

America does not even cover all its children. The United States ranks eighteenth in overall infant mortality. Only Portugal does worse. If the United States matched Japan's infant mortality rate, more than 15,000 American babies who died before their first birthday in 1994 would be alive. And the United States ranks eighteenth in the percentage of babies born at dangerously low weight. No industrialized country does worse than that.

Now again I do not want to keep coming up here and giving horror stories and talking about all the problems that we face because of the fact that the 10 million kids are not covered. But I think that the magnitude of this problem is such that if we do not do something quickly and if this House and this Congress does not address the problem fairly quickly, the problem only gets worse, the costs only get greater, and from a humane point of view it simply is something that we need to address, and so myself and other Democrats will be here on a regular basis tomorrow, the next few weeks or the next few months until our Republican colleagues on the other side of the aisle agree to take this up in a timely fashion.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 89, REQUESTING THE PRESIDENT SUBMIT A BALANCED BUDGET

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-18) on the resolution (H. Res. 90) providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 89) requesting the President to submit a budget for fiscal year 1998 that would balance the Federal budget by fiscal year 2002 without relying on budgetary contingencies, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

A POSITIVE AGENDA FOR THE 105TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the time for us to have this special order to speak not only of the importance of moving ahead with a positive agenda for the 105th Congress, but also I rise today in the spirit of the Hershey accords, the achievements of our recent weekend in Hershey, PA, to join my colleagues in offering this special order. Probably the most important bipartisan issue we can address for the citizens of this country is the balancing of the Federal budget.

I rise here today and will be joined by several of my distinguished colleagues, not least of which is GIL GUTKNECHT, a

Congressman from Minnesota, and urge the President to work with us using the same economic assumptions, meeting the requests made by the Congress following the number of elections and producing a budget that responsibly balances our budget by the year 2002. Once we can see where the President's priorities are in the free market of a balanced budget then we can begin a civil debate over the policy differences among the various proposals.

I just want to say at the outset that my feelings are that having talked to Republicans and Democrats alike this past weekend, our issues of balancing the budget, campaign finance reform, working on things like FDA reform, improving our transportation and working on other issues of common concern throughout the Congress certainly can be accomplished because the bipartisan spirit that I felt and the finding the common ground, I think, was very special.

You know for many of us, who may be one party or the other, we do not meet other Members of the aisle, the opposite Members of the aisle, unless we are on their committee or we come from their State. This particular retreat gave us for the first time in a long time a chance for us to meet on a personal level other Members who we do not serve within the same committee or from the same State, and by that we are able to at least find common ground, and while we do not want anybody to give up their principles, we do not want anybody to give up their agenda, we do want to make sure that we, as Members of Congress, will always remain civil, Mr. Speaker, and to make sure that we can do more and be more productive because we give the mutual respect they each deserve.

I wanted to ask CONGRESSMAN GUTKNECHT, who was an active participant at the conference, what his impressions were before we get into the issues of balanced budget and other items that are on your agenda, and I know how active you have been on your committee work, GIL. Could you tell a little bit of what your impressions were of the retreat and whether you thought it succeeded in achieving the goals that it set out to begin with.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Well, I would have to say it this way, that I was one of those who was not all that eager to go along, and it was guilt that got me to go to Hershey, PA. It may have been the chocolate that kept me there after the first several hours. But I must tell you as the weekend went along it was a very valuable experience, not only for me, but I hope for my colleagues and, most importantly, I think, for the American people.

I think that the American people sent us sort of a message in the last congressional elections. What they said in effect was that we want the Republicans to continue to control the House of Representatives and the Senate, but we want President Clinton, the Democrat, to run the executive branch of

Government, and we want there to be some checks and balances, but what they also said is they want us to work together as much as we possibly can.

