

## 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 January 27, 1995. The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues, which are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the concurrent resolution on the budget, House Concurrent Resolution 218, show that current level spending is below the budget resolution by \$2.3 billion in budget authority and \$0.4 billion in outlays. Current level is \$0.8 billion over the revenue floor in 1995 and below by \$8.2 billion over the 5 years 1995-99. The current estimate of the deficit for purposes of calculating the maximum deficit amount is \$238.7 billion, \$2.3 billion below the maximum deficit amount for 1995 of \$241.0 billion.

Since my last report, dated January 17, 1995, there has been no action that affects the current level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues.

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

U.S. CONGRESS,  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
Washington, DC, January 30, 1995.

Hon. PETE DOMENICI,  
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The attached report for fiscal year 1995 shows the effects of Congressional action on the 1995 budget and is current through January 27, 1995. The estimates of budget authority, outlays and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the 1995 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H.Con.Res. 218). This report is submitted under Section 308(b) and in aid of Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, and meets the requirements of Senate scorekeeping of Section 5 of S. Con. Res. 32, the 1986 First Concurrent Resolution on the Budget.

Since my last report, dated January 17, 1995, there has been no action that affects the current level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. BLUM,  
(For Robert D. Reischauer).

## THE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, FISCAL YEAR 1995, 104TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS JANUARY 27, 1995

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 218) <sup>1</sup>	Current level <sup>2</sup>	Current level over/under resolution
On-budget:			
Budget Authority .....	\$1,238.7	\$1,236.5	-2.3
Outlays .....	1,217.6	1,217.2	-0.4
Revenues:			
1995 .....	977.7	978.5	0.8
1995-1999 <sup>3</sup> .....	5,415.2	5,407.0	-8.2
Maximum deficit amount .....	241.0	238.7	-2.3

## THE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, FISCAL YEAR 1995, 104TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS JANUARY 27, 1995—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 218) <sup>1</sup>	Current level <sup>2</sup>	Current level over/under resolution
Debt subject to limit .....	4,965.1	4,711.4	-253.7
Off-budget:			
Social Security Outlays:			
1995 .....	287.6	287.5	-0.1
1995-1999 .....	1,562.6	1,562.6	*0.
Social Security Revenues:			
1995 .....	360.5	360.3	-0.2
1995-1999 .....	1,998.4	1,998.2	-0.2

<sup>1</sup> Reflects revised allocation under section 9(g) of H. Con. Res. 64 for the Deficit-Neutral reserve fund.

<sup>2</sup> Current level represents 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.

<sup>3</sup> Includes effects, beginning in fiscal year 1996, of the International Anti-trust Enforcement Act of 1994 (P.L. 103-438).

\* Less than \$50 million.

Note: Detail may not add due to rounding.

## THE ON-BUDGET CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, 104TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, SENATE SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995 AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS JANUARY 27, 1995

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted in previous sessions			
Revenues .....			\$978,466
Permanents and other spending legislation .....	\$750,307	\$706,236	
Appropriation legislation .....	738,096	757,783	
Offsetting receipts .....	(250,027)	(250,027)	
Total previously enacted ..	1,238,376	1,213,992	978,466
Entitlements and mandatories			
Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted .....	(1,887)	3,189	
Total current level <sup>1</sup> .....	1,236,489	1,217,181	978,466
Total budget resolution .....	1,238,744	1,217,605	977,700
Amount remaining:			
Under budget resolution .....	2,255	424	
Over budget resolution .....			766

<sup>1</sup> In accordance with the Budget Enforcement Act, the total does not include \$1,244 million in budget authority and \$6,361 million in outlays in funding for emergencies that have been designated as such by the President and the Congress, and \$1,027 million in budget authority and \$1,040 million in outlays for emergencies that would be available only upon an official budget request from the President designating the entire amount requested as an emergency requirement.

\* Less than \$500 thousand.

Notes: Numbers in parentheses are negative. Detail may not add due to rounding.

## ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LIBERATION OF AUSCHWITZ

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to solemnize the 50th anniversary last Friday of the liberation of Auschwitz, the concentration camp where nearly 1½ million innocents were exterminated by the Nazi regime, most of them for the simple reason that they were Jews.

