

Jacobs	Solomon
Johnston	Vento
McGrath	Walker
Miller (OH)	Washington
Mitchell (MD)	Wortley
Roemer	Yates
Sabo	Young (AK)
Schroeder	

There was no objection.

consideration of section 5 of the Senate amendment and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BOLAND, GORE, and ROBINSON.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Ottinger

NOT VOTING—44

Dyson	McCloskey
Edwards (OK)	McDade
Erlenborn	Mikulski
Ertel	Moffett
Fithian	Rhodes
Ford (MI)	Rhodes (SD)
Forsythe	Rose
Garcia	Roth
Ginn	Savage
Goldwater	Schumer
Hansen (ID)	Seiberling
Kennelly	Simon
Livingston	Williams (MT)
Long (LA)	Wilson
Marks	

□ 1215

the Journal was approved. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Morrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1482. An act for the relief of Christi-Boltz Sidders;

H.R. 3863. An act to amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act to increase the number of turkeys which may be slaughtered and processed without inspection under such Act, and for other purposes;

S. Res. 230. Joint resolution imploring the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to release Doctor Semyon Gluzman and his family to emigrate to Israel;

Con. Res. 111. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Government of the Soviet Union should release its imprisonment of Yuriy Shukhevich and permit him and his family to emigrate from the Soviet Union;

Con. Res. 205. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to violations of human rights by the Government of the Soviet Union in the Ukraine; and

Con. Res. 218. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the imprisonment and treatment of the Government of the Soviet Union of Nikluis, and for other purposes.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS TO SIT DURING 5-MINUTE RULE ON TOMORROW, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 23, 1982

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs be allowed to sit on tomorrow, Wednesday, June 23, 1982, during the 5-minute rule, said request having been cleared with the minority.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE TO SIT DURING 5-MINUTE RULE ON TODAY AND THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Commerce be permitted to sit during the 5-minute rule today and for the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object it was my understanding that a number of members of that committee were concerned about the fact that they would be sitting during the 5-minute rule, and the subject matter is the A.T. & T. bill, during a time when we were going to be debating important legislation on the floor, namely, the refugee assistance bill. Is that the bill that will be taken up, I might ask the gentleman?

Mr. SWIFT. That is the bill currently under consideration.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. The Chair will state that there must be 10 Members objecting. Those Members objecting will stand.

(Messrs. WALKER, KINDNESS, MYERS, DORNAN of California, GREGG, HENDON, SAWYER, NAPIER, SMITH of Oregon, and ROGERS also objected.)

The SPEAKER. A sufficient number has objected.

Objection is heard.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 5890, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1983

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5890) to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and for NOAA Landsat activities, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees:

From the Committee on Science and Technology for consideration of the entire bill and Senate amendment: Messrs. FUQUA, FLIPPO, GLICKMAN, NELSON, BROWN of California, WINN, GOLDWATER, and HOLLENBECK;

From the Committee on Armed Services, solely for the consideration of section 5 of the Senate amendment and modifications committed to conference: Mr. STRATTON and Mr. DICKINSON; and

From the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, solely for the

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE LAW AND GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO SIT DURING 5-MINUTE RULE ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 23, 1982

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Administrative Law and Governmental Relations of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit while the House is reading for amendment under the 5-minute rule on Wednesday, June 23, 1982.

The purpose is to have a markup on H.R. 24, Tort Claims Act; H.R. 6168, threats against Presidential candidates; H.R. 6204, Supreme Court Police, and S. 2317, National Federation of Music Clubs.

The minority has been consulted about this request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 92, FIRST CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 1983

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 92) setting forth the recommended congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1983, 1984, and 1985, and revising the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1982.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 97-614)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 92) setting forth the recommended congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1983, 1984, and 1985, and revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal year 1982, having met, after full and free conference, have been unable to agree on a conference report because the conference decisions have changed certain budget figures outside the scope of conference. As set forth in the accompanying Joint Explanatory Statement, the conferees do propose a congressional budget incorporated in a further amendment for the consideration of the two Houses.

JIM JONES,
BILL NELSON,
LES ASPIN,
W. G. BILL HEFNER,
DELBERT L. LATA,
RALPH REGULA,
BILL FRENZEL,
ED BETHUNE,

LYNN MARTIN,
BOBBI FIEDLER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PETE DOMENICI,
W. L. ARMSTRONG,
NANCY LANDON
KASSEBAUM,
RUDY BOSCHWITZ,
ORRIN G. HATCH,
JOHN TOWER,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE
COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 92) setting forth the recommended congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1983, 1984, and 1985, and revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal year 1982 report that the conferees have been unable to agree. This is a technical disagreement, necessitated by the fact that in some instances the conference decisions include figures which (for purely technical reasons) would fall outside the range between the corresponding House and Senate provisions.

It is the intention of the conferees that the managers on the part of the Senate will offer a motion in the Senate to recede and concur in the House amendment to the Senate-passed resolution with an amendment (in the nature of a substitute) consisting of the language agreed to in conference. Upon the adoption of such amendment in the Senate, the managers on the part of the House will offer a motion in the House to concur therein.

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate submit the following joint statement in explanation of the action agreed upon by the managers:

The substitute language which is to be offered as described above (and which should be considered the language of the concurrent resolution as recommended in the conference report for purposes of section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)—hereinafter in this statement referred to as the "conference substitute"—is as follows:

That the Congress hereby determines and declares that the Second Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1982 is hereby revised, the First Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1983 is hereby established, and the appropriate budgetary levels for Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985 are hereby set forth.

(a) *The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1981, October 1, 1982, October 1, 1983, and October 1, 1984:*

(1) *The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:*

Fiscal year 1982: \$628,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1983: \$665,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 1984: \$738,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1985: \$821,400,000,000.

and the amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 1982: —\$200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1983: +\$20,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 1984: +\$36,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1985: +\$41,400,000,000.

(2) *The appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:*

Fiscal year 1982: \$777,672,000,000.

Fiscal year 1983: \$822,390,000,000.

Fiscal year 1984: \$878,473,000,000.

Fiscal year 1985: \$960,611,000,000.

(3) *The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:*

Fiscal year 1982: \$734,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1983: \$769,818,000,000.

Fiscal year 1984: \$821,928,000,000.

Fiscal year 1985: \$881,356,000,000.

(4) *The amounts of the deficits in the budget which are appropriate in the light of economic conditions and all other relevant factors are as follows:*

Fiscal year 1982: \$105,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1983: \$103,918,000,000.

Fiscal year 1984: \$83,928,000,000.

Fiscal year 1985: \$59,956,000,000.

(5) *The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:*

Fiscal year 1982: \$1,143,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1983: \$1,290,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1984: \$1,420,219,000,000.

Fiscal year 1985: \$1,533,491,000,000.

and the amounts by which the current temporary statutory limits on such debt should be accordingly increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 1982: \$63,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1983: \$147,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1984: \$130,019,000,000.

Fiscal year 1985: \$113,272,000,000.

(6) *The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1981, and October 1, 1982, are as follows:*

Fiscal year 1982:

(A) *New direct loan obligations, \$63,600,000,000.*

(B) *New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$74,900,000,000.*

(C) *New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$69,000,000,000.*

Fiscal year 1983:

(A) *New direct loan obligations, \$59,700,000,000.*

(B) *New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$101,900,000,000.*

(C) *New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$68,300,000,000.*

(b) *The Congress hereby determines and declares the appropriate levels of budget authority, and budget outlays, for the fiscal years 1982 through and inclusive of 1985 and the appropriate levels of new direct loan obligations, new primary loan guarantee commitments, and new secondary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1982 and 1983 for each major functional category are:*

(1) *National Defense (050):*

Fiscal year 1982:

(A) *New budget authority, \$218,200,000,000.*

(B) *Outlays, \$187,550,000,000.*

(C) *New direct loan obligations, \$0.*

(D) *New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.*

(E) *New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.*

Fiscal year 1983:

(A) *New budget authority, \$253,566,000,000.*

(B) *Outlays, \$213,966,000,000.*

(C) *New direct loan obligations, \$50,000,000.*

(D) *New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$50,000,000.*

(E) *New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.*

Fiscal year 1984:

(A) *New budget authority, \$279,483,000,000.*

(B) *Outlays, \$243,283,000,000.*

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) *New budget authority, \$323,650,000,000.*

(B) *Outlays, \$279,000,000,000.*

(2) *International Affairs (150):*

Fiscal year 1982:

(A) *New budget authority, \$16,750,000,000.*

(B) *Outlays, \$11,400,000,000.*

(C) *New direct loan obligations, \$10,400,000,000.*

(D) *New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$8,100,000,000.*

(E) *New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.*

Fiscal year 1983:

(A) *New budget authority, \$15,900,000,000.*

(B) *Outlays, \$11,500,000,000.*

(C) *New direct loan obligations, \$10,200,000,000.*

(D) *New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$9,300,000,000.*

(E) *New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.*

Fiscal year 1984:

(A) *New budget authority, \$16,400,000,000.*

(B) *Outlays, \$11,900,000,000.*

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) *New budget authority, \$21,000,000,000.*

(B) *Outlays, \$11,800,000,000.*

(3) *General Science, Space, and Technology (250):*

Fiscal year 1982:

(A) *New budget authority, \$7,000,000,000.*

(B) *Outlays, \$7,000,000,000.*

(C) *New direct loan obligations, \$200,000,000.*

(D) *New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.*

(E) *New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.*

Fiscal year 1983:

(A) *New budget authority, \$7,800,000,000.*

(B) *Outlays, \$7,600,000,000.*

(C) *New direct loan obligations, \$200,000,000.*

(D) *New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.*

(E) *New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.*

Fiscal year 1984:

(A) *New budget authority, \$7,700,000,000.*

(B) *Outlays, \$7,800,000,000.*

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) *New budget authority, \$7,300,000,000.*