And one of the valuable things, I think, that came out of Hershey is we now, all of us who were there at least, have a little better understanding of a sense of history, and if you look at this institution, the House of Representatives, there have been some rather bloody fights on this House floor. I mean there have been Members who have been caned, there have been fist fights, there have been arguments—

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. The caning was in the Senate, the fist fights were in the House.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. But we have had more than our share of fisticuffs that were associated with the debate here on the floor. We have also had periods where there was consensus building, cooperation, and much more agreement and ability to work together in a civilized way.

□ 1900

I think what will happen as a result of what we saw in Hershey is hopefully both sides will begin to reach out to the other side. I think in the end what we really need to do is agree where we can agree, have honest debate where we disagree. And I think the American people expect that, but I think they also expect us to compromise where we can.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that over the next several months and over the balance of this 105th Congress we will see more civilized debate. There has been entirely too much trivializing, too much demonizing, too much personalizing the debate that occurs on the floor of this House.

We are going to have an honest discussion tonight about the budget. We obviously have a somewhat different view of the President's budget and the need to balance the budget perhaps than some of our colleagues. I brought with me some charts, and I am going to walk down there in a few minutes, and we are going to talk about what the President has proposed, what we might dispose. But I think most importantly we need to talk about, what does this mean to the average American family? What is this balancing the budget all about? Is it just some kind of an accounting exercise, or does it really ultimately impact real families and real Americans in homes and in the neighborhoods where they live?

Mr. Speaker, I think as we go through and talk a little bit about this, I think we can demonstrate that this really does have a dramatic impact not only on Americans today but, more importantly, on Americans in the future. We have some very serious problems, but I think, if we approach them in a cooperative relationship, a respectful relationship where we can have a civil and honest debate about the great issues facing our country today, then I think both the Congress and the American people will have been well served by what transpired up in Hershey, PA.

I would just say publicly for the benefit of those who may be watching back in Pennsylvania, I know we cannot refer to them, but I would like to thank them and all the folks from Pennsylvania for everything that they put into the weekend, because they really did a wonderful job and showed us tremendous hospitality. It was a beautiful setting, wonderful people. I think I gained about 4 pounds in 3 days, but it was just fantastic.

I would also just share one more thing that relates to Pennsylvania. I reminded some of the folks who were in my group, and I intend to do a 1-minute tomorrow morning and talk about, among other things, one of the things that Benjamin Franklin said. During the Continental Congress, there were some rather bitter and vicious debates that took place on the floor of those meetings. And after several days of very bitter rancor, debate going on in the Continental Congress, one morning Benjamin Franklin of Pennsylvania rose slowly at the back of the House Chambers and he said, "Let us for a moment, Mr. Speaker, contemplate our own fallibility."

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that we discussed in some of our sessions in Hershey was that there are two things that I think we need more of in this body. One is a little more humility, and second is a little more humor. Hopefully, we can bring that about in the coming days and weeks of this debate.

Tonight we want to talk about the budget, what it means to average Americans; talk a little bit about why the President's budget leaves a little to be desired. It is a starting point but something we have to work on with our colleagues here in the Congress and with the folks down at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. I am going to move down here and turn it back to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to mention that for a first bipartisan conference in Hershey I was very pleased to see 220 Members, both sides of the aisle being there. I think that augurs well for the future, when the next event I hope that we will have three-quarters, if not seven-eighths of the House present. Not only was Speaker GINGRICH there, but a Democratic leader, minority leader, RICHARD GEPHARDT was there, which shows that this was a bipartisan effort. Those who came to the bipartisan conference certainly left with the idea that we are going to do our part to raise the level of civility and professionalism and to make sure that we try to find a common ground without giving up principles and without giving up important items on our agenda, not only in our State, but in our country.

Mr. Speaker, one other item I think I should mention, a very important thing, is we found out that we have different regional needs. The Midwest has needs that the South does not need, and the South has needs that need to

be respected as well. So one of the outcomes that I think are going to happen, we are going to find Members visiting in those other regions. So while I am talking about how important mass transit is to the East so we do not have mass gridlock, overloading the roadways and increasing pollution and trying to help us get more trains and those initiatives, I can understand the Midwest having some interest in agriculture programs, and over in the Pacific Northwest and some of their environmental concerns.

