beating within the womb of that mother, and that life deserves our consideration in terms of the protections that we give it.

Recently there has been a lot of talk about new discoveries of brain activity and a lot of focus on that, focus brought to this floor by those who say we must make sure we give children ages zero to 3 the right opportunities so that their brain can develop in ways that medical science tells us it needs to develop to a fully competent human being. We need to ensure that that takes place.

What medical science is also telling us and what we have not discussed on this floor is that we now know that brain activity exists much earlier than we thought. Never has the conflict between science and abortion been more dramatic than in the recent discoveries about the science of the brain. We know that a human embryo at 10 or 12 weeks after conception has astonishing brain activity. We know that by the fifth month of gestation the brain is fully wired, as the scientists say, with the connections between neurons largely complete. Astounding evidence. We know that these neurons are firing with impressive complexity once a minute, shaping the brain itself, and we know that when this process is interrupted by malnutrition or drug abuse or a virus, the results can follow a child its entire life, and we know that a child may be born knowing the distinctive sound of its mother's and father's voices. In short, our mental development, not just our physical development, the mental development, the process of learning begins well before birth.

If we look at the evidence—not the rhetoric, not the anecdotes, but the evidence, the facts—it is increasingly evident that human life is a continuum in which birth is really not a particularly decisive moment. An essential part of who each of us is, who we are, including the shape of our minds, is determined even before we are born. Even those who do not call themselves pro-life have to find this a troubling experience and troubling knowledge. They have to because abortion not only destroys the body; it extinguishes a complex, developed mind. This point, I think, has particular relevance in this debate on partial-birth abortion because the very procedure itself destroys the brain. Yes, it kills the body, but when we understand the complexity of that brain, when we understand the development of that brain, mostly fully wired at the point of termination, we have to understand that plunging a scissors into the back of that skull and sucking out the brain has enormous implications.

Mr. President, I ask for just 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. COATS. So here we are on this floor debating something that is very much in the role of the Senate. If it is not in the role of a Senator to make moral judgments, then we might as well close the place up because there is very little else to do. Most of what we do here has moral implications. There are some things that do not, but most things do. If that is the case, then I think a lot of people are going to have to remove their names from sponsorship of legislation that mandates mammograms for women under a certain age. Some Senators are going to have to remove their names from support for laws that require 48-hour hospital stays after birth. Some Senators are going to have to remove their support for laws and legislation that condemns genital mutilation. Are those not medical procedures? So if we are going to leave all that to the world outside of this Chamber, I think a lot of Senators are going to have to rethink their positions on a lot of issues.

I also think it is inappropriate to suggest that this is some kind of male conspiracy against women. I think when the vote is taken today, we will see women voting to terminate this procedure. I think when the polls are taken and women are addressed throughout our society, we will find there are as many women in opposition to this procedure and in abhorrence of this procedure as there are men.

It is also wrong to say that this is only some kind of a pro-life Senate movement. There are a number of people here who have openly stated they are pro-choice Senators but are voting to ban this procedure. So let us tone down the accusations and let us deal with the facts.

I think the facts and medical science that have been presented to us so outstandingly by the Senator from Pennsylvania need to be carefully considered by each and every one of us. A civil right to the weakest among us, the inalienable right to life as enunciated in the most fundamental of all the documents of democracy, our Declaration of Independence, can be honored here today by our vote to ban this procedure.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania particularly for his outstanding work and yield back whatever time I have remaining.

Mr. SANTORUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, if you will notify me when I have 4 minutes remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 14 minutes and will be notified by the Chair when 4 minutes are remaining.

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the Chair. I thank the Senator from Indiana for his excellent work. I want to address a couple issues the Senator from California raised.

One, she mentioned support of the American College of Gynecologists. I have 50 letters here from fellows of that organization who are outraged at the organization for the position they have taken. We have a group of over 500 obstetricians and gynecologists who have signed on saying they are supporting the ban on partial-birth abortions and are also outraged at the position taken by the board here in Washington that was not voted on by the general membership.

So I just suggest that this, as the Senator from California noted but I want to reemphasize, is not speaking for all physicians, certainly not all obstetricians and gynecologists, because we have read plenty of statements from them as to why this procedure is never medically necessary.

She went through her facts. Let me tell you the first fact. This is not about abortion. This is about infanticide. This is about taking a baby that is born, in the process of being born, four-fifths outside of the mother, moving outside of the mother and killing that baby. We can talk about abortion. I know the Senator likes to get it back to the issue of abortion. The reason we believe, as I just read a letter from 62 law professors, it is not governed by Roe versus Wade is because the baby now has rights. It is being born. So do not keep focusing back on this issue of abortion. This is about infanticide.

If the Senate today does not muster up the moral courage for 67 votes, it will be validating infanticide—not the woman's right to choose, infanticide.

As one of the listed facts, the Senator from California said the fact is this procedure is done by obstetricians and gynecologists acting in the best interests of the mother to save her life or health. That is not a fact, and we all know that. Even people who support the position of the Senator from California know that is not a fact, admit it is not a fact. It is very difficult to get engaged in a real debate when the other side keeps using misinformation about what is going on here.

Ron Fitzsimmons, the director of an association of 200 clinics, said that 90 percent of the abortions done, partial-birth abortions done, are done on healthy mothers and healthy babies in the 5th and 6th months of pregnancy for birth control reasons.

Now, that is not, as the Senator from California suggested, a procedure done by obstetricians and gynecologists.

Let me make a parenthetical remark there. This procedure was not invented by an obstetrician or gynecologist. It was invented by a family practitioner who does abortions. Obstetricians and gynecologists do not do this procedure. This is not done in hospitals. It is done in clinics, not by, in many cases, obstetricians and gynecologists. So to suggest that this procedure is done by obstetricians and gynecologists acting in the best interests of the mother and that's the fact is not in fact the case.

This is done by abortionists—some of whom are obstetricians, many of whom are not—who perform in clinics, not in hospitals, who do it on healthy mothers and healthy babies. Those are the facts. That is why this is such a troubling debate today. That is why we have seen the movement across this country and in the Senate today, because the alleged facts that the Senator from California was offering again as the truth muddy the waters a little bit. But now we know what the real truth is from people who support her position. But yet we keep hearing these repeated allegations that have no basis in reality anymore, but they still find themselves on the Senate floor as a defense for an indefensible procedure, and this procedure is indefensible.

Mr. President, we have heard comments about women who suffered with a pregnancy that had gone tragic. Let me first say that my heart goes out to each and every one of the people whose picture we have seen displayed on the floor of the Senate. I know, I know personally the difficulty that these families face with a child that you hoped for and dreamed for and had something go wrong; that a life that you had hoped to be with and to mother and father would be cut short. I know what they went through.

I am just suggesting that the fact that the women came to testify, not the doctors, tells you something about the medical reality of what occurred. You have not seen any of these doctors who did these procedures come to the U.S. Senate, the House, or anyplace in a public arena and talk about what they did, because they know that they would not stand the light of day in front of any peer review. In fact, none of these procedures is peer reviewed. None of them is peer reviewed. None of these cases has been peer reviewed, none of them. They would not open up to any discussion by other experts in the field as to whether they acted correctly.

That is the problem, you see. We hide behind the emotion, and it is real, tragic, and I empathize, but we are hiding behind emotion when we are talking about the life and death of little babies. We owe it to them, we owe it to these mothers who are dealing with these tragic situations today to talk about the facts, to let the light shine in as to what are really the options, what is really necessary, not to hide behind pictures and emotional pleas that have no basis in medical fact, in medical practice.

I will give you a counterexample. This is a little baby girl, named Donna Joy Watts, who was born with hydrocephaly, the same condition that some of the children of the people Senator BOXER shared had. Her mother and father, Lori and Donny Watts, refused to abort this child. The genetics counselor and the obstetrician suggested a partial-birth abortion for this little baby. They said she couldn't survive, she wouldn't live. She had to go to four hospitals—four places—just to get this baby delivered. They wouldn't deliver her baby.

We worry so much about the right to choose. How about the right to choose life, to give your baby a chance? Well, Donny and Lori fought for this chance. This baby was born finally by cesarean section. And, by the way, the issue of future fertility, we hear that a lot, Lori and Donny now have another little baby. But this little baby was born and hooked up to IV's to give hydration to, water to, and for 3 days. These doctors, who will never come to testify before the Congress, all these doctors who recommend abortion, who never come to justify before a peer review panel what they do, called this little baby lying there breathing a fetus for 3 days. Do you want to know what some of the obstetricians and gynecologists think about little babies who are just not perfect? They called this baby a fetus 3 days after it was born. It is not a fetus, it is a baby. What they wanted to do was kill this baby by stabbing her in the base of her skull and suctioning her brains out, and Lori and Donny said no.

Through a lot of hard work, a lot of pain, a lot of suffering, a lot of forcing them to treat her daughter because they wouldn't treat her for 3 days, 5½ years later, this is little Donna Joy Watts, who is in my office right now. She would have been up in the gallery of the Senate were it not for the objection of the Senator from California prohibiting her from being there. She is in my office and watching this debate. She is watching to see whether the U.S. Senate is going to allow other doctors to misinform their mommies and daddies so we won't have other little Donna Joy Wattses to be with us, to ennoble us, to give us pride in our culture and in our civilization, that we care even for those who are like little Donna Joy—who runs around and plays in my office, who colors with my kids—but just didn't have the chance.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four minutes are reserved. Who seeks time?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask that I be allotted such time as I may consume in the remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes is remaining.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I myself find this a sad day. In a sense, it is a watershed debate, and I very much fear it is the first major legislative thrust to set this Nation back 30 years with respect to freedom of choice.

I am going to speak about what freedom of choice really means. Essentially, to me it means that Government will not become involved in these most intimate decisions that a woman has to make, not become involved in legislating a woman's reproductive system, what she must do, when she must do it, and how she must do it, but that government will essentially leave those intimate decisions to the physician, to a woman, to her faith, and to medicine. And here we have the Congress of the United States essentially saying that every woman in this country who may find out in her third trimester that she has a horribly, severely deformed child with anomalies incompatible with life, and if that child can be born, even if it is a major threat to her health, she must deliver that child.

Unfortunately, no Member of this body is going to be present, no Member of this body is going to hold that mother's hand and tell her that it is OK if she jeopardizes her health perhaps for the rest of her life. No Member of this Congress is going to be present in that delivery room and see a child who is incompatible with life, a baby that may not have a brain, a baby that may have a brain outside the head or other major physical anomalies. No Member of this Congress will be there to see that child delivered to live an hour, 6 hours, a day, 4 days and then die, and the woman's health may be seriously, adversely harmed in a major way for the rest of her life. No one will be there. No one will say, ''I'm so sorry, I didn't know about you when I cast this vote.''

We are all accustomed to legislating, and when we legislate, we legislate for a majority, not for the exception. We legislate with some knowledge, or should, of what we are doing. But I think in this case, it is a very skewed knowledge. It is based on a case that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania put forward of a young woman who I believe could have and would have been born in any event and saying that this one case typifies all mothers that we are talking about. In fact, it doesn't.

I must express my profound dismay. My father was chief of surgery at the University of California Medical Center. My husband, Bert Feinstein, was a distinguished neurosurgeon. And all my life, I have lived in a medical family. As I read the AMA's letter, essentially what they are doing is providing some protection for doctors, but they are doing nothing to see that a woman's health is protected, and I feel very badly about that. Both my husband and my father were members of the American Medical Association.

I take some heart in letters from the California Medical Association which indicate their opposition to this legislation and clearly state that they believe the amended legislation before us today falls very short of the mark. They indicate their strong opposition to this bill. I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD two letters I received from the California Medical Association.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CALIFORNIA MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
San Francisco, CA, May 20, 1997.

Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR FEINSTEIN: We have reviewed the amendments to HR 1122 and believe that they make no substantive changes to the legislation. While the debate over late-term abortion is painful, both within the medical community and the general citizenry, we believe these decisions must be left to physicians and patients . . . acting together.

While late-term abortions may have occurred inappropriately in some instances, they have also saved women's lives and the health and well-being of many American families. In a society where values are assaulted on every side . . . the bond between healer and patient is ever more important. Passages of HR 1122 would be one more step in eroding that relationship. The California Medical Association is opposed to this bill and is saddened the debate appeals to the emotive, rather than the reasoning, segment of America.

Sincerely,

ROLAND C. LOWE, M.D.,
President.

CALIFORNIA MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
San Francisco, CA, May 14, 1997.

Re opposition to H.R. 1122.
Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
Hart Senate Office Bldg., Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR FEINSTEIN: The California Medical Association is writing to express its strong opposition to Congressional intrusion into the physician-patient relationship, as exemplified by the above-referenced bill, which would ban ''partial-birth abortions.'' We believe that it is wholly inappropriate for a legislature to make decisions which prevent physicians from providing appropriate medical care to their patients. Physicians must be allowed to exercise their professional judgment when determining which treatment or procedure will best serve their patients' medical needs.

The obstetricians and gynecologists have already eloquently expressed the medical justifications for this procedure in rare but very real circumstances. CMA certainly does not advocate the performance of elective abortions in the last stage of pregnancy. However, when serious fetal anomalies are discovered late in a pregnancy, or the pregnant woman develops a life-threatening medical condition that is inconsistent with continuation of the pregnancy, abortion—however heart-wrenching—may be medically necessary.

CMA respects the concern that performing this type of abortion procedure late in a pregnancy is a very serious matter. However, political concerns and religious beliefs should not be permitted to take precedence over the health and safety of patients. CMA opposes any legislation, state or federal, that denies a pregnant woman and her physician the ability to make medically appropriate decisions about the course of her medical care. The determination of the medical need for, and effectiveness of, particular medical procedures must be left to the medical profession, to be reflected in the standard of care. It would set a very undesirable precedent if Congress were by legislative fiat to decide such matters. The legislative process is ill-suited to evaluate complex medical procedures whose importance may vary with a particular patient's case and with the state of scientific knowledge.

CMA urges you to defeat this bill. Many of the patients who would seek the procedure are already in great personal turmoil. Their physical and emotional trauma should not be compounded by an oppressive law that is devoid of scientific justification.

Sincerely,

ROLLAND C. LOWE,
President.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I believe the California Medical Association still represents the largest group of physicians anywhere in this Nation. No one seems to care about the Constitution, that this bill constitutes a direct challenge to the Roe versus Wade Supreme Court decision. The Supreme Court held that in Roe, a woman has a constitutional right to choose whether or not to have an abortion. It set for the different trimesters, some specific limitations on that right, that before viability, abortion cannot be banned; after viability, the Government can prohibit abortion, except when necessary to protect a woman's life or health.

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

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. This bill, the bill before us, says the woman's health doesn't matter, it is of no consideration. I must tell you, to me a woman's health matters. It should be of direct consideration.

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

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. So I will vote no on this bill, and I really regret that this day is upon us. I thank the Chair.

Mr. SANTORUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I just suggest the American Medical Association and the other hundreds of doctors understand the point that seems to elude the Members of this Chamber. By outlawing this procedure they are, in fact, protecting the health of the mother, because this is an unhealthy procedure, this is a dangerous procedure. This procedure, as said by over 500 physicians ''is never medically necessary, in order to preserve a woman's life, health or future fertility, to deliberately kill an unborn child in the second and third trimester, and certainly not by mostly delivering the child before putting him or her to death.''

I will quote another obstetrician/gynecologist, Dr. Camilla Hersh:

> Any proponent of such a dangerous procedure is at least seriously misinformed about medical reality or at worst so consumed by narrow minded ''abortion-at-any-cost'' activism to be criminally negligent.

What we are doing here is, in fact, advocating for the life health of the mother by banning a procedure which is a rogue procedure, not performed at hospitals, performed at abortion clinics, not even performed by obstetricians, invented by someone who is not an obstetrician. That is why the AMA wrote to me yesterday supporting H.R. 1122 as it now appears on the floor of the U.S. Senate saying:

> Thank you for the opportunity to work with you toward restriction of a procedure we all agree is not good medicine.

In other words, it is not in the interest of the health or life of the mother to do this procedure. It is wrong to do this procedure. It is immoral to do this procedure because you are killing a little baby. You are killing a baby that is fourth-fifths born, that is moving outside of its mother. How can we accept that when there are other options available?

As I suggested before, here is living proof of other options available: a little girl who is here today on Capitol Hill, who will be right out here by the elevators during that vote. I ask Members to go over and to look into her eyes, to talk to her, because if her parents would have listened to all the expert doctors who knew what was best for their child, she wouldn't be here today.

She would have had this brutality, this violence, this vile procedure done on this innocent little girl who now walks and talks and writes notes—''Donna'' with a hand there, reaching out asking that this procedure not be made available, so little girls like her, little boys like her, be given a chance at life.

The Senator from California said, these kids who are not well enough to make it. Who are we to decide whether they are well enough to make it? Who are we to say they should die because they are not perfect?

Give them a chance. Give them the dignity of being born and brought into this world with love, not violence and brutality. Give them a chance. Give them a chance.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will stand in recess now until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:01 p.m., recessed until 2:15; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire).

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT OF 1997

The Senate continued with consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is H.R. 1122, as amended.

Mr. HELMS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

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

The result was announced— yeas 64, nays 36, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 71 Leg.]

YEAS—64

Abraham	Faircloth	Mack
Allard	Ford	McCain
Ashcroft	Frist	McConnell
Bennett	Gorton	Moynihan
Biden	Gramm	Murkowski
Bond	Grams	Nickles
Breaux	Grassley	Reid
Brownback	Gregg	Roberts
Burns	Hagel	Roth
Byrd	Hatch	Santorum
Campbell	Helms	Sessions
Coats	Hollings	Shelby
Cochran	Hutchinson	Smith (NH)
Conrad	Hutchison	Smith (OR)
Coverdell	Inhofe	Specter
Craig	Johnson	Stevens
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Thomas
Daschle	Kyl	Thompson
DeWine	Landrieu	Thurmond
Domenici	Leahy	Warner
Dorgan	Lott	
Enzi	Lugar	

NAYS—36

Akaka	Feinstein	Lieberman
Baucus	Glenn	Mikulski
Bingaman	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Boxer	Harkin	Murray
Bryan	Inouye	Reed
Bumpers	Jeffords	Robb
Chafee	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Cleland	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Collins	Kerry	Snowe
Dodd	Kohl	Torricelli
Durbin	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Feingold	Levin	Wyden

The bill (H.R. 1122), as amended, was passed.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I wish to explain my vote today on H.R. 1122, the partial-birth abortion ban.

As with many of my colleagues, this was not an easy decision. Virtually every Senator who has participated in the debate has noted his or her abhorrence to the procedure.

I respect the views of Senators on either side of this issue. I have chosen to speak after the vote because this is a decision each Senator must decide for himself or herself.

My own decision was not easy, in part, because this bill may have no practical effect on abortions in this country. It is likely that doctors wishing to perform later-term abortions will simply choose another option.

As I repeated last week, this is not a ban of abortion; it is a ban of a specific procedure.

It is not an easy decision because I favor a woman's right to consult the physician of her choice to decide the most appropriate course of action on matters directly affecting her health and her most personal circumstances.

This decision was not easy because, in spite of the personal nature of this debate, its complexity, the medical repercussions, and its seriousness, this issue has become politicized to the extent that much of the rhetoric has substantially diminished the potential for real discourse on such an important matter.

The result is that sincere efforts to find common ground have been labeled as "shams," as "political cover," and "deceptive" by many who passed judgment without having even read the legislation.

Perhaps because my expectations were much too high, my greatest disappointment is reserved for some officials in the Catholic Church, especially in my State, for whom I had great respect and from whom I was given initial encouragement for my efforts. Their harsh rhetoric and vitriolic characterizations, usually more identified with the radical right than with thoughtful religious leadership, proved to be a consequential impediment to the decision which I have made today. It was most instructive.

This was not an easy decision, because it is highly likely that H.R. 1122 will be declared unconstitutional should it be enacted into law.

The Supreme Court has been very clear in regard to two issues concerning abortion.

First, prior to the viability of a fetus, a woman's ability to choose to terminate her pregnancy is a fundamental constitutional right and cannot be abrogated. The Court has ruled that the Government cannot impose an undue burden on a woman who wishes to terminate her pregnancy with an abortion, prior to the viability of the fetus. Second, that after a fetus is determined to be viable, it can be given protection, so long as it does not endanger the life or health of the mother.

On both principles, the bill just passed appears to be in conflict with numerous Supreme Court rulings.

Yet in spite of the difficulty in coming to my decision, I voted in favor of its passage because I still desire to find common ground with those outside the extremes who truly hope to resolve the issue in a constructive and meaningful way.

I will continue to insist that any common ground approach fall within the constitutional parameters which protect a woman and respect the legitimate concerns for her health. But I will consider other proposals which accommodate that need in a manner more effective than mine.

My hope is that we can get beyond this debate to find a lasting, more acceptable legislative response. Recurring efforts to pass and veto a bill which is likely to be found to be unconstitutional only delays meaningful progress in an effort to ban not just one procedure but all of them once a fetus is viable.

Failure to find common ground leaves little choice but to accelerate the legislative process to allow the earliest review of the law by the Supreme Court. Its determination of the questionable constitutionality of this approach will guide us and will certainly force those unwilling to compromise now to a more conciliatory position later.

Our Nation must find the solution to this deeply vexing, moral problem which has persisted in dividing us.

Let us not give up hope.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

RILEY ANNE CZARTORYSKI

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I certainly respect the comments of my colleague, and I will leave it at that because at this moment I would like to announce to my fellow Senators a joyous event in my family.

Yesterday afternoon at 4:46 my daughter, Shae Czartoryski, with the help of her husband Jeff, gave birth to our first grandchild—Suzanne Craig's and Larry Craig's first grandchild —a beautiful baby girl by the name of Riley Anne Czartoryski. She came in at 6 pounds 6 ounces, and 20½ inches long, and yelling her head off.

We are just tickled pink about that.

So, as we talk about life and as we talk about joy, I wanted to share with all of you today a joy in my life, my first grandchild, the first grandchild of our family.

I thank the Chair.

THE PARTIAL BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I supported passage of the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act when it was considered during the 104th Congress and I supported overriding the President's veto of that measure. Today, I again voted in favor of this legislation.

My position on abortion issues is clear. I have consistently stated that I would not support overturning the Supreme Court's decision in Roe versus Wade. I support a women's right to have an abortion. I do not think we should turn back the clock and make abortion illegal, but we should work in every way to reduce the number of abortions that are performed.

I have also cast votes in Congress in opposition to using Federal funds to pay for abortions except in cases of life endangerment, rape, or incest.

Today, the Senate again voted on legislation which would prohibit a physician from performing partial-birth abortions, a procedure in which a fetus is delivered into the birth canal before its skull is collapsed and delivery is completed. This legislation contains a provision which would make an exception for partial-birth abortions that are necessary to save the life of the mother in cases in which no other medical procedure would suffice.

After careful thought about this issue, I have concluded that I simply cannot justify the use of this specific procedure to terminate pregnancies in which the mother's life is not at stake. For this reason, I voted to support the ban on partial-birth abortions, and I hope that the President will reconsider his decision to veto this measure and sign it into law.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to express deep regret at the passage of H.R. 1122, the so-called partial birth abortion bill. I find it appalling that the U.S. Senate will enact legislation that is not just an attack on choice, but more importantly an assault on a woman's reproductive health.

I had hoped that the Daschle amendment, which I cosponsored, would address the alleged concerns about unnecessary abortions being performed after viability. This amendment was a reasonable approach and would have met the State objective of preventing late-term abortions on healthy fetuses when there was no serious threat to the life or health of the mother. However, it has become obvious what the real agenda is; to chip away at the guarantees and protections afforded to all women by the Supreme Court. Those on the other side have now solicited the American Medical Association [AMA] in their efforts to undermine Roe versus Wade and to jeopardize the health of women.

The AMA has simply cut a deal which unfortunately does not include women's reproductive health. They have acted in such a way to protect their interests and not the interest of their patients. Their announcement does not in any way change the intent of this legislation nor does it do anything to address the concerns about women's health. It is simply a political, calculated decision.

During the 104th Congress, there were 53 floor votes attacking reproductive health. Today's vote is simply a continuation of this attack. In the 104th Congress we witnessed attacks on title X, international family planning, and access to save and legal abortion coverage for Federal employees and military personnel. This is not about preventing late-term abortions, this is about preventing a women's and physician's right to determine their own health care needs. They will not stop here. This attack will continue until all abortions, regardless of viability or the life and health of the mother are illegal. Today, we have taken a huge step backward.

Since joining the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, I have heard from numerous groups representing physicians and from numerous doctors from Washington State. I have been told repeatedly that Congress must act to prevent the further eroding of the patient-doctor relationship currently taking place in the managed care delivery system. I have heard numerous stories about physicians who are unable to prescribe the appropriate treatment for their patients because insurance companies have determined this treatment too costly or not necessary. I have always agreed that doctors should be making health care decisions, not insurance companies. I now am baffled as to why the AMA would want the U.S. Congress to dictate what treatment options physicians can use to save the life and health of their female patients. Today's action invites the U.S. Congress into the operating room and appears to have the blessing of the AMA.

I am grateful that there is one last line of defense; the President's veto. I am hopeful that the President will act swiftly to veto this offensive and threatening legislation and that we will do the right thing and sustain this veto.

Mr. ENZI addressed the Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. ENZI. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. ENZI pertaining to the introduction of S. 765 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. ENZI. 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. 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

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, the concurrent budget resolution, and I might indicate that we conferred with the ranking minority member and he concurs in this consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 27) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the presence and use of small electronic calculators be permitted during consideration of the fiscal year 1998 concurrent resolution on the budget and any conference report thereon.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for full floor privileges be granted to the following members of the Budget Committee staff: Austin Smythe and Ann Miller.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. That is for the duration of the discussion on the resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that the staff of the Senate Committee on the Budget including congressional fellows and detailees from the executive branch named on the list I now send to the desk be permitted to remain on the Senate floor during consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27 and any conference report thereon.

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

The list is as follows.

SENATE BUDGET COMMITTEE—MAJORITY STAFF TITLE LIST

Scott Burnison, Budget Analyst.

Amy Call, Communications Assistant.

Jim Capretta, Sr. Policy Analyst.

Lisa Cieplak, Sr. Analyst for Education and Social Services.

Kay Davies, Legislative Counsel.

Kathleen Dorn, Administrative Director.

Beth Smerko Felder, Chief Counsel.

Alice Grant, Analyst for International Affairs.

Jim Hearn, Sr. Analyst for Government Finance and Management.

G. William Hoagland, Majority Staff Director.

Carole McGuire, Assistant Staff Director, Director of Appropriations Activities.

Anne Miller, Director of Budget Review.

Mieko Nakabayashi, Staff Assistant.

Cheri Reidy, Sr. Analyst for Budget Review.

Ricardo Rel, Sr. Analyst for Agriculture and Natural Resources & Community Development.

Karen Ricoy, Legal Assistant.

Brian Riley, Sr. Analyst for Transportation and Science.

Michael Ruffner, Sr. Analyst for Income Security and Veterans.

Andrea Shank, Staff Assistant.

Amy Smith, Chief Economist.

Austin Smythe, Assistant Staff Director, Director of Budget Process and Energy.

Bob Stevenson, Communications Director.

Marc Sumerlin, Fellow.

Winslow Wheeler, Analyst for Defense.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I note the presence of Senator LAUTENBERG in the Chamber and I wonder if he might join with me in at least discussing with the Senate how we might try together to be as helpful to fellow Senators yet move this resolution along as expeditiously as possible.

From my standpoint, I do not believe my opening remarks and the opening remarks of any Members that I am aware of who want to speak in favor of the resolution should take any longer than 1 hour. I am not holding anyone to that but just sort of indicating to the Senate that is the way I kind of see the time elapsing, to be exchanged side by side, one on the Democrat side and one on ours. But I think we need about 1 hour in that regard. Does the Senator have any idea in reference to that side?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I thank the chairman of the Budget Committee for the way in which cooperation has taken place. Both of us and our staffs have worked cooperatively together to get this done, and we now arrive at the point before giving our formal statements where we are about to begin the debate that counts the most, going beyond the discussions we have had within the committee.

I have had several requests for people who would like to make opening statements. I think I probably need 20 to 25 minutes on my own. I do not know how long the distinguished chairman of the committee is going to take for his statement, but I would think that an hour might be on the short side of things.

So, Mr. President, I hope that we could give enough of our colleagues a chance to air their views. It is my fervent hope we will be able to conclude our business before the full 50 hours are used. I also hope that we can get this budget agreement passed. We have a historic opportunity to work together on something that I think the American people want to see, a bipartisan effort to reduce our annual deficit to zero. I think we accomplished that, and I hope the amendments will be those we can discuss honestly, having votes where required and move on with the business of the country.

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me try this. I know that in our conference the leader, Senator TRENT LOTT, suggested we will be voting tonight and that we will be in here late and that is because we expect amendments. There may have to be a window of a couple of hours from 6 to 8 because of some event on that side of the aisle and likewise tomorrow night some window but we do intend to stay in late. I would be willing to accommodate Senators in any way possible, but we need Senators to begin to bring amendments down as soon as possible.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Absolutely.

Mr. DOMENICI. I am going to suggest if a Senator has amendments ready to go, even if we have not finished our opening remarks, other than the Senator's and mine, we ought to welcome them to the floor and proceed.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. In response to the need to get business done here, our leader asked at the caucus that people get their amendments up early this afternoon, at least let us know what amendments are coming so we can deal with them, and move on with the business. Meanwhile, I have alerted my colleagues on the Democratic side to the fact that we will be accepting opening statements this afternoon and those who want to make them are welcome to do so, I think under the structure of our understanding.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, first I thank my friend, Senator LAUTENBERG, for those remarks. Fellow Senators from either side of the aisle, if you have amendments, it would really be helping the Senate with its work if you would let us know about your amendments. We have about five or six already that we are aware of, and we will start sharing those with the Senator from New Jersey so that he will know about them. If the Senator will do the same with us, it will be very helpful.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. We have reason to believe there are about a half a dozen presently listed. We will confirm that.

Mr. DOMENICI. All right.

Mr. President, I want to thank and compliment a few people before I proceed to my substantive remarks. First and foremost, I thank Senator TRENT LOTT, the majority leader of the Senate. He has exhibited a rare determination and real dedication and commitment to trying to get a bipartisan budget resolution through so that the Congress could do the work of the people this year and do as much of it together as we possibly could.

I thank the Democratic leadership, at least the Democratic leadership in the Senate, for their work in behalf of this resolution. Senator DASCHLE has been extremely helpful. On the Democrat side, Senator LAUTENBERG, Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG of New Jersey, has been extremely helpful. He has worked hard. And together we intend to get this budget resolution out of here as close as possible to the form approved by the committee yesterday afternoon, by as overwhelming a vote as we could expect, 17 to 4, and I believe this morning the vote finished up at 17 to 5. So there were 17 Senators from both sides of the aisle and 5 against.

I thank President Clinton and his negotiators, the President personally for his insistence we stay with it and for his early determinations made to this Senator and to Senator LOTT that he wanted to proceed to try to do this.

Obviously, there are many other people who were very important. I am not going to name them all here now but in due course we will try to do that.

Let me say to those listening today that 2 weeks ago we announced in the rotunda that Republicans and Democrats had reached an important agreement on a bipartisan budget plan. That announcement represented a crucial step in both sides coming together to produce a budget in the best interests of the American people.

Yesterday, the Senate Budget Committee took the next step and approved this bipartisan plan, and I sincerely hope this body will follow suit and pass this agreement within the next day or two at the most.

Because the real winners in this budget are the American working families, this budget will lead to reduced Federal spending, the largest tax cut since 1981, and ultimately to lower interest rates that will mean more and better paying jobs.

Moreover, this agreement responds to the American people who clearly sent a message in the last election, tough elections for many Members with many issues, but I believe there was one unmistakable resonance through that campaign across America. I think the people said work together when the interests of the American people are at stake, work together when the issues are American. Do not fight all the time. So we have done just that. A year will find this Congress on opposite sides in the best tradition of debate, disagreeing with each other. Ultimately, parts of the implementation of this budget will find us disagreeing, but the truth is we have taken, yesterday afternoon, the first real step in saying to the American people we accept your request, in many cases your desire and your begging us to work together, and we have done just that. And in doing so we have produced a compromise that I believe will improve the lives of families today while providing a better future for tomorrow.

It will mean, when it is all finished, the first balanced budget in 30 years. It will mean $135 billion in gross tax relief over 5 years. Included in this will be a capital gains tax differential, obviously a child tax credit, and other things that both sides have talked about. Clearly, it will include some of the President's tax requests with reference to education, higher education and some of the ideas he has enacted.

Now, a budget resolution does not tell anybody precisely what these are. The committees that have to write the law will do that. But what we do give them is a flow of taxes over the years saying how much they can cut each year, and at the end of 5 years they will have a gross revenue number of $135 billion in new tax cuts. We have also agreed, the leadership has, that over 10 years just in the normal sequence of things that body of new taxes will amount to $250 billion in permanent reductions over a 10-year period.

I believe those two are pretty good propositions that many Americans would support, but we do not want to stop there. We have made adjustments to the trust fund for senior citizens under Medicare such that it will be solvent for about 10 years. That provides Americans, American leadership with ample opportunity to permanently reform the Medicare system. It also without question provides more options for the Medicare plan which can be adopted as part of this agreement by the Finance Committee and its counterpart in the House. Ten years of solvency for Medicare while providing more choice is, indeed, accomplishing something significant.

Entitlement reforms over the next 10 years including those that will be found in Medicare amount to about $630 billion over the next 10 years. Some of these might be challenged by Members and we are willing to debate them. But it is obvious that the entitlement package we are used to in our country will grow far less because of this budget resolution than if we had left everything alone. Funding for White House and Republican domestic priorities and Democratic priorities including education, transportation, housing, environment, crime control, and science programs have been provided for.

All of those will be in the ascendancy, and all of those will be deemed priorities so that the Appropriations Committee will have the full support of the leadership in funding these items at a higher level, including, if I did not mention, the basic environmental protection funding for the United States.

(Mr. KEMPTHORNE assumed the chair.)

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, passing this Balanced Budget Act of 1997 will force the Federal Government to finally live within its means. It makes permanent change that will reduce Government spending by some $320 billion in the next 5 years and more than $1 trillion over the next decade.

The agreement will also give families relief by cutting gross taxes, as I have indicated before, by $135 billion in the first 5 years and gross taxes by as much as $350 billion over 10 years.

Seniors can be assured that Medicare will remain solvent, ensuring this solvency for 10 years by enacting reforms that slow the growth of spending while providing seniors with more choices, which is what we need in the Medicare system. But nobody should assume that this budget resolution, and I would be prepared as one who knows a bit about budget resolutions, neither this nor any budget resolution will be the vehicle to provide permanent, long-term major reform of the Medicare system which is going to be needed within the next 5 to 6 to 7 years to meet what everybody understands is a very, very large population increase, where the demographics begin to change dramatically because of the baby boomers. We do not have a plan. This budget is not a plan to make Medicare solvent for that kind of change. Anybody who thought it should be has a mistaken understanding of what you can do in a budget resolution. But we did a lot, because it is done on a bipartisan basis and with the President.

This overall plan will shrink Government, making most of the programs leaner and more efficient. Medicaid, Federal retirement, housing, veterans, student loans programs are just some of those that will be targeted for reform and savings, while overall spending will be reduced, as I have indicated, over 10 years by an excess of $1 trillion. We have added money to protect priorities, and so those priorities that I have mentioned find themselves this time in this budget resolution, and the agreement that attends it finds modest but necessary increases for education, transportation, anticrime, environment, and science.

Contrasted with other budget resolutions, wherein these kinds of ideas would be nothing more than telling the Appropriations Committee what we hope would happen, we have entered into a very major bipartisan leadership agreement, which I will hold up here, and eventually it will be made a part of the RECORD, entitled the ''Bipartisan Agreement on the Budget,'' dated May 15, between the President and the leadership of Congress. It contains the summary tables, the description of agreements by major category, both in the discretionary programs and the mandatory and budget process reforms that have been agreed to that will have to work their way through the various bills, Mr. President, as they find themselves reported by the various committees.

There are also two letters pertaining to the taxes which were executed by the Republican leaders of the House and Senate directed to the committee chairmen and the President indicating the situation regarding the tax cuts. Once again, I know those listening would like for those of us who write a budget to tell them exactly what the capital gains tax will be. We don't know that. We know it will be significantly reduced. Exactly when the $500 child care credit will be totally implemented we cannot tell you, but it will be, because, with all of the tax proposals, it may be that some have to wait a little bit and others will start more quickly, but that will be done. Some education tax relief for middle-income Americans who are sending children to college as part of the President's request is included in the letter of agreement as to what our committees will work on as they carry out and implement this budget.

It should be pointed out that this is the first time we have ever had such an agreement, and that means that those of us in the bipartisan leadership and those who worked on this committee, my Democratic counterpart and I, have a very serious responsibility to see we try to carry out on the floor of the Senate not only the budget resolution, but the terms of the agreement as it applies to the budget resolution. We will try that, yet we will have the Senate working its will in its normal manner for the next couple of days.

I am sure there will be many very, very difficult votes. I myself believe the budget is about as good as we are going to get it. It is now agreed to by Democrats and Republicans and the President. I believe before we finish, it will receive an overwhelming vote of support, and we will just have to wait and see whether that prediction is true or not.

We have also agreed in two areas to deal with some problems in society that needed some attention, and let me address the two in a general way.

First of all, it is obvious that even with Medicaid, which should cover many of our children, poor children, there are a lot of American children who have no health insurance. We have agreed to put money into two programs, and in the basic agreement that we have with the President, it is spelled out that over the next 5 years, $16 billion will be spent in an effort to cover all children in America who are not covered. There is a lot of leeway on the part of the committees to write that, but it is obvious that there will be added moneys for Medicaid so that they can pick up many of the children who are not covered. There are additional resources in there for a program that will go back to the States, a partnership arrangement, where the States will receive our money and match it and try to cover other children in their own way as they manage the programs in the best possible way.

That is one area that we agreed needed coverage, and I am pleased to say my own polling of Republicans, not a whip check or anything, indicates there are many of them who want to do that. The question remains, how do we do it best and what will it ultimately cost? But we have provided the $16 billion that goes to the committee of jurisdiction to do the very best job they can.

We also found in the U.S. Senate not too many days ago on an appropriations bill presented by Senator STEVENS that the Senate voted by a huge margin to continue coverage for a group of legal—legal—residents of the United States who happened to come here as immigrants in a legal manner and remain here legally but are not American citizens. They come under an American program of generosity, which permits family reunification. Many of them come here as grandparents and parents. The program has broken down because the sponsors who are supposed to take care of them have not taken care of them, and the law intended to do that has not been enforced for years. As a result, there are more than a few thousand disabled senior Americans who are here as legal immigrants who are getting an SSI check every month. This budget resolution says we are providing sufficient funds so that those people will not drop off the rolls automatically on a date certain as contemplated under last year's law but will continue coverage so long as they live.

We have also said if there are Americans of the same condition that are here under the same circumstance that I described, if they reach the time when they are both senior and disabled, they would be entitled to SSI. But that ends the pool. In the future, any newcomers under these rules will have to rely upon their sponsors, and we wrote strong laws last year to make the sponsors more responsible.

Those are the two major areas of additional expenditures that we have put in place and agreed with the President on.

I will just make a few comparisons by dollars and show those who are paying any attention what we are talking about.

While some accounts are protected, as I indicated, the emphasis in this plan is clear: For every new $1 added to the budget, it is reduced by $15. For every new $1 in spending, there is roughly $3.50 in tax cuts.

This displays in a very vivid manner what happens to the deficit. Without the agreement is the red line; with the agreement is the green line. We think that is as simple as we can show it. The deficit will be going up from 90 and not coming back down significantly, according to the best estimates. And under these estimates, the green line represents how we will get to balance and, in fact, have a slight surplus by 2002, a pretty important and very-easy-to-understand chart.

This simple chart is nondefense discretionary spending. In our national budget, we have essentially three kinds of expenditures. One batch is called discretionary, which simply means we appropriate it every year. I am not one who thinks that is the greatest idea. I am hoping we can change that and appropriate for 2 years at a time. Part of that is defense, which is appropriated every year. It is a discretionary account annually done, and then all the domestic programs that are appropriated every year are called the nondefense discretionary program.

The sum total of those amount to about $540 billion plus, about 37 percent of the budget. Some people think it is the whole budget, but it is about 37 percent.

This shows under the greenline, spending without this agreement, for the discretionary domestic part of this budget, and under the red line, it shows what will happen. There were some a few weeks ago who were saying this budget agreement was one that was just throwing money at the discretionary programs instead of trying to get some frugality and some better performance.

This redline indicates that the entire discretionary piece of our Government for the domestic programs will go up, Mr. President, one-half of 1 percent a year. In the prior decade, it went up 6 percent on average. For some, that is bad news. For others, that is good news. The fact that the President of the United States has agreed to that and that we have and said even while it is adjusting at such a low rate of growth, we want to have some priorities like roads, like in education, to me seems to be the kind of thing the public would like us to do.

Share of the total outlays of our budget has changed dramatically, and I will just show that quickly and summarize my remarks very quickly.

When John Kennedy was President of the United States, the budget of the United States was broken up into two parts and went something like this. The interest on the debt was small, Mr. President, so let's leave that aside. It was about 67 percent discretionary spending for defense and domestic programs, those annual ones we do every year, and the rest of the budget, which would be about 33 percent, were what we call mandatory or entitlement programs. That means a program that spent out on its own, unless Congress changes the law—a Social Security check, a Medicare benefit payment to a hospital.

All the other programs, pensions, and the like, and I guess I would summarize them this way, any program that the U.S. Government has that if they failed to pay it to a citizen or an institution that is entitled to it, they can prevail in getting their money from the Treasury of the United States direct through a court of law.

It turns out from President Kennedy's time to ours, it has flipped on its head, and 67 percent of the budget is now on automatic pilot, running on its own, mandatory programs which we can only control if we change the underlying law by a vote of the Congress and the signature of the President. The balance of 33 percent makes up all of the expenditures for defense and domestic programs.

So it seems to most of us that we know where the area of growth is and the areas that cry out for reform if we are going to bring this Government's fiscal policy under control and not have to look at taxes skyrocketing 15 years from now and the bill that our children must pay getting bigger and bigger and the credit card that we kind of take from them without representation. If ever there was taxation without representation, it is the deficit you impose on kids where they do not get to vote. It clearly means they are going to have to pay taxes in order to pay these bills that they were not even around to vote on.

So I believe when you look at what we have done and add three other things, we will enforce this program. The discretionary caps, the discretionary programs that I have described for domestic spending, we will have a cap on them for each year at a dollar number agreed to in the resolution. That dollar number is the one that moves this one-half percent growth we spoke of. That will be a cap that says, at the end of a year if you spend more than that, by operation of law, every program in the Government will get cut by the percentage needed to bring it back to that cap.

It has been the only effective tool we have had. It has worked twice because we have only breached it twice. That is set to expire. We need to reput that in the law for another 5 years. That is provided for here.

We also preserve budget points of order against those caps. I will not go into that, but that is a second remedy to make sure we are doing what we promised and what we say here.

In addition, the deficit comes down each year starting in 1998, albeit not as much as we would like in the early years because, remember, we are cutting taxes in those early years and the entitlement program savings grow in the outyears. But essentially it will not go back up and down in spurts; it will be at a level and gradual road and path downward.

We used conservative economics in this budget. There is some confusion about that. But if one wants to check them, we use the economic assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office as to growth, unemployment, and those basic ingredients, those basic pieces of the economy that we measure.

This budget is conservative. So when somebody says you have not provided for a recession, I ask, have you ever seen a budget presented by a President or Congress that anticipates specifically a recession and says in 2 years we have a recession and therefore things are changed? Obviously, nobody does that. But when you use the conservative numbers that the Congressional Budget Office says should be used, they say built within it over time is the conservativeness that would permit you to be much safer in case of a recession, that your numbers will not be very much out of kilter, because of the conservatism of the economic assumptions.

Now, later on, if a Senator wants to talk about the revenues that we assume will come into this budget, I will be pleased to do that. We were confronted midstream with a change in the revenue expectations, but I would be pleased to discuss that with anybody who chooses during the next 2 days.

Suffice it to say that we hope—we found out the revenues were going to be up, and the Congressional Budget Office, heretofore very conservative in that regard, had decided that their estimates were too low. We spent only about $30 billion of their $225 billion, and that was done for very specific purposes, and the rest stayed in there as deficit reduction.

So I believe for the future of our country and in particular for the future of our children, the time is now to pass this budget rather intact and get on with implementing it.

Mr. President and fellow Senators, this budget has the best chance of reaching the reality that is predicted within the four corners of this resolution of any we have produced, because this is not one party's budget resolution, and that party being in Congress, and another party's President being in the White House with a different idea. Since we have something that is agreed to by both, it would seem to me that its implementation has a much better chance of being achieved rather than just fought over and reach stalemates because we cannot agree.

That is why last year as I finished doing our Republican budget, I said, I hope I do not have to do one that is just Republican again unless we happen to have a Republican President, because it would seem to me you have to take into consideration the President and his wishes to some extent. And I believe we have done that. And he has taken ours into account to some extent. And that is the final product.

So, fellow Senators, that is my best explanation. I will answer anybody's questions and go into as much detail on any parts of it that anyone wants. But for now, again, if you can give us ideas about amendments you intend to offer, it will be greatly appreciated.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LAUTENBERG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, first, I start by issuing the plea also that Senator DOMENICI, the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, started with; that is, to our fellow Senators, get your amendments down here. Do not cause a jam up at the end when you may not be able to get the floor. You may not be able to have a full explanation of that which you are interested in.

We want to move the process. This is no longer a time for delay and bickering among ourselves. We are obliged to move it because it is the right thing for America.

First, let me say that I am pleased to join my colleague, the chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI, in urging support for this budget resolution.

For the past several weeks, Senator DOMENICI and I, along with representatives of the administration and the House Budget Committee, have been working long hours and arduously to reach a budget agreement. It has been a long, difficult and occasionally a painful process. But in the end I am pleased to say that we succeeded in our mission.

Today, for the first time in many, many years, we will be considering a budget resolution that is truly bipartisan. This resolution, Mr. President, is historic. It will lead to the first balanced budget since 1969. It calls for the largest investment in education and training since the Johnson administration. It combines tough fiscal discipline with a strong commitment to Medicare, the environment, transportation, and other national priorities.

Beyond its substance, Mr. President, I am hopeful that this agreement represents a turning point in contemporary American politics. For many years, Congress has been dominated by partisanship and immobilized by gridlock. This constant infighting has undermined our standing around the country. It has made it more difficult to solve our Nation's problems. And we all hope that a sense of comity that now seems to be here during these budget discussions will prevail here in Washington. This agreement marks a major step in that direction.

The agreement shows Democrats and Republicans are ready to put aside partisan differences, rise above petty bickering, and make the hard decisions that our people across the country want us to do. That is what we are delivering.

Mr. President, this agreement comes before us at a time when our economy is remarkably strong. Over the past 2½ years the stock market has skyrocketed by more than 80 percent; unemployment is at its lowest point in 24 years; inflation is at the slowest pace in 31 years; new investment has soared at a 9 percent annual rate over the last 4 years, a welcome change from the performance over the preceding 8 years; and real wages have started to rise again after years of stagnation.

The tremendous strength of our economy is a tribute to President Clinton and the Democratic Party. When President Clinton came into office, the budget deficit was $290 billion and it was expected to explode to more than $500 billion by 2002. Since then, just the contrary has happened. The deficit has been cut by 63 percent, falling 4 years in a row to $107 billion in 1996. This year, the deficit is estimated to be falling to $67 billion.

This, Mr. President, is remarkable progress. We want to continue that progress, and this budget agreement will get it done.

People tend to think of budgeting as a zero sum game in which one person's win is another's loss. But this budget agreement is a win-win-win all around. It is a win for our economy. It is a win for ordinary Americans who are working hard to raise their families and keep their heads above water. It is a win for the future of our country.

Mr. President, both parties should be pleased with this bipartisan achievement. But I want to take a few minutes to explain why I think Democrats deserve to be especially proud.

Throughout this process, we Democrats have insisted on an agreement that imposes real fiscal discipline that builds on President Clinton's tremendous success in reducing the deficit, and that balances the budget in a real, credible way. And the American people have won.

Democrats have insisted that we make education a top national priority. We have demanded that middle-class families get tax relief to help pay for college, and that all Americans get assistance in affording further education and job training. And the American people have won.

Democrats have insisted that Medicare be protected. We have demanded that the solvency of the Medicare trust fund be extended, that senior citizens not be asked to bear unfair burdens, that the quality of their health care not be put at risk, and that new preventative benefits be added. And the American people have won.

Democrats have insisted on targeting tax relief to the middle class. We have demanded that when Congress cuts taxes, much of the relief must go to struggling families who need help the most. And the American people have won.

Democrats have insisted that uninsured children be provided with health insurance. We have demanded that millions of kids get the health care they need and deserve. And the American people have won.

Democrats have insisted on fairness for people who come into this country legally, who have obeyed the law, and paid their taxes and who then suffer from a disability. We have demanded the elimination of extreme laws that punish people because they get hit by a bus or lose their eyesight. And the American people have won.

Democrats have insisted on maintaining our commitment to environmental protection. We have demanded more funding to clean up hazardous waste sites while resisting schemes to gut the Environmental Protection Agency. And the American people have won.

Democrats have also insisted on investing in transportation. We have demanded that transportation be made a priority and that funding be increased substantially over the levels originally proposed earlier this year. And the American people have won.

Mr. President, my point is not that Democrats are the sole winners here. That of course is not true. This is a fair and balanced agreement. The Republicans have won on many of their most cherished priorities. Some of those wins have been bitter pills for me and for many Democrats, but I say to my friends on this side of the aisle, the fact is that we do not control either Houses of the Congress. And we have to respect the will of the American people. So there is no way to solve our Nation's problems without compromise. It is the only way, and painful though it may be for some, it is the right thing to do.

Mr. President, let me turn to some of the specifics in the budget agreement, some of which have been mentioned by the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, but I think are worthy of repetition.

First, and perhaps most fundamentally, this agreement will balance the budget by the year 2002. Beginning next year, when the agreement first goes into effect, the deficit will decline every year until we reach balance. Balancing the budget will require real fiscal discipline. This agreement calls for $320 billion in savings over the next 5 years. More than half of those savings will come from entitlement programs and other mandatory spending. More than $75 billion will come out of the military budget. While important domestic priorities will be spared the meat cleaver, nondefense discretionary spending, which encompasses many of the programs that the people across the country are interested in, will be reduced in real terms by $61 billion, or about 4 percent. As I said, some pain comes.

Will all of these savings really balance the budget? Mr. President, any budget projection must rely on economic assumptions. But the assumptions in this budget are on the conservative side. They are based on economic projections of the Congressional Budget Office which have proven to be far from reality for the past 4 years. They have missed the targets. They have overestimated some poor results.

Consider that just a few months ago, CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, estimated this year's budget deficit would be $124 billion. That was only in January. In March, CBO, 2 months later, revised its estimate down to $115 billion from $124 billion. Now, in May, there are reports that the deficit could be as low as $67 billion.

Think about that, Mr. President. We are talking about the current fiscal year which ends in less than 5 months, and in just that same length of time, the projected deficit has shrunk by 45 percent from $124 billion to $67 billion.

At this rate, some have suggested the best way to balance the budget would be for Congress to sit down, keep quiet, and go home. Who knows, they may be right. If they are, this agreement will produce significant budget surpluses, a result unimaginable not long ago.

My point, though, is simply that in using CBO's economic assumptions, we are using projections that have consistently proven to be too pessimistic. This budget does not rest on unrealistic rosy scenarios, as have past budget agreements, so it is very likely that we will actually reach balance or a surplus before the next 5 years is out if we can get this agreement enacted into law.

Mr. President, this budget resolution establishes without question that both political parties are now firmly committed to fiscal discipline. For years, Republicans have run for office by accusing the Democrats of being tax-and-spend liberals, unconcerned about fiscal responsibility. This agreement puts these charges to rest once and for all. It is now clear that Democrats and Republicans are both committed to a balanced budget. We disagree only about the means to that end and how the burden of the deficit reduction will be distributed.

Fortunately, this budget agreement is more than an accounting exercise. It will set our country on a firm course into the 21st century by empowering our people, by investing in them and ensuring they are ready to compete in the years and decades ahead.

As I noted earlier, this agreement includes the largest investment in education and training since the administration of Lyndon Baines Johnson. The agreement moves us toward a day when every 8-year-old child can read, every 12-year-old child can log in on the Internet, and every 18-year-old can go to college. Those are the goals that President Clinton committed to when he addressed us earlier this year, and they are the right goals for America.

Mr. President, I grew up the son of working-class immigrants, but was able, because of my service in World War II, to attend Columbia University, thanks to the GI bill. I want all Americans to have the same opportunities I had, because education is the key to prosperity and security and because, like I, not only will they learn important subjects, but maybe their horizons will be less limiting. My horizons were developed because I saw my parents standing behind the counter making sandwiches, washing dishes, working from 6 o'clock in the morning until 11 o'clock at night, typically, 7 days a week, just to grind out a living to take care of my sister and me. They could not give us much more than the comfort of interested parents, and goals to which they wanted us to aspire. That is the way it ought to be, Mr. President.

The opportunity came along for me to have an education that never would have come my way. It changed my perspective totally, and enabled me, without being too immodest, to start a company that started an industry—the computing industry—that is today larger than the hardware industry. That is on the service side, software—everybody now is familiar with software—outsourcing services. The company has 29,000 employees. I am a member of something called the ''Information Processing Hall of Fame,'' all of that because I got a boost from my Government, from my fellow citizens, for something that I did.

All Americans, no matter how rich or poor, should have access to that American dream. My parents never thought that I would have the opportunity to serve in the U.S. Senate, to be given the honor of serving the American people, but, again, it happened because a start was given to me at just the right time in my life.

Toward that end, Mr. President, toward access to the American dream, this agreement includes the largest Pell grant increases in two decades. Four million students will receive a grant of up to $3,000 for higher education. These grants, we hope, will open the doors of opportunity and help lead our country in the next century. Our entire Nation will reap the reward.

The agreement also will provide significant tax relief to those who want to attend college. It endorses the objectives of President Clinton's HOPE scholarship proposal, which would provide a $1,500 annual tax credit for higher education. This extra money would encourage millions of young people to go to college.

The agreement also endorses the objectives of the President's proposal to give a $10,000 tax deduction to help cover education and job training costs for young people in the family. This proposal is critical to ensure that Americans are able to train and retrain themselves throughout their lives, not just upper level managers, but each and every American.

There are several other education initiatives that are guaranteed by this agreement. For example, it guarantees funding for a child literacy initiative such as the President's America Reads proposal. This program would provide individualized after-school and summer help for more than 3 million children in kindergarten through the third grade. More than a million tutors would be involved.

The budget agreement also will fund a technological literacy initiative. The President has proposed to connect every American classroom to the Internet and to ensure that all teachers are trained to work with this latest in technology. His proposal would help schools integrate the technology into their programs so that no American child is burdened with computer illiteracy.

The budget agreement also calls for significant expansion of Head Start. This widely praised program has had tremendous success in preparing very young children for their education and for their futures. This agreement will help move us toward President Clinton's goal of increasing Head Start enrollments to 1 million children by the year 2002.

Mr. President, the combination of increased Pell grants, the tuition tax credit, the education training deduction, the children literacy initiative, the technological literacy program, Head Start, and many other educational initiatives, make this agreement a truly historic commitment to education, and it is reason enough for Democrats and Republicans alike to support this agreement.

I want to move on to some other important features of the budget resolution. It will ensure that up to 5 million uninsured children are provided with health coverage. The resolution includes $16 billion toward that end, and it will be up to the committees of responsibility to decide whether to use Medicaid expansion or a grant program to States or another approach, but the commitment and the resources are there to get the job done. In the end, that will mean that more children of working families will have health insurance.

This budget agreement also will strengthen and modernize our Medicare Program. The agreement first would extend the solvency of the Medicare trust fund for at least 10 years. Senator DOMENICI made mention of the fact that during that time we will have to look to the longer term problems often associated with Medicare while carrying on the wonderful, very positive benefits that have resulted. It makes positive structural reforms which will bring Medicare more into line with the private sector while preparing it for the baby-boom generation.

The agreement extends the trust fund solvency in part by reforming payment systems for hospitals and doctors. In addition, it gives the seniors more choices. It increases the number of health plan options such as preferred provider organizations and provider-sponsored organizations. It also gives beneficiaries comparative information about their options such as now provided Federal employees of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program.

Additionally, the agreement provides funding for several very significant new preventive benefits. These include expanded mammography coverage, coverage for colorectal screening, coverage for diabetes self-examination, and vaccinations. Beyond investing in education and protecting and improving Medicare, this agreement will provide significant tax relief to millions of American families.

In addition to the education tax cuts that I mentioned earlier, the agreement includes a $500-per-child tax credit. This will be of real assistance to many Americans who are working hard and struggling to make ends meet. The agreement also will allow the Finance Committee to cut capital gains and estate taxes, as well as expand IRA's and make other changes to the Tax Code. These changes will benefit many small businesses and farmers, goals which Republicans and Democrats strongly agree upon.

However, there is real concern, Mr. President, among many Democrats that these tax breaks will go disproportionately to the wealthy and will explode the deficit in the long term. Frankly, I share those concerns. In a time of scarce resources, it seems wrong to be handing out huge tax breaks to people who do not need them.

The bottom line is we would not have a budget agreement if Democrats were not willing to accept some of these tax breaks. This was the main win that the Republicans demanded. Though it is a bitter pill for some, in my view, it is a pill we have to swallow for the benefits of a balanced budget, education investment, health coverage for 5 million children, restoration of disability benefits for desperate legal immigrants, and other positive parts of this agreement.

I do want to assure my colleagues, however, that the agreement includes significant constraints in the tax area that will help prevent a redo of the kind of economics that created the deficit problem in the first place.

First, there are firm limits on the size of the tax cuts—the agreement states that the net tax cuts shall be $85 billion in the first 5 years, and no more than $250 billion through 2007. Second, Leader LOTT and Speaker GINGRICH have given their firm commitment—in writing—that tax cuts, and I quote ''shall not cause costs to explode in the outyears.''

For those who are not satisfied with that commitment, I would point out that President Clinton has made it clear that he will not tolerate a tax bill that imposes huge costs in the future. And while he has agreed to a significant capital gains and estate tax cut, he has not signed away his right to veto extreme legislation that violates our basic understanding.

I also want to assure my colleagues that the size of the tax cuts in this agreement are very small compared to the enormous breaks that were approved in the early 1980's. The tax cut of 1981 cost $2.8 trillion over 10 years, in today's dollars. By contrast, this agreement would allow tax cuts of $250 billion—less than 10 percent of those that were proposed 17 years ago.

Mr. President, Republicans may have won in their insistence on tax breaks for wealthier Americans, but they did abandon radical plans to completely gut domestic priorities, and undermine the basic functions of Government. Over the next 5 years, this agreement calls for $355 billion more in domestic discretionary spending than NEWT GINGRICH demanded in the infamous Contract With America. And it includes $189 billion more than in last year's Republican budget resolution.

Mr. President, lest anyone has the impression that Government is going to be growing over the next 5 years because of these increases in some of the discretionary funds, it won't be. Nondefense discretionary spending will be cut from baseline by 4 percent overall, and by 10 percent in real terms in 2002. And when you consider that priority programs will be spared, the real cuts in other programs will be significant.

Still, in nominal terms, available resources for basic Government functions will increase overall, if only modestly. And we will trim Government with a scalpel, not a meat axe cleaver. Under the circumstances, that's a major victory.

Let me now move on to another part of the budget agreement, which deals with Medicaid.

Mr. President, this agreement preserves the Medicaid Program in two major respects. First, it preserves the guarantee of health coverage for our Nation's most vulnerable citizens. Second, it rejects the administration's proposal to establish a per capita cap on Medicaid payments. I want to publicly thank my fellow negotiators for both of these decisions.

I think it would have been a poor way to administer the Medicaid Program. We shouldn't be adopting a scheme that jeopardizes the quality of health care for millions of children, seniors, and other vulnerable Americans.

At one point, I was in a distinct minority in the negotiating room in my opposition to the per capita cap, and I am very pleased that the proposal was rejected in the end. In my view, at a time when the growth in Medicaid spending has dropped dramatically, we should not be adopting risky schemes that could jeopardize the quality of health care for millions of children, seniors, and other vulnerable Americans.

Mr. President, the agreement does include a cut in payments for hospitals that serve a disproportionate share of Medicaid and uninsured patients. I have real concerns about this. Clearly, some States have abused the program, and we should be able to find savings by reforming the program. But we must be very careful not to hurt children's hospitals and others who are very reliant on this funding. I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Finance Committee to ensure that this does not happen.

Mr. President, let me turn now to another important element of this agreement, the provisions that will roll back some of the more extreme provisions in last year's welfare reform bill.

First, this agreement will restore Medicaid and disability benefits for many disabled legal immigrants. These are people who have come to this country legally, who have worked and paid their taxes, and who suffer from a serious disability.

Mr. President, it is wrong to punish these people for getting hit by a bus, or losing their eyesight. Many of them are desperately poor to begin with. Now they may be confined to bed or a wheelchair, with nowhere to go and nobody to turn to. They can't work. And they need help to survive. Providing basic assistance is the right thing to do.

This agreement also will provide relief to some individuals who would lose food stamps because they are unable to find work. This was another provision of the welfare reform bill that simply went too far. The agreement will permit States to exempt 15 percent of those who would lose benefits because of the law's very strict time limits, and would fund additional work slots for individuals subject to those limits.

In addition, the agreement includes $3 billion to help people move from welfare to work, something that all of us want to see happen.

Mr. President, let me now turn to an area of special interest to me, transportation.

Mr. President, as most of my colleagues know, I believe strongly in the value of investing in transportation, because I'm convinced that it yields tremendous benefits for our people and our economy. For years, our Nation has underinvested in transportation. And we are paying the price for that—in deteriorating roads, in snarling traffic, and in crumbling bridges and deteriorating rail systems.

Mr. President, when you compare transportation to other functions within the Government, this agreement treats transportation relatively well. I pushed hard in the negotiations for additional resources, and we were able to find over $8 billion more than the President's request over the next 5 years. That was a major increase from where we began.

