

Members sufficiently to confer standing. Moreover, having granted standing, the District Court went on to conclude that the Act was an unconstitutional delegation of Congress' Article I lawmaking power.

As the Senator whose name titles today's decision—*Raines v. Byrd*—I am obviously disappointed that a majority of the Supreme Court denied standing to Members of Congress. However, I remain mindful of the fact that the most important decision in this matter lies ahead. In the meantime, I am somewhat heartened by the fact that at least one member of the Court was willing to consider the merits of our argument. In what I believe will be a vindicated position, Justice John Paul Stephens wrote that "... the same reason that the [Members] have standing provides a sufficient basis for concluding that the statute is unconstitutional."

Madam President, let me take this opportunity to personally thank two groups of individuals who, I know, share my concern with the Court's decision.

First, I wish to thank my Senate colleagues—Senator MOYNIHAN, Senator LEVIN, and former Senator Hatfield—for their support, their wisdom, and their counsel throughout this process. Although this has been a collaborative effort, I, for one, have valued their contributions. And there were two Members of the other body who, likewise, joined us—Mr. SKAGGS and Mr. WAXMAN. Of course, I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge the absolutely stellar legal work provided to us by Lloyd Cutler, Louis Cohen, Alan Morrison, Charles Cooper, and Michael Davidson. Despite the temporary setback, I am convinced that no other group of attorneys could have provided us with better, or more sound, advice.

Finally, be assured that there will come a time when a State or locality, or an individual or group of individuals, will feel the brunt of the misguided legislative gimmick called the line-item veto, and will seek judicial relief. When that time comes, I will stand ready at the helm to support that effort.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Madam President, it is characteristic of our beloved former President pro tempore to thank others for the efforts that have led to the Court's nondecision today. Might I take the opportunity to thank him. It is his magisterial understanding of the Constitution and his Olympian commitment to it that brought us together, and brought to us the finest legal minds of this time to prepare the briefs that first won hands down in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, and now have been put aside by the Court, but only temporarily. I think it would be not inappropriate to note that one judge and one Justice have spoken to this subject, and in both cases they have spoken to the un-constitutional nature of the act.

I ask the Senate if I might just indulge to read a paragraph from Justice

Stevens' dissenting opinion this morning. He says:

The Line Item Veto Act purports to establish a procedure for the creation of laws that are truncated versions of bills that have been passed by the Congress and presented to the President for signature. If the procedure were valid, it would deny every Senator and every Representative any opportunity to vote for or against the truncated measure that survives the exercise of the President's cancellation authority. Because the opportunity to cast such votes is a right guaranteed by the text of the Constitution, I think it is clear that the persons who are deprived of that right by the Act have standing to challenge its constitutionality. Moreover, because the impairment of that constitutional right has an immediate impact on their official powers, in my judgment they need not wait until after cancellation authority to bring suit. Finally, the same reason that the respondents have standing provides a sufficient basis for concluding that the statute is unconstitutional.

Madam President, I thank you for your indulgence. I think we may have overrun by a moment or two. I most appreciate that.

Again, our appreciation to Senator BYRD. I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Has all time expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are approximately 3 minutes left in morning business.

Mr. TORRICELLI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

PRAISE FOR SENATOR BYRD

Mr. TORRICELLI. Madam President, I, too, would like to join in words of praise for Senator BYRD. Every Member of this institution knows the Senate of the United States has no finer scholar nor better defender of the U.S. Constitution than the Senator from West Virginia. I share his disappointment in the decision of the Court today that standing does not rest with Members of Congress. But, indeed, as Senator MOYNIHAN noted, this is not only not a defeat, it is not even a retreat. The only two judges who were to consider this matter on its merits have reached the inescapable conclusion that by statute the Congress of the United States cannot rearrange basic constitutional powers as contained in the Constitution itself.

There will be another day with other parties who will bring this matter before the Court on its merits. And on that date, this Court will again, as it has on so many occasions, preserve the basic structure of the U.S. Government as contained in the Constitution. On that day, Senator BYRD will have his victory. It is postponed, it is delayed, but it will not be denied.