So we need to have this shared vision for America where we all come together and work as well as we can.

Mr. Speaker, I think in looking at the balanced budget, in starting that discussion tonight, I think that is something that the Republicans and Democrats need to work on. The Clinton budget, I might say at the outset, leaves a deficit of \$70 billion in 2002, and it also, according to the Joint Committee on Taxation, is going to increase taxes by \$23 billion by 2002.

Mr. Speaker, I am interested in hearing the analysis of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] of the Clinton budget as a starting point for this House to move on. And I hope that we will have the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] join us, who is the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, and I would hope that he could join us as well.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Minnesota could start us on his outline of the Clinton budget, I know it would be a good starting point for tonight's discussion.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. As I said earlier, we need to have an honest debate about the numbers. Before we can have an honest and civil debate about the budget, we have to be speaking the same language. We cannot have a debate where I am speaking in German and someone else is speaking in French and someone else is speaking in another language altogether.

One of the problems we have in terms of our debate about the budget is we tend to be speaking in Congressional Budget Office terms, and the President this year is speaking in terms of the Office of Management and Budget. They take different assumptions.

Right now the Congressional Budget Office has gone through the budget that the President submitted, and what they have told us is that actually total deficit goes up under the President's plan in the first couple of years and then begins to come down; but even in the last year of the President's budget, the year 2002, he is still about \$69 billion short.

Now, we do not really want to have a debate about the Congressional Budget Office, who is more accurate, the CBO or the OMB or whomever, because I think sometimes the American people do not understand that. But what I hope they will understand is that, before we can have a debate about the

budget, we all have to be speaking the same language. So one of the things I think we need to get in agreement with the White House on over the next couple of weeks is what are the assumptions we are going to use.

One of the things we could do, and I learned this when I was in the State legislature and served on the Pension Commission, is that assumptions are everything. If we assume an economic growth rate, for example, of 3.5 percent over the next 5 years, frankly you do not have to make much in terms of budget changes in terms of the spending side, because the economic growth will solve it. If we assume a very low interest rate, it has a dramatic impact on the deficit. As a matter of fact, we were told by the Congressional Budget Office in the Committee on the Budget a couple of weeks ago that, if interest rates change by one-quarter of 1 percent, either up or down, it changes the deficit by \$50 billion over the next 5 years.

So one of the things we want to do is hopefully get the White House and the Congress to at least be using the same assumptions so that we are speaking the same language. As I say, then we can have a civil and honest debate about which items we are going to increase and which ones we are going to reduce.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. First let me commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] for sponsoring this discussion tonight. If I may just ask the gentleman's explanation of deficit in the Clinton budget.

The gentleman mentioned the scoring that takes place by two different agencies, the CBO and OMB. In spite of the fact that they do different scoring, they both agree, do they not, that the deficit goes up initially and then falls ever so slightly during the 1998-99 time frame, and then during the last 2 years of the 5-year plan, the President's 5-year plan, the deficit reduction that takes place is about 70 percent of the total deficit reduction that takes place during the whole plan. So we are essentially, under this proposal, pushing most of the deficit reduction off until after the year 2000, when we then promise the American people we will get to it. Is that fair to say under both sets of scoring?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, under both sets of scoring, and I think that is an accurate point, both the Congressional Budget Office and OMB acknowledge that in the first year, and this is really the only budget that counts for this Congress, is the budget we are going to debate for fiscal year 1998, both would agree that the deficit actually goes up this year, which in the view of some of us is a step in the wrong direction, because we have been moving in the right direction. Partly,

and let us give some credit, we want to give credit to the White House and to the economy and other things, but part of it is that the 104th Congress did confront some of those spending issues.