(B) *Outlays, \$7,400,000,000.*

(4) *Energy (270):*

Fiscal year 1982:

(A) *New budget authority, \$4,800,000,000.*

(B) *Outlays, \$6,400,000,000.*

(C) *New direct loan obligations, \$10,300,000,000.*

(D) *New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$400,000,000.*

(E) *New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.*

Fiscal year 1983:

(A) *New budget authority, \$4,800,000,000.*

(B) *Outlays, \$4,500,000,000.*

(C) *New direct loan obligations, \$12,000,000,000.*

(D) *New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$500,000,000.*

(E) *New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.*

Fiscal year 1984:

(A) *New budget authority, \$3,950,000,000.*

(B) *Outlays, \$3,300,000,000.*

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) *New budget authority, \$3,800,000,000.*

(B) *Outlays, \$3,000,000,000.*

(5) *Natural Resources and Environment (300):*

Fiscal year 1982:

(A) *New budget authority, \$10,300,000,000.*

(B) *Outlays, \$12,800,000,000.*

(C) *New direct loan obligations, \$30,000,000.*

(D) *New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.*

(E) *New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.*

Fiscal year 1983:

(A) *New budget authority, \$9,500,000,000.*

(B) *Outlays, \$10,950,000,000.*

(C) *New direct loan obligations, \$30,000,000.*

(D) *New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.*

(E) *New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.*

3724

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1984:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,800,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,700,000,000.
 (13) Agriculture (350):
 Fiscal year 1982:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,800,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$12,800,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$2,700,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1983:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,692,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,042,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$11,100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$2,600,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1984:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,600,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,110,000,000.
 (1) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
 Fiscal year 1982:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,480,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,750,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$12,850,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$26,200,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$68,200,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1983:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,837,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$12,100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$41,000,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$68,200,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1984:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,521,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,223,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,880,000,000.
 (1) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 1982:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,300,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$400,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$750,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$3,000,000.
 Fiscal Year 1983:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,450,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,900,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$300,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$800,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$3,000,000.
 Fiscal Year 1984:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,700,000,000.
 Fiscal Year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,050,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,600,000,000.
 (19) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal Year 1982:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$900,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal Year 1983:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,700,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,200,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$600,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal Year 1984:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,500,000,000.
 Fiscal Year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,400,000,000.
 (10) Education, Training, Employment and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 1982:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,100,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,300,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,500,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$700,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1983:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,832,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,205,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$800,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$7,200,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1984:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,214,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,161,000,000.
 (11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 1982:
 (A) New budget authority, \$78,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$73,700,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$100,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1983:
 (A) New budget authority, \$79,569,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$77,816,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$100,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1984:
 (A) New budget authority, \$91,725,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$86,249,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$103,229,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$98,830,000,000.
 (12) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 1982:
 (A) New budget authority, \$256,792,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$250,300,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,800,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$17,000,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1983:
 (A) New budget authority, \$274,797,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$270,895,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,000,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$18,700,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1984:
 (A) New budget authority, \$291,042,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$287,531,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$322,373,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$308,858,000,000.
 (13) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 1982:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,800,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,000,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$11,900,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1983:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,560,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,823,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,000,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$20,900,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1984:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,746,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,017,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,752,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,497,000,000.
 (14) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 1982:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,600,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1983:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,540,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,650,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1984:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,500,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,500,000,000.
 (15) General Government (800):
 Fiscal year 1982:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1983:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,650,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$50,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1984:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,450,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,300,000,000.

(16) General Purpose Fiscal Assistance (850):

Fiscal year 1982:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,300,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$200,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$300,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1983:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,500,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$200,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1984:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,700,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,850,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,850,000,000.

(17) Interest (900):
 Fiscal year 1982:
 (A) New budget authority, \$100,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$100,700,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1983:
 (A) New budget authority, \$113,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$113,200,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1984:
 (A) New budget authority, \$118,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$118,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$111,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$111,500,000,000.

(18) Allowances (920):
 Fiscal year 1982:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,850,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$800,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1983:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,016,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,816,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1984:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,383,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,033,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,150,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,750,000,000.

(19) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
 Fiscal year 1982:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,700,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1983:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,100,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1984:
 (A) New budget authority, \$48,790,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$48,790,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,280,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,280,000,000.

RECONCILIATION

Sec. 2. (a) Not later than July 20, 1982, the Senate committees named in subsection (b) (1) through (7) of this section shall submit their recommendations to the Senate Committee on the Budget and not later than August 1, 1982, the House committees named in subsection (c) (1) through (10) of this section shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. Those recommendations shall be sufficient to accomplish the reductions required by subsections (b) and (c) of this section. After receiving those recommendations, the Committees on the Budget shall report to the House and Senate a reconciliation bill or resolution or both carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

SENATE COMMITTEES

(b)(1) The Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee, (A) to require reductions in appropriations for programs authorized by that committee so as to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (B) which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, or (C) any combination thereof, as follows: \$779,000,000 in budget authority and \$779,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1983; \$1,083,000,000 in budget authority and \$1,083,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1984; and \$1,428,000,000 in budget authority and \$1,428,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1985.

(2) The Senate Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by \$213,000,000 and outlays by \$213,000,000 in fiscal year 1983; to reduce budget authority by \$693,000,000 and outlays by \$693,000,000 in fiscal year 1984; and to reduce budget authority by \$1,231,000,000 and outlays by \$1,231,000,000 in fiscal year 1985.

(3) The Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by \$0 and outlays by \$695,000,000 in fiscal year 1983; to reduce budget authority by \$0 and outlays by \$697,000,000 in fiscal year 1984; and to reduce budget authority by \$0 and outlays by \$687,000,000 in fiscal year 1985.

(4) The Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by \$4,000,000 and outlays by \$4,000,000 in fiscal year 1983; to reduce

budget authority by \$15,000,000 and outlays by \$15,000,000 in fiscal year 1984; and to reduce budget authority by \$27,000,000 and outlays by \$27,000,000 in fiscal year 1985.

(5) The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by \$0 and outlays by \$2,000,000 in fiscal year 1983; to reduce budget authority by \$2,000,000 and outlays by \$8,000,000 in fiscal year 1984; and to reduce budget authority by \$4,000,000 and outlays by \$15,000,000 in fiscal year 1985.

(6) The Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by \$0 and outlays by \$374,000,000 in fiscal year 1983; to reduce budget authority by \$240,000,000 and outlays by \$1,053,000,000 in fiscal year 1984; and to reduce budget authority by \$534,000,000 and outlays by \$1,793,000,000 in fiscal year 1985.

(7) The Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by \$77,000,000 and outlays by \$77,000,000 in fiscal year 1983; to reduce budget authority by \$155,000,000 and outlays by \$155,000,000 in fiscal year 1984; and to reduce budget authority by \$155,000,000 and outlays by \$155,000,000 in fiscal year 1985.

HOUSE COMMITTEES

(c)(1) The Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee, (A) to require reductions in appropriations for programs authorized by that committee so as to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (B) which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, or (C) any combination thereof, as follows: \$779,000,000 in budget authority and \$779,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1983; \$1,083,000,000 in budget authority and \$1,083,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1984; and \$1,428,000,000 in budget authority and \$1,428,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1985.

(2) The House Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by \$213,000,000 and outlays by \$213,000,000 in fiscal year 1983; to reduce budget authority by \$693,000,000 and outlays by \$693,000,000 in fiscal year 1984; and to reduce budget authority by \$1,231,000,000 and outlays by \$1,231,000,000 in fiscal year 1985.

(3) The House Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by \$0 and outlays by \$695,000,000 in fiscal year 1983; to reduce budget authority by \$0 and outlays by \$697,000,000 in fiscal year 1984; and to reduce budget authority by \$0 and outlays by \$687,000,000 in fiscal year 1985.

(4) The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law

344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by \$514,000,000 and outlays by \$675,000,000 in fiscal year 1983; to reduce budget authority by \$741,000,000 and outlays by \$739,000,000 in fiscal year 1984; and to reduce budget authority by \$815,000,000 and outlays by \$811,000,000 in fiscal year 1985.

(5) The House Committee on Foreign Affairs shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by \$0 and outlays by \$2,000,000 in fiscal year 1983; to reduce budget authority by \$2,000,000 and outlays by \$8,000,000 in fiscal year 1984; and to reduce budget authority by \$4,000,000 and outlays by \$15,000,000 in fiscal year 1985.

(6) The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by \$4,000,000 and outlays by \$4,000,000 in fiscal year 1983; to reduce budget authority by \$15,000,000 and outlays by \$15,000,000 in fiscal year 1984; and to reduce budget authority by \$27,000,000 and outlays by \$27,000,000 in fiscal year 1985.

(7) The House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by \$0 and outlays by \$376,000,000 in fiscal year 1983; to reduce budget authority by \$242,000,000 and outlays by \$1,061,000,000 in fiscal year 1984; and to reduce budget authority by \$538,000,000 and outlays by \$1,108,000,000 in fiscal year 1985.

(8) The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by \$77,000,000 and outlays by \$77,000,000 in fiscal year 1983; to reduce budget authority by \$155,000,000 and outlays by \$155,000,000 in fiscal year 1984; and to reduce budget authority by \$155,000,000 and outlays by \$155,000,000 in fiscal year 1985.

(9) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by \$593,000,000 and outlays by \$3,755,000,000 in fiscal year 1983; to reduce budget authority by \$705,000,000 and outlays by \$4,427,000,000 in fiscal year 1984; and to reduce budget authority by \$928,000,000 and outlays by \$5,168,000,000 in fiscal year 1985.

(10)(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of the committee sufficient to increase revenue by \$2,900,000,000 for fiscal year 1983; further, the Congress finds that the prospect of acceptably high deficits in future years requires additional revenues of \$2,000,000,000 for fiscal year 1984, and \$1,400,000,000 for fiscal year 1985.