The Nazi Holocaust represents one of the blackest eras of the 20th century, a time which casts a shadow across the landscape of the entire second half of this century.

I quote Paul Johnson, one of our eminent living historians, from one of his many great books, "A History of the Jews":

Hitler had wiped out a third of all Jews, especially the pious and the poor, from whom

Judaism had drawn its peculiar strength. The loss could be seen in secular terms. In the nineteenth century and early twentieth century the world had been immeasurably enriched by the liberated talent streaming out of the old ghettos, which had proved a principal creative force in modern European and North American civilization. The supply continued until Hitler destroyed the source forever. No one will ever know what the world thereby sacrificed. For Israel the deprivation was devastating. It was felt at a personal level, for so many of its citizens had lost virtually all their families and childhood friends, and it was felt collectively: one in three of those who might have built the state was not there. It was felt spiritually perhaps most of all.

"No one will ever know what the world sacrificed." We will always live with that absence; we will always live with the darkness of what was lost.

Churchill called it "the crime without a name." Last Friday at the ceremonies in Poland, Lech Walesa spoke of "the martyrdom of all nations, especially the Jewish Nation." And in Germany Helmut Kohl said it was "the darkest and most terrible chapter in German history." They were all correct.

Civilized men and women are fortunate today that the lands where the Holocaust occurred are free. But the truly free societies must bear burdens, and a burden of freedom is to examine one's past—for the purpose of recognizing the most brutal of realities; for the purpose, perhaps, of understanding; but most importantly, for the purpose of never forgetting. I submit that nations are never completely free until they have the ability, will, and courage to examine their pasts free of censorship, free of cant, free of willful neglect.

The Holocaust Museum in Washington provides a somber, moving, and dramatic memorial to man's most evil capabilities, and it draws thousands to pay homage to the millions of victims of genocide. There is strength in a society that can bear such witness.

Fifty years later, we still live in the shadow of the Holocaust, and indeed, until we can say that all men will respond instinctively and courageously with the highest outrage against genocide, we can never stray far from this darkness.

Last week we commemorated the liberation of Auschwitz. In the same week, 19 Israeli men were killed in a terrorist attack by one of the extremist groups dedicated to the destruction of Israel. In the same week, more intelligence reports surfaced about Iran's nerve gas production, which, combined with its current ballistic missile capabilities, puts it in a position to threaten Israel with gas attacks.

Again, I will quote Paul Johnson:

The overwhelming lesson the Jews learned from the Holocaust was the imperative need to secure for themselves a permanent, self-contained and above all sovereign refuge where if necessary the whole of world Jewry could find safety from its enemies. The First World War made the Zionist state possible. The Second World War made it essential.

It is a bitter realization to know that 50 years after the Nazi Holocaust, the Jewish State remains under attack; anti-Semitism is growing in certain parts of the world, as in Russia; genocide is practiced and ignored, as in Rwanda and, on the European Continent drenched in Jewish blood, in Bosnia.

The Nazi Holocaust demonstrated a human depravity that many refused to believe was possible. We must never forget that men are capable of the most heinous destruction of their fellow men. The name of Auschwitz should forever echo in the memories and consciences of civilized people as one of the pinnacles of evil achieved in the 20th century. For it was in Auschwitz and the other concentration camps of the Nazi era that genocide was practiced as a tool of nationalism. And if we ever choose to ignore the shadows of such a loss, of such a despicable past, we do so at the risk of blindly allowing it to happen again.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEMPTHORNE). Morning business is closed.

#### BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 1, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1) proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, we are happy at this point to have Senate Joint Resolution 1, the Hatch-Simon balanced budget constitutional amendment brought up. It is in the form of the House-passed amendment which is absolutely identical to the amendment that the distinguished Senator from Illinois and I and Members of the House, including CHARLES STENHOLM, from Texas, and, at that time, LARRY CRAIG back in the early days over in the House, who is now one of the leaders on the Senate floor, have been working on for years, ever since the 1982 balanced budget fight.

When I was chairman of the Constitution Subcommittee, we brought it to the floor and then to the leadership of Senator THURMOND, Senator DOLE, and Senator Baker at that time. We were able to pass it through the Senate.

