

REVISIONS TO THE AGGREGATE SPENDING LEVELS CONTAINED IN H. CON. RES. 84

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Sec. 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD revisions to the aggregate spending levels contained in H. Con. Res. 84 and a revised allocation for the House Committee on Appropriations to reflect \$360,000,000 in additional new budget authority and \$20,000,000 in additional outlays for "Payment of International Arrearages."

The House Committee on Appropriations submitted the conference report on H.R. 2159, a bill making appropriations for the Foreign

Operations for Fiscal Year 1998 which includes \$360,000,000 in budget authority and \$20,000,000 in outlays for international arrearages.

These adjustments took effect upon enactment P.L. 105-118.

Questions may be directed to Art Sauer or Jim Bates at x2-7270.

The adjustments are set forth on the attached table.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
[Dollar in millions]

| Discretionary | Current Allocation | | Change | | Revised Allocation | |
|--|--------------------|-----------|--------|-----|--------------------|-----------|
| | BA | 0 | AB | 0 | BA | 0 |
| General Purpose | \$520,165 | \$549,878 | +360 | +20 | \$520,525 | \$549,898 |
| Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund | 5,500 | 3,592 | | | 5,500 | 3,592 |
| Total | 525,665 | 553,470 | +360 | +20 | 526,025 | 553,490 |

The aggregate levels for budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 1998 are increased as follows:

[Dollar in millions]

| Current Aggregates | | Change | | Revised Aggregates | |
|--------------------|-------------|--------|-----|--------------------|-------------|
| BA | 0 | BA | 0 | BA | 0 |
| \$1,387,228 | \$1,372,502 | +360 | +20 | \$1,387,588 | \$1,372,522 |

Pursuant to Sec. 205(a) of H. Con. Res. 84, The Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1998 and Title V of P.L. 105-83 making Appropriations for the Department of Interior and Related Agencies for 1998, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a revised allocation for the House Committee on Appropriations to reflect \$700,000,000 in additional new budget authority and \$248,000,000 in additional outlays for

"Priority Federal Land Acquisitions and Exchanges."

Sec. 205(a) of H. Con. Res. 84 requires that the Chairman of the Budget Committee to make an adjustment " * * * after the reporting of an appropriation measure * * * that provides \$700 million in budget authority for fiscal year 1998 for Federal land acquisitions and to finalize priority Federal land exchanges, * * * "

Title V of P.L. 105-83 provides "That moneys provided in this title, when combined with moneys provided by other titles in this Act, shall for purposes of section 205(a) of H. Con. Res. 84 (105th Congress) be considered to provide \$700,000,000 in budget authority for fiscal year 1998 for Federal land acquisitions and to finalize priority land exchanges."

The adjustments are shown on the attached table.

ADJUSTMENTS FOR LAND ACQUISITIONS—COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
[Dollars in millions]

| | Current allocation | | Change | | Revised allocation | |
|--|--------------------|-----------|--------|------|--------------------|-----------|
| | BA | 0 | BA | 0 | BA | 0 |
| General purpose discretionary | \$520,525 | \$549,898 | +700 | +248 | \$521,225 | \$550,146 |
| Violent crime reduction trust fund | 5,500 | 3,592 | | | 5,500 | 3,540 |
| Total | 526,025 | 553,490 | +700 | +248 | 526,725 | 553,738 |

Aggregate levels for budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 1998 remain unchanged as follows:

[Dollars in millions]

| | |
|------------------------|-------------|
| Budget authority | \$1,387,588 |
| Outlays | \$1,372,522 |

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. ENGEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

INVOLVING AMERICAN PEOPLE IN SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, last night in the President's State of the Union address, he talked about something that is important to all Ameri-

cans, and what he said was let's save Social Security.

What I think that means for all of us is that we get involved in that debate, because what he outlined was the beginning of a conversation wherein groups like Concord Coalition or AARP would be involved in town meetings throughout this next year, and then in December there would be a Social Security summit at the White House, and maybe the possibility of legislative change after that.

Well, there have been a number of us here in the House that have been talking about Social Security for some time, and what needs to take place right now is that all Americans, as they think about Social Security, I would beg of them to be involved in this debate, because there is nothing more important to a whole lot of Americans than will or will not their Social Security check be there and waiting for them.

□ 1430

I think that as we begin to think about it, we all know the problem. The problem has been very well described. The Social Security trustees said that if we do nothing to save Social Security, it goes bankrupt in 30 years and it begins to run structural deficits in about 15 years. What the trustees' report also showed was that if we do nothing to save Social Security, that the average rate of return for somebody working and paying into Social Security is but 1.9 percent. Mr. Speaker, 1.9 percent. That is not the American dream.

The American dream is built upon putting a little bit of money away that actually grows towards something. But in this case, it is the case of putting money into a system; again, we are not talking about my grandmother's Social Security or my mother's Social Security, but we are talking about each of my three boys' Social Security. And that idea of earning 1.9 percent overall is bad, but what the trustees' report

also shows is that anybody born after 1948 will get a negative rate of return on their Social Security investment.

So as we think about this debate that is soon coming to this Congress and is soon coming to the White House, we ought to think about a couple of things. We ought to think about how do we fix it, because that is the big question. Do we simply cut benefits? I live along the coast of South Carolina and the retirees that I talk to there think that is a horrible idea. That is not the way to fix Social Security.