(B) If the changes in laws reported to the House Committee on the Budget by the House Committee on Ways and Means pursuant to subsection (a) contain changes in laws imposing the imposition of new or expanded taxes to directly finance programs within the jurisdiction of any other committee of the House (including, but not limited to, inland waterways or deep draft ports) or the imposition of any new or expanded user fees within the jurisdiction of any other commit-

tee of the House, an appropriate referral pursuant to rule X of the rules of the House should be considered.

SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE

(d)(1) The Senate Committee on Finance shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by \$1,106,000,000 and outlays by \$4,429,000,000 in fiscal year 1983; to reduce budget authority by \$1,444,000,000 and outlays by \$5,564,000,000 in fiscal year 1984; and to reduce budget authority by \$1,740,000,000 and outlays by \$5,976,000,000 in fiscal year 1985.

(2) The Senate Committee on Finance shall also report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee sufficient to increase revenues as follows: \$20,900,000,000 in fiscal year 1983; \$36,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1984; and \$41,400,000,000 in fiscal year 1985.

(3) The legislation required in paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection shall be reported to the Senate no later than July 12, 1982.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 3. It shall not be in order in the House or the Senate during fiscal years 1982 and 1983 to consider any bill, resolution, or amendment, except proposed legislation reported in response to reconciliation instructions contained in this resolution, authorizing new direct loan obligations or new loan guarantee commitments unless that bill, resolution, or amendment also provides that the authority to make or guarantee such loans shall be effective only to such extent or in such amounts as are contained in appropriation Acts. This section shall not be applicable to agricultural price support and related programs of the type in operation on January 1, 1982, that are funded through the Commodity Credit Corporation, loans and loan guarantee programs administered by the Veterans' Administration, or bills or resolutions reported to the House or Senate prior to the adoption of this resolution.

Sec. 4. (a) No bill or resolution providing new budget authority for fiscal year 1983, or new spending authority described in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act first effective in fiscal year 1983, which exceeds in either the House of Representatives or the Senate, the appropriate allocation or subdivision of such new discretionary budget authority, new budget authority, or new spending authority made pursuant to section 302 of such Act shall be enrolled until after the Congress has completed action on the Second Concurrent Resolution on the Budget required to be reported under section 310 of such Act.

(b) If Congress increases revenues in a trust fund exempt under section 401(d)(1)(B) of the Congressional Budget Act, 90 percent or more of the receipts of which consist of or will consist of amounts (transferred from the general fund of the Treasury) equivalent to amounts of taxes (related to the purposes for which such outlays are or will be made) received in the Treasury under specified provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, then for purposes of this section in the House of Representatives, "new discretionary budget authority" and "new spending authority", and for purposes of this section in the Senate, "new budget authority" and "new spending authority" shall not include spending authority or budget authority derived from such trust fund. This subsection shall only apply to trust funds—

- (1) exempt under section 401(d)(1)(B) of the Congressional Budget Act,
- (2) for which revenues are increased, and

(3) to the extent that such increased revenues exceed the appropriate allocation or subdivision of such new discretionary budget authority, new budget authority, or new spending authority made pursuant to section 302 of such Act.

Sec. 5. It is the sense of the Congress that if Congress acts to restore fiscal responsibility and reduces projected budget deficits in a substantial and permanent way, then the Federal Reserve Open Market Committee shall reevaluate its monetary targets in order to assure that they are fully complementary to a new and more restrained fiscal policy.

Sec. 6. It is the sense of the Congress that concurrent resolutions on the budget should reflect the full range of fiscal activities of the Federal Government. It is further the sense of the Congress, therefore, that each concurrent resolution on the budget, beginning with the first concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1984, shall list, for each functional category, the off-budget activities associated with that category, as well as the new budget authority, outlays, new direct loan obligations, new primary loan guarantee commitments, and new secondary loan guarantee commitments associated with that category.

Sec. 7. If Congress has not completed action by October 1, 1982, on the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget required to be reported under section 310(a) of the Budget Act for the 1983 fiscal year, then, for purposes of section 311 of such Act, and section 4 of this resolution, this concurrent resolution shall be deemed to be the concurrent resolution required to be reported under section 310(a) of such Act.

Sec. 8. It shall not be in order in either the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill or resolution, or amendment thereto, providing—

- (1) new budget authority for fiscal year 1983; or
- (2) new spending authority described in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Budget Act first effective in fiscal year 1983;

within the jurisdiction of any of its committees unless and until such committee makes the allocations or subdivisions required by section 302(b) of the Budget Act, in connection with the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget.

Sec. 9. (a) After the Congress has completed action on the concurrent resolution on the budget required to be reported under section 310(a) for fiscal year 1983, and, if a reconciliation bill or resolution, or both, for such fiscal year are required to be reported under section 310(c), after that bill has been enacted into law or that resolution has been agreed to, it shall not be in order in either the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, resolution, or amendment providing authority for—

- (1) new direct loan obligations for fiscal year 1983;
- (2) new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal year 1983; or
- (3) new secondary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal year 1983;

or any conference report on any such bill or resolution, if—

- (A) the enactment of such bill or resolution as reported;
- (B) the adoption and enactment of such amendment; or
- (C) the enactment of such bill or resolution in the form recommended in such conference report;

would cause the appropriate level of total new direct loan obligations for fiscal year 1983, total new primary loan guarantee commitments for such fiscal year, or total

new secondary loan guarantee commitments for such fiscal year set forth in such concurrent resolution on the budget to be exceeded.

(b)(1) The joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on this resolution shall include an estimated allocation, based upon the first section of this resolution as recommended in such conference report, of the appropriate levels of total new direct loan obligations, new primary loan guarantee commitments, and new secondary loan guarantee commitments authority among each committee of the House of Representatives and the Senate which has jurisdiction over bills and resolutions providing such new authority.

(2) As soon as practicable after this resolution is agreed to every committee of each House shall, after consulting with the committee or committees of the other House to which all or part of the allocation has been made, subdivide among its subcommittees the allocation of new direct loan obligations, new primary loan guarantee commitments, and new secondary loan guarantee commitments allocated to it in the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on this resolution.

(c) This section shall not be applicable to agricultural price support and related programs of the type in operation on January 1, 1982, that are funded through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Sec. 10. It is the sense of Congress that reductions in Federal employment should be accomplished through attrition.

EXPLANATION OF CONFERENCE SUBSTITUTE

The following table shows the functional allocations and budget aggregates included in the conference substitute. The numbers in the FY 82 column reflect revisions of the second budget resolution for FY 1982. The FY 1983 column shows the budget aggregates and functional allocations for the first budget resolution for FY 1983. The columns for FY 1984 and 1985 show budget aggregates and functional allocations which the conferees consider appropriate for those years.

CONFERENCE SUBSTITUTE, FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION, FISCAL YEAR 1983

(In millions of dollars)

Function	Fiscal year 1982		Fiscal year 1983		Fiscal year 1984		Fiscal year 1985	
	Budget authority	Outlays						
050: National Defense	218,200	187,550	253,566	213,966	279,483	243,283	323,650	279,000
150: International Affairs	16,750	11,400	15,900	11,500	16,400	11,900	21,000	11,800
250: General Science, Space, and Technology	7,000	7,000	7,800	7,600	7,700	7,800	7,300	7,400
270: Energy	4,800	6,400	4,800	4,500	3,950	3,300	3,800	3,000
300: Natural Resources and Environment	10,300	12,800	9,500	10,950	8,700	9,800	8,300	8,700
350: Agriculture	9,900	13,800	6,692	9,042	8,300	7,600	6,700	7,110
370: Commerce and Housing Credit	9,480	3,750	7,100	2,837	7,600	2,521	7,223	1,880
400: Transportation	20,800	21,300	21,450	19,900	21,700	19,700	22,050	19,600
450: Community and Regional Development	7,000	8,500	6,900	7,700	6,900	7,500	7,100	7,400
500: Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services	25,400	28,100	26,832	26,205	26,700	26,900	26,214	26,161
550: Health	78,500	73,700	79,569	77,816	91,725	86,249	103,229	98,830
600: Income Security	256,792	250,300	274,797	270,895	291,042	287,531	322,373	308,858
700: Veterans Benefits and Services	24,800	23,800	24,560	23,823	25,746	25,017	26,752	26,497
750: Administration of Justice	4,500	4,600	4,540	4,650	4,500	4,500	4,500	4,500
800: General Government	5,200	5,000	4,800	4,650	4,500	4,500	4,500	4,300
850: General Purpose Fiscal Assistance	6,400	6,300	6,500	6,500	6,700	6,700	6,850	6,850
900: Interest	100,700	100,700	113,200	113,200	118,000	118,000	111,500	111,500
920: Allowances	2,850	800	-3,016	-2,816	-2,383	-2,033	-2,150	-1,750
950: Undistributed Offsetting Receipts	-31,700	-31,700	-43,100	-43,100	-48,790	-48,790	-50,280	-50,280
Total Spending	777,672	734,100	822,390	769,818	878,473	821,928	960,611	881,356
Revenues		628,400		665,900		738,000		821,400
Deficit		105,700		103,918		83,928		59,956
Public Debt		1,143,100		1,290,200		1,420,219		1,533,491
Change in revenues		-200		+20,900		+36,000		+41,400
Change in public debt limit		+63,300		+147,100		+130,019		+113,272

ECONOMIC ASSUMPTIONS

The House and Senate used identical economic assumptions in their Resolutions. These assumptions were agreed upon in the budget discussions carried on by negotiators from the House, Senate, and Administration during April. The Conferees accepted these economic assumptions as the basis for the revenue, spending, and credit estimates in the conference agreement. The table below shows the levels of Gross National Product, incomes, unemployment, inflation, and interest rates in the economic assumptions.

