

Thornberry	Walsh	White
Thune	Wamp	Whitfield
Thurman	Waters	Wicker
Tiahrt	Watkins	Wise
Tierney	Watt (NC)	Wolf
Traficant	Watts (OK)	Woolsey
Turner	Waxman	Yates
Upton	Weldon (FL)	Young (AK)
Velázquez	Weldon (PA)	Young (FL)
Vento	Weller	
Visclosky	Wexler	

## NOT VOTING—14

Ackerman	Hall (OH)	Riggs
Ballenger	Kaptur	Sensenbrenner
Brown (CA)	Mollohan	Torres
Coble	Pomeroy	Weygand
Cooksey	Quinn	

□ 1213

Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Messrs. EWING, LAHOOD, SHUSTER, ROHRBACHER, HASTINGS of Washington, BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado, BECERRA, LARGENT, and FATTAH changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. McDERMOTT and Mr. DELAHUNT changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 600

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 600.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, is it true that there will not be another vote for about an hour on the floor, and that we are about to take up a rule which will consume about an hour?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House is about to take up a rule, on which an hour's time is allocated, so that would be a likely conclusion.

Mr. SOLOMON. The reason I inquire, Mr. Speaker, is to get some order in the House so that Members can either leave the Chamber or take seats.

## REQUESTING THE PRESIDENT SUBMIT A BALANCED BUDGET

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 90 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 90

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House 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. The resolution shall be considered as read for

amendment. The resolution shall be debatable for two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget or their designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to final adoption without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. The motion to recommit may include instructions only if offered by the minority leader or a designee. If including instructions, the motion to recommit shall be debatable for five minutes by its proponent and five minutes by an opponent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] pending which I yield myself such time as I might consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 90 provides for consideration in the House of House Resolution 89, which is a resolution requesting the President to submit a balanced budget under a structured rule. The rule provides for 2 hours of debate, divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority members of the Committee on the Budget or their designees.

Mr. Speaker, in trying to be as fair as possible, the rule also provides for one motion to recommit, which may contain instructions if offered by the minority leader or his designee. If it includes instructions, the motion to recommit is debatable for 5 minutes by a proponent and 5 minutes by an opponent, keeping in mind that there will have already been 2 hours of debate on this entire issue.

Under the rules of the House, a motion to recommit is not required to be given to the minority for the consideration of a House resolution. However, the Committee on Rules sought to provide such a motion to the minority for the purpose of the consideration of this bill to be, again, as fair as possible.

Mr. Speaker, after the 1996 elections when the American people returned bipartisan political leadership to Washington, the Republican Congress offered to begin budget negotiations right away. As a result of this bipartisan spirit, formal and informal discussions between the Congress and the White House on reaching a balanced budget has been ongoing. While these talks have been productive, they are not yet complete, and that is the way it has been year in and year out. It takes time.

As we all know, on February 6 of this year, President Clinton sent his budget to Congress, a budget which, according to the President, produced a surplus of \$17 billion in the year 2002, 5 years from now. Upon the receipt of that budget, the Republican Congress reacted in the same spirit of bipartisan cooperation. The budget was not declared dead on arrival, as was so often the case when Republican Presidents would present

their budget. Even though many of the budget specifics do not meet the expectation of many in this Congress, we still have kept an open mind on it.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the Republican Congress sought to give the administration every opportunity to explain and sell that budget to Congress and to sell it to the American people through the regular committee process, and that is as it should be.

After a thorough analysis by the committees, the bipartisan membership, and the Congressional Budget Office, the President's budget fails four specific tests, and I think that all Members in their offices, or wherever they might be, should pay particular attention to this, because it is what they were sent here to do, and that is bring some fiscal sanity to this body.

First, it does not achieve a balance in the year 2002; it actually leaves a deficit of almost \$70 billion. So what have we succeeded in doing? The truth is nothing in dealing with this terribly important issue.

Second, it does not specifically reduce spending in the first 3 years. It actually allows, listen to this, it actually allows the 1998 deficit to increase; not decrease but to increase. That is this coming year, to increase by \$24 billion. And even more so important, listen to this, it saves 98 percent of the deficit reduction in this whole 5-year period, 98 percent of any cuts, for the last 2 years.

Well, we all know what that means, It means we will not get there.

Third, it does not save Medicare from bankruptcy. It actually does less to save Medicare than even the last Clinton budget of last year.

Fourth, it does not provide permanent tax relief for American families. It actually increases taxes in the last 2 years. Imagine that. We are going to be coming down here and voting to increase taxes when the American people are already the most heavily taxed people in the world. As a result, the President's budget is found, believe me, found wanting.

Mr. Speaker, while we as the Congress are committed to negotiating a balanced budget agreement with the White House, there is one nonnegotiable item determined by the American people, by the American taxpayer: Any budget agreement must achieve balance in the year 2002 using the same deck of cards; in other words, comparing apples to apples. And that means using the Congressional Budget Office scoring so that we all can be playing with that same deck, as I said before.

This is a goal both the President and the Congress have embraced publicly and privately, and was perhaps the only item agreed upon during the budget negotiations of the last 2 years. Mr. Speaker, without an agreement on the parameters of the numbers, no real discussion on specifics can begin because no one will believe what we are talking about.

The President committed to this last year by submitting two budgets scored

in balance by CBO. However, his most recent budget, the one we have before us, reflects an abandonment of that commitment. We have to ask ourselves why.

The resolution before us today calls on the President to reaffirm that commitment to balancing the budget by 2002, using honest numbers and up-front cuts; up front in the first few years, not the last few years.

In contrast, the President's budget uses Gramm-Rudman. Now, many of my colleagues were not here back in the days of Gramm-Rudman, but that was even a Republican budget, and in that budget we had the cuts in the latter years. And guess what? We never got there, because in the last 2 years it was too doggone difficult and we could not do it. We did not have the guts to do it.

We cannot let that happen again. We cannot add another trillion dollars to this accumulated debt. That Gramm-Rudman budget took credit for cuts then, but they wanted to make the cuts at a later time and it just did not work.

Now, once we agree on these goals and what those goals mean, Congress and the President together can sit down and we can work out agreements on the details, details like this. Here is \$800 billion in cuts. Take your choice, Mr. President; take your choice, Congress. But we have to do it. We cannot just ignore it and let it go on year after year. Until that time, budget negotiations will be little more than partisan bickering and will never get us to where we all say we want to be.

Some of my colleagues will argue this resolution is meaningless because Congress has not yet produced its own budget. Well, in response I would like to just make three observations, and we will discuss this during the 2-hour general debate coming up in a few minutes.

First, the current laws governing the budget process required action by both the President and the Congress. Both of us. First the President then the Congress. That is what the law says. It is in here. Read it on page 802.

Now, it is true that the President has submitted a budget, which my colleagues must remember was actually submitted to Congress late, and that is the way it usually always is. And I will admit there is nothing in current law that requires the President to submit that balanced budget, although many of us would argue that. However, for the past 2 years and during the entire Presidential campaign of 1996, all discussions of the budget have assumed a balanced budget. We all began talking along that line, balancing the budget.

By submitting a budget not in balance, the President has submitted a budget that in reality cannot be considered by this Congress. I, for one, will not let that go through the Committee on Rules. Either it will be balanced and it is going to be honest, without smoke and mirrors, or it is not coming out of that Committee on Rules.

My colleagues may also remember that for the past 2 years the Committee on Rules has required that all budgets, whether offered by Republicans, whether offered by Democrats, whether offered by the Blue Dogs, or the Black Caucus or anybody else, had to be scored by CBO and they lived up to it. They went and they had their budgets scored. My own budget was scored by CBO. They were all honest. That is not a new requirement. This is what we agreed to in the last Congress and, by golly, this is what we are going to agree to in this Congress.

This resolution, therefore, calls upon the President to follow that process. If we were to take up the President's current budget, it would have to be scored by CBO, which shows that it is, in fact, not a balanced budget. Without a new budget, Congress' hands are tied by the rules of the Budget Act.

Second, we must remember that over the past 20 years Congress, under Democrat and Republican majorities, have only met the April 15 deadline for considering the budget resolution once. Once over the last 20 years. And not one of those budget resolutions was a balanced budget.

Furthermore, according to my calendar, it is only March 12. We have more than a month to work until that April 15 deadline.

Third and finally, if my colleagues went back and reviewed the history, they would find that every year in which a budget agreement was reached between Congress and the White House, whoever the President was, the budget resolution was adopted later than the deadline. Why? Because both sides sought to reach agreement on the priorities of the budget up front. The actual implementation of that agreement came later in the year, as we all know, through the appropriation process.

□ 1230

That is exactly what Congress is trying to do this year. The Republican Congress is acting in a cooperative way and I believe a very productive manner by offering to use an honestly balanced budget presented by the President as a basis for the debate. In the long run, this will set the context for an effective and productive debate.

The President needs to lead by presenting his visions and his priorities of how the country can reach its goals. However, he fails to achieve the goal of a balanced budget. In these budget negotiations, actually achieving balance through real and significant spending cuts, it is the whole ball game, my friends. If we do not do that, there is no reason to go through this whole exercise. The resolution calls on the President as an exercise of good faith to actually submit a balanced budget. Let us hope that he does.

Let me just show Members, there is a chart down in the well, I will not bother presenting it now, but this is what Members better be thinking about when voting on the resolution today.

The deficit of \$69 billion in 2002, that is what Members would be voting on if they voted on the President's budget today: a \$70 billion further deficit in that year, an accumulated deficit all during the 5-year period, 98 percent of the deficit reductions in the last 2 years.

That is not fair, to even come on this floor and talk about that. If we have not got the guts to vote on those cuts up front in year 1, in year 2, in year 3, then we should not be in this Congress. In this year alone we would, under the President's budget, increase the deficit by \$24 billion rather than staying on that glide path to a balanced budget over 5 years.

This is what this is all about today. We are urging the President to give us that balanced budget, scored by CBO, so that we can compare apples to apples and we can at least hopefully attain the balanced budget that we all are fighting so hard for.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], for yielding me the customary half-hour, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that last weekend's promise of new collegiality would last longer than 3 days, but this rule and this balanced budget bill have melted away that bipartisanship all too quickly.

Mr. Speaker, it should not come as much of a shock to anyone that my Republican colleagues do not like President Clinton's budget. If they do not like what the President does in the White House, I do not expect them to like what is in the President's budget. But how the President balances his budget is not the issue, Mr. Speaker. The real issue is the Republican budget, which nobody has seen.

The most persistent and urgent question at this point, Mr. Speaker, is where is the Republican budget? They have got 10 days left to produce it. The House can spend all the time it wants trying to tell President Clinton what to do, but the fact is the budget needs to come from the House of Representatives. It does not matter how the President balances his budget. It does not matter even if the President has a budget, because the budget has to come from the House of Representatives before April 15.

Mr. Speaker, section 301(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, says, "On or before April 15 of each year, the Congress should complete action on a concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year beginning on October 1 of such year."

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the budget needs to come from the House. Section 301(a) does not even mention the President. The House and Senate have to agree on a budget by April 15, and as I said, we have got 10 legislative days left to get it done. It is that simple. Yesterday House majority leader

DICK ARMEY announced that Congress will not consider a budget resolution until May, one month after the deadline that has been imposed by the law.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that President Clinton submitted his budget on February 6. His budget has been pored over for more than a month while the Republican budget is still a figment of somebody's imagination.

At this point it is easy for my colleagues to like the Republican budget. Nobody has seen it. And although how much someone likes President Clinton's budget is irrelevant, I would like to add, Mr. Speaker, that according to the Office of Management and Budget, President Clinton's budget is in balance. Even the Congressional Budget Office's March 3 analysis of the President's budget shows that it is balanced by the year 2002.

President Clinton has said in his own words that if the CBO's deficits are larger than the OMB's, the President will make sure that his budget balances with the higher deficit numbers. What could be fairer than that? He will make additional discretionary cuts, about 4 percent; he will make entitlement cuts, about 2.25 percent; and he will sunset some taxes. It does not get any better than that, Mr. Speaker.

But that is not the issue here today. The budget issue is the responsibility of the Congress. Putting together a budget with which both the House and Senate agree is the responsibility of the Congress. Meeting the April 15 deadline is the responsibility of the Congress. No amount of finger-pointing or politics is going to change that, Mr. Speaker.

So I suggest to my Republican colleagues that we remember last week's collegiality retreat and we work together constructively. The American people are not going to stand to have their Government closed down for the second year in a row because of Republican politics. And no matter how long the House waits, it is going to have to come up with a budget someday.

So I urge my colleagues, on this matter, to defeat the previous question, to make in order the Minge-Tauscher-Stenholm alternative.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with a very difficult question here this afternoon, and that is, how does this institution reconcile the serious political differences that exist in the country with respect to the budget of the United States of America?

The President took a stab at this when he sent to Congress a budget in early February. Unfortunately, he did not have the benefit of the Congressional Budget Office in projecting revenues and expenditures in making up this budget. CBO had not yet reached that stage in its analysis that it could provide that type of assistance. Once the budget arrived, CBO did attempt to evaluate, or score, the budget. In the

meantime, the Office of Management and Budget had provided the President with that guidance.

We now find that the Office of Management and Budget and the Congressional Budget Office disagree. The President attempted to address this difficult situation by having a so-called fail-safe or trigger mechanism, that tax cuts and certain expenditure programs would be sunsetted, reduced, if the budget was not balanced by the year 2002. For this reason, the Congressional Budget Office said that technically it can balance by 2002.

Now, it would be nice if the President would simply respond to each request that we send to him from the Hill, submit new budgets, and in a sense be negotiating with himself. But the position that we have taken and the amendment that we ask to be allowed in order to this particular resolution would simply recognize that we cannot depend on the President to do all of this. We have a responsibility here in Congress.

Some of us have put together a budget proposal which the Congressional Budget Office has indicated will balance by the year 2002 without the use of triggers, but unfortunately that budget is not being sponsored by the leadership of either party. We feel, those of us that are asking that our amendment be recognized as a viable alternative, that the leadership of this institution has a responsibility that is parallel to the President's, to introduce its own budget. Then we will have some choices on the table.

We are saying, introduce that budget on the majority side and ask the President to send up a revised budget simultaneously. We feel that this simultaneous obligation will move our process forward so that indeed we can be effective, efficient and timely. We would request that this amendment so be allowed, and if it is allowed, we would have the opportunity for an intelligent vote.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the esteemed majority leader. He is one of the reasons we have moved toward fiscal sanity in this body in the last several years.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me this time. If I may, let me give my regards to my good friend from Boston.

It is a pleasure for me to be able to participate in this debate, but I do feel that I want to raise a note of caution. As we all know in this town, it is all too often, I think, possible for people to gain a wrong impression of what is intended and how we act. Sometimes that is because we perhaps act in a clumsy manner. But if I could have my wish for how the President and the White House and members of his party would respond to or accept this action we are taking today, I would hope that they could accept it as an invitation and as an encouragement.

The President went out and campaigned, as well he should, for reelection, and he campaigned on a commitment to achieve a balanced budget that achieved many things, including tax relief for the American people and including saving Medicare from pending insolvency. And the President was reelected. Having won a reelection to the Office of the President of the United States, it is absolutely clear to all of us he won the right and I daresay the obligation to provide Presidential leadership to this first, most important concern of the American people.

When the President submitted his budget before us, we understood and I think we need to understand the White House went through a fairly large personnel change, two new persons at the White House, in particular, that I have enjoyed working with: Erskine Bowles the President's new Chief of Staff, and Frank Raines, his new Budget Director. It is perfectly well understandable that, given this change, that their first initial submission may have had some disappointments.

We have received the President's budget with all the consideration and all the respect that a President's budget should receive, and we have had it examined and scored by those agencies that must examine and score and see how a budget measures up.

The clear definitive agency that the President himself has spoken of so eloquently, even in front of this body in his State of the Union Message, that is definitive, is the Congressional Budget Office. What have we found? To our disappointment, and I have to say from my conversations, I will accept to the genuine surprise and concern of Erskine Bowles and Frank Raines, the President's budget just simply did not do a good job of making the mark.

His current budget raises taxes instead of cutting taxes. It delays 98 percent of the spending cuts until 2 years after the President leaves office. If we did nothing, we would be better off with respect to deficit reduction next year than if you passed the President's budget.

□ 1245

I do not believe the President and I do not believe the people that I have spoken to in the administration would find that an acceptable level of achievement, given the commitment that has been so eloquently expressed from the White House by the President, by the Vice President, and by so many of the people in the administration, and what we try to do today is extend an invitation.

Mr. President, as my mama told me so many, many times: "Don't harbor a disappointment, don't let yourself be defeated. If at first you don't succeed, try, try again."

Please let us work together. We are more than ready to welcome another submission, to get down and look at that. We must acknowledge one responsibility that this Congress has, and it

is the responsibility this Congress will not step down from, and that is to get before the American people in this year a truly balanced budget that makes the hard choices, that fulfills the rigorous demands, that calls on all of us to stretch ourselves out a little bit and achieves the promised goals of a balanced budget by the year 2000, of saving Medicare from the threat of insolvency and providing tax relief for the American people.

I truly believe that this year is the best year for us to get together, this body and the other body, working together and, in all that process, to work with the inclusion and the enthusiastic support and encouragement, one for another, with the administration. We can do that. We ought to do that.

Therefore, I, as we have discussed this whole question of putting this resolution on the floor today, have said from the outset we should do so, and we should do so as an invitation and as an encouragement to the administration to understand they put better work before us, and it will receive even more respect than that work which they put before us. We have understood their disappointments as the Congressional Budget Office and Joint Tax Committee have examined their work, and we want to work with them, and on that spirit I would encourage us all to vote for this resolution and encourage the White House to work with us.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], the ranking minority member on the Committee on Agriculture.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, the tenor of the last speaker, my friend and colleague from Texas, is exactly why I wonder why we are doing this today. It is just like last night when I appeared before the Committee on Rules. It seemed like we were in more agreement than disagreement, and yet I have to come to the floor expressing my extreme disappointment that the amendment that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE], the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. TAUSCHER], and I have suggested for today would not even be made in order, that we would not have the opportunity to even vote upon that.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, we discussed this at length, and we specifically cleared with the parliamentarian both of the amendments that he and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE] were seeking, and they are germane and they can be offered.

Mr. STENHOLM. But only as an offer to recommend, and I am reclaiming my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. But with a clean up or down vote on this subject.

Mr. STENHOLM. But there again we both know that those are more partisan than they are actual activities on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of our alternative is to try to put an end to finger pointing and the blame game that has distracted us from doing the serious work to balance the budget. I was reminded of a speech that I was making not too long ago. When they point a finger at the other side, they should take a good look at themselves; there are three aimed back at them.

Our amendment recognizes that both the Congress and the President must demonstrate more leadership than they have to date in order to reach a balanced budget. We should not allow Congress or the President to avoid this obligation.

The Minge-Stenholm-Tauscher amendment contains the exact same language as the underlying resolution requesting that the President submit a new budget by April 7. However, our amendment would hold Congress to the same standard as the President by requiring the House Committee on the Budget to report a balanced budget by April 7 as well.

Although the underlying resolution calls on the House to consider a balanced budget resolution, it sets no deadline or timetable for action. This will allow us to continue to postpone action and continue the current stalemate. We should not vote to exempt ourselves from responsibility to produce a credible balanced budget.

I believe it is very dangerous, in spite of the very eloquent words of my colleague from Texas a moment ago. I believe it is very dangerous for Congress, as an institution, to continue to shift responsibility for the budget to the President. Article I of the Constitution gives Congress primary authority over legislation dealing with tax and spending and borrowing money.

I encourage my colleagues to read an opinion editorial on our desk in last week's Washington Times by Professor Thomas DiBacco, who pointed out that for most of our history, Congress had the primary responsibility for budgets. Although Congress has given the President more authority in budgeting in order to bring more discipline to the process, the increased presidential role in the budget process has actually coincided with increased deficits.

