

SUPPORT FOR WEI JINGSHENG

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to associate myself with all of those who are concerned about the news reports begun by Reuters, quote "China imposes new punishments on dissident Wei."

□ 1830

As somebody who has supported opening a dialog with the Chinese Government, I simply want to say that I hope that the Secretary of State is going to make the strongest possible representation on behalf of Mr. Wei, that the United States Government is going to insist on an accounting for what is happening to him and that we are going to make clear to the Chinese Government that our commitment to human rights, our concern for political prisoners and our insistence on some standard of decency are real, run across all of American society, and that they should not assume that one vote one way or the other on a particular item indicates that they have a blank check to oppress human beings.

I appreciate the gentlewoman from California for bringing this to the House's attention. I hope that Secretary Albright will make the strongest possible representation on this issue.

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

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

CLINTON'S ENDORSEMENT OF THE NEW EPA AIR REGULATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my absolute disappointment, frankly disgust with the President's decision endorsing the EPA's stricter regulations on air pollution. The President says that the reason for imposing these new rigorous regulations was because he, and I, quote, thinks kids ought to be healthy. I agree with him. But I also think it is in the best interest of America's kids if their parents are able to remain employed.

And frankly, the new proposals may in fact hurt our kids. The current clean air standards already require cities to have emission-control plans to ensure the air is cleaner each year. As stated in the June 24 Wall Street Journal, current emission control plans will be thrown out while the new ones are being written. This will actually slow,

slow the clean air progress perhaps for years. And in the process our workers will be placed at risk. The unions know these standards will cost workers their jobs. That is why many are opposing the EPA's stricter standards.

I think we need to ask ourselves, when is enough enough? How many jobs must we lose to clean up the air more than it is? There is a point of diminishing returns where the cost far outweighs any benefits. Mr. Speaker, the Browner-Gore-Clinton EPA standards reaches that point.

We have made great progress in the last 20 years. Today the air is cleaner than it has ever been. When our current standards were put in place, the majority of our States and communities could not comply. Today over 96 percent, over 96 percent of our communities in nearly every State is able to comply with the current standards. Compliance has carried an expensive price tag but improving our environment and our air was necessary to protect the future of our country.

I believe we have succeeded. Now is not the time to turn the tables on these successes and apply more regulations and tougher standards on our communities, our workers and our families.

Right now, Mr. Speaker, the President is about to make perfect the enemy of good. Pushed by the most radical, including the Vice President and EPA Administrator Carol Browner, he is about to sacrifice our workers, our jobs and our economy at the altar of perfect air.

I and many others are not ready to blindly follow. I think we know the facts. We studied the circumstances and we have seen the data. For example, a New England Journal of Medicine study has said our children are harmed more by cockroaches, dust mites and mold than by our current air. Only 4 of the EPA's 21 scientists who serve on the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee actually supported the tougher standards that the President has endorsed. Even Newsweek provided a feature issue on how to protect your children from asthma. And almost nothing in that article, nothing focused on our current air standards as the problem.

The PR game has begun and the President is beginning to play his part on the bully pulpit. But I would suggest we not buy the snake oil that is being sold. His evidence is razor-thin and the costs are steep for our communities, our businesses, our workers, and our families.

Today we have a strong coalition, Republicans included, Democrats, business leaders, workers, who oppose these new regulations. I believe we need to stop the new EPA regulations before they do damage to America.

We need to commend our communities for the great progress that they have made on clean air and progress they have made. Instead, it seems President Clinton wants to reward them by punishing them with these im-

possible standards which they may never ever be able to meet.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET REGARDING CURRENT LEVELS OF SPENDING AND REVENUES REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JUNE 12, 1997 FOR FISCAL YEARS 1997-2001

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, on behalf of the Committee on the Budget and pursuant to sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, I am submitting for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an updated report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 1997 and for the 5-year period, fiscal year 1997 through fiscal year 2001.