(Calendar years, dollar amounts in billions)

	1982	1983	1984	1985
Gross National Product:				
Current dollars	\$3,116	\$3,493	\$3,875	\$4,259
Constant (1972) dollars	\$1,497	\$1,564	\$1,629	\$1,689
Percent change	-0.9	4.5	4.1	3.7
GNP deflator (percent change, year over year)	7.4	7.3	6.6	6.0
Consumer Price Index (percent change, year over year)	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.4
Unemployment rate (annual average, percent)	9.1	8.4	7.6	7.2
Taxable incomes:				
Wages and salaries	\$1,577	\$1,733	\$1,904	\$2,082
Nonwage personal income	\$593	\$666	\$736	\$792
Corporate profits*	\$206	\$248	\$303	\$324
Interest rate, 3-mo. Treasury bills (percent, annual average)	12.0	10.7	8.8	6.9

*After accounting for increased depreciation charges due to the Accelerated Cost Recovery System provisions of the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981.

The following table shows that the levels of spending and revenues contained in the conference substitute imply substantial restraint in the growth of government, both

in terms of nominal and real rates of change and as a share of GNP.

TRENDS IN REVENUES AND OUTLAYS IN CONFERENCE SUBSTITUTE

(In percent)

	Fiscal year—			
	1982	1983	1984	1985
Outlays as a percent of GNP	24.1	22.6	21.8	21.4
Revenues as a percent of GNP	20.6	19.6	19.5	19.9
Growth in outlays	11.7	4.9	6.8	7.2
Growth in revenues	4.9	6.0	10.8	11.3
Reference: Gross national product (in billions)	\$3,050	\$3,398	\$3,778	\$4,127

REVENUES

The Senate Resolution provided revenues of \$623.0 billion in fiscal year 1982, \$668.4 billion in fiscal year 1983, \$741.4 billion in fiscal year 1984 and \$825.5 billion in fiscal year 1985 and provided that legislation should increase revenues by \$23.4 billion in fiscal year 1983, \$39.4 billion in fiscal year 1984, and \$45.5 billion in fiscal year 1985.

The House amendment provided revenues of \$628.4 billion in fiscal year 1982, \$665.9 billion in fiscal year 1983, \$738.0 billion in fiscal year 1984 and \$821.4 billion in fiscal year 1985 and provided that legislation should decrease revenues by \$0.2 billion in 1982 and increase revenues by \$20.9 billion in 1983, \$36.0 billion in 1984, and \$41.4 billion in 1985.

The conference substitute provides for the House-passed revenues and legislated revenue changes, as follows:

(In billions of dollars)

	Fiscal year—			
	1982	1983	1984	1985
Current law revenues	628.6	645.0	702.0	* 780.0
Revenue change	-0.2	+20.9	+36.0	+41.4
Revenue floor	628.4	665.9	738.0	821.4

*Assumes extension of highway trust fund taxes of \$4.2 billion in 1985.

USER FEES

The managers agree that the amounts set forth above for increases in revenues include the assumption that the following amounts will be raised through increased user fees to recover costs of Federal programs and activities:

INCREASES IN REVENUES FROM USER FEES

(In billions of dollars)

	Fiscal year—		
	1983	1984	1985
Revenues from user fees	0.9	1.0	1.4

The spending totals in various functional categories of the budget also include assumed increases in offsetting receipts from new or expanded user fees. The Conference substitute assumes that certain user fees will be increased, but the managers agree that the budget may be implemented without the imposition of the specific user fees assumed.

BUDGET AGGREGATES AND FUNCTIONAL ALLOCATIONS

House and Senate resolutions contain substantial differences in budget aggregates and in functional allocations. The following four tables show the budget aggregates and functional allocations provided in the original House-passed and Senate-passed resolutions as well as the conference substitute for each of the four fiscal years with in the resolution. The first table, showing the numbers reflected in the revised second budget resolution for fiscal year 1982, also includes the budget aggregates and functional allocations provided in the original second budget resolution for 1982.

FISCAL YEAR 1982 BUDGET AGGREGATES AND FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES

(In billions of dollars)

Table with 4 columns: Second budget resolution, Revised second budget resolution (House passed, Senate passed, Conference substitute). Rows include Budget authority, Revenues, Deficit, Public debt, Change in revenues, Change in public debt limit, and various functional categories like National defense, International affairs, etc.

FISCAL YEAR 1983—BUDGET AGGREGATES AND FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES

(In billions of dollars)

Table with 3 columns: House passed, Senate passed, Conference substitute. Rows include Budget authority, Revenues, Deficit, Public debt, Change in revenues, Change in public debt limit, and various functional categories like National defense, International affairs, etc.

FISCAL YEAR 1984—BUDGET AGGREGATES AND FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES

(In billions of dollars)

Table with 3 columns: House passed, Senate passed, Conference substitute. Rows include Budget authority, Revenues, Deficit, Public debt, Change in revenues, Change in public debt limit, and various functional categories like National defense, International affairs, etc.

FISCAL YEAR 1984—BUDGET AGGREGATES AND FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES—Continued

(In billions of dollars)

Table with 3 columns: House passed, Senate passed, Conference substitute. Rows include Energy, Natural resources and environment, Agriculture, Commerce and housing credit, Transportation, Community and regional development, Education, training, employment, and social services, Health, Income security, Veterans benefits and services, Administration of justice, General government, General purpose fiscal assistance, Interest, Allowances, and Undistributed offsetting receipts.

FISCAL YEAR 1985—BUDGET AGGREGATES AND FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES

(In billions of dollars)

Table with 3 columns: House passed, Senate passed, Conference substitute. Rows include Budget authority, Revenues, Deficit, Public debt, Change in revenues, Change in public debt limit, and various functional categories like National defense, International affairs, etc.

FISCAL YEAR 1985—BUDGET AGGREGATES AND FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

	House passed	Senate passed	Conference substitute
Outlays	7.442	7.4000	7.400
80—Education, training, employment, and social services:			
Budget authority	26.214	26.4000	26.214
Outlays	25.369	26.5000	26.161
81—Health:			
Budget authority	102.569	103.6699	103.229
Outlays	98.830	97.2712	98.830
82—Income security:			
Budget authority	314.041	332.9000	322.373
Outlays	306.791	310.5000	308.858
83—Veterans benefits and services:			
Budget authority	26.940	25.5000	26.752
Outlays	26.497	25.4000	26.497
84—Administration of justice:			
Budget authority	4.250	5.1000	4.500
Outlays	4.250	5.1000	4.500
85—General government:			
Budget authority	4.500	4.7000	4.500
Outlays	4.300	4.4000	4.300

FISCAL YEAR 1985—BUDGET AGGREGATES AND FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

	House passed	Senate passed	Conference substitute
850—General purpose fiscal assistance:			
Budget authority	6.850	6.9000	6.850
Outlays	6.850	6.8000	6.850
900—Interest:			
Budget authority	111.500	114.6000	111.500
Outlays	111.500	114.6000	111.500
920—Allowances:			
Budget authority	-2.150	-0.8000	-2.150
Outlays	-1.750	-0.6000	-1.750
950—Undistributed offsetting receipts:			
Budget authority	-50.280	-47.3000	-50.280
Outlays	-50.280	-47.3000	-50.280

RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS

The conference substitute includes reconciliation instructions to eight Senate committees to report legislation to achieve savings in the fiscal years 1983-85, and reconciliation instructions to nine House committees to report legislation to achieve savings in fiscal years 1983-85. These savings are necessary for the committees to remain within their spending limits contemplated in the Resolution.

The Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee are also instructed by the Resolution to report legislation to increase revenues in the fiscal years 1983-85.

Any legislation included in the Reconciliation Bill reported pursuant to this Resolution shall achieve net spending reductions in the amounts required by this Resolution.

CONFERENCE SUBSTITUTE RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS—SENATE COMMITTEES

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—							
	1983		1984		1985		1983-85	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Spending reductions:								
Agriculture	-779	-779	-1,083	-1,083	-1,428	-1,428	-3,290	-3,290
Armed Services	-213	-213	-693	-693	-1,231	-1,231	-2,137	-2,137
Banking		-695		-697		-687		-2,079
Commerce	-4	-4	-15	-15	-27	-27	-46	-46
Finance	-1,106	-4,429	-1,444	-5,564	-1,740	-5,976	-4,290	-15,969
Foreign Relations		-2		-8		-15		-25
Governmental Affairs		-374		-1,053		-534		-1,793
Veterans' Affairs	-77	-77	-155	-155	-155	-155	-387	-387
Total spending reductions	-2,179	-6,573	-3,632	-9,268	-5,119	-11,312	-10,930	-27,153
Revenue increases:								
Finance		+20,900		+36,000		+41,400		+98,300
(User fee portion)		(+900)		(+1,000)		(+1,400)		(+3,300)
Total reconciliation instructions		-27,473		-45,268		-52,712		-125,453

CONFERENCE SUBSTITUTE RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS—HOUSE COMMITTEES

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—							
	1983		1984		1985		1983-85	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
Spending reductions:								
Agriculture	-779	-779	-1,083	-1,083	-1,428	-1,428	-3,290	-3,290
Armed Services	-213	-213	-693	-693	-1,231	-1,231	-2,137	-2,137
Banking		-695		-697		-687		-2,079
Energy and Commerce	-514	-675	-741	-739	-815	-811	-2,079	-2,225
Foreign Affairs		-2		-2		-4		-6
Merchant Marine		-4		-15		-27		-46
Post Office and Civil Service		-376		-1,061		-538		-1,808
Veterans' Affairs	-77	-77	-155	-155	-155	-155	-387	-387
Ways and Means	-593	-3,755	-705	-4,827	-928	-5,168	-2,226	-13,750
Total	-2,180	-6,576	-3,636	-9,278	-5,126	-11,330	-10,942	-27,184
Less double counting (Dual committee jurisdiction)	1	3	4	10	7	18	12	31
Total spending reductions	-2,179	-6,573	-3,632	-9,268	-5,119	-11,312	-10,930	-27,153
Revenue increases:								
Ways and Means		+20,900		+36,000		+41,400		+98,300
(User fee portion)		(+900)		(+1,000)		(+1,400)		(+3,300)
Total reconciliation instructions		-27,473		-45,268		-52,712		-125,453

CREDIT BUDGET

For fiscal year 1982, the Senate Resolution provided \$67.3 billion for new direct loan obligations, \$93.0 billion for new primary loan guarantee commitments, and \$69.0 billion for new secondary loan guarantee commitments. The House amendment provided \$63.4 billion for new direct loan obligations, \$74.85 billion for new primary loan guarantee commitments, and \$68.95 billion for new secondary loan guarantee commitments. The conference substitute

provides \$63.6 billion for new direct loan obligations, \$74.9 billion for new primary loan guarantee commitments, and \$69.0 billion for new secondary loan guarantee commitments.