I would remind my Republican colleagues of the words of a previous Republican Speaker, Joe Cannon, who said, "When Congress consents to the Executive Branch making the budget, it will have surrendered the most important part of governing. I think we had better stick pretty close to the Constitution with its division of powers well defined and powers close to the people."

The resolution before us today allows Congress to avoid its constitutional obligations on budget issues. What they are saying in their resolution is "Mr. President, you submit the budget." Our

responsibilities in this body are for us to submit the budget, and I am ready to reach out and work on both sides of the aisle on going through the regular legislative process. That is what our amendment would make in order.

I urge my colleagues, if they agree with the tenor of my conversation and the concerns about the Constitution, I urge them to defeat the previous question, allow our amendment to come up in which we say to us and the President, "Let's get on with the business of the American people."

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. TAUSCHER].

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule before us today, and I object to House Resolution 89. I am disappointed that the Committee on Rules has chosen to restrict debate on this measure, and I hope my colleagues will vote to defeat the previous question and allow us to offer the Minge-Stenholm-Tauscher substitute.

Our substitute, Mr. Speaker, is quite simple. It says that not only should the President have a CBO-scored balanced budget plan by April 7, but that the House Committee on the Budget must present one as well.

This is a reasonable request, and it is one that is made in the spirit of bipartisanship. It is an effort to place all the parties on a level playing field and to help facilitate useful discussions on balancing the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that we are here today not to debate the merits of different budget proposals, but it looks like it is a cynical attempt to make the President look bad. It is counterproductive to be considering House Resolution 89, but it is even worse that the rule prevents us from offering an amendment to apply the provisions of House Resolution 89 to the Committee on the Budget as well as the President. My colleagues on the Republican side say they are simply trying to get the President to submit a budget using CBO numbers, but that begs the question: Where is the Republican budget?

I came to Congress with a commitment to make the difficult choices necessary to balance the federal budget. I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Blue Dog Coalition budget proposal that makes those choices. Now it is time for the Committee on the Budget to do the same. The Minge-Stenholm-Tauscher substitute would apply the same rules of the game to each participant.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question and support this evenhanded alternative to House Resolution 89.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman, and I also appreciate the assistance of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the distinguished former chairman, who spoke fondly of our last

weekend retreat on collegiality. It was not, however, a retreat from our commitment to balance the budget. I thank those involved in this debate because it is an important debate.

This resolution is very direct and very simple, and in fact there is a provision in the motion to recommit for other views. It asks the President to live up to his word with a budget that reaches balance by 2002, as scored by the independent Congressional Budget Office. They are the scorekeepers on this; they are the referees. Far from balancing, the latest Clinton budget is projected to have a \$70 billion deficit in 2002 by the scorekeepers. So we do not have a balanced budget from the White House.

Now, some will contend that we should place Congress' own budget on the table because of the President's failure to balance the budget. Indeed we have heard that today. They say we need to begin now to do the heavy lifting necessary to balance the budget, and I could not agree more. I think we do need to get on with this, and I can assure my colleagues this process is underway. But the fact is the President must submit a budget. That is required under the law.

It is here; I could refer to it. It is page 872 of the House Rules Manual, and when we get into the law and we get into chapter 11 of title XXXI of the United States Code, section 1105, my colleagues will find in fact several pages of very fine print about what the President must do and when he must do it. And he has not done it in the sense of providing us a balanced budget. That is just the fact.

So, as the majority leader said, we are sending an invitation.

Now judging by President Clinton's track record, I think it is best to follow President Reagan's advice in these matters, and his advice was trust and verify.

President Clinton used his first State of the Union Address to endorse the CBO, and at that time it was important to use CBO estimates, he said, "so we could argue from the same set of numbers." I agree with that. Yet President Clinton fails to follow that pledge at this time.

Many believe President Clinton effectively killed the balanced budget amendment by demagoguing Social Security. A few weeks after sending us a budget that utilizes Social Security trust funds for deficit reduction, it is a rather curious situation.

So given these actions, is it not reasonable for Congress to question the strength of President Clinton's commitment to balance the budget and ask him for a balanced budget?

Mr. Speaker, the American people, I think, have had enough of the rosy scenarios and the political gestures that have no particular substance. If we are to be true partners in the process toward a balanced budget, we need to know that both sides are working off the same sheet. The people I represent

expect those in charge to do the job. It is therefore appropriate for us to ask the President to send up a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, that is what this resolution does.

I urge support for this rule, which is very straightforward, and I urge support for this resolution, which is also very straightforward and gets the job done.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 89 is a waste of time. To understand what I mean one has to look no further than its title: House Resolution 89, a one-House resolution, totally ineffectual to accomplish the purpose it proclaims, which is to make the President send up the second budget because it could not possibly affect the President, does not even bind the other body.

So we are doing today something we are spending 3-hours plus on what amounts to next to nothing.

Now if we are going to take up a matter like this because a majority feels that there is some purpose served by having a resolution like this debated in the House, then why not have a full and open debate? This is not a delicate, sensitive matter that cannot be entrusted to amendment on the House floor. Why can we not have full and open debate and an open rule?

Instead, we have got this rule before us, this resolution, which takes this debate and makes it even more pointless, more useless, by imposing upon it a closed rule and precluding virtually any amendments to the language that is before us in the Resolution No. 89.

Now we all know that the Budget Act calls for the President to submit his budget in early February. The President did that. He sent us a budget which complies fully with the Budget Act, scored by his budget shop, the Office of Management and Budget, not only to be balanced in the year 2002, but to be in surplus in the year 2002 by \$17 billion.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, we all know as well that section 301(a) then calls for the Congress, this House, to produce a concurrent budget resolution by April 15. That is a tighttime frame, but it is a rule that we imposed upon ourselves; we wrote that law.

We have missed that date for the last 2 years and we are going to miss it again this year. As I stand here today, ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, I am aware of no date in the middle of March that has been set for the markup of a House budget reso-

lution. I am aware of no date that has been set for floor consideration of a budget resolution. In fact, I am aware of no budget resolution.

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

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. I just want to ask the gentleman, he said that we have not reached the April 15 deadline in the last 2 years. Is the gentleman aware we have not reached that deadline in the last 18 years out of the last 19 years?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, in the House, the House Committee on the Budget in 6 out of 8 years that it was under House Democratic control, 6 of those 8 years, we reported and considered and passed a budget resolution in 6 out of those 8 years.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield, because I have a chart here—

Mr. SPRATT. We did not have the current budget resolution, but we had the House budget resolution before April 15. We at least got our work done here in the House.

Mr. DELAY. But if the gentleman would yield, the deadline is for a conference report by April 15, and this House has not reached that deadline in the last 18 years.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, that is beyond our control. That happened in the other body. We got our work done on time. If they had been moving in parallel process, we probably would have met that date.

The reason that we are doing what we are doing today is that we are about some diversion, distraction. We are trying to keep the American people from understanding that Congress is not doing its job, the majority is not doing its job. We are trying to shift attention from the fact that we do not have a budget resolution before us, have not scheduled one to be brought to the floor, by shifting the blame to the President of the United States when he has done what the law calls for him to do. He has sent us a budget scored by his budget shop as being in balance.

Everybody in this House knows what regular order calls for at this point. It calls for a House budget resolution, and that is what I call for today. Let us have a House budget resolution.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] said, and I agree with him, we need to sit down and negotiate. There are lots of things in the President's budget that are not going to happen, I know that, and a lot of things in the various budget proposals are not going to happen either. But the way to frame those negotiations, since the President has put his budget on the table, is for my colleagues to put their budget on the table. We beg the question of the debate today, why have my colleagues not done that?

Mr. Speaker, let me just back up and say where we stand with the President's budget. As my colleagues all

know, the Congressional Budget Office, the CBO, took the President's budget and scored it as producing a deficit in the year we are shooting for, the terminal year of 2002, of \$69 billion, not a surplus of 17. CBO took the President's budget and said, per our economic forecasts and our technical analysis, this budget will not be in surplus in the year 2002 by \$17 billion, it will be in deficit by \$69 billion.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons that they found this budget in deficit is that the President has requested \$98 billion in tax cuts. He has offset those tax cuts by \$76 billion in tax renewals and extenders and the repeal of certain tax expenditures, so there is a net revenue loss in the President's budget of \$22 billion.

In addition, the President has sent up over a 5-year period of time new entitlement initiatives, spending increases, that come over 5 years to about \$68 billion, according to the estimates of his budget shop, OMB. By the scoring placed upon this budget by the Congressional Budget Office, this budget can accommodate these tax cuts and these spending increases without producing a deficit; in this case the deficit is \$69 billion.

But I say to my colleagues, if the present budget cannot accommodate a \$90 billion package of tax cuts and entitlement spending increases, then neither can a budget scored by CBO accommodate \$190 billion in tax cuts, which is what the Republicans, my friends on the other side of the aisle, have been talking about. That is the range of magnitude that they have been proposing. That is why we are here today.

Mr. Speaker, they are unable to put before the House a budget resolution which can accommodate the tax cuts they are proposing without also necessitating deeper cuts in Medicare, Medicaid and education than they want to be seen openly proposing because the American people do not support it.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] says that Congress has never met the date; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] said the same thing. As I mentioned, 6 out of 8 years the House Committee on the Budget had its resolution on the floor by April 15.

But the key point is this: Why chastise Congress for not meeting the date that we have imposed upon ourselves with a resolution that calls upon the President to do something else? If we want to chastise ourselves for being tardy in the past, why not have a resolution today that sort of calls for hunkering down, for putting our hand to the wheel, for getting ahead with the problem, leaning into it.

We have a hearing today at 2:30 before the Committee on the Budget that deals with one of the most critical components in the solution to this whole problem, the so-called CPI, Consumer Price Index. Before us will be the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics testifying about ways

that the CPI can work out some of the biases that lead to overstatement of inflation in our economy.

It is a critically important hearing. Many of us on the Committee on the Budget, because we have to be on the floor to debate this resolution which amounts to nothing, will not be able to attend. That is not the critical path. That is not what we need to be doing if we are going to meet the self-imposed deadlines that we put in the Budget Act ourselves.

So the best way to proceed with the resolution of the budget, proceed toward a balanced budget is to vote against the previous question here, vote against the rule, and vote for putting the budget process back on the critical path and not chasing after red herrings like this resolution.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, another reason why we have moved toward some fiscal sanity in this Congress in recent years is because of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], our distinguished majority whip, and I yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate those words more than we can imagine, and I do appreciate it. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule because I rise in strong support of this very important resolution.

We said from the beginning of this Congress that we want to negotiate with the President, but we cannot negotiate with a President that does not want to balance the budget. We do not want to negotiate over whether to balance the budget or not; we want him to submit a budget that balances by CBO which he called for. We will negotiate with him in the parameters of a balanced budget and negotiate over the priorities within that balanced budget.

But if the President cannot submit one, how do we negotiate apples with oranges? You know, the saying goes, if at first you do not succeed, try, try again.

The President's first attempt at a budget this year did not balance, so we are giving him a chance to try it again. The President has said that he supports a balanced budget, and I hope he is honest in his statement. He also said that we did not need a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution if we had the will to balance the budget. But this President, Mr. Speaker, has done everything he can to derail the balanced budget process; first, by vetoing the first balanced budget in a generation, the last Congress; then, by working overtime to kill the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution; and, finally, by submitting another budget that simply does not balance.

Why is balancing the budget so important? Why should we care whether we pile up more debt on future generations? Mr. Speaker, I will tell my colleagues why. At our bipartisan retreat this last weekend a lot of Members in both parties brought their children.

The place was overflowing with kids. It was so much fun to see these kids having a good time. We are balancing the budget for their sake.

The President should explain to those kids why he will not take steps today to make their futures brighter tomorrow. The President should justify why he did not have the political will to make commonsense changes to entitlement programs so that those programs could survive when those children decided to retire.

Mr. Speaker, this debate should not be about green eyeshades, it should be about preserving the future for America's children.

So I just urge the President to be responsible and to resubmit his budget. America's children deserve better than they are getting from this President's current unbalanced budget.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREEN].

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

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to follow my colleague from Texas [Mr. DELAY] on the floor, and I look over and see the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman. We have worked together on lots of bills, Mr. Speaker, but obviously today we disagree on the need for this rule and also the need for the resolution.

We only have 11 days left until Congress by law must pass a budget plan. But here we are today debating a rule and debating a resolution that says, Mr. President, send us your second budget, and yet we do not even have our first here from Congress.

While the President and Democrats have fielded criticism for weeks now from the Republicans on the President's budget plan, we have not yet seen their alternative. The Republicans need to respond with their own budget before they can ask the President for a second budget. That is what is called give and take, and that is what this process is about.

This resolution calls for the President to submit another budget because of the claims that the CBO found that the current budget proposal from the President would not be balanced in the year 2002. I happen to see a letter from March 4 that the director of CBO analyzed the President's budget and showed that it would indeed be balanced by the year 2002.

As Democrats, we are not opposed to criticism if it is accompanied by concrete and realistic proposals. In fact, we have the moderate, conservative group of Democrats who have a budget plan, but where is the Republican majority budget plan? They do not have one. The President has one out on the table, the moderate, conservative Democrats have one, and yet the Republican majority does not have one.

We have had enough time to develop a budget alternative proposal through

our committee process. But yet, like my ranking member of the Committee on the Budget said, we are spending time debating resolutions instead of working in the Committee on the Budget.

In the 1980's we heard the slogan, "where's the beef," and now we are asking, "where is the meat?" Where is the meat in the Republican budget from our colleagues? If they want to have a balanced budget, let us see that meat that they have in their budget.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is ironic that I stand here because being honored to serve 20 years in the legislature, I saw our Governor submit budgets to us as a legislature, just like the President has done. And most of the time we would say, thank you, we can present it; and then we would work off of our own document. That is what Congress has been doing for many years, up until now. Now we are going to let the President provide that leadership?

I am not willing as a Member of this Congress to advocate that to the executive branch, no matter who is there. That is why I think it is so important that we have a congressional budget plan. I may disagree with it, but the Republicans here in the majority, they need to get up and find the meat and to do it instead of saying, well, Mr. President, you need to do a second plan because we do not like your first. Let us see what we can offer as a Congress to say, OK, Mr. President, this is our plan.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, one of the really respected Members of this body is a former fighter pilot and a great Congressman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, there may be a perception that this is not important to the other side, but the reality is important. For 28 years we have not been able to balance the budget because it has proven too difficult. In Gramm-Rudman, the deal was that for every tax dollar we take in, we will cut it by 3, and we will push out the cuts into the last year. We could not do that because the cuts were too hard.

Remember when George Bush moved his lips? The deal was that for every tax dollar we take in, we are going to cut spending by 3, and we are going to give you an absolute way to do that. We are going to put firewalls between each of the appropriation committees and we are going to put a cap. The leadership on my colleagues' side, how did they get around it? With emergency spending. We found outlandish emergency spending things on there, and the continuing resolutions that just carried over the spending. And it was not viable.

Remember in the 104th when the President gave us three balanced budgets? All increased the deficit by \$175 billion. And then in the fourth one he gave us, he balanced it using CBO numbers in 7 years, and 72 percent of the cuts came in the last year.

□ 1315

It is not realistic, even if the President gave us a second budget balanced but most of the cuts take place in the last year. We know that that is not feasible. It is smoke and mirrors. It also happens to be before the Committee on National Security, when the President has said that he is going to increase modernization for DOD. Do Members think that the more liberal Members on this side are going to decrease social spending and increase national security in those same 2 years? It is not feasible, Mr. Speaker.

We need to take a look at what reality is. We want a balanced budget. They say we do not have one. Well, have the President give us a balanced budget as he campaigned in the middle of the road and many of the Democratic leadership said, we are not going to support that. We do not want a balanced budget. That is what they are opposing this resolution for, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a note vote on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I intend to offer a motion which makes in order the Minge-Tauscher-Stenholm amendments which would require both the President and the House Committee on the Budget to produce budget plans by April 7 that achieve a balanced budget by the year 2002 using CBO assumptions. I believe that Members of the House should have the opportunity to vote on this.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the amendment:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 90

On page two, line three, strike "The resolution" and all that follows and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and on any amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget; (2) the amendments printed in section 2 of this resolution, which shall be considered as read, and which shall be debatable for a separate hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If including instructions, the motion to recommit shall be debatable for five minutes by its proponent and five minutes by an opponent."  
"Sec. 2.

AMENDMENT (IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE) TO H. RES. 90

OFFERED BY MR. MINGE OF MINNESOTA OR HIS DESIGNEE

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the House of Representatives requests the President to submit to the House, not later than April 7, 1997, a detailed plan to achieve a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002. The House further requests that the Committee on the Budget report, not later than April 7, 1997, a concurrent resolution on the budget containing reconciliation instructions to achieve a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002. Both the budget submitted by the President and the concurrent resolution re-

ported by the Committee on the Budget shall—

(1) use the most recent economic and technical assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office;

(2) reduce the deficit through programmatic reforms rather than through such budgetary procedures as automatic spending cuts and the sunset of tax cuts;

(3) realize a significant proportion of its total savings in the first 3 years; and

(4) offer sufficient Medicare reforms to forestall the imminent insolvency of the Medicare trust funds for a substantial period.

PREAMBLE AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 90

OFFERED BY MR. MINGE OF MINNESOTA OR HIS DESIGNEE

Amended the preamble to read as follows: Whereas a substantial majority of the Members of Congress are on record in support of a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution;

Whereas the President has observed on numerous occasions that a constitutional amendment is not necessary to balance the budget, observing in his State of the Union Address that "... we don't need a constitutional amendment, we need action.";

Whereas the President and the congressional leadership have repeatedly agreed to balance the budget by fiscal year 2002 based on the estimates of the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office;

Whereas the Congressional Budget Office has officially estimated that the President's budget would increase the deficit by \$24,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1998 and result in a deficit of at least \$69,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2002;

Whereas the Committee on the Budget has not proposed a budget resolution that could be scored by the Congressional Budget Office, and the only tax proposals introduced by the congressional leadership would increase the deficit;

Whereas article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution grants Congress the power to lay and collect taxes and to borrow money on the credit of the United States and article I, section 9 grants Congress the power to draw money from the Treasury; and

Whereas section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 requires that Congress shall complete action on a concurrent resolution on the budget before April 15: Now, therefore, be it'

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, as Ronald Reagan used to say, Ladies and gentlemen, I do not know what all the argument is about.

I really do not know why anyone can complain about this resolution that is on the floor here today. Let me just read the key part of it:

"The House of Representatives requests the President to submit to the House, not later than April 7, 1997, a detailed plan to achieve a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002 for the United States, as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office."

That is so we can play from the same deck of cards. What is wrong with that? That is what we did last year. That is what we did 2 years ago. The President agreed to it.

Now, we also asked that he use these assumptions:

"Uses the most recent economic and technical assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office," that is No. 1. Who can disagree with that?

No. 2, that "reduces the deficit through programmatic reforms rather than alternative budget procedures such as automatic spending cuts and the sunseting of taxes."

What does that mean? That means we do not want to cut Head Start the same as we cut legal services. In other words, let us offer the real amendment. Let us see what you are actually doing, not across the board where you are cutting good things and not cutting bad things at all. Then taxes, what are we doing? In other words, the President in his budget is sunseting the tax cuts so that 2 years, 3 years from now they go back into effect. What kind of smoke and mirrors is that?

No. 3, "realizes a significant proportion of its total savings in the first 3 years."

Look at this, the President's budget. The deficit at the end of 2002 is \$70 billion. We have not done anything. We said, we put out our press releases and, boy, are we brave. We are going to balance the budget. But when are we going to do it? We are going to do it 5 years from now. We are not going to do any cuts in year 1, 2, 3 or 4. Is that being fair to the American people?

No. 4, "offer sufficient Medicare reforms to forestall the imminent bankruptcy of the Medicare trust funds for a substantial period."

The President actually agreed to those reforms last year. We enacted them, but now is reneging on them.