I once again offer my congratulations to the Senator from West Virginia on what will be his ultimate victory.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I thank the Honorable Senator for his gracious remarks.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there anyone wishing to speak in morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

REVENUE RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 537

(Purpose: To implement the enforcement provisions of the Bipartisan Budget Agreement, enforce the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, extend the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 through fiscal year 2002, and make technical and conforming changes to the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 and the Balanced and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for an amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I believe it is my turn to offer an amendment. I am going to offer an amendment on behalf of myself and Senator LAUTENBERG of the State of New Jersey.

Before I send the amendment to the desk, let me just talk a little bit about what I am trying to do. In the agreement reached with the White House, on the very last page of it, the White House, members from both sides, and the House, agreed that we would, as part of enforcing this 5-year budget, that we would extend and revise the discretionary caps for 1998 to 2002 at agreed levels shown in tables included in the agreement, and to extend the current law of sequester, which had its early origins in T. Gramm-Rudman-Hollings.

We also agreed within the discretionary caps we would establish what we call firewalls. They have been in existence for some time. We struck a compromise and said for now we would only extend them for 2 years instead of for the entire agreement, meaning we will have to bring those up in about a year, but we will have an opportunity on the next budget resolution, or the one after that, for those who want to extend it beyond that time, and I do.

We also agreed, and I want everybody to understand this one, to return to current law on separate crime caps at levels shown in the agreed tables. That has to do with a matter that is of real importance to Senator BYRD, Senator BIDEN, and the distinguished Senator from Texas, Senator GRAMM. That is an extension of the trust fund for crime prevention, to fight crime, which was established here in the Senate when Senator GRAMM on one day sought to use up the savings attributable to a reduced workforce, as I recall, and then said in that, if we are going to save the money, we ought to spend it for something everybody understands and would be worthwhile.

That trust fund then came into being with the amendment of the Senator

from Texas, supported by Senator BYRD and others. Now, that law expires in 2 years, but we agreed in the sessions with the White House and the leadership that we would extend the trust fund within the caps for the 2 remaining years of that law, meaning 1998 and 1999, after which the Congress is free to pass a new law on the trust fund or whatever they would like with reference to the trust fund.

But I think it is clear that without a new law, since that is a trust fund, you couldn't just continue to appropriate, and the trust fund is a fund set aside within the caps and getting the highest priority because it is already there in trust.

We agreed to four or five other things that are less important, and then we agreed to extend the pay-go, pay-as-you-go provisions which had heretofore been adopted and become part of the Senate's working process from the year 1990. Those pay-go provisions essentially said, if you are going to raise entitlement spending, you must offset it with entitlement cuts or tax increases. If you are going to cut taxes, you must offset that with entitlement cuts and vice versa.

We have in this amendment done all of those things. The distinguished Senator from New Jersey, who was part of the agreement and also my ranking member on the Budget Committee, joins me in sending a Domenici-Lautenberg amendment to the desk on this matter, and we ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], for himself and Mr. LAUTENBERG, proposes an amendment numbered 537.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I want the Senate to know that this amendment is subject to a point of order, and I won't wait around for a point of order. I want the Senate to know that I am fully aware that this amendment is subject to a point of order, because it is obviously not part of deficit reduction. I am fully aware that a point of order could be made. I knew that from the beginning, and we knew that when we discussed extending this and putting in the caps for 5 years, which is the only way to enforce the discretionary savings in this budget. So I won't wait for a point of order. When the time is expired, I myself will move to waive the Budget Act in order to allow this legislation to be considered on this bill.

I say to my fellow Senators, there are many process amendments around. When the Senator from New Mexico

said I would not offer this on the first bill, about 12 amendments came tumbling down because they are all waiting for process reform. Some of those amendments I would sympathize with, others I would not, which is not necessarily very relevant. But I must make a point of order on each and every one of those, if the sponsors do not, that they, too, will take 60 votes, unless somebody has some magical way—and maybe Senator GRAMM will try a magical way, maybe he won't—to try to get these amendments in at 50 votes. But I think everybody who wants to do these kinds of process changes ought to get 60 votes or they ought not get it done. That will be applying the law to everybody who wants to change our processes.

I hope everybody knows we could be here for the entire remainder of this bill if everybody who has a process change intends to offer it.