This is slightly changed from then, but the basic principles are the same. Basically, there are three things that the general public needs to know are

very worthy reasons for passing this balanced budget amendment that is now in the form of the House resolution that was passed by 300 votes to 132 last Thursday evening.

No. 1 is that if this amendment is passed by the requisite two-thirds vote of the Senate and is ratified by the requisite three-quarters of the States, then from that point on, it will take three-fifths of both bodies in order to increase the deficit.

That is a supermajority vote, and the reason we have done that on the deficit is because the deficit is going out of control and we would have to have a supermajority vote in order to have real considerations as to whether or not we want to continue to expand the deficit.

So, No. 1, you would have to have a three-fifths vote if you want to increase deficit spending. No. 2, if you want to increase taxes to pay for the costs of Government, then you no longer can do it by a simple majority vote.

Some of the media in this country have had the idea that this amendment just has a simple majority vote. It is not true. It has what is called—and we put it into the 1982 amendment that passed the Senate by 60 percent but died in the House, then led by Tip O'Neill; he beat us over there—but we came up with the idea of a constitutional majority requisite vote in order to increase taxes.

Let me just explain that a little bit more. If this amendment becomes the 28th amendment to the Constitution, then in order to increase taxes, you are going to have to have 51 percent—a majority of the whole body of both the House and the Senate. So to put that in perspective, we could pass anything in this body as a general rule by a majority vote if we have a quorum of 51 Senators. We can pass anything by a vote of 26 to 25, if that is how close it was.

Under a constitutional majority, we cannot increase taxes without, No. 1, a vote and, No. 2, without getting at least, no less, than 51 U.S. Senators to vote for it and in the House at least no less than 218 Members of the House.

So those are two very important reasons for voting for this: No. 1, in order to increase the deficit, this amendment says you are going to have to have a three-fifths vote of both bodies, the Senate and the House. No. 2, if you want to increase taxes, you are going to have to have a constitutional majority to do so. And No. 3, you have to vote.

Right now, many times when we increase the deficit in this country, we do not vote at all. We just have a voice vote. Nobody knows who are the people that have put us into debt or put us into further debt. From here on in, in both cases, that of increasing the debt or increasing taxes, we are going to have to have rollcall votes. Those are the three pivotal and most important aspects of this amendment.

Let me just put it in further perspective, with regard to the constitutional majority necessary to raise taxes. If the President's fiscal stimulus bill had come up, as it came up last year, was passed the way it was, the Senate was equally divided 50-50. There were 50 who voted for it and 50 who voted against it. It took the Vice President to break the tie, and it passed 51 to 50.

If this amendment passes, my contention is it will take at least 51 Senators, regardless of the way the Vice President votes, in order to increase taxes.

So it will not be easy to increase taxes, although we have had many votes in the history of this body where we have had 51 votes for taxes.

I believe it will become the focal point from that point on. I believe the three-fifths vote will become the focal point on increasing the deficit.

Why are we even talking about a balanced budget amendment? I have talked to many of my constituents and there was more than one person who came to me and who said: "What kind of a legacy are we leaving to our children? How can I and my generation continue to spend us into bankruptcy and leave our children high and dry?"

I have had a number of people on Social Security all over my State come to me and say, "Look, Senator, if you don't get spending under control, our Social Security isn't going to be worth anything. We won't be able to survive because that is all we have to live on."

If we do not get spending under control, they say, they are going to not get many benefits out of Social Security.

These people put the correct issue first: Are we going to live within our means so that our dollar is worth something, so that we do not ultimately have to monetize the debt, devalue the dollar, and make even Social Security less worthwhile for people? And they are the first to admit that we need a balanced budget constitutional amendment to make it necessary for Congress to choose among competing programs.

I have had people in the military say, "What are we going to do? Military spending keeps going down." If we start getting into a range of inflation, because interest against the national debt is now over \$300 billion a year and going up exponentially and will be over \$400 billion, according to the Congressional Budget Office, after the first of the year, how are we going to keep our country safe and clear? And that is based on current interest rates. Will inflation not go up even more? The answer to that is probably so.

They said to me, as much as we want the military to be strong and our Nation to be secure, you are going to have to pass the balanced budget amendment.

The average person out there understands this. They do not get all caught up in the special interest concerns of the day. People who think clearly