Then finally somebody said, let us point fingers at each other. That is exactly what we did. We wrote in to this budget resolution, it says that the House of Representatives shall consider a budget plan to achieve a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002 that is in compliance with what I have just said, what we are asking the President to do. So we are asking ourselves to do the same thing.

I could go on down through this President's budget. I could talk about CBO by the way, their report on the President's budget. It says on page 2, in 1998, in fact, the net effect of the President's policies is to push the deficit \$24 billion above the baseline level. This says, this coming year. In other words, instead of cutting the deficit down, we are actually going to raise the deficit by \$24 billion. That is why we need this resolution.

We treat ourselves the same as we do the President. We say, Mr. President, Congressmen and women, let us act fiscally responsibly. Let us pass this resolution here today.

Some Members say to defeat the previous question so that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE] and others can offer their resolution.

I went to the Parliamentarian. They told me that these two amendments that they wanted to offer are germane, can be offered in the motion to recom-

mit and if they want to do that, fine. They are going to have 2 hours of debate on it and then they will have an up or down vote on the Minge amendments. That is being fair to everybody. I move the previous question at this time and I ask everybody to come over and vote for the previous question and for the rule and finally for the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 200, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 41]

YEAS—226

Aderholt	Davis (VA)	Hostettler
Archer	Deal	Houghton
Army	DeLay	Hulshof
Bachus	Diaz-Balart	Hunter
Baker	Dickey	Hutchinson
Ballenger	Doolittle	Hyde
Barr	Dreier	Inglis
Barrett (NE)	Duncan	Istook
Bartlett	Dunn	Jenkins
Barton	Ehlers	Johnson (CT)
Bass	Ehrlich	Johnson, Sam
Bateman	Emerson	Jones
Bereuter	English	Kasich
Bilbray	Ensign	Kelly
Bilirakis	Everett	Kim
Bilely	Ewing	King (NY)
Blunt	Fawell	Kingston
Boehlert	Foley	Klug
Boehner	Forbes	Knollenberg
Bonilla	Fowler	Kolbe
Bono	Fox	LaHood
Brady	Franks (NJ)	Largent
Bryant	Frelinghuysen	Latham
Bunning	Galleghy	LaTourette
Burr	Ganske	Lazio
Burton	Gekas	Leach
Buyer	Gibbons	Lewis (CA)
Callahan	Gilchrest	Lewis (KY)
Calvert	Gillmor	Linder
Camp	Gilman	Livingston
Campbell	Goodlatte	LoBiondo
Canady	Goodling	Lucas
Cannon	Goss	Manzullo
Castle	Graham	McCollum
Chabot	Granger	McCrery
Chambliss	Greenwood	McDade
Chenoweth	Gutknecht	McHugh
Christensen	Hansen	McInnis
Coburn	Hastert	McIntosh
Collins	Hastings (WA)	McKeon
Combest	Hayworth	Metcalf
Cook	Hefley	Mica
Cooksey	Herger	Miller (FL)
Cox	Hill	Molinari
Crane	Hilleary	Moran (KS)
Crapo	Hobson	Morella
Cubin	Hoekstra	Myrick
Cunningham	Horn	Nethercutt

Neumann	Rohrabacher	Spence
Ney	Ros-Lehtinen	Stearns
Northup	Roukema	Stump
Norwood	Royce	Sununu
Nussle	Ryun	Talent
Oxley	Salmon	Tauzin
Packard	Sanford	Taylor (NC)
Pappas	Saxton	Thomas
Parker	Scarborough	Thornberry
Paul	Schaefer, Dan	Thune
Paxon	Schaffer, Bob	Tiahrt
Pease	Schiff	Traficant
Peterson (PA)	Sensenbrenner	Upton
Petri	Sessions	Walsh
Pickering	Shadegg	Wamp
Pitts	Shaw	Watkins
Pombo	Shays	Watts (OK)
Porter	Shimkus	Weldon (FL)
Portman	Shuster	Weldon (PA)
Pryce (OH)	Skeen	Weller
Quinn	Smith (MI)	White
Radanovich	Smith (NJ)	Whitfield
Ramstad	Smith (OR)	Wicker
Regula	Smith (TX)	Wolf
Riggs	Smith, Linda	Young (AK)
Riley	Snowbarger	Young (FL)
Rogan	Solomon	
Rogers	Souder	

NAYS—200

Abercrombie	Gordon	Neal
Ackerman	Green	Oberstar
Allen	Gutierrez	Obey
Andrews	Hall (OH)	Olver
Baessler	Hall (TX)	Ortiz
Baldacci	Hamilton	Owens
Barcia	Harman	Pallone
Barrett (WI)	Hastings (FL)	Pascrell
Becerra	Hefner	Pastor
Bentsen	Hilliard	Payne
Berman	Hinchev	Pelosi
Berry	Hinojosa	Peterson (MN)
Bishop	Holden	Pickett
Blagojevich	Hoolley	Pomeroy
Blumenauer	Hoyer	Poshard
Bonior	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Borski	Jackson-Lee	Rahall
Boswell	(TX)	Rangel
Boucher	Jefferson	Reyes
Boyd	John	Rivers
Brown (CA)	Johnson (WI)	Roemer
Brown (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Rothman
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Capps	Kennedy (MA)	Rush
Cardin	Kennedy	Sabo
Carson	Kildee	Sanchez
Clay	Kilpatrick	Sanders
Clayton	Kind (WI)	Sandlin
Clement	Klecзка	Sawyer
Clyburn	Klink	Schumer
Condit	Kucinich	Scott
Conyers	LaFalce	Serrano
Costello	Lampson	Sherman
Coyne	Lantos	Sisisky
Cramer	Levin	Skaggs
Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
Danner	Lipinski	Slaughter
Davis (FL)	Lofgren	Smith, Adam
Davis (IL)	Lowey	Snyder
DeFazio	Luther	Spratt
DeGette	Maloney (CT)	Stabenow
Delahunt	Maloney (NY)	Stark
DeLauro	Manton	Stenholm
Dellums	Markey	Stokes
Deutsch	Martinez	Strickland
Dicks	Mascara	Stupak
Doggett	Matsui	Tanner
Dooley	McCarthy (MO)	Tauscher
Doyle	McCarthy (NY)	Taylor (MS)
Edwards	McDermott	Thompson
Engel	McGovern	Thurman
Eshoo	McHale	Tierney
Etheridge	McIntyre	Towns
Evans	McKinney	Turner
Farr	McNulty	Velazquez
Fattah	Meehan	Vento
Fazio	Meek	Visclosky
Filner	Menendez	Waters
Flake	Millender-	Watt (NC)
Foglietta	McDonald	Waxman
Ford	Miller (CA)	Wexler
Frank (MA)	Minge	Weygand
Frost	Mink	Wise
Furse	Moakley	Woolsey
Gejdenson	Mollohan	Wynn
Gephardt	Moran (VA)	Yates
Gonzalez	Murtha	
Goode	Nadler	

NOT VOTING—6

Coble  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Kaptur  
Kennedy (RI)  
Torres

Mr. FAZIO of California changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 202, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 42]

YEAS—226

Aderholt  
Archer  
Army  
Bachus  
Baker  
Ballenger  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bateman  
Bereuter  
Bilbray  
Billirakis  
Bliley  
Blunt  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bono  
Brady  
Bryant  
Bunning  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canady  
Cannon  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth  
Christensen  
Coburn  
Collins  
Combust  
Cook  
Cooksey  
Cox  
Crane  
Crapo  
Cubin  
Cunningham  
Davis (VA)  
Deal  
DeLay  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Doolittle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
English  
Ensign  
Everett  
Ewing  
Fawell  
Foley  
Forbes  
Fowler  
Fox  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Gibbons  
Gilchrist  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gingrich  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Goss  
Graham  
Granger  
Greenwood  
Gutknecht  
Hansen  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Hill  
Hilleary  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Jenkins  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kim  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaHood  
Largent  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lazio  
Leach  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Livingston  
LoBiondo  
Lucas  
Manzullo  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDade  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McKeon  
Metcalf  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Molinari  
Moran (KS)  
Morella  
Myrick  
Nethercutt  
Neumann  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pappas  
Parker  
Paul  
Paxon  
Pease  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Pombo  
Porter  
Portman  
Pryce (OH)  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Riggs  
Riley  
Rogan  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roukema  
Royce  
Ryun  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer, Dan  
Schaefer, Bob  
Schiff  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Skeen  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (OR)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith, Linda  
Snowbarger  
Solomon  
Soudade  
Spence  
Stearns  
Stump  
Sununu

Talent  
Tauzin  
Taylor (NC)  
Thomas  
Thomberry  
Thune  
Tiahrt  
Traficant

Upton  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Watkins  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller

White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

NAYS—202

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Allen  
Andrews  
Baesler  
Baldacci  
Barcia  
Barrett (WI)  
Becerra  
Bentsen  
Berman  
Berry  
Bishop  
Blagojevich  
Blumenauer  
Bonior  
Borski  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Capps  
Cardin  
Carson  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Condit  
Conyers  
Costello  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Cummings  
Danner  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dellums  
Deutsch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fazio  
Filner  
Flake  
Foglietta  
Ford  
Frank (MA)  
Frost  
Furse  
Gejdson  
Gephardt  
Gonzalez

Goode  
Gordon  
Green  
Gutierrez  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hefner  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Holden  
Hooley  
Hoyer  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
John  
Johnson (WI)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kanjorski  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind (WI)  
Kleczka  
Klink  
Kucinich  
LaFalce  
Lampson  
Lantos  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Luther  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manton  
Markey  
Martinez  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHale  
McIntyre  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek  
Menendez  
Millender-  
Ford  
Miller (CA)  
Minge  
Mink  
Moakley  
Mollohan  
Moran (VA)

Murtha  
Nadler  
Neal  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Peterson (MN)  
Pickett  
Pomeroy  
Poshard  
Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Rivers  
Roemer  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sawyer  
Schumer  
Scott  
Serrano  
Sherman  
Sisisky  
Skaggs  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith, Adam  
Snyder  
Spratt  
Stabenow  
Stark  
Stenholm  
Stokes  
Strickland  
Stupak  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor (MS)  
Thompson  
Thurman  
Tierney  
Towns  
Turner  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Waters  
Watt (NC)  
Waxman  
Wexler  
Weygand  
Wise  
Woolsey  
Wynn  
Yates

NOT VOTING—5

Coble  
Dixon  
Heger  
Kaptur  
Torres

□ 1350

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 90, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 89) requesting the President to submit a budget for fiscal year 1998 that would balance the Fed-

eral budget by fiscal year 2002 without relying on budgetary contingencies, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of House Resolution 89 is as follows:

H. RES. 89

Whereas the President has observed on numerous occasions that a constitutional amendment is not necessary to balance the budget, observing in his State of the Union address that " \* \* \* we don't need a constitutional amendment, we need action. "

Whereas the President has also repeatedly agreed, most recently on January 28, 1997, to balance the budget by fiscal year 2002 based on the estimates of the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office; and

Whereas the Congressional Budget Office has officially estimated that the President's budget would increase the deficit by \$24 billion in fiscal year 1998 and result in a deficit of at least \$69 billion in fiscal year 2002: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That (a) the House of Representatives requests the President to submit to the House, not later than April 7, 1997, a detailed plan to achieve a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002 for the United States, as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office, that—

(1) uses the most recent economic and technical assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office;

(2) reduces the deficit through programmatic reforms rather than alternative budgetary procedures such as automatic spending cuts and the sunset of tax cuts;

(3) realizes a significant proportion of its total savings in the first three years; and

(4) offers sufficient Medicare reforms to forestall the imminent bankruptcy of the Medicare trust funds for a substantial period.

(b) The House of Representatives shall consider a budget plan to achieve a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002 for the United States that is in compliance with paragraphs (1) through (4) of subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Pursuant to House Resolution 90, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SUNUNU] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] each will control 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from from New Hampshire [Mr. SUNUNU].

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

Mr. Speaker, we are here today with what we feel is an open hand to the President of the United States.

Yesterday the Washington Post ran a story stating that 75 percent of the American people feel that it is incumbent on the Congress and the President to work together to balance the budget. They know that a balanced budget will bring them economic benefits in the form of lower interest rates, more jobs and higher wages.

Here in Washington it is our job to hammer out an agreement that will balance the budget. Both Congress and the President agree that we must accomplish this goal. In fact, in his State of the Union Address the President spoke clearly. He affirmed his commitment to balancing the budget, and he

affirmed his commitment and his agreement to use the estimates of the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office. In a departure from common practice the Congress agreed not to declare the President's budget dead on arrival and to try to use that budget as the basis for our negotiations.

Unfortunately, when the President finally submitted his 5-year plan we found that it was inadequate. That is why we are here this afternoon. If we are going to heed America's call for a balanced budget, we must get to work today.

This resolution moves us forward by sending an important message to this House. To this House and to the President and to the people of America, we send a message that we must take seriously and deal honestly with the commitment we have made to balance our Nation's books.

This resolution calls quite simply for the President to work with this House toward a balanced budget agreement. We ask that the President submit a budget that meets a set of basic criteria, and in the spirit of bipartisanship we call on this Congress to abide by the exact same standards.

This resolution is fair, it is clear, and it is intended to provide an opportunity to work together with the President from a platform that he provides.

Just what are these standards that we ask the President to meet in his 5-year budget plan?

First, we ask that the budget proposal balance in the year 2002, using estimates of the Congressional Budget Office. We feel it is essential that we work from a common set of assumptions. We need to work from a common set of assumptions in a dialogue as important as this. The administration's current plan shows a deficit of \$69 billion in the year 2002.

Second, we ask that the budget proposal not rely on sunsetted tax relief for automatic across-the-board cuts in order to achieve balance. The administration's current plan uses such accounting provisions that are triggered in its final years.

Third, we ask that the budget proposal achieve a substantial amount of its deficit savings during the next 3 years. Unfortunately, the President's current plan defers over 98 percent of the deficit savings to the last 2 years of his budget after he leaves office.

Finally, we ask that the budget proposal preserve and protect Medicare for our children and for future generations. The administration's current plan simply postpones the bankruptcy of the Medicare trust fund for another 2 years.

By asking both Congress and the President to meet these four basic requirements in the submission of their budget plans we will establish a credible platform from which we can move forward together. A budget that increases spending by 200 billion over the next 3 years, it leaves a deficit of \$69 billion in the year 2002, will not put

money back in the pockets of working Americans, will not put money back in the pockets of American families. The results of this kind of overspending will be higher interest rates, higher costs to our families and stagnating wages. We owe the American people more than that.

Some people have argued that this resolution is a waste of time. I am sorry that they feel that way, but I believe that the substance of this debate and its impact on America's families is too important to just ignore or dismiss.

□ 1400

Honest and reasoned debate of our differences is essential to the strength and substance of this institution. Others have argued that it is inappropriate somehow to ask the President to submit a new budget when we have yet to complete work on our own. The fact is that Congress is moving forward on its own budget. We will propose a budget to the President, and this country, in compliance with budget law.

Two years ago critics claimed the Congress prepared its budget too quickly and did not take the President's import, did not take his concern into regard. Today these same critics argue that the pace is too deliberate and too slow.

Many of us were not here in the last Congress, but I do know the debate over the budget deteriorated to what a lot of American people thought was petty bickering. This year we want to change that mode of operation. We want to make things work, with the administration's cooperation, and fashion a solid budget agreement that balances in the year 2002.

But to do this we need the President to provide a realistic platform for budget discussions. I am determined to keep my faith, to keep the commitments I made to the constituents of the State of New Hampshire to fight for an honest balanced budget. I urge your support for this resolution that will enable Congress and the President to wage this fight together.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 89. This resolution demands that the President send us a second budget that meets the specifications of the Republican leadership. All it does is demand. It huffs and it puffs, but in the end it accomplishes nothing, because it is a one-House resolution. Look at its title, House Resolution 89. It is not binding on the President; it is not even binding on the other body. That is why I said earlier in the debate that this resolution is a waste of time.

It has been said that the President is obliged to send us a budget that balances, balances according to CBO scoring. If you will simply turn to the Congressional Budget Act and look at section 300, you will see that it says the

timetable with respect to the congressional budget process for any fiscal year is as follows: First Monday in February, President submits his budget.

That is what it says: President submits his budget.

The President missed that by just a few days this year because he first wanted to make his State of the Union before he submitted his budget, but he has sent us a budget scored by his budget shop, the Office of Management and Budget, as being in balance; not just being in balance, being in surplus by the year 2002 to the tune of \$17 billion.

Let me back up a few years and just observe why it is that we are here today earnestly talking about balancing the budget by the year 2002.

We are here today credibly talking about that goal which we commonly share because 4 years ago when President Clinton came to office, he took this challenge head on. I am sure there were other things he would have preferred to do first.

The first thing he found on his desk when he arrived there was the Economic Report of the President left behind a week before by President George Bush, and in it Michael Boskin, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors for President Bush, on page 69 predicted the deficit for fiscal year 1993 would be \$332 billion.

Now, Bill Clinton has been blamed for a lot of things, but he was in Little Rock when that bill was run up. He cannot be blamed for that.

On February 17, he laid on the doorstep of Congress a plan to get rid of that deficit, or at least cut it in half, over a period of 4 years. It did not pass the House by any substantial margin, two votes. It went right to the wire. It passed the other body by one vote. There were predictions it would cut the economy off at the knees.

But here we are, 4 years later, and here is what happened. In 1993, when we closed the books on fiscal 1993, the deficit was not \$332 billion, it was \$255 billion. One year later, the first full year under that Deficit Reduction Act of 1993, the deficit was \$203 billion. When we closed the books on 1995, the deficit was \$164 billion. And last September 30, 1996, the deficit was down to \$107.3 billion, down 65 percent in less than 4 years, 1.4 percent of GDP.

That makes it the lowest deficit as a percent of GDP since 1974, the lowest deficit in nominal dollars since Ronald Reagan's second year in office. That is what has been accomplished on his watch. Say what you will about his budget, the reason we are here and debating a plan to get the budget in balance within 5 years is that those 4 years were put to good purpose under a plan that he proposed.

Now, he set up a budget based upon a forecast of the economy done by his budget shop. Every President does that. That is what OMB is there for. According to their forecast, this budget will balance by the year 2002.

Now, there are things that I do not accept about that, and I have traditionally been a supporter myself of using CBO estimates, but there are some things in this forecast where I think OMB has the better half of the argument.

For example, OMB assumes that corporate income shares as a percentage of our GDP will not decline. They have increased substantially over the last few years because corporations are improving their balance sheets and improving their P&L's. That makes for a third of the difference between the two forecasts.

These are things that can be argued between reasonable people, reasonable economists, and there is no use to have a showdown on the budget today. We all know what the process calls for. We know what regular order is. We wrote the act. The Congressional Budget Act, section 301(a), says the Congress shall "complete action on the budget resolution on or before April 15th." The Congress shall complete action. The President started the ball rolling. Now it is our time to complete the action.

Since my friends on the other side of the aisle, the Republicans, have been in the majority here in the House, the conference agreement on the budget resolution has not cleared the House on April 15 in any of those years; not until June, as a matter of fact, 2 months after the deadline. In fact, the House Committee on the Budget in the last 2 years has not even marked up the budget resolution until a month after the April 15 deadline. This kind of slippage, this kind of inattention to the Budget Act and the deadlines we have laid down for ourselves, led to 14 continuing resolutions and 2 Government shutdowns in the last Congress.

I do not want to see that happen again. That is why I think this diversionary tactic, to distract us from what we need to be doing, off in pursuit of this red herring, is a total waste of time.

Let me say something else. It is now 10 minutes after 2. At 2:30 the House Committee on the Budget will have one of the most important hearings we will hold on the subject of how to get our hands around this problem and bring it to resolution.

We will have before us Dr. Catherine Abraham, who is the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and her responsibility is something called the CPI, the Consumer Price Index. That is a critical component to resolving this problem.