For fiscal year 1983, the Senate Resolution provided \$63.6 billion for new direct loan obligations, \$102.2 billion for new primary loan guarantee commitments, and \$68.3 billion for new secondary loan guarantee commitments. The House amendment provided \$58.05 billion for new direct loan

obligations, \$99.4 billion for new primary loan guarantee commitments, and \$68.25 billion for new secondary loan guarantee commitments. The Conference substitute provides \$59.7 billion for new direct loan obligations, \$101.9 billion for new primary loan guarantee commitments, and \$68.3 billion for new secondary loan guarantee commitments.

The credit budget aggregate totals and functional allocations for FY 1982 and FY 1983 are shown in the following table:

CONFERENCE SUBSTITUTE FISCAL YEAR 1982 AND FISCAL YEAR 1983 CREDIT ACTIVITIES

[In billions of dollars, by fiscal year]

Function	New direct loan obligations		New primary loan guarantee commitments		New secondary loan guarantee commitments	
	1982	1983	1982	1983	1982	1983
National Defense		0.05		0.05		
International Affairs	10.4	10.2	8.1	9.3		
General Science, Space, and Technology	0.2	0.2				
Energy	10.3	12.0	0.4	0.5		
Natural Resources and Environment	0.03	0.03				
Agriculture	22.6	18.1	2.7	2.6		
Commerce and Housing Credit	12.05	12.1	26.2	41.0	68.2	68.2
Transportation	0.4	0.5	0.75	0.8	0.003	0.003
Community and Regional Development	2.1	2.2	0.9	0.6		
Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services	1.3	0.8	6.5	7.2	0.7	
Health	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1		
Income Security	2.8	2.0	17.0	18.7		
Veterans Benefits and Services	1.0	1.0	11.9	20.9		
General Government	0.1	0.05				
General Purpose Fiscal Assistance	0.2	0.2	0.3			
Total Credit Activities	63.6	59.7	74.9	101.9	69.0	68.3

The Senate resolution contained a provision creating a point of order against consideration in fiscal years 1982 and 1983 of legislation that authorizes new direct loan obligations or new loan guarantee commitments, unless such authority is effective only to the extent provided in appropriation acts. The Senate resolution provided an exemption for agricultural price support and related programs of the type in operation on January 1, 1982, funded through the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC). The House amendment did not contain such a provision. The Conference substitute contains the text of the Senate provision, with further exemptions for loan and loan guarantee programs administered by the Veterans Administration and for bills or resolutions reported to the House or Senate prior to the adoption of this resolution.

The House amendment contained a provision providing a point of order against legislation considered after the adoption of a Second Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for fiscal year 1983 which would raise the aggregate levels of new direct loan obligations or new primary or secondary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal year 1983 set forth in the resolution to be enacted. The House provision also provided for an allocation to the appropriate committees of the Senate and House of the fiscal year 1983 credit budget totals set forth in the First Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for that year. The provision exempted agricultural price support and related programs of the type in operation on January 1, 1982, funded through the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC). The Senate resolution did not contain such a provision. The Conference substitute contains the House provision. In compliance with this provision, an allocation of the credit budget totals in the Conference substitute is printed in this Joint Explanatory Statement of Managers.

It is the intent of the conferees that direct loan and loan guarantee levels for the Rural Electrification Administration assumed in the fiscal year 1983 credit totals contained in the Conference substitute are predicated on the continuation of the present criteria and supplemental loan ratios and on interest rates set in the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981.

The Senate resolution expressed the sense of the Congress that the President through administrative actions should limit fiscal year 1983 Federal Financing Bank origination of direct loans to specified amounts and that direct borrowing by Federal agencies should be limited, to the maximum extent possible, to the Federal Financing Bank. The House amendment did not contain such

a provision. The Conference substitute does not contain the provision.

The House amendment contained a provision expressing the sense of the Congress that the President and the Congress, through the appropriations process, should limit in fiscal year 1983 the off-budget lending activity of the Federal government to specified levels. The Senate resolution did not contain such a provision. The Conference substitute does not contain the House provision.

Also contained in the Senate resolution was a sense of the Congress provision directing the committees of jurisdiction to act expeditiously to consider legislation establishing a process for annual determination of appropriate levels for and proper budgetary treatment of Federal credit activity. The House amendment did not contain such a provision. The Conference substitute does not contain the Senate provision.

SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENCY

The Senate resolution required the Senate Finance and House Ways and Means Committees to report legislation by December 1, 1982, to ensure the solvency of the social security system. The Senate language called for the solvency legislation to take into account the recommendations of the National Commission on Social Security Reform, and for the report of that Commission to be submitted to Congress by November 11, 1982. The changes in law were to do no more than was absolutely necessary to preserve the financial integrity of the social security system. The House resolution did not contain this provision.

The Senate conferees receded to the House.

In light of the need for legislative action to ensure the financial stability of the social security system, the conferees urge the President to direct the National Commission on Social Security Reform to report its recommendations at the earliest date possible. The conferees also urge the Congress to take action at the earliest possible time to ensure the solvency of the social security system.

DEFERRED ENROLLMENT

Both the Senate resolution and the House amendment provided for the deferred enrollment of certain spending bills pursuant to section 301(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act.

The House amendment also contained language dealing with certain trust fund expenditures.

The conference substitute provides that spending bills exceeding the appropriate allocation under section 302 of the Budget Act shall not be enrolled until the adoption of

the second budget resolution. For the Senate the appropriate allocations are "new budget authority" and "new spending authority"; for the House the appropriate allocations are "new discretionary budget authority" and "new spending authority".

In general, the conferees intend that increase in revenues and receipts through the imposition of user fees be used to reduce the deficit. However, the conference substitute would permit the authorizing legislation for spending financed by the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, the Highway Trust Fund, and any new trust fund created for urban mass transportation purposes to be enrolled to the extent that new spending in excess of the appropriate section 302(b) allocation is offset by increases in trust fund revenues.

SECTION 302(b) REPORT REQUIREMENT

The House amendment provided that it shall not be in order to consider spending bills within the jurisdiction of a committee until that committee has filed its report as required under Section 302 (b) of the Budget Act. The conference substitute includes this provision.

AUTOMATIC SECOND BUDGET RESOLUTION

The House amendment contained language which converts the resolution into the Second Concurrent Resolution on the Budget on September 25, 1982, if the Congress does not otherwise adopt a resolution by that date. The Senate version contained no such provision. The conferees agreed to strike "September 25," and insert "October 1." The Senate receded to the House language with the amendment.

TAX EXPENDITURES AND OFF-BUDGET SPENDING

The managers of the Conference urge the budget committees and other appropriate committees of Congress to study ways in which tax expenditures and off-budget spending can be addressed more fully in budget resolutions and incorporated into the procedures of the Congressional budget process.

FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT REDUCTIONS

The House amendment contained the following provision: "It is the sense of Congress that reductions in federal employment should be accomplished through attrition only."

The Senate resolution contained no such provision. The conferees agreed to delete the word "only". The Senate receded to the House provision with that amendment.

FEDERAL RESERVE

The Senate resolution contained a sense of the Congress provision relating to Federal Reserve as follows:

"It is the sense of the Congress that if Congress acts to restore fiscal responsibility and reduces projected budget deficits in a substantial and permanent way, then the Federal Reserve Open Market Committee shall re-evaluate its monetary targets in order to assure that they are fully complementary to a new and more restrained fiscal policy."

The House version contained a similar provision. The House receded.

ALLOCATION OF BUDGET AUTHORITY, OUTLAYS, AND CREDIT TO SENATE AND HOUSE COMMITTEES

Pursuant to section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act and section 9 of S. Con. Res. 92, the conference substitute makes the following allocation of budget authority, outlays, and credit among the committees of the respective Houses:

SENATE COMMITTEE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO SEC. 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1982

[In millions of dollars]

	Direct spending jurisdiction		Entitlements funded in annual appropriation acts	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Appropriations Committee	459,310	433,581		
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee	766	12,679	89	125
Armed Services Committee	12	9	15,192	15,155
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee	3,688	109		1
Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee	1,684	804	279	434
Energy and Natural Resources Committee	1,156	928	53	55
Environment and Public Works Committee	10,183	2,047	6	6
Finance Committee	351,208	350,130	43,801	45,474
Foreign Relations Committee	13,701	11,365		
Governmental Affairs Committee	42,984	29,839	(1)	(1)
Judiciary Committee	539	522	59	60
Labor and Human Resources Committee	5,410	5,585	5,504	5,341
Rules and Administration Committee	46	8		
Small Business Committee				
Veterans' Affairs Committee	1,363	1,024	15,752	15,253
Select Committee on Indian Affairs	515	362		
Not allocated to committees	-114,892	-114,892		
Total, budget	777,672	734,100	80,735	81,904

* Less than \$500,000.