Is it enough? No, it's not. But the bottom line is that there just aren't enough resources to balance the budget while doing everything we'd like. Compared with most parts of the Government, transportation does very well in this budget. And I'm hopeful we can identify even more resources as the legislative process moves forward.

Let me turn briefly to another area of particular interest to me, the environment. This budget agreement confirms that the environment is a priority. It commits the congressional leadership to fully fund environmental protection and natural resources. And it specifically protects the President's funding requests for operations of the EPA and the National Park Service's operation of the National Park System and the Everglades. In addition, the agreement reserves funds for cleaning up hazardous waste sites, assuming we can reach an agreement on policy issues concerning Superfund, which I expect will happen. Finally, the agreement provides an additional $700 million for priority land acqusitiions and exchanges.

Mr. President, before I close, let me once again say how much a privilege it has been for me to work with the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI. We have spent many, many hours together over the past several weeks. And the more I have gotten to know him, the more I have come to respect and like him. He is an honorable man who genuinely cares about our country, even if we often disagree. And he is a strong negotiator.

I also want to take this opportunity to publicly thank the other negotiators who have worked so hard to make this agreement a reality. First, Congressmen JOHN KASICH and JOHN SPRATT, men of totally different styles who share a common commitment to hard work and serious policymaking. And Frank Raines, John Hilley, and Gene Sperling of the administration, all of whom did a tremendous job in pulling this agreement together. The President has put together a very impressive team.

I also want to acknowledge the many contributions of Democratic Senators on the Budget Committee who have worked with us on this agreement.

Senators HOLLINGS, CONRAD, FEINGOLD and JOHNSON have all been vocal and effective advocates for truth in budgeting, and for a plan that makes real progress in addressing our long-term deficit problems. They have held our feet to the fire, and deserve real credit for that.

Senator SARBANES has taken the lead to ensure that the burdens of deficit reduction are distributed fairly. I know he still has some concerns about the resolution, but I want to thank him for his input as the process has moved forward.

Senators BOXER and MURRAY have been outspoken advocates for our children. They have demanded that we do a better job of covering our uninsured young people, and that we not make dangerous changes in the Medicaid Program that could jeopardize health care for our Nation's most vulnerable citizens. Their efforts will touch the lives of millions of Americans.

Senator WYDEN has been unrelenting in his demand that we modernize Medicare, that we provide additional health care choices for senior citizens, and that we protect the long-term solvency of the Medicare trust fund. No Senator has been more devoted to the future of this critical program, or more determined to make it work.

Last but not least, Senator DURBIN has in many ways been the conscience of our efforts in recent weeks. He has demanded that ordinary Americans, especially those with modest incomes, be treated fairly as we reduce the deficit. And he has helped lead the fight to restore critically needed protections for legal immigrants and children.

Mr. President, I know that many of my fellow Democrats have been frustrated with the process that led to this agreement. And I share that frustration. This was not the process that I wanted. But we have done our best under the circumstances to maximize consultation with committee members, and with all Senate Democrats. And I am optimistic that, in the end, most of my colleagues will be pleased with the end product.

Finally, I want to congratulate President Clinton for his leadership in this effort. We are here today on a bipartisan basis only because the President decided to make it happen. He deserves enormous credit for that. And I think his commitment will be appreciated and acknowledged for many years to come.

Mr. President, let me close this way. I don't think there's anyone who is entirely happy with this agreement. But while nobody sees it as perfect , everyone should see it as a good compromise. It's fair and it's balanced. And it will serve America well.

It will balance the budget. It will invest in education and training. It will provide tax relief to the middle class. It will protect Medicare and Medicaid. It will provide health care coverage to millions of children. It will throw a life vest to disabled legal immigrants. It will invest in transportation, and in environmental protection. And it will make life better for millions of ordinary, working Americans.

I close, Mr. President, with saying my thanks and appreciation to my staff who worked so hard on the Budget Committee—Bruce King, Sander Lurie, and Sue Nelson—and all of the members of the staff of the Budget Committee for their effort. We all did what we thought was right for America. I am proud to have been a part of it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, might I inquire of the number of Senators present on the floor—which pleases me to no end. Normally at this hour at this stage of the budget resolution nobody is interested. Senator DODD was here first. Might I inquire what he intends to do, so we kind of know?

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I thank the chairman. My intention was to offer an amendment at the appropriate time. I thought if I got here early, I would be high on the list, if not first, to offer my amendment. I will defer any comment on the bill itself and reserve time to offer an amendment favorably on the budget agreement that was reached. That is my purpose.

Mr. DOMENICI. Senator SARBANES?

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, it was my intention to offer a statement about the bill.

Mr. DOMENICI. Senator BYRD? I am not trying to limit or anything of this sort.

Mr. BYRD. Yes. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I expect to speak about 20 minutes. It will not be on the budget resolution.

Mr. DOMENICI. We will take the time off the resolution.

Mr. BYRD. Very well, if you will allow me.

Mr. DOMENICI. Indeed.

Senator WELLSTONE?

Mr. WELLSTONE. It is my intention to speak on the bill in general and to try to analyze the overall agreement. I will in all likelihood join with Senator DODD in his amendment later.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I think we have established in the beginning that we would go from side to side in recognition. If it is all right with my colleagues, I would like to give Senator BYRD the 20 minutes that he has asked for and permit him to speak as he wishes at this juncture.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I am going to leave Senator GORTON in my stead here in a minute or so. Whatever rights have been designated to me by the leader I designate to him under the statute. I am not going to try to make any further allotment. But if there are no Republicans forthcoming after Senator BYRD, then I will have no objection to whomever you choose next, and I will ask you to hold the amendments until some of these speeches are finished. Then we can kind of pile some of those up, and that is what people would like to do. I shouldn't use that word. That carries with it some resonance that is not so nice. We will try to stack them like beautiful lumber.

Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. SARBANES. Do they grow lumber in New Mexico?

Mr. DOMENICI. They grow anything you like in New Mexico. It is all sweet, aromatic, and beautiful.

Mr. President, I want to make a few points.

First of all, I am very glad, even though I did not intend to during this budget debate, to go through a litany of what Republicans have stood for and what we have accomplished, nor do I intend at this moment to go through all of the things the President asked for that he didn't get. I would like to make just a couple of comments.

First of all, I believe that I should be very proud of being a Republican because I don't believe without Republicans pushing for a balanced budget this President would ever have gotten to the point where he would have been for a balanced budget, much less negotiating one with us. I think history will reveal that. It was very hard to get him to come to that point.

I am not now offering this as a critical thing but merely saying that Republicans—since my friend Senator LAUTENBERG chose to have a great litany of Democratic things the Democratic Party has done—I am very pleased to be part of the party that actually pushed this country and its leaders to get a balanced budget.

Second, I would like to say I am unabashed in talking about tax cuts.

Mr. President, there is no question that our philosophy and our idea is that tax dollars don't belong to the Government, that they belong to the people who earned it, and that the Government ought to take from the people only that minimum amount needed leaving the people as free as possible.

I believe that before we are finished, many middle-income families will be receiving some of their money back. We will not be saying that we are refunding taxes to them. They will be keeping some of their money, which we are hopeful as time passes they can keep more and more of as we make Government more and more efficient.

The country with the most individual freedom is the country that is going to achieve the most. And one measurement of that over time is going to be the level of taxation that the Government chooses by virtue of which they take from people rather than leave money with people.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I thank the two managers for yielding time.

SEXUAL CONDUCT, TRAINING, AND AMERICAN NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, two weeks ago, on May 6, 1997, a military jury sentenced an Army staff sergeant to 25 years in prison for raping six female trainees, just one of a series of highly visible scandals regarding sexual relations now plaguing training facilities in the Army. Press reports indicate that hundreds of similar cases of alleged sexual abuse and discrimination have been reported and are being investigated at other military training commands around the country. On May 10, 1997, the senior enlisted soldier in the U.S. Army was charged with similar offenses. The extent of the scandals that have been unearthed at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, as well as other facilities, indicates to me that the time has arrived for a thorough review of further gender-integrated training in the military. There are those who feel that same-sex training has failed as a training mechanism and is adversely affecting morale, discipline and the integrity of our armed forces. This is a serious situation, involving very serious allegations with possible repercussions on our national security. The situation needs to be examined with a dispassionate attitude, and it greatly complicates our task if well-meaning advocacy groups in our country make the assumption that anyone who calls for a thorough investigation of the viability of gender integrated training and operational roles is per se, a bigot, is against equal treatment and opportunity, and is trying to roll the clock back because of his or her narrow vision.

The Senate Armed Services committee held a hearing on this matter on February 4, 1997, at which the Army leadership testified. Certainly one of the issues we need to understand is the pervasiveness of sexual misconduct in the services. Are these isolated incidents we have been reading about, or are there systemic problems rooted in the integration of the armed forces and the environments in which they must train and operate? There was some testimony before the committee that these incidents are akin to the proverbial few bad apples in the barrel, and that what needs to be done is emphasize right and wrong, professional behavior, and punish unprofessional behavior. But, Mr. President, the numbers involved here tell a different story. The Army established a hot line for women to report sexual harassment, misconduct, or abuse last fall when the first incidents were reported. In a little over two and a half months, that hot line received about 7,000 phone calls. That is an astonishing and disturbing number. It takes little courage to make such a phone call. One wonders how many phone calls, on top of the 7,000, that should have been made were not made for fear of retaliation, or just reticence. Now, the Secretary of the Army testified that by February the number of calls on the hot line had ''tapered off'' to about 50 a week. This is not indicative to me of just a few bad apples in the barrel. More than one thousand of those calls have generated an investigation of some kind. Furthermore, recent surveys taken by the Defense Manpower Data Center Survey indicated that large numbers of women reported one or more incidents of unwanted sexual attention. In 1988–89, 68 percent of women reported such incidents. In 1995 a similar survey got similar results, with 61 percent of the women in the Army reporting such incidents. So this is not just your random, marginal population. There is a serious, central problem that needs to be looked at.

This is not just about sexual harassment among soldiers of equal rank. It is about that, but it is about much more, it is about the use of power and authority of sergeants and officers whom we put in authority, over the recruits and junior people whom they are responsible to train and look after. It is about raw abuse of power of a shocking, crude kind. It is about power and sexual misconduct. It leads one to ask a fundamental question: are women actually safe in the U.S. military? As Senator SNOWE said during that hearing: ''As we incorporate the sexes together in tighter and tighter situations, at higher and higher stress situations, in more confined situations, common sense tells us that we are going to be dealing with a very difficult problem. Is there a danger that we are trying to minimize the very real differences here between men and women? Might there really be enough significant distinctions between being a man and being a woman that we should be more discriminating, not less, in terms of assignments and utilization?''

The Chief of Staff of the Army, Mr. Joe Reimer, testified at the Armed Services hearing that this is an issue that is not about policy, and instead it is an issue about right and wrong. That is, it is not about whether we should have women in the military, but whether we can expect our sergeants and officers in authority to carry out their job properly, not use their power to engage in misconduct. But, I think that just begs the question. While it is about right and wrong, it is also surely about policy. It is about in what situations, what kinds of training, what kinds of operations, women and men can work effectively in the military, and in what kinds of training and operations situations the sexual diversion is just too difficult a factor. For instance, we have had gender integrated training in the military since 1974, but we have only had such training of recruits in the military for the last three years. It is in the recruit training situation that we are certainly experiencing very serious problems, and surely that needs to be revisited now. I note that there is legislation moving through the other body to prohibit mixed recruit training. That is one natural reaction to the situation, as I now understand it, and that is the approach that I would support.

But I think the better policy question is this: are we putting people into situations that put at risk our goal of an effective trained combat force with high morale, discipline and unit cohesiveness, making that goal more difficult to achieve than it should be? Are we putting temptations in the face of people and saying to them, ''overcome those temptations?''

The U.S. military goal is not to change basic human nature. It is to mold that nature for very specific military tasks. We do not need a major sociological analysis to know that sexual tension between men and women is affected by the environment in which they are placed. Surely every military activity, and particularly recruit training, and high tension battlefield environments, are the kinds of environments wherein we need to be particularly attentive to the burdens we are placing on normal American men and women.

It certainly should be clear that integrating men and women in the training, and into the combat forces of the military, introduces an explosive new element into the attempt to create an effective fighting force. The ultimate, bottom-line question should be this: what is the impact of sexual integration on the battlefield? The purpose of an Army is to fight, and to win. If gender integration enhances the prospects of readiness, and effectiveness in combat, then we should all be for it. If it reduces American effectiveness on the battlefield, should we be for gender integration on the general grounds of social equality? I, for one, think the question answers itself, and the answer is no. Perhaps the facts are not all in. There are few, if any models around the world, of other modern, effective Armies which have gender-integrated their forces. So we are breaking new ground in America on gender integrated training, particularly when it comes to combat roles. In plain words, we are conducting an experiment.

I think that the scandals which we are seeing in the training commands must be taken as a danger sign that sexual integration complicates an Army's fighting capabilities, in that it introduces a new element which diverts the focused attention on winning battles that an Army must have.

It seems completely obvious to me that living and training in close quarters puts a strain and a stress on people's behavior. Furthermore, the effect of confined environments where men and women work and live in close quarters certainly involves sexual issues. It is laughable to assume otherwise. Sexual issues involve not just breaking the rules on fraternization and sexual relations, per se, but involve perceptions of favoritism in unit life which can negatively affect the cohesiveness, morale, and discipline that are the critical ingredients of success in military life, and success in combat. Whether one believes in equality among men and women is not the issue here. In the special world of military life where the ultimate mission of fighting and winning is uniquely different from all other environments and roles in civilian life, the issue is the national security of our nation and how best to maintain it with the most effective fighting force.

There is no real reason for social experimentation in mixing the sexes at all levels of military life and functions. Certainly this does not mean women cannot be as successful as men in all or certainly most of the levels of work in the military. But this may only be true with two caveats. First, because women are not as a rule as physically able to meet harsh combat conditions, they start with a disadvantage. This reality is central to the consideration by the Marine Corps not to include women in infantry units. Second, the relations among the sexes present an irreducible diversion which complicates the effectiveness of combat units. The Marines train women and men separately as recruits, and have found that it works best for them. After initial recruit training, they are trained together, except for the unique function of combat training, since women do not serve in Marine infantry units.

It is not at all clear to me that there is any body of evidence that a force trained on a gender-integrated basis performs better in combat than a force trained on a segregated basis. More to the essential point, there is no credible body of evidence showing that gender-integrated combat forces, such as infantry forces, perform better than all male units. Before we extend our desire to treat women fairly and equally with men, a bedrock working principle of American society, we need to satisfy ourselves that the conditions under which men fight are actually conducive to fielding integrated units. Indeed, it would be folly to assume that the natural attractions, jealousies and diversions that close sexual quarters enhance can be overcome by issuing an edict that professionalism only will be permitted. It is quite clearly the case, as Aberdeen and other scandals indicate to me, that gender-integrated training is having a very bumpy ride, and we should review the kinds of integrated training that will work, and the kinds of gender-integrated training that will not work.

Mr. President, there must be ways to thoroughly examine, review, and evaluate the reasons for the recent spate of scandals regarding sexual relations in training commands. Such a study should be made by an independent blue-ribbon body with unquestioned credentials—with no social agenda, but geared solely to the effect of gender integration at all levels of the military, in support as well as combat roles, in training recruits as well as seasoned soldiers—to evaluate the impacts solely on our national security. In the meantime, until such a review can be done and fully considered by the Congress, I intend to propose an amendment to the fiscal year 1998 Department of Defense authorization bill which would suspend the continuation of gender-integrated recruit training in all the services, as is currently the case with regard to the Marine Corps.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

The Senate continued with the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, as we are going back and forth, I will take a very few moments and then yield to one of my Democratic colleagues, so I yield such time as I may use.

Mr. President, the parentage of this successful budget resolution is ardently sought by many. Only failure is an orphan. In this case—I hope not to drive the metaphor too far—I believe that many properly may claim parentage of the resolution that is before us here.

In the decade and a half during which I have served in the U.S. Senate, this budget resolution marks two firsts. It is the first resolution that genuinely will yield us, when passed and enforced, to a balanced budget, to a situation in which we will no longer be piling debt upon debt on the backs of our children and our grandchildren. It is also, remarkably, the first budget resolution during that period of time that seems likely to pass with significant majorities in favor of it from both political parties.

As I look back on the history that has led to this point, I reflect on the fact that members of the Democratic Party and the President of the United States can claim some credit in moving in this direction for the highly controversial resolution that they proposed and passed without any support from the Republican Party some 4 years ago. Our predictions that that resolution would have dire consequences did not, in fact, turn out to be the case. We may still believe that a different course of action would have had even better results, but, obviously, at this point we cannot prove that. The Senator from New Jersey has already spoken to that proposition.

At the same time, 2 years later, when the Republicans became a majority in both the House and in the Senate, we passed and attempted to enforce a budget resolution more dramatic even than the one that is before us today, with its reform of entitlement programs, its securing of Medicare for many, many years to come, and in the tax relief that it provided for the American people.

Ultimately, the enforcing mechanism for that budget resolution was successfully vetoed by President Clinton, but, nonetheless, it charted a new and different course of action for the American economy and especially for the way in which the Congress and the President determined spending and taxing priorities.

Before the President vetoed the results of that budget resolution, he had, for the first time, committed himself to balancing the budget. I think, again, many Members of this side discounted that commitment, as we believed that it was not carried out by the policies that he recommended pursuant to his commitment to a balanced budget. But nevertheless, the debate then became not whether to balance the budget but how. That debate, a debate separating the two political parties, continued until just a short few weeks ago.

At that point, the President, the leaders of the Republican Party in both the House and the Senate, with the assent of much of the Democratic leadership, reached an agreement, not only on the ultimate goal but on the means by which to reach that goal, and it is some of the details of that agreement which, after further negotiation, are a part of the budget resolution that is before us this afternoon.

The Senator from New Jersey has outlined many of the elements of this budget resolution which he believes meet the agenda of his party and of the President of the United States. Ours on this side may be fewer, but we think they may be more profound. We have reached the goal we have sought without wavering and without compromise: of a resolution that would, in real terms, promise a balance to the Federal budget with lower interest rates, with a fiscal dividend that that would bring with it. And we are now right at the edge of meeting that goal.

We have succeeded in crafting a budget resolution and getting agreement to a budget resolution which will provide real genuine tax relief for the American people, for American families with children, for farmers and small businessmen, and estate tax relief, for investors and for job creators in the realm of capital gains, and we have also succeeded, at least modestly, in getting agreement to the beginnings of certain reforms in the entitlement programs, which are almost exclusively responsible for spending increases each and every year for decades that outpaced both inflation and the growth of our economy.

Government will not grow as a result of this resolution at anything like the rapidity it would have grown without it. The distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, the Senator from New Mexico, has, in this illustration, shown what happens with respect to the budget deficit, even including the tax relief that is an integral part of this resolution today.

So we will have more modest spending than would otherwise have been the case. We will have tax relief for the American people. We will have a balanced budget due to the diligence of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico and the broad support he has from his own party, due to the eloquence and hard work of the majority leader, the Senator from Mississippi, and the wonderful relationship he and the Senator from New Mexico created for one another, due to the hard work of many members of the Democratic Party and of the President and his advisers, and perhaps not least in all of the credit that should be given here in the parenting of this budget resolution would go to those outsiders led by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAUX] who last year created a bipartisan budget resolution, with all of the elements that this one has—some to a more dramatic extent than this one has—and came within four votes of carrying that resolution on the floor of this U.S. Senate, even though they were opposed by the leadership in both parties and by the President of the United States. Many of the elements of their proposal are included today, but they blazed the trail for a degree of bipartisan cooperation that had not previously existed.

So for my part at least, Mr. President, I am delighted to give credit where credit is due and to say that credit is extremely widely spread. I trust that after listening to the debate today and tomorrow—I hope not longer than that—that the resolution that is before us will not have been significantly changed by amendment, that it will be passed by a very substantial bipartisan majority, a majority of both parties, and that it will then be properly carried out and properly enforced by all of those who have supported it, for which the Congress and the President will deserve credit and thanks from the people of the United States, both for their responsibility and for having created the opportunities for greater economic growth and greater prosperity for the people of the United States.

Mr. LAUTENBERG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I yield so much time as the Senator from Maryland wants to use to make a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. President, in 1993, just 4 years ago, in order to reduce the deficit, the Congress, by a narrow margin, enacted a budget resolution which curtailed programs and increased taxes. The increase in taxes primarily impacted those at the upper end of the income scale.

This combination of spending restraint and revenue increases represents a logical way of dealing with the deficit issue. When you are trying to reduce and then eliminate the deficit, the logical way to do it is to restrain spending and to seek additional revenues. That combination, presumably, will result in lowering your deficits.

This approach has worked in a most impressive way. A flourishing economy has brought unemployment below 5 percent for the first time in 24 years. This chart shows the unemployment rate going back to 1971. As you can see, with one exception, the unemployment rate now is the lowest it has been in this period. Back here, in 1973, is when it just dipped below 5 percent. It has now gone below 5 percent again.

While unemployment is at a 24-year low, inflation is at a 31-year low, as is shown by this next chart, which shows the inflation rate from 1966 to 1996.

I do not know what better proof one can offer of a strong economy than the low unemployment rate and the low inflation rate we are now experiencing.

As a consequence of this flourishing economy, the deficit has declined on a steady basis since fiscal year 1992. In fiscal year 1992, the deficit was at $290 billion. And it has come down in each succeeding year, to $255 billion in 1993, $203 billion in 1994, $164 billion in 1995, and to $107 billion in the last fiscal year, the year that ended this past September 30. It is now expected to be below $70 billion for the current fiscal year. In other words, we will have gone from a $290 billion deficit in 1992 on a straight downward trend, and we are expecting a deficit under $70 billion for the fiscal year in which we now find ourselves.

As a percent of the gross domestic product, the deficit has declined in a most impressive way, from 4.9 percent in 1992 to 1.4 percent for the fiscal year that ended this past September 30. As you can see from this next chart, it declined from 4.9 percent in 1992 to 4.1 percent in 1993 to 3.1 percent in 1994 to 2.3 percent in 1995 to 1.4 percent in the fiscal year ending September 30, and it is now anticipated that the deficit as a percent of gross domestic product will be less than 1 percent for the current fiscal year, the lowest percentage since 1974.

So you have the best unemployment rate in 24 years, the lowest inflation in 31 years, the lowest deficit as a percent of GDP in 23 years.

By way of comparison, the Maastricht Agreement of the European Community, which established what are regarded as tough requirements for the member nations, has as its goal the bringing of deficits down to under 3 percent of GDP—3 percent. We, at the end of this year, will be down to less than 1 percent.

In fact, just comparing the United States with the other major industrial countries, we see from this chart that our deficit as a share of GDP is 1.4 percent. Japan is at 3.1 percent, Germany at 3.5 percent, Canada at 4.2 percent, France at 5 percent, the United Kingdom at 5.1 percent, and Italy at 7.2 percent.

Now, by any measure, this is a most impressive economic performance, and certainly a very impressive deficit reduction performance.

Given this performance, one would think that the wise policy would be to stay the course and finish the job. I mean, this is a spectacular course that I have outlined here that we have been following. So one would assume that the wise policy would be to stay the course and finish the job. Instead, the budget resolution before us combines spending restraint with tax cuts—I repeat, spending restraint with tax cuts.

Obviously, spending restraint, as in 1993, works in the direction of deficit reduction. As I said at the outset, that is logical. You are trying to bring the deficit down. Spending restraint works in the direction of deficit reduction. But tax cuts work against deficit reduction. And the tax cuts contained in this budget agreement will grow over time in a way that may well jeopardize the goal of reaching and staying—and staying—in budget balance.

The capital gains, inheritance, and IRA tax cuts, all of which are provided for in the tax portion of this budget agreement, carry with them the potential for substantial increases in future years.

In fact, this budget agreement recognizes such a trend line by providing for $85 billion net tax cuts in the first 5 years, 1998 to 2002, and almost double that, a net tax cut of $165 billion, in the next 5 years, 2003 to 2007. No agreements were made as to the following decade. But obviously, if we are concerned about the future strength and viability of the economy, it is important to look to the out years, to have some sense of where these trend lines may be taking us.

The budget agreement itself, in the tables accompanying the text of the agreement, projects that in the 10th year of the agreement—in other words, at the end of the period when we are to have a total of $250 billion in tax cuts—the tax cuts would be $42 billion. Now this represents a rising trend line with respect to the tax cuts. In fact, the projections are that the tax cuts will increase by $5 billion in each of the last 2 years of the 10-year agreement on which this resolution is based, that is from 2005 to 2006, and from 2006 to 2007.

If you are at $42 billion in the 10th year, then one can anticipate two scenarios for the following decade, from 2008 to 2017. If in fact the cost of the taxes stayed at $42 billion a year for each of those years, in other words, plateaued—a most unlikely assumption given the trend line—you would then project $420 billion in tax cuts over the next 10 years. If, however, the cuts continued to increase according to the trend line established through the first 10 years, in other words, increasing by $5 billion a year through 2017, you would have tax cuts of $700 billion in the following decade.

So we have a situation here where it is almost certain that the tax cuts that are part of this agreement will carry with them a rising trend that will, in effect, undercut the deficit reduction effort. And I ask, is it not imprudent, indeed irresponsible to commit to such tax cuts before we have actually achieved budget balance and before we have a more accurate and realistic view of whether it can be sustained?

We are talking about responsibility here. Yet we are undertaking in this resolution to commit to tax cuts before we have actually achieved budget balance and furthermore before we have a realistic and accurate view of whether budget balance can then be sustained.

I believe that the tax-reduction side of the budget agreement carries with it the potential for undermining the deficit-reduction effort. Furthermore, the combination of program curtailment on the one hand and tax reduction on the other represents an inequitable allocation of the burdens of deficit reduction.

The impact of a reduction in programs will be felt by ordinary working people primarily. The tax reductions, by contrast, will primarily benefit those at the top end of the income and wealth scale.

Consider that 75 percent of the benefits of the capital gains tax can be expected to go to those making over $100,000 a year, the top 5 percent of the population. The inheritance tax cut would benefit an even smaller percentage of the population. Yet this resolution that is before us imposes additional burdens on working people through program reductions.

In fact, the projections are that domestic discretionary programs will be 10 percent below—10 percent below—the current service level, namely, the level adjusted for inflation, in the year 2002. At the same time that we have a 10-percent cut in programs, substantial tax reductions will be given to those at the apex of the income and wealth pyramid. This is not fair or equitable.

A budget agreement should undertake equitable deficit reduction, namely, apportioning the burdens in a way that it is reasonably spread across the entire society, as was done in 1993, when ordinary working people made their contribution through program reductions and those at the top end of the income scale made their contribution through tax increases.

But in this instance, we have working people bearing a burden through program reduction, but we can anticipate tax reductions which markedly benefit those at the upper end of the income and wealth scale, and impose no burden on these individuals.

Thus, this budget fails the equity test. A budget agreement should also lead to lasting, long-term deficit reduction. As I have indicated, I am most apprehensive about this agreement because I foresee that we will not be able, even if we were to reach balance in 2002—and there is some serious doubt about that under this agreement—to sustain that balance in the subsequent decades. Thus, this agreement also fails the long-term deficit reduction test.

In short, this budget agreement does not have either of the two essential attributes of a budget: equitable deficit reduction and lasting, long-term deficit reduction. Because of that, I do not support it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask Senator ALLARD, do you want to offer an amendment?

Mr. ALLARD. I do have an amendment at the desk, but I understand that Senator DODD is going to offer an amendment before me.

Mr. DOMENICI. I say to the Senator, that means we are going to have Senator WELLSTONE give his general speech because we are going with general speeches ahead of amendments.

Is that all right with the Senator?

Mr. ALLARD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank all of my colleagues for their courtesy.

Let me first of all start out by saying I associate myself with the remarks of Senator SARBANES, the Senator from Maryland. Senator SARBANES talked about equitable deficit reduction. I emphasize the equitable part of that formulation.

Mr. President, those on both sides labored very hard. People make the decisions they think are the right decisions. I do not rise to point an accusatory finger at any of my colleagues. As I look at this agreement, I do not see that equitable deficit reduction.

To give but one example, I see very little of the shared sacrifice, and I think to be shared sacrifice we would have to extend part of the deficit reduction burden onto large and wealthy corporations and zero in on what has been called corporate welfare. That means some of our large multinational corporations—oil and gas, mining, pharmaceutical, health care conglomerates, and others—who now reap benefits of huge loopholes in our Tax Code, who are fed, if you will, at the trough of unjustified tax giveaways, would, in fact, be required to pay their fair share toward deficit reduction. They are the heavy hitters, the well connected. They are the players. That is not a part of this budget agreement. I do not think what we have here is equitable deficit reduction.

I know a number of my colleagues, as they look at some of these loopholes and deductions or as they make the case for across-the-board, what I call kind of a scatter-gun approach to cuts in capital gains or estate tax, make the argument this will bolster the economy by boosting savings and investments.

I cite a report by the Republican staff of the House Budget Committee from just a few short years ago:

> Whether aimed at increasing efficiency or growth, many so-called "growth enhancements" backfire. This is due to two factors. First, few incentives are very powerful, and simply do not result in large increases in output. Second, they typically lose revenues, increasing government borrowing as a consequence, and thus reducing the accumulation of private capital as a result.

My friends say to me, "But we are balancing the budget." I smile and say, "We will see." My guess is, as I look at those who are in control of the committees and especially are going to be dealing with the tax legislation, it looks to me like we go toward indexing capital gains. It looks to me that we will have across-the-board cuts in capital gains in estate not targeted to family business, not targeted to middle income, with the lion's share of benefits going to the very top of the American population.

Mr. President, studies have shown consistently that households with incomes of over $100,000 a year receive approximately 75 percent of the capital gains income. If the goal is to provide relief to middle-income taxpayers, that is one thing, but what is happening here is the vast majority of the benefits go to those at the very top.

At the same time, as we look at capital gains or estate tax, if you talk about family farmers or small businesses, fine. But I think that under the cover of the problems of small family farmers and small business people we are seeing in this budget agreement massive tax breaks to those who least need it.

This estate tax goes to some of our families. Some of the families that will benefit are Cargo Co., a family-owned company, or Mars Candy or Continental Grain. I suggest to you that the multinational corporations hardly need more by way of more tax breaks.

Mr. President, I think many Democrats are going to vote for this budget agreement but with far less enthusiasm than their public posture suggests. They are hoping when the reconciliation bill fills in the blanks on the budget and it comes to the floor this summer, we will not explode the deficits, and in addition, the critical investments in health care and education and children and all the rest that we believe in will, in fact, be there.

As I look at the record of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle over the last couple of years, I have seen a defeat of efforts to go after corporate welfare. I have seen outrageous tax giveaways. I have seen a relentless attack on those in society least able to protect themselves, and I have seen very little standard of fairness when it comes to deficit reduction. I have seen deficit reduction based upon the path of least political resistance. Cut the benefits for those who are weakest —for children, for legal immigrants, for low- and moderate-income people, but when it comes to the subsidies for large oil companies or big insurance companies or some of the multinational corporations, big grain companies, no; they need more by way of benefits.

I agree with my colleague from Maryland, I fear, and I think there is every reason to believe this based upon the pronouncements I have heard so far, that when we get to the tax part of this package we will see backloaded cuts, indexing, and cuts in capital gains and estate taxes that will explode the deficit as we move into the next millennium, at the very time, I might add, Mr. President, that many of us baby boomers come of age and we will have precious little by way of investment.

Mr. President, I have several amendments that I will propose. I will start out joining with my colleague from Connecticut, Senator DODD. But I just want to highlight a few things I want to focus on.

First let me talk a little bit about child nutrition. The School Breakfast Program, currently 6.5 million children participate. That is barely half of the children that are eligible. In the reform bill passed last year, all in the name of deficit reduction, we eliminated, wiped out grants for schools to start up the School Breakfast Program.

Anybody who understands anything about education, anybody who understands anything about children, anybody who spends any time in schools will certainly acknowledge the fact that children who come to school hungry and cannot participate in school breakfast because we cut the funding for this program, are not going to be able to do as well in school as children who do not come to school hungry.

Where is the standard of fairness?

Mr. President, we also have a Summer Food Service Program, not real well known. As a matter of fact, only 2 million out of 14 million children participate because we do not adequately fund it. But do you want to know something, Mr. President? These children that really are so dependent upon school lunch and school breakfast, where it is available, during the summer they are malnourished and do not have an adequate diet. We are able to fund only 2 million out of 14 million children. Mr. President, in my amendment I will call for increasing the funding for this program.

Finally, I want to talk a little bit about school construction. My friend Jonathan Kozol wrote a book called ''Savage Inequalities.'' He traveled all across the country and reported on what he observed.

Mr. President, let me just make the point, I will not give specific examples, but let me say to my colleagues, we have too many children who go to rotting schools. What kind of message are we conveying to children in this country when they go to schools that are dilapidated, with rotting infrastructure, toilets that do not work, cold in the winter, too hot in the summer, crumbling buildings, decrepit? What kind of message are we conveying to these children? Are they not all God's children? Is there not some need for investment in infrastructure?

The General Accounting Office reported in 1994, that over all, it would be about a $112 billion investment, and we want a $5 billion investment by way of a start as we move into the next century?

Mr. President, have I not heard before speeches given, the talk about the importance of building a bridge to the next century? If we are not going to invest in rotting schools, if we are not going to invest in the infrastructure of the schools our children attend in this country, if we are not willing to invest a little bit more in child nutrition programs, if we are not willing to invest in some of what Senator DODD's amendment, an amendment I want to join in and I know others will join, Head Start and Early Start, if we will not invest in children in these very critical early years of their lives, how can this budget agreement be a blueprint or a bridge for moving into the next century?

My amendments will just simply say, take it out of corporate welfare and invest it in Head Start, child nutrition programs, and invest in the infrastructure of schools in America for our children.

I have another amendment that will focus on some of the tax cuts that will say scale down the capital gains tax cut, scale down the estate tax cut, target it to middle-income people, target it to small business people, and target it to family farmers. Frankly, these large multinational corporations do not need it, nor do the top 1 or 2 percent of the population. Instead, invest in children. Invest in children.

Mr. President, my final point, because I know we want to go on with the amendments, my final point, we have in the last several months been reading in Time magazine, in Newsweek magazine, there was a White House conference on the importance of early childhood development and the argument that is made is that the neuroscience evidence tells us if we do not do well for these children from the very beginning of their lives, if we to not do well with a mother expecting a child, in the very early years up to age 3, many of these children will never come to school ready to learn, and many of these children will never be prepared for life.

One out of every four children in America under the age of 3 are poor. And one out of every two children of color in America under the age of 3 are poor.

Mr. President, it is a scandal. It is unconscionable that we do not yet even fully fund the programs that we know work—Head Start, to give children a head start, nutrition programs so they do not come to school hungry, investment in infrastructure so the schools are inviting places as opposed to being decrepit and so demoralizing for children.

Mr. President, my amendments will say invest in these areas and take it out of the subsidies of these large multinational corporations or scale back these tax giveaways that go mainly to the top 1, 2, or 3 percent of the population.

To my colleagues, all of us have to make our own decisions, but for my own part, I think this is a budget without a soul. Quite frankly, I say to Democrats in particular, I think there comes a point in time where there are certain values and there are certain principles we hold dear. I think there comes a point in time when we cannot keep giving the speeches about the importance of children, the importance of education, the importance of equality of opportunity, the importance of each and every child having the same opportunity to reach his and her full potential. We cannot keep giving those speeches if we do not match the legislative lives that we live with the words that we speak.

I will join with Senator DODD in his amendment, and I will have other amendments on the floor, and I will raise this issue over and over and over again. I will raise this question over and over and over again.

I do not believe this is a budget that calls for equitable deficit reduction. I do not believe this is a budget that is a bridge to the next century. I do not believe this is a budget that gives children in our country, every child—they are all God's children—the same opportunity to reach their full potential.

I do not think this is a budget that invests in our future, because this budget, as opposed to being a new deal for too many children in America, is a raw deal for too many children in America, and that makes this budget unfair and that makes this budget wrong and that makes this budget not the best that we can do for children in America. Therefore, I will oppose this budget agreement.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, as previously agreed, Senator DODD was to be recognized for 10 minutes to offer an amendment.

Mr. DODD. If I could, I have discussed this with my colleague from Colorado, and we will defer at this moment and let my colleague from Colorado go first and I will follow.

AMENDMENT NO. 293

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate about the Federal debt and that the President should submit a budget proposal with a plan for repayment of the Federal debt)

Mr. ALLARD. I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SNOWE). The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD] proposes an amendment numbered 293.

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

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON REPAYMENT OF THE FEDERAL DEBT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) Congress and the President have a basic moral and ethical responsibility to future generations to repay the Federal debt, including money borrowed from the Social Security Trust Fund;

(2) the Congress and the President should enact a law that creates a regimen for paying off the Federal debt within 30 years; and

(3) if spending growth were held to a level one percentage point lower than projected growth in revenues, then the Federal debt could be repaid within 30 years.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that—

(1) the President's annual budget submission to Congress should include a plan for repayment of the Federal debt beyond the year 2002, including the money borrowed from the Social Security Trust Fund; and

(2) the plan should specifically explain how the President would cap spending growth at a level one percentage point lower than projected growth in revenues.

Mr. ALLARD. Madam President, I would like to begin by commending the chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI, in fact, the entire Budget Committee, Senator LAUTENBERG, the ranking member of the committee, for their hard work and diligence in crafting the budget resolution.

While I am pleased that we have a budget resolution before the Senate, I believe that this document is not without faults and that improvements can be made.

The people of Colorado elected me on the premise that I would utilize all the tools at my disposal to balance the budget. This is a promise that I made to my constituents and a commitment that I do not take lightly.

In this light, I am pleased that the current budget debate is focused on not "if" we are going to balance the budget, but "how" are we going to balance the budget. I believe that this is in and of itself a moral victory for those of us who preach fiscal responsibility. Yet, we must now begin the process of balancing the budget by 2002. The framework provided within the budget resolution is an excellent starting point on which we can improve.

The sense-of-the-Senate amendment talks about what we are going to be doing today. The economy is strong. People have jobs. And the stock market is surging. History tells us, however, that this is not always the case. Unfortunately, the budget resolution assumes economic growth over the next 5 years that is unmatched in this country's history. I am a veterinarian. I am not an economist. But I do know that the document before us today must be able to account for a future that is not necessarily as rosy.

On the sense-of-the-Senate resolution, we are talking about the years that are following after 2002. Let us say that we have eliminated the deficit. Then what is the next step in the Congress? We need to begin to address the problem of the debt.

This amendment is a resolution that was adopted on the House side. It says that in order to continue to move forward on the fiscal soundness of this country, we need to begin to pay down the debt, and we do that by spending less than what we bring in in revenues. The amount that I suggested in the sense-of-the-Senate resolution is to spend 1 percent less than what comes in in revenues.

For example, if we have 5 percent in revenue that comes in in any one of the years, then we would spend out 4 percent. One percent would be moved toward paying down the debt. If the Congress, both the House and the Senate, will commit themselves to this type of plan to pay down the debt, we can balance the budget and pay down the debt by the year 2023.

The debate so far in both the House and the Senate has been concerning deficits that have been accumulating, and now we must move toward paying those down. I am comfortable that the direction of deficit spending is moving down. But once we eliminate deficit spending, then I think we have to begin to look at paying down the debt.

The debt is reflected in this budget by the interest that we are paying on the debt, which is running somewhere around $245 billion a year, about 15 percent of our total budget. That is almost as much as what we pay for defense.

So we put ourselves at considerable liability as we move through the years after 2002 because we do not know what the interest rates are going to be. We do not know whether they are going to be 2 percent, or 6 percent, and heaven forbid if they ever get into the double-digit inflation rates and interest rates that we had in the late 1970's.

The purpose of this amendment is to begin to pay down that total debt so we don't have that unknown liability that this country will be facing year after year. The sense-of-the-Senate resolution is to point out to the Senate that there is a potential problem.

So I am asking that this amendment be adopted so that we can begin considering a plan that says that we will begin paying down the debt by spending 1 percent per year less than comes in in revenues, which would eliminate our debt around the year 2023, which would indeed put this country on a very sound fiscal and financial basis.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Madam President, we are prepared to accept the amendment and yield time back off the amendment, if the Senator from Colorado agrees with that.

Mr. ALLARD. I yield the remainder of my time.

Is there any reason to ask for the yeas and nays? Is the floor manager ready for the yeas and nays?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, it was my understanding that this amendment was going to be offered and dealt with on a voice vote. As far as I know, there is no further debate required. If that is the case, then I suggest that we move in that direction.

Mr. ALLARD. Madam President, if the Senator from New Jersey will yield, I agree to a voice vote and ask for a voice vote.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. To my colleague, the manager at the moment, we will accept this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment (No. 293) was agreed to.

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

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Under a previous agreement, Madam President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, unfortunately, it is our obligation to yield time to our people.

So, is the Senator from Connecticut ready?

Mr. DODD. Yes, Madam President.

If my colleague will yield, I would like to take a few minutes to discuss the budget proposal generally, and then I will be offering an amendment on behalf of myself and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] and others. We have not reached any agreement on time, but I am sensitive to the needs of the committee to move along. I don't intend to take a long time on the amendment.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. With that understanding, Madam President, I would certainly be willing to yield as much time as the Senator from Connecticut requires.

Mr. DODD. I thank my colleague from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I would like to spend a few minutes on the overall budget agreement. I know several of my colleagues have talked about it earlier today.

I had the privilege of serving on the Budget Committee for a number of years with the distinguished chairman of the committee, Senator DOMENICI, and my colleague from New Jersey, Senator LAUTENBERG, and my colleague from South Carolina, whom I see on the floor, Senator HOLLINGS, and others.

It was involuntary servitude, I would say. Serving on the Budget Committee was not a position that I sought at all. I was asked to go on the committee and I served there for a number of years. I enjoyed my service. But it can be a thankless task in many ways to be on the Budget Committee.

So, I begin these brief remarks by commending the chairman of the committee and the ranking Democrat, Senator LAUTENBERG, for their tremendous effort. It is not easy to put these agreements together, this year in particular. Over the last several months, we have seen a major effort here to come up with a budget agreement that would bring the Federal budget into balance over the next 5 years. I commend them for their efforts.

I must say that despite reservations that we all have, I don't know of a single Member of this body who wouldn't have written a different agreement had they been king or queen for a day.

So I begin by complimenting my colleagues and endorsing their work with reservations. I will offer an amendment to do a bit better for Head Start, Healthy Start and child care issues.

I support this agreement. Obviously, I am going to watch what happens in the amendment process and reserve final judgment. I respect, as well, my colleagues on both sides who will have strong feelings about this agreement. But, as it stands today, I think the authors have done a pretty good job with this budget agreement.

In 1981, I voted against that budget agreement. In my view, that deal went way too far. As has been pointed out already, this agreement is vastly different from the 1981 agreement that created such huge deficits from which we still are recovering. In many ways, today's agreement is an effort to really try to solve the problem that began back almost 16 years ago with that vote and the problems which were created by that legislation.

David Stockman, who many may have forgotten, was the Director of the Office of Management and Budget at that time. He has since written a wonderful book about that agreement, ''The Triumph of Politics,'' which I strongly urge my colleagues to read if they want to know the history of what happened in 1981 when this earlier agreement was reached causing the deficit to reach the magnitude that we have seen in the last number of years.

So this agreement I think needs to be seen in a broader context. It is the culmination of a 4-year effort by the President and supporters in this body and the other to try to come up with a budget that would protect American families, that would allow us to reduce that deficit and reduce interest rates, which are like a tremendous tax people pay when they buy homes or automobiles. Obviously, as we have seen over the last several years, the declining deficit has contributed significantly to the growth and expansion in this country.

When the President came to office 4 years ago we had an annual deficit of some $290 billion. That annual deficit has been reduced to $67 billion, a major achievement over the last 4 years that has brought significant prosperity to this country. We have seen 12 million new jobs created, the lowest average inflation since John F. Kennedy was President; median family income rise over $1,600, and the list goes on and on of effects of the improved economy in this country.

Without this progress, obviously, we would never have what we have today, and that is the first credible chance in a generation to actually eliminate the deficit completely. I believe that we must take advantage of this chance, and that is why I will support this resolution, provided that it is not amended beyond recognition. It is a good framework for a budget that achieves real balance while protecting our Nation's most important priorities. It is, of course, as I said only a framework. We will have to see what the details will be before ultimate passage.

Obviously, there will be two sets of debates, the one that we will go through on the outlay side, and then, of course, on the tax-cut proposals, the specifics of which we will not see until the fall, and that will be another debate. I myself am going to be interested, as my colleagues will be, to see the details of the tax plan that is passed by the Finance Committee.

Any final tax bill should be designed, I think all of us would agree, so that its cost in the out years is limited. And I listened very carefully to the remarks of my colleague from Maryland, Senator SARBANES. I know my colleague from South Carolina will address this issue in part. Their concerns should not go unheeded because there is a legitimate concern about what happens at the end of this process. And if we end up where we were at the end of the 1981 process, with an explosion in the deficit, obviously, we may look back on this agreement and wish we had done otherwise.

But nonetheless, I think it strikes a good balance here with tax cuts in the education field. I for one might reserve any tax cuts until we actually got down to zero. I think there is a lot of legitimacy in that argument. But I accept the notion that that is not going to happen, that we are going to have some tax cuts here, and some, like the postsecondary education tax cuts, can actually be helpful to many families.

I would note as well that in addition to these tax cuts, there are large increases in discretionary spending on education. For instance, the Pell grant is increased to a historic high of $3,000 a year. Many of us have fought for this program, which we think is tremendously important, for years. There also is real progress in the area of children's health insurance. Obviously, we will have a chance with the Kennedy-Hatch proposal tomorrow to do even more in that regard. But nonetheless, I would be less than honest if I did not commend the budgeters for doing a lot in moving in the right direction.

Madam President, I think the budget agreement is pretty good and one that I think is going to help the country. This has not been an easy process. There have been weeks and weeks of discussion. I respect that. I also respect the fact that each and every one of us here as individual Members of this body have the right certainly and obligation where we disagree to offer some changes to this agreement.

And so for those reasons I will be offering an amendment that will increase funding for Head Start, Healthy Start, and child care. These are three issues that I have spent a good part of my entire career in this body working on. In fact, the Presiding Officer and I, in years past, worked on a number of issues together, as I have with a number of my colleagues here. I never would have passed the original child care development block grant legislation if it had not been for my colleague from Utah, Senator HATCH, who joined in bringing that bill together.

On the issue of Head Start, there have been a lot of people here who supported the efforts over the years to do more. I noted in this budget, there is a determination to serve 1 million children by 2002 in Head Start. That is certainly progress; it is an increase of 200,000 over where we are today. But I think we can do better over 5 years. We should ensure that all eligible children are served. We know it works so well and makes such a difference in children's lives. Particularly now with welfare reform, we are going to have so many more families that are going to need to have child care or Head Start. It is clear we are coming up short in this area. Serving 1 million children in Head Start is a laudable goal—but it is far short of what is needed. With this amendment over 1.4 million children eligible and in need would receive Head Start services.

In addition, this amendment would triple the size of the Early Head Start Program, which serves that critical zero to 3 group. We see so many of these families now that have these new infants, with Early Head Start, we can make a real difference in these children and their families to provide them a safe, quality environment where these infants will be while the parents go to work.

Welfare reform is all about getting people off welfare and into jobs. However, we know, and the Governors tell us, there will be tremendous need in the child care area. If we are going to move these families off welfare and public assistance into a working environment, there must be someone to care for these children.

I do not know of anyone who disagrees with that. No one wants to see children wander neighborhoods or in makeshift baby-sitting operations. In every State, there are horror stories of what has happened when parents have left children unattended and uncared for. We have had dreadful stories in my State in the last year alone; some five deaths have occurred in these settings that are far from high quality. I am not suggesting you are going to solve every one of those problems, but at a most basic level, none of us here could come to work each day if we had a child that we did not have someone to care for. We would miss votes, we would miss committee hearings, if it were a question of placing our child in a unsafe environment. And there is not one of our constituents who would disagree with that. We would be indicted publicly for irresponsibility.

This is a fine agreement, but we can do better in this area. This amendment would provide Head Start to 400,000 more children, it doubles the size of the child care development block grant and addresses infant mortality. When we are talking about $85 billion in tax cuts—and I do not disagree with that—do not tell me we cannot find over 5 years less than $15 billion to deal with Early Head Start, Head Start, Healthy Start, and child care so that these kids and families can really have the kind of support they need in their lives.

That is the intent of this amendment that I am offering on behalf of myself, Senator JEFFORDS, Senator MURRAY, Senator BINGAMAN, Senator WELLSTONE, and Senator LANDRIEU to this resolution. We think it is a modest request to make. It is not as if we do not respect the work of the Budget Committee. I also feel we can do a bit better here.

I support the hard work of those who put this agreement together, but let us not suggest somehow that this is totally inviolate. Some suggestions we might offer here would make this a better bill in our view. I think quality child care is one of those issue. I know very few of my colleagues who disagree with that. I know of no one who disagrees with Head Start, the work its done, and the Early Head Start Program. A few more dollars here, shaving off a bit on one end to provide a bit more on the other is really not too much to ask to make this agreement that much more worthwhile.

AMENDMENT NO. 296

(Purpose: To improve funding of critical programs to assist infants, toddlers and young children by increasing the discretionary spending caps by $15.752 billion in outlays over five years and offsetting this effort by closing corporate tax loopholes)

Mr. DODD. So with that, Madam President, I will send this 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 Connecticut [Mr. DODD], for himself, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Ms. LANDRIEU, proposes an amendment numbered 296.

Mr. DODD. 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 4, increase the amount by 2,006,000,000.

On page 3, line 5, increase the amount by 2,820,000,000.

On page 3, line 6, increase the amount by 3,991,000,000.

On page 3, line 7, increase the amount by 5,766,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by 2,006,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by 2,820,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by 3,991,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by 5,766,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by 2,533,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by 3,481,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by 4,993,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by 7,305,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by 2,006,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, increase the amount by 2,820,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by 3,991,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by 5,766,000,000.

On page 21, line 25, increase the amount by 1,013,000,000.

On page 22, line 1, increase the amount by 643,000,000.

On page 22, line 8, increase the amount by 1,951,000,000.

On page 22, line 9, increase the amount by 1,335,000,000.

On page 22, line 16, increase the amount by 3,453,000,000.

On page 22, line 17, increase the amount by 2,458,000,000.

On page 22, line 24, increase the amount by 5,755,000,000.

On page 22, line 25, increase the amount by 4,224,000,000.

On page 23, line 15, increase the amount by 20,000,000.

On page 23, line 16, increase the amount by 13,000,000.

On page 23, line 22, increase the amount by 30,000,000.

On page 23, line 23, increase the amount by 23,000,000.

On page 24, line 5, increase the amount by 40,000,000.

On page 24, line 6, increase the amount by 33,000,000.

On page 24, line 12, increase the amount by 50,000,000.

On page 24, line 13, increase the amount by 43,000,000.

On page 26, line 14, increase the amount by 1,500,000,000.

On page 26, line 15, increase the amount by 1,350,000,000.

On page 26, line 22, increase the amount by 1,500,000,000.

On page 26, line 23, increase the amount by 1,463,000,000.

On page 27, line 5, increase the amount by 1,500,000,000.

On page 27, line 6, increase the amount by 1,500,000,000.

On page 27, line 13, increase the amount by 1,500,000,000.

On page 27, line 14, increase the amount by 1,500,000,000.

On page 41, line 7, increase the amount by 5,766,000,000.

On page 41, line 8, increase the amount by 15,752,000,000.

On page 43, line 21, increase the amount by 2,533,000,000.

On page 43, line 22, increase the amount by 2,006,000,000.

On page 43, line 24, increase the amount by 3,481,000,000.

On page 43, line 25, increase the amount by 2,820,000,000.

On page 44, line 2, increase the amount by 4,993,000,000.

On page 44, line 3, increase the amount by 3,991,000,000.

On page 44, line 5, increase the amount by 7,305,000,000.

On page 44, line 6, increase the amount by 5,766,000,000.

At the appropriate place insert the following:

It is the sense of the Senate that funding should be increased for vital programs serving the youngest children. Head Start should be funded at a level necessary to serve all eligible children. Funding for the Child Care Development Block Grant should be doubled to support the working poor and new resources should be dedicated to addressing issues of quality and supply in areas such as infant care and care during non-traditional work hours. The Healthy Start should be expanded to improve maternal and infant health. These initiatives should be funded through by changes in the tax code such as the elimination of the runaway plant deduction, the billionaire's loophole, the exclusion of income from Foreign Sales Corporations and other changes as necessary.

Mr. DODD. Let me, if I can, briefly describe what the amendment does. I see my colleagues here who have come to the floor. I note the chairman standing. Is he looking for a time agreement? When a chairman stands, it usually means he is looking for a time agreement. Is my colleague from New Mexico looking for a time agreement?

Mr. DOMENICI. I wanted to just—excuse me. I yield on my time.

Mr. DODD. I will yield to my colleague.

Mr. DOMENICI. I just wanted to sort of suggest to those in the Chamber who I see—I see Senator DODD has an amendment, and I assume that is what the Senator from Minnesota is going to speak to.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, my colleague from New Mexico is correct. I join with him on his amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. I understand Senator HOLLINGS has an amendment, and I do not know how long the Senator intends to speak to it, but I plan sequentially to call on the distinguished Senator from Colorado, Mr. ALLARD, who has an amendment.

I was wondering if we might just at least be considering for our fellow Senators that we might finish the debate on those amendments by somewhere around 6: 15. It is 5:30 now. And then we try to stack these three so people after that could have a little time for dinner while we continue debating here. We would eventually ask those votes be 10-minute votes. I am just wondering, does that make any sense?

Mr. DODD. If my colleague will yield, I don't know how many Members want to speak on this, and there may not be that many. So rather than trying to spend the time negotiating an agreement, why not let it roll a little while on the bill; we just got underway, and see how it comes out. We may not need a time agreement. There is probably going to be just on this amendment 45 minutes, just the three of us on the floor who I know are sponsors of the amendment, and I presume Senator JEFFORDS is coming over, and there may be a couple of others. So we will try to move quickly. It is not my desire—I understand what the chairman wants to do, and we will try to move as fast as we can.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Senator SMITH is in the Chamber in my stead and whatever parliamentary privileges I have under the bill, I designate to him until I return.

Mr. LAUTENBERG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I do not want to cut off the debate, but I wonder, because I deferred to my colleague from Connecticut to present his comments on the amendment, whether there is—can we ask the people who want to speak, I ask the Senator, whether the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Washington would be able to conclude their remarks in 5 minutes. Would that be asking too much?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, if I could respond to my colleague from New Jersey, I think it would be difficult to do so. I think it is a very important amendment. I did not go into the specifics of what this amendment was about earlier because I thought we would have a chance to speak to it. I think it speaks to a fundamental question of priorities. I could not cover this in 5 minutes. I certainly will do whatever I can to stay within a reasonable limit but 5 minutes would not be a sufficient time. I do not know about Senator MURRAY.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. The Senator from Washington has requested 5 minutes. And we will take the rest of the time as needed. I yield the floor.

Mr. DODD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator.

Madam President, the amendment I have sent to the desk that is under consideration basically says I think we can do a little bit more here. That is basically what it comes down to. As I said earlier, it is not to be offered to undo the budget agreement that has been struck by the committee along with the President. I respect and support that agreement.

I think we can do a bit more when it comes to investing in our most important resource. Statements are made over and over on the floor of this Chamber, about America's children. I do not know anyone who would list a higher priority than doing what we can to serve the most innocent in our society, who have the most in front of them. There is no lack of people expressing an interest in the subject matter today.

I recall going back some 15 to 16 years ago when Senator SPECTER of Pennsylvania and I formed the first children's caucus of the Senate. We had a difficult time, but we tried to convince people over the years that this was a worthwhile endeavor in which to engage on child care, on the issue of Head Start, and family and medical leave. No one would believe it today, but back then we had to fight hard just to form a caucas. Fortunately, we were successful in that effort as well as in the effort to pass critical legislation on issues affecting families and their children.

Today, few argue against these initiatives. Most people agree in our society, as we look to the 21st century, that we want to give our children the best start they can possibly have. We cannot guarantee them success. No one can be guaranteed that in our society. But we want to guarantee them an opportunity.

What we are talking about with Healthy Start, Early Head Start, Head Start, and quality child care is trying to give children a good start, the best start we can so they will at least have the opportunity for success.

In that regard, the amendment I am offering increases funding for three children's programs that strike at the very heart of the most basic needs of children in our Nation: Head Start, Healthy Start, and child care. These three programs truly are sound investments and, I think, time tested. These are not new ideas. They have been around now, in the case of Head Start, a generation. We have had the benefit of analyzing the programs and know they work.

In the case of child care, it has been over a decade, and Healthy Start, almost as long. We know from recent scientific findings that creative, positive environments for children in their earliest years is an investment that yields tremendous returns in the long term.

We are now engaged in the process of laying out this Nation's priorities for the next 5 years. In addition to numbers, we are laying out where are our priorities, where do we believe the most important things that need to be addressed over the next half decade are. We managed to find $85 billion in tax cuts intended to spur investment. While I do not necessarily disagree with that, I think it can be tremendously helpful and important. But I believe we can certainly find an additional $14.6 billion over the next 5 years to improve the investment of children, and that is what I am talking about.

This amendment would provide for full funding of Head Start by the year 2002. The President's budget and the budget agreement take a positive step in this direction by committing, as I said, to serve 1 million children over the next 5 years. That is up from 800,000 currently to 1 million in 2002, 200,000 additional slots. I think we can do better. This amendment would ensure that all eligible children who need Head Start will get it. By increasing funding to $11.2 billion in the year 2002, Head Start could reach over 1.4 million children. That is 400,000 more who would be reached than under the budget agreement.

As my colleague from New Mexico, Senator BINGAMAN, related the other day, in Albuquerque, NM, they have a staggering number of children waiting to get into Head Start and were unable to because the resources were not there. I am sure that story can be repeated in every State in the country, where parents are trying to get their children into the programs.

Going from 800,000, where we are today, to 1 million, 1.4 million over the next 5 years ought not be an impossibility for us to achieve in this country.

This amendment would also triple funding for Early Head Start programs to $560 million by the year 2002. This program, which my colleagues certainly recall, provides high-quality child development for infants and toddlers ages zero to 3. Again, I am preaching to the choir here, I presume, because of the tremendous amount of new information on this 36-month period that occurs in a child's life, to see to it that they get the quality care and development they need.

This amendment that I have offered on behalf of myself and Senator JEFFORDS, along with others, would also make an investment in quality child care. It would double the size of the child care development block grant to $2 billion annually and provide an additional $500 million each year to help increase quality and meet supply shortages in critically underserved types of care, including infant care and nontraditional hours.

I heard my colleague from Minnesota speak on the need for child care during nontraditional hours. Most people think of people working from 8 to 5. However, there are a vast number of people in our country who do not work traditional hours because of time shifts and so forth. We have very few child care slots for the nontraditional hours. We need to be doing everything we can as people are struggling to hold their families together economically to provide for that quality child care.

Again, I say to my colleagues, when Senator HATCH and I initially offered the Child Care Development Block Grant Program 10 years ago, we made the point over and over again how important it is to working people that their children are in quality child care. The block grant provides vital assistance to working families as they struggle to meet these needs. But it is not enough; it is sorely underfunded. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that in the wake of welfare reform, there will be a $1.4 billion shortage in assistance for child care. This amendment provides an additional $1 billion for supply and another $500 million to address issues of quality and supply in key areas such as infants and the nontraditional hours. Again, as we move people from welfare to work, it is going to be critically important that we have these quality slots out there for people. So that is the second part of this amendment.

The additional $140 million is for the Healthy Start Program. Let me just remind my colleagues, I think all of us, I hope, have had an opportunity to visit Healthy Start programs. These programs offer to at-risk mothers prenatal care and other services that have been tremendously successful in seeing to it that new infants and their mothers get the proper care. Again, the studies show how critically important this can be for children's cognitive and emotional development.

Overall, this effort dedicates an additional, as I said, $14 billion to meeting the most basic needs of our youngest children. Healthy Start, Head Start, and quality child care are all about the earliest days. Obviously, the quality child care can spill over to school years, to after school programs, but nonetheless, the bulk of it goes to the earliest days of these infants' lives to see to it they have the best possible beginning. I realize $14 billion is not an insignificant amount, but over 5 years, that is less than $3 billion a year to fully fund Head Start, to double quality child care, and to provide more resources for Healthy Start. If we can find the $85 billion over 5 years, isn't it possible to find $3 billion less than that a year to make a difference in the lives of children from zero to 5 years?

So tonight, as we begin this process, this very first amendment that will be voted on in this budget debate, to say we have done a good job here and we can do a bit more. In my view, this agreement must serve the children who we talk about endlessly, who we debate and discuss at every meeting. Here is to reset our priorities for children with just a few more dollars. We know it is going to be hard. We realize there are other problems we are faced with, but when it comes to our children, this Congress, this Senate will stand up and say we can find the resources to see to it that these children get the proper kind of beginning that they deserve.

But don't look in the faces of innocent children and tell them we can't do a bit more. I know we are going to do a lot for people in the upper income levels, I understand that. If we can do that, we can do this and still balance this budget by asking for a little less in some areas for children, even though they don't vote, don't have political action committees, and don't participate in this process. With all the speeches that are given over and over again, this is the time to let rhetoric become a reality.

Madam President, at the proper time, obviously, I will ask for a rollcall vote on this amendment and urge my colleagues to join Senator JEFFORDS and me in this bipartisan proposal. Senator JEFFORDS is the chairman of the Labor and Human Resources Committee and has worked on a number of these issues over the years. He has joined with me, as Senator COATS did, on family and medical leave and Senator HATCH on the child care legislation.

With that, I yield the floor and invite my colleagues' comments.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Madam President, I yield myself 5 minutes. I would like to respond to the Senator from Connecticut.

I think there are many on my side of the aisle who care a great deal about issues with respect to children. I am one of those who has kind of bucked the tide in my party and signed up as a cosponsor, with enthusiasm, to the Hatch-Kennedy bill, which raises the tax on tobacco to provide expanded Medicaid to children. I also have great sympathy for many of the points Senator DODD is making. I believe we should fully fund Head Start. I am told it takes $10 billion to do that, not $14 billion——

Mr. DODD. Eleven billion dollars.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I am interested in that, but I am not interested in breaking this budget agreement, if it means that we are breaking our promises to the American people. Republicans and Democrats alike—neither side, frankly—are thrilled with every provision of this budget, but the truth is, a lot of promises are being kept with this budget.