And where is the Committee on the Budget? We are over here debating a resolution that is totally ineffectual. Instead of leaning into the problem, earnestly trying to find a solution to the problem, attending the hearing and asking intelligent questions and hearing what she has to tell us, we are over here on the floor.

This is the first time in 14 years in the House that I have seen a major piece of legislation or a piece of legisla-

tion come to the floor at the time the committee of jurisdiction is holding a hearing. That is why this is a total waste of time. But we are debating it.

The fact of the matter is, what we are trying to do is distract attention from the fact that the majority would prefer not to have to put up its own resolution. The reason they do not want to do this is the same reason that they are able to use and criticize the President's budget. The President's budget as scored by CBO does not produce a surplus in the year 2002. According to CBO, per its economic forecast, it generates a deficit of \$69 billion.

But if you use that same economic forecast and apply it to a reconstruction of what I would guess to be the Republican resolution, which would incorporate tax cuts up to \$190 billion, then the deficit is twice the size of the President's recommendation; or there will have to be deeper cuts in Medicare and Medicaid and education and other things that the American people broadly support, that they would not rather embrace themselves. So they want to be allowed to have the President take the hits on this.

If we are going to get this done, the President has sent a budget up here, we need to have a budget resolution with the other side. That will frame the debate and we can then sit down and negotiate, and we will have to make concessions on both sides.

The President's budget is not going to be fully carried out, I know that, nor is your budget going to be fully realized, and I think you know that. The sooner we get around to that reality and start talking, the better. The way to get there is for you to complete the process and frame the negotiation by putting your resolution on the table, bringing it to the House floor, getting it passed and getting a concurrent budget resolution adopted by April 15 or shortly thereafter.

For all of these reasons, I suggest that the House vote down this resolution, send the Committee on the Budget back to its work, and not after this pursuit of a red herring that leads us nowhere and accomplishes nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON].

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on the Budget, I rise to support House Resolution 89 and join the House in asking the President to send a balanced budget to Congress.

The President's budget was eagerly anticipated this year and there is a genuine desire to work constructively with him to enact a historic balanced budget plan that will eliminate the deficit by the year 2002. The budget committees of both Houses have spent the past several weeks examining the President's ideas in order to give them a full hearing and find the areas where we can work together constructively.

This is a very different approach than previous years when the Capitol was a morgue for the storage of budget plans declared dead on arrival. This year, however, the Capitol has been an emergency room, and though we are working hard to save it, the President's budget is gravely ill, primarily because it is \$69 billion in the hole, backloaded to the extreme, and fails to save Medicare for any significant period of time.

I can recall, as many can, the President campaigning that he was going to save the Medicare trust fund for 10 years. I do not see that. Where is it? Let us talk about it. If the President still wants his budget proposal to be the starting point for consideration this year, and I believe that can still happen, he needs to send us a budget that meets the minimum threshold for consideration, a budget that balances in 2002 according to the estimates which he said he would use, the estimates of the independent budget office. I remember hearing him say that right here in this House.

No gimmicks, Mr. President. Our friends on the other side of the aisle are challenging us to offer our own budget now, but my answer to them today is, we have already passed 2 years of balanced budgets in this Chamber. Those two budgets were the first of their kind in 26 years. We do not need to prove to anybody on this side of the aisle that we are committed to balancing the budget. The only reason it is in front and center of the congressional list of priorities right now, and the American people, is because we put it there. I am quite comfortable with our record of writing, supporting, and passing balanced budgets in this Chamber.

Frankly, the President should be thankful that he has been given a second chance to fulfill the promises he made to this country. I hope he takes advantage of this second opportunity, and I hope he sends us a true budget that does balance without a lot of gimmicks after he is not even President of the United States anymore.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, at this mellow time of interest in bipartisanship and collegiality, I have to say that, frankly, this is a weird resolution. Some might call it a back to the future resolution. Do my colleagues remember the movie about going back to the future? Well, this is going back all the way to the days of the Government shutdowns of 1995. Those who liked those shutdowns will remember those good old days. It only cost the American taxpayer \$1.5 billion for the kind of stunts that occurred in this House during 1995.

President Clinton in 1995 came forward and submitted a budget. It was scored by OMB. Our Republican colleagues, as they have said today, came forward and they said, "We want it

scored. We want it scored by CBO, and we are going to shut the Government down until it is." I think some of them wanted to shut the Government down until it was scored by HBO. But they delayed and they shut the Government down in order to get the kind of budget that they wanted.

Well, those costly Government shut-downs were not simply the product of extremism. They were the product of this Congress messing around on resolutions like the one we have before us today, instead of getting down to the hard work of trying to get a budget agreement.

The Committee on the Budget did not comply with the law and get the budget resolution heard and adopted on time. The appropriations committees did not approve the appropriation bills. They did not approve more than about half of them before it was time for the Government to be shut down.

□ 1415

So we got caught in a trap that was very expensive for the American taxpayer. Today we are headed down the same path. History is repeating itself. The Republican Congress has done practically nothing for the last 2 months, and today, instead of working to try to achieve a budget agreement, they are basically saying: We have not done our job, but, Mr. President, you have completed your job and we want you to do it again.

When it comes to the budget, the porridge is always too hot; and, if the President submitted another budget, it would be too cold. It is never just right for these folks.

Anyone who has ever bought a car or a house knows there is offer and counteroffer. What they need to do is to shut down these kinds of silly resolutions instead of shutting down the government and get to work negotiating a balanced budget.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. GRANGER], who is a member of the Committee on the Budget and has put in a great deal of effort and time in her commitment to making sure that this country balances its Federal budget.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues from New Hampshire and Pennsylvania in offering this resolution. Our resolution is not about shutdowns. Our resolution is not about CBO or OMB, and it is not about politics or partisanship. It is not even about how we score budgets. This resolution is about our America's children, about our daughters and our sons.

Today our children face a \$5.6 trillion debt, \$122,400 for every American. I have two sons and one daughter. That means my children owe \$67,200. Every child born in our country today will owe nearly \$200,000 in taxes over their lifetimes just to pay interest on the debt. That is because the Federal Government, the Federal budget has not been balanced in a generation.

Who among our children will be able to share in the American dream if each of them must pay \$200,000 just to pay interest on the debt?

The answer is that our children will not be able to realize the American dream, and they will not look forward to a future of hope, growth and opportunity tomorrow unless we balance our budget today. We can have a balanced budget for the first time in a generation. During the campaign both the President, President Clinton, and leaders of Congress promised that balancing the budget would be their top priority. Now is the time for both the President and Congress to come together to make good on this commitment. A fellow Texan, Sam Rayburn, once said that anything ever achieved by Congress was done in a bipartisan way.

Achieving a balanced budget would be a lasting accomplishment for America's families. A balanced budget would reduce interest rates, slashing the cost of a typical family's mortgage by \$38,000. The cost of student loans would be cut nearly \$9,000. An estimated 4¼ million new jobs would be created, and family incomes would rise.

This resolution will make this great achievement possible by establishing the crucial first step for both the President and Congress to come together to balance the budget. Step one is for both the President and Congress to use the same numbers when considering budgets and for both the President and Congress to balance the Federal books the same way that hard-working families balance their checkbooks each month. That is all this resolution does.

Families have to use accurate numbers when they balance their checkbooks, and our resolution asks the President to submit a budget that uses the most careful and accurate economic numbers of the Congressional Budget Office. Families must watch their spending each month. They cannot wait until the last week to use coupons or think about how they will pay the electric bill. So our resolution asks the President and Congress to present budgets that begin to save money today, not tomorrow.

And families cannot ignore their most important obligations like paying their mortgage. Similarly our resolution asks the President and Congress to submit budgets that meet the Government's obligation to our seniors by preserving Medicare and asks both the President and the Congress for budgets that preserve Medicare not just for the next election but for the next generation. It is not just American families who must meet the standards contained in our resolution. Last year the blue dog Democrats, the Congressional Black Caucus and the Republican majority and others all submitted budgets that met these basic and simple standards. Each these budgets use the most accurate CBO numbers, each of these budgets achieve budget balance through programmatic changes. Each

of these budgets help to address the long-term problem of Medicare. That is why each of these budgets would have met the commonsense standards of our resolution.

Unfortunately, the budget that the administration submitted to Congress last month did not meet these basic requirements. The administration's budget increased the deficit while this administration is in office promising to balance the budget after the President leaves office. That is just not right for our children.

This budget increased the deficit by \$24 billion this year and would leave the budget unbalanced in 2002. That is just not right for our children.

It used rosy scenarios and accounting contingencies, not tough choices, to achieve deficit reduction. That is just not right for our children. It failed to protect Medicare for this generation, let alone the future. That is not right for our children, for their parents or for their grandparents.

This resolution simply asks the President to meet the same standard that the majority, the blue dog Democrats, and the Congressional Black Caucus met last year. Since we must all work together to balance the budget, it asks all of us to use the same basic standards in our budget resolution.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution to establish a bipartisan, common ground for agreement on a balanced budget. Let us ask both the President and the Congress to submit budgets that meet the same basic requirements, the requirements that our families meet every day.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

(Mrs. MINK of Hawaii asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for offering me this time to participate in this debate.

I find it very strange that we are having this debate in the first instance on the floor of the House. This matter should be debated in our committee. I am a member of the Committee on the Budget. We have yet to really sit down and discuss exactly what kind of budget resolution we are going to offer this House. We have a statutory obligation to have this work done by April 15, and we have not begun this job.

It is simply irresponsible for the majority to abdicate its statutory duty. There is no way that they can pass the buck to the President. Under the Constitution, he offers his budget and it is for us to dispose of it. It is not to say to him, send another or send another because we do not agree with the minutia of its contents. It is for us to decide the details first within our committee.

So I find this a very shameful operation here today. Besides which, the head of the CBO that everybody is lauding today has said that there is

substantial agreement and that the administration's budget actually comes to a balance. We may not agree how it balances it, but the fact is the majority chose 2002 as the magic date and the President has come up with a budget that essentially does the job.

Now, who is the responsible body to make judgments as to forecasts? Forecasts are very difficult. It depends upon what the individual assumptions are, how we look at the future, the unemployment rate, how much taxes are coming in, and so forth.

I have a chart here which I would like to point to my colleagues where the Congressional Budget Office is off the mark. They are very, very conservative. Each year they projected far deeper deficits than occurred. And as a result, we cannot put much confidence on the CBO estimates.

To make the final point, the budget figures which the President offers have been equally conservative and equally conservative in looking at the economic projections. They have not been any further away from it than the CBO. So at this point bringing this resolution today out of the Rules Committee, charging that rosy scenarios are the culprit on the part of the administration budget, is absolutely wrong, not based upon fact and, I think, pure politics.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to draw attention to the fact that since 1993 there have been 20 deficit projections by OMB and CBO, and in 16 of those 20 projections CBO was more accurate than OMB in predicting the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. PICKERING].

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

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the resolution as a new Member of Congress, coming with what I hope will be a new start, a clean slate. There is much at stake, and we have great opportunity to do something that has not been done in 28 years. That is to actually reach agreement on balancing our budget.

I am disappointed in the President's budget that, as both the President and Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats, we all ran on the same themes of a smaller government, of balanced budgets, of tax relief for families. Unfortunately, the facts of the President's budget do not meet the words and the rhetoric.

The facts are that the President's budget increased taxes, increases taxes \$23 billion over the next 10 years. In fiscal year 1998, it increases the deficit \$24 billion. It undoes more than 50 percent of the savings in last year's welfare reform bill. It is \$69 billion short of a balanced budget in the year 2002. And instead of providing entitlement reform, it creates \$70 billion in new entitlement spending over the next 5 years.

The saddest or the most troubling component is that it leaves 98 percent

of deficit reduction until after the President leaves office.

Those are the facts, but it affects our families. I am here today representing the Third District of Mississippi, which has been represented in a tremendous way by G.V. (Sonny) Montgomery. He met the challenge of his day. He built a strong defense, contained Communism. Helped win the cold war. My children today have freedom and prosperity in large part because he was willing, and his generation was willing to sacrifice.

I have four small children, four boys, ages 7, 5, 3 and 1. At the end of my days, I want to say, I was part of giving them the same freedom, the same opportunity, the same prosperity. To do so, we must create a new foundation, a new framework to reach a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of House Resolution 89 as a new Member of Congress, coming with the hope for a new start, a clean slate. I am here today not only as a Representative from the great State of Mississippi, or the successor to the legendary G.V. "Sonny" Montgomery, but as the father of four young boys.

There is much at stake in this budget cycle, and we have a great opportunity to do something that has not been done in 28 years. That is to actually reach agreement on balancing the Federal budget. I am disappointed in President Clinton's rhetoric concerning a balanced budget because his words do not match his actions.

As the father of four boys, age 7, 5, 3, and 1, I would like to leave a nation as great as the one I received from my father. Unfortunately, at the rate our Government spends money, my four boys, and millions of other children across this great land, will not receive an inheritance from those of us in this generation.

No, Mr. Speaker, we cannot be confused, the children of today will not inherit the legacy that we did. They will not inherit the classic American dream. They will inherit our debt.

The President spoke often during the campaign of his bridge to the 21st century. And I look forward to the start of the 21st century—the next American century.

However, we will not, and cannot stand by while this administration builds a bridge to the 21st century on the backs of our children.

As of today, each child in the United States, will inherit over \$188,000 of debt from us.

Mr. Speaker, that is not the American dream. This is not the American way. This is not how we restore public trust in our Government.

In America we have always passed on the hope for a better, bigger, and brighter future. Yet the children of today can only look forward to debt, our debt.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the right thing to do. Nor is it right for the President to promise a balanced budget during the election and then provide us with yet another budget that simply does not balance.

While the President claims his budget comes into balance by 2002, it includes new spending initiatives and savings gimmicks that could cause the deficit to balloon in the subsequent years.

The tax cuts he provides are temporary while his tax increases will be part of the inheritance for our children.

Mr. Speaker, the tax increases are permanent while the tax cuts are temporary. In the President's budget, if the deficit reduction targets, based on rosy economic scenarios, aren't met, the President repeals the tax cuts in 2001 but the tax cuts are still in place.

We have many choices to make in this Congress that will effect the next generation. While we contemplate and debate which path to take, I recommend that we use our God given common sense.

I would suggest that it is only common sense to balance the budget. Millions of families across the Nation balance their check-books on a monthly basis. Is it too much to ask that the Federal Government does the same thing?

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that while we journey toward the 21st century that we take the road to action to ensure that our children are not stuck in a future with little or no hope.

We have made great strides toward balancing the budget, but we have more to do. Balancing the budget is just the first step.

House Resolution 89 will ensure cooperation between the Congress and the White House in working toward a balanced budget.

By using the same economic assumptions we can find the middle ground necessary to make the tough choices that lie ahead.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. McDERMOTT].

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, we are engaged today in a very fraudulent exercise. I will enter into the RECORD a letter from Dr. O'Neill, the head of the Congressional Budget Office.

The question was asked whether the alternative set of policies proposed by the President would achieve a budget balance in fiscal year 2002, which would be balanced.

And her answer is, "Our analysis, which provides CBO's estimate of the effect on the deficit of the President's alternative budgetary policies, shows a zero deficit in fiscal year 2002."

The President has submitted a bill, a budget that is balanced, according to the very person that we hear the Members on the other side saying they would worship at her feet. If she says it is balanced, it is zero, if the deficit is zero, that is good enough for them. We have the letter. This is fraudulent.

The question we have to ask ourselves is, why are we going through this exercise? I will tell you. It is very simple: 1995-96, the Republicans got burned by coming out here with policies that were unacceptable to the American people.

□ 1430

And now we are engaged in what I call the grand stall. The budget is supposed to be ready by the 15th of April. Will that budget be done on the 15th of April? We have 13 working days between now and then and we are not in the committee.

We have not had a single discussion about any alternative or a modification that we will make to the President's proposal. We are getting a case

built here that the reason we did not do it on the 15th of April was because the President never submitted us a budget.

Now, some of the freshmen out here do not understand the game. But let me tell them what it is. We will blame it on the President as long as we can, and then, finally, we will try to jam something through here without any discussion, the discussions about taking away quality of care for senior citizens and a variety of other things.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this.

The information referred to is as follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
Washington, DC, March 4, 1997.

Hon. FRANK R. LAUTENBERG,  
Ranking Member, Committee on the Budget,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: You asked whether the alternative set of policies proposed by the President in the event that Congressional Budget Office projections are used in the budget process would achieve unified budget balance in fiscal year 2002.

As we described in our March 3 preliminary analysis of the President's 1998 budgetary proposals, "the alternative policies proposed by the President were designed to fill exactly any size deficit hole that CBO might project under the basic policies." Therefore, Table 6 in our analysis which provides CBO's estimate of the effect on the deficit of the President's alternative budgetary policies shows a zero deficit for fiscal year 2002.

I hope that this answer meets your needs.  
Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL,  
Director.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to draw attention to the CBO report. In fact, to be clear, I will quote from it directly. "The CBO estimates that there will be a deficit of \$69 billion in 2002 under the President's basic policy proposals."

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. BLUNT.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here to support this resolution. I think it is no accident that this resolution is introduced by fellow freshmen, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. PITTS; the gentleman from New Hampshire, Mr. SUNUNU; and the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. GRANGER, who are joining me in this Congress and who come to this Congress from an understanding of how we believe responsibility ought to be taken in the real world and in real world budgeting.

Really, responsibility has to begin at the top. And this Congress, the last Congress, has shown the willingness to do that by giving the President for the first time ever the line item veto, saying to the President, we know there are some things that you can do that nobody can do as well. The President really has to lead in this area, and for the President to lead in this area effectively, we all do have to talk about the same numbers.

A great Missourian, Mark Twain, said that forecasting is always dif-

ficult, particularly when you are talking about the future. And it is difficult when we are talking about the future to predict. Everybody understands that. Everybody understands that we ought to be talking about the same numbers.

The President has said over and over again that we ought to be using the same numbers. Over and over again the President has turned to the Congressional Budget Office and verified that their numbers, over the course of time, have been better than other numbers available. As late as January, the President said we will work with the Congress to use numbers that everybody believes, numbers that come from the Congressional Budget Office.

This budget is out of balance. It has to be brought back into balance. We need the President to submit that budget.

The Federal Government is not doing a lot of terrible things. The tough choices in life are not between bad things and good things. The tough choices in life are determining what kinds of things really have to have priority, and that is what submitting a budget is really all about, submitting a budget with priorities.

I was a president before I came here. Was not the President of the United States. I was the president of a private university. We had a \$23 million budget. We had 300 employees. They all vigorously advocated what they needed to have happen. We were able to balance that budget over and over again primarily because we made those tough choices. We prioritized.

That is what we need the President to do with this budget. We need to get started with numbers that we can work with and agree with and move toward paying the bills of the country for the first time in 28 years.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. KASICH, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, let me make it clear that we will, of course, have a budget and it will be delivered to the House. This is not out of the ordinary, that the Congress has not brought this budget up. In the last 20 years, 19 of the times the budget resolution has come beyond a certain date required in the law.

The issue is not a hard fixed date, really. The issue at hand is whether we are able to either reach agreement with the administration and be able to bring a proposal forward; and absent an agreement with the administration, we will bring one forward that we will draft ourselves and that we will have an opportunity to consider in this House.

The issue today is really rather one of no matter what budgets come to this floor, they ought to be counted as being in balance. The Blue Dogs have brought a budget. It is in balance. They are going to appear before the Commit-

tee on the Budget. I have praised the Blue Dogs for their budget. The Black Caucus, in the past, has brought balanced budgets, as has the Republican majority, and we will bring one.

We are going to bring one on some date certain. I have already said that the administration could bring a budget and slip a date. Who cares about the specific date on a calendar? It is the work product we are most concerned about and the quality of the product.