This report is to be used in applying the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 178), for legislation having spending or revenue effects in fiscal years 1997 through 2001.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, June 19, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: To facilitate application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 1997 and for the 5-year period fiscal year 1997 through fiscal year 2001.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature as of June 12, 1997.

The first table in the report compares the current level of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set by H. Con. Res. 178, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997 as adjusted pursuant to 606(e) of the Budget Act for continuing disability reviews. This comparison is needed to implement section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 1997 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority, outlays, and new entitlement authority of each direct spending committee with the "section 602(a)" allocations for discretionary action made under H. Con. Res. 178 for fiscal year 1997 and for fiscal years 1997 through 2001. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to implement section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 602(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority or entitlement authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 1997 with the revised "section 602(b)"

sub-allocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. This comparison is also needed to implement section 302(f) of the Budget Act, because the point of order under that section also applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 602(b) sub-allocation. The revised section 602(b) sub-allocations were filed by the Appropriations Committee on September 27, 1996.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. KASICH,
Chairman.

Enclosures.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1997 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 178

[Reflecting action completed as of June 12, 1997—On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal years—	
	1997	1997–2001
Appropriate Level (as amended by P.L. 104–93):		
Budget authority	1,314,935	6,956,507
Outlays	1,311,321	6,898,627
Revenues	1,083,728	5,913,303
Current Level:		
Budget authority	1,324,402	(¹)
Outlays	1,324,181	(¹)
Revenues	1,104,262	5,975,917
Current Level over(+)/under(–) Appropriate Level:		
Budget authority	9,467	(¹)
Outlays	12,860	(¹)
Revenues	20,534	62,614

¹ Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for Fiscal Years 1997 through 2001 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

FY 1997 budget authority exceeds the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 178 as amended by P.L. 104–93. Enactment of measures providing any new budget authority for FY 1997 would be subject to point of order under section 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

OUTLAYS

FY 1997 outlays exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 178 as amended by P.L. 104–93. Enactment of measures providing any new outlays for FY 1997 would be subject to point of order under section 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

REVENUES

Enactment of any measure that would result in any revenue loss in excess of \$20,534,000,000 for FY 1997 (if not already included in the current level estimate) or in excess of \$62,614,000,000 for FY 1997 through 2001 (if not already included in the current level) would cause revenues to be less than the recommended levels of revenue set by H. Con. Res. 178.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO BUDGET ACT SECTION 602(a), REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JUNE 12, 1997

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

	1997			1997–2001		
	BA	Outlays	NEA	BA	Outlays	NEA
House Committee:						
Agriculture:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	4,996
Current level	5	5	5	55	55	55
Difference	5	5	5	55	55	–4,941
National Security:						
Allocation	–1,579	–1,579	0	–664	–664	0
Current level	–102	–102	–21	–289	–289	–34
Difference	1,477	1,477	–21	375	375	–34
Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs:						
Allocation	–128	–3,700	0	–711	–4,004	0
Current level	0	–6	0	0	0	0
Difference	128	3,694	0	711	4,004	0
Economic and Educational Opportunities:						
Allocation	–912	–800	–152	–3,465	–3,153	7,669
Current level	1,967	1,635	1,816	11,135	10,296	8,852
Difference	2,879	2,435	1,968	14,600	13,449	1,183
Commerce:						
Allocation	0	0	370	–14,540	–14,540	–41,710
Current level	3	3	492	242	195	1,430
Difference	3	3	122	14,782	14,735	43,140
International Relations:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	–1	–1	0	–1	–1	0
Difference	–1	–1	0	–1	–1	0
Government Reform & Oversight:						
Allocation	–1,078	–1,078	–289	–4,605	–4,605	1,668
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	1,078	1,078	289	4,605	4,605	1,668
House Oversight:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Resources:						
Allocation	–91	–90	–12	–1,401	–1,460	–59
Current level	–19	–20	0	–144	–167	0
Difference	72	70	12	1,257	1,293	59
Judiciary:						
Allocation	0	0	0	–357	–357	0
Current level	3	3	0	45	45	0
Difference	3	3	0	402	402	0
Transportation & Infrastructure:						
Allocation	2,280	0	0	125,989	521	2
Current level	2,345	65	12	4,748	121	56
Difference	65	65	12	–121,241	–400	54
Science:						
Allocation	0	0	0	–13	–13	0
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	13	13	0
Small Business:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Veterans' Affairs:						
Allocation	–90	–90	224	–919	–919	3,475
Current level	0	0	3	0	0	–52
Difference	90	90	–221	919	919	–3,527
Ways and Means:						
Allocation	–8,973	–9,132	–2,057	–134,211	–134,618	–10,743
Current level	8,338	8,302	–2,840	73,457	73,476	–38,717
Difference	17,311	17,434	–783	207,668	208,094	–27,974
Select Committee on Intelligence:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Authorized:						
Allocation	–10,571	–16,469	–1,916	–34,897	–163,812	–38,038
Current level	12,539	9,884	–533	89,248	83,731	–28,410
Difference	23,110	26,353	1,383	124,145	247,543	9,628