Ultimately, it comes into balance, but in addition to that, we are protecting essential programs, we are cutting taxes, and we are balancing budgets. I think that is what America expects. I think that is what they want, and overriding all of our individual little concerns, I think they want us to keep our word on balancing the budget. In defense of this Congress, I think it is important to point out that since 1990, funding for Head Start has tripled. It ought to do better, but it ought not to do so at the expense of the promises we have made to cut the tax burden on the American people.

In addition, children's programming is a priority in this budget. We have funded Head Start at the President's requested level of an additional $2.7 billion over 5 years. We provided $1 billion for this program last year and an additional $4.5 billion for child care through the welfare reform bill. So it is not like we are insensitive to this. In fact, many of us would like to do more. It is just the vehicle being chosen, and this vehicle, the Dodd amendment, will, frankly, in the end violate this bipartisan agreement, and that we cannot do, because to get a majority, we need to keep this promise to ourselves, to our constituents, and keep faith with the leadership and with the White House.

Thank you, Madam President.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, let me respond to the Senator from Oregon. I appreciate his remarks, but I want to point out that this amendment says that the offset comes from corporate welfare, as I understand it. Some we are looking at. The Joint Tax Committee and others have carefully studied hundreds of billions of dollars of tax loopholes that usually go to some of the largest corporations and some of the wealthiest individuals in the country.

We are saying, can you not take a little bit from that, and instead, wouldn't you invest this in Head Start? And wouldn't you invest this in affordable child care? And wouldn't you invest this in Early Start? And wouldn't this make much more of a difference in children's lives? And wouldn't this better represent the standard of fairness of the people in the country?

So, Madam President, this is not about breaking any deficit reduction plan. This is about whether or not this budget agreement reflects the priorities of people in this country.

With all due respect to my colleagues, I think that if the choice for people in this country is between eliminating some of these egregious loopholes and deductions and instead investing more in children, and especially investing in this critical area of early childhood development, I say absolutely we ought to be doing that.

Madam President, I would like to talk just a little bit about these programs and a little bit about the sort of overall context of this amendment.

First of all, I have heard it so stated—and I say to my colleague from Oregon I will be willing to be critical of my own colleagues. I actually say this in a scrupulously, if you will, nonpartisan way. We talk about how we are expanding Head Start and, therefore, we are going to serve an additional 1 million children. But are we doing enough to reach the 2 million children who are not now participating?

My colleague from Connecticut points out that in addition there is going to be some early Head Start funding, frankly, above and beyond the 1 million children who still are not receiving any assistance; that is, Head Start 3 to 5.

If I was to include early Head Start, which is very consistent with very compelling scientific evidence that these are the really critical years, you know, right after birth, 1, 2, up to age 3, we are not coming even close to providing many children in this country with a head start. I far prefer to do that than to continue with a variety of different loopholes and deductions and breaks for some of the largest corporations in this country and wealthiest individuals who do not need it.

I mean, I would be more than willing to lay out this proposition for people in the country over and over again and say, you know, whose side are you on? Cargo Continental Grain Co. or vulnerable children who are just looking for a break by way of Head Start to get them prepared for school or good child care or, as I was talking about earlier, though not in this amendment, adequate nutrition? That is what this is all about. That is what this amendment is all about.

So the issue is not whether or not Senators are going to vote against this amendment because they are opposed to a budget agreement. I think my colleague from Connecticut and I may have different views on the overall budget agreement. I do not know yet. I guess he reserves final judgment. But you can be for the budget agreement and vote for this amendment because this amendment still keeps us within this path of a balanced budget. It just says: Couldn't we do a little bit better for children?

I am aware of the fact that colleagues feel some time constraint, and I promise not to take more than a couple more minutes, but this is, I think, such an important amendment. I am proud to join in with the Senator from Connecticut and Senator JEFFORDS from Vermont and Senator MURRAY from Washington.

Another way of looking at this for just a moment, with all due respect—and this is my hard-hitting point; I might have said it before on the floor of the Senate but it just feels right to say it at 10 to 6 on Tuesday evening—a real heroine to me—she is no longer alive—was a woman named Fannie Lou Hamer. She was a share cropper from Mississippi, an African-American woman. She once said, ''I'm sick and tired of being sick and tired.'' She was a great civil rights leader.

I just get a little sick and tired of everybody who says they are for children and investment in children and we are now going to build a bridge going to the next century and we are all for these children—except when it comes to investment.

On the one hand, we say it is so important that children who come from really difficult circumstances get a head start. I mean, that is what we try to do. We do what the name of the program suggests, give these children a head start. And we talk about how unfair it is that so many children do not have this head start. And then we seem to be so comfortable with the fact that we still are not providing enough funding for 1 million children who are not going to receive it, ages 3 to 5, and God knows how many more children under the age of 3.

Can't we do better? Can't we do better? Can't we have just a little bit less by way of tax breaks, loopholes, deductions, whatever you want to call it, for large multinational corporations? I mean, Lord, we are just talking about $15 billion out of studies that have talked about hundreds of billions of dollars. Can't we just provide them with a little less so we can provide a little more for these children?

Second point. It will just be the last one, which is the child care piece. I believe my colleague from Connecticut, in this overall over 5 years, $15 billion, is saying we can do better. I think many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle agrees with this.

You look at the child care picture, and whether or not you want to talk about family-based child care or center-based child care or figure out ways you can have child care available for parent or parents at place of work, however you do it, however you do it, Madam President, it is just amazing, it is stunning how little we have done and how much we have to do.

David Packard, who was Deputy Secretary of Defense under President Reagan, and his wife Lucile Packard have a foundation. They issued a report this past summer, and they talk about child care. They make the point, look, it is not just nutrition, it is not just health care, but in addition, if these children do not get the kind of nurturing and intellectual stimulation that affects the way the brain is wired, that affects whether or not they are going to have a chance.

So many families—if we want to talk about working families, this is not just a poor people's issue. So many working families, so many of our children of parents in their thirties with two small children themselves, you look at their salaries, they cannot afford really good child care.

What Senator DODD is trying to do is at least expand some funding for good developmental child care. This is critical. This is the critical time.

If the medical evidence is so compelling, if it is so irreducible, if it is irrefutable, and if we know we have to do this for children, why cannot we in this budget agreement take a little bit away from or have a little less by way of tax breaks, loopholes, deductions, you name it, for large multinational corporations and wealthy people at the top of the economic ladder in our country and instead do a little better by way of investment in children, so each and every child can finish this way, each and every child?

I think we should be able to get good, strong bipartisan support. Each and every child in America, regardless of color of skin, regardless of income, regardless of religion, regardless of rural or urban, regardless of whether they be in Oregon or Connecticut or Maine or New Jersey or Minnesota, each and every child, regardless of religion, should have the same chance to reach her full potential, have a full chance to reach his full potential.

That is the essence of the American dream. That is the goodness of our country. That is what we believe in. This amendment takes us just a little bit—but, boy, it really matters to many children in many families—takes us a little bit further in that wonderful direction.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DODD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. How much time does my colleague from Washington need?

Mrs. MURRAY. Five minutes.

Mr. DODD. I yield the Senator from Washington 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, thank you.

We are at a historic time in our Nation's history where we have before this body a balanced budget agreement that purports to balance this budget by the year 2002. I think many of my colleagues feel, as I do, that we have worked long and hard to reduce the deficit and we are finally getting there and we feel good about it.

But what we also know is that this economy is doing very well. We know that unemployment is down. We know that those people on Wall Street are doing well. We know that our college graduates are getting jobs that were not available to them 5 or 10 years ago. And there is a lot of hope and opportunity out there.

Madam President, it seems to me that this is the right time to take a look and say, Who are we missing in this budget? And when we know that one out of four children in this country live in poverty, despite the fact that our economy is doing well and that things are looking really good, we ought to take this opportunity now, as we put this balanced budget agreement together, to make sure that this country focuses its resources on a place where it can really make a difference.

I come to you today as a mother, as a preschool teacher before I was in the Senate, and as a U.S. Senator to tell you that I can think of no place that we can invest money better than in the young children of this country.

I want to thank Senator DODD for his work on this issue over many years and for all the time and energy he has put in to make sure that that group of people who do not have a voice do have a voice on the Senate floor.

His amendment before us today, that I am delighted to be a cosponsor of, addresses the current needs of today's young children in a way that this budget does not and should.

I can tell you from personal experience that Head Start makes a difference, and it makes a dramatic difference for those kids who are not in Head Start today. I taught preschool. I know that when you have a child in your classroom and when they are 3, 4 years old and they learn cognitive skills and they learn, in their beginning time, to get along with other children and they learn child development in a healthy way with a good teacher and with good equipment and with good adults around them, they will enter our schools ready to learn. It makes an incredible difference.

But it makes an incredible difference in those families as well because that mother or father has to bring that child to your classroom every day, and as a result they begin to learn how to deal better with their own young children. The result is a rippling tide. You have the child in your classroom, you have the siblings of that child, and you have the parents of that child really focusing on family. This is about creating good, strong families in this country. There is nothing we can do better than to devote our resources to Head Start for the families across this country and for the children in this country.

The child care development block grants have been spoken eloquently to. We know, as welfare reform goes into effect, that as women and men on welfare go into the work force, who is going to be left behind at home is their children. If we do not do everything we can to provide child care at those odd hours when a mother is working the night shift at the grocery store, that we are going to have infants and children who are not well cared for.

The results of that are going to be dramatic on those young children as they are not paid good attention to. But it will have an even more dramatic impact on those welfare moms when they are at work, because I can assure you that just like every other parent today, if I know that my child is being taken care of, whether they are at school or whether they are in child care, I do a better job when I am at work.

We need to make sure that the child care is available out there so that every working adult can be the best and most competent they can be at work and so that those children grow up feeling secure. I am tired of having young children say to me today that they do not think adults care about them in this country. If we leave them home alone without child care, it sends that message strongly. Those children end up on our streets, they end up in gangs, and they end up disillusioned as American citizens. We have to invest time and money and energy into child care through the child care development block grant so that we can raise a healthy generation of adults.

Finally, on the Healthy Start, we know when we take care of children and their health when they are young, that it will pay dividends in the future. One out of four children live in poverty. One out of four children are not getting the health care they need, not being taken care of. Guess where they will be when they grow up?

Madam President, it is essential that as adults on the floor of the Senate, we take the time and the energy and the resources to send our country in the right direction when we have the time and energy to do that. And that is now.

I applaud the Senator from Connecticut and the other cosponsors, and I urge this body to do what needs to be done. Those children were not in on the budget agreement. They were not there. They were not available to be there for the handshakes. We have to be on this floor to speak for them and speak loudly. I urge your support of this amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DODD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I am going to shortly yield the floor as well to my colleague from New Mexico, who is also a cosponsor of the amendment.

Let me just address the issue of how does this get paid for. We are not allowed specifically here to target revenue sources, but I have tried to lay out in the amendment where the revenues will come from.

One source is the foreign sales corporation, which most of my colleagues may be familiar with. This was set up back about 1981 or 1982, in fact, part of another budget agreement, done in a conference report. These are basically paper companies with very few employees, if any, in some cases that enabled American companies to exempt export income from U.S. taxation. That is about $24 billion over 5 years. The cigarette tax is another source here.

I cannot dictate a specific revenue source in this amendment—I am prohibited from specifically directing the Finance Committee. But it would certainly be my intention, as we stated here, to take the $14 billion over 5 years from those sources. If you took a little bit from the foreign sales corporation—you do not have to take all of it—some from the cigarette tax increase, it would be easy to pay for this amendment to provide for full funding for Head Start, child care, and Healthy Start programs.

My colleague from New Mexico is here, and I yield, Madam President, 5 minutes to my colleague from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on behalf of this amendment by the Senator from Connecticut.

I think, to put this in context, at least as I see it, this budget resolution is a blueprint for taking us into the next century. It sets out our priorities as a nation as we go into the next century, what we think it is important to spend our resources on, and what can we justify to the people who elect us in our States for spending resources on.

I believe very strongly that we can justify to our constituents, to those who vote for us and those who vote against us, we can justify to any of them the additional expenditure for the Head Start Program that the Senator from Connecticut is recommending here.

I look at my home State and the inadequate funding that we have for Head Start there, and it is a great concern. Let me give you a few specifics. In a State like mine, New Mexico, for example, 16 percent of the eligible children under age 5 are enrolled in Head Start. That is in the 1995 fiscal year. The national average is around 20 percent; in my State, it is 16 percent. There are only 1,000 of the 8,000 eligible children that are being served by Head Start in our principal city of Albuquerque, NM, which is about 12 percent of the eligible children in Albuquerque being served. I had the good fortune of visiting a Head Start center and was impressed by the opportunities being offered to those young people, but for them to tell me there are 8,000 eligible students or eligible children who are not able to participate in Albuquerque, I think, is a real concern.

Despite the clear need and several proposals to obtain funding that received higher ratings, my State has no early Head Start programs. The early Head Start programs are for the students that are less than 3, as I understand it, and there are some of those around the country but very few. We will have another amendment later on in the budget debate here about the importance of early childhood education and the tremendous impact of trying to work with children from the age of birth until 3 years old. Early Head Start programs provide, fill a need there, and we are doing too little. In my State, we have no, absolutely no early Head Start programs.

Increasing Head Start participation to 1 million children by the year 2002, as has been proposed in the resolution, would only increase participation by about 200,000 children, as I understand it. We need to add 1 million children to Head Start, not reach the total of 1 million by the year 2002.

For these reasons, I am glad to cosponsor the amendment of Senator DODD, and glad to speak on behalf of this amendment.

Let me say we need to recognize here on the floor, we have a lot of talk about what we can afford and what we cannot afford. We are the wealthiest nation in the world. We have the largest economy of any nation in the world. We are able to afford what we determine is a priority in our country.

Unfortunately, we have not determined that it is a priority to fully fund Head Start. This amendment would correct that very major defect in this budget resolution. I strongly support it. I urge my colleagues to vote for the amendment.

MODIFICATION OF AMENDMENT NO. 296

Mr. DODD. I send a modification of my amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWNBACK). The amendment is so modified.

The modification is as follows:

On page 8 on line 13 after ''loophole,'' insert ''increases in the cigarette tax,''.

Mr. DODD. Briefly, Mr. President, the modification, as I pointed out a moment ago, obviously, under the way the budget agreement is struck here, we cannot dictate to the Finance Committee where revenues—that is up to the committee to decide. I listed various tax cuts that might be modified or increased to pay for the amendment. You have to offset it. I have listed a number at the end of the amendment. I have added the cigarette tax as one that could also be considered, obviously. So that is the modification I sent to the desk. I listed a couple of those already.

As I said earlier, I think this agreement is a pretty good agreement. I began my remarks in offering the amendment by suggesting that I thought the members of the Budget Committee and others have done a good job, certainly, in this process, and the reason we are debating and voting is we have to offer our own ideas to it. My colleagues may reject the idea or accept the idea.

I happen to believe that by doing a bit more, a little under $3 billion each year over the next 5 years, in Head Start, in child care, in Early Start, in Healthy Start, is in the best interests of our country. By doing so, by adding a bit more to the cigarette tax or lopping off some of the foreign sales corporation, a program that I think, in fact, we voted on, the billionaire tax cut I listed, 96 Senators voted, 1.6 billion it would bring in. Many times we voted on it. It is there. There are resources that would not in any way get to the issue of middle-income tax cuts that are also included as part of this agreement which I would support.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, there is no issue of greater importance to our country than the education of our citizens. The budget before us calls for modest new investments in education over the next 5 years by increasing resources for education and training programs. In addition, the budget provides tax credits and deductions to middle income families to help pay for postsecondary education as outlined in the budget resolution. I fully support those initiatives. However, I believe we can and must do better.

Several years ago I read a report by the Committee on Economic Development. This is a group of CEO's from some of our Nation's largest companies and they called on us to fundamentally change how we think about education. They said education is a process that begins at birth and that preparation must begin before birth. They called on the Federal Government to make additional investments in early intervention activities such as Head Start. I believe we should heed their words.

The pending amendment makes these investments to ensure the readiness of all children and I want to commend Senator DODD for his leadership.

Last month, at my request, the Labor, Health and Human Services Appropriations Subcommittee held a hearing focusing on the importance of early childhood education. That hearing was on the eve of the White House conference on early learning and the brain which highlighted this most significant issue of the education of our youngest children.

Over the past several months we have been reading a great deal about research on the brain and the implications for the education and development of young children.

The research provides the scientific evidence which validates what many parents and children's advocates have been saying for years—the greatest potential for learning happens during the first years of a child's life. Therefore, we need to make sure that all children have rich learning experiences during that critical time.

The first National Education Goal states that by the year 2000, all children will start school ready to learn. I strongly support all of the goals, but believe that the first goal is essential for achieving the rest of our national goals. Without a strong foundation in the early years, children, particularly children from low-income families, start school behind their peers school and often find it very difficult to catch up.

Early intervention also makes good economic sense. Studies tell us that each dollar invested in high quality early childhood education programs such as Head Start saves $7 in future costs by increasing the likelihood that children will be literate and employed rather than dependent on welfare or engaged in criminal activities. However, less than half of the 2.1 million children eligible for Head Start participate. With the additional resources provided by the Dodd amendment, Head Start will be fully funded in 2002. That's a goal that is long overdue.

The most perplexing problem for working families is the availability and affordability of high-quality child care. In Iowa, 67 percent of children under the age of 6 have all parents in the labor force. The cost of child care overwhelms the modest budgets of most working families since the care for one young child can cost as much as $4,000 per year. Availability of subsidies for working families are vital to helping many of these families stay off of welfare and the pending amendment provides an additional $7.5 billion over the next 5 years for this purpose.

Finally the amendment increases funding for the Healthy Start Program. This initiative provides grants to areas with high rates of infant mortality to decrease the incidence of infant deaths. The additional will help sustain the gains made in those places and help disseminate information on successful interventions for other areas.

Mr. President, we must not lose sight of the importance of investments in the education of young children. After all, high quality educational activities during a child's first years often alleviates the need for more expensive interventions later in life. I hope that we will be able to work together to create the infrastructure which truly redefines how we view education—as a process that begins at birth, with preparations beginning before birth.

This amendment significantly increases investments for these vital early intervention initiatives and pays for these investments by closing several tax loopholes.

I urge my colleagues to support the Dodd amendment and yield the floor.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator HARKIN be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Would the Senator from Connecticut call for the yeas and nays?

Mr. DODD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. DODD. Reserving the request, I withhold, and 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. SMITH of Oregon. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I ask all time be yielded back from our side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield back time?

All time is yielded back.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. The DODD amendment is not germane. Pursuant to section 305 of the Budget Act, I raise a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. DODD. This is not in line, I do not believe, on this particular amendment. There are no budget increases in the first year. I changed the amendment, and my colleagues may not have been aware of it, to comply.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. It is my understanding from the Parliamentarian that——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion. There is 1 hour equally divided.

Mr. DOMENICI. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. This will take 60 votes to waive the nongermaneness, will it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The Senator from New Mexico is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. Unless you need further time, we do not need time. We can have the vote.

Mr. DODD. My point was, I say to my colleague from New Mexico, to try to avoid a point of order is the reason we modified the amendment. I am happy to make this a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, and I think that would then get us away from the point-of-order issue, and I would so modify my amendment to make it a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, in which case we can avoid.

Mr. DOMENICI. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. I do not believe he can amend, can he?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would take unanimous consent to modify.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent if I can modify it to make it a sense of the Senate.

Mr. DOMENICI. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. DOMENICI. 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. 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, parliamentary inquiry: What is the status in the regular order at this moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to waive the Budget Act. The Senator from New Mexico has 20 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Have the yeas and nays been sought on the motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. They have not.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the sponsor of the bill would like to—and the manager of the bill on this side with the consent of Senator LAUTENBERG on the minority side—propose to the Senate a solution to this problem which would expedite the matter.

We would like to proceed—and I ask unanimous consent that we do this—that we vitiate the motion and we vitiate the germaneness statement; that the Senator be permitted to modify his amendment; that we will not make a germaneness point of order; and that we will proceed after about 5 minutes—and I will say who gets the 5 minutes—to move to a motion to table the amendment; and the yeas and nays will be ordered on that, and the first vote will then be on the motion to table this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DODD. Reserving the right to object, I apologize to my colleague from New Mexico. What was the last part?

Mr. DOMENICI. That when we rid ourselves of the germaneness and the motion to waive it, we will be back on the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut. And I will then move to table it, and the Senator from Connecticut will ask for the yeas and nays, which we will grant, obviously, and we will vote on a tabling motion to the Senator's amendment without a germaneness defense being asserted.

Mr. DODD. There will no other points of order raised. I will just offer the amendment as proposed with the modification.

Mr. DOMENICI. I think we are just permitting the Senator from Connecticut to make it as it is and not raising the germaneness issue.

Mr. DODD. I accept that. I would prefer we didn't have a tabling motion. But I respect my colleague.

Mr. DOMENICI. I suggest that we ought to have 3 or 4 minutes.

Mr. DODD. Let me have a quorum call so that I can make sure we have the modification correctly.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, perhaps as the amendment is being reworked, maybe I can comment very briefly.

This is one of those very difficult circumstances that I am sure the majority leader and I are going to find ourselves in throughout this debate. I am very enthusiastic about the subject matter, about the issue, about the amendment. I would in any other set of circumstances be a cosponsor of it. I applaud the Senator for raising the issue.

But because it falls outside the parameter of the agreement of this budget I am going to oppose this amendment under these circumstances.

Again, I regret that I have to do that. But that is the agreement that we have enjoined, and I am going to try to adhere to that agreement throughout this debate.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Democratic leader for making that statement at this time. I intend to do the same thing as we go forward.

When we have amendments that change the basic content of the budget agreement, as this one does, which would provide for changes in the tax provisions, to have tax increases in the code, and move that over into funding programs at a level above what was included in the budget agreement, we think that would be outside the agreement. And, while there are a number of Senators led by the Democratic leader who see an attractiveness in it, I think this is the right thing to do.

We were trying to be cooperative by not going through the waiver of a point of order. But we will have the vote on the motion to table.

It would be my intent to take the same position when amendments are offered of this nature from our side of the aisle.

I think it is important that the two leaders on both sides make it clear that we are going to try to stick with this agreement as we go forward in the next 2 days.

I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

MODIFICATION NO. 2 OF AMENDMENT NO. 296

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I send the modification to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

The modification No. 2 is as follows:

On page 8, line 5 after "that" add "the assumptions underlying the budget resolution assume that,".

Mr. DODD. I think this modification of the amendment conforms with the conversation that I had with the Parliamentarian.

Mr. DOMENICI. Has the modification been accepted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification has been accepted.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, a brief moment: That is to say, with great reluctance I am going to oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut. He has a long and distinguished record on matters affecting children and their well-being.

I have also been a supporter of those programs that protect America's children to try to help them develop into functioning citizens.

But we do have an agreement that was hammered out, if I can use the expression, in great pain with a great pain in many cases over many weeks of hard work.

I just make the point that I commend the Senator for his interest, his continuing interest in the well-being of our children in the country, and that I again acknowledge regretfully that in my position here I am going to be opposing the amendment.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be added as a cosponsor.

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

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask that I be permitted to speak for 2 minutes after which we will vote, unless the Senator wants a minute.

Mr. DODD. I will take 30 seconds.

I respect immensely both my leaders, the chairman and the ranking member of the Budget Committee, and their positions on all of this. I understand their positions. I understand as well that, as Senators, we all have a chance to modify this resolution, hopefully without doing damage to the underlying agreement.

This resolution is a 5-year commitment to our country. I thought it should also be a stronger 5-year commitment to our children.

It seems to me that in the midst of everything else going on here, shifting around a little bit to accommodate those needs is very little to ask for America's kids.

I understand again the leadership position on it. I respect it. I offered the amendment. I am one who supports this agreement, by the way. I am not out here to undo it. I simply want to make it better with this amendment.

I regret that the leadership will oppose this amendment. But I respect that position, and urge my colleagues to support the amendment when the tabling motion is made.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, because there will be a lot of people supporting my motion to table, I do not want them to feel the least bit embarrassed about doing that because, as a matter of fact, this agreement that is before us contains every single nickel that the President of the United States asked for in terms of Head Start—$2.7 billion. That is what he asked for. It is a priority item. It must be funded. And you can't do better than that.

We have a good record in the U.S. Congress in terms of child care. Mr. President, $1 billion was added last year, and $4.1 billion in the welfare bill.

So those who support my motion are, indeed, doing that with the full cognizance that the U.S. Congress and the President have done right by these programs over the last 2 years, and intend to do even better by them without the Dodd amendment when it is tabled tonight, because we are going to leave that $2.7 billion in. It is in the agreement right now.

With that, Mr. President, I move to table the Dodd amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 72 Leg.]

YEAS—61

Abraham	Faircloth	McCain
Allard	Ford	McConnell
Ashcroft	Frist	Murkowski
Baucus	Gorton	Nickles
Bennett	Gramm	Robb
Bond	Grams	Roberts
Breaux	Grassley	Rockefeller
Brownback	Gregg	Roth
Burns	Hagel	Santorum
Campbell	Hatch	Sessions
Chafee	Helms	Shelby
Cleland	Hutchinson	Smith (NH)
Coats	Hutchison	Smith (OR)
Cochran	Inhofe	Snowe
Collins	Johnson	Stevens
Coverdell	Kempthorne	Thomas
Craig	Kyl	Thompson
Daschle	Lautenberg	Thurmond
DeWine	Lott	Warner
Domenici	Lugar	
Enzi	Mack	

NAYS—39

Akaka	Feinstein	Levin
Biden	Glenn	Lieberman
Bingaman	Graham	Mikulski
Boxer	Harkin	Moseley-Braun
Bryan	Hollings	Moynihan
Bumpers	Inouye	Murray
Byrd	Jeffords	Reed
Conrad	Kennedy	Reid
D'Amato	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kerry	Specter
Dorgan	Kohl	Torricelli
Durbin	Landrieu	Wellstone
Feingold	Leahy	Wyden

The motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 296) was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I would like to propound ask a unanimous-consent agreement now which would say we would not have any more recorded votes until 7:45, but we would have two at 7:45.

So I ask unanimous consent the next two amendments in order to Senate Concurrent Resolution 27 be an amendment to be offered by Senator ALLARD and an amendment to by offered by Senator HOLLINGS, that no amendments be in order to either amendment, and at 7:45 this evening, the Senate proceed to vote on or in relation to the Allard amendment, to be followed by 2 minutes for debate, to be followed by a vote on or in relation to the Hollings amendment.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. We have no objection.

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

Mr. LOTT. I further ask all time between now and 7:45 p.m. be equally divided between the two amendments in the usual form, with Senator ALLARD's amendment being offered first.

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

Mr. LOTT. For the information of all Senators, it would be the intention, I believe, of the managers of this legislation, to proceed, then, to continue to work on some other amendments that would be voted on in the morning. But, for now, these would be the two votes stacked at 7:45, and they would be the last recorded votes tonight.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition? The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I request order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will please be in order in the Chamber.

AMENDMENT NO. 292

(Purpose: To require that any shortfall in revenues projected by the resolution be offset by reductions in discretionary spending)

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Could we please have order in the Chamber? The Senator is proposing an important amendment and deserves to be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD] for himself and Mr. INHOFE, proposes an amendment numbered 292.

Mr. ALLARD. 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 end of title II, add the following:

SEC. . OFFSET OF REVENUE SHORTFALLS BY DISCRETIONARY SPENDING REDUCTIONS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1999, 2000, 2001, or 2002 that provides a revenue total for any of those fiscal years below the levels provided in this resolution unless the discretionary budget authority and outlay totals in that resolution are reduced to offset the amount by which revenues are below the levels provided in this resolution.

(b) 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.

(c) 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.

(d) 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time on the amendment is limited to approximately 25 minutes.

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I again thank the chairman of the Budget Committee and the ranking member of the Budget Committee for their hard work in putting together this agreement. I still have one overriding concern. I think there are a number of Members in the Senate that share my concern about what happens if the revenues we are projecting do not hold up over the years.

Mr. President, I share the concern that as we move through our economic cycles, the projected revenues in this budget agreement may not hold up. So I think it is a very legitimate question for us to ask ourselves, what happens if the revenues do not hold up to this agreement? Potentially, we could find ourselves back at the negotiating table, working hard to reestablish those priorities set up in the original agreement because the revenues were falling short.

Mr. President, I ask you bring the Senate to order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. Can we please have order in the Chamber?

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I think it is important that we move toward our goal, that we continue to eliminate the deficit by 2002. The amendment that I am offering considers that if the revenues do not come in as projected, then there will be an automatic adjustment that would occur through the procedure set forth to hold down spending and keep the deficit from increasing.

We all recognize that the economy goes through cycles. As a member of the House Budget Committee several years ago, I felt the figures coming out of the Congressional Budget Office, built on the first 2 or 3 years prior to that, were good numbers. But I have a feeling that we are reaching the top of our economic cycle and that at some point in time we will be forced to address the problem of not meeting our projected revenues.

This amendment tries to address that problem. Today, the economy is strong. People have jobs and the stock market is surging. History tells us, however, that this is not always the case. Unfortunately, the budget resolution assumes economic growth over the next 5 years that is unmatched in this country's history.

The Congressional Budget Office has provided Congress with a series of revised revenue forecasts, all pointing to future economic growth. In fact, balancing the budget is $629 billion easier now than last year at this time. If these revenues do not materialize, then all of our hard work will be lost to increasing deficits. I do not want this hard work to be lost. That is why I have introduced my amendment today.

The concept behind my amendment is simple: Provide a means to reduce spending within this budget agreement if real revenues fall short of those projected. This amendment will decrease discretionary spending in proportion to the revenue shortfall. This would help ensure that the budget remains on the glidepath to balance by the year 2002.

I am well aware of the historic nature of this agreement and would like to back the resolution with my undivided support, but I cannot mortgage the future of my children and grandchildren on Congressional Budget Office revenue forecasts. We should make sure that the document before us today has a mechanism to secure deficit forecasts. I do not believe that this change alters the intent of the agreement, but rather enhances its ability to react to changes in the economy, changes we may never see. But we cannot be shortsighted in this matter. If we are going to craft legislation to blueprint the next 5 years, let us be smart enough to realize that we cannot see into the future. Let us be smart enough to include language that allows this agreement to react to future changes.

I believe we can and should do more. We should do more in the form of tax relief for the American family, more in the form of tax relief for the family farmer, more in the form of reducing waste and duplication within the Federal Government. But I also believe that we can do more in future budget debates.

My amendment is not to serve as a protest, but rather a constructive improvement to a realistic budget compromise. I served on the Budget Committee in the other body and realize how difficult it was even to get to the point where we are today. But this cannot preclude us from holding true to our commitments. This amendment locks in nothing but our commitment to balance the budget.

My greatest fear is that reduced future revenues will unravel this agreement, just as we have seen with similar resolutions in the past. This amendment allows for future economic changes and would only strengthen the budget resolution.

The people of Colorado sent me to Washington to balance the budget and, in the process, make sure that any budget agreement keeps the Federal budget on a glidepath to balance. I ask that my colleagues hold true to balancing the budget and support this amendment.

I yield my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

Is the manager opposed to the amendment?

Mr. DOMENICI. The manager is opposed to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then the manager controls time in opposition.

Mr. DOMENICI. Then I yield to Senator LAUTENBERG as much time as he wishes.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank the manager. I think, just to ask a parliamentary question, when there is time for an amendment, that time is automatically divided between the two sides regardless of which side is being spoken for?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. When an amendment is proposed, half of the time is controlled by the proponent of the amendment, the other half is controlled by the majority manager if he is in opposition, and if he is not in opposition, then the minority manager will control that time.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, now that that is resolved, this amendment would force a cut in discretionary programs, if I read the amendment correctly, if projected revenues fall. That means that we would be putting national security at risk as well, because we would be taking it from defense as well as from discretionary accounts. That hardly seems the way, in my view, that the country ought to be doing business.

There may be circumstances that we cannot possibly imagine at this juncture, and apart from the basic rule of saying, look, this falls outside the understanding that, again, was negotiated at length, this means that if the economy falters, critical programs, in addition to defense, would be cut. It might be a time when, if things suddenly start turning tough, you might want to make other decisions. This would tie our hands and not enable us to consider these things as expected, and there are many other conditions that might be considered.

Would the Senator from Colorado suggest, if revenues fall short, that taxes ought to be increased? I hardly think so. I will not bother the Senator for a response to that; I will answer for him, taking that liberty. I just want to make the point that an agreement has, again, been negotiated, considering all prospects—revenues, expenditures, firewalls, protection of defense, development of discretionary accounts—again, through long, arduous discussions. While I think there are probably a number of people who would like to change the agreement, the fact is this represents a consensus point of view, and we are going to oppose the Senator's amendment and hope that the manager will agree with us that the amendment is going to be opposed. I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, yes, I do oppose the amendment, and let me tell the Senate why. First of all, I think everybody should understand that revenues are not the only thing we estimate in the budget. We estimate the economic growth, we estimate the inflation, we estimate the unemployment, and, frankly, all of them are estimates. We also estimate the amount of revenues that are coming in.

Might I suggest, it is very interesting, during this recovery, which is not an enormously high recovery in terms of gross domestic product growth, it has been an enormous yielder of revenues. Revenues have been coming in for 4 successive years at much higher than the Congressional Budget Office ever assumed, and, frankly, we have been saying the OMB is too generous, it has even been coming in higher than they have assumed.

On the other hand, the economic growth, the gross domestic product, has come in higher than estimated by either OMB or CBO. Now, the best you can do in a budget resolution is get the information regarding those factors that you do not have control over, how much revenue is coming in, how fast are we going to grow, what is the inflation rate going to be, how much unemployment are you going to expect and the other myriad of indicators of economic significance to the country.

Why we would just take one, revenues, and say if revenues do not meet the expectation, that we would then set about to do what? To cut the appropriated accounts.

Let me remind everyone, the appropriated accounts are now about 33 percent of the budget, and guess what they are, Mr. President? Half of them are defense—about half, almost split in the middle—and half are all the rest of the domestic programs. But how about this? What about the 67 percent of the budget that are the entitlements and mandatory programs and all the other things?

It would seem to me if you are going to have some kind of automatic adjustment—we tried this before and it has never worked—but if you are going to have one, then you ought to do it to everything. Why would you pick out defense, and it essentially is going to get half the cut if such is necessary? I do not think that is fair. Right off the bat, I would oppose this amendment on that alone.

There are others who say, ''If you only do defense, we will support you, Senator from Colorado, and leave out the domestic.'' But the point of it is, you are not going to be absolutely accurate when it comes to estimating. You are not going to be absolutely accurate. You do the very best you can, and then you make the alterations year by year if such are required.

I have even reached the point where I think you ought to make the alterations every 2 years. That is what I think about estimating. Having to go through budgets and appropriations, I think it ought to be every 2 years rather than one.

I do commend the distinguished Senator from my neighboring State of Colorado. He is a new Senator, and he knows a lot about putting budgets together. He knows a lot about putting reserve funds in place so that you come out right, because he has told me about them in his State of Colorado, a good conservative State that knows how to budget.

Frankly, it is very difficult to be that accurate with our National Government's budget the size it is, since we have so many programs that, if you change the economic growth just a little bit, then the unemployment compensation goes up a whole bunch and we have a lot of indicators, a lot of things that are related to this estimating that we cannot be certain of, other than look back after we have done it.

Incidentally, we have even done that. We have even said that, if that is the case, let's look back and correct it retroactively. I am not for that either. I am for being conservative in the estimating, and we have been as conservative as you can be in this budget. We have used the economic assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office in terms of growth, in terms of all the other important indicators, and I believe that that is among the lowest and most conservative set of estimates out there. I think blue chips' is higher than that. I think OMB is higher than that. Most of the major companies who do it have higher ones than we do. I think we are protecting the integrity of this budget as best we can by using that approach.

Once again, I commend my friend and colleague and neighbor for being genuinely concerned and targeting some of the issues that we might look at more carefully and try to handle in a better way.

Let me suggest that the only other amendment after my good friend from Colorado completes his argument is Senator HOLLINGS' amendment. I kind of made a mistake. I thought we were going to have a full half hour, starting at 7:30, for Senator HOLLINGS, but it looks like we are going to vote at a quarter of. So I hope if somebody can get hold of him and get him here earlier—I will not use much time in opposition to his amendment, so he will have all the time once he gets here until the vote. I yield the floor.

Mr. ALLARD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, how much time do I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seven minutes.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I again compliment the chairman and ranking member. I know they have worked hard with the best figures they had. I come from a State, the State of Colorado, that has a balanced budget amendment. I have been involved in the legislative body in the State of Colorado when we went through good years and bad years. During those good years, you look back and you build your budget based on what you think is going to happen at some future point in time.

The fact is, we do go through economic cycles, and despite the best of intentions and how valid our figures are today, those cycles are unpredictable. I think at one point in time we will have an economic downturn. This Congress needs to be prepared to address those unforeseen circumstances.

The point of my amendment addresses when those unforeseen circumstances do happen, when revenues coming in do not meet what was forecast and we have a spending level up here and maybe the revenues are coming in lower than expected, we just bring down the spending level and say that we need to adjust our figures in the baseline so that our budget reflects the change in economic conditions in this country. I think it is a commonsense type of amendment, and I ask the Members of the Senate to vote yes on this amendment. I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Is the Senator finished?

Mr. ALLARD. I yield the floor, and if the Senator from New Mexico is willing to yield back his time, I will yield back my time.

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator from Colorado should not yield his time because we might get back to his amendment for a little bit. We are waiting for Senator HOLLINGS, and if the Senator doesn't mind, Senator DURBIN would like to speak in opposition for a couple minutes.

Mr. ALLARD. That will be fine.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding.

Not being a high priest on the Budget Committee, I am not bound by sacred oath to the agreement, but I stand in opposition to this amendment. I believe that the Senator from Colorado has raised an important issue.

We can see the fact that the economy has moved forward very nicely over the last 4½ to 5 years. Those on the Democratic side take particular pleasure in saying that, but regardless of the reason, we are happy the economy has moved forward. As the Senator from New Mexico has mentioned, it has generated more jobs, more revenue and, in fact, more economic growth than even some of the experts suggested.

If I follow the suggestion of the Senator from Colorado, he is saying that if at some future date the economy has a downturn, revenues to the Federal Government decrease, he would want us to cut spending programs to match those cuts in revenue. I stand in opposition to that for one very obvious reason.

Since the late 1940s, we have noticed a very positive occurrence in the economy of America. As we have gone into recessions, we have not seen those deep spikes that we had in years gone by. The recessions have been milder, there has been less unemployment, less dislocation by businesses and families. It is no accident. It is known as automatic stabilizers, things in our Government and in our economy that step in in times of recession to try to bring us back into a time of economic expansion.

For instance, if we have a recession and a business lays off workers, there are Government programs available to help that working family get back on its feet. We have training programs, we have education programs, we have safety net programs, whether it is food stamps or unemployment compensation, to make sure that family doesn't fall even deeper, but rather to keep them in a position and poised ready for retraining and reemployment, and it has worked.

With these automatic stabilizers and this Government spending, we have managed to moderate recessions. The Senator from Colorado has suggested we remove the stabilizers. If you have a recession, if you have a downturn, if your Government revenues have been reduced, then cut spending. Well, what about the family that needs a helping hand? ''I am sorry, there is not enough Federal money to go around.''

We are more determined to balance the budget than recover from a recession under the Senator's amendment, and I think that is a mistake. We do not want to see a downturn in the economy become a recession. We certainly do not want to see a recession become a depression. The Senator's amendment would make economic circumstances even worse for the families out of work, worse for the businesses that have had to close, worse for the family farmers who have had to give it up.

I would think that the Senator would want to go in the opposite direction. We would want to get the American economy moving forward again, help those families back to work, help that business back on its feet, help those farmers, if we can, and the ranchers as well. But the Senator's amendment would have exactly the opposite effect. As a recession hits, revenues go down, the Senator would say spend less and bring the economy back to its feet. I think that is the wrong, wrong medicine.

As important as a balanced budget is, it is more important for America to have an expanding economy, to recover from a recession, and to have the wherewithal to do it. So I respect the Senator for his suggestion, but I respectfully disagree with his point of view.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ALLARD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has 3½ minutes.

Mr. ALLARD. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I would like to respond to the comments made on the floor about our economy and what happens if we go through an economic downturn.

First of all, I think the biggest burden that the farmers and small businesspeople and the average American family has to deal with in today's world is this huge Federal debt that we are facing. When you look at the amount of interest that we are paying on that debt and the potential liability to the budget, I believe—and this is a fundamental difference being discussed here on the floor of the Senate—but I happen to believe that the most important thing we can do to help our economy, to help the farmers of this country, to help the small businesses and help the homeowner, to help the family businessperson, is to get that burden off their shoulders.

If you are born today, you are born with a $20,000 debt which each individual in America burdens. How did we get to this point? We got to this point because of the very arguments we just heard on how we need to continue to spend more and more believing that it is going to help our economy. But inevitably we are going to have to pay the price.

If we do not make the decisions today, the tough decisions today, we are going to have to make them tomorrow. If we do not make those tough decisions, then our children and grandchildren are going to have to pay the price. And I think that is unforgivable. I think it is morally wrong to pass those tough decisions off to the next generation.

I happen to feel that this is an important amendment because it is holding the Congress accountable, both the House and the Senate. I am saying that if revenues do not measure up, we reduce spending. We have some flexibility in there to protect the most needed programs. I think it is a commonsense amendment. I think it holds true to the agreement generally and the fact that we will hold our priorities together that were agreed upon between the President and the Congress. I think it is a good amendment, and I ask for an aye vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired on the amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. Has all time expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time has expired.

Mr. DOMENICI. For both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Both sides.

Mr. DOMENICI. This vote will not occur at this time.

Parliamentary inquiry. May I move to table it at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may make that motion now, and the vote will occur at 7:45.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to table the Allard amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the amendment is set aside, and the Senator from South Carolina is to be recognized to offer an amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, Senator HOLLINGS is the one we have the consent for. He is not here, but he is coming.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill 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.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I understood from the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee I have 30 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I say to the Senator, we vote at a quarter of. You have the time from now to a quarter of.

Mr. HOLLINGS. You said vote at 8 o'clock when I left the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. The leader asked for 7:45.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I ask unanimous consent that I have 30 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I will not object.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished chairman.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 295

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk and ask the clerk to report it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] proposes an amendment numbered 295.
>
> At the appropriate place, insert the following: ''Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, all function levels, allocations, aggregates and reconciliation instructions in this resolution shall be adjusted to reflect elimination of tax cuts of $85 billion from baseline levels and elimination of Presidential initiatives of $31.2 billion and interest savings of $13.8 billion for a total saving of $130 billion over five years.''

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, this amendment does away with the sweetheart deal that will continue to increase the deficit instead of decreasing the deficit that current budget laws allow. We have had 5 years of decreasing deficits. This amendment continues the decrease of the deficits and actually puts us on a steady path of a balanced budget with no deficit whatsoever by the year 2007.

I measure my comments and words because we have been engaged in an outrageous charade for 15 years now. I speak advisedly having been on the Budget Committee since its institution and as a former chairman of the Budget Committee. That is one of the reasons I wanted to try to cooperate with the distinguished chairman because he has a tremendous burden of moving this bill along. It was not my intent to hold the legislation up, but to bring into sharp focus the situation we have created for the American people.

I supported and worked on a balanced budget in 1968 with the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. We did not have a Budget Committee. We called over to the White House to ask President Lyndon Johnson if we could cut another $5 billion so that we could make sure that we had a balanced budget. And he said, ''cut it.''

Mind you me, Mr. President. We had the war in Vietnam: guns. We had the Great Society: butter. Guns and butter. President Lyndon Baines Johnson was awfully sensitive about paying the bill. Wherein, we have no idea in this particular budget resolution of paying the bill. It is a sweetheart resolution, much like we had back in 1985.

In 1985, the Republicans, to their credit, brought former Senator Pete Wilson to the floor in great pain. Senator Wilson had had an appendectomy, and they brought him in at 1 o'clock in the morning on a stretcher, and they voted to freeze spending, Social Security, and the other particular matters at the time.

We went over early the next morning to see President Reagan. At that particular time, President Reagan said, ''Now, gentlemen, before we start''—we were all gathered around the Cabinet table —he said, ''I want to tell you, I had a little visit from the Speaker last evening, Speaker O'Neill.'' And we went outside there, you see right underneath that tree, and we had a little toddy, and we talked along, and we finally agreed. The Speaker said, ''I'll take your defense if you take my Social Security entitlements.''

I can see Senator Dole now. He threw down the pencil on the Cabinet table and he said it was a whole waste of time.

We faced the fire. We did the job that was necessary. So did Senator DOMENICI. He remembers it. So there was a swap.

Now, here 12 years later in 1997, we have a swap. President Clinton says, ''I'll take your tax cuts if you take my spending increases.'' And then everybody races around and hollers ''balanced budget.'' But folks, there is no balance in this budget.

Like Patrick Henry might have said, ''But as for me, give me either a balanced budget or give me a freeze.''

Let me show you exactly what is going on here. What we have here are the actual budget realities. And underneath budget realities you can see, Mr. President, the budgets for every President, from Truman right on through President Clinton.

You see the United States budget, the borrowed trust funds in this particular column, what they call the ''unified deficit,'' which is the greatest deception of all. For years we have been acting like ''unified'' meant ''net.'' Necessarily, the Government has income. It also has spending. And the inference is this is a net deficit after you take it all in. Absolutely false.

The real actual deficit is really listed in this column, because this one here borrows the money and loots the trust funds.

We have been looting the Social Security trust fund, as of last year, $550 billion; by 1997, the end of this fiscal year, September 30, it will be $629 billion; and under this budget resolution they take another practically $500 billion, half a trillion bucks to $1.095 trillion.

They say, ''Oh, watch out here in the next century with the baby boomers. The baby boomers are coming. We used to have five or six workers per recipient or retiree. We're only going to have one worker per retiree.''

Do not watch the baby boomers in the next century. Watch the adults on the floor of the U.S. Senate. Watch the adults that are looting the fund. We are causing the deficit. And it is not any charismatic formula that changes now or in the next century. Incidentally, I voted and will continue to support Senator KERREY on doing something about entitlements. I am not messianic that you cannot touch entitlements. I voted already with the Danforth-Kerrey solution last Congress.

But be that as it may, we are using $1.095 trillion from the Social Security trust fund. We have been looting it. After 5 years, the military retirees fund will owe $173 billion and the government will say they ought to start contributing more. If there is any military retiree within the sound of my voice, watch out, because they are already doing this with civilian retirement funds. We have a full $422 billion surplus, and they are saying we have to increase the contribution. Why? If you increase the contribution it goes to the deficit, not civilian retirement.

It is the same with unemployment compensation and the highway trust fund. We are using $40 billion from the highway trust fund. I have been trying to get funding for a bridge in South Carolina. You can build a bridge in every one of the 50 States with the money we are using to reduce the deficit.

We are going to continue the airport tax to make way for a net tax cut. So we continue this tax for all the air travelers, but this money does not go to airports. It goes to reduce the deficit. It takes unmitigated gall to extend the airport tax, and then put it toward the deficit. In fact, you don't put it all toward the deficit. Some of it is put toward a tax cut for inheritance taxes or capital gains taxes. And everybody traveling in an airplane wonders why the planes are bumping into each other in the sky and the airport radar is broken down and communications go out and everything else—remember that we are solving the deficit in Washington. We are giving them a unified deficit instead of an actual deficit.

So turning to the resolution itself, Mr. President, I want you to show me in this document I hold in my hand—Calendar 55, Senate Concurrent Resolution 27—where it says the budget is balanced. Do not give me this nonsense about the conversation that is in the committee report. That is a farce. Look at the actual law, the actual resolution that we are going to pass. If you can find in here, by way of language that there is a balanced budget by the year 2002, I will jump off the Capitol dome. I made that particular charge 4 years ago with the chairman of the Budget Committee, and I have not had to jump yet. Why?

Just turn to page 2, line 23, under the heading of deficits. ''For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution'' it says, deficit for fiscal year 2002—$108.7 billion. Then turn the page and get the actual deficit. That only counts under the law of section 13301 about Social Security. But you see, you have all of the other trust funds in there. Anytime you want to add up the annual deficit, just subtract the annual increase of the debt from the present year. In other words, you go here to page 5 and you will find that we have a debt of $6,301,200,000,000 in 1997 but then for the fiscal year 2002 the debt has gone up to $6,473,500,000,000, a deficit of 172 billion bucks.

Why did they have to borrow? Because that is what the deficit is. Now you can see from this other chart that the deficit this year is $180 billion. That is after 5 years of deficits going down. Under this budget resolution, deficits go up in 1998, 1999, and the year 2000. They go way up. They do not go down. Just look at the figures.

So after 5 years, instead of a deficit of $180 billion, we will have a deficit of $172 billion. That is, if everything goes right. And then it is still back-end loaded, Mr. President. 72 percent of the spending cuts occur in the last 2 years. It is back-end loaded, as usual, and the back-end loaders will say that those Congresses can do it in the year 2001 and 2002. In any event, the deficit comes out $172 billion. That is according to the Committee's facts and figures.

What we have to do—and that is why I proposed this amendment—is see if we can just take the entire spending cuts and tax increases and just eliminate them. I want to be realistic. I would like to do away with the so-called spectrum auctions. These are totally out of the question. We got somebody to come in last year—and it was verified by the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission—and say that we can get $2.9 billion from this spectrum auction. We had a spectrum auction 6 months later and we got $13.1 million. This is the kind of extreme exaggerated figures we are dealing with.

But aside from that, take all the figures in the work of the two Budget Committees and the agreement they have made. Eliminate the tax cuts and eliminate the spending increases—the Presidential initiatives—and steady as you go. If we can do that—that is what my amendment calls for—then you actually get a balanced budget. Government on a pay-as-you-go basis in fiscal year 2007. An honest budget. Truth in budgeting.

Mr. President, we have had conscience. That is why we came back after the Reagan deal with Tip O'Neill. We came back in here and we passed Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. I got it through over on this side over the objection of the majority leader, the majority whip, and the chairman of the Budget Committee. I got 14 votes up and down, the majority of the Democrats joined with the Republicans, in

1985, for that initiative. We could develop that kind of initiative now, instead of this sweetheart deal.

What good really has occurred as a result of the 1993 vote? Give President Clinton credit. And give this side of the aisle credit, because we could not get a single vote on that side of the aisle. They said they were going to hunt me down in the street and shoot me like a dog. Majority leader Dole said it would cause a recession and the world would end. I wish we had time to read those particular statements made by opponents of the 1993 plan.

Be that as it may, it worked. And that is the first President that has come around here in the past 15 years, since we started that Reaganomics, and has lowered the deficit.

To President Clinton's credit, he lowered the deficit in 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, and we are in the fifth year of lowered deficits, and this particular instrument asks us to go turncoat and start increasing spending so that we can give the rich a tax cut. Inheritance taxes, capital gains taxes, and all of these other things. Somewhere, sometime, Mr. President, we have to tell the American people that we in the Congress have been giving them over 200 billion bucks a year in Government that we are not willing to pay for. We have been buying their votes.

They are talking about campaign finance reform: it starts on the floor of the U.S. Senate here this evening. If you really want campaign finance reform, quit using the subterfuge to the taxpayers of America and offloading the debt to future years and vote to do away. Keep us on a steady course, because that is exactly what we need to do.

We are moving this deficit over. I do not know if you can see this on the chart, come up here to President Kennedy. We had already had all the wars under President Kennedy, except the closing days of the war in Vietnam. We had Korea, the world wars, the Revolutionary War and everything else, and we only ran up a debt that cost us $9 billion in interest costs. Now, it is projected by CBO to be $359 billion. So you can see where we have come.

We are spending $360 billion more—for what? For waste. The crowd that came to town to do away with waste, fraud, and abuse has caused the biggest waste of all. That $360 billion more we are spending is the biggest spending item; it is like taxes. It is almost $1 billion a day. We are sitting around here giving each other the good government award saying, ''heavens above, balanced budget, balanced budget, balanced budget,'' when we are increasing taxes, or the same as taxes, interest on the national debt, of $1 billion a day.

Now Mr. President, let me just emphasize exactly the duplicitous conduct here of the Congress up here in Washington. Bob Reich, the Secretary of Labor, retired the other day and he wrote a book. I saw him on TV. He was proud of two things. He said, ''You know, we passed the Pension Reform Act of 1994, the Pension Reform Act of 1994.'' He said, ''In addition to getting the minimum wage, I am most proud of that Pension Reform Act because corporate America has to fully secure their pensions so the workers of America moving from one place to another are not going to lose their rights and their entitlements.''

Now what happens? Mr. President, I refer to the New York Times here just 10 some days ago, May 8, page 26: ''Former Star Pitcher Is Sentenced to Prison.''

> Denny McLain, the former star pitcher for the Detroit Tigers, was sentenced today to eight years in prison and ordered to pay $2.5 million in restitution for stealing from the pension plan of a company he owned.
>
> The two-time Cy Young Award winner, who was the last man to win 30 games in a season, and his business partner were convicted in December on charges that they had stolen $3 million from the pension fund of the Peet Packing Co., then used the money for company debts. . . .''

We make sure you get a criminal charge and a sentence, and a prison sentence if you steal from the fund, but up here in Washington, the same crowd that passed that, whoopee, there it is. We get the good government award. It is a wonderful thing. You can just steal from these funds; the money is there. I do not see how you could in good conscience come around here with this budget without getting ashes in your mouth. To say balanced budget when you know the instrument itself says we have a deficit of $108 billion. Look on page 4, you can see down there on line 23, the actual amount of $108 billion. Then you can see where they list the debt for each year. As it increased, you can find that the actual deficit in the fiscal year 2002 is 172 billion bucks.

So after all of this work, we have come from $180 billion—Mr. President, I see the distinguished ranking Member looking at the chart. The actual deficit according for this year according to CBO is $180 billion, not $70 billion. They are bragging about $67 billion. They gave us a figure of $70 billion a couple days ago because we use $110 billion of the trust funds. We steal that money and give it to ourselves, saying we have the deficit down to $70 billion and it is actually $180 billion; and after 5 years under this resolution, by their own figures, it is estimated to be $172 billion.

So, Mr. President, we have to stop the destruction of the economy of this country. It is a 1 percent drag on economic growth when you run these deficits and pay out all of this money when you don't pay for the Government you have. Here they have 12 million new jobs, low inflation, low interest rates, and the finest growth for 5 years in a row. If we can't stop look, listen, sober up, and begin to put this Government on a pay-as-you-go basis tonight and this week in Washington, DC, in this U.S. Congress, it is never going to happen. And somehow, somewhere, we have to get the free press, the media, to report the truth, because they continue to report misleading figures. They don't quote the actual deficit. All they have to do is read this bill. Find in here where they say they balance the budget in the year 2002.

On the work sheet, they had the figures down here, Mr. President, of a $1 billion surplus. But when they put out the actual resolution, that is not the case. They hide that in the descriptive language.

That is the way the system works. It is a cancer. We are spending more money on waste. Interest payments cannot build a school, a highway, and not 1 hour of research. There is no medical treatment. There is nothing for the children of America that we are all concerned about. There is nothing for Head Start, nothing for WIC, nothing for school construction. We could build all the new school buildings all over the country for $360 billion.

That is how much we have increased our national interest payments with this extravagance and this charade. It is a fraud on the American people. The free press is supposed to keep us honest. They, as co-conspirators, unindicted, joined with us to defraud the American people.

I hope we can vote for this amendment of mine this evening and stop the fraud and get back to truth in budgeting. It is not too traumatic. Everybody is doing fine this year.

Just the other day, the Senate said rather than shut down the Government we could take this year's budget for next year. The mayor of any city in this situation would say, ''Let's not fire the policemen and firemen. We will just take this budget for the next year.'' A Governor of any State would say, ''Let's just take this year's budget for next year.''

We can save $50 billion by doing it. But we don't want to do that. We play this game. We exact this fraud on the American people. Somehow, somewhere it has to stop.

I yield the floor, and I thank the distinguished chairman of our Budget Committee and our ranking member.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, we are due to vote, as I understand it, pursuant to the last unanimous-consent agreement at 10 minutes to 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I know that the manager, the chairman of the Budget Committee, wants to say something. I would like to make a quick comment, if I might.

Few have the knowledge of the budget that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has. He understands it thoroughly, and he has been a consistent purveyor of the alarm to be aware and to make sure that we do the right thing.

It would be an ideal situation if we had the trust funds off budget, if we could deal with that in a quick moment like this. But the reality is that we just can't do it, Mr. President. We have hammered out a budget. I used the term before. ''Hammer'' suggests the arduous effort that the budget agreement took to get 5 million children covered under health care, to make sure that impoverished seniors aren't further burdened by additional premiums because we have moved the home health care from part A to part B.

There are a whole series of things. There are tax cuts for the middle class. There are tax cuts for education. This bill was put together with a lot of work and a lot of giving by many people, people who do not like every part of this budget. I am one of them, I must tell you, but I am determined that we see that we pass this budget.

I say to the Senator from South Carolina, a dear friend to many of us here, that we ought to take a couple of these issues and work on them.

I agree with him on the trust funds on Social Security. I really do. I think we ought to take the time now—because we will be dealing with a more solvent situation in several of the trust funds—to deal with that. But it is not going to happen, I say here and now.

I will, unfortunately, be forced to vote against what the distinguished Senator from South Carolina is proposing. I intend to do just that, to vote against it.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Could I ask the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina still has 3 minutes left.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President. The distinguished chairman said in an ideal world that trust funds would be off budget. We live in an ideal world with respect to Social Security. Section 13301, in accordance with the Greenspan commission recommendation—President George Herbert Walker Bush signed legislation on November 5, 1990 that put Social Security off budget.

That is why, instead of a surplus in this document, you have a deficit of $108 billion. We didn't get the rest of the trust funds off budget like we should have. We should get the highways, airport, retirement trust funds, Medicare off budget. But this document uses the money on the deficit. You are allocating it to the deficit. So the ideal world would be truth in budgeting.

I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. DOMENICI. Has the Senator yielded back the remainder of his time?

Mr. HOLLINGS. I do.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I will use just 2 minutes.

Mr. President, there has been a lot of talk about trust funds. But let everybody understand that the amendment has nothing to do with trust funds. The amendment has to do with just two things.

One, it strikes all of the tax cuts provided in this budget agreement, hammered out with the President and the Democratic leaders and the Republican leaders of both Houses. That is No. 1. Strike them all.

Second, it says that the $31.2 billion over 5 years of new initiatives that we have hammered out with the President—and we cut his initiatives almost in half to get there—but it says those initiatives are gone, too.

So essentially the President got $31 billion in initiatives on covering the little kids and things like that that most of us want. He would take that out of this agreement, and at the same time, take out all of the tax cuts.

I don't intend to argue the substantive issue, which I think is totally wrong for America today. I just suggest that nothing could more basically attack the agreement than this, for the fundamentals of the agreement are gone if this amendment passes.

I yield any time I may have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded.

Under the previous order, the Hollings amendment is set aside.

AMENDMENT NO. 292

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the motion to table the Allard amendment, No. 292. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 29, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 73 Leg.]

YEAS—70

Akaka	Feingold	Mikulski
Baucus	Feinstein	Moseley-Braun
Bennett	Ford	Moynihan
Biden	Frist	Murray
Bingaman	Glenn	Reed
Bond	Gorton	Reid
Boxer	Graham	Robb
Breaux	Hagel	Roberts
Bryan	Hollings	Rockefeller
Bumpers	Inouye	Roth
Byrd	Jeffords	Sarbanes
Campbell	Johnson	Shelby
Chafee	Kennedy	Smith (OR)
Cleland	Kerrey	Snowe
Cochran	Kerry	Specter
Collins	Kohl	Stevens
Conrad	Landrieu	Thompson
D'Amato	Lautenberg	Thurmond
Daschle	Leahy	Torricelli
DeWine	Levin	Warner
Dodd	Lieberman	Wellstone
Domenici	Lott	Wyden
Dorgan	Lugar	
Durbin	Mack	

NAYS—29

Abraham	Gramm	Kyl
Allard	Grams	McCain
Ashcroft	Grassley	McConnell
Brownback	Gregg	Murkowski
Burns	Hatch	Nickles
Coats	Helms	Santorum
Coverdell	Hutchinson	Sessions
Craig	Hutchison	Smith (NH)
Enzi	Inhofe	Thomas
Faircloth	Kempthorne	

NOT VOTING—1

Harkin

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Regular order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will please come to order.

AMENDMENT NO. 295

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided on the HOLLINGS amendment No. 295.

The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the Chair. Right to the point, here is the concurrent resolution. You will not find in this document anywhere a balanced budget. Everyone is running hither and yon: ''Balanced budget, balanced budget.'' The truth is, if you look on page 5, you have the fiscal year debt to the year 2001 and for the year 2002, the fiscal year debt there going up to $172 billion. Actual deficit, without the use of the trust funds, without looting all the pension funds, there is $172 billion.

This increases the debt each year every year for 5 years, whereby the interest costs on the debt is a billion a day. We have spending on autopilot of $1 billion a day for absolutely nothing. Not for children. Not for highways. Not for research. Not for foreign aid. Not for defense. We have total waste.

We have a cancer and it ought to be removed. My particular amendment says do away with the tax cuts in this instrument; do away with the spending increases, the President's initiatives. We are on course for a balanced budget by the fiscal year 2007. Truth in budgeting is the question put before us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has 1 minute. The Senate will please come to order.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, this amendment takes out all of the tax cuts and all of the President's initiatives. Essentially it totally guts the entire agreement. There would be no tax cuts and there would be no initiatives that we have agreed with the President on. I urge a no vote. I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on the amendment No. 295. A rollcall has not been requested.

Mr. HOLLINGS. 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced, yeas 8, nays 91, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 74 Leg.]