So today what we are trying to say, both to the administration and to the Congress, and to anybody else that wants to draft a budget, use honest numbers. No gimmicks. Balance the budget and put the children first.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, before yielding to the gentleman from North Dakota, to simply note for the record that in 1993 the House Committee on the Budget produced a budget resolution on March 10; in 1994, on March 3.

Unfortunately, the last 2 years we have been May 10 and May 9, and under the current schedule, debating things like this, that seems to be where we are headed this year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, the people I represent in North Dakota are tired of the debate in this House where one side points to the other side and says they are terrible and get a "they are terrible" back, and more of the fracas just continues. Unfortunately, a lot of the debate this afternoon sounds much like that tired old partisan dialogue.

We can do better than that. We stand at a great point of opportunity. The deficit is down 63 percent from where it was 4 years ago. We have made real headway. There is just that final push to get us to a balanced budget. What is more, we stand at this point in time in agreement that there ought to be a balanced budget. We stand at this point in time that we ought to have that balanced budget achieved by 2002.

So with so much agreement, it seems to me we ought to be working hard at negotiating our way to a balanced budget rather than having a spurious debate of the kind before us.

No budget plan is perfect. There will always be a great deal of give and take in crafting the final product. Now, the budget process is structured in a formalized way. The President advances his budget, and at that point in time all eyes turn to the majority party for their budget plan. When they have their budget plan on the table, the sides get together and negotiations begin in great earnestness in terms of how the differences can be resolved.

So the President has advanced his budget. All eyes turn to the majority caucus. They do not have a plan. They, in fact, want to waste our time this afternoon asking the President to submit another budget. They know very

well the process. The process is it is their turn. Bring a budget forward. It takes two to tango. It takes two budget plans to get negotiated.

For the freshmen that for the first time are directing, I think impressively, a floor debate, I would just say they are in Congress now. There is something wonderful that comes with that. If they do not like the President's budget, they should write their own. The Blue Dog Democrats have already done precisely that. Other Democrat plans, I expect, will emerge.

Rather than carp and gripe about the shortcomings of the President's plan, just put pen to paper and come up with one. That would advance the process very significantly. That would get us to the table with the differences clearly etched so that they might be negotiated.

One final comment. We do not have much time. We want to get this done by 2002. We need 5 years to get it done. If we fritter away this year in partisan finger-pointing nonsense instead of earnest negotiation to a settlement, it will be only much harder to do in the future.

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

Mr. SUNUNU. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the Chair that I will be yielding my time to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. McDERMOTT] before I go to a committee hearing.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, they say the difference between a good baseball player and a great baseball player is the followthrough. Now is the time for Congress and the President to knock one out of the park for the American people and follow through on the promise to balance the budget.

The distinguished gentleman from Washington referred to a comment about my freshmen colleagues, and said, well, the freshmen do not understand the games that are played in Washington. I agree that perhaps we do not, and the American public does not. Whenever the President promises to submit a balanced budget, and it is scored as not being in balance, the American public understands that there is a need for the President to go back to the drawing board, to resubmit his budget, and that is what this resolution calls for.

The President has thrown us a curve ball with the budget he has submitted. It claims to be in balance by the year 2002, and yet it is not. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, which the President has agreed to abide by, concludes that the administration's budget will produce a \$69 billion deficit by the year 2002. This takes us in the wrong direction. And in fact next year, if no action was taken under the President's budget, there would be a \$24 bil-

lion increase in the deficit. We cannot get to zero by going the wrong direction.

I am concerned about the families of America. A government that spends 15 percent of its income on interest on the debt is an impediment to hope and prosperity for the average taxpayer. The American people cannot bear the weight of an excessive and out-of-control Federal Government.

We need only to look at the difficulties faced by the average American family. There was a time in the not too distant past, when I grew up as a child, when one parent could work in a factory or a store or an office and the other stay home in order to take care of the family.

My parents are examples of this. My father had a high school education and was limited in his job opportunities. He worked as an inspector in a chicken plant in northwest Arkansas, but yet despite the modest income, he was able to provide for his family, raise his children, allowing Mom to stay at home, and that is because the government did not eat up his paycheck as is done today.

The American family cannot do that today and that is why we need to balance the budget and that is why I support this resolution to give us hope in America once again.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, in the 11 years I have been in Congress to receive Presidential budgets, this budget is the best received I have ever seen by our colleagues. And there is good reason for that. The track record of the Clinton administration has been excellent in reducing the deficit.

It is the first administration in recent times that had 4 years in a row in reducing the deficit. It has submitted a budget that balances in the year 2002, according to OMB projections. There is a disagreement between CBO and OMB. Why do we not look at the track record and look at the past 4 years? In the past 4 years, OMB has been more accurate than CBO. The deficits have actually been smaller than we thought they were going to be. The President's has been more accurate.

The President goes one step further. He says if his economic projections are wrong, he puts an enforcement mechanism in his budget that guarantees us a balanced budget by the year 2002. That is why the gentleman from Washington is correct when he says that Dr. O'Neill has said that the President's budget will have a zero deficit in the year 2002.

The Congressional Budget Act says the President should submit his budget by February. He has done that. It then says that Congress shall pass a concurrent resolution by April 15.

Now, we have heard from the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget that we are not going to meet that deadline. I know that the leadership has instituted a new process known as Correction Day. Maybe we should put the Congressional Budget Act on Correction Day and eliminate the time limits that are put in here.

Rather than wasting our time on this resolution, I would support a resolution that would direct the Committee on the Budget to bring out its budget in time so that we can act by April 15.

□ 1445

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to note that with regard to the triggers that have been discussed, there is a fair amount of accuracy. There are triggers in the President's budget, and here is what the triggers do: Head Start cut \$400 million over 2 years; special education cut \$370 million over 2 years; Pell grants cut \$680 million over 2 years; veterans' hospitals cut \$1.4 billion over 2 years. That is what a trigger is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG].

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I commend him for bringing this resolution forward, and I support it.

Let me begin by pointing out that this resolution does matter. I sat on the Budget Committee 2 years ago when Alan Greenspan pointed out that if this Congress could balance the budget, it would make a real difference to Americans. Interest rates would drop.

This chart shows that following the 1994 elections, interest rates began to drop. But when we failed to agree with the President on a plan that would balance the budget, interest rates began to go back up. This debate does matter. It is critical that we balance the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I sat in this room and listened to the President announce that the era of big government is over. I sat in this Chamber and listened to him pronounce that this should be the Congress which finally balances the budget, and yet the budget which the President has submitted does not do that.

I rise in good faith to ask the President to join us in this effort, and to point out that a budget which increases the deficit in the coming year by \$24 billion over doing nothing is not, in good faith, an effort to balance the budget; that a budget such as the President has submitted, which results in a \$69 billion deficit in the year 2002 when it is supposed to be balanced, is not a good faith effort.

This is not a partisan fight. Both sides of the aisle agree we must balance the budget. I call on the President to join us in this fight, to join us so that we can benefit the American people by the kind of falling interest rates

which will occur, the lower car loans, the lower student loans, the lower home mortgage loan interest rates that Americans would enjoy if we had a balanced budget. I call upon the President to submit a budget which does balance and to join in this effort.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. This is nothing but a diversion, a political exercise and a futile attempt to shift the blame where it does not belong.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are trying to cover their tracks. Having promised too much in their recent election campaigns, they now find that they are unable to produce a budget that is both in balance and fair. So instead they are taking the highly unprecedented step of requesting the President to submit a second budget, something which we have not seen with previous administrations, including those who submitted budgets that were out of balance.

Before we vote, we should consider some important facts. The Constitution of the United States clearly states that it is the Congress and not the executive branch which enacts laws and appropriates funds. Article 1, section 8, clause 18 states:

The Congress shall have the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or officer thereof.

So, therefore, the Constitution is quite clear as to who is responsible for forming a budget. It is the Congress. Second, while the Congressional Budget Act of 1973 sets the procedure for the President to submit a budget for consideration by the Congress, ultimately it is up to the Congress to pass the laws enacting a budget for the United States. In fact, if we are to rely on the 1973 act, we find that the 105th Congress is woefully behind, with only 10 legislative days left in which the Committees on the Budget are to submit and the Congress to adopt a budget resolution. Yet only yesterday the Republican leadership stated that no budget would be submitted or debated until May.

We all know the President has submitted a budget, and while it may not be perfect, and few budgets are, he has met his goals in both form and substance. The administration can honestly state that using the assumptions of the Office of Management and Budget, the President's budget achieves balance by 2002. I might add that the CBO has also agreed with that statement. We can disagree with the President over assumptions and substance, but we cannot disagree with the fact that he has submitted his budget and it is in balance using his assumptions.

So what is the problem that requires the other side to ask that the administration submit a new budget? They have the power to submit their own budget. Many of my colleagues on the other side were here during the Reagan and Bush years. No one ever asked them to submit another budget when in fact their budgets were never in balance.

The problem, my colleagues, is that the Republican leadership cannot produce a balanced budget that cuts taxes by nearly \$200 billion and does not make deep cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment. They have simply overpromised and now they are stuck. They want the President to do the heavy lifting and that is why we are considering a bill here today that is nothing more than subterfuge. Let us be honest. The President has his budget, the Blue Dogs have their budget. It is time for the Republicans to put their budget on the table and let the American people compare.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT].

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SUNUNU] and the other freshmen who have put this together because far from being a senseless debate, as we have heard from some of our colleagues on the other side, this is a very important debate. Let me explain the consequences. Who is right and who is wrong is not as important as what happens if we are wrong.

As we have seen, we believe the President's budget is not in balance. That is important. That is significant. The deficit actually goes up and at the end of the budget cycle, according to the Congressional Budget Office, which is our official scorekeeper, the budget is still out of balance by \$69 billion come the year 2002.

What does that mean? What are the consequences? The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SUNUNU] tried to explain, and I think Members need to understand that if the Congressional Budget Office is correct, here is what is going to happen in the year 2002. I daresay no Republicans nor no Democrats want to vote for this, because it means that Head Start will be cut \$422 million, special education will be cut \$369 million, education to the disadvantaged will be cut \$707 million, Pell grants for college students will have to be cut \$680 million, the National Institutes of Health will have to be cut over \$1 billion.

Veterans hospitals, does anybody want to have to vote in the year 2002 to cut veterans hospitals by \$1.4 billion? Or the women, infants and children program, the WIC Program, by \$353 million? The FBI would have to be cut by \$230 million; the Immigration and Naturalization Service, \$147 million; the Federal Aviation Administration, they are the people who keep our air-

ways safe, by \$783 million; Federal highways by \$1.4 billion; the National Science Foundation, \$269 million worth of cuts if the President's triggers go into effect. Finally let me say, and we all care about national parks, do my colleagues really want to vote for a budget that could cause national parks to be cut by \$105 million?

I say the answer to that question is no. That is not the budget that we want. The debate that we are having today is an important debate for this reason, and I am still wearing my name tag from Hershey because I think we need a bipartisan budget. I think we have to work together. I think we have to have an honest debate. But how can we have an honest debate about the most important issue this Congress will deal with, the budget, if one side is speaking Greek and the other side is speaking Latin?

What this debate is about today, what this vote is about today is let us all speak the same language, because if we are right and the President is wrong, it is going to have dramatic consequences for lots of our constituents. That is not what we want, that is not what you want, and frankly I do not think that is what the President wants. What we want is an honest and fair debate using honest and fair numbers. Let us agree on the assumptions, let us agree on the language, then let us have an honest debate.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I take 1 second to remind the gentleman that last year he proposed the same kind of trigger in Medicare. He trusted it then. I am not sure why he does not trust it now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. WEYGAND].

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Speaker, I have some prepared comments which I would like to submit, but I would like to depart from those if I could, because in this discussion and debate today I have found some unusual rhetoric that I think really does not strike home to anybody outside of the beltway. I am just a poor kid from Pawtucket, RI, and when we talk about work, we mean about rolling up your sleeves, working together, agreeing to disagree but coming out with a budget.

What we have seen, though, unfortunately is a lot of political rhetoric about it is not fair to the children, we are not following through, this is a curve ball. The fact of the matter is whether you are in Pawtucket, RI; Westerly, RI; Texas; Washington; or Washington, DC, the issue before us is, let us get together and work on a budget that works.

The President submitted a budget on February 6. It balances by 2002. The Blue Dogs submitted a budget. The Black Caucus submitted a budget. But the Republicans have not yet, not today and not tomorrow, submitted one issue that is regarding a budget. Not even an amendment. Not a plan.

If we are really talking about bipartisanship, if we are talking about Hershey, PA, if we are talking about doing the things that all the people in my district in Rhode Island believe in, we should be then debating the issues of the President's budget, the Blue Dog budget, the minority caucus budget, and hopefully elements that you believe in, but let us debate them. Let us put them on the table.

Let us work to resolve the issue, rather than this political buffoonery that is before us today. This is wrong. This is not legislation. These are people being political pawns, and quite frankly everyone outside of the beltway is cringing today and saying, "What is wrong with these people in Washington? They just don't get it." Let us get it, let us get on with it, let us pass a budget that balances.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to note that of the budgets mentioned in the last presentation, the coalition budget meets the criteria placed for it here. The budget put forward by this Congress 2 years ago meets the criteria in this resolution. The Black Caucus budget discussed meets the criteria in this resolution. This resolution simply calls for Congress and the President both to fall into the criteria outlined here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PITTS] who has put forward a great amount of work in supporting this resolution and working toward a balanced budget.

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the resolution urging President Clinton to submit a budget that balances by 2002. We are all aware that balancing the budget is a top priority with the American people.

The budget submitted by President Clinton was touted as a legitimate plan to balance the budget by the year 2002. It does not do that. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the independent source which the President himself has suggested we use, this effort falls short of the balance goal by \$69 billion. Not only does the President's budget not balance by 2002, it leaves 98 percent of the deficit reduction until after he leaves office.

President Clinton increases the deficit by \$24 billion next year over what would be if we did nothing, which is considered the baseline. If we maintained spending next year at the same level as it is today, we will have a budget deficit next year of \$121 billion. That is the first year. The President would increase that deficit spending by \$24 billion over that baseline, to \$145 billion. That deficit spending increases and continues every year until 2002. So we would be better off if we did nothing, rather than using the President's plan.

Also, Mr. Speaker, looking at the President's budget, on page 331 we see

the amount of the debt over a 5-year period, the debt today being \$5.4 trillion, in 2002, \$6.6 trillion. I would like to submit this for the RECORD. In other words, we increase the debt in this 5-year period by \$1.2 trillion. Need I say more about needing a balanced budget?

We have not balanced the budget since 1969. To quote Thomas Jefferson, "There is nothing more important for our children and the next generation of Americans than to leave them a Nation that is debt free."

For the sake of our children and our grandchildren, the out-of-control spending must come to an end.

President Clinton said, "We don't need a balanced budget amendment. We need action."

Well, we need action. He has given us neither. It is action that we are calling for with this resolution, action that does not mean higher taxes. This proposal does raise taxes. According to the independent Joint Committee on Taxation, the President's budget would increase taxes by \$23 billion through 2007, hitting middle-income taxpayers first. This will directly impact over 100 million workers across the country. Another tax hike in the President's budget penalizes American companies that create export jobs, changing the tax formula to increase the amount of their taxes on income derived from sales abroad.

□ 1500

That is a real disincentive for companies who rely on trade and exports.

Another harmful tax is the capital gains tax, which is a tax hike on 10 to 15 million Americans that will occur. They are predominantly middle-income families who own mutual funds and stocks, and these tax hikes are all permanent, but the tax cuts are temporary. For example, the \$500 child tax credit is scheduled to disappear when a child reaches age 13, just about the time when kids get expensive. That means that single moms are left out in the cold after their kids are 13 and growing.

That is irresponsible. To shut down a tax credit when the going gets tough on parents like single moms is unwise.

The President's budget also calls for this tax credit to expire on December 31, year 2000, just when he leaves office.

Mr. Speaker, it is vital that the President resubmit a budget that serves as a starting point for discussion. Step one to an agreement is the need to use the same numbers. By assuring that both the President and the Congress use the same numbers, we begin to travel down the same road to a balanced budget, and this resolution would do that.

Mr. Speaker, we are hearing a lot about ethics today in Washington. I would like to ask a question. Is it ethical to spend money that we do not have and to stick our kids and grandkids with the bill? Most of us, when our parents die, expect maybe to inherit a house or maybe some savings, but how

would my colleagues feel if their parents went into such debt that they had to spend the rest of their life just retiring their debt? That is what we are doing to the next generation. The only people who lose in this deal are the kids.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to support this resolution.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, this resolution really trivializes what is perhaps the most significant legislative initiative we will undertake this session. Our colleagues may disagree with the President's budget, but it does indeed balance. Our colleagues may not like how it balances, they may think it should balance early, but CBO really said, "If you use his assumptions and his trigger, it would balance at the year that he indicated it would." The budget, however, provides guidance for how we spend our resources, who will we spend it on; it determines indeed what our resources will be spent on and indeed who is important.

The budget for our Nation is the most important plan that our people will have. We will decide whether small family businesses spanning generations will be able to survive through relief from unfair estate tax, we will decide the kind of assistance we will give to those who are aspiring for education, higher education, for Head Start, we decide whether American children will get a healthy start or any assistance at all. So this is no small matter talking about the budget, but it is a small matter what we are doing on this floor.

Mr. Speaker, right now as we are talking about this budget the Committee on the Budget is having a hearing that is on the issue that we should all be there. It is no accident they establish a date of April 15, tax day, the day that our citizens assume their share of the budget of our Nation that we in Congress should have a budget resolution. But at the rate we are going we will not meet that goal. Why? Because of such activities as we are having today.

The President's budget has been submitted.

Now there are some issues I disagree with, but nevertheless I am generally pleased by that budget and know that there are issues that I disagree with and I will have an opportunity to express. I urge my Republican colleagues to use that same effort: Go to the hearings, express their view, submit their budget, find a better way to improve this budget. If they want to submit a balanced budget, why not put that balanced budget on the floor?

Mr. Speaker, I urge that this resolution should not be voted on, and it should not be on the floor in the first place, and certainly we should vote against it.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRANKS].

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by observing that in my opinion both sides in this discussion are fundamentally committed to balancing the budget. Nobody ever said that that goal would be easy to attain. If it were easy, I suspect it would have been done long ago. But it is now clear that reaching that goal will require not only determination, but real leadership if we are to fundamentally change Washington spending habits.

Against that backdrop the budget submitted by the President, in my judgment, defers simply too many of the tough decisions. It leaves them for someone else to figure out.

According to the CBO, fully 98 percent of the savings needed to balance the budget will not come until the last 2 years. In those years that responsibility will fall to a different Congress and indeed a different President.

But let us be honest. Any plan to balance the budget relies on the greatest portion of savings to be achieved in the final years. That is because when we make changes in the way that Washington spends money we do not see instant results. It takes time to accumulate substantial savings. But the President's budget simply relies too heavily on back-loaded savings.

But there is a different problem, and it is just around the corner. For 4 consecutive years the deficit has been going down. That is to the President's credit and to ours. But the deficit now we find is at its lowest level in 15 years, but next year for a variety of reasons the deficit will begin going back up.

All of us should find that change in direction very troubling, and we should seek to limit the increase in next year's deficit to the greatest extent possible. But unfortunately that is not what the President's budget would do. According to CBO, the deficit next year will be \$24 billion worse than if his budget had been lost on its way up to Capitol Hill. The CBO estimates that if we stayed on our current path and did nothing, the deficit next year would be \$121 billion. That is \$24 billion lower than under the President's recommended spending plan.

There is another reality that we simply must face. We cannot expect to credibly balance the budget and keep it in balance beyond 2002 without making some structural changes in entitlement spending. Entitlements now account for over 55 percent of all Federal savings, and they are going up every year at an astonishing rate. We owe it to the American people to make the changes needed to keep entitlement spending under control while preserving the essential purposes of those programs.

We are committed to working with the President to end deficit spending. This resolution takes us in that direction by asking the President to take a second look at his proposal.