SENATE COMMITTEE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO SEC. 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1983

[In millions of dollars]

	Direct spending jurisdiction		Entitlements funded in annual appropriation acts	
	Budget Authority	Outlays	Budget Authority	Outlays
Appropriations Committee	483,005	459,361		
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee	4,332	8,482	94	90
Armed Services Committee	19	29	16,358	16,351
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee	3,971	-58		
Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee	1,135	-56	352	407
Energy and Natural Resources Committee	747	538	53	50
Environment and Public Works Committee	10,824	1,378	6	6
Finance Committee	387,984	387,986	41,874	46,330
Foreign Relations Committee	14,777	12,229		
Governmental Affairs Committee	46,061	37,033	(1)	(1)
Judiciary Committee	539	522	62	62
Labor and Human Resources Committee	5,784	5,933	5,438	5,396

SENATE COMMITTEE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO SEC. 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1983—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Direct spending jurisdiction		Entitlements funded in annual appropriation acts	
	Budget Authority	Outlays	Budget Authority	Outlays
Rules and Administration Committee	48	10		
Small Business Committee				
Veterans' Affairs Committee	1,374	917	14,912	15,463
Select Committee on Indian Affairs	548	414		
Not allocated to committees	-138,759	-139,901		
Total, budget	822,390	769,818	79,149	84,157

* Less than \$500,000.

SENATE COMMITTEE CREDIT ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 9 OF S. CON. RES. 92

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year 1983	New direct loan obligations	New primary loan guarantee commitments	New secondary loan guarantee commitments
Appropriations Committee	42,520	77,736	68,253
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee			
Armed Services Committee			
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee	924	20,997	
Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee	25	675	
Energy and Natural Resources Committee			
Environment and Public Works Committee	5,329		
Finance Committee			
Foreign Relations Committee			
Governmental Affairs Committee	80		
Judiciary Committee			
Labor and Human Resources Committee	3		
Rules and Administration Committee			
Small Business Committee			
Veterans' Affairs Committee	123		
Select Committee on Indian Affairs			
Not allocated to Committees	179		
Total, budget	49,242	99,408	68,253

* Section 9 exempts from the allocations \$10,500 million in new direct loan obligations and \$2,500 million in new primary loan guarantee commitments of agricultural price support and related programs of the type in operation on Jan. 1, 1982, that are funded through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES PURSUANT TO SEC. 302(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT—FISCAL YEAR 1982

[In millions of dollars]

	Direct spending jurisdiction	
	Budget authority	Outlays
HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE		
050 National Defense	219,110	188,463
150 International Affairs	15,384	12,379
250 General Science, Space, and Technology	6,999	7,000
270 Energy	4,536	6,196
300 Natural Resources and Environment	12,935	15,451
350 Agriculture	9,575	2,065
370 Commerce and Housing Credit	6,042	3,511
400 Transportation	11,408	21,074
450 Community and Regional Development	6,635	7,803
500 Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services	24,682	28,111
550 Health	41,977	43,130
600 Income Security	54,616	55,774
700 Veterans Benefits and Services	24,082	23,502
750 Administration of Justice	4,526	4,630
800 General Government	8,693	8,533
850 General Purpose Fiscal Assistance	5,278	5,175
900 Interest	(1)	(1)
920 Allowances	2,850	800
950 Undistributed Offsetting Receipts	-25	-25
Committee total	459,303	433,574
HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE		
300 Natural Resources and Environment	260	292
350 Agriculture	398	11,898
450 Community and Regional Development	1	518

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES PURSUANT TO SEC. 302(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT—FISCAL YEAR 1982—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Direct spending jurisdiction	
	Budget authority	Outlays
850 General Purpose Fiscal Assistance	242	242
Committee total	900	12,859
HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE		
050 National Defense	11	8
400 Transportation	(2)	(2)
700 Veterans Benefits and Services	(2)	(2)
850 General Purpose Fiscal Assistance		
Committee total	12	9
HOUSE BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE		
150 International Affairs	0	-255
370 Commerce and Housing Credit	3,417	249
450 Community and Regional Development	221	179
560 Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services	0	-3
550 Health	0	0
600 Income Security	30	3
700 Veterans Benefits and Services	0	-14
800 General Government	5	5
900 Interest	11	11
Committee total	3,684	173
HOUSE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE		
750 Administration of Justice	9	9
850 General Purpose Fiscal Assistance	80	80
Committee total	89	89
HOUSE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE		
500 Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services	15	21
600 Income Security	30	24
Committee Total	44	45
HOUSE ENERGY AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE		
300 Natural Resources and Environment	0	(*)
370 Commerce and Housing Credit	28	28
400 Transportation	816	816
550 Health	5	5
600 Income Security	5,356	5,531
850 General Purpose Fiscal Assistance	5	5
Committee total	6,209	6,384
HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE		
150 International Affairs	13,258	11,169
370 Commerce and Housing Credit	11	11
600 Income Security	433	186
Committee total	13,702	11,365
HOUSE GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE		
800 General Government	1	(*)
850 General Purpose Fiscal Assistance	4,567	4,567
Committee total	4,568	4,567
HOUSE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE		
250 General Science, Space, and Technology	(*)	(*)
500 Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services	6	6
800 General Government	39	1
Committee total	46	8
HOUSE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE		
270 Energy	280	1
300 Natural Resources and Environment	43	16
450 Community and Regional Development	515	361
800 General Government	(*)	(*)
850 General Purpose Fiscal Assistance	601	604
Committee total	1,439	981
HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE		
300 Natural Resources and Environment	(*)	(*)
370 Commerce and Housing Credit	22	18
600 Income Security	11	3
750 Administration of Justice	0	-5
800 General Government	506	506
Committee total	539	522

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES PURSUANT TO SEC. 302(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT—FISCAL YEAR 1982—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Direct spending jurisdiction	
	Budget authority	Outlays
HOUSE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE		
Natural Resources and Environment	167	144
Commerce and Housing Credit	27	0
Transportation	415	-59
General Purpose Fiscal Assistance	4	4
Committee total	612	89
HOUSE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE		
Commerce and Housing Credit	11	11
Health	0	-142
Income Security	32,181	19,179
General Government	10,702	10,702
Committee total	42,893	29,750
HOUSE PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE		
Energy	1,614	1,800
Natural Resources and Environment	79	82
Transportation	8,691	-2
Community and Regional Development	5	15
Committee total	10,389	1,895
HOUSE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE		
General Science, Space, and Technology	5	5
Energy	5	39
Natural Resources and Environment	18	18
Commerce and Housing Credit	(*)	(*)
General Government	(*)	(*)
Committee total	29	62
HOUSE VETERANS AFFAIRS COMMITTEE		
Veterans Benefits and Services	1,363	957
Committee total	1,363	957
HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE		
Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services	732	0
Health	54,739	48,928
Income Security	170,847	176,312
General Government	7	7
General Purpose Fiscal Assistance	337	337
Interest	120,071	120,071
Committee total	346,734	345,656
UNASSIGNED		
National Defense	-921	-921
International Affairs	-11,893	-11,893
General Science, Space, and Technology	-5	-5
Energy	-1,635	-1,635
Natural Resources and Environment	-3,203	-3,203
Agriculture	-73	-73
Commerce and Housing Credit	-77	-77
Transportation	-530	-530
Community and Regional Development	-376	-376
Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services	-35	-35
Health	-18,221	-18,221
Income Security	-6,711	-6,711
Veterans Benefits and Services	-645	-645
Administration of Justice	-35	-35
General Government	-14,754	-14,754
General Purpose Fiscal Assistance	-4,715	-4,715
Interest	-19,382	-19,382
Undistributed Offsetting Receipts	-31,675	-31,675
Committee total	-114,885	-114,885
Grand total	777,672	734,100

* Less than negative \$500,000.
 * Less than \$500,000.

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES PURSUANT TO SEC. 302(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1983

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Entitlement authority
Current level:			
050 National defense	16,868	89,031	0
150 International affairs	127	-109	0
250 General science, space, and technology	0	2,199	0
300 Natural resources and environment	14	16	0
370 Commerce and housing credit	0	-526	0
400 Transportation	407	858	0
450 Community and regional development	53	53	0
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	7,387	7,315	0
550 Health	32,095	36,684	0
600 Income security	29,454	29,677	0
700 Veterans benefits and services	14,279	14,306	0
750 Administration of justice	91	663	0
800 General government	4,759	4,733	0
850 General purpose fiscal assistance	4,567	-4,567	0
Subtotal	110,102	189,468	0
Discretionary appropriations action:			
050 National defense	235,074	123,285	0
150 International affairs	14,128	12,480	0
250 General science, space, and technology	7,800	5,401	0
270 Energy	5,089	5,084	0
300 Natural resources and environment	13,078	14,586	0
350 Agriculture	6,617	1,743	0
370 Commerce and housing credit	3,347	3,182	0
400 Transportation	11,205	19,668	0
450 Community and regional development	6,504	6,764	0
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	18,736	18,948	0
550 Health	8,000	8,979	0
600 Income security	28,469	30,296	0
700 Veterans benefits and services	8,927	8,869	0
750 Administration of justice	4,462	4,009	0
800 General government	4,135	4,049	0
850 General purpose fiscal assistance	642	642	0
920 Allowances	-832	-648	0
950 Undistributed offsetting receipts	12	12	0
Subtotal	375,394	267,348	0
Discretionary action by other committees:			
050 National defense	2,362	2,378	0
400 Transportation	-4	-4	0
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	-59	-31	0
550 Health	-487	-640	0
600 Income security	-895	-863	0
700 Veterans benefits and services	632	578	0
920 Allowances	-84	-68	0
Subtotal	1,465	1,351	0
Committee total	486,961	458,167	0
HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE			
Current level:			
300 Natural resources and environment	297	291	0
350 Agriculture	175	8,299	45
450 Community and regional development	1	711	0
850 General purpose fiscal assistance	294	294	294
Subtotal	767	9,595	339
Discretionary action:			
300 Natural resources and environment	-36	-36	0
350 Agriculture	-12	-912	0
370 Commerce and housing credit	-21	-21	0
Subtotal	-69	-969	0
Committee total	698	8,626	339
HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE			
Current level:			
050 National defense	18	27	16,777
850 General purpose fiscal assistance	1	1	0
Subtotal	19	29	16,777
Discretionary action:			
050 National defense	0	0	-75
Subtotal	0	0	-75
Committee total	19	29	16,702
HOUSE BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE			
Current level:			
150 International affairs	0	-226	0
370 Commerce and housing credit	3,797	948	0