YEAS—8

Byrd	Feingold	Reid
Conrad	Hollings	Robb
Dorgan	Moynihan	

NAYS—91

Abraham	Feinstein	Lugar
Akaka	Ford	Mack
Allard	Frist	McCain
Ashcroft	Glenn	McConnell
Baucus	Gorton	Mikulski
Bennett	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Gramm	Murkowski
Bingaman	Grams	Murray
Bond	Grassley	Nickles
Boxer	Gregg	Reed
Breaux	Hagel	Roberts
Brownback	Hatch	Rockefeller
Bryan	Helms	Roth
Bumpers	Hutchinson	Santorum
Burns	Hutchison	Sarbanes
Campbell	Inhofe	Sessions
Chafee	Inouye	Shelby
Cleland	Jeffords	Smith (NH)
Coats	Johnson	Smith (OR)
Cochran	Kempthorne	Snowe
Collins	Kennedy	Specter
Coverdell	Kerrey	Stevens
Craig	Kerry	Thomas
D'Amato	Kohl	Thompson
Daschle	Kyl	Thurmond
DeWine	Landrieu	Torricelli
Dodd	Lautenberg	Warner
Domenici	Leahy	Wellstone
Durbin	Levin	Wyden
Enzi	Lieberman	
Faircloth	Lott	

NOT VOTING—1

Harkin

The amendment (No. 295) was rejected.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I rise in support of the fiscal year 1998 balanced budget resolution.

I congratulate the hard-working chairman of the Budget Committee for his leadership and dedication in bringing us to this point, as well as our distinguished majority leader.

Am I especially happy to be able to use those 2 words, ''balanced budget.''

This budget resolution represents a victory for the American people; for sound, conservative principles; for those of us who have fought for years for a balanced budget; for the seniors who will be protected by a safer, sounder Medicare system; and for the workers of today and the children of tomorrow, who will benefit from a healthier economy and better jobs.

Some may be disappointed because this is not a ''perfect'' budget; but it's a big improvement over the status quo; and there's a world of difference between this budget and the big-government, tax-and-spend budgets of just a few years ago.

Less than 2 years ago, President Clinton was saying we didn't even need to balance the budget; then he said, maybe we could balance by 2005; but the new Republican majority elected in 1994, and reelected in 1996, insisted on a plan to a balanced budget by 2002—and now we've got one.

Two years ago, when the first Republican Congress in 40 years took office, we found a Medicare system ready to go bankrupt in 2001.

We said it was time to fix Medicare and we tried to slow its rate of growth to 6 or 7 percent a year, with pro-senior citizen, pro-consumer reforms.

Some from the other side tried to hit us with 30-second attack ads, claiming that seniors' benefits would be slashed and burned.

But the American people didn't believe them.

Today, finally, we have a sober, responsible, bipartisan agreement that says Medicare must be repaired—so that Medicare continues to be there for our seniors who need it.

And yes, in this budget agreement, Medicare grows at about 6 percent a year.

Under this budget, Medicare part A will be solvent for a decade.

The details that finally emerge later this year in a budget reconciliation bill will probably not contain all the structural, market-based reforms that Medicare needs for the long term, but this budget should be a good start.

Four years ago, the President asked for, and Congress unfortunately passed, the biggest tax increase in history.

Today, this budget agreement includes real, pro-family, pro-growth, tax cuts.

We finally begin to roll back that last, huge tax increase.

The skeptics said you couldn't balance the budget, cut taxes, and get bipartisan agreement.

But this budget will do those things.

Let's remember: What this budget begins to do is let the people keep more of their own money.

Under this budget, we will finally begin to get spending growth under control.

Will the government still be too big and intrusive? Yes.

But the Federal Government will spend $1.1 trillion less over the next 10 years than it would have spent under previous policies.

Spending growth will drop from 4.4 percent a year under previous policies to 3.1 percent a year under this budget—just barely more than inflation.

The Government will finally begin to shrink relative to the size of the economy.

Spending will still go up in nominal dollars, but it will drop from 20.8 percent to 18.9 percent of gross domestic product, by 2002.

Of course, a lot depends on the enforcement provisions that will have to be part of the budget reconciliation legislation later this year.

I'll be watching that legislation closely.

We've learned from bitter existence in the past that permanent procedures are needed to keep spending from running wild.

After all, the road to a $5.3 trillion debt was paved with good intentions.

That's why we should have passed—and still need—a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

But the budget enforcement rules called for under this budget resolution should help keep us on course to a balanced budget by 2002.

A majority of the people in America have seen the budget balanced exactly once or never in their lifetimes.

The last two balanced budgets were in 1960 and 1969.

A majority of Americans alive today were born after 1960.

It's time for that destructive trend to end.

It's time to create a better future for all Americans.

This budget resolution is the right beginning of that promising future.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate resumes the budget resolution on Wednesday, there be an additional 5 hours subtracted from the overall time constraints provided for in the Budget Act.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I assume we have no further amendments tonight, but I think Senator GRASSLEY would like to take some time, and I will yield that time to him at this point. How much time would the Senator like?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Can I have 20 minutes?

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator mind closing the Senate after his 20 minutes? Does the Senator from New Jersey have any objection? The Senator from Iowa is going to take 20 minutes, and we will let him close the Senate if we are finished for the evening.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. No, I certainly trust the Senator from Iowa. He is not going to cut taxes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each. I assume that is after I have finished my remarks on the resolution.

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

BIGOTRY MUST BE DENOUNCED

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise to condemn in the strongest possible terms recent comments that have been attributed to Mr. Freih Abu Medein, the Justice Minister in the Palestinian authority.

In a May 17 article in the Washington Post, journalist Barton Gellman reported that Mr. Medein stated last month that ''five Zionist Jews'' are running the United States' Middle East policy and, in the words of the article, he ''added that it is implausible that a nation the size of the United States can find no one else to maintain diplomatic contacts with Palestinians.''

This statement, if quoted correctly, is deeply offensive on two counts. First, it is patently anti-semitic, or more properly, anti-Jewish. Its conspiratorial overtones reflect the worst traditions of hate-mongering that characterizes classical anti-semitism.

Second, it is a thinly veiled attempt to manipulate our sovereign right as a country to choose whoever we wish to represent us diplomatically. It also evinces complete ignorance of the American system.

I am confident that the individuals to whom Mr. Medein refers were not chosen for their religious beliefs, but rather on the strength of their qualifications for the jobs for which they were selected. Anyone who thinks otherwise has great deal to learn about this country.

If Mr. Medein or anyone else in the Palestinian Authority has difficulty meeting with American representatives who happen to profess a particular religious faith, then that is their problem, not ours.

I would submit, Mr. President, that we have the right to choose a person of any faith, any gender, and any race to represent us in any place. Should we choose an American who happens to be a Muslim to represent us in Israel, a Hindu to represent us in Pakistan, a Jew in Syria, a Roman Catholic in Yugoslavia, a Greek Orthodox in Turkey, or a Buddhist in China, then that is our sovereign right as a nation. The only criterion should be that the person be qualified for the job for which he or she is selected. Religious affiliation should have absolutely nothing to do with it. Zero. Zilch.

That is what distinguishes us from the rest of the world. For unfortunately, Mr. Medein's views are not isolated ones. They reflect an all-to-common obsession with race, religion, and ethnicity that plagues much of the world.

We may not be perfect, but our guiding ideals are unassailable. And we have successfully put those ideals into practice, with the result that many others seek to emulate us.

Mr. President, the day we pause even for a fraction of a second to contemplate the possible validity of remarks such as Mr. Medein's is the day that we abandon our most fundamental beliefs.

Bigotry must be denounced, whether it is at home or abroad. American representatives who are the object of bigoted attacks deserve to know that their country stands four-square behind them.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Monday, May 19, 1997, the Federal debt stood at $5,344,451,048,224.65. (Five trillion, three hundred forty-four billion, four hundred fifty-one million, forty-eight thousand, two hundred twenty-four dollars and sixty-five cents)

Five years ago, May 19, 1992, the Federal debt stood at $3,920,456,000,000. (Three trillion, nine hundred twenty billion, four hundred fifty-six million)

Ten years ago, May 19, 1987, the Federal debt stood at $2,291,418,000,000. (Two trillion, two hundred ninety-one billion, four hundred eighteen million)

Fifteen years ago, May 19, 1982, the Federal debt stood at $1,066,133,000,000. (One trillion, sixty-six billion, one hundred thirty-three million)

Twenty-five years ago, May 19, 1972, the Federal debt stood at $428,331,000,000 (Four hundred twenty-eight billion, three hundred thirty-one million) which reflects a debt increase of nearly $5 trillion—$4,916,120,048,224.65 (Four trillion, nine hundred sixteen billion, one hundred twenty million, forty-eight thousand, two hundred twenty-four dollars and sixty-five cents) during the past 25 years.

TRIBUTE TO COL. ROBERT LEARY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is a privilege to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Col. Robert Francis Leary, who died on April 27 at his home in Concord, MA.

Colonel Leary served in the U.S. Army for 34 years, retiring in 1987. His tours of duty included positions as executive officer of the 373rd General Hospital, and chief of staff of the 804th Medical Brigade, coordinating the medical readiness of Army Medical Units in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Germany. He also served as commandant at Fort Devens, MA, successfully conducting this course the first time it was exported outside of Fort Sam Houston, TX. Colonel Leary was the recipient of numerous military awards for distinguished service, including Meritorious Service Medals, the U.S. Army Commendation Medal, and the Legion of Merit.

Colonel Leary also had a distinguished civilian career. He was employed by the Department of Veterans Affairs in Bedford, MA as coordinator and supervisor in the Social Work Service Department. Most recently, he was program manager of the Veterans Homestead transitional housing program in Leominster, MA. In addition, he served as an equal employment opportunity Officer at Veteran Affairs Central Office in Washington, DC, and in several capacities in private practice as a licensed independent clinical social worker.

Colonel Leary shared his many wide-ranging interests with his family and friends including politics, travel, golf, hockey, baseball, and soccer. He was constantly involved in youth sport activities and was his children's most avid fan. To all who knew him, he was a model citizen and family member. His patriotism and commitment to service are an example to us all, and I am honored to pay tribute to him today.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, 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 sundry nominations which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE ORDER PROHIBITING NEW INVESTMENT IN BURMA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 38

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:

Pursuant to section 570(b) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1997 (Public Law 104–208) (the ''Act''), I hereby report to the Congress that I have determined and certified that the Government of Burma has, after September 30, 1996, committed large-scale repression of the democratic opposition in Burma. Further, pursuant to section 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)) (IEEPA) and section 301 of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1631), I hereby report that I have exercised my statutory authority to declare a national emergency to respond to the actions and policies of the Government of Burma and have issued an Executive order prohibiting United States persons from new investment in Burma.

The order prohibits United States persons from engaging in any of the following activities after its issuance:

—entering a contract that includes the economic development of resources located in Burma;

—entering a contract providing for the general supervision and guarantee of another person's performance of a contract that includes the economic development of resources located in Burma;

—purchasing a share of ownership, including an equity interest, in the economic development of resources located in Burma;

—entering into a contract providing for the participation in royalties, earnings, or profits in the economic development of resources located in Burma, without regard to the form of the participation;

—facilitating transactions of foreign persons that would violate any of the foregoing prohibitions if engaged in by a United States person; and

—evading or avoiding, or attempting to violate, any of the prohibitions in the order.

Consistent with the terms of section 570(b) of the Act, the order does not prohibit the entry into, performance of, or financing of most contracts for the purchase or sale of goods, services, or technology. For purposes of the order, the term ''resources'' is broadly defined to include such things as natural, agricultural, commercial, financial, industrial, and human resources. However, not-for-profit educational, health, or other humanitarian programs or activities are not considered to constitute economic development of resources located in Burma. In accordance with section 570(b), the prohibition on an activity that constitutes a new investment applies if such activity is undertaken pursuant to an agreement, or pursuant to the exercise of rights under an agreement that is entered into with the Government of Burma or a non-governmental entity in Burma, on or after the effective date of the Executive order.

My Administration will continue to consult and express our concerns about developments in Burma with the Burmese authorities as well as leaders of ASEAN, Japan, the European Union, and other countries having major political, security, trading, and investment interests in Burma and seek multilateral consensus to bring about democratic reform and improve human rights in that country. I have, accordingly, delegated to the Secretary of State the responsibilities in this regard under section 570(c) and (d) of the Act.

The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, is authorized to issue regulations in exercise of my authorities under IEEPA and section 570(b) of the Act to implement this prohibition on new investment. All Federal agencies are also directed to take actions within their authority to carry out the provisions of the Executive order.

I have taken these steps in response to a deepening pattern of severe repression by the State Law and Order Restoration Council (SLORC) in Burma. During the past 7 months, the SLORC has arrested and detained large numbers of students and opposition supporters, sentenced dozens to long-term imprisonment, and prevented the expression of political views by the democratic opposition, including Aung San Suu Kyi and the National League for Democracy (NLD). It is my judgment that recent actions by the regime in Rangoon constitute large-scale repression of the democratic opposition committed by the Government of Burma within the meaning of section 570(b) of the Act.

The Burmese authorities also have committed serious abuses in their recent military campaign against Burma's Karen minority, forcibly conscripting civilians and compelling thousands to flee into Thailand. Moreover, Burma remains the world's leading producer of opium and heroin, with official tolerance of drug trafficking and traffickers in defiance of the views of the international community.

I believe that the actions and policies of the SLORC regime constitute an extraordinary and unusual threat to the security and stability of the region, and therefore to the national security and foreign policy of the United States.

It is in the national security and foreign policy interests of the United States to seek an end to abuses of human rights in Burma and to support efforts to achieve democratic reform. Progress on these issues would promote regional peace and stability and would be in the political, security, and economic interests of the United States.

The steps I take today demonstrate my Administration's resolve to support the people of Burma, who made clear their commitment to human rights and democracy in 1990 elections, the results of which the regime chose to disregard.

I am also pleased to note that the Administration and the Congress speak with one voice on this issue, as reflected in executive-legislative cooperation in the enactment of section 570 of the Foreign Operations Act. I look forward to continued close consultation with the Congress on efforts to promote human rights and democracy in Burma.

In conclusion, I emphasize that Burma's international isolation is not an inevitability, and that the authorities in Rangoon retain the ability to secure improvements in relations with the United States as well as with the international community. In this respect, I once again call on the SLORC to lift restrictions on Aung San Suu Kyi and the political opposition, to respect the rights of free expression, assembly, and association, and to undertake a dialogue that includes leaders of the NLD and the ethnic minorities and that deals with the political future of Burma.

In the weeks and months to come, my Administration will continue to monitor and assess action on these issues, paying careful attention to the report of the U.N. Special Rapporteur appointed by the U.N. Human Rights Commission and the report of the U.N. Secretary General on the results of his good offices mandate. Thus, I urge the regime in Rangoon to cooperate fully with those two important U.N. initiatives on Burma.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive order that I have issued. The order is effective at 12:01 a.m., eastern daylight time, May 21, 1997.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 20, 1997.*

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–1933. A communication from the Acting Executive Director of the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the final schedule of fees received on May 15, 1997; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1934. A communication from the Assistant Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to conditional registration; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1935. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to debt; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1936. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Referral of Known or Suspected Criminal Violations'' (RIN3052-AB33) received on May 1, 1997; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1937. A communication from the Chairman of the Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for calendar year 1996; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1938. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual animal welfare enforcement report for fiscal year 1997; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1939. A communication from the Administrator of the U.S. Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a rule entitled ''Small Business Size Regulations'' received on May 12, 1997; to the Committee on Small Business.

EC–1940. A communication from the Administrator of the U.S. Small Business Administration, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation of the SBA budget for fiscal year 1998; to the Committee on Small Business.

EC–1941. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of State (Legislative Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the certification of a proposed issuance of an export license; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1942. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a rule entitled ''Custody of Investment Company Assets Outside the United States'' (RIN3235–AE98) received on May 14, 1997; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1943. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer of the Office of Thrift Supervision, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a rule entitled ''De Novo Applications For A Federal Savings Association Charter'' (RIN1550–AA76) received on May 15, 1997; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1944. A communication from the Chairman of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for fiscal year 1996; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1945. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation entitled ''The Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment and Benefit Programs Improvement Act of 1997''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–1946. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of State (Legislative Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘Amendments to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations’’; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1947. A communication from the Director of the Executive Office for Immigration Review, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a rule affecting representation and appearances by law students and law graduates (RIN1125–AA16) received on May 14, 1997; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1948. A communication from the Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a rule entitled ‘‘Postsecondary Education Programs for Inmates’’ (RIN1120–AA35) received on May 7, 1997; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1949. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1996; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. ENZI (for himself, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. BURNS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. THOMAS, and Mr. HUTCHINSON):

S. 765. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to further improve the safety and health of working environments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Mr. REID, Mr. WARNER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. JEFFORDS):

S. 766. A bill to require equitable coverage of prescription contraceptive drugs and devices, and contraceptive services under health plans; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. GREGG (for himself and Mr. GRAMM):

S. 767. A bill to clarify the standards for State sex offender registration programs under the Jacob Wetterling Crimes Against Children and Sexuality Violent Offender Registration Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'AMATO (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. DODD, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BIDEN, and Mr. DEWINE):

S. 768. A bill for the relief of Michel Christopher Meili, Giuseppina Meili, Mirjam Naomi Meili, and Davide Meili; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. KERRY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 769. A bill to amend the provisions of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986 to expand the public's right to know about toxic chemical use and release, to promote pollution prevention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. NICKLES:

S. 770. A bill to encourage production of oil and gas within the United States by providing tax incentives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. HAGEL (for himself, Mr. KERRY, Mr. CLELAND, Mr. KERRY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. ROBB, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BOND, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DODD, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRIST, Mr. GLENN, Mr. GORTON, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HELMS, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. LOTT, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MACK, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. REED, Mr. REID, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mr. WARNER):

S. Res. 87. A resolution commemorating the 15th anniversary of the construction and dedication of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. BURNS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. THOMAS and Mr. HUTCHINSON):

S. 765. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to further improve the safety and health of working environments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADVANCEMENT ACT

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I am very pleased and proud to rise and speak in support of S. 765, the Safety and Health Advancement Act that I have sponsored.

I thank all of the people who have been involved in the process of coming up with an OSHA modernization bill. You notice I mentioned modernization, not reform.

There have been a lot of people involved in this. My colleagues, my staff members, and over 50 organizations have been involved in reviewing suggestions that we have had for modernizing the OSHA process.

Over the last 6 years, there have been bills introduced by both Republicans and Democrats that wound up on the great scrap heap of unfinished business because they have been put in to make a statement, a political statement.

For every time that a bill is put into committee, there is a committee report, an 8½ by 5½ inch booklet that lists a paragraph-by-paragraph analysis of the bill, the majority opinion, the minority opinion, every amendment that has been suggested for the bill, and how people voted on it.

We have gone back through the last 6 years of those bills, and we found on the issues that there seem to be common ground, and we have put those in the bill. We have looked for the issues that were conscientious that were dividing, and we found some new approaches for some of those things.

We have not been able to address everything. But we have a bill that will help to move small business forward, that will give small business a better chance to have safety in the workplace for their workers.

That is the main point of this bill.

Again, I thank all of the people who have helped me on it, and I look forward to working with everybody on what I think will be a very reasonable approach that can go through both bodies and help out the workers in the workplace.

For 6 year's Members on both sides of the aisle have seen the need for modernization. Unfortunately, its been approached each year as reform—and often as drastic reform. Big business and big union have seen the bills as an opportunity to make a statement—a political statement. The workers and small business have needed some clarification and a lot of help that has gotten lost in the statements. The issue of workplace safety and health is extremely important to a healthy America. Advancing safety and health in the American workplace is a matter of great importance and it must be considered in a serious and rational manner by Congress, by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, by employers, and yes, by employees too. This bill is overdue, common sense legislation.

When I began my service on the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, I was surprised to discover the volume of documentation and resources available to us and our staffs. Each time a bill is reported out of committee, a 5½- by -8½ booklet is made available to us that lists every detail about that bill—a luxury I never had when I served in the Wyoming State Legislature. Included in that booklet is a paragraph by paragraph analysis of the bill, with a majority and a minority opinion on each section. It shows every amendment, discusses them at length and reports who voted for and against them in committee. With this abundance of committee reports, I felt like a kid in a candy store. I just picked up 6 year's worth of OSHA bills and began reading. Surprisingly enough, I found that the things that business and labor needed to have done were pretty commonly agreed upon as necessary. Just the politicized statements separated the two sides.

The fate of each bill was determined when such statements reared their ugly heads and squelched any chance of improving the safety and health of

America's workplaces. Each year, legislators in the House and Senate introduce bills that appeal to a wide variety of special interests—setting the stage for a lot of mudslinging. These bills contained good ideas, but they eventually toppled from a barrage of political attacks—tossing them all onto the great scrap heap of Congress' unfinished business. It just goes to show that people who sling mud, lose ground. I found that both big businesses and big unions have made a lot of statements over the years, but statements don't become law and they certainly don't change things. Good legislation becomes law. It is time that we tuck the statements back into our coat pockets and start passing some common sense legislation that advances the safety and health of the American workplace.

We all want a healthy and safe workplace. Legislation should therefore revolve around not what we want, but how to get there in a manner that is fair and equitable to all. There is no room for politics in the arena of human life. For this reason, I spent the last 14 weeks pouring the foundation for a new, comprehensive OSHA bill. This foundation does not consist of cement, but something stronger—the thoughts, suggestions and good ideas of employees, employers, and the individuals that govern them. I want to be clear that this bill does not include all the concerns of every interested party, but I do believe that it constitutes an important first step.

This bill sticks to a theme— ''the advancement of safety and health in the workplace.'' I am proud to say that it has been crafted to promote and enhance workplace safety and health—rather than dismantle it. We are addressing an issue that affects people from all walks of life. It is essential that we take each step with care.

To be successful and effective, a well-crafted bill must provide incentives for employers and employees to act more responsibly. We need to make the profit motive work for worker safety, not against it. This spirit of cooperation must overpower political polarization if true improvements are to be achieved. OSHA must recognize that the vast majority of employers are not heartless and cruel. Having played the wage payer role for over 26 years, I take great offense when employers are characterized as Ebenezer Scrooges or Simon Legrees. The majority of employers cherish their most valuable assets—their employees. It is truly misleading and deceptive for anyone to say otherwise. For without the employee, management will ultimately have no staff, no profits—and no business. Watching out for employees is just good business

When the Occupational Safety and Health Act was enacted 27 years ago, its intended purpose was to make the workplace free from ''recognized hazards that are causing, or likely to cause death or serious physical harm to . . . employees.'' As is the case with many programs established by Congress over the years, OSHA strayed from its original mission of protecting people from occupational safety and health hazards through preventative measures. The focus has instead been heavily weighted toward and concentrating on penalties and enforcement. OSHA should retain the ability to punish employers who don't embrace workplace safety and health, but it should reward those who do. The carrot and stick approach has always worked before, but OSHA prefers using the stick by itself—and they rarely walk softly. I want to be clear that this bill does not dismantle OSHA's enforcement capabilities. That approach has been tried time and time again. But, enforcement alone cannot ensure the safety of our Nation's workplaces and the health of our working population. America would be better served by an OSHA that places a greater emphasis on promoting employers and employees working together and this bill would strike that balance.

To continue the course set by Congress' original intent back in 1970, consultative services must be drastically expanded. My bill calls for that. Studies have shown that many sites where serious workplace accidents have occurred were not inspected by Federal OSHA inspectors for several years prior to the accident. This lack of attention to potential problem areas is due in part to an overemphasis on enforcement. If just the inspectors are working on safety, you can't possibly have enough inspectors. Everyone has to be involved. My legislation will allow OSHA greater flexibility in allocating its resources so it can give the most serious workplace problems its highest priority and most careful attention.

This bill advances safety and health by allowing employers to actively promote employee/employer discussions concerning occupational safety and health hazards. Voluntary compliance by employers would be encouraged as part of the solution, not as part of the problem—as part of the prevention, not as part of the penalty. Employers would have the option of implementing an alcohol and substance abuse testing program in order to ensure a safe workplace. I have had the opportunity to see first hand the benefits of this type of program. I have been tested and given tests and I know about validity and dignity. Employees would be held accountable for misconduct in a site that has been determined by OSHA to be in compliance with existing regulations. Employees have the ultimate control as to whether safety toes, hard hats or safety goggles are worn. Employers would receive incentives from OSHA for utilizing the services of third party consultants. Moreover, continuing education and professional certification for OSHA consultants and inspectors would be required to ensure that the rapid advancement of technology doesn't surpass OSHA's ability to identify occupational safety and health hazards in the workplace.

Not only have 6 years of OSHA proposals been reviewed, Meetings have been held with over 50 interested groups from the National Federation of Independent Businesses to the AFL-CIO. Contact has been made and some explanation given to every member of the Labor Committee. All suggestions received have been considered. Those that meet the goal of safety and health improvement without appearing contentious have been included. I am looking forward to a bipartisan effort to create the kind of workplace we want and need in America. This bill doesn't call for radical change, but it does start the progress and the process to safety. It makes changes small business can't wait any longer for.

The Safety and Health Advancement Act represents a clean, fresh start to addressing the problems that affect OSHA, employers and employees. I am quite eager to work with each of my distinguished colleagues as this issue winds its way through the legislative process. By working together, we can return OSHA to its original course as envisioned by Congress when it crafted the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970. I urge my colleagues to give fair consideration to this bill and I welcome your support.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 765

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Safety and Health Advancement Act''.

(b) REFERENCE.—Whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C 651 et seq.).

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

Section 2(b) (29 U.S.C. 651(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (13), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(14) by increasing the joint cooperation of employers, employees, and the Secretary in the effort to ensure safe and healthful working conditions for employees.''.

SEC. 3. EMPLOYEE AND EMPLOYER PARTICIPATION PROGRAMS.

Section 4 (29 U.S.C. 653) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c)(1) In order to further carry out the purpose of this Act to encourage employers and employees in their efforts to reduce occupational safety and health hazards, employers may establish employer and employee participation programs which exist for the sole purpose of addressing safe and healthful working conditions.

''(2) An entity created under a program described in paragraph (1) shall not constitute a labor organization for purposes of section 8(a)(2) of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 158(a)(2)) or a representative for purposes of sections 1 and 2 of the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 151 and 151a).

''(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect employer obligations under section 8(a)(5) of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 158(a)(5)) to deal with a certified or recognized employee representative with respect to health and safety matters to the extent otherwise required by law.''.

SEC. 4. ESTABLISHMENT OF SPECIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

Section 7 (29 U.S.C. 656) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d)(1) Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall establish an advisory committee (pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App)) to carry the duties described in paragraph (3).

''(2) The advisory committee shall be composed of—

''(A) 3 members who are employees;

''(B) 3 members who are employers;

''(C) 2 members who are members of the general public; and

''(D) 1 member who is a State official from a State plan State.

Each member of the advisory committee shall have expertise in workplace safety and health as demonstrated by the educational background of the member.

''(3) The advisory committee shall advise and make recommendations to the Secretary with respect to the establishment and implementation of a consultation services program under section 8A.''.

SEC. 5. THIRD PARTY CONSULTATION SERVICES PROGRAM.

(a) PROGRAM.—The Act (29 U.S.C. 651 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 8 the following:

''SEC. 8A. THIRD PARTY CONSULTATION SERVICES PROGRAM.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall establish and implement, by regulation, a program that certifies individuals to provide consultation services to employers to assist employers in the identification and correction of safety and health hazards in the workplaces of employers.

''(2) ELIGIBILITY.—Each of the following individuals shall be eligible to be qualified under the program:

''(A) An individual licensed by a State authority as a physician, industrial hygienist, professional engineer, safety engineer, safety professional, or occupational nurse.

''(B) An individual who has been employed as an inspector for a State plan State or as a Federal occupational safety and health inspector for not less than a 5-year period.

''(C) An individual qualified in an occupational health or safety field by an organization whose program has been accredited by a nationally recognized private accreditation organization or by the Secretary;

''(3) GEOGRAPHICAL SCOPE OF CONSULTATION SERVICES.—An individual certified under the program may provide consultation services in any State.

''(b) SAFETY AND HEALTH REGISTRY.—The Secretary shall develop and maintain a registry that includes all individuals that are certified under the program to provide the consultation services described in subsection (a) and shall publish and make such registry readily available to the general public.

''(c) DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may revoke the status of an individual certified under subsection (a) if the Secretary determines that the individual—

''(A) has failed to meet the requirements of the program; or

''(B) has committed malfeasance, gross negligence, or fraud in connection with any consultation services provided by the certified individual.

''(d) CONSULTATION SERVICES.—

''(1) SCOPE OF CONSULTATION SERVICES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The consultation services described in subsection (a), and provided by an individual certified under the program, shall include an evaluation of the workplace of an employer to determine if the employer is in compliance with the requirements of this Act, including any regulations promulgated pursuant to this Act.

''(B) NON-FIXED WORK SITES.—With respect to the employees of an employer who do not work at a fixed site, the consultation services described in subsection (a), and provided by an individual certified under the program, shall include an evaluation of the safety and health program of the employer to determine if the employer is in compliance with the requirements of this Act, including any regulations promulgated under this Act.

''(2) CONSULTATION REPORT.—Not later than 10 business days after an individual certified under the program provides the consultation services described in subsection (a) to an employer, the individual shall prepare and submit a written report to the employer that includes an identification of any violations of this Act and requirements with respect to corrective measures the employer needs to carry out in order for the workplace of the employer to be in compliance with the requirements of this Act.

''(3) REINSPECTION.—Not later than 30 days after an individual certified under the program submits a report to an employer under paragraph (2), or on a date agreed on by the individual and the employer, the individual shall reinspect the workplace of the employer to verify that any occupational safety or health violations identified in the report have been corrected and the workplace of the employer is in compliance with this Act. If, after such reinspection, the individual determines that the workplace is in compliance with the requirements of this Act, the individual shall provide the employer a declaration of compliance.

''(4) GUIDELINES.—The Secretary, in consultation with an advisory committee established in section (7)(d), shall develop model guidelines for use in evaluating a workplace under paragraph (1).

''(e) ACCESS TO RECORDS.—Any records relating to consultation services (as described in subsection (a)) provided by an individual qualified under the program shall not be admissible in a court of law or administrative proceeding against the employer except that such records may be used as evidence for purposes of a disciplinary action under subsection (c).

''(f) EXEMPTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If an employer enters into a contract with an individual certified under the program, to provide consultation services described in subsection (a), and receives a declaration of compliance under subsection (d)(3), the employer shall be exempt from the assessment of any civil penalty under section 17 for a period of 2 years after the date the employer receives the declaration.

''(2) EXCEPTIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply—

''(A) if the employer involved has not made a good faith effort to remain in compliance as required under the declaration of compliance; or

''(B) to the extent that there has been a fundamental change in the hazards of the workplace.

''(g) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'program' means the program established by the Secretary under subsection (a).''.

SEC. 6. INDEPENDENT SCIENTIFIC PEER REVIEW.

Section 6(b) (29 U.S.C. 655(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking: ''(4) Within'' and inserting: ''(4)(A) Within''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(B)(i) Prior to issuing a final standard under this paragraph, the Secretary shall submit the draft final standard and a copy of the administrative record to the National Academy of Sciences for review in accordance with clause (ii).

''(ii)(I) The National Academy of Sciences shall appoint an independent Scientific Review Committee.

''(II) The Scientific Review Committee shall conduct an independent review of the draft final standard and the scientific literature and make written recommendations with respect to the draft final standard to the Secretary, including recommendations relating to the appropriateness and adequacy of the scientific data, scientific methodology, and scientific conclusions, adopted by the Secretary.

''(III) If the Secretary decides to modify the draft final standard in response to the recommendations provided by the Scientific Review Committee, the Scientific Review Committee shall be given an opportunity to review and comment on the modifications before the final standard is issued.

''(IV) The recommendations of the Scientific Review Committee shall be published with the final standard in the Federal Register.''.

SEC. 7. CONTINUING EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATION FOR CERTAIN OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION PERSONNEL.

Section 8 (29 U.S.C. 657) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) Any Federal employee responsible for enforcing this Act shall (not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this subsection or 2 years after the initial employment of the employee) meet the eligibility requirements prescribed under subsection (a)(2) or (c).

''(j) The Secretary shall ensure that any Federal employee responsible for enforcing this Act who carries out inspections or investigations under this section, receive professional education and training at least every 5 years as prescribed by the Secretary.''.

SEC. 8. THE USE OF ALTERNATIVE METHODS AS AN AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE.

Section 9 (29 U.S.C. 658) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) A citation issued under subsection (a) to an employer who violates section 5, or any standard, rule, or order promulgated pursuant to section 6, or any other regulation promulgated under this Act shall be vacated if such employer demonstrates that the employees of such employer were protected by alternative methods that are equally or more protective of the safety and health of the employees than the methods required by such standard, rule, order, or regulation in the factual circumstances underlying the citation.''.

SEC. 9. EMPLOYEE RESPONSIBILITY.

The Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 651 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 10 the following:

''EMPLOYEE RESPONSIBILITY

''SEC. 10A. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, an employee who willfully violates any requirement of section 5 or any standard, rule, or order promulgated pursuant to section 6, or any regulation prescribed pursuant to this Act, may be assessed a civil penalty of up to $500, but not less than $50 for each violation.

''(b) If, upon inspection and investigation, the Secretary or the authorized representative of the Secretary believes that an employee of an employer has violated any requirement of section 5 or any standard, rule, or order promulgated pursuant to section 6, or any regulation prescribed pursuant to this Act, the Secretary shall within 60 days issue a citation to the employee. Each citation shall be in writing and shall describe with particularity the nature of the violation, including a reference to the provision of this Act, standard, rule, regulation, or order alleged to have been violated. No citation may be issued under this section after the expiration of 6 months following the occurrence of any violation.

''(c) The Secretary shall notify the employee by certified mail of the citation and proposed penalty and that the employee has 15 working days within which to notify the Secretary that the employee wishes to contest the citation or penalty. If no notice is filed by the employee within 15 working days, the citation and the penalty, as proposed, shall be deemed a final order of the Commission and not subject to review by any court or agency.

''(d) If the employee notifies the Secretary that the employee intends to contest the citation or proposed penalty, the Secretary shall immediately advise the Commission of such notification, and the Commission shall afford an opportunity for a hearing (in accordance section 554 of title 5, United States Code). The Commission shall thereafter issue an order, based on findings of fact, affirming, modifying, or vacating the Secretary's citation or proposed penalty, or directing other appropriate relief, and such order shall become final 30 days after issuance of the order.''.

SEC. 10. INSPECTION QUOTAS.

Section 9 (29 U.S.C. 658), as amended by section 8, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) The Secretary shall not establish for any employee within the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (including any regional director, area director, supervisor, or inspector) a quota with respect to the number of inspections conducted, the number of citations issued, or the amount of penalties collected, in accordance with this Act.

''(f) Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this subsection and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall report on the number of employers that are inspected under this Act and determined to be in compliance with the requirements prescribed under this Act.''.

SEC. 11. REVIEW BY THE COMMISSION.

Section 17 (29 U.S.C. 666) is amended by striking subsection (j) and inserting the following:

''(j)(1) The Commission shall have the authority to assess all civil penalties under this section. In assessing a penalty under this section, the Commission shall give due consideration to the appropriateness of the penalty with respect to—

''(A) the size of the employer;

''(B) the number of employees exposed to a violation;

''(C) the likely severity of any injuries directly resulting from the violation;

''(D) the probability that the violation could result in injury or illness;

''(E) the good faith of the employer in correcting the violation after the violation has been identified;

''(F) the history of previous violations by an employer; and

''(G) whether the violation is the sole result of the failure of the employer to meet a requirement, under this Act or prescribed by regulation, with respect to—

''(i) the posting of notices;

''(ii) the preparation or maintenance of occupational safety and health records; or

''(iii) the preparation, maintenance, or submission of any written information.''.

SEC. 12. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 21(c) (29 U.S.C. 670(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(c) The'' and inserting ''(c)(1) The'';

(2) by striking ''(1) provide'' and inserting ''(A) provide'';

(3) by striking ''(2) consult'' and inserting ''(B) consult''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(2)(A) The Secretary shall, through the authority granted under section 7(c) and paragraph (1), enter into cooperative agreements with States for the provision of consultation services by such States to employers concerning the provision of safe and healthful working conditions. A State that has a plan approved under section 18 shall be eligible to enter into a cooperative agreement under this paragraph only if such plan does not include provisions for federally funded consultation to employers.

''(B)(i) Except as provided in clause (ii), the Secretary shall reimburse a State that enters into a cooperative agreement under subparagraph (A) in an amount that equals 90 percent of the costs incurred by the State for the provision of consultation services under such agreement.

''(ii) A State shall be fully reimbursed by the Secretary for—

''(I) training approved by the Secretary for State personnel operating under a cooperative agreement; and

''(II) specified out-of-State travel expenses incurred by such personnel.

''(iii) A reimbursement paid to a State under this subparagraph shall be limited to costs incurred by such State for the provision of consultation services under this paragraph and the costs described in clause (ii).

''(C) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, not less than 15 percent of the total amount of funds appropriated for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration for a fiscal year shall be used for education, consultation, and outreach efforts.''.

(b) PILOT PROGRAM.—Section 21 (29 U.S.C. 670) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d)(1) Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall establish and carry out a pilot program in 3 States to provide expedited consultation services with respect to the provision of safe and healthful working conditions to employers that are small businesses, as defined by the Small Business Administration,. The Secretary shall carry out the program for a period not to exceed 2 years.

''(2) The Secretary shall provide consultation services under paragraph (1) not later than 4 weeks after the date on which the Secretary receives a request from an employer.

''(3) The Secretary may impose a nominal fee to an employer requesting consultation services under paragraph (1). The fee shall be in an amount determined by the Secretary. Employers paying a fee shall receive priority consultation services by the Secretary.

''(4) In lieu of issuing a citation under section 9 to an employer for a violation found by the Secretary during a consultation under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall permit the employer to carry out corrective measures to correct the conditions causing the violation. The Secretary shall conduct not more than 2 visits to the workplace of the employer to determine if the employer has carried out the corrective measures. The Secretary shall issue a citation as prescribed under section 5 if, after such visits, the employee has failed to carry out the corrective measures.

''(5) Not later than 90 days after the termination of the program under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall prepare and submit a report to the appropriate committees of Congress that contains an evaluation of the implementation of the pilot program.''.

SEC. 13. PREVENTION OF ALCOHOL AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE.

The Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 651 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking sections 29, 30, and 31;

(2) by redesignating sections 32, 33, and 34 as sections 30, 31, and 32, respectively; and

(3) by inserting after section 28 (29 U.S.C. 676) the following:

''SEC. 29. ALCOHOL AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE TESTING.

''(a) PROGRAM PURPOSE.—In order to secure a safe workplace, employers may establish and carry out an alcohol and substance abuse testing program in accordance with subsection (b).

''(b) FEDERAL GUIDELINES.—An alcohol and substance abuse testing program described in subsection (a) shall meet the following requirements:

''(1) SUBSTANCE ABUSE.—A substance abuse testing program shall permit the use of an onsite or offsite urine screening or other recognized screening methods, so long as the confirmation tests are performed in accordance with the mandatory guidelines for Federal workplace testing programs published by the Secretary of Health and Human Services on April 11, 1988, at section 11979 of title 53, Code of Federal Regulations (including any amendments to such guidelines), in a lab that is subject to the requirements of subpart B of such mandatory guidelines.

''(2) ALCOHOL.—The alcohol testing component of the program shall take the form of alcohol breath analysis and shall conform to any guidelines developed by the Secretary of Transportation for alcohol testing of mass transit employees under the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1992.

''(c) TEST REQUIREMENTS.—This section shall not be construed to prohibit an employer from requiring—

''(1) an applicant for employment to submit to and pass an alcohol or substance abuse test before employment by the employer; or

''(2) an employee, including managerial personnel, to submit to and pass an alcohol or substance abuse test—

''(A) on a for-cause basis or where the employer has reasonable suspicion to believe that such employee is using or is under the influence of alcohol or a controlled substance;

''(B) where such test is administered as part of a scheduled medical examination;

''(C) in the case of an accident or incident, involving the actual or potential loss of human life, bodily injury, or property damage;

''(D) during the participation of an employee in an alcohol or substance abuse treatment program, and for a reasonable period of time (not to exceed 5 years) after the conclusion of such program; or

''(E) on a random selection basis in work units, locations, or facilities.

''(d) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to require an employer to establish an alcohol and substance abuse testing program for applicants or employees or make employment decisions based on such test results.

''(e) PREEMPTION.—The provisions of this section shall preempt any provision of State law to the extent that such State law is inconsistent with this section.

"(f) INVESTIGATIONS.—The Secretary is authorized to conduct testing of employees (including managerial personnel) of an employer for use of alcohol or controlled substances during any investigations of a work-related fatality or serious injury.".

SEC. 14. VOLUNTARY PROTECTION PROGRAMS.

(a) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary of Labor shall establish cooperative agreements with employers to encourage the establishment of comprehensive safety and health management systems that include—

(1) requirements for systematic assessment of hazards;

(2) comprehensive hazard prevention, mitigation, and control programs;

(3) active and meaningful management and employee participation in the voluntary program described in subsection (b); and

(4) employee safety and health training.

(b) VOLUNTARY PROTECTION PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Labor shall establish and carry out a voluntary protection program (consistent with subsection (a)) to encourage and recognize the achievement of excellence in both the technical and managerial protection of employees from occupational hazards. The Secretary of Labor shall encourage small businesses (as the term is defined by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration) to participate in the voluntary protection program by carrying out outreach and assistance initiatives and developing program requirements that address the needs of small businesses.

(2) PROGRAM REQUIREMENT.—The voluntary protection program shall include the following:

(A) APPLICATION.—Employers who volunteer under the program shall be required to submit an application to the Secretary of Labor demonstrating that the worksite with respect to which the application is made meets such requirements as the Secretary of Labor may require for participation in the program.

(B) ONSITE EVALUATIONS.—There shall be onsite evaluations by representatives of the Secretary of Labor to ensure a high level of protection of employees. The onsite visits shall not result in enforcement of citations under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 651 et seq.), unless representatives of the Secretary of Labor observe hazards for which no agreement can be made to abate the hazards in a reasonable amount of time.

(C) INFORMATION.—Volunteers who are approved by the Secretary of Labor for participation in the program shall assure the Secretary of Labor that information about the safety and health program of the volunteers shall be made readily available to the Secretary of Labor to share with employees.

(D) REEVALUATIONS.—Periodic reevaluations by the Secretary of Labor of the volunteers shall be required for continued participation in the program.

(3) EXEMPTIONS.—A site with respect to which a program has been approved shall, during participation in the program be exempt from inspections or investigations and certain paperwork requirements to be determined by the Secretary of Labor, except that this paragraph shall not apply to inspections or investigations arising from employee complaints, fatalities, catastrophes, or significant toxic releases.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I want to compliment my distinguished colleague from Wyoming, Senator ENZI, for introducing this important piece of legislation. This bill addresses an issue that is critical to small businessowners across America. I am proud to be an original cosponsor.

The Safety and Health Advancement Act is a commonsense approach to reining in an overreaching Federal agency.

I worked in Congress when the Occupational Safety and Health Administration [OSHA] was created in the 1970's. Many people today would find it hard to believe that OSHA was created to assist business—especially small businesses. In its original intent, OSHA existed not just to help enforce workplace safety laws, but to help small businessowners understand those laws and advise them on how to comply.

What OSHA has grown into is an agency of confrontation and intimidation. The mere mention of OSHA strikes fear in the hearts of small businessowners everywhere.

The father of one of my staff members owns small heating and air-conditioning business in Nebraska. He's a good employer. He runs a safe workplace and treats his employees fairly. But he faces the constant threat that an unannounced visit by OSHA could shut him down because he doesn't have the resources to appeal the high fines frequently handed out by OSHA.

I hear stories like this from small businessowners throughout Nebraska. Businesses that are fined tens of thousands of dollars for a minor infraction of a regulation they frequently did not even know existed. They are forced to close their doors and lay off their employees because they can't afford to fight the fines that come through arbitrary process.

Mr. President, the safety of our workplaces must continue to be a top priority. Where there are those violating the law and creating unsafe working conditions, we should go after them and persecute to the fullest extent of the law. Those are the individuals OSHA should be going after. But the Government should not be killing jobs by intimidating honest, hard-working small businessowners. We need to focus on the real problems in the workplace.

The Safety and Health Advancement Act would help address this problem. It gives OSHA the flexibility to prioritize its resources in order to target the worst offenders. It encourages voluntary compliance by rewarding employers who use third-party consultants. It holds employees responsible for their misconduct at a site that is in compliance with OSHA regulations.

This bill returns OSHA to its original intent and expands its consultative services. Under this legislation, OSHA would actually work hand in hand with small businessowners to create safe workplaces, not merely hand down punitive fines. It moves OSHA away from confrontation and back toward cooperation.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the Safety and Health Advancement Act. Not only will this bill help make America's workplaces safer, it will go a long way in freeing America's small businessowners from the heavy burdens of Government regulation. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation.

By Mr. D'AMATO (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. DODD, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mrs. BOXER and Mr. BIDEN):

S. 768. A bill for the relief of Michel Christopher Meili, Giuseppina Meili, Mirjam Naomi Meili, and Davide Meili, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE RELIEF LEGISLATION

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today, along with Senators FEINSTEIN, HATCH, DODD, ABRAHAM, TORRICELLI, BIDEN, and BOXER to introduce a bill to provide protection to Christophe and his family so that they may stay in this country and that Christophe may be allowed to work and support his family.

Christophe Meili is the Swiss bank guard fired after he reported the destruction of Holocaust era bank records at the Union Bank of Switzerland, Zurich branch, on January 8, 1997. He is here along with his wife Guiseppina, and his two children, Miriam and David.

For his bravery in saving historically important documents from the shredder, Christophe was fired and today is under investigation for violating Swiss bank secrecy laws for disclosing the records, first to the Zurich Jewish Community and then to the Swiss police. He has faced persecution and penalties for a deed that ennobles him in the eyes of the world. Moreover, he and his family have faced hundreds of death threats, including kidnaping threats made against his children. He is truly a man without a country.

When we held a hearing on his plight in the Banking Committee, he made two remarkable statements. First, when asked why he felt the records he saved were important, he responded,

> "A few months before, I had seen the movie 'Schindler's List.' And that's how, when I saw these documents, I realized I must take responsibility; I must do something."

When I asked him at the end of the hearing if he had anything to add, he said,

> Please protect me in the U.S.A. and in Switzerland. I think I become a great problem in Switzerland. I have a woman, two little children, and no future. I must see what goes on in the next days for me. Please protect me. That is all.

Mr. President, we owe Christophe Meili this much. He has asked to be protected and it is our duty to do so. We are in the presence of a very good man, a man who has made a difference and will be remembered for generations to come.

Christophe Meili should be viewed as a hero, not a criminal. His actions in preventing the destruction of evidence are courageous and serve the cause of justice for the victims and survivors of the Holocaust and their families. It is a stain upon the victims' memory that a young man who saved records to help their cause is now being made a victim. It is unfortunate that the chairman of UBS, Robert Studer, has even made remarks questioning the motivation of Christophe for preventing the destruction of these records.

Moreover, while Christophe and his family have been persecuted for his noble deed, it is a disgrace that the bank's archivist who ordered the shredding at UBS, Erwin Haggenmuller, still has his job. I wrote to Peter Cosandey, the district attorney of Zurich who is investigating this case, and I asked him to end his harassment of Christophe. I also asked him why he is not investigating Erwin Hagenmuller for his role in ordering the shredding of the files.

Christophe has been unemployed since January and this hardship is taking its toll on this brave young man and his family. Thankfully, Edgar Bronfman has come to the rescue once again by offering Christophe a job. I am sure that this is a comfort to Christophe and his family.

Christophe Meili's story is one of a man dedicated to seeing that justice is achieved, yet persecuted because he tried to ensure it. His treatment by the security firm that employed him and the bank that wants him prosecuted, is unjust and unfair.

This is a tragedy. Because he did his job, Christophe Meili was fired. Because he showed courage and integrity, Christophe Meili was fired. And now, they are threatening him with prosecution. The people deserve better.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to join me in granting this hero, this righteous man, the sanctuary that he has requested and that he and his family deserve.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 768

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The actions of Swiss banks and their relations with Nazi Germany before and during World War II and the banks' actions after the war concerning former Nazi loot and heirless assets placed in the banks before the war have been the subject of an extensive and ongoing inquiry by the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and a study by a United States interagency group.

(2) On January 8, 1997, Michel Christopher Meili, while performing his duties as a security guard at the Union Bank of Switzerland in Zurich, Switzerland, discovered that bank employees were shredding important Holocaust-era documents.

(3) Mr. Meili was able to save some of the documents from destruction and then turned them over to the Jewish community in Zurich and to the Swiss police.

(4) Following Mr. Meili's disclosure of the destruction of the Holocaust-era documents, Mr. Meili was suspended and then terminated from his job. He was also interrogated by the local Swiss authorities who tried to intimidate him by threatening prosecution for his heroic actions.

(5) Since this disclosure, Mr. Meili and his family have been threatened and harassed, and have received many death threats. Mr. Meili also received a hand-delivered note threatening the kidnapping of his children in return for the ''Jewish money'' he would receive for his actions, and urging him to emigrate to the United States or be killed.

(6) Because of his courageous actions, Mr. Meili and his family have suffered economic hardship, mental anguish, and have been forced to live in fear for their lives.

SEC. 2. PERMANENT RESIDENCE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.), Michel Christopher Meili, Giuseppina Meili, Mirjam Naomi Meili, and Davide Meili shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act upon payment of the required visa fees.

SEC. 3. REDUCTION OF NUMBER OF AVAILABLE VISAS.

Upon the granting of permanent residence to Michel Christopher Meili, Giuseppina Meili, Mirjam Naomi Meili, and Davide Meili as provided in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to reduce by the appropriate number during the current fiscal year the total number of immigrant visas available to natives of the country of the aliens' birth under section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(a)).

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. KERRY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. DEWINE, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 769. A bill to amend the provisions of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986 to expand the public's right to know about toxic chemical use and release, to promote pollution prevention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

THE RIGHT-TO-KNOW MORE AND POLLUTION PREVENTION ACT OF 1997

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, today the Environmental Protection Agency is making public its annual inventory of toxic chemical releases. This information is made available to the public under the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act which I authored in 1986.

EPA announced today a 45.6 percent decrease nationwide in the release of toxic chemicals since 1988, when these data were first collected. In my State of New Jersey, which has a large chemical industry, releases were reduced by a stunning 70 percent.

Mr. President, the right-to-know law has been an enormous success. Shedding the light of day on toxic pollution has encouraged industries to find ways to reduce the threat of these cancer causing materials to our communities. We should build on that success.

Today I am introducing with Senators TORRICELLI, BOXER, KERRY, GRAHAM, KENNEDY and WELLSTONE the Right-to-Know More and Pollution Prevention Act of 1997, which will significantly expand the public's right-to-know about toxic chemicals in their homes, workplaces, and communities.

The landmark 1986 Right-to-Know Act requires companies to list the amount of certain chemicals that leave their facilities as pollution and enter our air, water, or soil. It has often been cited as one of the most effective environmental laws on the books. By shining a public spotlight on pollution, the public is better informed, and many companies have taken voluntary steps to reduce pollution.

In fact, without using traditional ''command and control requirements,'' the publication of right-to-know data has led companies to voluntarily reduce their releases of toxic chemicals by almost 46 percent, or 1.6 billion pounds, between 1988 and 1994.

The bill I am introducing today significantly expands the community right-to-know reporting requirements by tracking toxic materials as they move through a facility—to tell us what comes in, what is transformed into product or waste, and what leaves a facility as pollution. This tracking system, known as chemical use or materials accounting, can further decrease the use of toxic chemicals and their release into the environment.

When my own State of New Jersey began collecting information on toxic chemicals used by industries, in addition to recording toxic chemical releases, the results were dramatic. Whereas the national decrease in toxic emissions reported is 45.6 percent since 1988, in New Jersey it has been 70 percent. The discrepancy between New Jersey and the rest of the country, I believe, is due to the State requirement for materials accounting.

The reason that materials accounting data is so valuable is that it provides information to industry and incentives to prevent pollution. With this data, industrial facilities have the information necessary to develop pollution prevention plans.

Pollution prevention is the highest priority in managing waste, and falls at the top of the ladder of steps industry can take to reduce pollution—starting with prevention, then recycling, and then treatment, with disposal or release into the environment the least desirable last step. This so-called hierarchy of waste management has been endorsed by the Environmental Protection Agency as well as many Fortune 500 companies and the armed services.

Materials accounting makes pollution prevention planning possible. You can't reduce toxic use if you don't know the quantity of toxics used and how they're used. That's why materials accounting data is so important. The bill requires companies which collect materials accounting data to prepare pollution prevention plans to decrease their use of toxics to protect those who might be exposed to them and can help companies improve their bottom line.

It represents a strong marriage between environmental concerns and economic efficiency.

A recent New Jersey study found that for every dollar spent on additional reporting, companies actually saved between five and eight dollars in reduced costs. By reducing waste, companies reduce their cost of doing business.

Mr. President, materials accounting provides a framework for identifying opportunities to reduce pollution at the source through changes in production, operation and raw materials use. A random survey of 42 New Jersey facilities showed that 62 percent of the companies questioned anticipated that pollution prevention initiatives, based on information gleaned from materials accounting data, could save them money. Business wins, the public wins, and the public health and environment wins.

Mr. President, my bill directs the EPA to expand right-to-know reporting to include information on toxic chemicals being transported through communities and used by industries in their products and workplaces.

It would fill reporting gaps in the existing law by requiring all companies that have more than the stipulated threshold amounts to file reports, regardless of the industrial classification in which they fall. EPA could exempt categories of industry groups if the benefits and paperwork requirements are disproportionate to any benefit.

Finally, the bill requires businesses to prepare pollution prevention plans based on the materials accounting data they collect.

Mr. President, EPA has proposed requiring materials accounting data under existing authorities of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Law [EPCRA] and other statutes.

I believe the law gives them that authority. However, some industry groups have challenged literally every action by the office that implements the Right-to-Know Law. To avoid continuing court fights and avoid needless delays, this law would clarify congressional intent.

Mr. President, this bill will help ensure a healthier environment for all of us, and can save industry money, making our economy and chemical industry more cost competitive. It makes good environmental sense and good business sense. And it's legislation that the public wants. I hope we will move to enact it in this Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be inserted in the RECORD, along with letters from EPA Administrator Browner and USPIRG and the Environmental Information Center supporting the bill.

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

S. 769

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Right-To-Know-More and Pollution Prevention Act of 1997''.

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

TITLE I—PUBLIC RIGHT TO KNOW ABOUT TOXIC CHEMICAL USE

SEC. 101. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) THRESHOLDS FOR TOXIC CHEMICALS WITH CERTAIN SIGNIFICANT RISKS.—Section 313(f) of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 11023(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following:

''(C) With respect to each of the toxic chemicals described in paragraph (3) that are released from a facility, the amount of the threshold for the toxic chemical under that paragraph.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) THRESHOLDS FOR TOXIC CHEMICALS WITH CERTAIN SIGNIFICANT RISKS.—

''(A) ESTABLISHMENT OF THRESHOLDS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator shall establish a threshold for each toxic chemical that the Administrator determines may present a significant risk to children's health or the environment because of—

''(i) the tendency of the toxic chemical to persist or to bioaccumulate or disrupt endocrine systems; or

''(ii) other characteristics of the toxic chemical.

''(B) CHEMICALS TO BE INCLUDED.—Among the toxic chemicals for which the Administrator shall establish thresholds under subparagraph (A) shall be lead, mercury, dioxin, cadmium, chromium, and the substances listed as bioaccumulative chemicals of concern in the notice published by the Administrator at 60 Fed. Reg. 15393.''.

(b) ADDITIONAL CHEMICALS.—Section 313(c) of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 11023(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''are those'' and inserting the following: ''are—

''(1) the'';

(2) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) dioxin and substances listed as bioaccumulative chemicals of concern in the notice published by the Administrator at 60 Federal Register 15393.''.

(c) RELEASES.—Subsections (a) and (b)(1) of section 313 of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 11023) are amended by striking ''or otherwise used'' and inserting ''otherwise used, or released''.

(d) CIVIL ACTIONS.—Section 326(a)(1)(B) of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 11046(a)(1)(B)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating clauses (iii) through (vi) as clauses (iv) through (vii), respectively, and

(2) by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

''(iii) Establish a reporting threshold for a toxic chemical described in section 313(f)(3).''.

(e) REVISED THRESHOLDS.—Section 313(f)(2) of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 11023(f)(2)) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''paragraph (1)'' and inserting ''subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1)''.

SEC. 102. DISCLOSURE OF TOXIC CHEMICAL USE.

(a) TOXIC CHEMICAL RELEASE FORM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 313(g) of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 11023(g)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(C)—

(i) by inserting ''for the preceding calendar year'' after ''items of information'';

(ii) in clause (i) by striking ''is'' and inserting ''was'';

(iii) in clause (ii) by striking ''preceding'';

(iv) in clause (iv) by striking ''annual quantity of the toxic chemical entering'' and inserting ''quantity of the toxic chemical that entered''; and

(v) by adding at the end the following:

''(v) The number of employees (including contractors) at the reporting facility, the number of employees (including contractors) at the reporting facility who were potentially exposed to the toxic chemical;

''(vi) The following materials accounting information:

''(I) A description of the uses of the toxic chemical at the facility.

''(II) The starting (as of January 1) inventory of the toxic chemical at the facility.

''(III) The quantity of the toxic chemical produced at the facility.

''(IV) The quantity of the toxic chemical that was transported to the facility and the mode of transportation used.

''(V) The quantity of the toxic chemical consumed at the facility.

''(VI) The quantity of the toxic chemical that was shipped out of the facility as a product or in a product and the quantities intended for industrial use, commercial use, consumer use, and any additional categories of use that the Administrator may designate by regulation.

''(VII) The quantity of the toxic chemical that entered any waste stream (or that was otherwise released into the environment) prior to recycling, treatment, or disposal (as required to be reported under section 6607(b)(1) of the Pollution Prevention Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13107(b)(1))).

''(VIII) The amount of toxic chemical at the facility as of December 31.

''(IX) The amount of the toxic chemical recycled at the facility that was used during the calendar year at the facility.

''(X) The toxic chemical use of the chemical that is calculated by adding the quantities reported under subclauses (II), (III), (IV), and (IX) and subtracting the quantity reported under subclause (VIII).

''(XI) If the sum of the quantities reported under subclauses (II), (III), (IV), and (IX) does not equal the sum of the quantities reported under subclauses (V), (VI), (VII), and (VIII), a statement of the cause of the discrepancy.

''(vii) The reduction (from the calendar year preceding the calendar year for which the form is submitted) in the quantity of the toxic chemical that is reported under clause (vi)(VII), as a result of the following: equipment or technology modifications; process or procedure modifications; reformulation or redesign of products; substitution of raw materials; and improvements in housekeeping, maintenance, training, or inventory control.

"(viii) The reduction (from the calendar year preceding the calendar year for which the form is submitted) in the quantity of toxic chemical use as defined in subclause (X) as a result of the following: equipment or technology modifications; process or procedure modifications; reformulation or redesign of products; substitution of raw materials; and improvements in housekeeping, maintenance, training, or inventory control."; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(3) COMPUTATIONS.—Quantities reported under this subsection shall be complete and verifiable by computations under generally accepted principles of materials accounting.".

(2) DEFINITION OF MATERIALS ACCOUNTING INFORMATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 329 of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 11049) is amended—

(i) by redesignating paragraphs (7), (8), (9), and (10) as paragraphs (8), (9), (10), and (11), respectively; and

(ii) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

"(7) MATERIALS ACCOUNTING INFORMATION.—The term 'materials accounting information' means the information described in section 313(g)(1)(vi).".

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 6603(4) of the Pollution Prevention Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13102(4)) is amended by striking "329(8)" and inserting "329".

(3) REGULATION.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall promulgate a regulation regarding the information to be provided under clauses (v), (vi), (vii), and (viii) of section 313(g)(1)(C) of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 11023(g)(1)(C)), as added by paragraph (1).

(b) OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall by regulation integrate the reporting requirements under the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 11001 et seq.) and the Pollution Prevention Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.).

SEC. 103. ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTING AND PUBLIC ACCESS TO INFORMATION.

(a) STREAMLINED DATA COLLECTION AND DISSEMINATION.—Section 313 of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 11023) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(m) STREAMLINED DATA COLLECTION AND DISSEMINATION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—To enhance public access and use of information resources, to facilitate compliance with reporting requirements, and to promote multimedia permitting, reporting, and pollution prevention, not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Administrator shall—

"(A) create standard data formats for information management;

"(B) integrate information resources, using common company, facility, industry, geographic, and chemical identifiers and any other identifiers that the Administrator considers appropriate;

"(C) establish a system for indexing, locating, and obtaining agency-held information about parent companies, facilities, industries, chemicals, geographic locations, ecological indicators, and the regulatory status of toxic chemicals and entities subject to agency regulation;

"(D) consolidate all annual reporting requirements under this title and other Federal environmental laws for small businesses, including by permitting reporting to a single point of contact using a single form or electronic reporting system; and

"(E) provide the public a single point of contact for access to all the publicly available information gathered by the Administrator for any regulated entity.

"(2) CONSOLIDATION.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Administrator shall consolidate all annual reporting under this title and other Federal environmental laws administered by the Administrator for each entity required to report, including by permitting reporting to a single point of contact using a single form or electronic reporting system.

"(3) EASE OF COMPLIANCE.—In improving the means by which the Administrator provides information to the public and requires information be reported by regulated entities, as required by paragraphs (1) and (2), the Administrator, building on the experiences of the States, shall use technology to facilitate reporting by regulated entities and improve access to the data by the public.".

(b) DISCLOSURE OF USES OF TOXIC CHEMICALS.—

(1) BASIC REQUIREMENT.—Section 313(a) of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 11023(a)) is amended in the second sentence by inserting "toxic chemical uses and" before "releases".

(2) USE OF RELEASE FORM.—Section 313(h) of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 11023(h)) is amended in the second sentence by inserting "the uses of toxic chemicals at covered facilities and" before "releases of toxic chemicals to the environment".

SEC. 104. TRADE SECRET PROTECTION.