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

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRANKS] makes the best case for not reducing taxes. The President's budget would continue down if we did not reduce taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the American people sent us here to get the job done, not to play games. As a freshman member of the Committee on the Budget, I am eager to get to work on a plan that will balance the budget, but here it is the second week of March and we have yet to really begin an open and honest discussion as to Federal spending and the priorities that we must face as a Congress.

There are legitimate differences over the merits of a tax cut and how to best achieve savings in Medicare and Medicaid spending, but we must start to work through these difficulties and begin debating the issues. Unfortunately, today the House is debating a resolution which serves no useful purpose. At best this resolution is a waste of time; at worst it is a diversion from our work in the Committee on the Budget, which should be meeting right now.

We have a legal obligation to submit a budget resolution by April 15. We have an obligation to our constituents to work toward a plan which will balance the budget. The time for action is now. The responsibility is ours as a Congress. We should commit ourselves to reconciling our differing visions of how to balance the budget and get to work on an honest and open debate on the issues before us.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA].

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SUNUNU] for yielding me the time. I would just like to take a look at what the President is proposing in the area of education.

We all recognize that much work needs to be done in education. We are currently engaged in a process which we call Education at a Crossroads which examines what is working and what is wasted in education in America today. We are taking a look at the Washington response, which is 760 programs going through 39 different agencies, spending about a \$120 billion per year, and what we believe is that before we put another overlay of new programs and spending on this education bureaucracy, let us take a look at what is working and what is wasted, and, if we have new priorities, let us find some money in the old programs that appear not to be working, and let us reestablish priorities.

There is enough money in education. We do not need more money.

The President is proposing a building program, recognizing that when we put Federal dollars into building programs

we prohibit the use of volunteers on those projects and we have to pay premiums through the Davis-Bacon law. And then the President on the other hand wants to encourage volunteerism by expanding the Corporation for National Service, its involvement in tutoring programs. So on one hand we are saying volunteers are bad, on the other hand we are going to say we are going to have more volunteers paid \$27,000 per year involved in teaching our kids to read. It is great that they are teaching our kids to read because the Corporation for National Service cannot keep its books, and just recently there was another report that said their trust fund is now unauditible. These people cannot teach our kids math, so maybe they can help on reading.

What is the President's vision for education? He wants to build our schools, put in the technology, develop the correct curriculum, test our kids, certify our teachers, teach them about sex, teach them about drugs, feed them breakfast, feed them lunch, do midnight basketball, and other than that it is your school. He has got a vision of big government and more spending, proposing \$55 billion of increased spending, new spending, \$11 billion per year for the next 5 years. That means that 2.2 million American families will have to pay \$5,000 a year for increased spending on education when that money already exists.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] raises the question. I say Put your alternative on the table; we would love to see it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, today's debate sounds like a line from a popular song: "Isn't It Ironic?"

Is it not ironic that the majority party is demanding the President submit a second budget when they have not yet come about to present any budget plan? Is it not ironic that the budget process is behind schedule for the third year in a row under Republican leadership? Is it not ironic that one Member of the majority party's leadership has stated it would be inappropriate for Republicans to produce a budget while another Member of the same leadership had said they will produce a budget resolution in May. Is it not ironic?

Enough of this budget gridlock, Mr. Speaker. The President has submitted a budget; the Republicans have not.

Today's resolution is nothing more than a diversion. It is simply an attempt to distract, an attempt to distract the American people from the fact that the majority is not doing its job.

Do not fall for this trick. Vote no on House Resolution 89.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this afternoon we had before us the proposition of whether we should adopt a rule that controls the debate on this matter that is pending. We did adopt a rule, and unfortunately that rule denied the minority a chance at asking this body to vote on an equitable proposition. That proposition would have challenged both the leadership of this Congress and the administration to produce a budget that complies with the standards that are set forth and have been so frequently addressed here.

I for one feel that these standards are important, that we should have conservative forecasting, that we should have a glidepath to deficit reduction or eliminating the deficit, that we should deal with the problems of the Medicare system.

□ 1515

Unfortunately, we are now grappling with just the politics of how this is to be presented. It is cosmetics, and that is one of the tragedies. We should be insisting, as newer Members of Congress, that both the Republican leadership and the Democratic White House meet the same standard and do so simultaneously. Both groups should be putting their cards on the table and saying, this is what our hand looks like, now let us sit down and negotiate the next step.

We all know those negotiations have to take place. The longer we delay those negotiations, the greater the risk that we will again experience the tragic shutdown of the Federal Government that occurred in 1995.

It is my fervent wish that we put to one side this type of a dilatory tactic and say: time to get on with the task; time, as Republican leaders to present a budget; time for the White House to present a budget that complies with the standards that we all know ought to be the standards that govern budgeting in this institution.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire for yielding and congratulate him on his work in this area.

I do rise in support of the resolution, but I really take the floor not so much because of this resolution, which I do not consider to be either dilatory or a waste of time, because it is getting its focus on what I think we should be talking about here in the U.S. Congress today, and that is balancing the budget of our country. I think it is absolutely vital.

Let us not forget that people such as Mr. Greenspan has said that we will reduce interest rates by 2 percent if we can balance the budget. We are all talking about balancing the budget,

and I think we should go with doing it. I think this is a good exercise to put some of these issues on the floor.

I am not critical of the White House. As a matter of fact, I had a very good meeting this morning with Mr. Franklin Raines, the budget director, and Mr. Gene Sperling of the White House, and about a dozen of us to talk about the budget issues, the numbers. I think they showed some flexibility in terms of revisiting, relooking at some of the numbers which are here.

However, I do become concerned when we do not move forward, and I do become concerned with some of the numbers that we are dealing with with respect to this particular budget. I think, first and foremost, it really has not recognized the parameters of using the Congressional Budget Office estimates and assumptions, and I think we should get to that point so we can at least argue from the same set of numbers. I realize there will still be some differences, but we did promise to do that.

I think without the same economic baseline and numbers used for comparison purposes, it is too difficult to decide which is more and which is less. It simply allows no political accountability under the President's assumptions as we have now.

I do congratulate, by the way, the Blue Dog Coalition budget makers. I think they did an extremely good job of recognizing the issues before us that are making the kind of hard decisions that I think each of the 435 of us should make and the President and his advisors should make with respect to balancing the budget.

I might point out that it is not only the Republicans that called on the President to issue a balanced budget, but the nonpartisan Concord Coalition as well, that concurs with the Congressional Budget Office that his budget postpones most spending cuts until after the year 2000 and after he actually leaves the White House.

So we have some serious problems with the delays, and I think we need to address these and deal with it, and I hope we can keep moving forward.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHERMAN].

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are called here in this Chamber today not to do the people's business but to engage in what I think is dilatory tactics. We are called upon to spend a day in this Chamber not making laws, but engaged in a ritualistic attack on President Clinton and his fiscal record. So I figured we ought to take a minute just to look at the President's fiscal record.

This chart here shows where we were headed in terms of a deficit before President Clinton took office. We see this line exceeding \$100 trillion. Now, I have only served in Congress for a short time. I remember when \$1 billion

was a lot of money. And we used to explain it as a line of \$100 bills going from Washington all the way across the country or a stack of \$1 bills all the way to the Moon. We were headed for a \$100 trillion deficit. That is a stack of \$100 bills going all the way to whatever planet Yoda lives on.

Instead, we have fiscal responsibility in the White House, and we have been able to bring long-term prospects represented by that lower line to a position where a balanced budget, a long-term and permanent balanced budget, is within reach.

Now, the laws says that we are supposed to have a budget resolution just 10 legislative days from today. Instead of passing resolutions, we should start by writing a budget in the Committee on the Budget. And I felt, why have the Republican majority not put forward a budget? And I thought maybe it was in absence of pen and paper and a chance to sit down and actually write some numbers down. So I brought this here.

Mr. Speaker, as we can see, it sets forth everything we have been told about the majority's budget. It comes equipped with a pen, and I would hope that in the spirit of Hershey, PA, some of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle would come down here and give us some numbers, because a journey toward a trillion-dollar budget starts with the first digit.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. ALLEN].

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, last week-end half of the Members in this House participated in a bipartisan congressional retreat to help restore civility in our debate. The American people want us to do the people's work and to do so in a bipartisan fashion.

Today's resolution requesting the President to submit a second balanced budget is partisan and counterproductive. The President submitted a balanced budget in February. While we may honestly disagree about the President's budget priorities, the Constitution gives this Congress the power of the purse. Section 301(a) of the Congressional Budget Act requires this Congress to complete action on the budget resolution on or before April 15, 1997. That date is less than 5 weeks away. To request a second balanced budget from the President is simply irresponsible. He has done his job.

The Committee on the Budget must not duck the tough choices necessary to balance the Federal budget, but that is what is going on today. Let us do our job. Let us vote against this resolution and urge the Committee on the Budget to submit a budget resolution to this Congress by April 15.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a waste of time. Why do

my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to stall the budget process? I thought that the clock was ticking for us to enact a balanced budget, which I support. In the rush to pass a fiscal year 1998 budget, the Republicans are setting up another scenario for last-minute legislation. In that rush, the most vulnerable populations will be targeted again for the highest spending cuts and the lowest assistance. It is remarkable how far the Republicans will single out poor families.

The deadline grows near for our national budget to be balanced. Note that my Republican colleagues have not submitted a budget proposal. They must not be serious about negotiating a balanced budget agreement. What is their strategy now? To shut down the Federal Government again? Remember, it did not work before; it will not work again.

I ask my colleagues to consider the human face on this debate. Consider Miguel Pena from Brooklyn, a 72-year-old Dominican legal immigrant with mental illness who will lose his SSI disability benefits within months because he is not a citizen. He, like hundreds of thousands of other legal immigrants, has no other source of income.

Consider the 30 percent of the 30,000 Hasidic children in Williamsburg who will lose their Federal assistance. Consider Maria Rodriguez, 27 years old, a legal secretary with two children and no subsidized daycare options. Hard-working people have to make painful decisions on a daily basis about keeping a roof over their heads or putting food on their table. We should not be spending precious time on political posturing at the expense of America's future.

The families I represent in Brooklyn, Manhattan, and Queens carefully manage their limited incomes to make ends meet. They cannot postpone their budget; neither should we. Let us get on with the people's business.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BALDACCI].

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

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering a resolution which demands that the President submit yet another balanced budget plan. Apparently the first one was not to the House leadership's liking. Such an ironic twist and somewhat bold in light of the fact that the House leadership has failed to submit a balanced budget plan of their own, one that meets the criteria that they have set forth that they have asked the President to meet. To date we have the President's balanced budget plan, we have the coalition's balanced budget plan, and I have yet to see a plan from the Republican leadership.

Now, reasonable people can disagree over what should or should not be in the plan to balance the but. The President's plan is very strong on education

and children's health care, and some may disagree about that. But the President made a good-faith effort to meet the demands of the House leadership, only to be told that he must submit a second budget before they even submit the first one.

The President has submitted a detailed balanced budget plan that includes the economic and accounting analysis, information on Federal receipts and collections and detailed priorities. It is a good-size document weighing more than a few pounds with a little over 1,200 pages of great detail.

I urge my colleagues who dislike the President's budget plan to meet him halfway and submit a plan of their own. The President cannot negotiate with himself and should not be asked to submit a new plan until those who disagree with him have an approach all their own.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SNOWBARGER].

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

Mr. SNOWBARGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about one particular aspect of the budget that is before us and the subject of the comments today, and that is the issue of tax relief. The fact of the matter is that over the next 10 years this budget proposes a tax increase of over \$23 billion.

Mr. Speaker, if a budget is going to promise tax relief, it should be permanent tax relief. It is better to have no tax relief than phony tax relief. The child care tax credit for children under 13 is only \$300 for the first 3 years. Then it supposedly increases to \$500. But the budget also proposes that all the tax reductions will automatically be repealed in the year 2000 if the rosy scenario and the imaginative arithmetic conflict with reality, as CBO has said it will, and it turns out the budget then will not be balanced.

A tax credit for children should not be scheduled to expire in a few years. Neither should a tax credit for children disappear when the child turns 13, just when children become the most expensive. You know, when they eat everything in sight and go through two or complete wardrobes a year. Under the administration's plan, a family will get relief only if its children were born between 1985 and 1999.

While promising tax relief with one hand and taking it away with the other, the budget also belies the President's assertion that the age of big Government is over. The President claims to have reduced the Federal civilian work force by 299,600 employees from 1993 through 1998. This is misleading on several counts, including the following: two-thirds of these reductions are from the Department of Defense. These personnel reductions actually come from the Defense downsizing of the Bush administration, which occurred because the United States and its allies won the cold war under the leadership of the Reagan-Bush administrations. The new budget claims to reduce 26,600 additional employees by the end of fiscal year 1998. But the President fails to

emphasize the fact that he is actually cutting 27,800 workers from the Department of Defense, when the non-DOD Government labor force will actually increase by 1,200.

The administration's budget also uses creative accounting to hide increased spending. The President's budget actually makes substantial increases in discretionary spending. Compared to 1997 levels the budget increases discretionary spending by \$100 billion over next 5 years.

I served in the Kansas State Legislature for 12 years. During that time I worked with Republican and Democratic Governors, and reached principled compromises. I want the Congress and the President to reach an agreement on a budget that is balanced, and that will stay balanced. But it has to be an honest agreement, with honest numbers. The only way to accomplish that is for the President to submit a budget that is truly balanced. Then we can engage in the true give-and-take of the legislative process.

The difference between the President's current budget and what needs to be done on this issue is the difference between saying we're going to balance the budget and actually balancing it. To pretend we are balancing the budget when we're not dishonors us, betrays our constituents, and endangers programs like Social Security, which the President insists he wants to protect. In the long run, the promises of a bankrupt Federal Government are worthless. The best thing we can do to ensure that Social Security is here tomorrow is to start balancing the budget today.

For these reasons the House must pass this resolution calling on the President to prepare another budget, one that really balances.

□ 1530

A tax credit for children should not be scheduled to expire in a few years. Neither should a tax credit for children disappear when a child turns 13, just when the child becomes most expensive: when they eat everything in sight and go through two or more wardrobes a year.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PRICE].

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. speaker, one of my first experiences in this body in 1987 came when we were voting on the floor on four competing budget resolutions, including one offered by the majority party, as is always done, at least until this year.

I remember at the end of the day it struck me that 140 Members of this body had voted "no" on all four resolutions, in the spirit of a comment made by the then-minority whip, Mr. LOTT, who said, "You do not ever get into trouble for those budgets which you vote against."

I am sure Members in this body also remember 1993, when we passed a 5-year budget plan that has since reduced the deficit by \$700 billion. Yet we barely passed that plan, by only one vote in both Houses.

It is easiest to vote "no," and it is hard to produce a budget, but it is our

obligation to produce a budget. Particularly, it is the obligation of the majority party to deliver what every majority party has delivered in the past: A budget proposal which then serves as a blueprint for subsequent congressional action.

The majority apparently does not want to put its fingerprints on any budgetary unpleasantness, so they are trying to shift the blame onto the President. But the President has already produced a budget. No one is claiming that it is perfect, but our Republican friends are exaggerating the difference between CBO and OMB projections as a diversionary tactic, trying to divert attention from their own failure to do the tough work of writing and passing a budget resolution. If they do not like the President's budget they can produce a different budget, but it is the Republican majority's turn to put its own budget on the table so we can move forward to confront the country's challenges.

Surely we do not want to repeat the scenario of deadlock and Government shutdown. Time is almost up. The statutory deadline is April 15. Only 9 legislative days remain to pass a budget resolution. The majority party is way overdue in putting their own budget on the table, a budget proposal which we could be debating today rather than this irrelevant and diversionary resolution.

Let us get the budget process back on track. Defeat this resolution and bring a budget resolution to the floor, as the majority party has always done and is still obligated to do.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH], a distinguished member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and congratulate him for his important work on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, this is about principle. We have talked about what the President has said, and the President's words are important. The President has said, and we have repeatedly relied on these statements, because words should have meanings, Mr. Speaker; the President said, I have made it clear we will work with Congress, the Congressional Budget Office, and we are going to do this. We are going to do the right thing.

We are taking the President at his word. We are taking the President at his word that he means to make the difficult decision and that he means to be a leader and not a politician.

Politics have ruled this debate for too long on both sides of the aisle. I have heard about Hershey and the spirit of bipartisanship, and we need to treat each other civil. We should not have to be reminded about that. We are adult politicians. But the fact is that we have very legitimate policy differences, and they are subjective differences.

What is objective, Mr. Speaker, is that the President has said he will abide by CBO. CBO has said his budget is not in balance. We expect the President to give us a balanced budget. We want the President to give us a balanced budget. The American people deserve a balanced budget.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the majority leader announced that the Congress will not consider a budget resolution until May, 3 months after the President submitted to this House a balanced budget plan. Yet today my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to vote on a resolution to force the President to submit another balanced budget. They continue to criticize the President's plan, despite a letter from the director of the Congressional Budget Office asserting that the President's plan is truly a balanced budget.

Where may I ask is a Republican plan to balance the budget? My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are too busy with partisan attacks to focus on actually submitting a budget proposal of their own.

It is time for House Republicans to stop holding press conferences and to start crunching numbers. The only bill today reflecting the Republican budget priorities is a proposal by the majority leader of the Senate, and it is a tax bill. This legislation, according to Citizens for Tax Justice, would mostly benefit the wealthiest 5 percent of Americans.

It sounds to me like the Republicans are up to their old tricks: Balancing the budget on the backs of working American families while cutting taxes for the rich. The American people deserve to see how the Republicans plan to pay for these large tax cuts. Let us work together on the issues that matter to the American people.

We cannot afford to have another Government shutdown because the Republicans are too busy attacking the President to work on a balanced budget. It is time for us to work together on the issues that matter to the American people.

We have seen the Democratic proposal to balance the budget. The American people deserve to see the Republican budget proposal.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to note that this resolution is precisely about working together. This resolution is about working to get a platform from the President from which we can conduct bipartisan budget negotiations.

If we truly want to move in that direction, we need a substantive balanced budget, one that does not include triggers, one that does not include a \$69 billion deficit in the year 2002, one that does not increase the deficit \$24 billion in 1998. That is all we seek. We lay out criteria that will give us this platform, and we apply the exact same standards

to this House that we ask the President to abide by.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. PARKER].

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, the matter before us today is viewed by many as a useless exercise in political finger-pointing. That is precisely the way it was defined in the Committee on Rules yesterday.

Perhaps we are being a bit too subtle. This is not an attack on the President or on his budget. House Resolution 89 is simply a message to the White House. It is an appeal to the President to recognize the historical opportunity available to him to actively participate in a bipartisan effort to finally craft a balanced Federal budget.

There is a genuine desire on the part of the Republican Members of this House to work with the President in such an effort. We anxiously awaited submission of his budget last month in order to let him establish the starting point in this process. My feeling is that he passed on that opportunity. Instead, he sent us a political document. I think perhaps it is the best political document that I have seen in my tenure here in the House.

Still, many of us remain prepared to work with the President and our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. That is what this resolution is all about. We need to debate policies, programs, and spending cuts. Instead, we are debating, once again, whose economic assumptions, either the OMB or CBO, should be the basis for more substantive debate.

The fact is, the House will use CBO assumptions. The matter is no longer subject to debate. The Committee on the Budget will present a balanced budget, a proposal scored by CBO, in the near future. This process could be eased somewhat if the President worked from the same assumptions. In the past he said that he would, but as his budget proposal demonstrates, he will not.

This exercise today is simply one last appeal to him to join us, rather than confronting us. It is my belief that we will work with him.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FATTAH].

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, what we have is seemingly a disagreement between two groups of economists about what might happen some 5 years out in terms of the largest economy in the world, a slight difference of opinion about that between the President's economists and the CBO. But we should not waste our time here today with this resolution. This has no import or impact on the President of the United States in terms of any legal meaning.