Mr. Speaker, we did make some real reductions in discretionary domestic spending, and it is showing some impact. The deficit now is about half of what it was when Congressman FOX and I first came to Washington. As a matter of fact, it is less than half of what it was when we first came to Washington.

I would point out this other chart. This again is according to the Congressional Budget Office, which is the official scorekeeper for the House and the Senate, that the deficit will be about \$69 billion in the year 2002.

To get to the other point that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] made, 98 percent of the deficit reduction comes in the last 2 years of the President's budget plan. That is one of the concerns we have that is entirely too heavily what we call backend-loaded. Actually, according to the CBO, the increase in the deficit will be about \$24 billion more than it would have been if this Congress did nothing.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, it just seems to me, and this chart points it out even more clearly, I said that 70 percent of the reduction takes place in the last weeks of the last 2 years, and my colleague is saying that virtually all of the deficit reduction under the President's plan, 98 percent, takes place during the last 2 years. It would seem to me that, if we are going to be serious about deficit reduction and getting to a balanced budget, that we ought to start in earnest right away to make a serious step down of the deficit to take place beginning in 1998 and not waiting until the year 2000. Would my colleague agree with that analysis?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. If the gentleman would yield back, that is one of the debates that we have had, and over the last couple of years Congresses have used what we called a manana budget. It is real easy to cut the budget after we leave office. So what we are really concentrating on is what can we do in fiscal year 1998 to put us on a path toward a balanced budget.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very clear that your leadership and the leadership of Congressman SAXTON is needed to move us forward to have a balanced budget. I know that Congressman SAXTON is the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee and has been trying to work to make sure we get that balanced budget, because by doing that, we reduce the interest cost, whether it is for car loans, for mortgages, for student loans, all of the items in life where we can make a cost difference for families back in our districts. That is what it is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to at this time to include with our discussion tonight the gentleman from Utah [Mr. COOK], who has been doing a great deal

of work and has been speaking out about fiscal responsibility when he ran for the office and in his early weeks here as a Congressman has displayed that kind of fiscal responsibility. I would like to call on Congressman COOK now, if he could give us some of his thoughts on this issue and just where we should be going in this 105th Congress on the balanced budget.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate this opportunity to speak briefly on a subject that is very dear to me. As a longtime advocate of a balanced budget and tax reform, I am not really happy about President Clinton's proposed 1998 budget. I think in many ways this budget is a mockery of the American people's desire for a balanced budget and responsible spending in Washington.

President Clinton promised us a plan that would balance the budget by 2002. However, as my colleagues have been saying, the Congressional Budget Office reports that Clinton's budget would have a deficit of \$69 billion in 2002. Under the President's spending plan, the budget deficit would even drop to last year's level of \$107 billion until 2000. Between now and then, the deficit would balloon, to allow the President to increase aid to foreign countries and pad our welfare program, six new entitlement programs. And he would increase welfare spending alone by \$21 billion over the next 5 years.

President Clinton is proposing a budget that carries tax-and-spend ways through, I believe, the rest of his administration, leaving the bulk of his own deficit reductions for another President to implement. Play now, pay later.

The American people expect better of their President. This splurge now, starve later tactic, I think, is an offense to our people who are really looking hopefully to Washington for the fiscal responsibility they yearn for from their leaders.

I am a strong supporter of tax reform and tax relief for struggling American families. As a longtime proponent of tax reform, I really question the President's claim that he too wants to help working American families when he heaps \$23 billion in proposed permanent tax increases on those families.

□ 1915

His promise of the family-friendly tax cut, the \$500 per child tax cut, would only be good for the next 3 years if the economy does not perform the way he hopes it will. The much-touted education tax credit would only apply to families with children in college during the next 3 years on the same basis.

President Clinton offers his tax breaks that last only while he is around to take credit. Conveniently, his tax increases, too, do not start until after he leaves office, but unlike the tax breaks, they are very permanent. Indeed, his proposed legacy of \$23 billion in tax increases will linger, I am afraid, decades after he is gone.