Section 322 of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 11042) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1) by adding the following at the end:

"(C) WITHHOLDING OF MATERIALS ACCOUNTING INFORMATION.—A person that is required to submit materials accounting information under section 313(g)(1)(C)(vi) may withhold an element or portion (as defined by a regulation promulgated by the Administrator under subsection (c)) of the information if the person complies with paragraph (2) with respect to the information to be withheld.";

(2) in subsection (b)(4) by inserting "or other information withheld" after "The chemical identity";

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the first sentence, by striking "toxic chemical which" and inserting "toxic chemical or other information that";

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting "or other information withheld" after "specific chemical identity";

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting "or other information withheld" after "specific chemical identity";

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by inserting "or other information withheld" after "chemical identity"; and

(iii) in subparagraph (C), in the first sentence, by inserting "or other information withheld" after "chemical identity" each place it appears; and

(D) in paragraph (4)(A), by inserting "or other information withheld" after "chemical identity";

(4) in subsection (f), by inserting "or other information withheld under subsection (a)(1)" after "specific chemical identity"; and

(5) in subsection (h)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting "or other information withheld" before "is claimed as a"; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting "or other information withheld" after "identity of a toxic chemical".

SEC. 105. CIVIL ACTIONS.

(a) PAST AND ONGOING VIOLATIONS.—Section 326(a)(1)(A) of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 11046(a)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting "any past or ongoing" after "An owner or operator of a facility for".

(b) VENUE.—Section 326 of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 11046(b)) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

"(2) ACTIONS AGAINST THE ADMINISTRATOR.—

"(A) PETITIONS IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—Review of an action of the Administrator described in clause (ii) shall be sought by filing a petition for review in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

"(ii) ACTIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATOR.—The actions of the Administrator described in this clause are—

"(I) a final agency action in response to a petition filed under section 313(e);

"(II) a final agency action to revise a threshold under section 313(f)(2);

"(III) a final rule to modify nationally the reporting frequency under section 313(i);

"(IV) any other rulemaking of general applicability under this title; and

"(V) any other action that is based on a determination of nationwide scope or effect if, in taking the action, the Administrator publishes a finding that the action is based on such a determination.

"(B) PETITIONS FOR REVIEW IN OTHER CIRCUITS.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—Review of an action of the Administrator described in clause (ii) shall be sought by filing a petition for review in the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the geographic region to which the action relates is situated.

"(ii) ACTIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATOR.—The actions of the Administrator described in this clause are—

"(I) a final rule to modify the reporting frequency under section 313(i) for a particular geographic region; and

"(II) any other rulemaking specific to a particular geographic region.

"(C) CIVIL ACTIONS IN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT.—An action of the Administrator under subsection (a) other than an action described in subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be brought in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia."; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(i) TIME FOR FILING PETITION FOR REVIEW OF ACTION BY THE ADMINISTRATOR; EXCLUSIVE MEANS OF REVIEW.—

"(1) TIME FOR FILING PETITION.—A petition for review of an action of the Administrator under subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b)(2) shall be filed not later than 60 days after the date on which notice of the action is published in the Federal Register.

"(2) EXCLUSIVE MEANS OF REVIEW.—An action of the Administrator with respect to which review can be or could have been obtained under subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b)(2) shall not be subject to judicial review in a civil or criminal enforcement proceeding.".

TITLE II—COMMUNITY RIGHT TO KNOW AND POLLUTION PREVENTION PLANNING

SEC. 201. TOXIC CHEMICAL RELEASE FORMS.

Section 313(b) of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 11023(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2); and

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''(A) The requirements'' and inserting ''The requirements'';

(B) by striking ''and that are in Standard Industrial Classification Codes 20 through 39 (as in effect on July 1, 1985)'';

(C) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(2) DELETION OF FACILITIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator, at the instance of the Administrator or in response to a petition, may delete by rule a particular facility or category of facilities from the requirements of this section based on a determination that reporting by the owner or operator of the facility or category of facilities is inconsistent with the efficient operation of this title.

''(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—In making a determination under subparagraph (A), the Administrator may consider the toxicity of the toxic chemical, proximity to other facilities that release the toxic chemical or to population centers, the history of releases of toxic chemicals at the facility or category of facilities, and such other factors as the Administrator considers appropriate.'';

(D) in subparagraph (C) —

(i) by striking ''(C) For purposes'' and inserting ''(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes'';

(ii) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subparagraphs (A) and (B); and

(iii) in subparagraph (B) (as redesignated by clause (ii)), by redesignating subclauses (I) and (II) as clauses (i) and (ii).

SEC. 202. POLLUTION PREVENTION PLANNING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 11001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subtitle C as subtitle D; and

(2) by inserting after subtitle B the following:

''Subtitle C—Pollution Prevention Planning

''SEC. 316. POLLUTION PREVENTION PLANS.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) AUTHORIZED STATE.—The term 'authorized State' means a State authorized under subsection (m) to carry out the Administrator's authorities and responsibilities under this section.

''(2) BYPRODUCT.—The term 'byproduct' means a toxic chemical that—

''(A) is generated prior to storage, recycling (except in-process recycling), treatment, control, disposal, or release;

''(B) is not intended for use as a product; and

''(C) is required to be reported under section 6607 of the Pollution Prevention Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13107).

''(3) FACILITY.—The term 'facility' means a facility for which a toxic chemical release form is required to be submitted under section 313.

''(4) IN-PROCESS RECYCLING.—The term 'in-process recycling' means the practice of returning a recycled toxic chemical to a production process using dedicated equipment that is directly connected to and physically integrated with a production process.

''(5) PILOT FACILITY.—The term 'pilot facility' means a facility, or designated area of a facility, used for pilot-scale development of a product or process not primarily involved in the production of a good for commercial sale.

''(6) POLLUTION PREVENTION.—The term 'pollution prevention' means—

''(A) toxic use reduction; or

''(B) source reduction.

''(7) PRODUCTION PROCESS.—The term 'production process' means a process, line, method, activity, or technique used to produce a product or to reach a planned result.

''(8) RECOVERY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'recovery' means the act of extracting or removing the toxic chemical from a waste stream that includes—

''(i) the reclamation of the toxic chemical from a stream that entered a waste treatment or pollution control device or process (including an air pollution control device or process, wastewater treatment or control device or process, Federal or State permitted treatment or control device or process, and any other type of treatment or control device or process) where destruction of the stream or destruction or removal of certain constituents of the steam occurs; and

''(ii) the reclamation for reuse of an otherwise used toxic chemical that is spent or contaminated and that must be recovered for further use in the original operation or any other operation.

''(9) RECYCLING.—The term 'recycling' means—

''(A) the recovery for reuse of a toxic chemical from a gaseous, aerosol, aqueous, liquid, or solid stream; or

''(B) the reuse or the recovery for reuse of a toxic chemical that is a hazardous waste or is a constituent of a hazardous waste under the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.), as determined by the Administrator.

''(10) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY.—The term 'research and development laboratory' means a facility or a designated area of a facility used for research, development, and testing activity, and not primarily involved in the production of a good for commercial sale, in which a toxic chemical is used by or under the direct supervision of a technically qualified person.

''(11) SOURCE REDUCTION.—The term 'source reduction' has the meaning given the term in section 6603 of the Pollution Prevention Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13103).

''(12) TARGETED PRODUCTION PROCESS.—The term 'targeted production process' means a production process or a group of production processes (identified by the owner or operator of a facility) that accounts for 90 percent or more of—

''(A) the total toxic chemical use calculated in accordance with section 313(g)(1)(C)(vi)(X); or

''(B) the total quantity of byproducts generated at the facility.

''(13) TOXIC USE REDUCTION.—The term 'toxic use reduction' means the reduction in the quantity of toxic chemical use reported under section 313(g)(1)(C)(viii) that is reduced so as to reduce potential exposure to the public, workers, consumers, and the environment.

''(b) POLLUTION PREVENTION PLANNING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—To promote the assessment and implementation of pollution prevention alternatives, the owner or operator of a facility shall periodically complete a pollution prevention plan.

''(2) INITIAL PLAN AND UPDATES.—The owner or operator of a facility shall—

''(A) complete a pollution prevention plan on or before July 1 of the second calendar year that begins after the date of enactment of this section; and

''(B) review and update the pollution prevention plan biennially thereafter.

''(3) CONTENTS OF POLLUTION PREVENTION PLANS.—

''(A) ITEMS TO BE INCLUDED.—Except as provided in section 317, a pollution prevention plan shall include—

''(i) a statement of management policy regarding pollution prevention;

''(ii) a written certification by the owner or operator of the facility regarding the accuracy and completeness of the plan;

''(iii) 2- and 5-year pollution prevention goals for targeted production processes, including a numerical statement regarding the intended reduction in the quantity of each toxic chemical manufactured, processed, or otherwise used;

''(iv) a statement of progress achieved toward previously submitted pollution prevention goals;

''(v) an analysis of each targeted production process, including—

''(I) an assessment of materials accounting information of toxic chemicals with respect to the targeted production process; and

''(II) a full cost accounting of the direct and indirect costs (including liabilities) of toxic chemical purchase, use, and waste management;

''(vi) an evaluation of the options for reducing the use of toxic chemicals or the generation of byproducts in the targeted production unit process by means of the substitution of raw materials, reformulation or redesign of products, production unit modifications, and improvement in operation and maintenance, including—

''(I) identification of options that minimize potential exposure to workers, consumers, the public, and the environment; and

''(II) an assessment of the technical and economic feasibility of the options identified under subclause (I);

''(vii) an identification of options identified under clause (vi)(I) that are technically feasible and have a payback period of less than 2 years;

''(viii) a schedule for implementing the options identified under clause (vii) that the owner or operator of the facility intends to implement; and

''(ix) if there is an option identified under clause (vii) that is not included in the schedule developed under clause (viii), a statement of the reason why the option is not included.

''(B) ITEMS NOT TO BE INCLUDED.—A pollution prevention plan shall not include a waste management or control activity.

''(4) POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN SUMMARIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For each pollution prevention plan, the owner or operator of a facility shall prepare a pollution plan summary.

''(B) CONTENTS.—A pollution plan summary shall include the information reported under—

''(i) clauses (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv) of paragraph (3)(A); or

''(ii) if applicable, subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) of section 317(c)(2).

''(c) POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN PROGRESS REPORTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning with the second full calendar year after a pollution prevention plan has been prepared under subsection (b), the owner or operator of a facility shall prepare a pollution prevention plan progress report annually for the facility in accordance with the schedule for the submission of toxic release forms under section 313.

''(2) CONTENTS.—A pollution prevention progress report shall include—

''(A) a description of the facility and identification of each targeted production process;

''(B) a numerical statement demonstrating the progress of the facility towards achieving each of its 5-year goals for pollution prevention; and

''(C) if the annual progress of the facility does not achieve the level of progress anticipated in the pollution prevention plan schedule for implementation, an explanation of the reasons why that level of progress was not achieved.

''(d) GUIDELINES FOR PREPARATION OF POLLUTION PREVENTION PLANS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator shall by regulation establish guidelines for the preparation of pollution prevention plans, pollution prevention plan summaries, and pollution prevention plan progress reports.

''(e) AVAILABILITY OF POLLUTION PREVENTION PLANS, SUMMARIES, AND REPORTS.—

''(1) POLLUTION PREVENTION PLANS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The owner or operator of a facility shall—

''(i) retain each pollution prevention plan at the facility; and

''(ii) make each pollution prevention plan available for inspection by the Administrator or authorized State.

''(B) NOT PUBLIC RECORDS.—A document or other record obtained from or reviewed at a facility owned or operated by a private person shall not be considered to be a public record.

''(2) POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN SUMMARIES AND PROGRESS REPORTS.—

''(A) SUBMISSION.—The owner or operator of a facility shall submit a pollution prevention plan summary for the facility and progress reports, with the toxic release forms required under section 313 for the year in which the summary is required, to the Administrator and to the State in which the facility is located, in a format that is compatible with electronic information storage and retrieval and compatible with the data submitted under section 313 (except in a case in which the Administrator determines that preparation in electronic format would create a significant hardship).

''(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Administrator shall, using electronic and other means, make pollution plan summaries and progress reports available to the public consistent with section 313(j).

''(f) REQUIRED MODIFICATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator or an authorized State may require the modification of a pollution prevention plan or pollution prevention plan summary if the Administrator or authorized State determines that the pollution prevention plan does not meet the requirements of subsection (b) or the pollution prevention plan summary does not meet the requirements of subsection (b)(4).

''(2) TIME FOR COMPLETION OF REQUIRED MODIFICATION.—Any modification required by the Administrator or authorized State shall be completed by the owner or operator of the facility not later than 90 days after the date on which the Administrator or the State provides written notice that the modification is required.

''(g) PRODUCT FORMULAS.—Nothing in this subtitle authorizes the Administrator or a State to require that information concerning nontoxic chemicals, or product formulas for mixtures that include only nontoxic chemicals, be included in a pollution prevention plan, summary, or progress report.

''(h) GROUPING OF PROCESSES.—The Administrator may publish rules establishing criteria pursuant to which the Administrator may permit an owner or operator of a facility to consider production processes that use similar ingredients to produce 1 or more similar products as a single production process.

''(i) TRAINING.—The Administrator or an authorized State may require that individuals that prepare pollution prevention plans for facilities in particular industrial categories or subcategories receive training or attend seminars and workshops on the proper preparation of toxic release inventories and pollution prevention plans and on the use of available pollution prevention measures.

''(j) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT LABORATORIES.—The owner or operator of a facility shall not be required to prepare a pollution prevention plan, pollution prevention plan summary, or pollution prevention progress report concerning a research and development laboratory located at the facility.

''(k) PILOT FACILITIES.—The owner or operator of a facility shall not be required to prepare a pollution prevention plan, pollution prevention plan summary, or pollution prevention plan progress report for a pilot facility.

''(l) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—At the request of the owner or operator of a facility, the Administrator or an authorized State may provide technical assistance in pollution prevention planning.

''(2) REIMBURSEMENT.—The Administrator may seek full (or in the case of a small business, full or partial) reimbursement for any technical assistance provided to a facility.

''(3) NO REQUIREMENT OF PARTICULAR MEASURES OR STANDARDS.—Nothing in this subsection authorizes the Administrator to require that a particular pollution prevention measure be implemented or that a pollution prevention performance standard be achieved at a facility or targeted production process.

''(m) STATE ADMINISTRATION.—

''(1) REQUEST FOR STATE AUTHORIZATION.—

''(A) GUIDELINES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator shall publish guidance that would be useful to the States in submitting a program for approval under this paragraph.

''(B) SUBMISSION OF PROGRAMS.—A State may submit to the Administrator a program for carrying out this section in the State.

''(C) IMPLEMENTATION OF STATE PROGRAMS.—On and after the date that is 180 days after date on which the Administrator receives a State program under subparagraph (B), the State may carry out the program in the State in place of the Federal program under this section, unless the Administrator notifies the State that the program is not approved.

''(2) CRITERIA FOR STATE AUTHORIZATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall approve a State program submitted under paragraph (1) if the Administrator determines that the State program requires that—

''(i) each facility develop a pollution prevention plan that includes materials accounting for full cost accounting; and

''(ii) each pollution prevention plan address the reduction of the use and generation as byproduct of toxic chemicals subject to this section so as to reduce overall risks to the public, workers, consumers, and the environment without shifting risks between them.

''(B) DISAPPROVAL.—If the Administrator does not approve a State program, the Administrator shall notify the State in writing of any revisions or modifications that are necessary to obtain approval.

''(3) WITHDRAWAL OF STATE AUTHORIZATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Administrator determines after public hearing that a State program approved under paragraph (1) no longer meets the criteria of paragraph (2), the Administrator shall so notify the State in writing. If appropriate corrective action is not taken within a reasonable time (not to exceed 90 days after notification), the Administrator shall withdraw authorization of the program and establish a Federal program under this section.

''(B) NOTIFICATION.—The Administrator shall not withdraw authorization of a State program unless the Administrator first notifies the State and makes public in writing the reasons for the withdrawal.

''(4) NO PREEMPTION OF STATE PROGRAMS.—Nothing in this subsection affects the authority of a State or political subdivision of a State to establish or continue in effect any regulation or any other measure relating to pollution prevention.

''(n) REPORTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this section and not less frequently than every 3 years thereafter, the Administrator shall submit a report to the President and Congress that describes the pollution prevention plans that have been prepared under this section.

''(2) MATTERS TO BE ADDRESSED.—A report under paragraph (1) shall include—

''(A) a detailed analysis that indicates the progress achieved toward any pollution prevention goals established by the Administrator under section 6604 of the Pollution Prevention Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13103); and

''(B) a detailed analysis of the steps that need to be taken to ensure that the goals are achieved, including an identification of the industrial categories or subcategories that should be the highest priority for pollution prevention measures and that need improvement with respect to pollution prevention.

"SEC. 317. SMALL BUSINESS POLLUTION PREVENTION COMPLIANCE AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The Administrator shall establish a small business pollution prevention compliance and technical assistance program to assist owners and operators of facilities in identifying and applying methods of pollution prevention.

''(b) ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM.—The program under subsection (a) shall—

''(1) provide compliance assistance, technical assistance, and other assistance to small businesses;

''(2) use funds provided under this subsection for matching grants to State and local government agencies for programs to promote the use of pollution prevention techniques by small businesses; and

''(3) allow small businesses to comply with the pollution prevention planning requirements of this by title complying with subsection (c).

''(c) USE OF MANUAL AND CHECKLIST IN LIEU OF POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may by regulation allow a small business in a commercial sector for which a pollution prevention opportunity assessment manual and checklist have been published under paragraph (2) to comply with the pollution prevention planning requirements of subsections (a) and (b) of section 316 by completing the checklist and retaining on site the manual and checklist in lieu of preparing a pollution prevention plan.

''(2) CONTENTS OF MANUAL AND CHECKLIST.—The Administrator may publish a manual and checklist for any commercial sector by the use of which a small business in the commercial sector would develop—

''(A) a statement of management policy regarding pollution prevention;

''(B) a written certification by the owner or operator of the facility regarding the accuracy and completeness of the plan;

''(C) 2- and 5-year pollution prevention goals for targeted production processes, including a numerical statement regarding the intended reduction in the quantity of each toxic chemical produced or used and each toxic chemical generated as a byproduct;

''(D) a statement of progress achieved toward previously submitted pollution prevention goals;

''(E) an estimate of the costs associated with toxic chemical purchase, use, and waste management;

''(F) an evaluation of production processes and material, storage, and treatment practices;

''(G) an evaluation of toxic use reduction and source reduction opportunities; and

''(H) an economic impact analysis of options for achieving reductions in toxic chemical use and byproduct generation.''.

(b) CIVIL ACTION.—Section 326(a)(1)(A) of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 11046(a)(1)(A)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(v) Complete and submit a pollution plan summary or pollution plan progress report under section 316.''.

(c) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents in section 300(b) of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. prec. 11001) is amended by striking the item relating to subtitle C and inserting the following:

''Subtitle C—Pollution Prevention Planning

''Sec. 316. Pollution prevention plans.

''Sec. 317. Small business pollution prevention compliance and technical assistance program.

''Subtitle D—General Provisions.''.

SEC. 203. INFORMATION GATHERING AND ACCESS.

Section 325 of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 11045) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) PROVISION OF INFORMATION AND RECORDS; INSPECTIONS.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) AUTHORIZED OFFICER.—The term 'authorized officer' means—

''(i) an officer, employee, or representative of the Administrator; or

''(ii) an officer, employee, or representative of an authorized State carrying out that section 316.

''(B) AUTHORIZED STATE.—The term 'authorized state' means a State that is authorized to carry out and enforce section 316 under section 317.

''(2) PROVISION OF INFORMATION AND RECORDS.—At the request of an authorized officer, a person who has or may have information relevant to the identification, nature, or quantity of materials, including hazardous chemicals, extremely hazardous substances, toxic chemicals, or other materials subject to this title that may have been manufactured, processed, or otherwise used, stored, or otherwise managed (including recycling, treating, combusting, releasing, or transferring from a facility subject to the requirements of this title) shall—

''(A) furnish to the authorized officer information pertaining to the identification, nature, and quantity of the materials; and

''(B) at the option and expense of the person—

''(i) afford the authorized officer access at all reasonable times to the facility or location to inspect and copy all documents and records relating to the identification, nature, and quantity of the material; or

''(ii) copy and furnish to the authorized officer all such documents and records.

''(3) INSPECTIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—At the request of an authorized officer, the owner or operator of a facility subject to the requirements of this title shall permit the authorized officer to enter, at reasonable times—

''(i) the facility; or

''(ii) any other facility, establishment, or other place or property owned or operated by the owner or operator of the facility, if, in the opinion of the authorized officer, entry is needed to determine compliance with and enforce this title with respect to the facility.

''(B) SAMPLES.—An authorized officer may inspect and obtain—

''(i) samples from any facility subject to the requirements of this title or from a facility, establishment, or other place or property described in subparagraph (A)(ii); or

''(ii) samples of any containers of toxic chemicals or other materials maintained at the facility.

''(C) PROMPT COMPLETION.—An inspection under this paragraph shall be completed with reasonable promptness.

''(D) RECEIPT FOR SAMPLES AND COPIES OF ANALYSES.—If an authorized officer obtains a sample under subparagraph (B), the authorized officer shall—

''(i) before leaving the premises, give to the owner or operator of the facility a receipt describing the sample obtained and, if requested, a portion of the sample; and

''(ii) furnish promptly to the owner or operator of the facility a copy of the results of any analysis made of the sample.

''(4) COMPLIANCE ORDERS.—

''(A) ISSUANCE.—If the owner or operator of a facility failed to comply with a request of an authorized officer under this subsection, the Administrator or authorized State may, after such notice and opportunity for consultation as is reasonably appropriate under the circumstances, issue an order directing compliance with the request.

''(B) CIVIL ACTION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may request the Attorney General to commence a civil action to compel compliance with a request or order under this subsection.

''(ii) RELIEF.—If the court finds that there is a reasonable basis on which to believe that there may be a violation of this title, unless the court finds that, under the circumstances of the case, the request or order under this subsection was arbitrary and capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law, the court—

''(I) shall enter an order directing compliance with the request or order; and

''(II) may assess a civil penalty of not more than $10,000 for each day of noncompliance.

''(5) OTHER AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this subsection precludes the Administrator or an authorized State from securing access or obtaining information in any other lawful manner.''.

SEC. 204. PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.

Section 313(j) of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 11023(j)) is amended in the second sentence by striking ''on a cost reimbursable basis''.

SEC. 205. FEDERAL FACILITIES.

Section 329(7) of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 11049(7)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''or the United States''.

SEC. 206. ENFORCEMENT.

Section 325(c)(1) of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 11045(b)(1)) is amended by striking ''or 313'' and inserting '', 313, or 316''.

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY,
Washington, DC, May 20, 1997.

Hon. FRANK LAUTENBERG,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LAUTENBERG: I am writing to thank you for your leadership on community right to know. As you are aware, expanding the public's right to know about harmful pollutants in our communities is a top priority for this Administration. We understand that your bill, The Right to Know More and Pollution Prevention Act of 1997, seeks to advance community right to know, pollution prevention planning and the information available to the public on chemical use.

This Administration believes that putting environmental and public health information into the hands of the American people is one of the most effective ways to reduce local pollution and prevent it from occurring in the future. In fact, the Agency recently made final a rule to add seven new industry categories to the Toxics Release Inventory (TRI), increasing the number of covered facilities to 31,000—a thirty percent increase. During the coming year, we will be working on ways to further improve TRI, including a stakeholder process to address reporting burdens, an examination of types of data collected, consideration of new thresholds for persistent, bioaccumulating toxic chemicals and developing options regarding chemical use information.

I look forward to working with you in the future to further the public's right to know about environmental health threats in their homes, schools and communities.

Sincerely,

CAROL M. BROWNER.

U.S. PUBLIC INTEREST RESEARCH GROUP,
Washington, DC, May 20, 1997.

DEAR SENATOR LAUTENBERG: We are writing on behalf of U.S. PIRG and the State PIRGs with more than a million members nation wide, to express our support for the Right to Know More and Pollution Prevention Act of 1997. This bill will dramatically improve the amount and quality of information that citizens count on to keep themselves and their children safe. This bill will also encourage pollution prevention. The reduction of toxic chemical use and waste is urgent while waste generation is steadily increasing nationwide, except in New Jersey and Massachusetts where companies are required by state law to collect and report toxic use data. The Right to Know More and Pollution Prevention Act of 1997 will reverse the dangerous trend for the rest of the nation.

The Community Right to Know Act is the best source of public information about toxic pollution and is lauded by the administration, environmentalists, and often industry leaders as one of the most effective environmental protections. Unfortunately, reporting under this law is woefully inadequate. Less than 5% of pollution information is reported to the public. We need to protect and expand the public's Right to Know. The Right to Know More and Pollution Prevention Act of 1997 will expand the public's Right to Know to include:

1. Toxics use reporting which tells the public about toxic chemicals transported through their neighborhoods; produced, used and stored in the work place and put into consumer products.
2. More complete data on toxic emissions including information from all major industrial sources of toxic pollution and data on extremely hazardous substances like dioxins and mercury which are currently not collected under the law.
3. Pollution Prevention Planning which will direct companies to develop pollution prevention plans by setting their own goals for pollution reduction.

The public has a right to know more than they currently do about toxic chemicals. In addition, preventing pollution must be our goal in light of the data revealing the steady rise in waste creation throughout the nation. We hope each Senator makes this legislation a top environmental priority.

Sincerely,

CAROLYN HARTMANN,
Environmental Program Director.
ANDREA ASKOWITZ,
Right to Know Campaign Coordinator.

ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION CENTER,
Washington, DC, May 19, 1997.

Hon. FRANK LAUTENBERG,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LAUTENBERG: I want to express the support and appreciation of the Environmental Information Center for your efforts to expand the Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act. Your efforts should provide additional and useful information about toxic chemicals to every community and family in the country.

The last decade has proven how well community right to know laws work. You know well the success of the more comprehensive facility reporting statute in New Jersey, and we commend you for seeking to expand use data to better inform workers and families about toxic chemicals in their communities. In addition, bill language aimed at improving pollution prevention will help to eliminate problems before they occur.

We will support early consideration and passage of this legislation and look forward to working with you on this bill.

Sincerely,

PHILIP E. CLAPP,
Executive Director.

By Mr. NICKLES:

S. 770. A bill to encourage production of oil and gas within the United States by providing tax incentives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

THE DOMESTIC OIL AND GAS PRODUCTION AND RECOVERY ACT

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Domestic Oil and Gas Production and Preservation Act. This legislation is an effort to help revive our domestic oil and gas industry which plays such a vital role in our national security. If our domestic industry is to survive, then Congress needs to act now to provide tax incentives to encourage production in America.

Since the early 1980's, oil and gas extraction employment has been cut in half. Employment in the oil and gas industry has declined by 500,000 since 1984. Imports of crude oil products were $68 billion in 1996, up 24 percent over last year and the import dependency ratio now exceeds 50 percent. From 1973 to 1996, crude oil production dropped 44 percent in the lower 48 States. We must take action now to save domestic production not only for the sake of the oil and gas industry but for the sake of the national security of this Nation.

To date, the Clinton administration has done nothing to encourage domestic production. In fact, in 1996, crude oil reserves continued to decline by 788 million barrels. Natural gas reserves fell by 2,600 Bcf to 162,415 Bcf. In the President's budget there is nothing to aid this industry. That is why I am introducing this bill today.

The Domestic Oil and Gas Production and Preservation Act is intended to do just what its name implies—encourage oil and gas production and preserve and revitalize the domestic oil and gas industry. This bill would accomplish these goals through specific tax proposals. Section 2 of the bill would allow current expensing of geological and geophysical costs incurred domestically including the Outer Continental Shelf. These costs are an important and integral part of exploration and production for oil and natural gas, and should be expensed.

In addition to the G&G expensing, this bill provides for the elimination of the net income limit on percentage depletion. Currently, the net income limitation requires percentage depletion to be calculated on a property-by-property basis and disallows depletion to the extent it exceeds the net income from a particular property, thus discouraging producers from investing income from other oil and gas properties to maintain marginal wells.

Furthermore, this bill clarifies that delay rental payments are deductible, at the election of the taxpayer, as ordinary and necessary business expenses. This clarifies an otherwise gray area in Treasury regulations and eliminates costly administrative and compliance burdens on both taxpayers and the IRS. It would also extend the 90-day prepayment period to 180 days for determining when deductions may be taken on certain oil and gas investments. Harsh winter conditions in many States make the current 90-day limitation for commercial drilling impractical.

Lastly, section 6 includes hydro injection as a tertiary recovery method for purposes of the enhanced oil recovery credit. Although the Treasury Department is tasked with continued evaluations and editions to the list of recovery methods covered under the EOR, they have proven notably lax in pursuing this objective. By legislating this outcome, this bill keeps domestic production of our endangered marginal wells on the cutting edge of available technology.

Collectively, the provisions of this bill provide much-needed incentives to an industry that is vital to our national security. The sooner the administration and Congress acknowledge the critical importance of the domestic oil and gas industry and stop burdening this industry with high taxes and regulatory obstacles, the sooner we can take the necessary actions to preserve and revitalize this important sector of our economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

SUMMARY OF THE DOMESTIC OIL AND GAS PRODUCTION AND RECOVERY ACT

SECTION 2. ELECTION TO EXPENSE GEOLOGICAL AND GEOPHYSICAL EXPENDITURES

Current law treatment

G&G costs are not deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses but are treated as capital expenditures recovered through cost depletion over the life of the field. G&G expenditures allocated to abandoned prospects are deducted upon such abandonment.

Reasons for change

These costs are an important and integral part of exploration and production for oil and natural gas. They affect the ability of domestic producers to engage in the exploration and development of our national petroleum reserves. Thus, they are more in the nature of an ordinary and necessary cost of doing business. These costs are similar to research and development costs for other industries. For those industries such costs are not only deductible but a tax credit is available.

Crude oil imports are at an all-time high which makes the U.S. vulnerable to sharp oil price increases or supply disruptions. Domestic exploration and production must be encouraged now to offset this potential threat to national security and our economy. Allowing current deductibility of G&G costs would increase capital available for domestic exploration and production activity.

The technical "infrastructure" of the oil services industry, which includes geologists and engineers, has been moving into other industries due to reduced domestic exploration and production. Stimulating exploration and development activities would help rebuild the critical oil services industry.

Encouraging the industry to use the best technology available and to reduce its environmental footprint are important public policy reasons to clarify that these ordinary and necessary business expenses for the oil and gas industry should be expensed.

SECTION 3. ELIMINATION OF NET INCOME LIMITATION ON PERCENTAGE DEPLETION FOR OIL AND GAS

The net income limitation severely restricts the ability of independent producers to use percentage depletion. Depletion is subject to many other limitations. First, it may only be taken by independent producers and royalty owners and not by integrated oil companies. Also, depletion may only be claimed up to specific daily production levels (1,000 barrels of oil or 6,000 mcf of natural gas). The depletion allowance is further limited to 65% of taxable income.

The net income limitation requires percentage depletion to be calculated on a property by property basis and disallows percentage depletion to the extent it exceeds the net income from a particular property. The current requirement creates a nightmarish quagmire of record keeping, paperwork and compliance for taxpayers and the IRS. The typical independent producer can have numerous oil and gas properties, and many of them can be marginal properties (with high operating costs and low production yields). During periods of low prices, the producer may not have net income from a particular property, especially from these marginal properties. In this situation, when domestic production is most susceptible to being plugged and abandoned, the net income limitation discourages producers from investing income from other oil and gas properties to maintain marginal wells.

PROPOSAL: ELIMINATE THE NET INCOME LIMITATION ON PERCENTAGE DEPLETION

Reasons for change

The Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission (IOGCC) estimates there are more than 433,000 marginal wells in the U.S. which produced more than 333 million barrels of oil in 1995. This represented more than 18% of all the oil produced in the U.S. (excluding Alaska). The United States is the only country with significant production from marginal wells. They represent the ultimate in conservation, since once wells are plugged and abandoned access to the remaining resource is often lost forever. Eliminating the net income limitation on percentage depletion will encourage producers to keep marginally economic wells in production and enhance optimum oil and natural gas resource recovery. Relief would be focused to independent producers and royalty owners.

Eliminating the net income limitation on percentage depletion would simplify record keeping and reduce the administrative and compliance burden for taxpayers and the IRS.

SECTION 4. ELECTION TO EXPENSE DELAY RENTAL PAYMENTS

Delay rental payments are made by producers to an oil and gas lessor prior to drilling or production. Unlike bonus payments (made by the producer in consideration for the grant of the lease) which generally is treated as an advance royalty and thus capitalized, producers have historically been allowed to elect to deduct delay rental payments under Treasury Regulations 1.612–3(c). However, in September, 1995, the IRS issued a technical advice (LTR 9602002) stating that such payments are preproduction costs subject to capitalization under Section 263A of the Internal Revenue Code. The legislative history of Section 263A is unclear and subject to varying interpretation.

PROPOSAL: CLARIFY THAT DELAY RENTAL PAYMENTS ARE DEDUCTIBLE, AT THE ELECTION OF THE TAXPAYER, AS ORDINARY AND NECESSARY BUSINESS EXPENSES

Reasons for change

In passing the Section 263A uniform capitalization rules, Congress broadly intended to only affect the ''unwarranted deferral of taxes.'' Congress did not intend to grant the IRS the authority to repeal the well-settled industry practice of deducting ''delay rentals'' as ordinary and necessary business expenses.

Treasury Reg. 1.612–3. states that, ''a delay rental is an amount paid for the privilege of deferring development of the property and which could have been avoided by abandonment of the lease, or by commencement of development operations, or by obtaining production.'' Such payments represent ordinary and necessary business expenses, not an ''unwarranted deferral of taxes.'' Given the clear disagreement over the legislative history and the likelihood of costly and unnecessary litigation to resolve the issue, clarification would eliminate administrative and compliance burdens on taxpayers and the IRS.

SECTION 5. EXTENSION OF SPUDDING RULE

The Internal Revenue Code provides a ''spudding'' exception to the ''economic performance rule'' in determining the year in which deductions may be taken on certain oil and gas investments. The economic performance rule will be satisfied, in certain circumstances, when amounts are paid during the preceding tax year so long as the well is spudded (the initial boring of the hole) within 90 days of the beginning of the following year.

PROPOSAL: EXTEND THE 90 DAY PREPAYMENT PERIOD TO 180 DAYS

Reasons for change

Harsh winter weather conditions in many states and locations make the 90 day limitation for the commencement of drilling impractical. Moreover, the current shortage of skilled drilling rig personnel and the high utilization rate of land-based drilling equipment, make it difficult, and in some parts of the country impossible, to meet the 90-day requirement. This personnel shortage has resulted from skilled workers moving into other industries due to vastly reduced domestic exploration and production activity over the past few years.

Expanding the 90 day prepayment period to 180 days would ease the industry's ability to attract capital.

SECITON 6. INCLUDE HYDRO INJECTION AS A TERTIARY RECOVERY METHOD UNDER THE ENHANCED OIL RECOVERY TAX CREDIT

Marginal wells are our most endangered domestic energy resource. By providing incentives for new methods for enhanced recovery, we ensure domestic production of the marginal wells remains on the cutting edge of available technology.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 127

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 127, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the exclusion for employer-provided educational assistance programs, and for other purposes.

S. 178

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the names of the Senator from Louisiana [Ms. LANDRIEU] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] were added as cosponsors of S. 178, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to clarify that the reasonable efforts requirement includes consideration of the health and safety of the child.

S. 351

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 351, a bill to provide for teacher technology training.

S. 356

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 356, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, the title XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to assure access to emergency medical services under group health plans, health insurance coverage, and the medicare and medicaid programs.

S. 394

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 394, a bill to partially restore compensation levels to their past equivalent in terms of real income and establish the procedure for adjusting future compensation of justices and judges of the United States.

S. 397

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 397, a bill to amend chapters 83 and 84 of title 5, United States Code. to extend the civil service retirement provisions of such chapter which are applicable to law enforcement officers, to inspectors of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, inspectors and canine enforcement officers of the United States Customs Service, and revenue officers of the Internal Revenue Service.

S. 460

At the request of Mr. BOND, the names of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DEWINE] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] were added as cosponsors of S. 460, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction for health insurance costs of self-employed individuals, to provide clarification for the deductibility of expenses incurred by a taxpayer in connection with the business use of the home, to clarify the standards used for determining that certain individuals are not employees, and for other purposes.

S. 503

At the request of Mr. NICKLES, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] were added as cosponsors of S. 503, a bill to prevent the transmission of the human immunodeficiency virus (commonly known as HIV), and for other purposes.

S. 511

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the names of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAUX] and the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] were added as cosponsors of S. 511, a bill to require that the health and safety of a child be considered in any foster care or adoption placement, to eliminate barriers to the termination of parental rights in appropriate cases, to promote the adoption of children with special needs, and for other purposes.

S. 525

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. CLELAND], and the Senator from Louisiana [Ms. LANDRIEU] were added as cosponsors of S. 525, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide access to health care insurance coverage for children.

S. 526

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. CLELAND], and the Senator from Louisiana [Ms. LANDRIEU] were added as cosponsors of S. 526, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the excise taxes on tobacco products for the purpose of offsetting the Federal budgetary costs associated with the Child Health Insurance and Lower Deficit Act.

S. 572

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the name of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 572, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal restrictions on taxpayers having medical savings accounts.

S. 607

At the request of Mr. COATS, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 607, a bill to amend the

Communications Act of 1934 to provide for the implementation of systems for rating the specific content of specific television programs.

S. 621

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ENZI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 621, a bill to repeal the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, to enact the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1997, and for other purposes.

S. 627

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 627, a bill to reauthorize the African Elephant Conservation Act.

S. 649

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the names of the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] were added as cosponsors of S. 649, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of bone mass measurements for certain individuals under part B of the medicare program.

S. 689

At the request of Mr. BROWNBACK, the names of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES], the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], the Senator from Louisiana [Ms. LANDRIEU], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] were added as cosponsors of S. 689, a bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Mother Teresa of Calcutta in recognition of her outstanding and enduring contributions through humanitarian and charitable activities, and for other purposes.

S. 727

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 727, A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage for annual screening mammography for women 40 years of age or older if the coverage or plans include coverage for diagnostic mammography.

S. 742

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 742, a bill to promote the adoption of children in foster care.

S. 747

At the request of Mr. ROTH, the name of the Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 747, a bill to amend trade laws and related provisions to clarify the designation of normal trade relations.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 21

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, her name was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 21, A concurrent resolution congratulating the residents of Jerusalem and the people of Israel on the thirtieth anniversary of the reunification of that historic city, and for other purposes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 87—RELATIVE TO THE VIETNAM VETERANS MEMORIAL

Mr. HAGEL (for himself, Mr. KERREY, Mr. CLELAND, Mr. KERRY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. ROBB, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BOND, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DODD, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRIST, Mr. GLENN, Mr. GORTON, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HELMS, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. LOTT, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MACK, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. REED, Mr. REID, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mr. WARNER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 87

Whereas 1997 marks the 15th anniversary of the construction and dedication of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, D.C.;

Whereas this memorial contains the names of more than 58,000 men and women who lost their lives from 1957 to 1975 in the Vietnam combat area or are still missing in action;

Whereas every year millions of Americans come to this monument to pay their respects for those who served in the Armed Forces;

Whereas the Vietnam Veterans Memorial has been a source of comfort and healing for Vietnam veterans and the families of the men and women who died while serving their country; and

Whereas this memorial has come to represent the legacy of healing that has occurred and demonstrates the appreciation all Americans have for those who made the ultimate sacrifice: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses its support and gratitude for all of the men and women who honorably served in the United States Armed Forces in defense of freedom and democracy during the Vietnam War;

(2) extends its sympathies to all Americans who suffered the loss of friends and family in Vietnam;

(3) encourages all Americans to remember the sacrifices of our veterans; and

(4) commemorates the 15th anniversary of the construction and dedication of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

THE PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT OF 1997

SANTORUM AMENDMENT NO. 290

Mr. SANTORUM proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 1122) to amend title 18, United States Code, to ban partial-birth abortions; as follows:

On page 2, line 16, strike the semicolon and all that follows through "purpose" on line 17.

On page 3, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

"(3) used in this section, the term 'vaginally delivers a living fetus before killing the fetus' means deliberately and intentionally delivers into the vagina a living fetus, or a substantial portion thereof, for the purpose of performing a procedure the physician knows will kill the fetus, and kills the fetus.

On page 3, between lines 21 and 22, insert the following:

"(d)(1) A defendant accused of an offense under this section may seek a hearing before the State Medical Board on whether the physician's conduct was necessary to save the life of the mother whose life was endangered by a physical disorder, illness or injury.

"(2) The findings on that issue are admissible on that issue at the trial of the defendant. Upon a motion of the defendant, the court shall delay the beginning of the trial for not more than 30 days to permit such a hearing to take place.

On page 3, line 22, strike "(d)" and insert "(e)".

BUDGET CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

MURRAY (AND WELLSTONE) AMENDMENT NO. 291

(Order to lie on the table.)

Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Mr. WELLSTONE) submitted an amendment intended to proposed by them to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 27) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS ON FAMILY VIOLENCE OPTION CLARIFYING AMENDMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Domestic violence is the leading cause of physical injury to women. The Department of Justice estimates that over 1,000,000 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 ¼ of battered women surveyed had lost a job partly because of being abused and that over ½ 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, Illinois, document, for the first time, the interrelationship between domestic violence and welfare by showing that from 34 percent to 65 percent of AFDC recipients are current or past victims of domestic violence.

(5) Over ½ 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.

(6) The restructuring of 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.

(7) In recognition of this finding, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate in considering the 1997 Resolution on the budget of the United States unanimously adopted a sense of the Congress amendment concerning domestic violence and Federal assistance. Subsequently, Congress adopted the family violence option amendment as part of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996.

(8) The family violence option gives States the flexibility to grant temporary waivers from time limits and work requirements for domestic violence victims who would suffer extreme hardship from the application of these provisions. These waivers were not intended to be included as part of the permanent 20 percent hardship exemption.

(9) The Department of Health and Human Services has been slow to issue regulations regarding this provision. As a result, States are hesitant to fully implement the family violence option fearing that it will interfere with the 20 percent hardship exemption.

(10) Currently 15 States have opted to include the family violence option in their welfare plans, and 13 other States have included some type of domestic violence provisions in their plans.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that the provisions of this Resolution assume that—

(1) States should not be subject to any numerical limits in granting domestic violence good cause waivers under section 402(a)(7)(A)(iii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 602(a)(7)(A)(iii)) to individuals receiving assistance, for all requirements where compliance with such requirements would make it more difficult for individuals receiving assistance to escape domestic violence; and

(2) any individual who is granted a domestic violence good cause waiver by a State shall not be included in the States' 20 percent hardship exemption under section 408(a)(7) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 608(a)(7)).

ALLARD (AND INHOFE) AMENDMENT NO. 292

Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, supra; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. . OFFSET OF REVENUE SHORTFALLS BY DISCRETIONARY SPENDING REDUCTIONS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1999, 2000, 2001, or 2002 that provides a revenue total for any of those fiscal years below the levels provided in this resolution unless the discretionary budget authority and outlay totals in that resolution are reduced to offset the amount by which revenues are below the levels provided in this resolution.

(b) 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.

(c) 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.

(d) 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.

ALLARD AMENDMENT NO. 293

Mr. ALLARD proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, supra; as follows:

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

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON REPAYMENT OF THE FEDERAL DEBT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) Congress and the President have a basic moral and ethical responsibility to future generations to repay the Federal debt, including money borrowed from the Social Security Trust Fund;

(2) the Congress and the President should enact a law that creates a regimen for paying off the Federal debt within 30 years; and

(3) if spending growth were held to a level one percentage point lower than projected growth in revenues, then the Federal debt could be repaid within 30 years.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that—

(1) the President's annual budget submission to Congress should include a plan for repayment of the Federal debt beyond the year 2002, including the money borrowed from the Social Security Trust Fund; and

(2) the plan should specifically explain how the President would cap spending growth at a level one percentage point lower than projected growth in revenues.

McCAIN (AND MACK) AMENDMENT NO. 294

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. MACK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 27, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . HIGHWAY DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) 10 demonstration projects totaling $362 million were listed for special line-item funding in the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982;

(2) 152 demonstration projects totaling $1.4 billion were named in the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987;

(3) 64 percent of the funding for the 152 projects had not been obligated after 5 years and State transportation officials determined the projects added little, if any, to meeting their transportation infrastructure priorities;

(4) 538 location specific projects totaling $6.23 billion were included in the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991;

(5) more than $3.3 billion of the funds authorized for the 538 location specific-projects remained unobligated as of January 31, 1997;

(6) the General Accounting Office determined that 31 States plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico would have received more funding if the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act location-specific project funds were redistributed as Federal-aid highway program apportionments;

(7) this type of project funding diverts Highway Trust Fund money away from State transportation priorities established under the formula allocation process and under the Intermodal Surface Transportation and Efficiency Act of 1991;

(8) on June 20, 1995, by a vote of 75 yeas to 21 nays, the Senate voted to prohibit the use of Federal Highway Trust Fund money for future demonstration projects;

(9) the Intermodal Surface Transportation and Efficiency Act of 1991 expires at the end of Fiscal Year 1997; and

(10) hundreds of funding requests for specific transportation projects in Congressional Districts have been submitted in the House of Representatives.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) notwithstanding different views on existing Highway Trust Fund distribution formulas, funding for demonstration projects or other similarly titled projects diverts Highway Trust Fund money away from State priorities and deprives States of the ability to adequately address their transportation needs;

(2) States are best able to determine the priorities for allocating Federal-Aid-To-Highway monies within their jurisdiction;

(3) Congress should not divert limited Highway Trust Fund resources away from State transportation priorities by authorizing new highway projects; and

(4) Congress should not authorize any new demonstration projects or other similarly-titled projects.

HOLLINGS AMENDMENT NO. 295

Mr. HOLLINGS proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following: ''Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, all function levels, allocations, aggregates and reconciliation instructions in this resolution shall be adjusted to reflect elimination of tax cuts of $85 billion from baseline levels and elimination of Presidential initiatives of $31.2 billion and interest savings of $13.8 billion for a total saving of $130 billion over five years.''

DODD (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 296

Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. JEFFORDS, Ms. MURRAY, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. LANDRIEU, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. KERRY) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, supra; as follows:

On page 3, line 4, increase the amount by 2,006,000,000.

On page 3, line 5, increase the amount by 2,820,000,000.

On page 3, line 6, increase the amount by 3,991,000,000.

On page 3, line 7, increase the amount by 5,766,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by 2,006,000,000

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by 2,820,000,000

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by 3,991,000,000

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by 5,766,000,000

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by 2,533,000,000

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by 3,481,000,000

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by 4,993,000,000

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by 7,305,000,000

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by 2,006,000,000

On page 4, line 14, increase the amount by 2,820,000,000

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by 3,991,000,000

On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by 5,766,000,000

On page 21, line 25, increase the amount by 1,013,000,000

On page 22, line 1, increase the amount by 643,000,000

On page 22, line 8, increase the amount by 1,951,000,000

On page 22, line 9, increase the amount by 1,335,000,000

On page 22, line 16, increase the amount by 3,453,000,000

On page 22, line 17, increase the amount by 2,458,000,000

On page 22, line 24, increase the amount by 5,755,000,000

On page 22, line 25, increase the amount by 4,224,000,000

On page 23, line 15, increase the amount by 20,000,000.

On page 23, line 16, increase the amount by 13,000,000.

On page 23, line 22, increase the amount by 30,000,000.

On page 23, line 23, increase the amount by 23,000,000.

On page 24, line 5, increase the amount by 40,000,000.

On page 24, line 6, increase the amount by 33,000,000.

On page 24, line 12, increase the amount by 50,000,000.

On page 24, line 13, increase the amount by 43,000,000.

On page 26, line 14, increase the amount by 1,500,000,000.

On page 26, line 15, increase the amount by 1,350,000,000.

On page 26, line 22, increase the amount by 1,500,000,000.

On page 26, line 23, increase the amount by 1,463,000,000.

On page 27, line 5, increase the amount by 1,500,000,000.

On page 27, line 6, increase the amount by 1,500,000,000.

On page 27, line 13, increase the amount by 1,500,000,000.

On page 27, line 14, increase the amount by 1,500,000,000.

On page 41, line 7, increase the amount by 5,766,000,000.

On page 41, line 8, increase the amount by 15,752,000,000.

On page 43, line 21, increase the amount by 2,533,000,000.

On page 43, line 22, increase the amount by 2,006,000,000.

On page 43, line 24, increase the amount by 3,481,000,000.

On page 43, line 25, increase the amount by 2,820,000,000.

On page 44, line 2, increase the amount by 4,993,000,000.

On page 44, line 3, increase the amount by 3,991,000,000.

On page 44, line 5, increase the amount by 7,305,000,000.

On page 44, line 6, increase the amount by 5,766,000,000.

At the appropriate place insert the following:

It is the sense of the Senate that funding should be increased for vital programs serving the youngest children. Head Start should be funded at a level necessary to serve all eligible children. Funding for the Child Care Development Block Grant should be doubled to support the working poor and new resources should be dedicated to addressing issues of quality and supply in areas such as infant care and care during non-traditional work hours. The Healthy Start should be expanded to improve maternal and infant health. These initiatives should be funded through by changes in the tax code such as the elimination of the runaway plant deduction, the billionaire's loophole, the exclusion of income from Foreign Sales Corporations and other changes as necessary.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet at 10 a.m. on Tuesday, May 20, 1997 in open session, to receive testimony on the quadrennial defense review and the impact of its recommendations on national security as we enter the 21st century.

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

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Human Resources be authorized to meet for a Full Committee Hearing on ''Health Plan Quality'' during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 20, 1997, at 10 a.m.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 20, 1997, at 10 a.m. to hold an open hearing on intelligence matters.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Immigration, of the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 20, 1997, at 9:30 a.m. to hold a hearing on ''A Private Relief Initiative for Christopher Meili.''

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

NATO ENLARGEMENT AND U.S. SECURITY

• Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the topic of North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] enlargement and U.S. security. Now that there is agreement on the Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security Between NATO and the Russian Federation, a significant obstacle to NATO enlargement has been removed. I have said before and say again that NATO enlargement is good for the United States, good for our NATO allies, good for the candidate states, and good for Russia.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is scheduled to announce at its July 8 and 9 summit meeting in Madrid, Spain, which candidate states will be invited to engage in negotiations leading to accession of these states to the Washington Treaty by 1999. Each of the states that have expressed interest in consideration for accession are participating states in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe [OSCE].

As Chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, I have led the Commission through a series of hearings on NATO enlargement which we will complete with a final hearing next Tuesday. We have invited official representatives of states to present their own positions to the Commission at these hearings to help meet the Commission's responsibility to the Congress and the American people to oversee implementation of the Helsinki Accords and subsequent Helsinki process documents, with a particular emphasis on human rights and humanitarian affairs. Congress and NATO have both recognized the significance of candidate states' compliance with OSCE principles in various official documents.

The Commission's approach to this series of hearings is focused on how well these candidate states have implemented OSCE agreements and complied with OSCE principles. Commissioners ask questions relating to other areas of candidate states' policies and conduct that have been identified as critical to acceptance into NATO, but we are not competing with the committees having legislative jurisdiction in these areas, who will examine those issues more thoroughly and with greater expertise.

Let me make it very clear that I am a supporter of NATO enlargement. I think that, in principle, every candidate state should be included in NATO when they meet the standards for accession. I do not believe that NATO enlargement should end with the Madrid announcement of the states invited to participate in accession negotiations.

I believe that it is very important that the United States, and our NATO allies, make very clear to those states not invited to join in the first round that the door is not closed, that the process has not ended, and that we and our allies encourage them to press ahead to meet the standards so that they can join when they are ready.

We must, with our allies, establish a clearly defined process for achieving membership. If we don't, we run the risk of cutting the legs out from under the reform movements just now taking control of some of the Eastern European countries that have failed to reform their political, military, and economic systems fast enough to meet NATO member country standards. These reform governments must be given a clear, strong signal that when they meet the standards, they will be allowed to join.

We must not create in Eastern Europe a gray zone between NATO and Russia where the old spheres of influence and balance of power politics could give rise to lasting political instability, poverty, and isolation. While I have not yet seen the text of the new Founding Act, according to news reports it does not create a group of second class NATO members whose security guarantees are diluted and undermined. NATO enlargement does not threaten Russia's security.

An Eastern Europe without NATO could become a black hole of unrest, poverty, ethnic conflict, and extremism of the worst kinds. This would likely attract overt and covert Russian intervention in the affairs of the states in this area, pulling Russia into rebuilding its military machine and deploying it westward, and triggering United States and allied reaction. Neither the United States nor Russia want that to happen.

An eastern Europe without NATO would threaten Russia's security by preventing Russia from changing its thinking about NATO and about European political and economic relations, preventing constructive changes in Russian policy, and delaying or blocking Russia's full integration into the community of nations.

NATO enlargement is good for Russia. Russian agreement to the Founding Act signals that the Russian foreign policy elite recognizes that fact. Now, Russian energies can focus on driving political and economic reform to a successful conclusion instead of battling NATO enlargement. Russia should be pleased that one of its strategic flanks will be secured by a strong, friendly defensive alliance.

Russia should take note that the political, economic, military, and foreign policy changes NATO is insisting upon in successful candidate states will build stable, democratic, free market countries that will not themselves engage in aggression against Russia and that will not allow themselves to become participants in some other state's aggressive designs. Russia should want states with these characteristics on its borders.

The Russian foreign policy elites should climb up in the Kremlin's towers and look hard at the situations on Russia's other borders. Agreement with the Final Act signals some understanding that it is not in Russia's best long term interests to keep eastern Europe unstable and economically backward. After Russia's experiences in Afghanistan and Chechnya, does Russia really think that any threat, much less the main threat, to its independence and territorial integrity comes from NATO?

Russia's leaders have a question to which they need an answer—when Russia gets into trouble, who can Russia call upon for help? Recent reports of closer relations between Russia and China should not lead to the conclusion that Russia has a friend or an ally in China.

The only nations Russia can count on for help are the nations with the capacity to help. The only nations with that capacity are the developed nations of the West, the most powerful of whom are NATO members, and Japan.

For that help to be available, Russia now needs to press ahead with the same agenda of reforms that the NATO candidate states are implementing. It would be far easier to convince the western republics that Russia deserves help when it needs it if Russia is a democratic, rule-of-law state with a free market economy.

Reportedly under the new Founding Act, Russia does not have a veto over NATO enlargement and no state's candidacy is foreclosed. Russia needs leaders who can discard cold war thinking and stop seeing NATO enlargement as a victory for the West and a defeat for Russia. Boris Yeltsin is such a leader.

NATO enlargement is good for the United States, good for NATO's current member states, good for the candidate states, and, finally, good for Russia.

Wednesday's agreement on the Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security Between NATO and the Russian Federation between NATO Secretary General Solana and Russian Foreign Minister Primakov proves that Russia's current leaders are not as opposed in fact as they sounded in rhetoric to NATO enlargement. The agreement reportedly was put before the North Atlantic Council, NATO's highest body, earlier today, and was approved.

Among other things, it draws Russia into closer collaboration with NATO on matters of mutual concern. The new NATO-Russia Council will give Russia insight into NATO processes and input into NATO consideration of issues without allowing Russia to block measures the alliance agrees must be taken for our mutual security.

Perhaps the best part of this enlargement process is not the military security guarantees that go with it to successful candidate states, but the leverage that the enlargement process exerts for basic change in each candidate state that will result in better, safer, and more prosperous lives for each of their citizens. The impact of that leverage has been on view during the course of the Commission's hearing process, as ambassadors of candidate states discuss their progress in meeting the standards for membership.

Even better, there may be the beginning of a halo effect on the surrounding countries. As they see their neighbors moving into closer integration with the West, they are becoming concerned about their own futures. They can see NATO membership being followed by European Union membership for these successful neighbors. They can see them pulling ahead in the competition for foreign investment, trade, and market access, growing in prosperity and stability behind NATO's shield. And they understand that there is no alternate path that they can follow that will get them to the same place any time soon.

Thus, even those states that are not now candidates for NATO membership are influenced in the direction of political and economic reform by the process of NATO enlargement. This will have a very positive and long-lasting impact on Europe's political stability, prosperity, and freedom, and decrease the chances that the security guarantees we solemnly extend to new NATO members will ever have to be invoked in crisis or in conflict. This, in the end, is a tremendous benefit for the security of the United States.

I believe that we must be resolute in pursuing our aim of expanding NATO to encompass all candidate states that meet the standards for membership. We must make it clear that the enlargement is a continuing process that will not end with the first group announced at Madrid, and that NATO membership remains open to states as they improve conditions for their people. In the end, this effort will move European security, prosperity, freedom, and human rights ahead more rapidly than any other course of action.

In closing, I want to briefly say something to those Americans who can trace their roots to those countries now being considered for NATO membership. Thanks in part to the hopes and beliefs that you would not let die even when times were very bad, and to your hard work in the American political system, these countries are free and independent again, something the realists of 10 years ago would have said couldn't happen, and would never happen. Keeping the faith, making sure that the United States never recognized the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union, making sure that we supported Solidarity, sustaining support for Charter 77, keeping the life lines open to the many struggling Helsinki groups, making your voices heard here in Washington, those were key events that helped pave the way to where we are today. Thank you for your efforts and know that the futures of these countries could have been much worse but for your active support for their sovereign independence, and for freedom and human rights for their citizens.●

TRIBUTE TO JAMES R. MELLOR

• Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to James R. (Jim) Mellor, who retires next week from his position as chief executive officer and chairman of the board of General Dynamics Corp., a position he has held for 3 years. Jim has been with General Dynamics for a total of 16 years. Prior to becoming CEO and chairman, he was the president and chief operating officer and before that, the executive vice president—Marine, Business Systems and Corporate Planning. Jim Mellor is completing an illustrious 42 year career in the defense industry having worked at Litton Industries and Hughes Aircraft Corp. before joining General Dynamics.

During his time with General Dynamics Jim took part in the delivery of 18 Trident ballistic missile submarines, the upgrade of the Army's M1 tank to the state-of-the-art M1A2, and the development and transition into production of the Tomahawk cruise missile. The Trident submarine played a major role in bringing about the end of the cold war, and we are all familiar with the important contributions made by the M1 tank and the Tomahawk cruise missile in our overwhelming success in Desert Storm.

Jim is a graduate of the University of Michigan, earning both bachelor of science and master of science degrees from that institution. He served in the U.S. Army from 1952 to 1955. While at Hughes & Litton he received three patents relating to large screen display and digital computing technology. He has also authored more than 30 articles in national and international publications covering a wide range of management and technical subjects.

In addition to these accomplishments, Jim has been active in many charitable and community causes. He is a member of the University of Southern California Business School Board of Councilors, a member of the National Advisory Committee of the University of Michigan, and a trustee of Ford's Theater. Under his leadership for the past 7 years, General Dynamics has sponsored the annual Memorial Day Concert held right here on the Capitol Grounds. Jim has also been an active sponsor of and participant in the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation's annual walk on the Mall. Jim and his wife, Suzanne, will be moving to California to be near their three children and nine grandchildren, but will maintain a residence in the Washington area and will remain active in business and governmental issues.

Please join me in paying tribute to this distinguished engineer, business leader, civic sponsor, and family man.•

TRIBUTE MARKING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF U.S. ARMY SPACE AND MISSILE DEFENSE

• Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to recognize the celebration of the 40th anniversary of U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense.

During this week, May 19–22, 1997, a number of special events will be taking place in Huntsville, AL, to celebrate this important anniversary. I wish to express my congratulations to the Army community in Huntsville for their splendid record of achievement in space and missile defense, and to ask my colleagues to join me saluting them for what this has meant to our Nation's security.

The U.S. Army led the nation into space and ballistic missile defense [BMD] in 1957 with the authorization to proceed with the launch of an artificial satellite and the start of development of the Nike Zeus BMD system. The Army Ballistic Missile Agency successfully launched the free world's first artificial satellite in 1958, only 89 days after receiving the go-ahead, restoring America's leadership in space exploration following the Soviet Sputnik launch 3 months earlier.

The Huntsville BMD team performed the first demonstration of a successful intercept of an ICBM class ballistic missile in 1962, deployed the first and only BMD system in the United States, conducted the first nonnuclear intercept of an ICBM in 1984, and carried out the first and the largest number of intercepts of tactical ballistic missiles, including the spectacular performance of the Patriot system against Scud rockets during Desert Storm.

The U.S. Army role in space has continued to provide significant contributions to battlefield communications, precise detection, tracking of threatening missiles, and a host of space-based capabilities tailored for the warfighter on the ground.

The Huntsville team has made significant contributions to BMD technology, including development of nuclear and nonnuclear interceptors and kill vehicles; advanced BMD radar and optical sensors; the first BMD computer, associated software and a long progression of innovations in BMD computational capabilities; and lastly, a wide range of BMD phenomenology, components and techniques.

In view of their long record of outstanding achievements, the future of military space and BMD lies to a large extent in the hands of the men and women who work in the Army organizations in Huntsville, together with their industry team mates.

Mr. President, I salute Huntsville and the hard-working men and women of that great community. Most importantly, I wish to extend a warm and hearty congratulations to the U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense team for a job well done, and best wishes for its continued success now and during the next 40 years.•

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD P. SCOTT, VA ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CONGRESSIONAL AFFAIRS

• Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, it is with a mixture of happiness and sadness that I pay tribute to Edward P. Scott, VA's Assistant Secretary for Congressional Affairs, as he retires from Federal service—happiness for Ed and his family as they embark on a new phase of their lives, and sadness for those of us who will miss Ed's wise counsel and assistance as we carry on our work on veterans issues.

Mr. President, Ed has had a long and distinguished career, including 16 years here in the Senate where he served on the Veterans' Affairs Committee as general counsel, minority general counsel, and in the 102d Congress, as chief counsel and staff director. I first became familiar with Ed's work when I joined the Veterans' Affairs Committee in 1985 when I first came to the Senate; I have recognized and relied on his great professionalism and integrity ever since. I particularly appreciated his assistance in 1993 when he worked tirelessly to ensure that my transition to the chairmanship of the committee went as smoothly as possible.

For the past 4 years, Ed has served ably in the often challenging job of Assistant Secretary for Congressional Affairs at the Department of Veterans Affairs. He is enormously knowledgeable about veterans' programs and laws, and both the committee and the Department have relied heavily on his expertise and keen insight. He has worked hard to keep his various constituencies—most particularly, Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Jesse Brown and the authorizing and appropriating committees of both the House and Senate—informed and working together. On any number of occasions, Ed has kept the train on the tracks when it was threatening to tumble off.