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH SUBALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO BUDGET ACT SECTION 602(b)

[In millions of dollars]

	Revised 602(b) suballocations (Sept. 27, 1996)				Current level reflecting action completed as of June 12, 1997				Difference			
	General purpose		Violent crime		General purpose		Violent crime		General purpose		Violent crime	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
Agriculture, Rural Development	12,960	13,380	0	0	13,051	13,427	0	0	91	47	0	0
Commerce, Justice, State	24,493	24,939	4,525	2,951	24,812	25,059	4,526	2,954	319	120	1	3
Defense	245,065	243,372	0	0	242,193	242,737	0	0	-2,872	-635	0	0
District of Columbia	719	719	0	0	719	719	0	0	0	0	0	0
Energy & Water Development	19,421	19,652	0	0	19,951	19,922	0	0	530	270	0	0
Foreign Operations	11,950	13,311	0	0	12,267	13,310	0	0	317	-1	0	0
Interior	12,118	12,920	0	0	12,492	13,184	0	0	374	264	0	0
Labor, HHS & Education	65,625	69,602	61	38	70,684	71,780	61	39	5,059	2,178	0	1
Legislative Branch	2,180	2,148	0	0	2,204	2,132	0	0	24	-16	0	0
Military Construction	9,983	10,360	0	0	9,793	10,334	0	0	-190	-26	0	0
Transportation	12,190	35,453	0	0	10,463	35,638	0	0	-1,727	185	0	0
Treasury-Postal Service	11,016	10,971	97	84	11,621	11,299	97	83	605	328	0	-1
VA-HUD-Independent Agencies	64,354	78,803	0	0	60,876	79,195	0	0	-3,478	392	0	0
Reserve/Offsets	768	219	0	0	-2,750	-5,850	0	0	-3,518	-6,069	0	0
Grand total	492,842	535,849	4,683	3,073	488,376	532,886	4,684	3,076	-4,466	-2,963	1	3

Note.—Amounts in Current Level column for Reserve/Offsets are for Spectrum sales and BIF/SAIF. Those items are credited to the Appropriations Committee for FY 1997 only.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, June 19, 1997.

Hon. JOHN KASICH,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, this letter and supporting detail provide an up-to-date tabulation of the on-budget current levels of new budget authority, estimated outlays, and estimated revenues for fiscal year 1997. These estimates are compared to the appropriate levels for those items contained in the 1997 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 178) and are current through June 12, 1997. A summary of this tabulation follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	House current level	Budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 178)	Current level +/- resolution
Budget Authority	1,324,402	1,314,935	+9,467
Outlays	1,324,181	1,311,321	+12,860
Revenues:			
1997	1,104,262	1,083,728	+20,534
1997-2001	5,975,917	5,913,303	+62,614

Since my last report, dated April 10, 1997, Congress has cleared and the President has signed the 1997 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (P.L. 105-18). These actions have changed the current level of budget authority and outlays.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL,
Director.