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES PURSUANT TO SEC. 302(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1983—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Entitlement authority
Current level:			
450 Community and regional development	192	155	0
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	0	-2	0
600 Income security	25	0	0
700 Veterans benefits and services	0	-13	0
800 General government	7	7	0
900 Interest	11	11	0
Subtotal	4,031	889	0
Discretionary action:			
370 Commerce and housing credit	-63	-758	0
Subtotal	-63	-758	0
Committee total	3,968	121	0
HOUSE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE			
Current level:			
750 Administration of justice	9	9	9
850 General purpose fiscal assistance	86	86	0
Subtotal	95	95	9
Committee total	95	95	9
HOUSE ENERGY AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE			
Current level:			
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	14	13	4,405
600 Income security	37	32	5,489
Subtotal	51	44	9,895
Committee total	51	44	9,935
HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE			
Current level:			
370 Commerce and housing credit	29	29	0
400 Transportation	122	122	121
550 Health	5	5	115
600 Income security	5,723	5,879	5,899
850 General purpose fiscal assistance	6	5	6
Subtotal	5,884	6,040	6,141
Discretionary action:			
270 Energy	-360	-360	0
300 Natural resources and environment	-27	-27	0
550 Health	0	0	-514
Subtotal	-387	-387	-514
Committee total	5,497	5,653	5,627
HOUSE GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE			
Current level:			
800 General government	1	0	0
850 General purpose fiscal assistance	4,567	4,567	4,567
Subtotal	4,568	4,567	4,567
Committee total	4,568	4,567	4,567
HOUSE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE			
Current level:			
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	7	6	0
800 General government	41	3	69
Subtotal	48	10	69
Committee total	48	10	69

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES PURSUANT TO SEC. 302(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1983—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Entitlement authority
HOUSE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE			
Current level:			
270 Energy	180	1	0
300 Natural resources and environment	51	21	14
450 Community and regional development	547	412	53
800 General government	1	1	0
850 General purpose fiscal assistance	653	653	653
Subtotal	1,433	1,089	721
Discretionary action:			
300 Natural resources and environment	-22	-22	0
Subtotal	-22	-22	0
Committee total	1,411	1,067	721
HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE			
Current level:			
370 Commerce and housing credit	23	23	0
600 Income security	10	2	2
750 Administration of justice	0	-9	91
800 General Government	505	506	506
Subtotal	540	523	599
Committee total	540	523	599
HOUSE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE			
Current level:			
300 Natural resources and environment	180	153	0
370 Commerce and housing credit	29	0	0
400 Transportation	407	-49	336
850 General purpose fiscal assistance	4	4	0
Subtotal	620	108	336
Discretionary action:			
400 Transportation	-150	-150	-4
Subtotal	-150	-150	-4
Committee total	470	-42	332
HOUSE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE			
Current level:			
370 Commerce and housing credit	11	11	0
550 Health	0	-268	1,075
600 Income security	34,450	21,055	21,055
800 General government	11,504	11,504	9
Subtotal	45,965	32,312	22,148
Discretionary action:			
600 Income security	0	-374	-374
Subtotal	0	-374	-374
Committee total	45,965	31,938	21,774
HOUSE PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE			
Current level:			
270 Energy	1,622	1,500	0
300 Natural resources and environment	80	83	0
400 Transportation	4,718	-5	71
450 Community and regional development	6	9	0
Subtotal	6,426	1,587	71
Discretionary action:			
300 Natural resources and environment	-370	-370	0
400 Transportation	5,285	0	1
Subtotal	4,915	-370	1
Committee total	11,341	1,217	72
HOUSE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE			
Current level:			
250 General science, space, and technology	5	5	0
270 Energy	3	9	0

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES PURSUANT TO SEC. 302(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1983—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Entitlement authority
300 Natural resources and environment			
Subtotal	29	34	0
Committee total	29	34	0
HOUSE VETERANS AFFAIRS COMMITTEE			
Discretionary action:			
700 Veterans benefits and services	1,469	829	14,707
Subtotal	1,469	829	14,707
Discretionary action:			
700 Veterans benefits and services	-95	-95	632
Subtotal	-95	-95	632
Committee total	1,374	734	15,339
HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE			
Current level:			
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	790	0	2,845
550 Health	60,981	57,238	71,803
600 Income security	185,729	193,646	211,834
800 General government	8	8	0
850 General purpose fiscal assistance	362	362	362
900 Interest	136,311	136,311	136,311
Subtotal	384,181	387,565	423,155
Discretionary action:			
550 Health	-515	-3,672	-3,162
600 Income security	0	0	-593
900 Interest	-329	-329	0
920 Allowances	0	0	500
Subtotal	-844	-4,001	-3,255
Committee total	383,337	383,564	419,900
UNASSIGNED			
Current level:			
050 National defense	-756	-756	0
150 International affairs	-12,664	-12,664	0
250 General science, space, and technology	-5	-5	0
270 Energy	-1,734	-1,734	0
300 Natural resources and environment	-3,766	-3,766	0
350 Agriculture	-88	-88	0
370 Commerce and housing credit	-58	-58	0
400 Transportation	-540	-540	0
450 Community and regional development	-403	-403	0
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	-44	-44	0
550 Health	-20,509	-20,509	0
600 Income security	-8,668	-8,668	0
700 Veterans benefits and services	-652	-652	0
750 Administration of justice	-23	-23	0
800 General government	-16,162	-16,162	0
850 General purpose fiscal assistance	-4,682	-4,682	0
900 Interest	-22,793	-22,793	0
920 Allowances	-2,100	-2,100	0
950 Undistributed offsetting receipts	-43,112	-43,112	-19,062
Subtotal	-138,759	-138,759	-19,062
Committee total	-138,759	-138,759	-19,062
Total—current level	446,931	508,246	480,677
Total—discretionary action	375,459	261,572	-3,591
Grand totals	822,390	769,818	477,086

Note.—Totals may not add because of rounding.

ALLOCATION OF FEDERAL CREDIT PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY PURSUANT TO SECTION 9 OF THE PROPOSED CONFERENCE SUBSTITUTE FOR S. CON. RES. 92, FISCAL YEAR 1983

[In millions of dollars]

	New direct loan obligations	New primary guarantee commitments	New secondary guarantee commitments
HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE			
050 National defense	50	50	
150 International affairs	10,202	12,743	
250 General science, space, and technology	171	171	
270 Energy	7,392	6,400	
300 Natural resources and environment	27		
350 Agriculture	14,265	6,778	
370 Commerce and housing credit	17,650	48,675	68,250
400 Transportation	493	1,056	3
450 Community and regional development	3,415	1,903	
500 Education, training, employment and social services	844	7,250	
550 Health	119	155	
600 Income security	2,029	19,771	
700 Veterans benefits and services	2		
800 General government	43	43	
850 General purpose fiscal assistance	145		
Subtotal, gross activity	56,847	104,995	68,253
Less, Federal financing bank purchase of loan assets	-8,938		
Less, guarantees of direct loans		-26,595	
Committee total	48,009	78,400	68,253
HOUSE BANKING, FINANCE, AND URBAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE			
370 Commerce and housing credit	5	75	
Committee total	5	75	
HOUSE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE			
850 General purpose fiscal assistance	80		
Committee total	80		
HOUSE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE			
600 Income security	3		
Committee total	3		
HOUSE PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE			
270 Energy	5,340	5,289	
400 Transportation	20		
Subtotal, gross activity	5,390	5,289	
Less, Federal financing bank purchase of loan assets	-5,289		
Less, guarantees of direct loans		-5,289	
Committee total	101		
HOUSE VETERANS AFFAIRS COMMITTEE			
700 Veterans benefits and services	1,041	20,934	
Committee total	1,041	20,934	
Grand total	149,239	199,409	68,253

*These amounts are less than the aggregates in the proposed conference substitute for direct loan obligations and primary loan guarantee commitments because the proposed conference substitute would exempt credit programs administered by the Commodity Credit Corporation from the allocation process.

JIM JONES,
BILL NELSON,
LES ASPIN,
W. G. BILL HEFNER,
DELBERT L. LATTA,
RALPH REGULA,
BILL FRENZEL,
ED BETHUNE,
LYNN MARTIN,
BOBBI FIEDLER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PETE DOMENICI,
W. L. ARMSTRONG,
NANCY LONDON,
KASSEBAUM,
RUDY BOSCHWITZ,
ORRIN G. HATCH,
JOHN TOWER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House, I move to recede from the amendment to Senate Concurrent Resolution 92, and to amend such Resolution with an amendment in the nature of a substitute (contained in the joint statement of managers). The Clerk read the motion, as follows:

JONES of Oklahoma moves to recede from the House amendment to Senate Concurrent Resolution 92, and to amend such Resolution with an amendment in the nature of a substitute contained in the joint statement of managers.

SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of Monday, June 14, 1982, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Jones) will be recognized for 5 minutes, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. Latta) will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Jones):

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I will be very brief.

Mr. Speaker, essentially this conference report is very close to the Latta substitute that passed the House a few days ago. There are some improvements in some of the means-tested programs in order to make it more fair in the bill that passed the House, but basically this is the Latta substitute.

Those who voted for the Latta substitute when it passed the House last week clearly have the responsibility of explaining for this conference report now. I assume that they will do so.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Weiss).