I will use no more time other than to shortly yield to Senator LAUTENBERG with reference to the amendment which he cosponsors. But let me make it very simple, if we do not adopt this amendment, or something like it, there is no way of enforcing the 5-year caps on appropriations. This was a three-legged stool. We get savings on the caps on appropriations, we get savings in entitlements, and we would do that sufficient to allow for a \$85 billion tax cut, the third leg. There will be no enforcement of the appropriations total accounts that they can spend, and there will be no firewall between defense if we don't adopt something like this amendment.

I think it is properly drawn, and I hope that we can adopt it later on this evening when the debate is finished.

I yield the floor to Senator LAUTENBERG.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, I join with Senator DOMENICI in offering the amendment. It implements a provision in the bipartisan budget agreement that relates to the budget process. Without the support that comes from this, I think the work that had been done would be relatively penetrable in so many ways that we would not be able to come up with the final target that we are shooting for, and that is to make certain that we have the deficit down to zero at the end of 2002, and then we have preserved the caps that were placed there to achieve that objective.

The amendment extends several provisions in the Budget Enforcement Act that otherwise will expire and preserves the existing system for enforcing the fiscal policies established by the Congress.

Madam President, current law establishes an overall cap on the amount of spending that Congress can appropriate each year, but discretionary spending—I am referring to the programs appropriated annually by the Congress, including the entire gamut of Federal

Departments and Agencies and most of their day-to-day operations. By contrast, discretionary spending does not include entitlement spending, Social Security, Medicare, which flows without the need for annual congressional action.

Under current law, total spending on discretionary programs cannot exceed the prescribed limits. However, these limits expire in fiscal year 1998, and the amendment would extend these limits to 2002 in accordance with the budget agreement. The levels established are the same as those adopted in the agreement and in the budget resolution.

In addition, the amendment extends the so-called pay-as-you-go or pay-go system. Under that system, all tax cuts, all increases in entitlement spending have to be offset by either revenue increases or reductions in other entitlements. The amendment will extend this system through 2002.

There was little disagreement in the bipartisan budget negotiations that the discretionary spending limits and the pay-as-you-go system ought to be extended. These two budget mechanisms are at the very core of the Budget Enforcement Act. The act has been in place since 1990 when it replaced the old Gramm-Rudman-Hollings law, and the system has proven to be successful.

There are many ways to measure success, but I begin by pointing to the bottom line. Since BEA, the Budget Enforcement Act, was put into place, our deficit has been reduced from \$270 billion plus down to about \$70 billion, a \$200 billion reduction. By contrast, the old Gramm-Rudman system had promised dramatic deficit reduction, but when it came to producing results, frankly, it laid an egg.

When Gramm-Rudman came into effect in 1986, the deficit was \$221.2 billion. By 1990, when Gramm-Rudman was repeated, the deficit had moved from \$220 billion to the same level, \$221.2 billion. That, Madam President, is not my idea of progress. Beyond helping to implement the real deficit reduction, the Budget Enforcement Act has avoided many of the political and policy distortions that were originally created by the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings legislation. The old system created an incentive for both Congress and the White House to use unrealistic economic assumptions and other gimmicks in order to game the system.

Since BEA was enacted, while there are still plenty of games in Federal budgeting, the process has dramatically improved. For example, Presidential budgets have used much more realistic economic assumptions, and we have largely been free of the threat of massive across-the-board cuts in defense and domestic appropriated programs that used to be so disruptive.

So, Madam President, I, along with Senator DOMENICI and Congressman KASICH, Congressman SPRATT and the administration, all in the negotiations agreed we should retain the basic framework of the Budget Enforcement

Act system. That is what we are proposing in the amendment before us. It is a fairly simple proposition.

In addition, this amendment includes separate spending limits for defense discretionary programs and nondefense discretionary programs in the next 2 fiscal years. This also reflects the bipartisan budget agreement.

Along with many other Democrats, I have long been skeptical of firewalls, but I remind my colleagues that these firewalls apply equally to both sides of the discretionary budget and could protect domestic initiatives from those who would shift funding from domestic discretionary to the military. I will also note that the separate defense and nondefense caps expire after 2 years.