With those tax increases, he will make it harder for American families to pull one end close enough to meet the other. He barbers our children's future with tax increases and false promises of a balanced budget, ironically while claiming to build a bridge to that future.

The Democrats' success in defeating the balanced budget amendment in the Senate was a disappointment to many, many of us and, I think, to the American people who hoped this year would finally be the year when Congress made that tough decision. We must keep faith with those Americans who must balance their own budgets and rightfully expect Congress to do likewise.

We cannot approve yet another White House tax-and-spend budget. If President Clinton does not have the courage to begin whittling Federal spending down, I think while he is around to take some of the heat himself, we do have that courage. We made an agreement, I think, with the American people, an agreement that included fiscal prudence and meaningful tax relief.

The idealism and confidence of those promises are the reasons I wanted to come to Washington. I was proud to come back here this year and stand with those who in 1994 promised a better way. We have had a rough few years with the White House fighting every inch of progress in keeping our word to the American people. Some who have stood for this have lost their bids for reelection along the way.

But keeping our word is not about our own political careers. It is not about popularity in the polls. It is about restoring integrity to government. It is about once again deserving the trust of the American people.

Mr. SAXTON. If the gentleman will yield on the one point that he made on his mention of taxes, I think it is very important to point this out, and I think the gentleman is right on, relative to this issue, when we talk about balancing the budget. There are undoubtedly some in this Chamber, as apparently the President is, apparently at least partly in favor of tax increases to try to move toward a balanced budget.

I think it is a very foolish course to follow, because history shows that every time Congress has increased taxes, Congress has also seen fit to increase spending by \$1.59 for every dollar we have increased taxes. So in spite of the fact that we had tax increases in 1990 and tax increases in 1993, in both cases, in a stated attempt to balance the budget, in both cases the deficit got worse. There are reasons for that that I will not go into, but they had to do with the way the economy performs when we raise taxes and the way it performs in a positive way when taxes are reduced.

I happen to favor a version of the balanced budget amendment which creates a supermajority provision to raise taxes. In other words, if we as an institution decide that it might be a good

idea to raise taxes instead of cutting spending to balance the budget, then we ought to do it, in my view, with a supermajority two-thirds vote.

It makes imminently common sense to me, because history has shown that over and over and over again, this institution and the President have chosen to try to control the deficit by increasing taxes. It has not worked. We need to recognize that. The supermajority provision in the balanced budget amendment seems to me to be one safeguard against the Congress falling into that trap yet again.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have to agree with the comments made by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. COOK]. They are very poignant regarding the importance of balancing the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I would yield back the balance of my time and ask the Speaker to consider making the Speaker's designee the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUTKNECHT]

BALANCING THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is recognized for the remainder of the 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from the great State of New Jersey [MIKE PAPPAS] who has joined the discussion tonight to talk a little bit about the budget and balancing the budget and from his perspective as a new Member of this body. We welcome him to this special order tonight and hope it will not be the last time he will join us.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I ran for Congress last year because I believe very strongly that if we as a nation could not get our Nation's fiscal house in order, the future will not be as bright as it should be. Everyone in this city says they are for a balanced budget, yet some of those same people opposed the balanced budget amendment, which would have forced both the administration and the Congress to do what every American in this country has to do each and every year: balance their own budget; that every small business person has to do each year, to balance their budget.

I think it is unfortunate that while they say they want to balance the budget, they present a plan, a plan, not a budget but a plan, that sees the budget in imbalance to the tune of \$69 billion.

I can recall back in 1992 when Mr. Clinton was running for office, that he said that he had a plan to balance the budget in 5 years. Now we are in the fifth year of his administration, and yet we are looking beyond to another 4 or 5 years when he is out of office. I am

here to act, I am here to vote. I am here to do what the people of the 12th District in central New Jersey sent me to do, to see a balanced budget within our lifetime. I am absolutely committed to do that.