During these 4 years, Ed has played an important role in working with Congress to ensure passage of significant legislation to improve benefits and services for the service men and women who have sacrificed so much for our great country. He was particularly instrumental in working with the Congress last year to enact health care eligibility reform legislation, Public Law 104–262. Ed has also been in the middle of efforts to make sure that the Congress understood what the administration was doing in response to the concerns of veterans of the Persian Gulf.

Ed's high standards—in doing the job and doing it right, in being a person of unassailable integrity, and in working with all parties concerned to find solutions that all could embrace—have inspired all who have worked with him.

Mr. President, Ed's earlier career was equally distinguished. He graduated cum laude from the University of Pennsylvania Law School where he was an editor of the law review. Following a clerkship with a justice of the New Jersey Supreme Court, he entered active duty in the Air Force and served as assistant staff judge advocate at Keesler Air Force Base, MS. He then served with the Peace Corps, first in the Office of General Counsel, where he served as the deputy general counsel, and then as the Peace Corps country director in Korea. Ed also worked at the Mental Health Law Project here in Washington, an experience that gave him significant expertise on mental health issues which he has brought to bear on any number of VA mental health matters.

Mr. President, I am certain that all in the Senate who have had the privilege of knowing and working with Ed Scott join me in wishing him well as he retires from a distinguished career of Government service. We will be the poorer for his going, but the richer for his having worked among us.●

NATIONAL EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES WEEK

● Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize National Emergency Medical Services Week and the heroic and courageous work our emergency medical service providers perform everyday.

As an author of the Emergency Medical Services Efficiency Act, I have had the opportunity to meet with many EMS providers both in Minnesota and Washington to hear firsthand the problems they face every day—and their suggestions on how those problems can be resolved. The meetings were constructive, and we identified specific areas of concern and ways in which Congress can address them. I hope that the Emergency Medical Services Efficiency Act will serve as a blueprint for helping these dedicated public servants make the system more efficient.

Mr. President, emergency medical services have come a long way since the 1860's when the first civilian ambulance service was begun in Cincinnati and New York City. Now we have sophisticated medical equipment on ambulances around the country, and the American people have come to rely on the readiness, efficiency, and quick response of the EMS system. Yet many Americans—including Members of Congress—take these crucial services for granted.

Mr. President, I have a great admiration and respect for those who dedicate their time and talents to the emergency care profession, whether as a career or through volunteering. It's a field that offers a great many rewards. And yet along with those rewards often come great challenges. EMS professionals are often thrust into dangerous situations—situations that set their profession apart from most any other 9-to-5 job. It's a difficult, sometimes terrifying time to be part of the public health and safety professions.

I'm reminded of a frightening example of the terrors EMS professionals face that happened here in Washington just 5 months ago when a paramedic team was attacked by a gunman. Emergency workers were transporting a shooting victim to the hospital when the gunman stormed the ambulance, killing the victim and wounding one of the paramedics. That followed another violent incident just a month earlier, when a man who had been shot was stalked by his attacker to the hospital and was fatally wounded as he sought treatment.

Despite these risks, there are many thousands of Americans who serve their communities with determination and compassion as paramedics and emergency medical service personnel. Last night, they honored those who exemplify the best of their profession as "Stars of Life." I was asked to speak to their group, but was unable to attend due to the Budget Committee's markup of the fiscal year 1998 budget resolution. I was disappointed I could not attend so I wanted to take the time to recognize their achievements on the Senate floor today.

Mr. President, at this time I ask that the names of this year's "Stars of Life" be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

Far too often, Washington fails to respond to pressing concerns until they become a crisis. We cannot wait for a crisis to occur before we respond to the needs of our emergency medical system.

It's ironic that we expect so much from our EMS providers and yet, when they seek assistance, we continue to ignore their 9–1–1 call for help. In recognizing and celebrating National EMS Week, we should all take the time to congratulate the "Stars of Life," and their colleagues, who receive no special recognition and yet answer every call, every day, because they have chosen to serve.

The names follow:

STARS OF LIFE RECIPIENTS 1997

Irene Acquisto, NY.
Mike (Dewey) Albritton, MS.
Josh Alger, MI.
Thomas Anderson, CT.
Jim Bard, OR.
Robert Barmore, KY.
Sue Beals, ME.
Trish Beckwith, NV.
Walter Bedward, NJ.
Jeffrey Blank, WA.
Charles Blattner, CA.
Andy Bowersox, IN.
Terry Bracy, AR.
Ken Bradford, CA.
Tim Braithwaite, SD.
Bernie Callahan, PA.
Marty Carlson, OR.
Bryan Clark, GA.
Mike Coburn, NV.
Keith Cooper, PA.
David Curran, RI.
Virginia Davis, CA.
Vito DePietro, PA.
Jeffrey DeVine, MA.
George Drum, AZ.
Dave Elle, OR.
David Ellis, MO.
Linda Emery, OH.
Clarence Ervin, MI.
Ramona Fincher, LA.
Wayne Gilbert, MA.
Tom Gottschalk, MI.
Dave Green, NY.
Robert Gregory, CT.
Julian Guerrero, TX.
Marlene Guillory, LA.
David Hahn, IL.
Paul Haynie, CA.
Margaret Heckmann, IL.
Leigh Hennig, NY.
Victor Hoffer, OR.
Lynda Hoffman, NY.
Gregory Hogan, MA.
Dennis Hogges, GA.
Sharon Houghton, MO.
Shane Husted, MI.
Christopher Imm, NY.
Brent James, NE.
Charles Jarmon, CT.
Wilson Jean, FL.
Leonard Joseph, NY.
Shelly Kaczynski, MI.
James Lanier, FL.
Tony Lee, MA.
Carl Lind, AZ.
Thomas Lindgren, MA.
William Lindsay, OK.
Alvin Lynn, VA.
Tonia Mack, MA.
Steve Madrid, AZ.
Quijuan Maloof, CA.
Michael Mangan, MD.
Kerry Mariano, PA.
Donald Marsh, MI.
Greg Martino, CO.
Vicky McClanahan, TN.
Ed (Hunter) McKeever, CO.
Chris Mixon, LA.
Edward Moser, NY.
Jim Neal, ME.
Rella Neal, ME.
Keith Overcash, NC.
Cheryl Pasquarella, MN.
Thinh Pham, LA.
Ron Piel, FL.
John Piombo, FL.
Maye Pittman, CA.
Suzanne Pluskett, CA.
Judy Rains, VA.
Richie Ray, TX.
John Rivas, FL.
Jodi Roberts, OK.
Stephen Roberts Jr., TN.
Earl Ruberts, NJ.
Todd Sadler, OH.
Orlando Segarra, FL.
Mia Shelton, NY.
Penny Shuler, GA.
Todd Sims, NC.
Randy Sizelove, IN.
Mary Sloan, GA.
Carroll Smeltzer, AR.
Brent (Michael) Smith, TX.
Robert L. Smith Jr., NC.
John Sotero, CT.
Todd Stockford, MI.
Regina Stoneham, TX.
Matt Syverson, AZ.
Steve Thurman, PA.
Linda Tracey, NY.
Kevin Waddington, CO.
Beth Wally, NC.
Greg Ware, LA.
Courtney Williamson, GA.
Kevin Winte, CA.
Bill (Ronald) Wright, DE.
Destry Young, TN.●

DEATH SENTENCES FOR SALE OF LAND

● Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I was profoundly disturbed to learn that the Palestinian Authority has adopted a policy that any Palestinian caught selling land to a Jew will receive the death penalty. Only days after the announcement, the New York Times reported the brutal abduction and murder of Mr. Farid Bashiti, a 70-year-old

Palestinian real estate dealer who had been interrogated 2 weeks before his murder by the Palestinian police for allegedly selling land to Jews in and around Jerusalem.

Palestinian authorities have denied any involvement in Mr. Bashiti's death, and I understand an investigation is underway by Palestinian and Israeli police. I do not seek to prejudge that. But it is noteworthy that Palestinian officials have not condemned his death and have openly called Mr. Bashiti a traitor. I hope that his family is able to learn the truth, and that those responsible are brought to justice. This was a horrendous crime whatever the motive, and whoever was behind it should be severely punished.

But apart from Mr. Bashiti's murder, the policy of imposing a death sentence for the sale of land is nothing short of barbaric. It cannot be justified under any circumstances. I am very aware that Palestinians fervently disagree with the Israeli decision to proceed with the construction of Jewish housing in Har Homa. I disagree with that decision as well. And I am disturbed by the reports that torture is used by Israeli police. But executing someone because he or she sold land to Jews is beyond comprehension.

Mr. President, I have spoken many times about the fragility of the peace process in the Middle East. I am very disappointed by any actions that exacerbate the situation, when the focus should be on easing tensions and seeking common ground.●

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ECONOMIC RECOVERY ACT

● Mr. MACK. Mr. President, last Thursday, I, along with Senators LIEBERMAN and BROWNBACK, reintroduced the District of Columbia Economic Recovery Act (S. 753). I now ask that the text of this bill be printed in the RECORD.

The text of the bill follows:

S. 753

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 ''District of Columbia Economic Recovery Act''.

SEC. 2. SPECIAL RULES FOR TAXATION OF INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE RESIDENTS OF OR INVESTORS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to determination of tax liability) is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

''PART VIII—SPECIAL RULES FOR TAXATION OF INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE RESIDENTS OF OR INVESTORS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

''Sec. 59B. Limitation on tax imposed on residents of the District of Columbia.

''Sec. 59C. Taxation of capital gains sourced in the District of Columbia.

''SEC. 59B. LIMITATION ON TAX IMPOSED ON RESIDENTS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

''(a) GENERAL RULE.—If a taxpayer elects the application of this section, the net income tax of an individual who is a resident of the District of Columbia for the taxable year shall not exceed the limitation determined under subsection (b) for such year.

''(b) LIMITATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The limitation determined under this subsection is the sum of the following amounts:

''(A) 15-PERCENT RATE.—15 percent of so much of District-sourced income as exceeds the exemption amount.

''(B) AVERAGE RATE.—An amount equal to the average rate of the non-District-sourced adjusted gross income.

''(2) DISTRICT-SOURCED CAPITAL GAINS.—

''For exclusion from tax of capital gains, see section 59C.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) RESIDENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—An individual is a resident of the District of Columbia for the taxable year if—

''(A) such individual used a residence in the District of Columbia as a place of abode (and was physically present at such place) for at least 183 days of such taxable year, and

''(B) such individual is subject to the District of Columbia income tax for such taxable year.

''(2) NET INCOME TAX.—The term 'net income tax' means—

''(A) the sum of regular tax liability and the tax imposed by section 55 (determined without regard to this section), reduced by

''(B) the aggregate credits allowable under part IV (other than section 31).

''(3) EXEMPTION AMOUNT.—The term 'exemption amount' means—

''(A) $30,000 in the case of a joint return or a surviving spouse,

''(B) $15,000 in the case of—

''(i) an individual who is not a married individual and is not a surviving spouse, and

''(ii) a married individual filing a separate return, and

''(C) $25,000 in the case of a head of a household.

''(4) AVERAGE RATE.—The term 'average rate' means the percentage determined by dividing—

''(A) the sum (determined without regard to this section) of the taxpayer's regular tax liability and the tax imposed by section 55, by

''(B) the taxpayer's taxable income.

If the percentage determined under the preceding sentence is not a whole number of percentage points, such percentage shall be rounded to the nearest whole number of percentage points.

''(5) REGULAR TAX LIABILITY.—The term 'regular tax liability' has the meaning given to such term by section 26(b).

''(d) DISTRICT-SOURCED INCOME.—For purposes of this section, the term 'District-sourced income' means adjusted gross income reduced by the sum of—

''(1) non-District-sourced adjusted gross income,

''(2) the deduction allowed by section 170, and

''(3) the deduction allowed by section 163 to the extent attributable to qualified residence interest (as defined in section 163(h)).

''(e) NON-DISTRICT-SOURCED ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—For purposes of this section, the term 'non-District-sourced adjusted gross income' means gross income of the taxpayer from sources outside the District of Columbia reduced (but not below zero) by the deductions taken into account in determining adjusted gross income which are allocable to such income.

''(f) SOURCES OF INCOME.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) RETIREMENT INCOME AND OTHER INCOME NOT SOURCED UNDER SUBSECTION.—The source of any income not specifically provided for in this subsection shall be treated as from sources within the District of Columbia.

''(2) PERSONAL SERVICES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Compensation (other than retirement income) for services performed by the taxpayer as an employee, and net earnings from self-employment (as defined in section 1402)), shall be sourced at the place such services are performed.

''(B) SERVICES PERFORMED IN WASHINGTON-BALTIMORE AREA TREATED AS PERFORMED IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—Services performed in the Washington-Baltimore area shall be treated as performed in the District of Columbia.

''(C) INDIVIDUALS PERFORMING 80 PERCENT OF SERVICES WITHIN WASHINGTON-BALTIMORE AREA.—If, during any taxable year, at least 80 percent of the hours of service performed by an individual are performed within the Washington-Baltimore area, all such service shall be treated for purposes of this paragraph as performed within the District of Columbia.

''(D) WASHINGTON-BALTIMORE AREA.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'Washington-Baltimore area' means the area consisting of—

''(i) the Washington/Baltimore Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area (as designated by the Office of Management and Budget), and

''(ii) St. Mary's County, Maryland.

''(3) INTEREST.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Interest received or accrued during the taxable year shall be treated as from sources outside the District of Columbia.

''(B) EXCEPTION FOR SMALL AMOUNTS OF NON-DISTRICT-SOURCED INTEREST.—Interest which would (but for this subparagraph) be treated as from sources outside the District of Columbia shall be treated as from sources in the District of Columbia to the extent the amount of such interest does not exceed $400.

''(C) EXCEPTION FOR INTEREST PAID BY DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESSES AND RESIDENTS.—

''(i) BUSINESSES.—In the case of interest paid during a calendar year by a debtor which was required to file (and filed) a franchise tax return with the District of Columbia for the debtor's taxable year ending with or within the prior calendar year, an amount equal to the D.C. percentage (as shown on such return) of such interest shall be treated as from sources within the District of Columbia. The preceding sentence shall apply only if such percentage is furnished to the taxpayer in writing on or before January 31 of the year following the calendar year in which such interest is paid.

''(ii) OTHERS.—Interest shall be treated as from sources within the District of Columbia if the interest is paid during a calendar year by a debtor—

''(I) which was required to file (and filed) an income tax return with the District of Columbia for the debtor's taxable year ending with or within the prior calendar year, and

''(II) which is not required to file a franchise tax return with the District of Columbia for such taxable year.

''(D) SPECIAL RULE FOR DETERMINATION OF D.C. PERCENTAGE FOR NEW BUSINESSES.—Interest shall be treated as from sources within the District of Columbia if the interest is paid during a calendar year by a debtor which was required to file (and filed) a franchise tax return with the District of Columbia for such debtor's taxable year ending with or within such calendar year, but which was not required to file such a return for such debtor's prior taxable year.

''(4) DIVIDENDS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Dividends received or accrued during the taxable year shall be treated as from sources outside the District of Columbia.

''(B) EXCEPTION FOR SMALL AMOUNTS OF NON-DISTRICT-SOURCED DIVIDENDS.—Dividends which would (but for this subparagraph) be treated as from sources outside the District of Columbia shall be treated as from sources in the District of Columbia to the extent the amount of such dividends do not exceed $400.

''(C) EXCEPTION FOR DIVIDENDS PAID BY CORPORATION ENGAGED IN BUSINESS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—In the case of dividends paid during a calendar year by a corporation which was required to file (and filed) a franchise tax return with the District of Columbia for the corporation's taxable year ending with or within the prior calendar year, an amount equal to the D.C. percentage (as shown on such return) of such dividends shall be treated as from sources within the District of Columbia. The preceding sentence shall apply only if such percentage is furnished to the taxpayer in writing on or before January 31 of the year following the calendar year in which such dividends are paid.

''(D) SPECIAL RULE FOR DETERMINATION OF D.C. PERCENTAGE FOR NEW BUSINESSES.—Dividends shall be treated as from sources within the District of Columbia if the dividends are paid during a calendar year by a corporation which was required to file (and filed) a franchise tax return with the District of Columbia for such corporation's taxable year ending with or within such calendar year, but which was not required to file such a return for such corporation's prior taxable year.

''(5) DISPOSITION OF TANGIBLE PROPERTY.—Income, gain, or loss from the disposition of tangible property shall be sourced to the place such property is located at the time of the disposition.

''(6) DISPOSITION OF INTANGIBLE PROPERTY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Income, gain, or loss from the disposition of intangible property shall be treated as from sources outside the District of Columbia.

''(B) EXCEPTION.— If any portion of the most recent income received or accrued by the taxpayer before such disposition which was attributable to such property was from sources within the District of Columbia, a like portion of the income, gain, or loss from such disposition shall be treated as from sources within the District of Columbia.

''(7) RENTALS.—Rents from property shall be sourced at the place where such property is located.

''(8) ROYALTIES.—Royalties shall be treated as from sources outside the District of Columbia.

''(9) INCOME FROM PROPRIETORSHIP.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a trade or business carried on by the taxpayer as a proprietorship, income from such trade or business (other than income which is included in net earnings from self-employment by the taxpayer) shall be treated as from sources outside the District of Columbia.

''(B) EXCEPTION FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESSES.—If the taxpayer is required to file (and files) a franchise tax return with the District of Columbia for the taxable year, subparagraph (A) shall not apply to an amount equal to the D.C. percentage of such income.

''(10) INCOME FROM PARTNERSHIP.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxpayer who is a partner in a partnership, income from such partnership (other than income which is included in net earnings from self-employment by any partner) shall be treated as from sources outside the District of Columbia.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to a partnership—

''(i) which was required to file (and filed) a franchise tax return with the District of Columbia for the partnership's taxable year ending with or within the taxpayer's taxable year to the extent of the D.C. percentage of the taxpayer's distributive share of the partnership income, or

''(ii) which was not required to file a franchise tax return with the District of Columbia for the partnership's taxable year ending with or within the taxpayer's taxable year to the extent of the taxpayer's distributive share of partnership income which is not (as determined under this subsection) from sources outside the District of Columbia.

''(11) INCOME IN RESPECT OF A DECEDENT; INCOME FROM AN ESTATE.—Income in respect of a decedent, and income from an estate, shall be sourced at the place where the decedent was domiciled at the time of his death.

''(12) INCOME FROM A TRUST.—Income (other than retirement income) from a trust shall be treated as from the same sources as the income of the trust to which it is attributable.

''(g) DEFINITIONS RELATING TO SUBSECTION (f).—For purposes of subsection (f)—

''(1) RETIREMENT INCOME.—The term 'retirement income' has the meaning given such term by section 114(b)(1) of title 4, United States Code (determined without regard to subparagraph (I) thereof).

''(2) D.C. PERCENTAGE.—The term 'D.C. percentage' means the percentage determined by dividing—

''(A) the net income taxable in the District of Columbia (as shown on the original return for the taxable year), by

''(B) total net income from all sources (as shown on such return).

The preceding sentence shall be applied based on amounts shown on the original applicable District of Columbia franchise or income tax return.

''(h) SECTION NOT TO APPLY TO ESTATES AND TRUSTS.—This section shall not apply to an estate or trust.

''(i) ELECTION.—The election provided in subsection (a) shall be made at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe. Any such election shall apply to the first taxable year for which such election was made and for each taxable year thereafter until such election is revoked by the taxpayer.

''(j) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section.

''SEC. 59C. EXCLUSION OF CAPITAL GAINS SOURCED IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

''(a) EXCLUSION.—

''(1) GENERAL RULE.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), in the case of a taxpayer who is an individual, gross income shall not include any qualified capital gain recognized on the sale or exchange of a District asset held for more than 3 years.

''(2) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN GAIN OF NONRESIDENTS.—In the case of a taxpayer who is not a resident of the District of Columbia for any taxable year, gross income shall not include 50 percent of the qualified capital gain recognized on the sale or exchange of residential rental property (within the meaning of section 168(e)(2)(A)) which is a District asset held for more than 3 years and which is not taken into account under section 1202.

''(b) DISTRICT ASSET.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'District asset' means—

''(A) any District stock,

''(B) any District business property,

''(C) any District partnership interest, and

''(D) any principal residence (within the meaning of section 1034).

''(2) DISTRICT STOCK.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'District stock' means any stock in a domestic corporation if—

''(i) such stock is acquired by the taxpayer on original issue from the corporation solely in exchange for cash,

''(ii) as of the time such stock was issued, such corporation was a District business (or, in the case of a new corporation, such corporation was being organized for purposes of being a District business), and

''(iii) during substantially all of the taxpayer's holding period for such stock, such corporation qualified as a District business.

''(B) REDEMPTIONS.—The term 'District stock' shall not include any stock acquired from a corporation which made a substantial stock redemption or distribution (without a bona fide business purpose therefor) in an attempt to avoid the purposes of this section.

''(3) DISTRICT BUSINESS PROPERTY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'District business property' means tangible property if—

''(i) such property was acquired by the taxpayer by purchase (as defined in section 179(d)(2)),

''(ii) the original use of such property in the District of Columbia commences with the taxpayer, and

''(iii) during substantially all of the taxpayer's holding period for such property, substantially all of the use of such property was in a District business of the taxpayer.

''(B) SPECIAL RULE FOR SUBSTANTIAL IMPROVEMENTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The requirements of clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A) shall be treated as satisfied with respect to—

''(I) property which is substantially improved by the taxpayer, and

''(II) any land on which such property is located.

''(ii) SUBSTANTIAL IMPROVEMENT.—For purposes of clause (i), property shall be treated as substantially improved by the taxpayer if, during any 24-month period beginning after the date of the enactment of this section, additions to basis with respect to such property in the hands of the taxpayer exceed the greater of—

''(I) an amount equal to the adjusted basis at the beginning of such 24-month period in the hands of the taxpayer, or

''(II) $5,000.

''(C) LIMITATION ON LAND.—The term 'District business property' shall not include land which is not an integral part of a District business.

''(4) DISTRICT PARTNERSHIP INTEREST.—The term 'District partnership interest' means any interest in a partnership if—

''(A) such interest is acquired by the taxpayer from the partnership solely in exchange for cash,

''(B) as of the time such interest was acquired, such partnership was a District business (or, in the case of a new partnership, such partnership was being organized for purposes of being a District business), and

''(C) during substantially all of the taxpayer's holding period for such interest, such partnership qualified as a District business.

A rule similar to the rule of paragraph (2)(B) shall apply for purposes of this paragraph.

''(5) TREATMENT OF SUBSEQUENT PURCHASERS.—The term 'District asset' includes any property which would be a District asset but for paragraph (2)(A)(i), (3)(A)(ii), or (4)(A) in the hands of the taxpayer if such property was a District asset in the hands of all prior holders.

''(6) 10-YEAR SAFE HARBOR.—If any property ceases to be a District asset by reason of paragraph (2)(A)(iii), (3)(A)(iii), or (4)(C) after the 10-year period beginning on the date the taxpayer acquired such property, such property shall continue to be treated as meeting the requirements of such paragraph; except that the amount of gain to which subsection (a) applies on any sale or exchange of such property shall not exceed the amount which would be qualified capital gain had such property been sold on the date of such cessation.

''(c) OTHER DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) QUALIFIED CAPITAL GAIN.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the term 'qualified capital gain' means any long-term capital gain recognized on the sale or exchange of a District asset held for more than 3 years.

''(2) CERTAIN GAIN ON REAL PROPERTY NOT QUALIFIED.—The term 'qualified capital gain' shall not include any gain which would be treated as ordinary income under section 1250 if section 1250 applied to all depreciation rather than the additional depreciation.

''(3) DISTRICT BUSINESS.—The term 'District business' means, with respect to any taxable year, any individual, partnership, or corporation if for such year either—

''(A)(i) at least 50 percent of the total gross income of such individual, partnership, or corporation is derived from the active conduct of a trade or business in the District of Columbia,

''(ii) substantially all of the use of the tangible property of such individual, partnership, or corporation (whether owned or leased) is within the District of Columbia, and

''(iii) at least 35 percent of the employees of such individual, partnership, or corporation are located in the District of Columbia, or

''(B) at least 50 percent of the employees of such individual, partnership, or corporation are located in the District of Columbia.

''(d) TREATMENT OF PASS-THRU ENTITIES.—

''(1) SALES AND EXCHANGES.—Gain on the sale or exchange of an interest in a pass-thru entity held by the taxpayer (other than an interest in an entity which was a District business during substantially all of the period the taxpayer held such interest) for more than 3 years shall be treated as gain described in subsection (a) to the extent such gain is attributable to amounts which would be qualified capital gain on District assets (determined as if such assets had been sold on the date of the sale or exchange) held by such entity for more than 3 years and throughout the period the taxpayer held such interest. A rule similar to the rule of paragraph (2)(B) shall apply for purposes of the preceding sentence.

''(2) INCOME INCLUSIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Any amount included in income by reason of holding an interest in a pass-thru entity (other than an entity which was a District business during substantially all of the period the taxpayer held the interest to which such inclusion relates) shall be treated as gain described in subsection (a) if such amount meets the requirements of subparagraph (B).

''(B) REQUIREMENTS.—An amount meets the requirements of this subparagraph if—

''(i) such amount is attributable to qualified capital gain recognized on the sale or exchange by the pass-thru entity of property which is a District asset in the hands of such entity and which was held by such entity for the period required under subsection (a), and

''(ii) such amount is includible in the gross income of the taxpayer by reason of the holding of an interest in such entity which was held by the taxpayer on the date on which such pass-thru entity acquired such asset and at all times thereafter before the disposition of such asset by such pass-thru entity.

''(C) LIMITATION BASED ON INTEREST ORIGINALLY HELD BY TAXPAYER.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any amount to the extent such amount exceeds the amount to which subparagraph (A) would have applied if such amount were determined by reference to the interest the taxpayer held in the pass-thru entity on the date the District asset was acquired.

''(3) PASS-THRU ENTITY.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'pass-thru entity' means—

''(A) any partnership,

''(B) any S corporation,

''(C) any regulated investment company, and

''(D) any common trust fund.

''(e) SALES AND EXCHANGES OF INTERESTS IN PARTNERSHIPS AND S CORPORATIONS WHICH ARE DISTRICT BUSINESSES.—In the case of the sale or exchange of an interest in a partnership, or of stock in an S corporation, which was a District business during substantially all of the period the taxpayer held such interest or stock, the amount of qualified capital gain shall be determined without regard to any intangible, and any land, which is not an integral part of the District business.

''(f) CERTAIN TAX-FREE AND OTHER TRANSFERS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a transfer of a District asset to which this subsection applies, the transferee shall be treated as—

''(A) having acquired such asset in the same manner as the transferor, and

''(B) having held such asset during any continuous period immediately preceding the transfer during which it was held (or treated as held under this subsection) by the transferor.

''(2) TRANSFERS TO WHICH SUBSECTION APPLIES.—This subsection shall apply to any transfer—

''(A) by gift,

''(B) at death, or

''(C) from a partnership to a partner thereof of a District asset with respect to which the requirements of subsection (d)(2) are met at the time of the transfer (without regard to the 3-year holding requirement).

''(3) CERTAIN RULES MADE APPLICABLE.—Rules similar to the rules of section 1244(d)(2) shall apply for purposes of this section.''

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 55(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Such regular tax shall be determined without regard to section 59B.''

(2) The table of parts for subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Part VIII. Special rules for taxation of individuals who are residents of or investors in the District of Columbia.''

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. EXPENSING OF ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION COSTS WITHIN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to itemized deductions for individuals and corporations) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 198. EXPENSING OF ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION COSTS WITHIN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—A taxpayer may elect to treat any qualified environmental remediation expenditure which is paid or incurred by the taxpayer as an expense which is not chargeable to capital account. Any expenditure which is so treated shall be allowed as a deduction for the taxable year in which it is paid or incurred.

''(b) QUALIFIED ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION EXPENDITURE.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified environmental remediation expenditure' means any expenditure—

''(A) which is otherwise chargeable to capital account, and

''(B) which is paid or incurred in connection with the abatement or control of hazardous substances at a qualified contaminated site.

''(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR EXPENDITURES FOR DEPRECIABLE PROPERTY.—Such term shall not include any expenditure for the acquisition of property of a character subject to the allowance for depreciation which is used in connection with the abatement or control of hazardous substances at a qualified contaminated site; except that the portion of the allowance under section 167 for such property which is otherwise allocated to such site shall be treated as a qualified environmental remediation expenditure.

''(c) QUALIFIED CONTAMINATED SITE.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified contaminated site' means any area within the District of Columbia—

''(A) which is held by the taxpayer for use in a trade or business or for the production of income, or which is property described in section 1221(1) in the hands of the taxpayer, and

''(B) which contains (or potentially contains) any hazardous substance.

''(2) TAXPAYER MUST RECEIVE STATEMENT FROM ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCY.—An area shall be treated as a qualified contaminated site with respect to expenditures paid or incurred during any taxable year only if the taxpayer receives a statement from the appropriate agency of the District of Columbia in which such area is located that such area meets the requirements of paragraph (1)(B).

''(3) APPROPRIATE AGENCY.— For purposes of paragraph (2), the appropriate agency of the District of Columbia is the agency designated by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency for purposes of this section. If no agency is designated under the preceding sentence, the appropriate agency shall be the Environmental Protection Agency.

''(d) HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'hazardous substance' means—

''(A) any substance which is a hazardous substance as defined in section 101(14) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, and

''(B) any substance which is designated as a hazardous substance under section 102 of such Act.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—Such term shall not include any substance with respect to which a removal or remedial action is not permitted under section 104 of such Act by reason of subsection (a)(3) thereof.

''(e) DEDUCTION RECAPTURED AS ORDINARY INCOME ON SALE, ETC.—Solely for purposes of section 1245, in the case of property to which a qualified environmental remediation expenditure would have been capitalized but for this section—

''(1) the deduction allowed by this section for such expenditure shall be treated as a deduction for depreciation, and

''(2) such property (if not otherwise section 1245 property) shall be treated as section 1245 property solely for purposes of applying section 1245 to such deduction.

''(f) COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROVISIONS.—Sections 280B and 468 shall not apply to amounts which are treated as expenses under this section.

"(g) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"Sec. 198. Expensing of environmental remediation costs within the District of Columbia."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to expenditures paid or incurred after the date of the enactment of this Act, in taxable years ending after such date.

SEC. 4. FIRST-TIME HOMEBUYER CREDIT FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to nonrefundable personal credits) is amended by inserting after section 23 the following new section:

"SEC. 24. FIRST-TIME HOMEBUYER CREDIT FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—In the case of an individual who is a first-time homebuyer of a principal residence in the District of Columbia during any taxable year, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount equal to so much of the purchase price of the residence as does not exceed $5,000.

"(b) FIRST-TIME HOMEBUYER.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'first-time homebuyer' means any individual if—

"(A) such individual (and if married, such individual's spouse) had no present ownership interest in a principal residence in the District of Columbia during the 1-year period ending on the date of acquisition of the principal residence to which this section applies, and

"(B) subsection (h) or (k) of section 1034 did not, on the day before the close of such 1-year period, suspend the running of any period of time specified in section 1034 for such individual with respect to gain on a principal residence in the District of Columbia.

"(2) ONE-TIME ONLY.—If an individual is treated as a first-time homebuyer with respect to any principal residence, such individual may not be treated as a first-time homebuyer with respect to any other principal residence.

"(3) PRINCIPAL RESIDENCE.—The term 'principal residence' has the meaning given such term by section 1034.

"(4) DATE OF ACQUISITION.—The term 'date of acquisition' means the date—

"(A) on which a binding contract to acquire the principal residence to which this section applies to is entered into, or

"(B) on which construction or reconstruction of such principal residence is commenced.

"(c) CARRYOVER OF CREDIT.—If the credit allowable under subsection (a) exceeds the limitation imposed by section 26(a) for such taxable year reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under this subpart (other than this section and section 25), such excess shall be carried to the succeeding taxable year and added to the credit allowable under subsection (a) for such taxable year.

"(d) SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) ALLOCATION OF DOLLAR LIMITATION.—

"(A) MARRIED INDIVIDUALS FILING JOINTLY.—In the case of a husband and wife who file a joint return under section 6013, the $5,000 limitation under subsection (a) shall apply to the joint return.

"(B) MARRIED INDIVIDUALS FILING SEPARATELY.—In the case of a married individual filing a separate return, subsection (a) shall be applied by substituting '$2,500' for '$5,000'.

"(C) OTHER TAXPAYERS.—If 2 or more individuals who are not married purchase a principal residence, the amount of the credit allowed under subsection (a) shall be allocated among such individuals in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe, except that the total amount of the credits allowed to all such individuals shall not exceed $5,000.

"(2) PURCHASE.—The term 'purchase' means any acquisition, but only if—

"(A) the property is not acquired from a person whose relationship to the person acquiring it would result in the disallowance of losses under section 267 or 707(b) (but, in applying section 267 (b) and (c) for purposes of this section, paragraph (4) of section 267(c) shall be treated as providing that the family of an individual shall include only his spouse, ancestors, and lineal descendants), and

"(B) the basis of the property in the hands of the person acquiring it is not determined—

"(i) in whole or in part by reference to the adjusted basis of such property in the hands of the person from whom acquired, or

"(ii) under section 1014(a) (relating to property acquired from a decedent).

"(3) PURCHASE PRICE.—The term 'purchase price' means the adjusted basis of the principal residence on the date of acquisition."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 23 the following new item:

"Sec. 24. First-time homebuyer credit for District of Columbia."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to purchases after the date of the enactment of this Act, in taxable years ending after such date.●

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

● Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I hereby submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report prepared by the Congressional Budget Office under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. This report meets the requirements for Senate scorekeeping of section 5 of Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, the first concurrent resolution on the Budget for 1986.

This report shows the effects of congressional action on the budget through May 19, 1997. The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues, which are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the 1997 concurrent resolution on the budget (H. Con. Res. 178), show that current level spending is above the budget resolution by $16.9 billion in budget authority and by $12.6 billion in outlays. Current level is $20.5 billion above the revenue floor in 1997 and $101.9 billion above the revenue floor over the 5 years 1997–2001. The current estimate of the deficit for purposes of calculating the maximum deficit amount is $219.6 billion, $7.6 billion below the maximum deficit amount for 1997 of $227.3 billion.

Since my last report, dated April 15, 1997, there has been no action to change the current level of budget authority, outlays or revenues.

The report follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, May 20, 1997.

Hon. PETE V. DOMENICI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The attached report for fiscal year 1997 shows the effects of Congressional action on the 1997 budget and is current through May 19, 1997. The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the 1997 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 178). This report is submitted under Section 308(b) and in aid of Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

Since my last report, dated April 15, 1997, there has been no action to change the current level of budget authority, outlays or revenues.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL,
Director.

THE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE FISCAL YEAR 1997, 105TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS MAY 19, 1997

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget resolution H. Con. Res. 178	Current level	Current level over/under resolution
ON-BUDGET			
Budget authority	1,314.9	1,331.8	16.9
Outlays	1,311.3	1,323.9	12.6
Revenues:			
1997	1,083.7	1,104.3	20.5
1997–2001	5,913.3	6,015.2	101.9
Deficit	227.3	219.6	-7.6
Debt subject to limit	5,432.7	5,257.7	-175.0
OFF-BUDGET			
Social Security outlays:			
1997	310.4	310.4	0.0
1997–2001	2,061.3	2,061.3	0.0
Social Security revenues:			
1997	385.0	384.7	-0.3
1997–2001	2,121.0	2,120.3	-0.7

Note: Current level numbers are the estimated revenue and direct spending effects of all legislation that Congress has enacted or sent to the President for his approval. In addition, full-year funding estimates under current law are included for entitlement and mandatory programs requiring annual appropriations even if the appropriations have not been made. The current level of debt subject to limit reflects the latest U.S. Treasury information on public debt transactions.

THE ON-BUDGET CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, 105TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, SENATE SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS MAY 19, 1997

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted in Previous Sessions			
Revenues			1,101,532
Permanents and other spending legislation	843,324	801,465	
Appropriation legislation	753,927	788,263	
Offsetting receipts	−271,843	−271,843	
Total previously enacted	1,325,408	1,317,885	1,101,532
Enacted This Session			
Airport and Airway Trust Fund Reinstatement Act of 1997 (P.L. 105–2)			2,730
Entitlements and Mandatories			
Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted	6,428	6,015	
Totals			
Total current level	1,331,836	1,323,900	1,104,262

THE ON-BUDGET CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, 105TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, SENATE SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS MAY 19, 1997—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Total budget resolution	1,314,935	1,311,321	1,083,728
Amount remaining:			
Under budget resolution	....	....	....
Over budget resolution	16,901	12,579	20,534
Addendum			
Emergencies:			
Funding that has been designated as an emergency requirement by the President and the Congress	1,814	1,233	....
Funding that has been designated as an emergency requirement only by the Congress and is not available for obligation until requested by the President	315	300	....
Total emergencies	2,129	1,533	....
Total current level including emergencies	1,333,965	1,325,433	1,104,262•

TRIBUTE TO LARRY DOBY

• Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Larry Doby, originally of Camden, SC, who was the first African-American to play in the American League. Mr. Doby's contributions to baseball and the American cultural conscience are of ineffable importance. He exemplified grace under fire, showing tact, resilence, and dignity in the unforgiving arena of a segregated nation. In light of his personal qualities and his professional achievements, I ask that the following editorial from the Chronicle Independent be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

LARRY DOBY

During this 50th anniversary of the desegregation of Major League Baseball, Jackie Robinson has again become a household name. Perhaps now more than ever, people—and not only baseball fans —are stopping to consider the true impact that Mr. Robinson had, not only as a baseball player but as a social pioneer. For indeed, that's what he was—a pioneer. When Brooklyn Dodgers owner Branch Rickey broke the color line by bringing Jackie Robinson up to the big leagues, he knew Mr. Robinson would face abuse. He also knew that the talented player had the character and the savoir faire to handle the situation.

Somewhere lost in the shuffle has been Kershaw County's own Larry Doby, who became the first black player in the American League. Few people realize that Mr. Doby, who was born in Camden and moved to New Jersey after the death of his father, followed Mr. Robinson into the major leagues by only 11 weeks. As in other phases of U.S. history, we usually remember the first person to do something, but those who follow shortly thereafter often get forgotten. That's been the case with Mr. Doby.

He was, after all, an excellent baseball player and athlete. He led the American League in home runs in 1952, and during a 13-year career, most of them with the Cleveland Indians, he batted .283 and made six consecutive American League all-star teams. Five times in a seven-season span, he drove in more than 100 runs. A player who posts those kinds of statistics today receives millions of dollars a year, but that wasn't the case back then. But Larry Doby was more than a great baseball player; just as Mr. Robinson did, he blazed a trail that made baseball at its highest level open to everyone, not just white players. And in doing so, he gracefully endured abuse that would be difficult to imagine today.

It is only proper that Mr. Doby is finally receiving his due for his accomplishments. This year's all-star game will be dedicated to him, and the Indians will honor the 50th anniversary of his debut before their July 5 game against Kansas City. He is now special assistant to the president of the American League.

Those who have reflected with Mr. Doby on his achievements, including the sports editor of this newspaper, have been impressed with his recall of the events of 50 years ago. Like Jackie Robinson, he struggled through a difficult time to open doors for all people.

Baseball fans—and yes, Americans who really don't give much of a hoot for the national pastime—should pay tribute to Jackie Robinson this year, a man whose courage and talent have made him a household name. But at the same time, let those of us in Kershaw County not forget one of our own: Larry Doby, a true champion in every sense of the word.•

MASS TRANSIT AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1997

• Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise to join with my colleague from Pennsylvania, Senator ARLEN SPECTER, in supporting the Mass Transit Amendments Act of 1997. This bill is a bipartisan effort to support investment in our Nation's mass transit systems and industry. But more important, this bill will ensure that a critical part our Nation's transportation infrastructure—transit—will receive adequate investments into the 21st century. A healthy transit system will go a long way toward reducing congestion and increasing mobility even when vehicle miles traveled is increasing.

Good public transit increases the efficiency of existing roadways, especially in congested regions where many people live. Transit is essential to rural, suburban, and urban residents, it is a cost-effective solution to healthcare access, a key to successful welfare reform, and an environmentally sensible way to meet the commuting needs. It is an increasingly important service for the elderly, for persons with disabilities, for students, and for those who cannot afford a car.

Mr. President, anybody who questions the necessity for transit services only has to visit my home State of New Jersey. The most densely populated State in the Nation, it also has the most vehicle density on its roads. Located between two heavily populated metropolitan areas, New Jersey is known as the Corridor State. Over 60 billion vehicle miles are traveled on New Jersey's roads annually. The ability of trucks and cars to move freely on New Jersey's roads directly affects New Jersey's economy—congestion has dramatic effects on the economy.

New Jersey is also a commuter State. Millions of New Jerseyans face serious commuter problems every day. In many areas in New Jersey, there is nowhere else to lay new roads. We simply cannot build ourselves out of congestion. That's why New Jersey is heavily reliant on mass transit. The Midtown Direct, an Urban core project, was inaugurated 1 year ago. Within weeks, the ridership doubled in its projections. Transit in New Jersey is well used and well supported.

Nationally, transit has also proven to reduce congestion, and transit saves dollars. A 1996 report conducted by the Federal Transit Administration found that the annual economic loss to U.S. business caused by traffic congestion is $40 billion, and the additional annual economic loss if all U.S. transit commuters drove instead would be $15 billion.

It's also good for the environment. According to the FTA, transit use saves 1.5 billion gallons of U.S. auto fuel consumption every year. Transit is energy efficient, and the less gasoline used, the less the United States is dependent on foreign oil.

Mr. President, Americans also see direct public health benefits from transit use. According to the Environmental Protection Agency, up to 110 million Americans breathe air that is unhealthful. The American Lung Association estimates the national health care bill for air pollution-related illness is $40 billion a year. Transportation sources cause 40–60 percent of pollution that produces ozone, and 70–80 percent of carbon monoxide emissions. Nearly one-third of carbon dioxide—the most significant greenhouse gas—comes from transportation sources. The fastest growing source of carbon dioxide emissions is the transportation sector.

Mr. President, transit produces real environmental benefits. On average, riding transit instead of driving cuts hydrocarbon emissions that produce smog by 90 percent and carbon monoxide by more than 75 percent. One person using mass transit for a year instead of driving to work saves our environment 9 pounds of hydrocarbons, 62 pounds of carbon monoxide and 5 pounds of nitrogen oxides.

It doesn't stop there. Over the past 30 years, the U.S. transit industry and its riders have prevented the emission of 1.6 million tons of hydrocarbons, 10 million tons of carbon monoxide, and 275,000 tons of nitrogen oxides into the air; the importation of 20 billion gallons of gasoline; and the construction and maintenance of 20,000 lane-miles of freeways and arterial roads and 5 million parking spaces to meet demands, saving at least $220 billion.

Transit is an important part of our Nation's transportation system, and we ought to ensure that it is afforded the same priority as other modes of transportation.

Mr. President, this bill does just that. It increases the authorization level for transit programs to provide $34.4 billion over 5 years. It increases discretionary capital grants and formula capital grants. It preserves operating assistance within formula programs for all areas and it continues funding for transit planning and research. It also makes a number of technical changes in the program to ensure better flexibility and streamlining, allowing transit managers to administer the program more effectively.

Mr. President, this bill does a few more things. It includes a provision which shifts the 4.3 cents of gas taxes per gallon currently allocated to deficit reduction, into transportation trust funds. One-half cent of the 4.3 cents is allocated into a new intercity passenger rail trust fund to fund Amtrak capital expenses; the rest—the 3.8 cents—is divided along the traditional 80 percent/20 percent split of highways/mass transit, respectively. Thus, 3.04 cents will go into the highway account of the highway trust fund, and 0.76 cents will go into the mass transit account of the highway trust fund. This is the fair, equitable way to divide any new trust fund revenue that would be allocated for transportation.

However, Mr. President, until a mechanism is provided to actually permit the expenditure of that additional funding, we will not see the investment we seek. Instead, the trust fund balances will only grow. As party to the budget negotiations just completed, I know as well as any Senator how hard it will be to make the necessary investments as we move to a balanced budget by 2002. However, I think it is important to lay out this principle and do our best to work toward it.

Mr. President, unfortunately, the balanced budget agreement reached last week will make it difficult to fund mass transit at the levels provided in this bill. As ranking Democratic member of the Budget Committee, I fought hard to ensure that we will be making an adequate investment within the context of the balanced budget agreement. I must say, it will be difficult to fund transportation at the levels I support over the next few years. However, as ranking Democratic member of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, I will work to ensure continued, adequate funding over these years.

Mr. President, the Mass Transit Act Amendments of 1997 represent what I believe, and what transit advocates believe, is necessary to provide for transit's growing needs into the 21st century. As Congress considers funding for transportation, I look forward to discussing ways that transit, and other modes of transportation, can benefit.

Mr. President, this bill also includes a Reverse Commute Pilot Program which intends to assist individuals in both urban and rural areas receive employment and job training. This annual $250 million discretionary program reflects the growing needs of the work force, particularly those in urban and rural areas who do not have access to suburban jobs. A 1996 report conducted by the Eno Transportation Foundation, ''Commuting in America II,'' found that ''today, the dominant commuting flow pattern is suburban, with 50% of the Nation's commuters living in the suburbs and over 41% of all jobs located there, up from 37% in 1980.'' Suburban areas are now the main destination of work trips. The report also found that there was a substantial increase in reverse commuting—the central city-to-suburb commuting rose from a 9-percent share of growth over the decade from 1970 to 1980, to 12 percent from 1980 to 1990.

Mr. President, reinvesting in our cities is important. However, if jobs are in the suburbs, we should provide mechanisms for employers, local and State employment and transportation agencies to assist those potential employees to simply get to where the work is. For those of us who are concerned about the effects of the Welfare Reform Act signed into law last year, we need to do all we can to ensure that the unemployed can move from welfare to work quickly and easily. The Reverse Commute Pilot Program makes sense.

Mr. President, we all know that the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act—ISTEA—will expire on September 30. That law was far-reaching and visionary. It recognized that good transportation policy does not mean simply pouring more concrete and asphalt. Instead, it focused on moving goods and people—in a way that makes the most sense for our Nation, our States, our communities, and our economy. Its very title acknowledged a simple, yet important, aspect of transportation which had been previously overlooked—intermodalism. During this year's debate over reauthorization of ISTEA, it is imperative that we continue this tradition of intermodalism. We must continue the strong investments in transit and the flexibility provided in the first ISTEA.

Mr. President, this bill continues that tradition. I support it and I urge my colleagues to join me in doing so.●

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations on the Executive Calendar: Calendar Nos. 77, 82–89, 94–97, 113, 114, and all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Navy and Coast Guard.

I further ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, 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 considered and confirmed, en bloc, are as follows:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, United States Code, section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. John J. Batbie, Jr., 0000
Brig. Gen. Winfred N. Carroll, 0000
Brig. Gen. Dennis M. Gray, 0000
Brig. Gen. Grant R. Mulder, 0000
Brig. Gen. Virgil J. Toney, Jr., 0000

To be brigadier general

Col. William E. Albertson, 0000
Col. Paul R. Cooper, 0000
Col. Gerald P. Fitzgerald, 0000
Col. Patrick J. Gallagher, 0000
Col. Edward J. Mechenbier, 0000
Col. Jeffrey M. Musfeldt, 0000
Col. Allan R. Poulin, 0000
Col. Giuseppe P. Santaniello, 0000
Col. Robert B. Siegfried, 0000
Col. Robert C. Stumpf, 0000
Col. William E. Thomlinson, 0000

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer for appointment in the U.S. Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Claudia J. Kennedy, 0000

The following-named officer for appointment in the U.S. Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Tommy R. Franks, 0000

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the U.S. Marine Corps to the grade indicated under title 10, United States Code, section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Kevin B. Kuklok, 0000

The following-named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the U.S. Marine Corps to the grade indicated under title 10, United States Code, section 624:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Terrence P. Murray, 0000

The following-named officers for appointment in the Reserve of the U.S. Marine Corps to the grade indicated under title 10, United States Code, section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. James R. Battaglini, 0000
Col. James E. Cartwright, 0000
Col. Stephen A. Cheney, 0000
Col. Christopher Cortez, 0000
Col. Robert M. Flanagan, 0000
Col. John F. Goodman, 0000
Col. Gary H. Hughey, 0000
Col. Thomas S. Jones, 0000
Col. Richard L. Kelly, 0000
Col. Ralph E. Parker, Jr., 0000
Col. John F. Sattler, 0000
Col. William A. Whitlow, 0000
Col. Frances C. Wilson, 0000

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, United States Code, section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Karen A. Harmeyer, 0000

The following named officer for appointment as Judge Advocate General of the U.S. Navy and for appointment to the grade indicated under title 10, United States Commission, section 5148:

To be rear admiral

Capt. John D. Hutson, 0000

The following-named officer for appointment in the U.S. Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Lee F. Gunn, 0000

IN THE COAST GUARD

Vice Admiral Roger T. Rufe, U.S. Coast Guard, to be Commander, Atlantic Area, U.S. Coast Guard, with the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Rear Admiral James C. Card, U.S. Coast Guard, to be Commander, Pacific Area, U.S. Coast Guard, with the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

The following regular officers of the United States Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of rear admiral lower half:

Thomas J. Barrett
James D. Hull
John F. McGowan
George N. Naccara
Terry M. Cross

The following regular officers of the U.S. Coast Guard for the appointment to the grade of rear admiral lower half:

Robert C. North
Timothy W. Josiah
Fred L. Ames
Richard M. Larrabee, III
John T. Tozzi
Thomas H. Collins
Ernest R. Riutta

IN THE ARMY

The following U.S. Army Reserve officers for promotion in the Reserve of the Army to the grades indicated under title 10, United States Code, sections 14101.14315 and 12203(a):

To be major general

Brig. Gen. William F. Allen, 0000
Brig. Gen. Craig Bambrough, 0000
Brig. Gen. Peter A. Gannon, 0000
Brig. Gen. Francis R. Jordan, Jr., 0000

To be brigadier general

Col. James P. Collins, 0000
Col. William S. Crupe, 0000
Col. Alan V. Davis, 0000
Col. John F. Depue, 0000
Col. Bertie S. Duett, 0000
Col. Calvin D. Jaeger, 0000
Col. John S. Kasper, 0000
Col. Richard M. O'Meara, 0000
Col. James C. Price, 0000
Col. Richard O. Wightman, 0000

The following-named officer for appointment in the U.S. Army to the grade indicated under title 10, United States Code, section 624:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Gregory A. Rountree, 0000

IN THE COAST GUARD AND NAVY

Coast Guard nomination of Brenda K. Wolter, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 1997.

Coast Guard nominations beginning Kelley Elizabeth Abood, and ending Andrew James Wright, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 1997.

Navy nominations beginning Michael J. Bailey, and ending Stan A. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 25, 1997.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 49, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 49) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the resolution appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 49) was agreed to.

EXTENDING CERTAIN PRIVILEGES, EXEMPTIONS, AND IMMUNITIES TO HONG KONG ECONOMIC AND TRADE OFFICES

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar No. 49, S. 342.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 342) to extend certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to Hong Kong Economic and Trade Offices.

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. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read for the third time and passed, 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 bill (S. 342) was deemed read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 342

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PRIVILEGES, EXEMPTIONS, AND IMMUNITIES TO HONG KONG ECONOMIC AND TRADE OFFICES.

(a) APPLICATION OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IMMUNITIES ACT.—The provisions of the International Organizations Immunities Act (22 U.S.C. 288 et seq.) may be extended to the Hong Kong Economic and Trade Offices in the same manner, to the same extent, and subject to the same conditions as such provisions may be extended to a public international organization in which the United States participates pursuant to any treaty or under the authority of any Act of Congress authorizing such participation or making an appropriation for such participation.

(b) APPLICATION OF INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT ON CERTAIN STATE AND LOCAL TAXATION.—The President is authorized to apply the provisions of Article I of the Agreement on State and Local Taxation of Foreign Employees of Public International Organizations, done at Washington on April 21, 1994, to the Hong Kong Economic and Trade Offices.

(c) DEFINITION.—The term ''Hong Kong Economic and Trade Offices'' refers to Hong Kong's official economic and trade missions in the United States.

EXPRESSING CONCERN FOR THE CONTINUED DETERIORATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN AFGHANISTAN

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar No. 50, Senate Concurrent Resolution 6.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) expressing concern for the continued deterioration of human rights in Afghanistan and emphasizing the need for a peaceful political settlement in that country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment and an amendment to the preamble:

(The parts of the resolution intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets and the parts of the resolution intended to be inserted are shown in italic.)

S. CON. RES. 6

[Whereas Congress recognizes that the legacy of civil conflict in Afghanistan during the last 17 years has had a devastating effect on the civilian population in that country and a particularly negative impact on the rights and security of women and girls;

[Whereas the longstanding civil conflict in Afghanistan among the warring political and military factions has created an environment where the rights of women and girls are routinely violated;

[Whereas the Afghan forces led by Burhanuddin Rabbani and Abdul Rashid Dostum are responsible for numerous abhorrent human rights abuses, including the rape, sexual abuse, torture, abduction, and persecution of women and girls;

[Whereas Congress is disturbed by the upsurge of reported human rights abuses, including extreme restrictions placed on women and girls, since the Taliban coalition seized the capital city of Kabul;

[Whereas Afghanistan is a sovereign nation and must work to solve its internal disputes; and

[Whereas Afghanistan and the United States recognize international human rights conventions, such as the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights, which espouse respect for basic human rights of all individuals without regard to race, religion, ethnicity, or gender: Now, therefore, be it]

Whereas Congress recognizes that the legacy of civil conflict in Afghanistan during the last 17 years has had a devastating effect on the civilian population in that country, killing 2,000,000 people and displacing more than 7,000,000, and has had a particularly negative impact on the rights and security of women and girls;

Whereas the Department of State's Country Reports on Human Practices for 1996 states: "Serious human rights violations continue to occur[...] political killings, torture, rape, arbitrary detention, looting, abductions and kidnappings for ransom were committed by armed units, local commanders and rogue individuals.";

Whereas the Afghan forces affiliated with Burhanuddin Rabbani and Abdul Rashid Dostum are responsible for numerous abhorrent human rights abuses, including the rape, sexual abuse, torture, abduction, and persecution of women and girls;

Whereas Congress is disturbed by the upsurge of reported human rights abuses in Taliban-controlled territory, including extreme restrictions placed on women and girls;

Whereas the Taliban have provided safe haven to suspected terrorists and may be allowing terrorist training camps to operate in territory under its control;

Whereas Afghanistan is a sovereign nation and must work to solve its internal disputes; and

Whereas Afghanistan and the United States recognize international human rights conventions, such as the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, which espouse respect for basic human rights of all individuals without regard to race, religion, ethnicity, or gender: Now therefore, be it.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), [That (a) Congress hereby—

[(1) deplores the violations of international humanitarian law by the Taliban coalition in Afghanistan and raises concern over the reported cases of stoning, public executions, and street beatings;

[(2) condemns the Taliban's targeted discrimination against women and girls and expresses deep concern regarding the prohibition of employment and education for women and girls;

[(3) takes note of the recent armed conflict in Kabul, affirms the need for peace negotiations and expresses hope that the Afghan parties will agree to a cease-fire throughout the country.

[(b) It is the sense of Congress that the President should—

[(1) continue to monitor the human rights situation in Afghanistan and should call for an end to discrimination against women and girls in Afghanistan and for adherence by all factions in Afghanistan to international humanitarian law;

[(2) review United States policy with respect to Afghanistan if the Taliban coalition and others do not cease immediately the harassment and other discriminatory practices against women and girls;

[(3) encourage efforts to procure a durable peace in Afghanistan and should support the United Nations Special Mission to Afghanistan led by Norbert Holl to assist in brokering a peaceful resolution to years of conflict;

[(4) call upon the Government of Pakistan to use its good offices with the Taliban to reverse the Taliban's restrictive and discriminatory policies against women and girls;

[(5) call upon other nations to cease providing financial assistance, arms, and other kinds of support to the militaries or political organizations of any of the warring factions in Afghanistan.

[SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this concurrent resolution to the President with the request that he further transmit such copy to the United Nations and relevant parties in Afghanistan.]

That (a) Congress hereby—

(1) deplores the violations of international humanitarian law by the Taliban coalition in Afghanistan and raises concern over the reported cases of stoning, public executions, and street beatings;

(2) condemns the Taliban's targeted discrimination against women and girls and expresses deep concern regarding the prohibition of employment and education for women and girls;

(3) urges the Taliban and all other parties in Afghanistan to cease providing safe haven to suspected terrorists or permitting Afghan territory to be used for terrorist training; and

(4) takes note of the continued armed conflict in Afghanistan, affirms the need for peace negotiations and expresses hope that the Afghan parties will agree to a cease-fire throughout the country.

(b) It is the sense of Congress that the President should—

(1) continue to monitor the human rights situation in Afghanistan and should call for adherence by all factions in Afghanistan to international humanitarian law;

(2) call for an end to the systematic discrimination and harassment of women and girls in Afghanistan;

(3) encourage efforts to procure a durable peace in Afghanistan and should support the United Nations Special Mission to Afghanistan led by Norbert Holl to assist in brokering a peaceful resolution to years of conflict;

(4) call upon the Government of Pakistan to use its good offices with the Taliban to cease human rights violations, end provision of safe haven to terrorists and terrorist training camps, and reverse discriminatory policies against women and girls; and

(5) call upon other nations to cease providing financial assistance, arms, and other kinds of support to the militaries or political organizations of any of the warring factions in Afghanistan;

(6) undertake a review of United States policy toward Afghanistan.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this concurrent resolution to the President with the request that he further transmit such copy to the United Nations and relevant parties in Afghanistan.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote for Senate Concurrent Resolution 6—a resolution disapproving the alarming human rights conditions in Afghanistan and highlighting the deleterious effects increased political strife has had on Afghan women and girls.

Intensification of armed hostilities and the proliferation of human rights abuses have characterized Afghanistan for too long. In both the countryside and in urban areas nearly two decades of civil conflict and chaos have wreaked havoc and disaster on innocent Afghan civilians. And, unfortunately the likelihood of peace for Afghans seems to grow dimmer with each new political development.

After successfully ousting the Soviet military in 1992, foreign threats to peace were almost immediately replaced by civil threats. Rivalries among political and military Afghan intensified the civil turmoil. Regional conflicts reached a new level of severity in September 1996, after the Taliban coalition seized the capital city of Kabul.

Upon seizure of Kabul and approximately two-thirds of Afghanistan, the Taliban imposed extreme restrictions on civilians including banning music and books, and specifically prohibiting women and girls from working or attending school. Penalties for those who do not observe the Taliban's strict code of conduct have been extreme ranging from verbal abuse, street beatings, amputations, to death. Western journalists were quick to report the upsurge of human rights abuses, writing about the summary justice used to punish Afghans, and the unusually brutal methods by which the Taliban killed Mr. Najibullah the former President. Amnesty International and other non-governmental organizations reported on the severity of the human rights situation in Afghanistan and urged greater international attention. The United Nations created a special rapporteur on human rights in Afghanistan to monitor the situation more closely.

Among all the accounts of human rights abuses in Afghanistan what has been particularly disturbing to me is the treatment of women and girls. Though under the Taliban women are no longer treated as spoils of war, women and girls have been subjected to a series of extreme restrictions including the prohibition to work, attend school, or leave one's home during the day. Without the ability to work, mothers, many widowed due to armed conflict, have no means to support their families. Without the ability to leave their homes to buy food, clothing, attain medical attention, women are unable to care for themselves and their families. Without education, girls are not being taught how to read or write—basic skills necessary for adulthood. The conditions under which Afghan women and girls live is unacceptable, and I can think of no reasonable justification for such circumstances.

Taliban leaders have been quick to point out in their defense that other political and military factions have committed numerous other human rights abuses. The Taliban is right to point this out. And while it is true that, none of the political factions vying for power in Afghanistan have thus far demonstrated a commitment to uphold international standards of human rights or decency. This does not diminish the gravity of those abuses committed by the Taliban, or the obligation of the international community to speak out against such abuses.

The need for peace in Afghanistan is clear, but it is equally clear that peace will not be sustainable in an environment where human rights are routinely violated and disregarded. Internationally recognized rights such as freedom from torture, freedom of expression, and equality before the law regardless of race, gender, religion, or beliefs have long been absent in Afghanistan. Any ruling coalition, must know that the international community, and the United States in particular, will not turn a blind eye to a rights-abusive regime.

Though, we, in the United States, can not singlehandedly solve the crisis in Afghanistan, for that is a process which must take place internally, we can and should do something. As a first step I have offered this resolution—a sense of the Congress which emphasizes the plight of Afghan women and girls, expresses support for the United Nations-led peace negotiations, and recommends that the administration reevaluate United States policy toward Afghanistan.

I believe this resolution will send a strong message to the warring factions in Afghanistan that the United States is deeply concerned about the deteriorating human rights conditions. Further I hope this resolution will provide some hope to Afghan women and girls who silently disagree with the Taliban's code of conduct.

As the United States strongly supports an end to the armed conflict, we should emphasize that peace is not only defined by the absence of armed conflict but also the absence of human rights abuses. It has long been the experience of many other states that only with a rights-protective regime can there be any lasting prospects for peace.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 6, a resolution expressing concern over the continuing deterioration of the human rights situation in Afghanistan and calling on the United States and the international community to redouble efforts to bring peace to that war-torn land.

Indeed, with yesterday's announcement that the Taliban militia have apparently seized power in the northwestern province of Faryab, it is especially fitting that we consider this resolution today.

I am particularly concerned about the situation in Afghanistan because, with the seizure of power by the Taliban militia, it appears that another tragic chapter in the story of the suppression of women's rights is being written. Worse still, this situation has unfolded with scant international attention, let alone condemnation.

Afghanistan has been embroiled in an almost constant state of war for close to two decades.

From 1979 to 1989 the Mujahedeen fought and finally outlasted the invading army of the Soviet Union. Then the Muslim warriors turned on each other. Since 1979 more than 1 million of Afghanistan's 16 million inhabitants have been killed, and millions more have become refugees. The capitol city of Kabul has been obliterated by the factional fighting, with over 45,000 civilians killed, and almost every prominent building damaged or destroyed.

In the last 2 years of the seemingly endless Afghan civil war the Taliban—who grew from a movement of former religious students and Islamic clerics along the Afghan-Pakistani border—have emerged as the strongest of the five major factions. After beating back its rivals, the Taliban movement now control more than two-thirds of Afghanistan, including Kabul, which they captured last September.

