The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1655, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1655) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the U.S. Government, the community management account, and the Central Intelligence Agency retirement and disability system, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNN of Oregon). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

REVISED BUDGET RESOLUTION REFLECTING THE PRESIDENT'S MOST RECENT PROPOSAL

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, Pursuant to House Resolution 309, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 122) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 122 is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 122

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

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996.

That the Congress determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996 is hereby revised and replaced and the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1997 through 2002 are hereby set forth.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002:

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

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

Fiscal year 1996: $1,039,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,073,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,114,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,162,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,214,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,291,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,354,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1996: −$3,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: −$9,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: −$9,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: −$11,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: −$17,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $3,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $3,000,000,000.

(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 1996: $1,282,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,334,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,399,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,438,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,493,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,539,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,569,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1996: $1,268,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,334,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,378,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,426,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,482,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,525,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,556,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1996: $229,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $261,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $264,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $264,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $268,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $234,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $202,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1996: $5,149,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $5,423,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $5,691,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $5,954,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $6,200,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $6,474,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,718,000,000,000.

SEC. 3. DEBT INCREASE.

The amounts of the increase in the public debt subject to limitation are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $264,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $274,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $268,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $263,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $266,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $254,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $244,000,000,000.

SEC. 4. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1996 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $257,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $261,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $253,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $256,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $259,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $254,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $266,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $259,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $276,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $286,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $275,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $286,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $280,000,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $19,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $17,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $16,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $15,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $17,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $17,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $17,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $16,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $16,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $16,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,000,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $5,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $4,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $4,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $3,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $3,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $3,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $3,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,000,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $22,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $21,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $20,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $20,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $19,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $19,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $19,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,000,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $9,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $11,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $14,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $13,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $13,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $12,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $12,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,000,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $4,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$6,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $3,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$4,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $3,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $2,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $4,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $2,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $2,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,000,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $37,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $39,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $38,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $34,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $34,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $34,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,000,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $10,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $9,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $9,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $8,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $8,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $8,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $8,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,000,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $59,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $60,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $62,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $63,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $65,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $66,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $67,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,000,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $124,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $123,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $132,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $132,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $142,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $142,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $154,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $153,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $167,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $166,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $181,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $181,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $197,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $197,000,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $180,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $178,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $196,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $195,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $211,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $209,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $226,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $224,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $240,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $238,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $258,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $256,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $277,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $275,000,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $216,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $219,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $233,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $237,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $252,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $246,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $257,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $257,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $267,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $276,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $275,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $286,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $283,000,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $6,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $8,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $9,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $10,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $10,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $11,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $12,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,000,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $39,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $39,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $39,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $40,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $40,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $40,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $42,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,000,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $22,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $23,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $24,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $25,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $25,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $24,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $22,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,000,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $14,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $15,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $15,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $15,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $15,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $15,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,000,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $279,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $279,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $291,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $291,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $302,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $302,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $309,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $309,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $316,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $316,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $320,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $320,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $325,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $325,000,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, −$5,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, −$6,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$6,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$5,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, −$6,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$6,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$3,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$7,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$7,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$23,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$23,000,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, −$32,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$32,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, −$31,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$31,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$31,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$31,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, −$33,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$33,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$39,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$39,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$48,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$48,000,000,000.

SEC. 5. RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS.

Upon the adoption of this resolution, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate, after consultation with the ranking minority member of such committee, shall each file reconciliation directives in the Congressional Record to effectuate the provisions and requirements of this resolution. For all purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, those reconciliation directives shall be deemed to be reconciliation directives set forth in this revised concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 309, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] each will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding time to me.

Twenty-eight days ago, this Congress reached an historic agreement with the President, really a contract, submit a plan to balance the budget, a plan that would balance the budget within 7 years, a plan that would balance the budget using Congressional Budget Office numbers.

Over the next 2 hours, you will hear a lot of debate and discussion on the President's plan. We will then have a referendum. We will have a vote on the President's best effort to balance the budget, an effort which disappointingly still has at least a $75 billion deficit in the year 2002.

The President's plan does not reach balance. We will have to decide as a Congress whether this plan is good enough, whether this plan is good enough for this Congress at this time. But more importantly, we will have to decide whether this plan is a plan that is good enough for our kids. Is it good enough for the next generation?