I am disappointed, yet at the same time I am hopeful, because at least now within the administration there is at least agreement that we need to balance our budget. That is tremendous progress from what we may have seen many, many years ago, where there was even a difference of agreement with regard to that.

So I am here to literally roll up my sleeves, to make the tough decisions now, over the next year or two, at least within this term while I am serving the people of my district. Back home in New Jersey our State government, our county, our municipal governments, our school districts, each are required by our Constitution to have a balanced budget. I think it works very well for the people that I represent.

There are those I have even heard that have said, at least in New Jersey, those that have opposed the concept and voted against balancing the budget, they have said that when they were a local official in their community that they balanced their budget. They did not add that the Constitution requires them to balance their budget, and if that requirement was not in existence, I have to wonder and we all would have to wonder whether that would be the reality.

So I am here just to add my voice to the chorus here on both sides of this aisle that wants to see this budget balanced. I want to, as I said earlier, roll up my sleeves, make the very, very tough decisions that each of the people out there, throughout this country, have to make every day. People elected us to do that. They did not elect us to come up with a plan.

It seems even in some of the committees that I serve on, there are people that talk about specific needs that need to be filled for various segments of our population. Some of those things I think have to be addressed today, or within the next year or two, versus saying we have a plan and we are going to project that in 10 years or in 8 years, that this particular need will be met and that this particular program will be initiated.

It is great to have a plan, but the plan is only as good as the paper it is written on. If we do not follow the plan that the American people have expected us to do, or expect me to be part of instituting, then I think we will have failed. I do not think they want us to do that. I do not want to do that, and I believe that the majority of the people, at least in this Chamber, do not desire to do that.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I would just share, just to follow up with some of those comments, that what the gentleman was talking about, I think if the voters had been told last fall that

part of the plan would be to increase the deficit by \$24 billion this year, and ultimately wind up with a 5-year plan, and that according to our official scorekeepers, the Congressional Budget Office, that would actually leave us with a \$69 billion deficit in the year 2002, my sense is that the voters would have been incensed. They would have said no way.

I want to point out, this is one more chart that describes what we are talking about. In some respects it is like a person who says I am going to go on a diet. I am going to lose 50 pounds. But first I am going to gain 10 pounds. I will actually do most of the weight loss program in the last week of this plan of the diet.

That is crazy. That is not the way the world works. That is not the way human beings work. Frankly, we know that is probably not going to happen. At least we have a start.

I want to point out some other things. I want to get the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] back involved in the discussion as well. Today the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Rubin, came and testified before the Committee on the Budget. I wrote down some quotes of things that he said. I agreed with much of what he said today. I did not agree with his analysis, I did not agree with his final budget plan, but at least there were a number of points that he did say that I really agree with.

One of them, he said, was that we have an historic opportunity. I think that is absolutely true. One of the unfortunate things, and the gentleman from New Jersey used the term "disappointing," and I think disappointment is the right term. For the first time in a very long time we have an electorate who wants us to make those tough decisions, we have a body politic who has said we want to balance the budget, we have a President who says that he wants to balance the budget, and we have a Congress that is prepared to make the tough choices.

Unfortunately, when we start with this kind of a plan, it makes the job even tougher. That is why I think it is disappointing.

He also said, and this is a quote:

Financial markets will punish bad behavior and they will reward good fiscal behavior.

It was interesting, because the Secretary previously had been, I believe, the CEO of Goldman Sachs, and they recently put out a newsletter, an economic analysis of what was happening in Washington. The headline on this newsletter was "No Meaningful Fiscal Restraint Before the Millennium."

They go on to say, "The prospects for a balanced budget agreement remain excellent. Republicans plan to use the Clinton plan as a starting point in the construction of their own proposal," which I think is accurate. Then they say, "The bad news is that it appears increasingly likely that a deal will not result in meaningful fiscal restraint until the next millennium. In the Clinton budget plan the fiscal restraint is