With the ascendency of the Taliban, Afghanistan is experiencing a new conflict: What some warriors call true Islam, others, including the U.N. General Assembly, say is an abuse of human rights.

Although the peculiar version of Islamic religious Sharia law espoused by the Taliban has fallen harshly on many in Afghanistan—in Kandahar this past July a man and woman accused of adultery were stoned in public, men have been forced to grow beards, and Taliban militia members harass men in the streets if they do not rush to the mosques for prayers—women, in particular, have come to feel the full brunt of the new extremism.

Afghani women have been banned from work.

Women have been banished from school.

Reportedly, Taliban soldiers have been so threatening that some women have not left their homes for months.

But there is nothing in Afghan tradition that can account for the Taliban phenomenon. The type of secret-police state that they are fostering and the widespread denial of women's basic human rights has little precedent in Afghan culture or history.

The new brand of extremism fostered by the Taliban and their gross violations of women's basic human rights have pushed an already war-torn and war-weary Afghanistan to the brink of disaster.

It is estimated, for example, that close to 500,000 to 800,000 war widows have been forced out of their jobs and have no opportunity to earn money for food, clothing, or shelter for either themselves or their children. In Kabul's stark ruins hordes of children—12,000 according to one estimate—paw each day through the shattered bricks and masonry in search of scrap metal that can be sold. And their mothers, many who previously worked in professional jobs, have been reduced to begging in the hopes of being able to feed their children.

The ban on women in the workplace has also compounded the already precarious food situation. With the war having killed more than 9 million head of cattle and sheep and destroyed much of Afghanistan's croplands, irrigation systems, and roads, the average Afghan has a caloric intake equal to less than a pound of bread a day. Relief needs are so critical that the United Nations expects to have to feed one in five Kabul residents this year.

Ironically, many of the relief and other local humanitarian agencies find that they can no longer hire local women—many of whom are highly skilled. An orphanage in Kabul has reportedly lost all but 100 of its 450 employees, decimating its ability to provide food, education, and medical care to thousands of children. In fact, in light of the continuing conflict, U.N. development agencies in Afghanistan have recently put operations on hold until an assessment of the situation is complete.

It is little surprise that a recent U.N. report on human rights in Afghanistan concluded that "deprivation of basic rights and freedoms" are coupled with "newly emerging threats to basic rights," especially women's.

The silence from the world's capitols in light of these systematic abuses has been deafening. Former U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali warned the Taliban that the United Nations objects to the extreme discrimination practiced against women. The European Union's Minister to the U.N. Food Conference expressed "deep concern" over the situation. Theresa Loar, the State Department's senior coordinator for women's issues has assured us that the situation in Afghanistan is "very high on the United States agenda."

In the nuanced language of diplomacy, these milquetoast statements are the equivalent of an international shrug of the shoulders.

Where is the world's outrage? Fully half of Afghanistan's population cannot work for a living or be educated. The world has responded by issuing mild denunciations and turning away. This is unacceptable.

In calling for the President to monitor the human rights situation in Afghanistan, and the situation of women in particular, this resolution calls on the United States to play a leading role in the international community in raising the salience of respect for women's rights.

For too long and in too many other tragic circumstances we have remained silent, placing women's rights on a second tier of concerns in our conduct of international affairs. Other Muslim nations with which the United States enjoys good relations and which respect women's rights, such as Turkey and Indonesia, can provide much needed leadership in this area, and assist the United States in our diplomatic efforts. It is incumbent upon us to call upon the nations of the international community —regardless of religious persuasion or cultural heritage—to take a strong stand in recognition of fundamental rights of women.

Because the United States lacks significant influence in Afghanistan, this resolution calls on the administration to urge the other states in the region who do have influence to bring pressure to bear on the Taliban. In particular Pakistan—which has both elected the first female Prime Minister in the Islamic world and provided assistance to the Taliban—should cease to provide patronage to the Taliban and take a position at the forefront of international efforts to provide humanitarian assistance to Afghanistan.

This resolution also recognizes that the only long-term solution to the plight of the Afghani people is to help bring an end to the conflict that has created the Taliban, and to begin the long process of rebuilding a stable and prosperous Afghanistan. Food security, let alone the sort of long-term economic redevelopment that will be necessary to repair Afghanistan's battered infrastructure will not be possible unless both men and women are able to take up gainful employment and have equal access to educational opportunities.

To this end, this resolution calls for the members of the international community to cease activities, such as supplying weapons or financial assistance, to any of the warring factions in Afghanistan and encourages international efforts, especially that of the U.N. Special Mission, in procuring a durable and lasting peace in Afghanistan.

The treatment of Afghanistan's women should not be ignored. To continue to do so will send a dangerous message to others around the world who might violate the human rights of ethnic or religious minorities, or their own female populations.

I urge my colleagues to support Senate Concurrent Resolution 6, and send an important message to the Taliban and the entire international community regarding women's rights.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment be agreed to, the resolution be agreed to, the amendment to the preamble be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the resolution be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6), as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

CONGRATULATING THE REUNIFICATION OF JERUSALEM

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar No. 51, Senate Concurrent Resolution 21.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 21) congratulating the residents of Jerusalem and the people of Israel on the thirtieth anniversary of the reunification of that historic city, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the resolution be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 21) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, with its preamble, is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 21

Whereas for 3,000 years Jerusalem has been Judaism's holiest city and the focal point of Jewish religious devotion;

Whereas Jerusalem is also considered a holy city by members of other religious faiths;

Whereas there has been a continuous Jewish presence in Jerusalem for three millennia and a Jewish majority in the city since the 1840s;

Whereas the once thriving Jewish majority of the historic Old City of Jerusalem was driven out by force during the 1948 Arab-Israeli War;

Whereas from 1948 to 1967 Jerusalem was a divided city and Israeli citizens of all faiths as well as Jewish citizens of all states were denied access to holy sites in the area controlled by Jordan;

Whereas in 1967 Jerusalem was reunited by Israel during the conflict known as the Six Day War;

Whereas since 1967 Jerusalem has been a united city, and persons of all religious faiths have been guaranteed full access to holy sites within the city;

Whereas this year marks the thirtieth year that Jerusalem has been administered as a unified city in which the rights of all faiths have been respected and protected;

Whereas in 1990 the United States Senate and House of Representatives overwhelmingly adopted Senate Concurrent Resolution 106 and House Concurrent Resolution 290 declaring that Jerusalem, the capital of Israel, ''must remain an undivided city'' and calling on Israel and the Palestinians to undertake negotiations to resolve their differences;

Whereas Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin of Israel later cited Senate concurrent Resolution 106 as having ''helped our neighbors reach the negotiating table'' to produce the historic Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government Arrangements, signed in Washington on September 13, 1993; and

Whereas the Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–45) which became law on November 8, 1995, states as a matter of United States policy that Jerusalem should remain the undivided capital of Israel: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress—

(1) congratulates the residents of Jerusalem and the people of Israel on the thirtieth anniversary of the reunification of that historic city;

(2) strongly believes that Jerusalem must remain an undivided city in which the rights of every ethnic and religious group are protected as they have been by Israel during the past 30 years;

(3) calls upon the President and Secretary of State to publicly affirm as a matter of United States policy that Jerusalem must remain the undivided capital of the state of Israel; and

(4) urges United States officials to refrain from any actions that contradict United States law on this subject.

REGARDING THE TREATY OF MUTUAL COOPERATION AND SECURITY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND JAPAN

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar No. 52, Senate Resolution 58.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 58) to state the sense of the Senate that the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security Between the United States of America and Japan is essential for furthering the security interests of the United States, Japan, and the countries of the Asia-Pacific region, and that the people of Okinawa deserve recognition for their contributions toward ensuring the Treaty's implementation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the resolution be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 58) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, is as follows:

Whereas the Senate finds that the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security Between the United States of America and Japan is critical to the security interests of the United States, Japan and the countries of the Asian Pacific region;

Whereas the security relationship between the United States and Japan is the foundation for the security strategy of the United States in the Asia-Pacific region;

Whereas strong security ties between the two countries provide a key stabilizing influence in an uncertain post-cold war world;

Whereas this bilateral security relationship makes it possible for the United States and Japan to preserve their interests in the Asia-Pacific region;

Whereas forward-deployed forces of the United States are welcomed by allies of the United States in the region because such forces are critical for maintaining stability in the Asia-Pacific region;

Whereas regional stability has undergirded economic growth and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region;

Whereas the recognition by allies of the United States of the importance of United States armed forces for security in the Asia-Pacific region confers on the United States irreplaceable good will and diplomatic influence in that region;

Whereas Japan's host nation support is a key element in the ability of the United States to maintain forward-deployed forces in that country;

Whereas the Governments of the United States and Japan, in the Special Action Committee on Okinawa Final Report issued by the United States-Japan Security Consultative Committee established by the two countries, have made commitments to reducing the burdens of United States forces on the people of Okinawa;

Whereas such commitments will maintain the operational capability and readiness of United States forces;

Whereas the people of Okinawa have borne a disproportionate share of the burdens of United States military bases in Japan; and

Whereas gaining the understanding and support of the people of Okinawa in fulfilling these commitments is crucial to effective implementation of the Treaty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security Between the United States of America and Japan remains vital to the security interests of the United States and Japan, as well as the security interests of the countries of the Asia-Pacific region; and

(2) the people of Okinawa deserve special recognition and gratitude for their contributions toward ensuring the treaty's implementation and regional peace and stability.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 1997

Mr. GRASSLEY. 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 Wednesday, May 21. I further ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, immediately following the prayer, the routine requests through the morning hour be granted and that the Senate then immediately resume consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, the first concurrent budget resolution.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. I further ask unanimous consent that at 9:30 a.m., Senator KENNEDY, or his designee, be recognized to offer his amendment on tobacco taxes. Following the disposition of the Kennedy amendment, I ask unanimous consent that Senator GRAMM be recognized to offer his amendment regarding deficit neutral natural disaster relief.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, Senators can expect rollcall votes throughout Wednesday's session as the Senate attempts to complete work on the first concurrent budget resolution. The majority leader states that he is still hopeful that the Democratic leader will join him in an effort to yield back much of the statutory time limitation for the budget resolution. All Members will be notified accordingly as any votes are ordered with respect to any amendments to this important legislation. Again, on behalf of the majority leader, I want to remind all Members that this is the last week prior to the Memorial Day recess, so we will appreciate all Members' cooperation in scheduling of votes and of other floor action. The majority leader expresses thanks to all Members for their attention.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment, under the previous order, following the remarks of the Senator from Iowa.

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to speak briefly on the plan to pump up the Pentagon budget. This resolution jacks it up by $2.6 billion in budget authority.

Last year, by comparison, we were staring at a $10 to $12 billion increase in the defense budget.

I was very much opposed to such a large increase and did everything I could to block it all the way through the process. In the end, I failed.

This year's proposed defense add-on of $2.6 billion is relatively modest.

Mr. President, I do not intend to offer an amendment to kill the $2.6 billion add-on.

I know defense is a top priority in the agreement and the defense number constitutes a carefully crafted consensus. Like last year, however, I still think we should stick with the President's request.

The $265 billion requested by the President for defense is plenty to maintain a strong national defense—if the money is spent right. Unfortunately, that's not what happens. Some of it will be wasted.

The Pentagon is like a ravenous monster that has an insatiable appetite for money. I am afraid the $2.6 billion add-on will be frittered away on cold war relics.

Mr. President, I think we need to give the Pentagon some strict guidance about how the extra money may be spent. The Budget Committee could do it. The Armed Services Committee could do it. Or the Appropriations Committee could do it. Somebody needs to do it.

The language should stipulate that the extra money be used exclusively to maintain the force structure and combat readiness. Otherwise, the Pentagon bureaucrats are going to rob the readiness accounts to pay for modernization.

In recent years, DOD has consistently promised to pay for modernization with savings derived from lower infrastructure costs. But the promised savings have never materialized. So they rob the readiness accounts to get the money. We should not let that happen.

Mr. President, the highly touted Quadrennial Defense Review or QDR will not solve this problem. The QDR is just a smoke screen for the status quo. It's another cover for robbing the readiness accounts to pay for modernization. The QDR is simply a repeat of the Bottom-Up Review.

They douse the cold war programs with perfume to make them smell better, but it is still the same old stuff. We still have cold war programs hooked up to a post-cold war budget. This is a recipe for disaster.

The QDR tells us to keep spending money on all the cold war relics—like the F–22 fighter. The F–22 is an excellent case in point. The F–22 was designed to defeat a Soviet military threat that is now ancient history. And it's cost is spinnning out of control.

In 1991, we were told that we could buy 750 F–22's for $58 billion. Now we are told that far fewer F–22's will cost $6 billion more. The quantity drops by 40 percent and the price goes up by 10 percent. That's the Pentagon way.

Four hundred thirty-eight F–22's are now estimated to cost $64 billion total, and production hasn't even started yet. If current trends continue, the Air Force will be lucky to get 200 F–22's for $100 billion.

Mr. President, I think the F–22 is the threat. The F–22 has the potential for ruining the Air Force. It will eat away at Air Force fighter muscle and will totally demolish plans to modernize the fighter force.

With the F–22, the Air Force will be lucky to have 2 or 3 wings—total, versus its force of 20 wings today. During the Reagan years, we actually had 40 wings and planned for more.

Lockheed Martin CEO Norman Augustine put this problem in perspective in his book ''The Defense Revolution.''

I would like to quote from his book. He is an authority. He should know. This is what Mr. Augustine said:

> If the cost of tactical aircraft continues to increase as it has since the World War I Spad [airplane], a projection of the history of the defense budget over the past century leads to the calculation that in the year 2054 the entire U.S. defense budget will purchase exactly one aircraft.

The F–22 is a prime candidate for fulfilling Mr. Augustine's prophecy.

Mr. President, we need to reverse this trend. We should make sure the extra money is used to maintain combat readiness. The extra money should be used to buy more training, fuel, spare parts, and maintenance. And that's it.

Mr. President, we need to take some drastic action. The centerpiece of Mr. COHEN's QDR is the plan to retain a capability to fight two major regional conflicts or MRC's simultaneously. If we fail to protect readiness and force structure, Mr. COHEN's two MRC's will be nothing but a pipe dream.

Mr. President, I hope my colleagues on the defense committees will find a way to strike a better balance between readiness and modernization.

We must put well-trained, combat-ready troops ahead of obsolete programs.

That is the real choice. It is the only choice.

Mr. President, when I look at this budget agreement, I find myself playing Hamlet. I go back and forth, between all the good things, and all the bad things. And then I agonize over which way to go. To agree or not to agree. That is the question.

Usually when the leaders of the two parties get together on a budget agreement, it ends up being bad news. It means spending goes up for programs favored by each side. It is like a rising tide lifting all boats. And then the deficit is made to look OK. A little fairy dust produces a sudden windfall of revenues. This time it happens to be 225 billion dollars' worth.

I think back to the Rose Garden Budget in 1984 under President Reagan. And, the Andrews Air Force Base agreement in 1990. They were similar.

''Rising Tide'' agreements do two things. First, all the sacred cows get more money than they should. Second, accountability for those programs goes out the widow. Desperately needed reforms do not take place.

In 1984, we should have frozen the defense budget and demanded reforms. Instead we looked the other way. The freeze did not occur until the next year—with my amendment—and the reforms did not take place until 3 years later—with Nunn-Goldwater and the Packard Commission. By that time, we had already poured lots of money down a rathole.

In addition, with rising tide agreements, the budget enforcements we put in place are then violated. We saw that in 1990, when we gave Gramm-Rudman a fix. The only thing we fixed in that budget was the ability to overtax and overspend. Now, we're seeing another enforcement violated to accommodate the rising tide—and that's Exon-Grassley. If we violated budget enforcement before, why should we believe it won't happen again?

Meanwhile, in this budget, the absence of Medicare reform is deafening. A colossal structural nightmare is facing us just 15 years down the road. Especially in Medicare. Long-term reform is needed. Does this budget address that? No.

And the sacred cows? Two examples. One supported by my side of the aisle, another by the other side.

The cold war is over. But we need to spend an extra $2.6 billion this year for a defense budget that's still geared toward fighting the cold war. The same cold war that disappeared 10 years ago.

What the Pentagon should not do—but will do with this money—is buy a bunch of cold war relics, like the F–22 fighter. That money should be going into the readiness and training accounts. But it won't be. Because politics is more powerful than commonsense.

The Quadrennial Defense Review is simply a repeat of the Bottom-Up Review. It's a smokescreen to maintain the status quo, to plan for an obsolete war. Meanwhile, this is the same defense budget with 50 billion dollars' worth of unmatched disbursements, which cannot pass an audit, and whose financial records are in absolute chaos. We do not know what anything costs. It is hard to make rational decisions on bad information. It is a budget crying out for reform.

But that is OK. Because the other side of the aisle also has a few sacred cows crying out for reform. But we'll pump those up, too. Take AmeriCorps. Cannot pass an audit. Cannot even be audited. No accountability. In bad need of reform. We were shelling out $27,000 per volunteer. That is crazy.

So, last year we froze AmeriCorps and pushed for reforms. They have been promised, but not yet delivered. But this agreement would jeopardize reform and accountability at AmeriCorps. Instead of a freeze, plus reforms, this program will get an extra three-quarters of a billion dollars, plus no incentive to implement the promised reforms. And that hurts the efforts of many of us who have tried to save this program, but make sure the taxpayers are getting their money's worth.

Finally, there is the matter of the deficits. Under this agreement, they go up, and then they fall off the table. In other words, the only progress on deficit reduction comes in the last 2 years. This reflects that phenomenon I call the narcotic of optimism. We're still addicted to it. It is simply not realistic. But it sure feels good.

So that is a mountain of reasons why this agreement is bad. The reasons on the good side are not as impressive-sounding. But there are a couple of reasons.

First, even though the tide is rising, it does not mean we cannot push even harder for reforms, to make sure they take hold. We desperately need long-term Medicare reform. We have a responsibility to provide it. We cannot duck it. If it takes a bipartisan commission instead of a budget agreement, so be it.

But the most powerful reason, in my mind, in favor of this agreement, is that it is a bipartisan agreement of the leaders. When's the last time we saw that in this town? This is a first step, and only a first step. But it represents clearing a major, major hurdle—which was a lack of bipartisan cooperation. The importance of that accomplishment cannot be underestimated. And the desire of the American people to have us working together instead of fighting all the time also cannot be underestimated.

And so that means, even though I have a mountain of reasons to oppose this agreement, and even though the reasons for supporting it are the size of a mouse by comparison, it is a mouse that roars for us to take the first step.

And if we take that step, it means we are all the more obliged to pursue reforms in the meantime, and make sure we stick to the enforcement measures.

And so, Mr. President, I think ultimately the chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI, and the other leaders on both sides of the aisle are to be commended for taking a positive, yet very difficult first step toward addressing our fiscal problems. Even though I might disagree with much of this agreement, I look forward to supporting it, and then appealing to my colleagues over the next 5 years to keep us on track for two things: a balanced budget, and much needed program reforms.

THE CERTIFICATION PROCESS II

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, recently I spoke about the annual certification process on drug cooperation. I wanted to follow up on those remarks. As I noted then, I believe it is important to address some of the myths that have grown up around certification. I also believe that it is important to put on record why we need to keep this process.

One of the reasons often advanced for doing away with the certification process is that it just makes administrations lie.

Now, in the first place, I don't believe that this is true. But even if it were, I do not see changing a valid oversight requirement by Congress on the premise that compliance makes liars out of the administration. It seems to me that if there is a law and the administration isn't being honest, then you take steps to hold it responsible. You don't shrug your shoulders and throw away the law. Where would we be if we did that routinely? We might as well forget about oversight. We might as well legalize lying.

Like many of my colleagues, I have had problems with the executive branch. I am aware of misconduct, misfeasance, and downright lying by executive branch agencies and agents.

But I do not believe that simple differences of opinion or interpretation necessarily constitute lying. It is even possible to disagree over policy without calling someone a liar for disagreeing. Misguided perhaps.

It is possible, then, that the administration and Congress might disagree over a particular certification decision without jumping to conclusions about motive. It is also possible to have such differences without concluding that the only proper recourse is to scrap oversight efforts. Accountability is essential to our political process. This holds true even when there are serious disagreements about outcomes and procedures.

The recent certification decisions on Mexico and Colombia are cases in point. This last March 1, the President decided to again decertify Colombia. At the same time, he decided to fully certify Mexico. Both decisions caused concern in Congress. It is important to understand that there were lots of different concerns. Additionally, many of these concerns arose from contradictory opinions.

Some felt that if Colombia was decertified Mexico should have been. Others believed that if Mexico was certified then Colombia should have been. Still others believed that both should have gotten national interest waivers. Because none of these views were vindicated in the actual decision, many have drawn the conclusion that certification didn't work. Or they have concluded the administration lied. The answer in either case seems to be, ''dump certification.''

As I have already said, I don't think this is the right course. I believe the view is wrong on both substance and process.

In the first place, when we in Congress created the certification process, we did not create a pass/fail system. Nor did we create a system of shared outcomes. That is, we created a process that evaluated each country on its own merits in fighting drugs. Just like we don't give everyone in school the same grade if they performed differently, we don't base certification decisions on group behavior. We designed the process to permit nuanced decisions. We recognized the need to draw conclusions based not on single issues or purely momentary situations.

At the same time, we realized that without the push of law the administration, any administration, would likely not have made drugs a major foreign policy concern. In that sense, Congress had a healthy incredulity of administration motives. I remind my colleagues that it was a Democratic-controlled House and a Republican-controlled Senate that first passed certification during the tenure of a Republican President. We had a bipartisan wariness of the executive branch. It is, after all, the business of Congress to give administrations heck from time to time.

Initially, the administration resisted certification. It chose not to apply the standards in the law with any vigor. Indeed, the first countries to get decertified were all soft targets. Countries like Burma, Iran, and Syria.

These were countries we already disliked and with whom we had only limited dealings. Initially, no serious countries got decertified. Because of this history, a certain cynicism grew up around certification. There is also today an evident impatience with what is and must be a complex decision-making process.

That process has been around for 10 years. As with other cases, the longer the requirement has been on the books and the more Congress has insisted it be taken seriously, the more used and useful it has become. The process has gathered momentum. Last year, in fact, I asked the Congressional Research Service to review the merits of the certification process. That review, which is still available, makes clear how the certification process has matured and proved effective.

In the past several years, in fact, the list of countries decertified or given a national interest waiver has grown to include some real countries. Such countries as Nigeria, Colombia, Peru, Bolivia, and Pakistan. Countries with which we have a wide variety of interests apart from drugs. Just a few years ago, no one in Congress believed that any administration would ever decertify Colombia. Certainly there was a lot of sentiment in Congress that believed the evidence justified decertification. But the conviction was that it wouldn't happen. It did.

Not only has the standard been applied with more rigor, it has also encouraged greater cooperation from certified countries. All in all, more countries now take as a given that drug control must be an important element in their thinking.

That list includes the United States. To voluntarily choose to abandon such a tool out of a passing frustration is not very sound policy.

But, as the list of affected countries has grown to include more significant U.S. partners, the more controversial certification has become. This was to be expected. When Burma squawked, few in this country cared. Few people cared internationally. The military rulers of Burma had few friends. With Colombia affected and Mexico implicated, however, the noise level has gone up considerably. Both here and abroad.

To me, this indicates that certification is working. As I noted in an earlier statement, the fact that countries such as Colombia are complaining about our process is no sufficient reason to change it, much less throw it overboard.

Conversely, the fact that there was a difference of opinion on whether to certify Mexico or not, is also no sufficient reason to scuttle the boat.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in adjournment until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, May 21, 1997.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 9:10 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, May 21, 1997, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 20, 1997:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

A. PETER BURLEIGH, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE THE DEPUTY REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY, VICE EDWARD WILLIAM GNEHM, JR.

JAMES W. PARDEW, JR., OF VIRGINIA, FOR THE BANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS U.S. SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR MILITARY STABILIZATION IN THE BALKANS.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 20, 1997:

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JOHN J. BATBIE, JR., 0000
BRIG. GEN. WINFRED N. CARROLL, 0000
BRIG. GEN. DENNIS M. GRAY, 0000
BRIG. GEN. GRANT R. MULDER, 0000
BRIG. GEN. VIRGIL J. TONEY, JR., 0000

To be brigadier general

COL. WILLIAM E. ALBERTSON, 0000
COL. PAUL R. COOPER, 0000
COL. GERALD P. FITZGERALD, 0000
COL. PATRICK J. GALLAGHER, 0000
COL. EDWARD J. MECHENBIER, 0000
COL. JEFFREY M. MUSFELDT, 0000
COL. ALLAN R. POULIN, 0000
COL. GIUSEPPE P. SANTANIELLO, 0000
COL. ROBERT B. SIEGFRIED, 0000
COL. ROBERT C. STUMPF, 0000
COL. WILLIAM E. THOMLINSON, 0000

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE U.S. ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. CLAUDIA J. KENNEDY, 0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE U.S. ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. TOMMY R. FRANKS, 0000

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE U.S. ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be major general

BRIG GEN. KEVIN B. KUKLOK, 0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE U.S. MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. TERRENCE P. MURRAY, 0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE U.S. MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. JAMES R. BATTAGLINI, 0000
COL. JAMES E. CARTWRIGHT, 0000
COL. STEPHEN A. CHENEY, 0000
COL. CHRISTOPHER CORTEZ, 0000
COL. ROBERT M. FLANAGAN, 0000
COL. JOHN F. GOODMAN, 0000
COL. GARY H. HUGHEY, 0000
COL. THOMAS S. JONES, 0000
COL. RICHARD L. KELLY, 0000
COL. RALPH E. PARKER, JR., 0000
COL. JOHN F. SATTLER, 0000
COL. WILLIAM A. WHITLOW, 0000
COL. FRANCES C. WILSON, 0000

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. KAREN A. HARMEYER, 0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL OF THE U.S. NAVY AND FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 5148:

To be rear admiral

CAPT. JOHN D. HUTSON, 0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE U.S. NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. LEE F. GUNN, 0000

IN THE COAST GUARD

VICE ADMIRAL ROGER T. RUFE, U.S. COAST GUARD, TO BE COMMANDER, ATLANTIC AREA, U.S. COAST GUARD, WITH THE GRADE OF VICE ADMIRAL WHILE SO SERVING.

REAR ADMIRAL JAMES C. CARD, U.S. COAST GUARD, TO BE COMMANDER, PACIFIC AREA, U.S. COAST GUARD, WITH THE GRADE OF VICE ADMIRAL WHILE SO SERVING.

THE FOLLOWING REGULAR OFFICERS OF THE U.S. COAST GUARD FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE OF REAR ADMIRAL (LOWER HALF).

THOMAS J. BARRETT
JAMES D. HULL
JOHN F. MCGOWAN
GEORGE N. NACCARA
TERRY M. CROSS

THE FOLLOWING REGULAR OFFICERS OF THE U.S. COAST GUARD FOR THE APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF REAR ADMIRAL:

ROBERT C. NORTH
TIMOTHY W. JOSIAH
FRED L. AMES
RICHARD M. LARRABEE, III
JOHN T. TOZZI
THOMAS H. COLLINS
ERNEST R. RIUTTA

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING U.S. ARMY RESERVE OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTINS 14101, 14315 AND 12203(A):

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM F. ALLEN, 0000
BRIG. GEN. CRAIG BAMBROUGH, 0000
BRIG. GEN. PETER A. GANNON, 0000
BRIG. GEN. FRANCIS R. JORDAN, JR., 0000

To be brigadier general

COL. JAMES P. COLLINS, 0000
COL. WILLIAM S. CRUPE 0000
COL. ALAN V. DAVIS, 0000
COL. JOHN F. DEPUE, 0000
COL. BERTIE S. DUEITT, 0000
COL. CALVIN D. JAEGER, 0000
COL. JOHN S. KASPER, 0000
COL. RICHARD M. O'MEARA, 0000
COL. JAMES C. PRICE, 0000
COL. RICHARD O. WIGHTMAN, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE U.S. ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10 UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. GREGORY A. ROUNTREE, 0000

IN THE COAST GUARD

COAST GUARD NOMINATION OF BRENDA K. WOLTER, WHICH WAS RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF FEBRUARY 5, 1997.

COAST GUARD NOMINATIONS BEGINNING KELLEY ELIZABETH ABOOD, AND ENDING ANDREW JAMES WRIGHT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WAS RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF FEBRUARY 5, 1997.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING MICHAEL J. BAILEY, AND ENDING STAN A. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 25, 1997.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LITTLE LEAGUE VERSUS THE IRS

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, spring time has arrived and the IRS has left it's annual April 15 calling card, taking more than one-third of our earnings. As American as apple pie, kids have also hit the playing fields. But this time, the IRS is trying to steal home. In Orange County, CA, the IRS was trying to take away something as American as hotdogs and apple pie—the girl's softball team. Only after public outcry did the IRS back down and leave the softball team alone.

By proving once more to be a large and intrusive Federal bureaucracy, the IRS has illustrated its uncanny ability to punish the right things and reward the wrong things. It's simply astounding that criminals are skirting the system and being rewarded while our hometown little league team was so close to being wiped out.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to shut down the IRS for good. If it weren't for the nationwide attention the Fountain Valley Girl's Softball League received, the IRS would not have reversed its decision to seize the league's tangible assets. How many times are we going to let the IRS hurt us and our communities before we do something to reform our tax system?

Recently, I cosponsored legislation introduced by my colleagues, Representatives DAN SCHAEFFER (R–CO) and BILLY TAUZIN (R–LA), which would abolish the Internal Revenue Service and enact a national retail sales tax. With a national sales tax, there would be no need for the 136,000 IRS employees who give us the runaround, the 480 different and confusing tax forms and the 190,000 disputes between the IRS and taxpayers which result in legal action.

Mr. Speaker, by enacting this legislation, we would be free from the IRS for good. All consumers would pay a tax on everything they buy. Little league players, volunteers and criminals alike would pay their just taxes to the Federal Government. Nonprofit groups and small businesses would be free from compliance paperwork.

The time is now to make a change. It is time to bring down the IRS, not our softball leagues and community associations.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF PRESIDENT LEE TENG-HUI'S INAUGURATION

HON. MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, May 20, 1997, marks the first anniversary of President Lee Teng-hui's inauguration. I would like to take a brief moment to congratulate President Lee and the Taiwanese people for reaching this important democratic milestone.

Ever since martial law was lifted in 1987, Taiwan has moved inexorably toward political liberalization and the development of a truly multiparty democratic system. Last year, the Taiwanese people, for the first time in their history, directly elected their President.

Besides holding free and fair elections, Taiwan has liberalized its economy and reduced its trade surplus with the United States. As a leading member of the Asian Tigers, Taiwan has emerged as one of the world's top 15 trading entities and America's sixth largest trading partner. It should come as no surprise that the United States is today Taiwan's main foreign investor and trading partner, underscoring our special relationship.

The United States receives about 25 percent of Taiwan's exports, mostly in the form of manufactured electronic goods, textiles, and other consumer products. I believe that it is imperative for the United States to strengthen its political and economic ties with Taipei by supporting Taiwan's efforts to join the United Nations and other international organizations. Moreover, the United States must continue to support Taiwan's ability to purchase necessary weapon systems so that it can better defend itself from potential military threats from its more imposing and threatening neighbor to the west.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I salute the indomitable spirit of the Taiwanese people and commend them and President Lee on this important democratic anniversary.

TRIBUTE TO BEATRICE CASTIGLIA-CATULLO

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Beatrice Castiglia-Catullo, an outstanding individual who has dedicated her life to the care of those in need.

Mrs. Castiglia-Catullo is our Mother Teresa of the South Bronx. Her life is an example of kindness, selflessness, faithfulness, generosity, and fruitfulness.

While working as a charge nurse, Mrs. Castiglia-Catullo faced the enormous challenge of her demanding work, raising three children, taking care of her mother-in-law who was terminally ill, and managing the household.

Her faith in God provided her with the strength to meet her daily responsibilities. In response to her answered prayers, she decided to devote more time to helping others in the community.

Mrs. Castiglia-Catullo raised funds for the Sister Servants of Mary who had helped her in her difficult times. She also organized and became the first president of the Parkchester Chapter of Cancer Care, Inc., and founded the Medical Mission Aid Center at St. Raymond's Parish.

Being a nurse, Mrs. Castiglia-Catullo was well aware of the need to provide continuing services to patients who were discharged from the hospital without proper home care. In 1964, she founded a home attendant service to take care of elderly patients.

Mrs. Castiglia-Catullo decided to name the organization R.A.I.N., for Regional Aid for Interim Needs, after she looked up to the sky for God's inspiration and saw that it was raining. She devoted her time and her own financial resources to the care of her patients. In gratitude and admiration for her generosity, one of her patients made a $500 donation to the organization.

While still working at the hospital, Mrs. Castiglia-Catullo rented a space on Westchester Avenue to establish R.A.I.N. Through hard work and devotion she turned an office that held a desk, a chair, and a telephone, into an operation with a $33 million budget.

R.A.I.N. home attendant services now assists over 1,100 disabled, homebound, disadvantaged elderly and youth. The organization serves over 2,000 meals daily through 5 senior citizen centers, Meals-On-Wheels, and the 3–H Program.

In her personal life, Mrs. Castiglia-Catullo has been blessed with three successful children and nine grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me, the family of Beatrice Castiglia-Catullo, her friends, the people she has served, and the South Bronx community, in expressing our gratitude for her loving and longstanding service to the community.

INTRODUCTION OF THE MARRIED COUPLES HOME SALE EQUITY ACT

HON. DAVE WELDON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing the Married Couples Home Sale Equity Act. This bill will correct an inequity in the Tax Code that unfairly penalizes married couples.

Let's take Tom and Mary as an example. Tom and Mary have been married for 30 years and have lived in their home for 15 years. They are each over the age of 55 and have decided to sell their home now that their children are no longer at home. They want to move to a smaller home and use the money they have earned from the appreciation on their home for their retirement. They bought their home for $100,000 and it has appreciated to $350,000. When Tom and Mary sell their home, they are allowed a combined $125,000 exemption from capital gains taxes. This means they will have to pay capital gains taxes on the other $125,000.

Let's take the exact same situation except we will assume that Tom and Mary chose not to marry but decided to live together outside of the bond of marriage. When Tom and Mary sell the home they are each entitled to exempt $125,000 from capital gains taxes for a total of $250,000. Thus they are exempted from having to pay any taxes at all, even though they realized the same gain on their home. The only differing factor is that they are not married.

Our Government should be about the business of encouraging strong families, not penalizing them for staying married. We should do everything within our power to promote strong marriages and families. Correcting this inequity will help us do this.

My bill gives both a husband and a wife $125,000 each upon the sale of their home, thus raising from $125,000 to $250,000 the total exemption available to married couples. This is the same level of exemption nonmarried individuals are entitled to and its time we treated married couples equitably.

I encourage my colleagues to join me by cosponsoring this bill. Let's help America's families. Let's encourage marriage and the stability it brings to our society and our children.

SPECIAL TRIBUTE TO HONOR THE LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENTS OF RETIRED PHOTOGRAPHER, MAURICE SORRELL

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, Maurice Sorrell, a native Washingtonian, has been involved in photography in the D.C. area since the early 1950's. His interest in this medium was piqued as he observed his uncles, both amateur photographers, taking pictures of his parents. In 1947, determined to develop his skills, Mr. Sorrell enrolled in a 3-year photography course at the Department of Agriculture Graduate School which he completed in 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, in 1957, Mr. Sorrell was hired by the Pentagon as a photographer. As a result of discrimination, however, he was only permitted to work in the dark room. Maurice Sorrell left the Pentagon to work full-time as a freelance photographer and also worked as a photographer for the Johnson Publishing Co. Mr. Sorrell served as a mentor, colleague, and friend to the Exposure Group—the African American Photographers Association, Inc. in Washington, DC.

Mr. Speaker, Maurice Sorrell's photographs of black events graced the pages of the Washington Afro-American Newspaper. In 1961, through the efforts of the late Art Carter, publisher of the Afro-American Newspaper, and the late Louis Lautier, a national congressional correspondent, Mr. Sorrell was the first black photographer to gain admittance to the prestigious White House News Photographers Association. Mr. Sorrell traveled to more than 24 countries including 14 countries in Africa. He shot the World Series as well as NFL sporting events. He photographed inmates on death row and in the gas chamber at a Federal prison in North Carolina. He traveled aboard Air Force One and covered six Presidents. Maurice Sorrell traveled throughout the South with Lady Bird Johnson taking pictures of ''poverty.'' He covered the march to Selma, AL. He was in Memphis, TN, covering the garbage worker's strike when Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was assassinated. It was Maurice Sorrell who took the first group photograph of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this body join me in a salute to this photographer, this historian and the magnificent sum of his accomplishments.

FITTING WORDS HONORING DICK FITTON

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, Richard J. Fitton retired as chairman of the board of First Financial Bancorp on April 22, 1997. Today, I rise to honor Dick Fitton, a man for whom I have a tremendous amount of admiration and respect.

Dick began his banking career in 1952 as a management trainee for First National Bank and Trust Co. in Hamilton, OH. In 1965, he was elected to the bank's board of directors, and became president and chief executive officer the following year. He led management in the formation of First Financial Bancorp in April 1983 and served as the holding company's president and chief executive officer. In 1991, he retired as president of First Financial Bancorp and was elected chairman of the board. His retirement from day-to-day banking activities came in 1992 when he relinquished his duties as chief executive officer of First Financial Bancorp. During his distinguished banking career, Dick served on the board of directors of the American Bankers Association, the Ohio Bankers Association, and the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland—Cincinnati Branch.

As a lifelong resident of Hamilton, OH, Dick is one of this city's most respected and admired citizens. His continual commitment to the community and its people is an inspiration to all who know him. Dick carries with him a belief that his work is not finished until his community is better off. He has been a primary supporter of Ft. Hamilton-Hughes Memorial Hospital, Junior Achievement, the United Way, and the Hamilton Community Foundation. He has worked on many community projects that have benefited the city of Hamilton greatly, including the formation of Miami University's Hamilton campus, the Hamiltonian Hotel, and the low-level dam on the Great Miami River. His work on these projects, and others, have made his name synonymous with Hamilton, OH.

Mr. Speaker, Hamilton, OH, would not be the city it is today had it not been for the lifelong commitment that Dick Fitton has put forth to this community's development. He is a friend and a citizen we can all be proud of.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THOMAS M. CLIFTON

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Thomas M. Clifton, chief of the Totowa, NJ, Police Department on his retirement after nearly four decades of dedicated and distinguished public service. Chief Clifton will be honored by his friends and colleagues at a retirement dinner tomorrow night. There will be a great outpouring of deepest appreciation for his years of service. He has been a leading figure in keeping Totowa a safe community—the sort of place where you can raise a family, own a business, and build friendships that last a lifetime.

Born in New York City, Chief Clifton grew up in Paterson, where he graduated from the Paterson Technical and Vocational High School. Chief Clifton joined the U.S. Navy Reserve for 2½ years at age 17, followed by a 4-year, regular-duty enlistment in the Air Force. He attained the rank of staff sergeant before his honorable discharge in 1955.

Returning to civilian life, Chief Clifton began his career in law enforcement in 1956 when he became a part-time police marshal with the Totowa Police Department. He was appointed as a regular patrolman in 1957, under the command of the late Chief James C. Pellington.

Chief Clifton made detective in 1968, and a series of rapid promotions followed. He became a sergeant in less than a year and was named detective bureau commander, with the rank of lieutenant, in 1971. He was promoted to detective captain in 1977, and 3 years later became deputy chief. He served in that post for a decade before becoming chief of police in March 1990.

While Chief Clifton spent the later years of his career in police management, he was active in the police union during his earlier days. He joined the Policemen's Benevolent Association in 1958, and served from 1963 to 1969, as the New Jersey State delegate for Local 80, which included the police departments of Totowa, West Paterson, Little Falls, Pequannock, and the Passaic County Park Police.

Married to the former Dorothy V. Darby, Chief Clifton and Mrs. Clifton are the proud parents of six children and nine grandchildren.

We place our full trust in police officers like Chief Clifton to protect our lives, families, children, neighbors, and property on a daily basis. The citizens of Totowa are extremely grateful for the dedication and professionalism that have been the hallmarks of Chief Clifton. His strong leadership has ensured that members of the Totowa Police Department have been among the finest in the communities that make up the Fifth Congressional District.

TRIBUTE TO JAKE POWERS

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to revise and extend my remarks about an extraordinary member of the Worcester, MA, community, Jake Powers.

For literally decades in the city of Worcester, men and women and children of all ages have benefited from the leadership, vision, and organizational skills of Jake Powers and his special commitment to community service.

In the 1950's, Jake Powers organized a summer basketball league—which at the peak of its popularity attracted more than 12,000 fans annually. In the 1960's, Jake Powers created the Worcester Park Touch Football League which at one time had 2,500 participants each year and 5,000 spectators during the annual super bowl.

Remarkably, over a 20-plus-year period, Jake Powers' determination and commonsense strategies raised more than $400,000 for the Mercy Center for Developmental Disabilities.

Then in the 1970's, he participated in the creation of the Stan Musial Baseball League and was the vice chairperson of the Irish Celtic Cross Memorial which is on the grounds of city hall.

Jake Powers is the acknowledged historian in Worcester of all subjects with an Irish theme.

And legend has it that this gentleman once removed a manhole cover and inserted a canoe at the basin of the Blackstone Canal. Jake Powers paddled under the streets of Worcester—for educational purposes—to study the structure of the canal which was built by Irish immigrants. Fortunately for so many of us, Jake didn't get lost on that occasion.

Jake's family includes his wonderful wife Martha and the proverbial apples of their eyes, Michael, Mary, and Kathy.

On behalf of Jake Powers' numerous students, fans, admirers, and beneficiaries of his lifetime efforts, I am inserting John Dempsey's column of May 16 from the Worcester Telegram & Gazette:

SORRY, JAKE, JUST GRIN AND BEAR IT

I'm pretty sure that Jake Powers does crack a smile now and then.

I figure he indulges in one occasionally with members of his family, or perhaps with some particularly close colleague. As for my own experience, all I can say is that I've known him for years and the closest thing to a smile I've seen on his long, lugubrious Irish face was a wry smirk.

Which isn't to say that he lacks a sense of humor. On the contrary, Powers wields a keen and waspish wit. It's as dry as a dowager's martini, and by the time you get the joke the conversation has often moved on to the next topic.

But Mr. Smiley-face, he's not.

Powers is formally known as Vincent E. Powers, professor of history at Worcester State College. But you'd have to go back even further than his last full-face grin to find anyone who actually uses his real name. The ''Jake'' dates back more than half a century to his boyish summer days in the outfield, when his Lincoln Street buddies named him for some now long-forgotten baseball star. It stuck, but good.

His mother always loathed the nickname, refusing to pass on messages directed to Jake Powers. Her little boy was named Vincent, if you don't mind. There was nobody in her house by the name of Jake.

Powers is a legend in Worcester. He'll hate me for saying that, firstly because he loathes the kind of facile hagiographic stuff that too often makes its way into the newspaper, and, secondly, because as a former athlete he believes that games are won by teams, not individuals.

REVERED BY STUDENTS

But his achievements are undeniable. Former students revere his ability to ground the study of history in the reality of the city around them, and he is known for guiding graduates in their careers long after they have left his classroom. Powers, along with friend Edwin Butcher Jr., has long managed the city's huge parks football program, which over the past 20 years has raised one-third of a million dollar for the Mercy Center.

Along with North High classmate John J. Conte, now Worcester district attorney, Powers built up the basketball program at Crompton Park, which in its heyday drew thousands of fans.

Most importantly, without Jake Powers there would be next to no working-class history of Worcester. He pioneered research into the Irish immigrants who came here decades before the potato blight to build canals and railways. He knows Worcester inside-out, from the days when cows grazed on the Common, through its times of glory as a surging industrial power, right down to today, as the city uncertainly edges toward a post-industrial redefinition of itself.

Anyway, Powers is 67 now, and his many friends, former students and football and baseball players figured it was time for a tribute. So they've arranged a big bash Thursday at Wachusett Country Club. ''He's always been a behind-the-scenes guy,'' said Walter Shea. ''He's always done things for others, and was never really recognized.''

The organizers thought Powers wouldn't be crazy about the idea—and they were absolutely right. But they went ahead anyway.

''One committee member is in the state police,'' Shea said, ''so we figure we'll get Jake there even if we have to have the cops detain him.''

They won't have to go that far, but Powers is still ticked off by the whole affair. This week he is trying to correct final exams and put together a summer baseball schedule, and the last thing he needed was some dumb appreciation night he didn't ask for anyway.

''I'm not sure what this damn testimonial is for,'' he said. ''I don't even know what to call it. It's not a retirement party, because I'm not retiring. It's not a wake, because I'm not dead. If you say it's for coaching, well, I had good players. If it's for teaching, I had good students. For the sports programs, I had good people around me. No one person does it all. People exist in a social network, and they depend on the ability and cooperation of all involved.''

Come on, Jake, I said. You have to admit that you're this unusual blend of jock and academic.

Wrong approach.

''I don't like labels,'' he said. ''I like sports, but I resent being categorized as a jock. And I dislike the notion that if you're an academic you're somehow effete, intellectual and nonphysical.''

Jake, I said, won't you at least try to have a good time?

He chuckled. ''Oh, I guess I'll be able to enjoy myself,'' he granted.

In his own way, of course.

''He's got that expression, 'I'm not going to crack a smile no matter what,''' said Shea. ''It'll make no difference if we use a video or a still camera for the benefit—all the photos of Jake will come out looking like still pictures.''

IN RECOGNITION OF CARMEN PAPALE

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the contributions of Carmen Papale who will retire next week as manager and international vice president of the Union of Needletrades, Industrial and Textile Employees.

Mr. Papale was born and raised in Baltimore and went to work in the men's clothing industry as a cutter at Haas Tailoring Co. in 1965 rising to the level of shop steward. As many Members of the House may know, Haas Tailoring is the place to order custom suits. Haas produces the finest American made custom suits and over the years has served a diverse clientele, ranging from many members of the Baltimore Ravens, to Ambassadors and members of the diplomatic corps, to Tiger Woods. Carmen Papale was part of that fine tradition.

Carmen left Haas and went to work for the Baltimore Regional Joint Board in July 1973 as an organizer and soon was promoted to business agent representing members in shops in Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia. He was elected vice president of the International Union, the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers. He has been reelected to this position at every national convention since 1982. In addition, Mr. Papale has served as comanager and then manager of the Baltimore Regional Joint Board since 1982 and serves as chair of the board of trustees of the Board Health and Welfare Fund, as well as a member of the board of directors of the Amalgamated Bank of New York and on the executive board of the Maryland State and D.C. AFL–CIO.

To say that Mr. Papale retires from a lifetime of commitment to the working people of this country is an understatement. Carmen has seen and participated in great changes in the conditions under which clothing workers labor. He has also fought with all his heart his industry's abandonment of the great manufacturing centers of America for cheap labor around the world.

Over the years, Carmen has offered me his good counsel on many national and local issues. We have not always agreed, but I have always tremendously valued the wisdom, knowledge, and caring for the working men and women of this Nation that his words impart. While I wish Carmen the best in a well deserved retirement, I also hope to continue benefiting from his advice for years to come.

I hope other Members of the House will join me today in thanking Carmen Papale for all his work in the labor movement of this Nation. His efforts will be missed; his shoes hard to fill.

TRIBUTE TO BENJAMIN AND VERONICA DePHILLIPS ON THEIR 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate Benjamin and Veronica DePhillips on their 50 years of marriage. Benjamin and Veronica DePhillips are constituents of mine from Chicago, IL.

On June 15, 1947, Benjamin and Veronica took their vows at Five Holy Martyrs in Chicago, IL. This June marks 50 years of sharing their lives, dreams, work, struggles, and commitment to each other. The DePhillips were blessed with four fine children: Russell, Brian, Tina, and Kevin. Also, Benjamin and Veronica are the proud grandparents of two wonderful grandchildren, Danielle and Christopher.

The DePhillips have been members of the 23d ward for over 44 years. Now retired, Mrs. DePhillips worked at the Park District and Mr. DePhillips worked at the Department of Transportation in Illinois. Their devotion to the community and to each other is evident.

Mr. Speaker, the occasion of a 50-year wedding anniversary is truly worthy of a great celebration and I am pleased to offer my most hearty congratulations to the DePhillips on the occasion of their 50th wedding anniversary.

IN RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL MARITIME DAY

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the gallant men who served in World War II in the United States Maritime Service. One of my constituents, Sol Axelrod, who himself is a veteran, wrote a poem, which he feels tells the true story of our merchant seamen.

At this time, I wish to share this fine poem with my colleagues:

SEA GOING AMERICAN PATRIOTS OF WORLD WAR II

(By Sol Axelrod)

The Merchant Seamen and the Navy Armed Guard
Fought valiantly with the help of God.

These brave lads brought soldiers to fight
When men were wanted at a combat site.

It was never easy or even routine
To sail the waters where death reigned supreme.

They roamed this world with cargo intact,
Even mindful of any enemy attack.

When supplies were needed, without delay,
They were delivered by night and by day.

As the battles turned hot,
Some got through, many did not.

Heroes all, in death as in life,
Doing their duty in time of strife.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and distinct honor to bring this dedication and recognition to the attention of the House of Representatives. I ask all my colleagues to join me in saluting our Merchant Seamen whose role in World War II was vital to all of our troops, and in applauding the commitment and talent of my constituent, Sol Axelrod.

THE RIEGLE-NEAL CLARIFICATION ACT OF 1997

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of the Congress and the Nation the concerns of the National Conference of State Legislatures with regard to H.R. 1306, the Riegle-Neal Clarification Act of 1997, which the House will consider today under suspension of the rules. H.R. 1306 was introduced on April 10, 1997, and referred to the Banking Committee where it was approved by voice vote in subcommittee with no full committee markup. As the NCSL letter notes, this legislation would negatively affect the ability of State legislatures to regulate the sale of the insurance products when those sales are conducted through banks. As most Members are aware, the Comptroller of the Currency presently is considering whether to preempt a statute enacted by the State of Rhode Island. I am inserting in the RECORD copies of the NCSL letter and the comment letter I signed with 11 other House colleagues critical of the OCC proposal. We have been afforded insufficient time and process to consider the negative implications of H.R. 1306 on consumer protection and fair competition. I remain concerned about these issues and trust that our Senate colleagues will address these matters with more deliberation than has the House.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATE LEGISLATURES
May 16, 1997.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DINGELL: We write to you today to reiterate the concerns of the National Conference of State Legislatures with regard to H.R. 1306, the ''Riegle-Neal Clarification Act of 1997,'' which will be considered on Suspension Calendar during the week of May 19th. You may have heard from certain sources that NCSL had withdrawn its opposition to H.R. 1306. We want to make clear that this is simply not true.

The National Conference of State Legislatures has long been a proponent of our nation's dual banking system and the benefits of that system to our nation's financial well being. In recognition of the advantages of the dual banking system to the public and to the health of the financial services industry, NCSL historically has opposed any efforts by the federal government to restrict state authority to charter, supervise or regulate the powers of state-chartered banks and thrifts. For this reason we must oppose H.R. 1306. The legislation would alter the intent of Congress as embodied in the Reigle-Neal Interstate Banking and Branching Efficiency Act of 1994, which set specific parameters for the branching of state chartered banks across state lines. For the 45 state legislatures which voted to ''opt-in'' to interstate bank branching, this would significantly change the ground rules which they accepted in allowing their states to host branches of banks from another state.

Let us provide one example of the impact of H.R. 1306 on the authority of state legislatures. The Rhode Island General Assembly has passed legislation which sets the requirements that all banks must follow in the sale of insurance products. At present the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) is considering preempting this legislation's applicability to national banks. Should this happen, under H.R. 1306, the Rhode Island statute would not apply to branches of state-chartered banks from other states doing business in the State of Rhode Island. The Rhode Island law would only apply to those state banks chartered in Rhode Island. This would cause an unfair competitive disadvantage for Rhode Island state banks and thus limit the ability of state legislative authority. It does not take any stretch of the imagination to understand that should H.R. 1306 be enacted in its present form the OCC will soon be the sole arbiter of banking law and regulation.

As state legislators we are as concerned about the financial viability of our state banking systems, as are state banking supervisors and governors. We are well aware of the enormous contributions that state banks have made to the economic vitality of our states and we seek to continue working with our states' governors to ensure the viability of the dual banking system. However, we must also be concerned that state chartered banks which have no desire to branch across state lines are not placed at a competitive disadvantage. Of the over 7,000 state chartered banks, less than 30% have assets over $100 million and therefore are not likely candidates to branch across state lines. Most state banks are small community banks which have well served our nation's cities and rural areas and have been the economic backbone of our country for over one hundred years. They are the banks which have responded time and time again to our communities economic needs. They have no desire to become a multinational financial giant, branching from coast to coast. As elected state officials we have an obligation to these smaller community states banks and their customers that efforts such as H.R. 1306, geared to the top 30% of state banks, do not place unfair burdens on the vast majority of our state banking industry.

During the mark-up by the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, NCSL offered reasonable amendments to the legislation which would have provided sufficient accountability to host state legislatures and most importantly its citizens. Unfortunately, the Subcommittee did not accept our changes. Therefore, we must once again declare our opposition to H.R. 1306. We respectfully request that you abide by the commitment made by a previous Congress and we would ask that until some accountability is restored to the host state, you vote no on H.R. 1306.

Thank you for this opportunity to make clear NCSL's position on this important legislation.

Sincerely.

BILL SCHROEDER,
Senate Majority Chairman—Colorado, Vice Chair, NCSL Commerce & Communications Committee.

MYRA JONES
Chair, House City, County & Local Affairs—Arkansas, Vice Chair, NCSL Commerce & Communications Committee.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, February 6, 1997.

Re Docket No. 97–01, 62 FR 1950 (January 14, 1997) Preemption Determination.

Hon. EUGENE A. LUDWIG,
Comptroller of the Currency,
Washington, DC.

DEAR COMPTROLLER LUDWIG: We are writing in response to the above-referenced request for written comments on whether the ''Financial Institution Insurance Sales Act,'' recently enacted by the State of Rhode Island, should be preempted by Section 92 of the National Bank Act.

The Act does not prevent banks from selling insurance. The Rhode Island State legislature passed this Act to remove Rhode Island's statutory ban on the sale of insurance by state-chartered banks. The legislation also is a valid exercise of that State's right to regulate the business of insurance by protecting consumers from unfair trade practices and providing a level playing field for all sellers of insurance products. For example, section 6 of the bill prohibits the illegal tying of the sale of an insurance product to the extension of credit and section 7 of the bill requires disclosure to consumers that an insurance product is not a deposit and is not federally insured. This legislation is the result of extensive negotiations with representatives of Rhode Island's federally-chartered and state-chartered banks.

The public has a substantial interest in the continued functional regulation of insurance by the States, regardless of who is conducting the activities. We support the principles of State's rights, functional regulation, and fair and reasonable consumer protection. We support the Rhode Island law and believe that it meets the standard established by the decision in *Barnett Bank* v. *Nelson* 116 S.Ct. 1103 (1996).

The Act authorizes the Department of Business Regulation's commissioner of banking to promulgate regulations to implement the sale of insurance under the Act and ''to ensure the safety and soundness of the banking and insurance business.'' Your notice and request for comment makes no mention of the implementing regulations drafted by the Rhode Island Department of Business Regulation and that are pending a February 10, 1997 hearing before that Department and possible further revisions before finalization. As legislators we are outraged at your efforts to usurp the authority and subvert the processes of an elected State legislature that is engaged in valid lawmaking.

We strongly urge you not to act to preempt the Rhode Island Financial Institution Insurance Sales Act.

Sincerely,
John D. Dingell, Tim Holden, Earl Pomeroy, Bobby Rush, Collin C. Peterson, David Minge, Edward J. Markey, John S. Tanner, Gary Condit, Ron Klink, Anna G. Eshoo, Gene Green.

NATIONAL ORGANIZATION OF WOMEN HONORS SEVEN

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the accomplishments of seven outstanding women who exemplify the best that the legal profession has to offer. These women will be honored next week by the New York City National Organization for Women because they have displayed the intelligence and perseverance that is absolutely essential to be a successful attorney, and possess an unswerving dedication to advancing the rights of women in society.

Janet Benshoof is one of the premier experts on reproductive rights and privacy law in America. As the founder and president of the Center for Reproductive Law and Policy, she had been involved in most of the landmark Supreme Court cases involving reproductive rights. Ms. Benshoof had been previously honored by the MacArthur Foundation Fellowship and by the National Law Journal as 1 of the 100 most influential lawyers in America.

Sylvia Law is the Elizabeth Dollard professor of law, medicine and psychiatry and codirector of the Arthur Garfield Hays Program at New York University Law School. She has been involved with many landmark cases, including Goldberg versus Kelly, in which the Supreme Court recognized that welfare is an entitlement that cannot be discontinued without reason or an opportunity to protest. She is also the author of several books and articles on jurisprudence, welfare, and health care policy.

Donna Lieberman is founder and director of the New York Civil Liberties Union's reproductive rights project, and one of the leaders of the New York pro-choice movement. She has broadened the base of the reproductive rights movement, linking reproductive rights with the issues of HIV/AIDS prevention, gender equity, and education.

Elizabeth Mason has gained national recognition in her representation of victims of sexual harassment and violence in the workplace. Elizabeth has been instrumental in drafting legislation to guarantee an employee's right to seek relief against an employer if she is sexually assaulted in the workplace.

Valorie Vodjik argued the groundbreaking Supreme Court decision that overturned the 152-year-old male-only admission policy at the Citadel. In that case she won the opportunity for women to obtain an undergraduate, military-style education. Ms. Vodjik is an expert on sexual discrimination and supervised the NYU sexual harassment law clinic.

As the U.S. attorney for the southern district of New York, Mary Jo White is a preeminent role model for women. Under her leadership, the U.S. attorney's office has prosecuted large-scale securities and financial frauds, other white collar offenses, international terrorism, money laundering, official corruption, organized crime, and drug trafficking. Her leadership has led to the dismantling of some of the largest and most violent gangs in New York.

Patricia J. Williams is an internationally renowned expert on race relations and women's studies. She is a professor at the Columbia University School of Law and the author of a number of books, including ''The Alchemy of Race and Rights: Diary of a Law Professor.'' She wrote an amicus brief in support of planned parenthood in the Supreme Court case of Planned Parenthood versus Casey.

Mr. Speaker, these seven women together have changed the course of the women's rights movement in America. Almost every woman in America has benefited from their actions. I am truly honored to recognize their accomplishments in the U.S. House of Representatives.

HONORING THE TRI-STATE CHRISTIAN DAY CARE AND PRESCHOOL CENTER

HON. ROBERT W. NEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Tri-State Christian Day Care and Preschool Center in St. Clairsville, OH, on the occasion of their first child care appreciation ceremony as part of National Child Care Week in March.

The teachers and child care providers, under the direction of Pastor E. Keith Stevens and Administrator Connie Patton, are dedicated to providing a caring, learning environment for the many children who attend the Tri-State Christian Day Care Center. Today, there are many demands and responsibilities parents must balance while raising their children, and it is often necessary for both mothers and fathers to work to support their homes and their families. It is comforting for parents to know that their children are safe and being cared for by dedicated teachers, volunteers, and aides.

The Tri-State Christian Day Care and Preschool Center plays an important role in the lives of their students and the children who attend their day care center. The teachers and volunteers at Tri-State share a commitment to the child care ministry and to teaching God's word to the children who attend the day care and preschool center. As a parent, I am thankful that there are facilities like Tri-State Christian Day Care and Preschool Center which provide this important service to families and children.

I would like to thank the Tri-State Christian Day Care and Preschool Center for inviting me to attend their first child care appreciation ceremony and see the excellent services they provide for Ohio Valley families. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Tri-State, and child care centers like Tri-State, that are helping families by providing a caring atmosphere for children to learn and grow. I wish them continued success.

IS COSCO STRATEGIC THREAT

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, does the possible presence of the Chinese Ocean Shipping Co. [Cosco] in an American port represent a strategic threat to United States interests?

That is what I've asked Navy Secretary John Dalton to determine. Given the efforts of the People's Republic of China to manipulate American elections, given the PRC's success in securing ports on both sides of the Panama Canal, given the continued absences of human rights in China and the continued trade deficits we face with that country, I believe it is a fair question and one that we are obliged to ask as Members of Congress.

I place in today's RECORD a recent Washington Times story explaining, if such an explanation were necessary, why America should be concerned with the proposal to give

China the former Navy base at Long Beach, and the unseemly help by the Clinton administration in facilitating the deal.

[From the Washington Times]

SOLOMON: IS COSCO ''STRATEGIC THREAT?'' LONG BEACH DEAL TRIGGERS CONCERN

(By Rowan Scarborough)

A senior House Republican yesterday asked Navy Secretary John H. Dalton to report whether the Chinese Ocean Shipping Co. (Cosco) represents a ''global tactical or strategic threat'' to the Navy.

The effort by Rep. Gerald B.H. Solomon, chairman of the House Rules Committee, to force the Navy to make an assessment is the latest development in a campaign to block Cosco from taking over the abandoned Long Beach Naval Station in California.

''In order to understand the magnitude of the growing threat of the PRC [People's Republic of China], I would like you to state the U.S. Navy's position on [Cosco],'' Mr. Solomon, New York Republican, wrote in a one-page letter to Mr. Dalton.

''Considering their potential world-wide information gathering capabilities, a history as the delivery system of weapons of mass destruction to terrorist countries and the size of this fleet under direct control of the communist regime—does Cosco pose a potential global tactical or strategic threat against the U.S. Navy?''

The Solomon letter represents a more specific question for the Navy. Before, congressional inquiries have centered on whether Cosco at Long Beach would be a regional threat. The congressman wants to know if Cosco, and its 600-ship fleet, poses a danger to the Navy itself.

Mr. Solomon was one of the first in Congress to speak out against the Chinese-Long Beach connection.

''This is almost a caricature of Lenin's prediction that the West will hand the rope to its Communist executioners,'' he said March 10. ''The Clinton administration seems to be going out of its way to help the most serious threat to American security, the so-called People's Republic of China.''

Cosco plans to lease 144 acres to operate a large container terminal, giving Beijing an important beach-head in making Cosco one of the world's largest carriers.

Lawmakers in recent weeks have emerged from closed-door intelligence briefings with conflicting interpretations.