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT—105TH CONGRESS,
1ST SESSION, HOUSE ON-BUDGET SUPPORTING DETAIL
FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS
JUNE 12, 1997

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
PREVIOUSLY ENACTED			
Revenues			1,101,533
Permanents and other spending legislation	855,751	814,110	
Appropriation legislation	753,927	788,263	
Offsetting receipts	-271,843	-271,843	
Total previously enacted	1,337,835	1,330,530	1,101,533
ENACTED THIS SESSION			
Airport and Airway Trust Fund Tax Reinstatement Act, 1997 (P.L. 105-2)			2,730
1997 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (P.L. 105-18)	-6,497	281	

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT—105TH CONGRESS,
1ST SESSION, HOUSE ON-BUDGET SUPPORTING DETAIL
FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS
JUNE 12, 1997—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
APPROPRIATED ENTITLEMENTS AND MANDATORIES			
Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted	-6,936	-6,630	
TOTALS			
Total Current Level	1,324,402	1,324,181	1,104,262
Total Budget Resolution	1,314,935	1,311,321	1,083,728
Amount remaining:			
Under Budget Resolution			
Over Budget Resolution	9,467	12,860	20,534
ADDENDUM			
Emergencies:			
Funding that has been designated as an emergency requirement by the President and the Congress	9,198	1,913	
Funding that has been designated as an emergency requirement only by the Congress and is not available for obligation until requested by the President	345	304	
Total emergencies	9,543	2,217	
Total current level including emergencies	1,333,945	1,326,398	1,104,262

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM AMENDMENT—SYMPTOM OR CAUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's Supreme Court decision in City of Boerne versus Flores is being touted as a blow to religious liberty and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993. It is, however, a blow to neither. The case of City of Boerne versus Flores came to the Supreme Court as a result of the zoning laws in Boerne, Texas which restricted the uses to which Reverend Cummings could put the property belonging to the Roman Catholic Church for which he worked. These particular zoning restrictions were not directed at Reverend Cummings or the Roman Catholic Church. The zoning laws were not even directed at religious organizations or churches generally. Rather, these zoning restrictions were directed at property owners in general in the name of historic preservation. These facts, however, beg the question as to why this case

was argued instead as a violation of religious liberties protected by the first amendment.

What made this an issue of religious freedom in the court and "court of public opinion" is perhaps a symptom of the U.S. Supreme Court's holding in Village of Euclid, Ohio versus Ambler Realty Co. (1926) in which the Court sanctioned the abandonment of individual rights to property in the name of zoning for the "collective good." For those whose property rights are regulated away, devalued, or "taken" regulatorily, it is a natural symptom to expect these aggrieved parties to cling to whatever Constitutional liberties might still gain them a sympathetic ear in the courts. Those destroying flag-like property scramble for protection under the banner of free expression and Reverend Cummings sought property rights protection elsewhere within the first amendment, namely, religious freedom. Absent local, state, or federal governments' realization that such dilemmas are hopelessly irreconcilable outside a framework of individual property rights, similar cases will continue to find their way to various levels of the judicial system as those suffering infringements upon their rights in property, grope for justice against the collective expropriation which has become not only the rule, but the rule of law, in this country.

It is no accident that a case such as this did not originate in Houston, Pasadena, or Alvin, Texas. Each of these cities have allowed the marketplace, through a series of voluntary contractual exchanges, (rather than a central-planning-style zoning board), to determine how private property is most effectively developed.

The first amendment is meaningless absent a respect for property rights. Freedom of the press is a mere sham without the right to own paper and ink. Freedom of religion is vacuous absent the right to own a pulpit from which to preach or at least a place in which to practice or worship. Until this country's lawmakers and courts restore a system of Constitutional jurisprudence respective of the inextricable nature of so-called economic and fundamental liberties, all liberties will be subject to eradication at the whim of the legislatures, the courts, or both.

HONORING GENERAL THOMAS S.
MOORMAN, Jr.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under a previous order of the