The result of the passage of this resolution is just that the House will have taken up the time of the House, rather than working on producing a budget that could be scored by CBO and that could take into account the President's

priorities which, by the way, are the Americans' priorities, as illustrated in the last election. The public wants more investment in education and environmental protection. These are issues we should be debating, we should be working toward. This political oneness between the House and the White House does not make a lot of sense.

We have a role here in the Congress to play. We are one of two Houses, and along with the White House, and we have to do the most important thing we do every year, which is to pass a budget. I would ask that my colleagues vote "no" on the resolution, and then urge ourselves to get to work, not through the words we speak on the floor, but in the hard work of designing a budget to take this Nation into the next century.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to this debate from the beginning. One of the things I am very impressed with is the demeanor on both sides of the aisle. I am particularly impressed with the contributions of the freshmen Members from both sides of the aisle, and my colleague who introduced this resolution, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SUNUNU]. We are talking about ideas, we are talking about policies, and we are talking about the direction this country should head.

This congressional majority has three major objectives. We want to balance the Federal budget and get our financial house in order; we want to save our trust funds for not only future generations but for present generations, because Medicare in particular is running out of money; and third, we want to transform this caretaking society into a caring society. We want to transform this caretaking social and corporate and agricultural welfare state into a caring opportunity society.

In the process of doing all three of those things, we want to move the power and the money and the influence back home and away from Washington. That is our objective. That is what we will seek to do. That is what we will do with our budget when we present our budget, which we will do, and which we are required to do.

The President deserves a tremendous amount of credit for deficit reduction since he has been present. The first 2 years he achieved deficit reduction with a Democrat majority by tax increases. The last 2 years of his 4 years as President he reduced the deficit, with the help of this new Republican majority, by spending cuts. It is clear that we are going to continue to go on a downward path by spending reductions, not tax increases.

What is alarming, however, is the President still insists on not using the same budget numbers that we are required to use, the Congressional Budget

Office. This resolution soundly requires that we use the same set of numbers so we do not have a Government shutdown. It argues that we do not have automatic spending cuts so we do not have a Government shutdown. It argues as well that major savings take place in the first 3 years, not the fourth and fifth year, so we do not have a Government shutdown.

Why is it important? Because we are in Congress for the next 2 years. And why is that significant? Under the President's budget, scored by CBO, they say the deficit goes up \$24 billion. This year it would go up an additional \$1 billion from his plan, and next year it would go up an additional \$24 billion, to a \$145 billion deficit.

For 4 years the President and Congress have succeeded in going down, and under his plan it is now going up. It goes up the next year and the year after that, and only slightly goes down the third year, and then the fourth and fifth year, when we are not in Congress, when he in fact is not President, in the fifth year we do most of the deficit reduction.

Mr. Speaker, I have a big problem with the argument on the other side that it is balanced in the fifth year. It is balanced in the fifth year. It is like the person who says I am going to lose 50 pounds in the next 5 years, and seeks to gain pounds in the first 2 years, and then in the fifth year basically says, I am going to lose 49 pounds out of my 50.

□ 1545

Technically, it is balanced, but it is just a fraud. We know the next White House cannot do that, and we know that the Congress, from the next one and the one beyond, will not do that. We have got to make constructive reductions each and every year.

This resolution requires that we work together in both the White House and Congress and in using the same budget numbers so we can compare apples to apples, so we do not have automatic spending cuts. It requires Congress to do that as well and that we make substantive savings in the first 3 years of the 5-year plan, not in the fifth year. So for that, Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to be associated with this effort.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Connecticut heard Mr. Rubin yesterday say that if the—

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I mean this graciously, but if the gentleman would yield time instead of just speaking without yielding himself time, I think it would be fair for both sides.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman recognizes it is taken off my time by the timekeeper.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. McDERMOTT].

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. The gentleman from Connecticut knows that, if we took the tax increase out of the President's budget, we would have balance now. The question is, where is the gentleman's budget? The gentleman says everything is wrong with the President's budget, but he will not put anything on the table.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ].

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 89. This resolution unnecessarily singles out the President by telling him to submit a second budget while ignoring the fact that the Republican leadership has yet to present a budget of its own.

We are fast approaching the statutory deadline by which we must adopt a budget resolution. Now, I have seen plenty of budgets around here: the President's, the blue dog budget, the progressive budget and several others; I might add, all of which were put forward by the Democrats. Some of them I like some pieces. Some I do not agree with. I, for one, believe we can balance the budget before the year 2002. But the problem is, without having a budget from the Republican leadership, we have nothing to talk about and no debate to go on.

Today's vote is really a waste of time, and it is so sad that we show up here every day, doing the work of the people and have nothing to show for it in the end.

It is time that we get beyond this. It is time that we get to work. I ask the other side to please put forward their budget, and I ask my colleagues to stand strong and work together to bring forward a budget that the American people can live with for the next year.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult not to be discouraged by this debate today. Why in the world are we wasting time debating a meaningless one-sided resolution which has little or no value other than seeking political points?

I must clarify several points. First, those of us who were gagged by the closed rule today are not interested in letting the President off the hook. We wanted to include every single requirement on the President, even though he had already met his legal responsibilities that the majority created. We simply wanted to demand the same sort of responsible behavior from the Congress. We were denied an opportunity to debate our amendment.

Second, the last-minute provision added by this resolution's sponsors does not set the same requirement on

Congress. It does not set a deadline for action. It does not acknowledge Congress's constitutional and statutory responsibilities. It does not reference, in an equal manner to the President's budget, the shortcomings or the outright absence of the Republican budget efforts. It is a false statement to make on the House floor that the resolution creates the exact same standard for Congress as it does for the President.

Americans are tired of us making unfulfilled promises about balancing our budget and trying to place the blame on the other side. The public wants us to roll up our sleeves and just do it. The current standoff in which both the congressional leadership and the President refuse to move until the other side goes first simply increases the public cynicism about us all.

That is why the blue dogs have stepped up to the plate with a balanced budget plan that we believe represents a credible fair approach to balancing the budget. We have already received a good deal of editorial praise for our approach. We have the support of the most credible fiscal group out there, the Concord Coalition, received warm reception on the Senate Budget Committee the other day. Frankly, I appreciate the praise, but we would like to have some support.

That is what we are looking for now. I appreciate the fact that we are beginning to sense that on both sides of the aisle.

The chart that I have up here, the blue line shows the blue dog budget. It brings the deficit down. The other line, the red line, is the criticism that we join in on the President's budget because it does increase the deficit. But the yellow line is the baseline with the Senate recommended tax cuts, which we have to assume. And I know this is a relatively cheap shot and I am not taking it as a cheap shot. I am just pointing out that, until we have a budget resolution, that is all we have to go by.

I share the disappointment, as I mentioned, the shortcomings of the President's budget. And I know that my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the chairman, is soon to be on the floor with a budget. And I know that, once we get through this little exercise today, we are not doing irreparable harm, but it has been a great disappointment that we are even here debating this today. It is not helpful in finding a solution when we have a one-sided finger-pointing operation.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, may I have a quantification of the time left for each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SUNUNU] has 10¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. McDERMOTT] has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the previous speaker for his generous qualification of his rhet-

oric as a relatively cheap shot, and I want to further commend him in all seriousness for the quality of the budget that the coalition has put forward.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire on a parliamentary basis, is this being credited against the gentleman's time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes, it is, indeed; as was that of the gentleman from Washington, the Chair might state for the record.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, the coalition budget, as I have mentioned in remarks before, has met the four criteria placed out in this resolution, and this resolution further asks that Congress consider a budget that meets these criteria and that the President submit a budget that meets these criteria. It is in the essence of fairness and bipartisanship that we put this resolution forward.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH].

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, in hearing the debate today, I wanted to announce myself as being one of those freshmen of the class of 1994 who during the course of the 104th Congress had the unfortunate, felt the unfortunate necessity of voting to shut down the government. A little bit earlier in the debate it was mentioned that the reason that we voted to shut down the Government was because of the fact that we did not get the budget that we wanted. I wanted to come down and clarify the record that the reason that we unfortunately had to go through a Government shutdown 2 years ago is that we felt that rhetoric was not being matched with deed as far as the seriousness of putting forward straight proposals to balance the budget.

The budget process, many of us believe, is an opportunity to accomplish four things for this country, for America. The budget process could end with better health for Americans. It could end with better protection for every senior citizen in this country, better environmental protection and better education. A budget that serves as a blueprint toward these things would work. Unfortunately we have to get serious about our budget. This one is not serious.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, what is happening today is a classic saying of an old adage, the Republicans are doing that, it is, do as I say and not as I do. They are criticizing the President for purportedly not submitting a balanced budget when in fact they have not submitted a balanced budget. They have not submitted any budget at all.

So how can they be critical of the President's budget when they have not

even put forward their plan? We saw the Republican plan last Congress in the 104th Congress when they put forth their balanced budget, which gave huge tax breaks for the rich at the expense of cutting Medicare and cutting Medicaid and giving us the largest education cuts in the history of the United States and gutting the environment and hurting working men and women in this country. That was their proposal for a balanced budget in the 104th Congress. They were burned by it. The voters saw what it was, and the voters answered it. And a lot of them were burned by it.

So being afraid to be burned again, they are just sitting tight on their hands, not submitting a budget, and pointing fingers at the President. It would seem to me that it is absolutely preposterous to point a finger at the President when at least he submitted a budget. You may disagree with his budget. You may not like his budget. You may say it is not balanced, and that is in question. Some say it is; some say it is not. But how do you point a finger and criticize when you have not even put forward one of your own?

The fact of the matter is, under this President the deficit has gone down 3 years in a row. That has not happened since Truman's administration. It has gone down. It needs to come down further. We need to have a balanced budget. No one is disputing that. But it would seem to me in a deliberative body like this, when we have to make decisions, we need to have a budget. We need to have the Republican budget.

And so we have the President's budget and the Republican budget and then we can compromise somewhere in the middle. But when you have not even played the game and you will not play the game, how do you point a finger at anybody else? This is preposterous and this resolution ought to be defeated.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PITTS].

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, we have heard the argument that we are wasting our time. Nothing could be more important than relentlessly pressing for a budget that truly balances by the year 2002.

On a bipartisan basis, the President's plan has left many Members very disappointed. We just heard a representative of the blue dogs recognize that Clinton's plan does not balance. The concern is not just coming from Republicans. Members of the press have expressed dissatisfaction. Even Members on the other side in the Committee on the Budget have expressed concern about backloading tough decisions.

We do not want to punish President Clinton for a disappointing first attempt. We just want him to try again and use the same numbers that Congress has to use, CBO numbers. Unless we use the same numbers, we are never going to reach agreement. I urge Members to pass the resolution.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NEAL].

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, before I begin I would just like to make a brief comment about the gentleman from California's suggestion just a few moments ago that he was guided by principle when it came to shutting down the Government. The most telling quote about the Government shutdown came from that sage of wisdom in the Republican leadership on the Senate side when he looked at the House at that grim moment and said, "It is time for adult leadership over in the House." For anybody to suggest that the Government shutdown ought to be used as an example for not getting the budget resolution out on time fails under any sort of scrutiny.

As of last night in this institution, we had cast about 38 rollcall votes. We have been in session since the beginning of January and we have had few legislative days. Now I know we all would say that that is a welcome contrast to what we had done 2 years ago. But who even in this institution today speaks of the Contract With America? Who even remembers the term the "Contract With America"?

What I think is more telling is that there must indeed be a middle ground between what we did 2 years ago and what we are doing so far in the 105th Congress.

It strikes me as being odd that while we have had, since January 3 or January 4, an opportunity to proceed with a budget resolution, that we have accomplished so little.

I used to do a lot of contract negotiations. I can tell you that in successful contract negotiations, both sides offer up opening positions. To have meaningful, substantive accomplishment at the end of the day, we simply go back and forth until we reach a resolution that all might not love, but all can learn to live with. Have we seen any evidence of that from the other side? The flat response is, absolutely not. We should have seen some guidelines for spending. We have seen none on this occasion.

□ 1600

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to note that this resolution is not about Government shutdowns. In fact, the three principal sponsors of this resolution are the three new members of the Republican Committee on the Budget. We were not here 2 years ago.

Our interest is not in moving to the past, it is to move forward and it is to move forward in cooperation with this President.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. GRANGER].

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, wasting time pointing fingers is not what we are about here. This resolution is about working together in a bipartisan way to balance the budget. That is why our resolution invites our President to

take the lead and for this Congress to follow the President's leadership.

As a freshman, I was sent by my district to work in a bipartisan way to solve our problems. They believed and I believe also that we can solve the problem of the deficit if we work together. This resolution makes this possible by asking the President and the Congress to use the same numbers.

I spoke about our responsibility to children, the children of this Nation. I have spoken to the young people who have sat in this Chamber listening to this debate. We must work in a bipartisan way to leave them a nation that does not spend their future.

I say no to partisanship rancor and debate over numbers, but I do say yes to bipartisanship and a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution and hope we have support in this Chamber.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PASCARELL].

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, working families from the Eighth Congressional District in the State of New Jersey elected me to solve problems, to work together across the aisle and, specifically, to bring closure on issues such as campaign finance reform, environmental sensibility, and balancing the budget.

Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that the majority is bringing a resolution to the floor to demand that the President submit a second budget when the majority has yet to present their first budget. Where is the Republican budget?

Section 301(a), the Congressional Budget Act, requires that the Congress complete action on the budget resolution on or before April 15. Since the majority became the majority party in the House, the conference agreement on the budget resolution has not cleared both houses until June, 2 months after the deadline.

Over the last 10 years, the House Committee on the Budget marked up the budget resolution well in advance of the April 15 deadline. Six out of the eight times it was controlled by the Democrats. In 1992, the Committee on the Budget markup was on February 27. In 1993 the markup was on March 10, and March 3 in 1994.

This budget resolution is behind schedule for the third year in a row under Republican leadership. And there is a simple reason why Republicans have not released the budget. They want \$200 billion in net tax cuts, but they have not figured out how to balance the budget and enact huge tax cuts without imposing deep cuts in programs such as Medicare, Medicaid, and education.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member very much for allowing me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are confused here this afternoon. We are confused because even in the Washington Times it clearly says that for most of the Nation's history, Congress simply did the budgeting.

This resolution shows that we are overly confused. The President has done what he needed to do, and that is to offer us an advisory budget. The Congressional Budget Office indicated that the estimate of the effect on the deficit of the President's alternative budgetary policy shows a zero deficit for fiscal year 2002. What more do we want?

Actually, what we are saying is that the President has offered a balanced budget; but while we need to move forward and discuss Medicare and Medicaid, affordable housing in the 18th Congressional District, the need to preserve education and higher education for our youth around the Nation, and, yes, in my district, NASA and the space station, and ISTEA 69 and the provisions for transportation, we are here debating whether the President has offered a budget.

If we ask the American public, they recognize that not only has the President offered a budget, but he has his philosophy. He agrees we should enforce and be concerned about children's health care, he believes we should be the education Congress and the education Nation, he believes that Americans should have affordable housing.

The real issue is that we will be jeopardizing our business if we, in this Congress and the Republican leadership, do not insist upon putting forth a budget that does not have the drastic tax cuts that will have a negative effect on bringing down the deficit.

The failed balanced budget amendment took up most of the time when we here can actually balance the budget. I voted for a balanced budget, and I believe we can do it, considering the responsibilities to education, to senior citizens, to affordable housing, to transportation, to the space station, to science. We can balance the budget. The real question becomes: Do we know our job to handle the pursestrings for America and to do it right?

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to the absurdity of this motion. The Constitution gives Congress authority over the Nation's purse strings. This authority bring with it responsibility. And it is a responsibility that the Republicans seems eager to dodge.

The President is required by law to submit his budget proposals to Congress. He has done so. The President's budget proposal is not law, it is precisely that, a proposal. It is nothing more than his request or recommendation to Congress. Once he has made these recommendations, it is the responsibility of the Members of this Congress to review the budget and to pass a concurrent resolution on the budget by April 15.

I believe the President's budget, deserves our serious consideration. In it he provides \$100 million for a new access to jobs and training initiative; \$10 million to expand HUD's

Bridges-to-Work project, which links low-income people in central cities to job opportunities in surrounding suburbs; provides an increase of funding by more than 50 percent for basic skill, high school equivalency, and English classes for disadvantaged adults; and expand the Community Development Financial Institutions fund, thereby expanding the availability of credit, investment capital, financial services, and other development services in distressed urban and rural communities.

But whether you support every item of the President's budget proposal, or even support the budget as a whole, is irrelevant. The point is that we need to move forward. It is our responsibility to move forward. If there are problems with the budget, we can hammer them out here.

The Republicans have yet to show us an alternative to the budget proposal that is now on the table. Obviously, they have discovered that it is awfully easy to sit back and criticize and poke holes. It is considerably more difficult to actually put together a responsible constructive proposal.

Let's stop this posturing, vote against this motion, and move forward with the people's business.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close in the same manner that I started.

This resolution before us today accomplishes very little. We will have a vote in just a little while. The House will declare itself, probably in favor of asking the President to send up another budget, and little will be noted after that.

I understand the other body has no intention to follow up and, in any event, this is designated House Resolution 89. It is not binding on anybody, barely binding on us. What we need to do is take the resolution, the earnestness that we have seen here on the floor today, and put it to work getting a budget resolution produced by the Committee on the Budget and on the floor of this House according to regular order, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

Mr. Speaker, I will offer at the close of debate a motion to recommit which will go just to that objective, getting on with the business at hand, getting the budget resolution passed in the House, sending it to the Senate so that we can complete our work on time this year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to offer a closing note before yielding to the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

I want to make the point, Mr. Speaker, that we have attempted today to carry on a reasoned debate about an important subject matter, not a waste of time. Terms like "political buffoonery" were used, and I do not think that those are the most appropriate terms to discuss the important matter of balancing this Nation's budget, of putting money back in the pockets of working American families, and trying to move forward in a bipartisan way with the President.

We have encouraged the President with this resolution to put forward a budget that can be used as a platform for bipartisan negotiations, and that is the intention of the resolution. The goal of the resolution is to apply to the President the exact same set of standards that we applied to this House of Representatives.

By treating each other fairly, by trying to move forward together, by trying to work with a budget that the President submits, meeting some basic criteria of fairness and financial legitimacy, I think we will have that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, let us try to get to this all in perspective. The President came up here several years ago and stood right at this podium and the President said, we are going to use the same arithmetic; Congress is going to use the arithmetic that I use, I am going to use the arithmetic they use, and we will use the most conservative numbers.

Some of the Republicans booed him when he said that, but we decided to take him up on the challenge. We might argue a lot about policy, but we should not argue about arithmetic.

The simple fact of the matter is the President sent us a budget and it is not in balance. It is \$69 billion short. So for the Americans out there hoping that we can finally get this done, they need to understand that we now have the first part of this. The President sent us a budget. It does not balance. It is almost \$70 billion in the hole in the last year. Plus, in the very first year, the first real test of the intent of the President's budget, the deficit is \$24 billion higher than if the President's budget had never gotten here.

In other words, if the guy coming from the White House with the documents up to Capitol Hill stopped at a pizza shop and somebody broke into his car and stole the documents, next year's deficit numbers would be \$24 billion less than if that budget had never gotten up here. So in the very first year we go up.

Let me say there are also six new entitlement programs. The President says he wants to declare an end to the era of big government. He can hardly declare an end to the era of big government while creating six new entitlement programs to drain resources from hardworking families in this country. We want to let families keep more of what they earn so that they can stay together, be stronger and more prosperous.

In addition to that, we have the typical Washington diet budget. The typical Washington diet is, I am going to lose 50 pounds this year. In the first 51 weeks, I am going to lose 1 pound, but in the last week, I am going to lose 49. Now, that is the way we do things in Washington. And it is time to stop that process.

In other words, let us start doing the job right today. Let us not push up the deficit, push up the spending, keep the spending real high, and then when the President leaves office, it falls off of a cliff using a bunch of gimmicks.