I do not think this plan meets that test. This House can do better. This House must do better. We must do significantly better than the President's plan.

I think over the last 28 to 30 days it has become increasingly clear that, as we wage this historic battle, this House of Representatives must take the lead in restoring fiscal sanity to this country. This is an historic battle. This House has to lead this effort. The vote will happen in 2 hours. Vote no on the President's plan, and let us continue working on a real plan that reaches balance.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished 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 today in deep disappointment with the Republican Members of this House.

It's bad enough that they are pushing a budget plan that slices deeply into Medicare and Medicaid to shower tax breaks on the wealthiest Americans.

It's bad enough that they won't accept the President's constitutional obligation to veto their extremist budget—and actually shut down the Government twice to try to keep it on the table.

Now the Republicans want to waste 3 hours of the precious time in which we should be negotiating, by forcing a vote on a phony budget which even the Republicans admit is a sham.

I suppose the Republican leadership thinks this is good politics. But let's face it: It's lousy Government.

This pointless, vote has absolutely nothing to do with the real work of this Congress: reopening the Government with no threats or conditions; and then finding budget solutions, not just budget soundbites.

This vote does nothing to end the Republicans' Government shutdown, which has denied millions of Americans the services they depend on—the services they pay for.

This vote does nothing to balance the budget in 7 years—or in any number of years.

In fact, this vote amounts to little more than a posture and a press release—a cynical attempt to play politics instead of rolling up our sleeves and getting down to work.

Well, let me say this:

America doesn't want deep Medicare cuts that will double seniors' premiums and force them to give up their doctors—all to give wealthy investors another tax windfall.

America doesn't want to slash child health, child nutrition, and school lunches to stuff the stockings of the most affluent Americans.

You never told them that was your agenda when they voted for you in last November's elections. In fact, when they find out what's really going on, hard-working families are overwhelmingly opposed to the Republican agenda.

And I hate to be the one to tell you this, but nowhere in the United States Constitution does it say that the Congress gets to shut down the Government if it does not like the President's veto, and doesn't feel like compromising even 1 inch.

You see, that seems to be the Speaker's belief. He said in yesterday's Wall Street Journal, and I quote, he ''had to find a trump to match—the President's veto.'' So while the Republicans are busy rewriting the Constitution and inventing partisan card games—children, seniors, and whole families are falling on the chopping block.

You see, almost 1 month ago, the Republicans in this House made a pledge to protect Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment. Since then, they have failed that test—every day and in every way.

So let us stop trying to change the subject. Let us stop these hollow political gestures.

Let us start to work together, across party lines—not just to play accountant, and balance the budget at any cost and in any way——

But to balance the budget in a way that also balances our priorities.

Frankly, if the Republicans can not do that—if it's more important to them to stall and showboat—then it's not Republicans or Democrats who lose—it's all of America.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the very distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the previous gentleman, the minority leader, as well as the other gentleman from Missouri suggested that this is a show, this vote is a show. The problem is not that this vote is a show. The problem is that the President has been a no-show. The President made an agreement 29 days ago that he would in good faith negotiate a balanced budget based on honest numbers by the year 2002. But the President has been a complete no-show.

So I applaud our chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], who has rendered into reality the ideas that the President has talked about and has forced the President into a budget which actually shows what he would have. If the President does not like it, if the Democrats do not like it, then let them say where they do not like it and correct it, and let the President come to the table and negotiate with the only, the sole precondition that we have a balanced budget in 7 years with honest numbers.

☐ 1430

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

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

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABO. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, we were just told by the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE]; he said to us that, if we did not like it, we could change it. I suppose he means change it here on the floor.

Let me ask the gentleman this question:

Was there a committee hearing on this proposal that we are to vote on today?

Mr. SABO. No.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, how in the world, the question then is how in the world, are we supposed to change it? By the way, it is a closed rule that the Republicans just passed, does not allow us to offer any amendments, so we cannot say how we would change it other than by giving up and trying to get a second or two and make a speech.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman and I know this is a political sham it is hollow, as the minority leader said, and it is not deserving of the attention of this House, nor is it deserving of the votes of the Members who represent constituents across this country, and I, for one, do not intend to vote for what is now being called a majority staff report, and that is all it is on the Committee on the Budget, the staff puts some notes together, and I am not going to vote for or against it. It is not worthy of my time.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time.