We have many young people. Other people say, all right, if we cannot cut benefits, maybe we can raise payroll taxes. I think that is a crazy idea, because the young people that I talk to on a daily basis at home in South Carolina say that the idea of raising payroll taxes would squeeze them that much more. We can only squeeze but so much blood from a turnip and those young families that I talk to say they are squeezed. The idea of raising taxes would hurt them.

That only leaves one other option out there for saving Social Security and that is letting one earn more on their Social Security investment, more than this 1.9 percent or more than this negative number. That is, I think, the significance of at least thinking about the idea of personal savings accounts. Because when personal savings accounts have been tried around the globe, people overwhelmingly have elected that option.

In South American countries, 95 percent of the workers in Chile chose the idea of personal savings accounts. In Great Britain, whose demographics are remarkably similar to our own, 75 percent of the workers chose the option of personal savings accounts, or in our own country, a number of counties down in south Texas ran into the same problem we are running into in terms of demographics. They said, how are we going to fix Social Security, and prior to 1983 at the county government level, the State government level, one could create one's own Social Security system. Those counties in south Texas did and 80 percent of the workers, when given the option of personal savings accounts, chose that option.

So I think that as we think about this debate that is coming our way, we really need to look at how do we save Social Security, and I think at least part of the formula for saving Social Security will be the option of personal savings accounts. Not mandatory, but again, leaving people above the age of 65 alone. We do not yank the rug out from underneath seniors, but offer the young people the choice, if it makes more sense for them and for their families, this option of personal savings accounts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

SANCHEZ WON FAIR AND SQUARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today this House took an action that I think does not speak well of the premise that if one runs fairly and wins fairly, one should be allowed to serve fairly.

Leader GEPHARDT offered to this House an opportunity to move democracy forward by ceasing and desisting from the pursuit of an investigation against Congresswoman LORETTA SANCHEZ, who won her election fair and square in California.

So I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to challenge the injustice to a person who deserves justice. I rise today concerning the continuing investigation of the Committee on House Oversight into the partisan political crusade that they have carried on in an effort to harass Congresswoman LORETTA SANCHEZ since she defeated Bob Dornan in the last congressional election. That committee, despite the lack of any shred of credible evidence, has dragged on its investigation for no other reason except partisan politics. We already know that the constituents of LORETTA SANCHEZ' district appreciates her service, has received her well, agrees with her positions, and she is serving them well.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say in American lingo, the jig is up. An Orange County grand jury has concluded its investigation of Mr. Dornan's delusions of voter fraud and concluded there was no credible evidence to indict anyone and that there was no criminal conspiracy to commit voter fraud. This is the system that we put in place, and that system has determined that there is no criminal acts to be prosecuted.

Mr. Dornan's accusations that a Latino civil rights organization conspired to commit voter fraud in order to defeat him did not stand up under the scrutiny of an Orange County grand jury investigation. What Mr. Dornan now needs to understand and the Committee on House Oversight needs to determine once and for all is that LORETTA SANCHEZ beat Bob Dornan and LORETTA SANCHEZ has been properly representing the people of the 46th District in California. Get a grip, understand reality, be fair, and allow this particular Congressperson to have the same kind of justice that any one of us would want to have and to be able to represent her constituents.

This is a shameless vendetta carried on by Mr. Dornan against Latino voters, and it now must come to an end. The local prosecutors have concluded their investigation. It is now time for the Members of the Committee on

House Oversight to pull up its stakes and stop spending our taxpayers' dollars chasing the smoke screen being spread by former Members.

This is a former Member whose own colleagues have recognized him as an embarrassment to the principles of this House. His outrageous behavior on the floor of the House in doing various acts of swearing, insulting and threatening other Members was without precedent in this august body. When the House voted to revoke his privilege as a former Member from coming to the floor, that should serve, or should have served, as our notice about the credibility of these charges. That vote was a blight on a former Member that was unprecedented and should have moved the committee to hasten the conclusion of its proceedings. But the members of the committee have continued to follow the lead from this defeated, radical, right wing ideologue, flying in the face of that vote, and now the conclusions of a local grand jury. The committee keeps up its witch-hunt to invalidate votes in Congresswoman SANCHEZ'S 1996 election.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Dornan and his band of followers need to now admit to themselves the simple fact that the voters in California's 46th Congressional District understood in November of 1996 LORETTA SANCHEZ beat Bob Dornan fair and square. Get a life, and let us get over it. But more importantly, let us move forward. Let us allow this House to proceed, accepting every single Member that has been duly elected by their constituents. We cannot do it with the votes we have on the Democratic side of the aisle; we know the Republicans have the upper hand, but we call upon our fair-minded colleagues. This is not a partisan issue, this is a fairness issue for the Democratic and Republican constituents of the 46th District. I believe that taxpayers' money should not be spent.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that these individuals who have control over this process be allowed, of course, to cease and desist from doing this particular proceeding.

Mr. Speaker, as I conclude, let me tell my colleagues just a brief reason, or reasons, why LORETTA SANCHEZ and others of us need to get on with our business. I want to emphasize some remarks I heard earlier today on the President's vision in his State of the Union, and just simply say, we need all of the hands we possibly can get to do what the American people have asked us to do. One, to save Social Security. I applaud the process that the President has offered. And then lastly, we need all the hands to make sure that health care is the right kind of health care for all Americans, and that it is not dictated by gurus sitting up in ivory towers saying that the bottom line is about money. We need all of our voters, Mr. Speaker, all of our Members, and I hope we can get on with the business of the House and the American people.