Conservatives who oppose the deal say the intelligence shows Cosco is a tool of the Chinese People's Liberation Army, trafficking in weapons of mass destruction to known terrorist states such as Iran.

But local Long Beach legislators say the briefings show Cosco is not a threat.

President Clinton personally backed the city of Long Beach's overture to Cosco, after a commission had targeted the station for closure as part of armed forces downsizing.

The negotiations occurred at a time China is suspected of funneling millions of dollars in illegal campaign contributions into the United States in a government-sponsored operation to influence the 1996 election.

Some Republicans wonder if there is a connection between Cosco's expansion plans and the Democratic fund-raising scandal.

Reps. Duncan Hunter and Randy ''Duke'' Cunningham, both California Republicans, want to stop the Cosco-Long Beach marriage through legislation attached to the 1998 defense authorization bill. The House National Security Committee is schedule to write the bill next month.

However, the Cosco transaction may die before the Navy officially transfers the property to the city's Harbor Commission.

A coalition of conservationists and history buffs have filed suit to stop the project, which calls for leveling every naval station building.

A judge in Los Angeles has ordered the city to terminate the Cosco lease and re-evaluate the plan's environmental impact.

The New York Times reported yesterday that Clinton appointee, Dorothy Robyn, in November urged the preservationists to abandon their effort to save any buildings.

Miss Robyn, who serves on the National Economic Council, told the paper she made the calls as a favor to Long Beach's mayor. She said she had no contacts with Cosco officials.

Meanwhile, Sen. John McCain, Arizona Republican, has asked the Federal Maritime Commission to report whether Cosco is guilty of predatory pricing.

NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS MEMORIAL DAY

HON. THOMAS W. EWING

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, on May 15, 1997, hundreds of law enforcement officers from across the country came together at the U.S. Capitol to honor slain law enforcement officers on Peace Officers Memorial Day.

Last Thursday we paused to pay tribute to those who have lost their lives in service to the Nation as law enforcement officers. One hundred and fifteen officers were killed 1996. Among these fallen heroes was a 26-year-old officer from the 15th Congressional District of Illinois.

On October 17, 1996, Officer Anthony Samfay of the Kankakee Police Department was shot and killed while conducting a routine traffic stop on a vehicle at Fair and Greenwood Avenue in Kankakee.

Officer Samfay said the only job he ever wanted was to be a police officer. It is with much honor that I pay my respect to Officer Samfay, his mother, the other fallen heroes, and all law enforcement officers who put their lives on the line every day to help protect and serve America.

MEMORIAL DAY

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute, to the millions of men and women who have served this Nation in its Armed Forces. Call it by any name you wish, Remembrance Day, Decoration Day, Memorial Day. It is a time when this country recounts the price for the liberty and freedom it enjoys today. That cost was paid for in the numerous lives and countless sacrifices given to it, by the servicemen and women of this country. The courage and devotion they expressed are the finest example by which all Americans must measure themselves. It is their sense of responsibility and duty that has tied them to all the generations of Americans, past and present, who have answered their country's call to service.

Who are these extraordinary people who have made such a difference in our lives? they are not the sons and daughters of kings or emperors but the hard working farm boys of the heartland, who sat in the muddy trenches of Europe in World War I. They are the former store clerks and factory workers who withstood the crushing siege of Bastogne in World War II. They are the courageous men and women who fought to stem the tide of communism along the 38th parallel in Korea. They are the devoted servicemen and women who fought in the steamy jungles and rice paddies of Vietnam. In our own decade they have been our own sons and daughters and in some circumstances our grandchildren who marched off to the desert to liberate the country of Kuwait.

How does one thank these men and women who have suffered so much that many could live in freedom? Mr. Speaker the debt of gratitude we owe is immeasurable. These men and women, whose deeds and stories are countless, are the reason why this country has been able to remain a shining example of freedom and democracy for the world. To merely say thank you is not enough. This country's continued support for its veterans must be a priority. The words of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Jesse Brown, ring strongly: ''I believe a Nation is judged by the way it treats its Veterans.'' It is this thought that we must bear in mind when issues arise in the Congress that may impact the veterans of this country.

To ignore these issues is to do our veterans and their families a great disservice. Their sacrifice and commitment must be equally reflected in our effort to pay a debt that can never be monetarily repaid. Mr. Speaker, what price can you put on the life of a citizen who is willing to pay the ultimate sacrifice for his or her country in a time of war or national peril?

It is fitting that on this occasion we reaffirm our support and gratitude to this special group of Americans whose devotion to duty was expressed in the highest manner. By their willingness to lay down their life for this Nation, they have assured the security and future for generation of Americans to come.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure and honor to express my deep and heartfelt gratitude for the service of America's veterans. Call this day by what ever name you choose, it is a memorial to all the generations of men and women who have served this Nation and upheld its finest traditions of liberty and democracy. God bless our veterans.

HONORING THE BELLAIRE LIONS CLUB ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THEIR CHARTER

HON. ROBERT W. NEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Bellaire Lions Club which will be celebrating the 50th anniversary of their charter on May 21, 1997.

The Bellaire Lions Club was chartered in district 13–G on May 21, 1947, with 24 original members. The district's motto is ''Positive growth through teamwork,'' and the club is asked ''to encourage service-minded men and women to serve their community.'' The Lions Club in Bellaire, OH, has exemplified this motto through 50 years of support and service to the Bellaire community and Belmont County.

Over the past 50 years, the Bellaire Lions Club has had many dedicated members. These members adopted the motto ''We Serve'' and chose work associated with the prevention and awareness of vision related illnesses. To promote the well-being of the community and awareness of vision related illnesses, the Bellaire Lions Club has sponsored eye testing, glaucoma clinics, and street signs. The club has also been active in area schools by donating science awards for Bellaire High School and St. John's High School as well as trophies for area sports teams.

The Bellaire Lions Club has stood as an example of the importance of volunteerism and helping one's neighbors. Their commitment to the Ohio Valley and to service continues today as they celebrate the 50th anniversary of their charter. I am proud to represent the members of this organization who generously give their time to others and work to improve their community. I ask my colleagues to join me today in congratulating the Bellaire Lions Club members on the 50th anniversary of their charter, and to wish them continued success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SONNY BONO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. BONO. Mr. Speaker, I am writing to explain that on Tuesday, May 20, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote No. 139. If I was present, I certainly would have voted ''aye'' in support of approving the journal. Thank you for recognizing my position regarding this vote.

DOES MONEY TALK?

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, they say that money talks. If it doesn't, enough of it certainly seems to gain access to the White House. At least, that seemed to be the case for the Riady family of Indonesia. A recent Washington Times editorial reminds us that the Riady family has given various Democrat candidates and committees nearly $2 million since 1991. It also seems to have been money well spent, because Riady managed to have one of their own, John Huang, strategically placed at the Commerce Committee.

Mr. Speaker, a White House or a foreign policy for sale is not a laughing matter. I submit the Washington Times editorial in today's RECORD.

WHAT MR. RIADY WANTS

The Pacific Leadership Council (PLC), a fund-raising and influence-seeking organization formed in the 1980s by Lippo Group magnate James Riady, Maria Hsia and John Huang, all of whom figure prominently in the Democratic Party's growing money scandal, was anything but indirect about its motives. One original PLC member acknowledged to the Los Angeles Times recently that the group's political support ''wasn't altruistic at all.'' The Riady family and its PLC colleagues ''wanted to know what kinds of appointments and what kinds of contracts we could get out of all this,'' the member candidly admitted.

How much is ''all this''? According to the Times, the now-disbanded PLC and its members donated about $500,000 through 1990, $250,000 of it to the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee (DSCC). Since 1991, Riady-controlled corporations, their executives and close associates have donated nearly $2 million to various Democratic committees and candidates, including more than $850,000 to the Democratic National Committee (DNC). Since the presidential election, the DNC has returned $450,000 it received from the daughter and son-in-law of a Riady business partner.

At one PLC fund-raiser held in his home in April 1988, Mr. Riady raised $110,000 for the DSCC. Four days later, Mr. Riady wrote a highly detailed three-page memo to Ms. Hsia instructing her to ''follow up and let me know of progress'' in pursuing the numerous quid pro quos Mr. Riady meticulously outlined in a summary appropriately headlined, ''DSCC Issues and Agenda.'' Indeed, so blatantly and crassly self-interested was Mr. Riady's modus operandi that the then-DSCC chairman, Massachusetts Sen. John Kerry, later described Mr. Riady's letter to Ms. Hsia as a ''raw, graphic memo'' reflecting the kind of special-interest agenda that is ''usually communicated discreetly and verbally, not in writing.'' Mr. Riady was even more direct in a second memo that month, this one sent to DSCC Executive Director Robert Chlopak: ''The issues and concerns that were discussed [at the Riady fund-raiser] need to be followed up and actions need to be delivered.''

Among other things, Mr. Riady wanted the Democratic senators to ''impress upon Taiwan to allow Asian-American banks (or at least the Bank of Trade [the former name of LippoBank] to be allowed to open a branch office in Taiwan.'' He also sought ''appointments of Asian-Americans to policy-making positions in the federal government.'' As it later developed, thanks in part to a letter of recommendation overflowing with praise from Senate Minority Leader Tom Daschle, Mr. Riady's former top U.S. executive, Mr. Huang, was appointed to an influential position in the Commerce Department, where he received more than 100 secret briefings, including CIA information about China, and routinely telephoned LippoBank from his office. The FBI is now investigating whether economic espionage occurred and whether the Riadys, Mr. Huang or anyone else may have laundered and then funneled illegal campaign contributions from the Chinese government. In March, the vice president of the Asian-American Business Roundtable charged Mr. Huang with attempting to funnel $250,000 illegally to the DNC through the group's members. Meanwhile, Mr. Huang has asserted his Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination in refusing to cooperate with a congressional investigative committee.

And whaddya know? After Sen. Daschle could ''personally attest to John's strong background'' in a 1992 letter to the Clinton transition team, Sen. Daschle's aide recently told the Times that the senator ''actually doesn't know John Huang well at all.'' Moreover, after receiving a telephone call from an irate President Clinton at one o'clock in the morning following Wisconsin Sen. Russell Feingold's call for an independent counsel to investigate Mr. Clinton's 1996 fund-raising, Sen. Daschle has managed to close the barn door, locking in all the other Democrats except Daniel Patrick Moynihan of New York.

As for Ms. Hsia, she later helped Mr. Huang arrange the illegal fund-raiser at the tax-exempt California Buddhist temple where Vice President Gore shook down impoverished monks, bagging nearly $150,000, much of which the DNC has promised to return. More laundering problems. As a founding member of the PLC, Ms. Hsia enticed then-Sen. Gore to visit Taiwan in 1989, promising him in a letter that she ''will persuade all my colleagues in the future to play a leader role in your [next] presidential race'' if ''you decide to join this trip.'' Although political contributions from foreign nationals who are not U.S. residents are expressly forbidden, the PLC had planned to use that trip ''to recruit new members overseas and potentially to raise some money for PLC,'' according to a document obtained by the Los Angeles Times.

Whether it is bankrolling Webster Hubbell to the tune of $100,000 during the period when he was supposed to be cooperating with the Whitewater prosecutor or whether it is orchestrating nearly $2 million in political contributions from family and associates to Mr. Clinton and associates, one thing ought to be clear by now: James Riady does nothing for nobody that is not intended to benefit his interests, including White House access to lobby for expanding trade with China and to downplay Indonesia's notorious human-rights record on East Timor.

COMMENDING THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA ON THE FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF PRESIDENT LEE TENG-HUI AS TAIWAN'S FIRST DEMOCRATICALLY ELECTED PRESIDENT

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to join me today in commending the Republic of China on the first anniversary of President Lee Teng-hui as Taiwan's first democratically elected President. I was part of the official delegation President Clinton sent to mark the occasion last year.

President Lee was directly elected by the people of Taiwan as their ninth President and inaugurated 1 year ago today. Despite an attempt at intimidation, democracy won. The United States has vital economic and military interests in this area of the world, and it is important for our country to commend the democratic efforts in this region.

One year after his inauguration, President Lee is considered a beacon of democracy in the Far East. Taiwan's democratization should be an inspiring model for governments around the world. The United States is a government that rewards democracy and capitalism, so Taiwan's free and fair elections are indeed cause to celebrate.

Both President Bill Clinton and House Speaker Newt Gingrich have made clear that Taiwan is our friend, so it is appropriate today that we pay tribute to this young democracy on the first anniversary of President Lee's inauguration.

I also ask my colleagues to join me in commending Foreign Minister John Chang as he begins his second year of promoting stronger relations between the United States and Taiwan.

CELEBRATING PRESIDENT LEE'S FIRST YEAR AS PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

HON. THOMAS J. MANTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago this week the 2 million people of Taiwan went to the polls to participate in the first direct election of a President for the Republic of China. Voter turnout was high despite the attempts by the People's Republic of China to intimidate the electorate by conducting military exercises in the Taiwan Straits.

The voters of Taiwan overwhelmingly elected Lee Teng-Hui as President of the ROC. President Lee defeated three other candidates in a free and fair election. In doing so, President Lee became the first popular elected head of state in Chinese history. His election was the culmination of a 10-year period of democratization for the Republic of China. Today, the ROC is a full-fledged democracy with a strong, multiparty system. Government officials from the President to members of the local legislatures are all selected by the people of Taiwan.

Mr. Speaker, this week also marks the 1-year anniversary of the selection by President Lee of John Chang as the Republic of China's Foreign Minister. Under Mr. Chang's leadership, the already excellent relationship between the United States and Republic of China has grown even stronger. During the past year, many members of this body have traveled to Taiwan to see firsthand Taiwan's impressive economic growth. Furthermore, many senior ROC Government officials have visited the United States and have met with Members of Congress and other United States officials. All of this activity is a tribute to Foreign Minister Chang.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to note that nearly 1 year has passed since Jason Hu assumed the post of Taipei's Economic and Cultural Representative in Washington. The Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative's office serves as the unofficial embassy in the United States, and Ambassador Hu, who previously served as President Lee's spokesman and a member of the Legislative Yuan, has done a very good job promoting a dialog between Congress and the people of Taiwan. He has worked tirelessly to visit with Members of this body and to inform Members of the current activities in Taiwan. Representative Hu, like Foreign Minister Chang, is proof that President Lee has made many fine choices in filling the senior appointed positions of his government. I am certain with President Lee's leadership, our relationship with the ROC will continue to be on a steady and even keel in the years ahead.

INTRODUCTION OF THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1997

HON. MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, for more than three decades, the Older Americans Act has been providing our Nation's seniors with the services that help them enjoy security, health, and independence. Therefore, it is with great pleasure that I introduce the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1997, which will update this statute for the 21st century and beyond.

The majority of this legislation is based upon the administration's proposal for reauthorization of the Older Americans Act which I introduced during the 104th Congress. It includes provisions that grant flexibility to States, area agencies on aging, and providers which will foster new and creative ways to design and administer services for the elderly. This measure also allows for the expansion of cooperative partnerships for the identification of local needs and delivery of comprehensive services. Most importantly, all this is accomplished with a strong commitment to those protections that have and will continue to ensure seniors' health and well-being for years to come.

Despite my support for much of what is contained in the administration's proposal there are some areas which I feel warrant change and further negotiation. One area in particular concerns the future of the Senior Community Services Employment Program [SCSEP]. While the administration would transfer the SCSEP to the Administration on Aging, the legislation I introduce today retains the program within the Department of Labor. While in principle and practice I have previously supported various proposals to consolidate and coordinate related Federal programs and services, the fact that the SCSEP is fundamentally an employment program compels me to support maintaining the program within the Labor Department.

As take up the Older Americans Act reauthorization again this year, I look forward to working with the administration and my colleagues on both sides of this aisle to fashion bipartisan legislation that continues to protect our Nation's seniors.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

HON. ROBERT SMITH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of President Lee Teng-hui's first anniversary in office, I wish to make a few remarks.

President Lee is the first democratically elected head of state in China's history. He is a man committed to preserving political freedom for his 23 million fellow citizens.

President Lee is also committed to economic growth. In the last year Taiwan has maintained its economic expansion and its position as a major trading partner of the United States. Many of our agricultural products find ready markets in Taiwan.

On behalf of my constituents, I send my best wishes and congratulations to President Lee Teng-hui, Dr. Jason Hu, Taiwan's top representative in Washington, and the people of Taiwan as they celebrate May 20, 1997, the first anniversary of President Lee's first term in office.

TRIBUTE TO THE TOWN OF JOHNSTON

HON. LINDSEY O. GRAHAM

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, the rich heritage of the town of Johnston, SC, began during the Colonial days with three families: The Lott family to the east, the Gomillion family to the south, and the Bush family on land that is in the present town center. Before the Revolutionary War, a gentleman by the name of Richard Bush accumulated land in the area. In the mid-19th century, his descendant, Isaac Bush, sold 1,200 acres of land to Dr. Edward J. Mims of the nearby town of Edgefield. Dr. Mims and his family moved onto this newly acquired land which is the original townsite of Johnston.

The name of the town was not established until its inhabitants saw the rapid expansion of the railroad throughout the South. Dr. Mims was determined to include his community in the booming opportunity the railroad provided. He successfully petitioned William Johnston, president of the Charlotte, Columbia, and Augusta Railroad, to route the railway through the land on the Mims plantation. In return, Dr. Mims agreed to name the town for Mr. Johnston. Earlier the village was called Johnston Station, then Johnston's Turn Out, and finally, on May 25, 1897, it was chartered as its present name, Johnston.

Today, Johnston, known as the Peach Capital of the World celebrates the centennial of its charter. The Johnston Historic District, a collection of 146 houses, businesses, and churches dating from the 1870's to the 1920's is listed in the National Register of Historic Places. From the 1870's Johnston had a renowned educational institution, first called the Johnston Academy, then the Johnston Institute, and later Johnston High School. The town of Johnston remains proud of its history and maintains its early emphasis on agriculture and education. However, the town also has a strong present and future with state-of-the-art manufacturing technology in its many textile mills. With firm roots and forward progress, Johnston will continue to prosper well into the 21st century.

KEEP THE PROMISE

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, we all remember the promise President Clinton made to end welfare as we know it.

But when given a chance to do so, in the form of a sound program by Texas Governor Bush, the President did everything possible to scuttle the plan. The plan would have meant a savings in welfare administration costs of 20 to 35 percent for the people of Texas.

This is not the first promise this administration has broken. I suggest members read the Wall Street Journal editorial in today's RECORD as a reminder:

[From the Wall Street Journal]

CLINTON PROMISES

Trying to provide better health care coverage for some 150,000 needy children, Texas

Governor George W. Bush wants to generate some savings by spending less on welfare administration. After nine months of stalling, the Clinton White House has just turned him down.

This is the same Bill Clinton who famously promised ''to end welfare as we know it.'' This is the same Bill Clinton who has been pressing to expand health coverage for poor children, insisting that the budget agreement with Congress earmark $18 billion for that purpose. This is the same Bill Clinton who during last year's election campaign signed a welfare reform bill supposedly giving wide discretion to the states. In the end, though, this same Bill Clinton overruled his own Cabinet to side with his reactionary union allies.

The story is worth recounting simply to show what it's like to negotiate with our present President, but also because it has huge potential implications for welfare reform nationwide. The administrative costs that Governor Bush wants to pare in Texas cost federal and state governments a whopping $28 billion a year—to deliver $250 billion a year in welfare benefits. Several governors are convinced these administrative functions could be privatized, with likely administrative savings of 20% to 35%.

Many states are already experimenting with contracting out parts of their welfare apparatus. Thirty states use Lockheed Martin to collect child Support payments, for example, and the company also runs the federal computer to find deadbeat dads. Maximus Corp. of McLean. Va., which helps run local welfare offices for states, has doubled in size in the past year. Wisconsin is allowing both private companies and nonprofits such as Goodwill Industries to bid on screening, training and placing welfare recipients in jobs. California and Arizona have plans similar to that just vetoed in Texas.

Paring state bureaucracies, of course, is anathema to public employee unions: to them the loss of state jobs spells smaller union dues and less political clout. When Governor Bush and Texas legislators decided to contract with private firms to set up one-stop assistance bureaus that would allow recipients to apply for all their benefits at once, the unions went ballistic. Their radio ads featured the sound of exploding bombs; ''Texas is under attack. They're coming after us,'' an announcer intoned. ''The guys who brought us the $3,000 toilet seat are trying to take over public services for families, children and seniors.''

Worried that Governor Bush's plan would create a bandwagon effect in other states, the unions helped convince the White House to sit for nine months on his request for a federal waiver. On March 28, President Clinton met at the White House to discuss the Texas welfare plan with four union leaders, including AFL–CIO President John Sweeney.

In April, a memo to the President warned that ''we must give Texas an answer immediately.'' The memo—signed by Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala, Agriculture Secretary Dan Glickman and White House domestic policy adviser Bruce Reed—observed that ''the state has engaged in good faith discussions with various agencies for more than nine months, and state officials are now publicly criticizing the administration.'' It suggested the White House approve a compromise plan, giving Texs leeway on administration of income supports while barring private workers from the food stamp and Medicaid programs, on which the welfare reform bill provided tighter federal regulation.

''As you know, labor leaders would like us to refuse the Texas request entirely,'' the memo read. ''They see even limited privatization as a dangerous precedent and have made clear they view this decision as critically important to public employee unions.'' On May 5, Governor Bush fired off an angry letter to Secretary Shalala complaining about ''double talk and runarounds.'' And last Friday, Governor Bush finally got his answer: No.

Mr. Clinton rejected not only the Texas waiver, but also the compromise proposed by his own Cabinet officials. At a news briefing Ms. Shalala explained that only state employees could determine eligibility for federal programs. Governor Bush's office criticized the White House for ''letting its waiver policy be determined by the AFL–CIO.''

For all the Clinton welfare promises, and all the ballyhoo about the welfare reform bill, the Clinton White House is now fighting a rear-guard action to save welfare as we know it. We have to wonder what this says about whether the White House will make a good-faith effort to honor the federal budget agreement now being ballyhooed as welfare reform was a year ago.

PRINCIPLED WRITINGS

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer into the RECORD two record examples of the fine writing often found in one of district newspapers, The Brazosport Facts. While many find it easy to deride the press as liberal and closed to the notions of liberty, free markets, and constitutional principles, I am pleased to report that The Brazosport Facts in general, and these two authors in specific, seek to bring a fair, even balance to the coverage of news and ideas.

Today I enter into the RECORD an editorial written by Glenn Heath, a former executive editor of The Brazosport Facts and now a retired member of the community active yet active on the paper's editorial board. Also, I enter into the RECORD a column written by Bill Sturdevant, a frequent contributor to the Facts.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly encourage my fellow Members of Congress to read these principled writings. I offer my congratulations and thanks to these two men for supporting the ideas of liberty; and to the entire staff of The Brazosport Facts for their ongoing dedication to presenting fair coverage of events and ideas.

FREEDOM & SAFETY

A larger principle than the bill itself is involved. The principle applies to many human circumstances where a mandated gain entails a substantial loss.

For decades, a safety measure has been before the Legislature, either asking the state to require motorcycle riders to wear a protective helmet, or asking the state to repeal such a law. Riders have been in the gallery in force to oppose one or support the other.

This time it's repeal. Sen. Jerry Patterson's bill would relieve all motorcycle riders aged 21 or over of wearing the helmet. Legislators deleted a provision that they must carry added insurance if they did so.

The Senate is expected to vote on Patterson's bill Thursday or Friday.

From a purely practical standpoint, the arguments for the original bill had merit. In case of an accident, the helmet would help protect against head injuries.

Even most riders would admit that motorcycles can be dangerous. In the best of road conditions, their speed capability is often abused; and on slick surfaces or loose surfacings they can be treacherous. In a crash with a four-wheel vehicle, the motorcycles always lose.

But motorcycles are designed as much for fun as for practical transportation. Even those who accept the helmet for its safety would agree that using one diminishes the pleasure of motorcycling.

More important, the helmet protects no one but the one wearing it. So the effect of the law is to force a person to do something entirely for personal safety.

That should be that person's choice. No government should regulate an individual's right to accept risks, and in doing so deprive that person of the freedom to enjoy a pleasure.

That doesn't mean there should be no rules of highway safety. Faulty brakes threaten not just the driver of an auto, but every other vehicle on the road. Slick tires, malfunctioning lights endanger others. These are concerns of government.

But not air bags. These don't prevent crashes and they don't protect others on the road; they only tend to reduce the injuries to a driver and possibly a passenger after a crash.

When air bags were a prospective federal mandate, the estimated cost for each was about $300. Once they were in place, they were said to have saved 1,600 lives. For this to happen, tens of millions of motorists must pay the high cost of the devices.

And in a few cases, the air bags have actually killed people. New proposals would soften the impact, and would allow a motorist to have the air bag disabled. Then why shouldn't the motorist be allowed to avoid the expense altogether?

These are only two examples. We need protection from the negligence of others, but there should be limits on how much government limits our freedom and pleasure in protecting us from ourselves.

Benjamin Franklin had words for it: ''Those who would give up essential Liberty, to purchase a little temporary Safety, deserve neither Liberty nor Safety.''

WHEN POLITICIANS SAY ENTITLEMENTS, THINK ROBBERY

(By Bill Sturdevant)

Rights are counterbalanced with responsibility; juxtaposed and eternally linked. In the United States of America, we have a government created by a group of individuals collectively called ''the people,'' who are not only ''endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights,'' those being ''life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness,'' but also have the ''equal right to the use of our own faculties, to the acquisitions of our own industry,'' and ''to honor and confidence from our fellow-citizens, resulting not from birth, but from our actions and their sense of them.'' (Thomas Jefferson).

In short, we have the right to choose what is best for us. We have the right to pursue happiness as we define it, we have the right to keep the fruits of our labor that we earn in that pursuit, and we have the right to decide how to dispose of those rewards. At the same time, we must reconcile these rights with the responsibility of respecting the rights of others, and living with the consequences of our decisions and actions. If our country's founding fathers had written a golden rule for our citizens, it would have read ''Respect the God-given rights of others, while at the same time protecting your own rights.''

What bothers me is that there seem to be fewer and fewer people who understand and live by this golden rule. More and more often, people are turning to the federal government to secure the force necessary to take from others something that they are not by right entitled to. I may have the right to eat, but I don't have the right to steal someone else's food. I have the right to have children, but I don't have the right to force someone else to pay for my child's food, house, clothes or education. The decision is mine; it therefore follows that the responsibility is also mine. Many federal ''entitlement'' programs, including Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security, are morally wrong because they require, by threat of force, that people give up part of what they earn so that it can be redistributed to someone who did not earn it.

But wait a minute, you say. All of the above mentioned federal programs were created by the will of the majority of Americans, and it is therefore our civic duty to contribute. My response to that is, ''So what?'' My rights are not bestowed to me by government or by a majority of the electorate. They do not have the legitimate authority to force me to contribute to programs that are not enumerated in the Constitution. In too many cases in the history of mankind, the majority has used the power of government to enslave the minority, or at least create an unfair advantage for themselves.

Say that a congressman and a police officer were riding in a bus that was full of other passengers. On the bus was a ''rich'' man, who had one dollar more than the others. The Congressman announced: ''If you vote for me, I will use the government's police power to take the dollar from the rich man, and redistribute it to you.'' A vote was held, and the majority of those on the bus decided the rich man should contribute his dollar for the good of all the rest. The policeman seized the dollar, and the congressman divided it up. He gave 25 cents to the policeman, 25 cents was given to the people on the bus, (which they immediately started fighting over), and he kept 50 cents for himself. It seemed that everyone, except the rich man, was happy, but were they right?

In his first inaugural address, Thomas Jefferson said of the ''sacred principle'' of our federal government, ''that though the will of the majority is in all cases to prevail, that will, to be rightful, must be reasonable; that the minority possess their equal rights, which equal law must protect, and to violate would be oppression.'' It could be argued that it was wrong to take the dollar from the rich man because he could have used it to build a factory, employ everyone on the bus, and thus create wealth for all.

My point is that it doesn't matter what you or I may think, the person who earns the money is the only one with the right to decide how to spend it, so long as doing so does not infringe on your or my legitimate rights. Jefferson continued by defining the ''good government'' as being ''wise and frugal, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned.''

The next time a politician promises you an ''entitlement,'' think about who he is going to rob to pay for it. Ask yourself if, by accepting it, you would have to abdicate your personal responsibility and therefore your freedom. Ask yourself if you are legitimately entitled to it because you earned it. If the government has the power to ''take from Peter to pay Paul,'' what is to stop it from taking from both? Ask yourself why the politician isn't battling to restore your lost liberty.

Please understand that I am not against charity. There are people who, through no fault of their own, need temporary assistance, and I believe we have a moral obligation to help them if we can. But to lose our freedom, in the name of ''charity,'' by allowing confiscatory taxation of our money, really only benefits politicians and bureaucrats. This is not only dangerous, it is absurd.

Only by accepting our responsibility to honor the rights of others can we hope to protect our own rights. As Jefferson said, only by protecting our rights can we hope to ''regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety.''

SUPPORT OF THE SCREENING APPROACH ADOPTED IN THE COLORECTAL CANCER SCREENING ACT, H.R. 1128

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss important information on the issue of colorectal cancer screening. Earlier this year, I introduced the Colorectal Cancer Screening Act, H.R. 1128, which would provide Medicare coverage for all available colorectal cancer screening procedures including the fecal occult blood test, sigmoidoscopy, the barium exam, and colonoscopy. I hope that Congress will soon consider colorectal cancer screening as part of a package of preventive benefits to be included in Medicare reform legislation.

The purpose of my remarks today is to share with my colleagues important recent statements in support of the colorectal cancer screening approach taken in H.R. 1128 by the American Cancer Society, former Virginia Governor L. Douglas Wilder, and the Washington D.C. Chapter of the NAACP. The Colorectal Cancer Screening Act is the only legislation in the House which provides coverage for all available colorectal cancer screening procedures, including the barium exam, allowing doctors and patients to choose procedures, rather than the Federal Government. H.R. 1128 is also important because it is the only House legislation which assures that adequate screening options will be available to meet the screening needs of African-American Medicare recipients.

In remarks submitted last Congress, I cited several medical studies which show that African-Americans disproportionately develop cancer in the right side of the colon, the portion of the colon that is beyond the reach of sigmoidoscopy, a common screening procedure. These studies make clear that a procedure, such as the barium exam, which can screen the entire colon, must be made available to meet the needs of African-American patients. The barium examination is the safest and most cost-effective way to screen the entire colon, and is one of only two procedures which can image the entire colon. The studies also indicate that colorectal cancer screening programs that do not include barium exams are inadequate for African-Americans.

The American Cancer Society recently released its new colorectal cancer screening guidelines. These screening recommendations were produced as a result of a comprehensive examination of all available information regarding the cost and availability of various screening procedures. One of the significant changes from earlier versions is that the ACS now recommends the barium enema as one of the options for the initial screening of average and moderate-risk individuals over age 50. The American Cancer Society recommendations are as follows:

* * * the National Board of the American Cancer Society recently approved new colorectal guidelines which provide clear guidance to practitioners and their patients for the early detection of colorectal polyps and cancer at various levels of risk. These guidelines include the following:

For average risk individuals (65 percent–75 percent of cases), the American Cancer Society recommends annual fecal occult blood test plus sigmoidoscopy every 5 years; or colonoscopy every 10 years or double contrast barium enema every 5 to 10 years. Testing should begin at age 50.

For moderate risk individuals (20 percent–30 percent of cases), the American Cancer Society recommends colonoscopy or a total colon exam, which includes colonoscopy or double contrast barium enema, depending on family history and the size of the polyps. Testing interval and age to begin depend on initial diagnosis and family history.

For high risk individuals (5 percent–8 percent of cases) with a history of familial adenomatous polyps, the Society recommends early surveillance with endoscopy, counseling to consider genetic testing, and referral to a specialty center. Testing should begin at puberty. For high risk individuals with a family history of hereditary non-polyposis colon cancer, the Society recommends colonoscopy and counseling to consider genetic testing. Testing should begin at age 21.

In addition, former Governor L. Douglas Wilder recently wrote a commentary in the Richmond Times Dispatch, which discussed the importance of prostate and colorectal cancer screening procedures. His comments support the colorectal cancer screening approach adopted in H.R. 1128. Governor Wilder's commentary follows.

Finally, the Washington Branch of the NAACP wrote a letter to the House Ways and Means Health Subcommittee on the importance of colorectal cancer screening for African-Americans. The letter written by the NAACP supports the screening provisions of H.R. 1128 and barium exams. The letter follows.

I commend Governor Wilder and the Washington Branch of the NAACP for their involvement in this issue, and I urge my colleagues to read and examine all of the aforementioned statements.

Mr. Speaker, colorectal cancer screening is an important part of providing preventive services to our Nation's seniors, a concept which I strongly support. However, it is also important that colorectal cancer screening legislation meet the needs of our Nation's seniors. There is an emerging consensus that barium exams must be included in colorectal cancer screening legislation. I urge my colleagues to join this consensus by supporting the provisions of H.R. 1128, the Colorectal Cancer Screening Act.

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, Apr. 6, 1997]

BLACKS NEED BETTER ACCESS TO SCREENING TESTS FOR CANCER

(By L. Douglas Wilder)

RICHMOND.—A recent symposium on ''Race and Health Care as We Approach the Twenty-First Century'' at Virginia Commonwealth University was the first of what will be annual topical discussions on matters of utmost concern to all of us. I was privileged, in my post at the Center for Public Policy, to convene the two-day meeting. Participants included scholars who have achieved national acclaim for providing solutions to the problems; they represented a broad spectrum of women, minorities, academicians, practitioners, and others. The participants discussed not only the unique challenges faced by African Americans in health care, but also the obstacles they face in gaining access to adequate screening for certain kinds of cancer.

At a time when President and Congress are considering measures to provide preventive screening to the Medicare population for certain cancers, it is essential that we consider the differences in how cancer manifests itself in American Americans, and what this means to appropriate screening.

The challenge is particularly acute for prostate and colorectal cancers. The data on these diseases are clear and simple: While the nation's focus has been on the 40,000 deaths each year from AIDS and the more than 44,000 deaths each year from breast cancer in the United States, it is important to recognize that colorectal cancer will claim more than 50,000 and prostate cancer more than 42,000, Americans in 1997. For African Americans, the statistics are particularly frightening, as African Americans are struck more frequently than, and differently from, other Americans. And surprise, surprise, there are no genetic or hereditary deficiencies that account for this.

For prostate cancer, African Americans males have the highest incidence in the world—66 percent higher than white men, with a mortality rate more than two times higher. If detected while localized, the five-year survival rate for prostate cancer is 99 percent. For colorectal cancer, the mortality rate among African Americans continues to rise, even as the American Cancer Society reports declines in colorectal cancer among other segments of the population.

African Americans who get colorectal cancer are 50 percent more likely to die of the disease than others in this country. In addition, the disease affects African Americans differently from the way it affects white Americans: The National Cancer Institute's Black/White Cancer Survival Study found that African Americans have a greater tendency to get colorectal cancer in the right colon—the portion not reached by sigmoidoscopy—than other Americans, explaining, at least in part, the higher mortality rate from the disease. These data illustrate the special importance of regular prostate and colorectal screening for African Americans to detect these cancers at the earliest stages and, to the extent possible, correct the disparity in the incidence of the disease.

What can be done to meet the challenge of reducing the mortality rate for these cancers among all segments of the Medicare population? I am pleased to see that Medicare coverage for preventive screening benefits is one area where President Clinton and Republican congressional leaders appear to agree. President Clinton has recognized the importance of preventive screening, and his FY 1998 budget proposes to extend Medicare coverage to including screening for prostate and colorectal cancer, as well as other preventive benefits. In addition, a group led by Republican Congressmen Bill Thomas and Mike Bilirakis, who head the two key Health Subcommittees in the House of Representatives, has introduced legislation to provide similar benefits under Medicare. Similar efforts are underway in the U.S. Senate as well. With bipartisan support, these important screenings will be available to all elderly Americans served by Medicare.

The extension of Medicare coverage to include these new benefits may screening of the entire colon—with colonscopy or barium enema—possible for early detection of colorectal cancer. Key members of the U.S. Congress have adopted an approach that provides appropriate choice for patients in the Medicare population, including the African Americans population and other Medicare recipients who prefer a comprehensive screening option. Congressman Norman Sisisky of Virginia, himself a colorectal cancer survivor, has taken a leading role in advocating regular preventive screening and has indicated that his ''mission in the 105th Congress [is] to enact Medicare coverage for colorectal cancer screening.''

Congressman Sisisky has supported the excellent work of Congressman Alcee Hastings and Senator John Breaux, who in the 104th Congress introduced legislation in the House and Senate to provide Medicare coverage for colorectal cancer screening and who are likely to do so again in the 105th Congress. Their approach has also been supported by a number of members of the Congressional Black Caucus, including the distinguished Ranking Member of the Ways and Means Committee, Congressman Charles Rangel. Caucus members know and understand the special needs of the African American population and are personally committed to providing appropriate screening options to accommodate those needs.

Legislation alone will not be enough to persuade Americans—including African Americans—to undergo preventive screening. A broad public education campaign is needed to foster serious discussion about the benefits of these screening procedures for all Americans. I hope part of this campaign will provide African Americans with information about the special impact of these cancers on our population, and about our special screening needs. I am pleased that the American Gastroenterology Association recently published recommendations for regular colorrectal cancer screening, which recommended procedures appropriate for the African American population. I understand the America Cancer Society will also be issuing its recommendations for preventive colorrectal cancer screening.

It is vitally important that preventive screening be covered by Medicare and that all Americans—have access to affordable, appropriate screening methodologies. Now is the time to act. I challenge President Clinton and the Republican-led Congress to make good on their promise to the American people that the next two years will be ones of action rather than delay and partisanship.

In this instance, the lives of tens of thousands of elderly Americans could be saved and their quality of life improved if President Clinton and the Congress have the courage to meet the people's challenge to work together for the common good.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,
Washington, DC, March 27, 1997.

Hon. WILLIAM THOMAS,
Chairman, Health Subcommittee, House Ways and Means Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to commend you for convening a hearing on the issue of Medicare coverage for preventive benefits. The legislation you have introduced, the Medicare Preventive Benefits Improvement Act, H.R. 15, is a good first step towards addressing the health concerns of African Americans, who suffer disproportionately from diseases such as breast cancer, prostate cancer, and colorectal cancer. While I support the overall effort to enact preventive benefits legislation represented by H.R. 15, I believe that significant changes need to be made to address the colorectal cancer screening provisions of this legislation, which I believe are inadequate for screening the African American population.

You and I would agree that preventive screening is the key to detecting colorectal cancer in its earliest stage, so colorectal cancer can be treated and removed before it becomes fatal. It is my understanding that over the years you have supported several bills that provide Medicare coverage for colorectal cancer screening, and I applaud your efforts.

However, I am very concerned about the impact of H.R. 15 on the African American community. As it stands now, African Americans who develop colorectal cancer have a fifty percent greater mortality rate than the general population. In addition, medical studies have shown that African Americans disproportionately develop cancer in the right side of the colon, which means that African Americans need access to screening procedures that can view the entire colon. Legislation that provides for screening with only fecal occult blood tests and flexible sigmoidoscopy is inadequate to meet the screening needs of African Americans. In addition, the high-cost and risk associated with colonoscopy also make this procedure an inadequate solution for screening African Americans for colorectal cancer. African American patients and their doctors should be given a choice of all available options.

As mentioned, the issue of choice is crucial for African American patients and their doctors when deciding which procedures to use for colorectal cancer screening. The Medicare Preventive Benefits Improvement Act (H.R. 15), does not provide Medicare coverage for all commonly used colorectal cancer screening procedures, and therefore, limits the choices of doctors and patients. This legislation would have a devastating effect on screening for African Americans, who would be denied access to one of the most cost-effective procedures for screening the entire colon, the barium enema. This lack of access to such an important screening procedure will needlessly cost thousands of lives.

Colorectal cancer screening is an important issue for all Americans, not only African Americans. Patients and doctors, whether they are African American or not, should decide which screening procedures are appropriate—not the federal government.

I urge you to support the provisions included in bi-partisan legislation introduced by Congressman Alcee Hastings and co-sponsored by members of the Congressional Black Caucus which provides Medicare coverage for colorectal cancer screening using all commonly used procedures including fecal occult blood tests (FOBT), flexible sigmoidoscopy, colonoscopy, and the barium enema. Congressman Hastings' legislation, the Colorectal Cancer Screening Act, provides the same Medicare coverage for FOBT, flexible sigmoidoscopy, and colonoscopy as H.R. 15, but also corrects a significant omission in H.R. 15 by including the barium enema. I believe that Congressman Hastings' provisions should be included in H.R. 15 to give all Americans a complete choice of colorectal cancer screening procedures.

Once again, thank you for your work to support and promote Medicare coverage for preventive benefits. As a supporter of Medicare coverage for preventive services, I also thank you in advance for pursuing the passage of inclusive colorectal cancer screening legislation which is not biased against African Americans.

Please include these remarks in the record of your March 13, 1997 Health Subcommittee hearing.

Sincerely,

REV. MORRIS L. SHEARIN,
President.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act.

The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 84, Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for FY 1998.

The House passed H.R. 1650, to authorize the Congressional Gold Medal to Mother Teresa.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4691–S4780

Measures Introduced: Six bills and one resolution were introduced as follows: S. 765–770 and S. Res. 87. **Page S4748**

Measures Passed:

Vietnam Veterans Memorial Anniversary: Senate agreed to S. Res. 87, commemorating the 15th anniversary of the construction and dedication of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. **Pages S4691–94**

Partial-Birth Abortion Ban: By 63 yeas to 36 nays (Vote No. 71), Senate passed H.R. 1122, to amend title 18, United States Code, to ban partial-birth abortions, after taking action on the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S4694–S4715**

Adopted:

Santorum Amendment No. 290, to provide a procedure for determining whether a physician's conduct was necessary to save the life of the mother. **Pages S4694–95**

Authorizing Use of Capitol Grounds: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 49, authorizing the use of the Capitol grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby. **Page S4773**

Hong Kong Economic and Trade Office: Senate passed S. 342, to extend certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to Hong Kong Economic and Trade Offices. **Page S4773**

Afghanistan Human Rights: Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 6, expressing concern for the continued deterioration of human rights in Afghanistan and emphasizing the need for a peaceful political settlement in that country, after agreeing to a committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S4773–76**

Congratulating Residents of Jerusalem: Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 21, congratulating the residents of Jerusalem and the people of Israel on the thirtieth anniversary of the reunification of that historic city. **Page S4776**

Japan/U.S. Mutual Cooperation: Senate agreed to S. Res. 58, to state the sense of the Senate that the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security Between the United States of America and Japan is essential for furthering the security interest of the United States, Japan and the countries of the Asia-Pacific region, and that the people of Okinawa deserve recognition for their contributions toward ensuring the treaty's implementation. **Pages S4776–77**

Concurrent Budget Resolution: Senate began consideration of S. Con. Res. 27, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States government for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, taking action on amendments proposed thereto, as follows: **Pages S4716–45**

Adopted:

Allard Amendment No. 293, to express the sense of the Senate about the Federal debt and that the President should submit a budget proposal with a plan for repayment of the Federal debt. **Page S4729**

Rejected:

Dodd Modified Amendment No. 296, to increase the discretionary spending caps by $15.752 billion in outlays over five years to improve funding of critical programs to assist infants, toddlers and young children, and offset this effort by closing corporate tax loopholes. (By 61 yeas to 39 nays (Vote No. 72), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S4731–38**

Allard/Inhofe Amendment No. 292, to require that any shortfall in revenues projected by the resolution be offset by reductions in discretionary spending. (By 70 yeas to 29 nays (Vote No. 73), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S4738–41, S4744**

By 8 yeas to 91 nays (Vote No. 74), Hollings Amendment No. 295, to adjust the President's initiatives for increased spending and the tax cuts. **Pages S4741–45**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the resolution and certain amendments to be proposed thereto, on Wednesday, May 21, 1997. **Page S4777**

Messages From the President: Senate received the following messages from the President of the United States:

Transmitting the report of the executive order prohibiting new investment in Burma; referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–38). **Pages S4746–47**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

Vice Admiral Roger T. Rufe, U.S. Coast Guard, to be Commander, Atlantic Area, United States Coast Guard, with the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Rear Admiral James C. Card, U.S. Coast Guard, to be Commander, Pacific Area, United States Coast Guard, with the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

16 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

17 Army nominations in the rank of general.

15 Marine Corps nominations in the rank of general.

3 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Coast Guard, Navy. **Pages S4772–73, S4779–80**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

A. Peter Burleigh, of California, to be the Deputy Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

James W. Pardew, Jr., of Virginia, for the Rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as U.S. Special Representative for Military Stabilization in the Balkans. **Page S4779**

Messages From the President: **Pages S4746–47**

Communications: **Pages S4747–48**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Pages S4748–60**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S4760–61**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S4761–63**

Authority for Committees: **Page S4763**

Additional Statements: **Pages S4763–72**

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today. (Total—74). **Pages S4715, S4738, S4744–45**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m., and adjourned at 9:10 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Wednesday, May 21, 1997. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4777.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Foreign Operations held hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for foreign assistance programs, focusing on international financial institutions, receiving testimony from Robert E. Rubin, Secretary of the Treasury.

Subcommittee will meet again on Thursday, May 22.

APPROPRIATIONS—INTERIOR

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies concluded hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the Department of the Interior, after receiving testimony from Bruce Babbitt, Secretary of the Interior.

APPROPRIATIONS—CAPITOL POLICE BOARD/CBO

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on the Legislative Branch held hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the United States Capitol Police Board and the Congressional Budget Office, receiving testimony from Gregory S. Casey, Senate Sergeant at Arms, Wilson Livingood, House Sergeant at Arms, Gary L. Abrecht, Chief, U.S. Capitol Police, and Alan M. Hantman, Architect of the Capitol, all on behalf of the United States Capitol Police Board; and June E. O'Neill, Director, Congressional Budget Office, who was accompanied by several of her associates.

Subcommittee will meet again on Thursday, June 5.

QUADRENNIAL DEFENSE REVIEW

Committee on Armed Services: Committee held hearings to examine the Department of Defense Quadrennial Defense Review which relates to the shape, makeup, characterization, and the implementation of American armed forces for the next several years, receiving testimony from William S. Cohen, Secretary of Defense; and Gen. John M. Shalikashvili, USA, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

PRIVATE RELIEF

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Immigration concluded hearings on S. 768, to grant Michel Christopher Meili and his family, of Switzerland, permanent residence in the United States for his efforts in providing evidence of relations between Swiss banks and Nazi Germany during and after World War II regarding the disposal of assets of Holocaust victims, after receiving testimony from Senators Hatch and D'Amato; and Michel Christopher Meili, Rutihof, Switzerland.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

Committee on Labor and Human Resources: Committee concluded hearings on proposed legislation to provide patients quality health care, while maintaining affordability and the consumers right to receive all relevant information regarding their treatment and costs, including S. 449, to prohibit the restriction of certain types of medical communications between a health care provider and a patient, and S. 644, to establish standards for relationships between group health plans and health insurance issuers with enrollees, health professionals, and providers, after receiving testimony from Senators Kyl, Wyden, and D'Amato; Representatives Ganske and Norwood; Theodore N. Tsangaris, Breast Care Center/ George Washington University Medical Center, Andrew Webber, Consumer Coalition for Quality Health Care, Mary Jane England, Washington Business Group on Health, and Karen Ignagni, American Association of Health Plans, all of Washington, D.C.; Dennis O'Leary, Joint Commission on the Accreditation of Health Organizations, Oakbrook Terrace, Illinois; and William A. Reynolds, Missoula, Montana, on behalf of the American College of Physicians.

1985 ZONA ROSA TERRORIST ATTACK

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee concluded hearings to examine the United States response to the murders of four United States marines and two private U.S. citizens in the Zona Rosa district of San Salvador in 1985, after receiving testimony from John R. Hamilton, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Central America, the Caribbean and Cuba; Michael O'Neil, General Counsel, Central Intelligence Agency; James S. Reynolds, Chief, Terrorism and Violent Crime Section, Criminal Division, Dale L. Watson, Chief of the International Operations Section, National Security Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation, and Phyllis A. Coven, Director of International Affairs, Immigration and Naturalization Service, all of the Department of Justice; William Walker, former United States Ambassador to El Salvador; Ed Mulvaney, Anniston, Alabama; Joe Dickson and Betty Malone, both of Northport, Alabama; Andy and Brenda Whitt, and Beth Kwiatkowski, all of Wausau, Wisconsin; and John and Marlene Weber, both of Cincinnati, Ohio.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 25 public bills, H.R. 1661–1685; 1 private bill, H.R. 1686; and 1 resolution, H. Res. 154, were introduced. **Page H3069**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed as follows:

H. Res. 153, providing for consideration of H.R. 408, to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to support the International Dolphin Conservation Program in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean (H. Rept. 105–103);

H.R. 1377, to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to encourage retirement income savings, amended (H. Rept. 105–104); and

H.R. 956, to amend the National Narcotics Leadership Act of 1988 to establish a program to support and encourage local communities that first demonstrate a comprehensive, long-term commitment to reduce substance abuse among youth, amended (H. Rept. 105–105 Part I). **Page H3068**

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designated Representative Pryce to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H2927**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:03 a.m. and reconvened at 12:00 noon. **Page H2932**

Journal Vote: By a yea-and-nay vote of 311 yeas to 44 nays, Roll No. 139, the House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of Monday, May 19. **Pages H2932–33**

Member Sworn: Representative-elect Bill Redmond presented himself in the well of the House and was administered the oath of office by the Speaker. **Page H2933**

Private Calendar: It was made in order that the call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with on Tuesday, May 20. **Page H2937**

Motions to Suspend the Rules on Wednesday, May 21: It was made in order that on Wednesday, May 21, the Speaker be authorized to entertain motions to suspend the rules and pass the following bills and resolutions: H.R. 1377, Savings are Vital to Everyone's Retirement Act of 1997; H.R. 1306, Riegle-Neal Clarification Act of 1997; H.R. 911, Volunteer Protection Act of 1997; H. Res. 121, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the March 30, 1997 Terrorist Grenade Attack in Cambodia; H. Con. Res. 63, reaffirming the Commitment of the United States to the Principles of the Marshall Plan; and H.R. 956, Drug-Free Communities Act. **Page H2937**

Suspensions: The House voted to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Ceremony Honoring Mother Teresa: S. Con. Res. 26, to permit the use of the Rotunda of the Capitol for a congressional ceremony honoring Mother Teresa—clearing the measure for the President (agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 415 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 142); **Pages H2937–38, H2959–60**

Congressional Gold Medal to Mother Teresa: H.R. 1650, to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Mother Teresa of Calcutta in recognition of her outstanding and enduring contributions through humanitarian and charitable activities; and **Pages H2938–41, H2960**

Activities to Provide Decent Homes: H. Res. 147, amended, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the House of Representatives should participate in and support activities to provide decent homes for the people of the United States. Agreed to amend the title. **Pages H2941–46, H2960**

Concurrent Budget Resolution: By a yea-and-nay vote of 333 yeas to 99 nays, Roll No. 148, the House agreed to H. Con. Res. 84, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002. **Pages H2960–H3065**

Rejected:

The Waters amendment in the nature of a substitute that sought to achieve a balanced budget and reduce defense spending and corporate tax considerations, delay tax cuts until the budget is balanced, and increase funding for education, training, healthcare, community development, crime prevention, and other discretionary programs (rejected by a recorded vote of 72 ayes to 358 noes with 1 voting "present", Roll No. 143); **Pages H3021–32**

The Doolittle amendment in the nature of a substitute that sought to achieve a balanced budget and reduce non-defense discretionary spending, provide additional tax cuts, and allow a point of order against any concurrent resolution on the budget or against any measure that would cause total outlays to exceed total receipts in FY 2002 and beyond (rejected by a recorded vote of 119 ayes to 313 noes, Roll No. 144); **Pages H3032–40**

The Brown of California amendment in the nature of a substitute that sought to achieve a balanced budget and delay tax cuts until the budget is balanced, decrease defense outlays, increase net savings from overall spending reductions and the elimination of unwarranted benefits, and increase funding for research and development, transportation, education and training, and law enforcement (rejected by a recorded vote of 91 ayes to 339 noes, Roll No. 145); **Pages H3040–47**

The Kennedy of Massachusetts amendment in the nature of a substitute that sought to achieve a balanced budget and reduce defense funding and tax cuts and increase funding for healthcare, education, transportation, research and development, Medicaid, and other domestic discretionary spending programs (rejected by a recorded vote of 123 ayes to 306 noes, Roll No. 146); and **Page H3047–55**

The Shuster amendment in the nature of a substitute that sought to achieve a balanced budget and increase outlays for federal highway and mass transit programs with offsets from a 0.39 percent across the board reduction to discretionary spending and tax cuts phased in over four years (rejected by a recorded vote of 214 ayes to 216 noes Roll No. 147). **Page H3055–65**

H. Res. 152, the rule that provided for consideration of H. Con. Res. 84, was agreed to earlier by a yea-and-nay vote of 278 yeas to 142 nays, Roll No. 141. Earlier, agreed to order the previous question by a yea-and-nay vote of 220 yeas to 200 nays, Roll No. 140. **Pages H2946–59**

Presidential Message—National Emergency Re Burma: Read a message from the President wherein he transmits his report concerning the repression of the democratic opposition in Burma, his declaration of a national emergency to respond to the actions and policies of the Government of Burma, and his issuance of an Executive order prohibiting United States persons from new investment in Burma—referred to the Committees on International Relations and Appropriations and ordered printed (H. Doc. 105–85); **Pages H3065–66**

Senate Messages: Message received by the Senate today appears on page H2959.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Five yea-and-nay votes and five recorded votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H2932–33, H2958, H2958–59, H2959–60, H3031–32, H3039–40, H3047, H3054–55, H3064–65, and H3065. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: Met at 10:30 a.m. and adjourned at 3:32 a.m. on Wednesday, May 21.

Committee Meetings

FINANCING NATIONAL FOREST ROADS

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Forestry, Resource Conservation, and Research held a hearing to review the financing of National Forest roads. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

DOE CIVILIAN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

Committee on Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power held a hearing on H.R. 1277, Department of Energy Civilian Research and Development Act of 1997. Testimony was heard from Kyle Simpson, Senior Policy Advisor, Department of Energy.

OVERSIGHT—CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution held an oversight hearing regarding the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice. Testimony was heard from Isabelle Katz Pinzler, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, Department of Justice; and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims held an oversight hearing regarding visa fraud and immigration benefits application fraud. Testimony was heard from Mary Ryan, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Consular Affairs, Department of State; the following officials of the Department of Justice: Paul W. Virtue, Acting Executive Associate Commissioner, Programs, Immigration and Naturalization Service; and Michael R. Bromwich, Inspector General; and Benjamin F. Nelson, Director, International Relations and Trade Issues, National Security and International Affairs Division, GAO.

OVERSIGHT

Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held an oversight hearing on the agreement reached by the United States, the environmental community and the mining industry in the New World Mine proposed buyout. Testimony was heard from Kathleen A. McGinty, Chair, Council on Environmental Quality; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands held a hearing on the following bills: H.R. 60, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance to the Casa Malpais National Historic Landmark in Springerville, AZ; H.R. 951, to require the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain lands located in Hinsdale, CO; H.R. 822, to facilitate a land exchange involving private land within the exterior boundaries of Wenatchee National Forest in Chelan County, WA; H.R. 1198, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the City of Grants Pass, OR; and H.R. 960, to validate certain conveyances in the City of Tulare, Tulare County, CA. Testimony was heard from Representatives Hayworth, Thomas, Hastings of Washington and Smith of Oregon; from the following officials of the Department of the Interior: Katherine H. Stevenson, Associate Director, Cultural Resource Stewardship and Partnership, National Park Service; and W. Hord Tipton, Assistant Director, Bureau of Land Management; and public witnesses.

INTERNATIONAL DOLPHIN CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a modified closed rule providing 1 hour of debate on H.R. 408, International Dolphin Conservation Program Act. The rule provides that, in lieu of the Resources Committee amendment, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the Congressional Record and numbered 1 shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and said amendment shall be considered as read. Clause 7 of rule XVI (germaneness) is waived against the Resources Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The rule further provides for an amendment printed in the Congressional Record to be offered by Representative Miller of California or his designee; and said amendment 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.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Representatives Saxton, Gilchrest, Cunningham and Miller of California.

RURAL EMPOWERMENT

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Empowerment held a hearing on regulatory, tax, licensing incentives and impediments to empowerment in rural and impoverished communities. Testimony was heard from Senator Lugar; Representative Jones; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Conferees: Continued in evening session to further resolve the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions of H.R. 1469, making emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters, and for overseas peacekeeping efforts, including those in Bosnia, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997.

NATO ENLARGEMENT

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki Commission): Commission resumed hearings to examine the process to enlarge the membership of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), receiving testimony from H.E. Branislav Lichardus, Ambassador of the Slovak Republic to the United States; Gyorgy Banlaki, Ambassador of the Republic of Hungary to the United States; and Stefan Tafrov, Ambassador-at-Large of the Republic of Bulgaria to the United States.

Hearings were recessed subject to call.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST *p. D492)*

H.R. 968, to amend title XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to permit a waiver of the prohibition of offering nurse aide training and competency evaluation programs in certain nursing facilities. Signed May 15, 1997. (P.L. 105–15)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 1997

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Defense, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the Department of Defense, focusing on Air Force programs, 10 a.m., SD–192.

Committee on Armed Services, to continue hearings on the Quadrennial Defense Review, focusing on its impact on the future years defense program, 2 p.m., SH–216.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, to hold hearings to review a General Accounting Office report on management and program weaknesses at the Department of Transportation, 9:30 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, business meeting, to consider pending calendar business, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation, to hold hearings on S. Res. 57, to support the commemoration of the bicentennial of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, S. 231, to establish the National Cave and Karst Research Institute in the State of New Mexico, S. 312, to revise the boundary of the Abraham Lincoln Birthplace National Historic Site in Larue County, Kentucky, S. 423, to extend the legislative authority for the Board of Regents of Gunston Hall to establish a memorial to honor George Mason, S. 669, to provide for the acquisition of the Plains Railroad Depot at the Jimmy Carter National Historic Site, and S. 731, to extend the legislative authority for construction of the National Peace Garden memorial, 2 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Finance, to hold hearings to examine the Federal Employees Health Benefit Plan as a model for Medicare reform, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Subcommittee on Social Security and Family Policy, to hold hearings on proposed legislation relating to child welfare reform, 2 p.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations, to hold hearings on United States implementation of prison labor agreements with China, 10 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Indian Affairs, to hold oversight hearings on programs designed to assist Native American veterans, 9:30 a.m., SR–485.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, on Members of Congress, 10 a.m., 2358 Rayburn.

Committee on Banking and Financial Services, to continue hearings on Financial Modernization, including, H.R. 10, Financial Services Competitiveness Act of 1997, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Commerce, Subcommittee on Finance and Hazardous Materials, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 1262, Securities and Exchange Commission Authorization Act of 1997; and H.R. 1053, Common Cents Stock Pricing Act of 1997, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families, hearing on Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention legislation, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, hearing to review the status of scientific information on ergonomics, 10 a.m., 2261 Rayburn.

Committee on House Oversight, to consider motions on subpoenas issued in connection with the Contested Election in the Forty-sixth District of California, 5:30 p.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on International Relations, Subcommittee on Africa and the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade, joint hearing on Obstacles to U.S.-African Trade and Investment, 1 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

*Committee on National Security, hearing on Quadrennial Defense Review, 9:*30 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 79, Hoopa Valley Reservation South Boundary Adjustment Act; H.R. 765, Shackleford Banks Wild Horses Protection Act; H.R. 856, United States-Puerto Rico Political Status Act; H.R. 858, Quincy

Library Group Forest Recovery and Economic Stability Act of 1997; H.R. 985, to provide for the expansion of the Eagles Nest Wilderness within Arapaho and White River National Forests, CO, to include the lands known as the Slate Creek Addition upon the acquisition of the lands by the United States; H.R. 1019, to provide for a boundary adjustment and land conveyance involving the Raggeds Wilderness, White River National Forest, CO, to correct the effects of earlier erroneous land surveys; H.R. 1020, to adjust the boundary of the White River National Forest in the State of Colorado to include all National Forest System lands within Summit County, CO, which are currently part of the Dillon Ranger District of the Arapaho National Forest; H.R. 1127, National Monument Fairness Act of 1997; H.R. 1439, to facilitate the sale of certain land in Tahoe National Forest, in the State of California to Placer County, California; and H.R. 1460, to allow that election of the Delegate from Guam by other than separate ballot, 11 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Science, Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, hearing on the Science behind EPA's Proposed Particulate Matter/Ozone Standards, Part 3, 2:30 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, hearing on Commercial Space Act of 1997: Commercial Remote Sensing, Part I, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, hearing on the private right of action provision in the Supplement to California's state OSHA plan (Cal/OSHA), 11 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Aviation, hearing on Medical Kits on Commercial Airlines, 9:30 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to mark up the following: H.R. 1362, Veterans Medicare Reimbursement Demonstration Act of 1997; a measure to facilitate voluntary retirement of VA physicians; and a resolution naming Bob Hope an honorary veteran; and to hold a hearing to accept the report of the Veterans' Claims Adjudication Commission, 1:30 p.m., 334 Cannon.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Wednesday, May 21

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 27, Fiscal Year 1998 Concurrent Budget Resolution.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Wednesday, May 21

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Receive former Members of Congress;

Consideration of 6 Suspensions:

1. H.R. 1377, Savings are Vital to Everyone's Retirement Act of 1997;
2. H.R. 1306, Riegle-Neal Clarification Act of 1997;
3. H.R. 911, Volunteer Protection Act of 1997;
4. H. Res. 121, expressing the Sense of the House of Representatives regarding the March 30, 1997 Terrorist Grenade Attack in Cambodia;
5. H. Con. Res. 63, reaffirming the Commitment of the United States to the Principles of the Marshall Plan; and
6. H.R. 956, Drug-Free Communities Act; and

Consideration of H.R. 408, International Dolphin Conservation Program Act (modified closed rule, 1 hour of debate)

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate 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 gpoaccess@gpo.gov, or a fax to (202) 512–1262; or by calling Toll Free 1–888–293–6498 or (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, $150.00 for six months, $295.00 per year, or purchased for $2.50 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $141.00 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.