Mr. Speaker and Members, I think it is sort of a sad day. We have important work to do in this Congress. We should be passing a continuing resolution to have the Government operating. Then people who have very large and fundamental disagreements should be at the table negotiating differences. We should be there negotiating over substance and dollars that involve the fundamental future of this country rather than engaging in gamemanship.

To my friends on the Republican side, Mr. Speaker, let me just say, Please watch your rhetoric as it relates to certain things. I hear all this description of honest numbers, real numbers. I don't know what they are, CBO doesn't know that they are. I would just remind my friends that from midsummer to a couple of weeks ago those so-called and honest numbers changed by $135 billion. They were called real and honest in mid-summer; $135 billion later they are still real; and honest.

The reality is we are looking to the future, we are trying to look longer in to the future than we have ever looked before in a budget. We are looking 7 years rather than 5 years. We have trouble looking 5 years into the future. We make guesses based on certain assumptions, and we should have a little humility.

I happen not to disagree with my colleague's conclusion that we should use in the fundamental differences over CBO revenue numbers, where there is a $57 billion difference in 2002, but I do not describe them as honest or unreal, but if we are going to seriously try and balance the budget and hope that it may actually work, we should use cautious numbers. That is what they are, the more cautious numbers, not the real numbers as if somebody else is using unreal or honest versus dishonest. That is not the case. There are legitimate, very small differences in economic assumptions than when you project over 7 years become substantial. If we were projecting 5 years, those differences would not be that great.

As a matter of fact, over the first 3 years amazingly the revenue number between OMB and CBO differs by a grant total of $1 billion. But just as in the hope that what we do this year may actually work, I want to use cautious numbers. I also want to make sure that we structure a program on the spending side that may actually work rather than putting together crazy scenarios where the odds of success are very little. That relates in part to how we structure a tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, I look at their tax numbers, I disagree with them on the substance of capital gains tax cut for the most affluent in this country, but, if we are going to do it, do honestly.

I look at their numbers, and it costs $9 billion in 2001, and then it gains money in 2002. Where did the money go? Then it is back up to $9 billion in 2003. How amazingly it goes like this, dips in the year they are in balance, and goes up the year afterwards. Same as using the most optimistic revenue assumptions.

I look at their Medicaid Program. My State; I trust that better than the projections I get from various experts around here. Lo and behold, I discover that they expect in the first 2 years they are going to get more money than if we did no change. But then at the end of the year 4 it falls off the table. I compare it to our coalition budget. First 3 to 4 years, about the same; year 2002, miraculously theirs costs $2 billion less.

Unrealistic assumptions about what States with any great flexibility can do. I suspect a little politics. All of these Governors are going to get all their money to play with with no guarantee they provide health care to anyone. I think they will all either be reelected to their second term in office or they will all be out of office before the real cuts occur that are going to force them either to take people off the health rolls or they increase their State and local taxes, and they do that throughout their budget.

So to the President I say, Be cautious on your revenue estimates. To the Republican majority I say, Be real in the way you structure the long-term funding of programs. Then may be we can succeed in the end.

But I have to tell my colleagues if I really want to balance the budget, have lower interest rates, which I think will happen, it is possible, but we are going to have to get pragmatic, we are going to have to depolarize things, and we are going to have to fundamentally conclude that borrowing lots of extra money to pay for a tax cut to start on the path to a balanced budget does not make much common sense.

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

Mr. SABO. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask one question I have asked several times. I was hoping the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] would be here because I trust him to be a honorable man in, certainly, our friendship over the years, and I have asked this question time and time again. People have come to this well and talked about how there is no cuts in Medicare, and we have talked about how the cuts in Medicare will affect senior citizens, and I happen to be a senior citizen. We talked about how they are going to use the tax cuts from Medicare for a tax cut. I would ask the gentleman:

If CBO does not score the $270 billion in reductions, or cuts, or whatever the gentleman wants to call it, in Medicare, unless they score them, we cannot have the $240 billion tax cut; is that right?

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, we have got to score enough cuts in Medicare and other programs to provide for a $242 billion tax cut over 7 years, and the Medicare cut was 270, now it is 230-something.