Another provision in this amendment, which also implements the bipartisan budget agreement, would revise the rule governing scoring of asset sales. Under the proposal, asset sales could be counted in budget calculations only if they do not increase the deficit. This should help ensure we don't sell assets only for short-term income if those assets would generate significant revenues in the future. An example might be a Government-owned recreational facility that generates significant user fees.

Madam President, this amendment also includes provisions that establish reserve funds for Amtrak, highways and transits. These provisions will allow us to implement the comparable reserve funds that were included in the budget resolution, and they have been top priorities for me and, given my longstanding commitment to transportation investment, I worked very hard to make sure that we were going to provide the funds necessary to provide the investment in infrastructure so critically needed in our country.

Finally, Madam President, this amendment includes a variety of technical changes that are designed to correct errors and eliminate unnecessary reporting requirements and to revise the outdated provisions. So, I hope my colleagues will support us in this amendment. I express my appreciation, once again, to Senator DOMENICI and the staff, especially Sue Nelson, my Budget Committee staff, for their hard work and cooperation in the development of this legislation. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished majority leader is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I have a unanimous consent request that I have cleared with the Democratic leader.

PROVIDING FOR ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF BOTH HOUSES OF CONGRESS

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate

now proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 108, the adjournment resolution, which was received from the House. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 108) was agreed to, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 108

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, June 26, 1997, it stand adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, July 8, 1997, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, June 26, 1997, Friday, June 27, 1997, Saturday, June 28, 1997, or Sunday, June 29, 1997, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader, or his designee, in accordance with this concurrent resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, July 7, 1997, or such time on that day as may be specified by the Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

Mr. LOTT. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

REVENUE RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 537

Mr. DOMENICI. How much time do I have on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-four minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. And the opposition has 44 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. So we have used 16. Actually, unless Senator LAUTENBERG has anything further to say, I believe I have stated the case for the DOMENICI-LAUTENBERG amendment No. 537. Does Senator GRAMM want to offer an amendment to the amendment?

Mr. GRAMM. I think Senator BIDEN is going to offer an amendment first, and after his amendment is disposed of, then I will have an amendment, as will several other people.

Mr. BIDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Madam President, I wonder if the Democratic manager would yield me time off the bill.

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator has time on his amendment.

Mr. BIDEN. Parliamentary inquiry. Can I get time in my own right?

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is controlled by Senator DOMENICI and Senator ROTH.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back?

Mr. DOMENICI. We yielded back our time.

Mr. BIDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

AMENDMENT NO. 539 TO AMENDMENT NO. 537

Mr. BIDEN. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN], for himself and Mr. GRAMM, proposes an amendment numbered 539 to amendment No. 537.

Mr. BIDEN. Madam President, I ask that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 43 of the amendment, strike lines 14 through 21 and insert the following:

“(5) with respect to fiscal year 2001—

“(A) for the discretionary category: \$537,677,000,000 in new budget authority and \$558,460,000,000 in outlays; and

“(B) for the violent crime reduction category: \$4,355,000,000 in new budget authority and \$5,936,000,000 in outlays;

“(6) with respect to fiscal year 2002—

“(A) for the discretionary category: \$546,619,000,000 in new budget authority and \$556,314,000,000 in outlays; and

“(B) for the violent crime reduction category: \$4,455,000,000 in new budget authority and \$4,485,000,000 in outlays;

as adjusted in strict conformance with subsection (b).”

(2) TRANSFERS INTO THE FUND.—On the first day of the following fiscal years, the following amounts shall be transferred from the general fund to the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund—

(A) for fiscal year 2001, \$4,355,000,000; and

(B) for fiscal year 2002, \$4,455,000,000.

Mr. BUMPERS. Will the Senator from Delaware yield for an inquiry for a moment?

Mr. BIDEN. I would be happy to.

Mr. BUMPERS. Could the managers of this bill tell us how many second-degree amendments there are to this process?

I assume we are on the second-degree amendment process; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BUMPERS. Could the managers tell us how many second-degree amendments they anticipate on this?

Mr. DOMENICI. I do not know.

Mr. GRAMM. I believe there will be four. Senator BIDEN will offer one for himself. Once that is adopted, I will offer a second-degree amendment. And