We do not want to do that anymore, and I do not think the President wants to do it, honestly. This is really an opportunity for the President to come back and to complete his job, to give us a document that meets the arithmetic as he promised.

Now, what about us? What about our budget? Why have we not seen it yet?

What is interesting is that the President of the United States is the leader of the free world. He is the big man. He ought to be. He is the man we revere and respect regardless of what party or what personality. He is the leader. The country, the American people have a right to examine carefully, closely, and take some time in understanding exactly what the leader of the free world is proposing for the way the Government of the United States ought to look.

Frankly, what we are saying today is the President has fallen short. We need a better effort on his part. And Congress will have to meet the same standard. Congress cannot weasel out. We cannot wiggle out. We cannot go out the back door. We have to send the budget that has the integrity where the arithmetic adds up.

And when will we bring it here? We are going to bring it here really very soon, and we are going to bring it here like we have, and I have been involved with, since 1989. I brought budgets up here in 1989 and 1990 and 1991 and in 1993. Two in 1993 with Penny-Kasich, and in 1994 and in 1995 and 1996, and there will be one in 1997.

Have no doubt we will produce a budget and have no doubt that it is going to meet the arithmetic challenge. In fact, we will start to improve the lives of Americans by beginning that road to improving their standard of living by raising wages and giving their children a chance at the future.

Let me just suggest to my colleagues here today that the bigger disappointment in some respects than the President not balancing the budget is he does not have a plan to save Medicare. He does not have a plan to solve the long-term problems of Medicaid. He has not addressed the Consumer Price Index and the way in which we can have more accurate projections. These are big issues and we have to get at them and we have to get at them together.

At the end of the day, we will come forward with our plan. Maybe before we come forward with our plan, we will be able to reach an agreement with the White House. But that plan ought to put us on the road to using honest arithmetic, leveling with the American people, starting the progress now, letting people keep more of what they earn, addressing the problems that provide security for our senior citizens

while, at the same time, not bankrupting our adult children, and beginning to restore the American dream as we all knew it as children.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to this House, let us pass this resolution. And this is not just a signal to the President of the United States. Frankly, it is a signal to my colleagues as well. My Republican friends, we have to do it. We will do it right and we want the President to join us.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting House Resolution 89 today because it is vital that the President submit a true balanced budget proposal so that serious bipartisan talks on balancing the budget can begin. Unless both the President and Congress are willing to confront the hard choices a balanced budget requires, we cannot succeed. The burden of starting the process rests squarely on the President.

The truth is that there are no gimmicks, no sleight-of-hand tricks or silver bullets to magically make the Federal budget balance. We have to cut spending and change programs to spending cuts work. We cannot flip-flop, reversing our course depending on how close we are to an election. Republicans offered the President clear examples of the hard choices that need to be made when we offered our Balanced Budget Act of 1995—much of which the President would later sign into law. For a true bipartisan effort, we need the President's budget to show where he and his party are willing to make hard choices now.

The President's February budget does not do the job. First, it will leave us with nearly a \$120 billion deficit in the year he leaves office and a \$69 billion deficit 2 years after he is gone. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office says 98 percent of the spending cuts proposed in his budget are scheduled to occur after the President leaves office. The new spending he proposes, including \$60 billion in new entitlements, goes on forever.

The President's budget also produces a \$23 billion tax increase, not a tax cut, over its lifetime. The targeted tax breaks he offered people for education, savings, and several other things completely vanish in 3 years when he leaves office. The tax increases he proposes are permanent.

With regard to Medicare, the President certainly missed the mark. We should be striving to save Medicare for current and future retirees by dealing with the factors that make Medicare spending grow by billions of dollars every year. The President's budget proposes to hide Medicare's problems through illusory savings that are actually accounting tricks.

We want a bipartisan budget that gets results. The President claims to want one but he opposes amending the Constitution to require a balanced budget. If he's serious about making discipline the key to Federal budgeting, he can end the mistrust of his policies by submitting a new budget that actually meets the goals he says he wants to meet.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this resolution calling for the President to submit a new budget using the most recent CBO assumptions. Last month, our President presented a budget that did exactly what both parties have identified as a priority and that is having a balanced Federal budget in 2002. The President's budget proposal makes tough choices but is responsible economic policy.

I strongly oppose the efforts of this resolution. The President should not be required to submit two budgets before Congress even comes up with one. Does this resolution's sponsors have a prepared alternative for us to review? Since the President introduced his budget, there have been no concrete alternatives proposed by the Republican leadership. In fact, the Republican leadership has indicated it would be May before a budget resolution is passed. By law, the conference report is supposed to be done by April 15. Even as recently as 1992, with a Democratic Congress and a Republican administration, this body has passed the budget resolution on March 5—well over a month before the required April 15 deadline.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can move on to the real work before this Congress, and that is getting the budget resolution ready as quickly as possible. The President has done his part; this body must do ours.

□ 1615

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 90, the resolution is considered as read for amendment and the previous question is ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman the designee of the minority leader?

Mr. SPRATT. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the resolution?

Mr. SPRATT. I am, in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SPRATT moves to recommit the resolution, House Resolution 89, to the Committee on the Budget with instructions to report a detailed budget plan to achieve a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002 in sufficient time for the House of Representatives to fulfill its obligations under section 301(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, which requires Congress to complete action on or before April 15 on a concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year beginning on October 1 of such year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I do not need to take the allotted time of 5 minutes to explain this motion because it does not need much explanation.

What we are calling for is purely and simply regular order. What we are asking for in this motion to recommit is to follow the procedures that this House, this Congress has laid down for our own internal processes that have been observed ever since the Budget Act of 1974 was first adopted, for more than 20 years.

This resolution, House Resolution 89, does not advance the budget process. It does not move us one single inch. In

fact, it retards the process. It slows us down. It does not focus the House on the hard decisions that have to be made, on what needs to be done here in the House itself, in the Committee on the Budget, and on the floor, in the well of this House.

What we need to be about is the formulation of a budget, making the hard choices that will go into our budget resolution and bringing them to debate here on the House floor before April 15, well before April 15. Instead, what we do with this resolution is shift attention from the work at hand by trying to shift the blame, by pointing the finger at the President and saying to him that he should come, present another budget even though he has complied, literally complied with the Budget Act by sending his budget up within the time that is required under the law.

This is no way to advance the budget process. This is no way to move us toward a balanced budget in 5 years, pointing fingers, wasting a whole legislative day on a fruitless resolution.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] says the President needs to send us a plan to save Medicare. He sent a plan up to save Medicare. Part A would be rendered solvent for years to come. They do not agree with the manner in which the President does it. They do not want to see part of the cost of home health care shifted out of part A into part B. Fine. Put up your substitute. Put up your alternative. Put up your plan to save Medicare.

The same with Medicaid. The President has taken a bold step there, bold enough that almost all the Governors in this Nation have opposed him. He says we are saving substantial sums because the cost of Medicaid has come down 4 percent in 1995, 3.3 percent in 1996. We need to hold those cost savings in place, and if we can, we can realize as much savings in Medicaid or more than we were attempting in the last session of Congress.

He has proposed per capita caps. The chairman of the Committee on the Budget does not support per capita caps. Fine. That is what this process is all about. Put up your alternative. That is the point which we are now on. What we need to do is frame this debate.

The other part of the frame that is missing and required at this point in time is a budget resolution adopted by the House which we can put on the table, and at that point we can then sit down and talk about everything, including CPI adjustments as part of the whole mix.

We need to be about regular order, we need to be focused on the procedure that is time-tested and been shown to work. We need to be about our own business. We need to bring a budget resolution to this floor so that we can have a concurrent resolution by April 15. That is exactly what this motion to recommit calls for, regular order towards a successful outcome.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everyone to support this motion to recommit so we can get on with the business at hand.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, it is a good thing I have been lifting weights. This is what I could accumulate in terms of what the Republicans and any budget team that I have been associated with since 1989 have put together in terms of details. See this? This is pretty heavy. Most Americans would probably have a little trouble, and I am not sure if the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] could hold this up, actually. This is pretty heavy. But, nevertheless, all that is detailed work to provide for a balanced budget.

This was an effort that some of us started in 1989. When it was not cool to be for balanced budgets, we were out here doing it. We got as many votes as you could put in a telephone booth, but the fact is that we came in 1989 and I came on this floor against a Republican President. I came on this floor in 1990 against a Republican President.

I came on this floor twice in 1990, the first time in 1990, the second time I went to the Rules Committee with about \$780 billion worth of savings and the Rules Committee would not let me offer it on the House floor because it was \$10 billion short. Then in 1993 the President said show us your budget, and the Committee on the Budget wrote the most detailed and extensive budget ever produced since the Budget Act of 1974. And then we came back in 1994 and then we came back in 1995 and in 1996.

I have got to tell you this. I am so proud of my colleagues, the ones that voted for the first effort, frankly the first effort, real effort since 1969 to actually put our detailed program on the floor. You have got to give me a break when you start wondering whether we are going to have a budget. Of course we are.

This motion to recommit is designed to send this back to committee and kill this whole idea that the President has fallen short in his arithmetic. The simple fact of the matter is that we have got to defeat the motion to recommit, we have got to pass the resolution, and of course we are working. We are working right now with the administration. We are working right now internally to develop our package, and at the end of this year I suppose I will be able to come back and add to this amount that is the most detailed work by any congressional committee in recent memory to actually meet this challenge, and I suspect at the end of the day I am going to have to have lifted more weights, because that next document is going to make this even heavier.

So let us defeat the motion to recommit, pass the resolution, and let us get off to a good start in terms of fairness for America, a good future for our children, and a stronger American family.

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

Mr. KASICH. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman makes my case. All of that is the handiwork of the Budget Committee. We have done it in years past. All this resolution calls for is that we do it again this year, all of that effort there.

Mr. KASICH. Let me tell the gentleman two things. First of all, I am the one that worked to get the President the economics as early as was possible, and I am the one that said to the President and his administration officials, "You don't have to meet some deadline on your budget. If you need more time, you take it." You see, I think that deadlines and calendars are not the key. What is key is the quality of the work.

Unfortunately the quality just is not there with the President when it comes to meeting the challenge. The quality has been there for us in the past. No one ever criticized the intellectual honesty of our proposals. You may disagree with the policies.

And we are going to try to come in with an April 15 deadline if we can, but deadline is not the deal. What is important is that we reach agreement, and we will, and you have got my word on it in terms of coming before us with a proposal.

Let us not send this thing back to committee and kill this whole resolution. Let us reject that, let us get on with it, and this resolution will force the Congress to do precisely what we are asking the President to do. If we ask for anything less than that, it would not be fair. Let us pass the resolution and defeat the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 202, nays 225, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 43]  
YEAS—202

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Allen  
Baesler  
Baldacci  
Barcia  
Barrett (WI)  
Becerra  
Bentsen

Berman  
Berry  
Bishop  
Blagojevich  
Blumenauer  
Bonior  
Borski  
Boswell  
Boucher

Boyd  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Capps  
Cardin  
Carson  
Clay  
Clayton

Clement  
Clyburn  
Condit  
Conyers  
Costello  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Cummings  
Danner  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dellums  
Deutsch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fazio  
Filner  
Flake  
Foglietta  
Ford  
Frank (MA)  
Frost  
Furse  
Gejdenson  
Gephardt  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Green  
Gutierrez  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hefner  
Hilliard  
Hinchev  
Hinojosa  
Holden  
Hooley  
Hoyer  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson

John  
Johnson (WI)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kanjorski  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind (WI)  
Kleczka  
Klink  
Kucinich  
LaFalce  
Lampson  
Lantos  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Luther  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manton  
Markey  
Martinez  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHale  
McIntyre  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek  
Menendez  
Millender  
McDonald  
Miller (CA)  
Minge  
Mink  
Moakley  
Mollohan  
Moran (VA)  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Neal  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor

Payne  
Pelosi  
Peterson (MN)  
Pickett  
Pomeroy  
Poshard  
Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Rivers  
Roemer  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sawyer  
Schumer  
Scott  
Serrano  
Sherman  
Sisisky  
Skaggs  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith, Adam  
Snyder  
Spratt  
Stabenow  
Stark  
Stenholm  
Stokes  
Strickland  
Stupak  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor (MS)  
Thompson  
Thurman  
Tierney  
Torres  
Towns  
Traficant  
Turner  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Waters  
Watt (NC)  
Waxman  
Wexler  
Weygand  
Wise  
Woolsey  
Wynn  
Yates

NAYS—225

Aderholt  
Archer  
Armey  
Bachus  
Baker  
Ballenger  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bateman  
Bereuter  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bliley  
Blunt  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bono  
Brady  
Bryant  
Bunning  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canady  
Cannon  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth  
Christensen

Coble  
Coburn  
Collins  
Combest  
Cook  
Cooksey  
Cox  
Crane  
Crapo  
Cubin  
Cunningham  
Davis (VA)  
Deal  
DeLay  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Doolittle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
English  
Ensign  
Everett  
Ewing  
Fawell  
Foley  
Forbes  
Fowler  
Fox  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Gibbons

Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Goss  
Graham  
Granger  
Greenwood  
Gutknecht  
Hansen  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Herger  
Hill  
Hilleary  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Jenkins  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kim  
King (NY)

Kingston Packard Shaw  
 Klug Pappas Shays  
 Knollenberg Parker Shimkus  
 Kolbe Paul Shuster  
 LaHood Paxson Skeen  
 Largent Pease Smith (MI)  
 Latham Peterson (PA) Smith (NJ)  
 LaTourette Petri Smith (OR)  
 Lazio Pickering Smith (TX)  
 Leach Pitts Smith, Linda  
 Lewis (CA) Pombo Snowbarger  
 Lewis (KY) Porter Solomon  
 Linder Portman Spence  
 LoBiondo Pryce (OH) Stearns  
 Lucas Quinn Stump  
 Manzullo Radanovich Sununu  
 McCollum Ramstad Talent  
 McCrery Regula Tauzin  
 McDade McDade Taylor (NC)  
 McHugh Riley Thomas  
 McInnis Rogan Thornberry  
 McIntosh Rogers Thune  
 McKeon Rohrabacher Tiahrt  
 Metcalf Ros-Lehtinen Upton  
 Mica Roukema Walsh  
 Miller (FL) Royce Wamp  
 Molinari Ryun Watkins  
 Moran (KS) Salmon Watts (OK)  
 Morella Sanford Weldon (FL)  
 Myrick Saxton Weldon (PA)  
 Nethercutt Scarborough Weller  
 Neumann Schaefer, Dan White  
 Ney Schaffer, Bob Whitfield  
 Northup Schiff Wicker  
 Norwood Sensenbrenner Wolf  
 Nussle Sessions Young (AK)  
 Oxley Shadegg Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—5

Andrews Kaptur Souder  
 Dixon Livingston

□ 1642

Messrs. DUNCAN, BONO and POMBO and Mrs. CUBIN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. FLAKE and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 197, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 44]

YEAS—231

Aderholt Bunning Crapo  
 Archer Burr Cubin  
 Armey Burton Cunningham  
 Bachus Buyer Davis (VA)  
 Baker Callahan Deal  
 Ballenger Calvert DeLay  
 Barr Camp Diaz-Balart  
 Barrett (NE) Campbell Dickey  
 Bartlett Canady Doolittle  
 Barton Cannon Dreier  
 Bass Castle Duncan  
 Bateman Chabot Dunn  
 Bereuter Chambliss Ehlers  
 Bilbray Chenoweth Ehrlich  
 Bilirakis Christensen Emerson  
 Bishop Coble English  
 Bliley Collins Ensign  
 Blunt Combest Everett  
 Boehlert Condit Ewing  
 Boehner Cook Fawell  
 Bonilla Cooksey Foley  
 Bono Cox Forbes  
 Brady Cramer Fowler  
 Bryant Crane Fox

Franks (NJ) Lazio  
 Frelinghuysen Leach  
 Gallegly Royce  
 Ganske Lewis (KY)  
 Gekas Linder  
 Gibbons Livingston  
 Gilchrest LoBiondo  
 Gillmor Lucas  
 Gilman Manzullo  
 Goode McCollum  
 Goodlatte McCrery  
 Goodling McDade  
 Goss McHugh  
 Graham McInnis  
 Granger McIntosh  
 Greenwood McKeon  
 Gutknecht Metcalf  
 Hall (TX) Mica  
 Hansen Miller (FL)  
 Hastert Molinari  
 Hastings (WA) Moran (KS)  
 Hayworth Morella  
 Hefley Myrick  
 Herger Nethercutt  
 Hill Neumann  
 Hilleary Ney  
 Hobson Northup  
 Hoekstra Norwood  
 Horn Oxley  
 Hostettler Packard  
 Houghton Pappas  
 Hulshof Parker  
 Hunter Paul  
 Hutchinson Paxon  
 Hyde Pease  
 Inglis Peterson (MN)  
 Istook Peterson (PA)  
 Jenkins Petri  
 Johnson (CT) Pickering  
 Johnson, Sam Pitts  
 Jones Pombo  
 Kasich Porter  
 Kelly Portman  
 Kim Pryce (OH)  
 King (NY) Quinn  
 Kingston Radanovich  
 Klug Ramstad  
 Knollenberg Regula  
 Kolbe Riggs  
 LaHood Riley  
 Largent Rogan  
 Latham Rogers  
 LaTourette Rohrabacher

NAYS—197

Abercrombie Kennedy (RI)  
 Ackerman Kennelly  
 Allen Kildee  
 Baesler Kilpatrick  
 Baldacci Kind (WI)  
 Barcia Kleczka  
 Barrett (WI) Etheridge  
 Becerra Evans  
 Bentsen Farr  
 Berman Fattah  
 Berry Fazio  
 Blagojevich Filner  
 Blumenauer Flake  
 Bonior Foglietta  
 Borski Ford  
 Boswell Frank (MA)  
 Boucher Frost  
 Boyd Furse  
 Brown (CA) Gejdenson  
 Brown (FL) Gephardt  
 Brown (OH) Gonzalez  
 Capps Gordon  
 Carson Green  
 Clay Gutierrez  
 Clayton Hall (OH)  
 Clement Hamilton  
 Clyburn Harman  
 Coburn Hastings (FL)  
 Conyers Hefner  
 Costello Hilliard  
 Coyne Hinchey  
 Cummings Hinojosa  
 Danner Holden  
 Davis (FL) Hooley  
 Davis (IL) Hoyer  
 DeFazio Jackson (IL)  
 DeGette Jackson-Lee  
 Delahunt (TX)  
 DeLauro Jefferson  
 Dellums John  
 Deutsch Johnson (WI)  
 Dicks Johnson, E. B.  
 Dingell Kanjorski  
 Kennedy (MA)

Ros-Lehtinen Nadler  
 Roukema Neal  
 Royce Nussle  
 Ryun Oberstar  
 Salmon Obey  
 Sanford Olver  
 Saxton Ortiz  
 Scarborough Owens  
 Schaefer, Dan Pallone  
 Schaffner, Bob Pascrell  
 Schiff Pastor  
 Sensenbrenner Payne  
 Sessions Pelosi  
 Shadegg Pickett  
 Shaw Pomeroy  
 Shays Poshard  
 Shimkus Price (NC)  
 Shuster Rahall  
 Smith (MI) Rangel  
 Smith (NJ) Reyes  
 Smith (OR) Rivers  
 Smith (TX) Roemer  
 Smith, Linda Rothman

NOT VOTING—4

Andrews Kaptur  
 Dixon Souder

□ 1700

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 89, the resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 96-388, as amended by Public Law 97-84 (36 U.S.C. 1402(a)), the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council:

Mr. YATES of Illinois.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF HOUSE COMMISSION ON CONGRESSIONAL MAILING STANDARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of section 5(b) of Public Law 93-191, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards:

Mr. THOMAS of California, chairman;  
 Mr. NEY of Ohio,  
 Mr. BOEHNER of Ohio,  
 Mr. HOYER of Maryland,  
 Mr. CLAY of Missouri, and  
 Mr. FROST of Texas.