Mr. HEFNER. But we have to have it scored by CBO.

Mr. SABO. Absolutely.

Mr. HEFNER. So if it is scored to make room for a tax cut, it is a cut in Medicare to make room for a tax cut, it is a cut in Medicare to make room for a tax cut. If it walks like a duck, it quacks like a duck, in all probability it is a tax cut, and they are going to use Medicare to pay for it, and make no mistake about it, and it is not scare tactics. It is telling the senior citizens the truth, and that is what scares them.

Mr. SABO. The gentleman from North Carolina has good judgment.

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this sad alternative to a real balanced budget.

The President agreed almost a month ago to balance the budget using honest numbers. Instead, he has offered us this budget, unbalanced and discredited.

This budget alternative has been discredited for two simple reasons. It does not balance. It will not get any support from an overwhelming bipartisan majority of this House.

First, the budget does not balance. it does not even come close to balancing. Even with a parade of smoke and mirrors that would make Houdini blush, the President's budget still remains $87 billion short of balance.

Why is reaching balance so important? Because if we do not reach balance, we cannot get the balanced budget dividend.

The President wants his cake, and wants to eat it too. That may work in the White House, but it does not work in the real world.

To get interest rates down, to give middle-class families a break on car loans, on mortgage rates, on school loans, we need a balanced budget.

And if my colleagues do not believe me, look what happened yesterday on the stock market.

Second, this budget will not come close to receiving a majority vote in this House, and that opposition will be bipartisan. Members on both sides realize that the President's budget is a loser.

My question to the President is this: If you knew it was wildly unpopular, why did you put it on the table?

And that is the real reason why we are voting on this alternative. We have not been able to engage the President in honest discussions, so we are forced to show the American people where the administration has failed. And it has failed miserably.

So, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to send the President another message:

Get serious on a real balanced budget. Keep your promise, keep your word, and work with the Congress to save America's future.

Balance the budget now.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, sometimes the answers to our problems are so obvious that we miss them entirely, and that is exactly what is happening right now in this debate.

With the budget developed by the Democratic coalition, we can break this impasse right now. We can give the American people the best Christmas present ever: A budget that is balanced fairly and equitably.

Our plan balances the budget in 7 years under CBO scoring, it reduces the deficit faster and deeper than the Republican plan, and it provides greater resources to programs vital to working Americans.

But let me use my time to focus for a moment just on Medicare.

The Coalition has developed a Medicare reform plan that meets the demand of the American people for fairness, and efficiency and reform. It assures the solvency of Medicare through the year 2014. It asks all participants in Medicare to share in protecting the program's future. It achieves private-sector innovations, including provider sponsored networks and private-sector managed care. It provides expanded coverage for preventive care. It avoids the deep cuts that threaten the future of rural hospitals in my district and other rural areas.

Our bill provides $100 billion more for Medicaid than does the Republican Conference plan, and by doing so it insures health care coverage for our most vulnerable citizens and for our rural communities. This is why an increasing number of health providers are lining up behind the coalition's Medicare reforms.

Just last Thursday, the American Hospital Association issued a statement which said it is time for a bipartisan solution on the budget and on Medicare and Medicaid, and the coalition plan is a good framework. More than a dozen other leading organizations have joined the AHA in praising our budget's health care provisions.

N O T I C E

Incomplete record of House proceedings. Except for concluding business which follows, today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SCARBOROUGH (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of family matters.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of a death in the family.

Mr. YATES of Florida (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) after 3 p.m. today, on account of personal business.

Mr. EDWARDS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of the birth of his son.

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. MILLER of California) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. OLIVER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POSHARD, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. MORELLA) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MORELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DICKEY, for 5 minutes, on December 21.

Mr. RIGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHADEGG, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes each day, today and on December 20.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes each day, today and on December 20.

Mr. MICA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SAXTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOODLATTE, for 5 minutes, today

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCINNIS, for 5 minutes, on December 20.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 38. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the Vermont-New Hampshire Interstate Public Water Supply Compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 395. An act to designate the United States courthouse and Federal building to be constructed at the southeastern corner of Liberty and South Virginia Streets in Reno, Nevada, as the ''Bruce R. Thompson United States Courthouse and Federal Building.''

H.R. 660. An act to amend the Fair Housing Act to modify the exemption from certain