Mr. WEISS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished chairman for giving me time to me.

Mr. Speaker, today we are being asked to approve a budget resolution that may serve the immediate political needs of the Reagan administration, but it brazenly ignores the pressing needs of our people and of our faltering economy. No Democrat worthy of the name should be caught dead voting for it.

This conference report makes a pathetic showing stock of the budget process and shakes all credibility in the Congress. It is a budget package wrapped in deceit, based on phony figures, erroneous assumptions, and questionable projections—particularly with regard to deficit levels.

But more importantly, the budget resolution is a defeat because it fails to undo the previous errors of Reaganomics. It continues the administration's dismantling of social programs with additional cuts of \$4.3 billion in Medicare and Medicaid, \$900 million in food stamps, \$1 billion in AFDC and SSI, and \$1 billion in job training. And it leaves unchanged the tragic circumstances of

families faced with the calamity of unemployment, of elderly citizens forced to forego needed health care, of hungry children denied adequate nutrition, and of disabled workers stripped of their means of survival.

Rather than playing an encore of last year's congressional lost sheep, we should find the wisdom and the courage to reject this resolution and develop a budget that is credible, just, and compassionate. The American people demand, and deserve, no less.

□ 1230

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. JONES of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished committee chairman yield for a question only?

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the question is, concerning the conference report, does this contain both the budget conference as well as the debt ceiling limitation provisions?

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the answer to the gentleman's question is affirmative, and this is under the GEPHARDT rule that was passed in the previous Congress.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for his answer.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. Glickman).

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

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a terrible budget, but I am going to vote for it. It is slightly better than the Latta budget which the House passed before in terms of the numbers on the social side. It is an example of how Reaganomics has gone awry in America.

However, Mr. Speaker, if we reject this budget, we are going to end up with more chaos than we ever dreamed of in America and probably a worse budget for all our constituents. So reluctantly I will vote for the budget.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that I believe this conference report deserves the support of the House. It is a good agreement that we have come to with the Senate. It is not a perfect agreement, but it is one which we can support, and which I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support.

Let me say to those who do not like certain parts of this conference report, that I hope you do not vote against the report on the basis of a deficit that is \$100 million more than you would like or that a multi-billion-

dollar program is \$50 million short of what you would like. If you do that in the belief you can send this report back to conference and get something you like better, chances are you will be disappointed. What comes out of conference next time—if anything comes out—probably will be even less to your liking.

As I said, this is not a perfect document. In fact, if I had the power to write a budget on my own and present it to this House as an accomplished fact, this is not the document I would write. I would like a balanced budget with a zero deficit but I realize this cannot be accomplished in fiscal year 1983. But this compromise heads us in that direction.

Let me remind my colleagues this is a compromise—and this means it is a product of many viewpoints and minds. It is a compromise which will further aid us in getting Federal spending under control.

To assist everyone in better understanding the contents of this conference report, I would like to go through it and explain to you what the conferees did. Before I do that, let me remind you once again that many of the assumptions contained herein are just that, assumptions. We assume certain savings can be achieved and additional revenues can be raised. In the end, however, many of the final decisions will be up to other committees, particularly the Appropriations Committee.

The conference report calls for outlays in fiscal year 1983 of \$769.816 billion, a \$35.7-billion increase over fiscal year 1982 outlays. Let me emphasize this, we are not below 1982 expenditures but are \$35.7 billion above. Budget authority for fiscal year 1983 will be \$822.390 billion, a \$44.7 billion increase over 1982. This represents \$4.6 billion more in spending for fiscal year 1983 than was contained in the House-passed budget resolution and raises the deficit from \$99.271 to \$103.918 billion. Revenue estimates for fiscal year 1983 remain at the House-passed number of \$665.9 billion.

Now, let us take a look at the details.

FUNCTION 050: DEFENSE

In defense spending, the Senate accepted the numbers in the House-passed resolution which called for \$253.566 billion in budget authority and \$213.966 billion in outlays. As I mentioned earlier, this represents a \$9.43 billion cut in budget authority from the President's April request and a \$10.24 billion cut from the CBO baseline for 1983 outlays.

By capping cost-of-living increases for retired military personnel at 4 percent and allowing for a 4-percent pay increase for both military and civilian workers, approximately \$2.25 billion was saved. Another \$2.2 billion was saved by rejecting the CBO reestimate. The balance in savings was left for the Pentagon and Appropriations Committee to work out. A majority of

the conferees were of the belief that these savings could be achieved without doing damage to President Reagan's program for rebuilding our military forces.

FUNCTION 150: INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

In international affairs, the House and Senate were \$362 million apart. We compromised on an outlay figure of \$11.5 billion which was \$600 million less than the Senate figure. What we did was to basically assume the current level of spending for programs or the President's request for the programs, whichever was less. However, a few programs can be funded at higher levels at the discretion of the Appropriations Committee. The \$1.5 billion assumes a savings in foreign aid of approximately \$740 million but provides for an additional \$28 billion for foreign military sales.

FUNCTION 250: GENERAL SCIENCE, SPACE AND TECHNOLOGY

We agreed to the Senate level of spending of \$7.6 billion in fiscal year 1983 for function 250, general science, space and technology. This number includes \$200 million added in conference under an amendment offered by Chairman JONES. It allows for funding for most programs at the level of the President's request.

FUNCTION 270: ENERGY

The conferees settled on an outlay figure for fiscal year 1983 of \$4.5 billion for function 270, energy. This number is \$500 million less than what the Senate had in this function. It assumes enactment of user fees for the Federal Regulatory Commission and for nuclear waste disposal. The conferees added \$700 million to this function over the House passed resolution.

FUNCTION 300: NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

In function 300, natural resources and environment, the conferees settled on an outlay figure for 1983 of \$10.95 billion which was \$450 million less than in the Senate passed resolution. The Senate accepted the House assumption of \$400 million from user fees to be enacted for cost recovery for Corps of Engineers deep-draft ports and inland waterways. The \$10.95 billion is sufficient to maintain most discretionary programs under this function at 1982 levels.

FUNCTION 350: AGRICULTURE

The conferees agreed on the House number for spending in fiscal year 1983 in function 350, agriculture, which was \$9.042 billion. The \$1.3 billion savings from the CBO baseline was achieved by freezing discretionary spending at the 1982 level. We then added back for some programs and found additional savings in others. For example, we provide \$300 million in budget authority for Federal crop insurance as requested by the President. We reduce outlays for the dairy price support program by \$900 million and raise interest rates for agricultural credit loans for a savings of \$12 million.

FUNCTION 370: COMMERCE AND HOUSING

Outlays for fiscal year 1983 in function 370, commerce and housing, are \$2.837 billion which is \$1.063 billion less than in the Senate passed resolution. I might say right here that the \$2.837 billion is considered sufficient to accommodate the level of funding needed for the Lugar mortgage interest subsidy bill.

This number also assumes funding for the Postal Service of \$400 million and an additional \$500 million for the Lugar housing bill.

Savings are achieved by freezing most discretionary spending at 1982 levels and then assuming additional savings for such programs as the Patent and Trademark Office, Scientific and Technical Research, the Travel and Tourism Administration, the FCC and the FTC.

FUNCTION 400: TRANSPORTATION

For function 400, transportation, the House conferees agreed to the Senate level of spending for fiscal year 1983 of \$19.9 billion which was \$150 million lower than in the House-passed resolution. This assumes savings of some \$46 million in various discretionary programs. It does allow additional spending above the 1982 level for such programs as the rail service assistance and the urban mass transit fund.

FUNCTION 450: COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Again in function 450, community and regional development, the House conferees agreed to the Senate level of spending of \$7.7 billion which is \$147 million less than the House-passed level. To achieve the additional savings from the House-passed level, the conferees accepted the Senate assumption for disaster loans which is the CBO/OMB level for the loans.

FUNCTION 500: EDUCATION, TRAINING, EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL SERVICES

The Senate agreed to the House-passed outlay figure of \$26.205 billion for function 500, education, training, employment, and social services.

It is assumed that some discretionary programs will be funded at levels above the 1982 freeze including compensatory education, education for the handicapped, Pell grants, and vocational-adult education.

FUNCTION 550: HEALTH

Spending for fiscal year 1983 in function 550, health, will be at the House-passed level of \$77.816 billion which includes money added back in conference when we accepted an amendment offered by Chairman JONES to increase spending by \$610 million in three functions—health, income security, and science, space, and technology.

The conferees assume the largest savings will come in entitlement programs including \$3.6 billion in medicare savings and \$600 million in medicare aid savings. The medicare savings can be achieved without increasing out of pocket expenses for recipients.

FUNCTION 600: INCOME SECURITY

Fiscal 1983 outlays for function 600, income security, will be \$270.895 billion, \$2.1 billion less than the Senate level. In this function we agree to spending levels above the House approved levels for food stamps, aid to families with dependent children, the supplemental security income program, and subsidized housing.

Funding here assumes the full cost of living increases for social security and railroad retirement benefits. All other COLA's for civil service retirement, black lung, Federal employee injury compensation and Foreign Service retirement are assumed capped at 4 percent.

FUNCTION 700: VETERANS BENEFITS AND SERVICES

The \$23.823 billion in spending for veterans in fiscal year 1983 is the level contained in the House-passed resolution. The conference report provides for full cost-of-living increases for veterans in 1983 and for the service-connected disabled in 1984 and 1985. The Senate resolution had capped those increases at 4 percent.

FUNCTION 750: ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

The conference report sets spending in fiscal year 1983 for function 750, the administration of justice, at \$4.65 billion, \$250 million less than in the Senate resolution. It is assumed that an additional \$150 million will be spent over the House recommended level for such discretionary programs as the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Immigration and Naturalization Service and Legal Services.

FUNCTION 800: GENERAL GOVERNMENT

The conferees agreed on the House level of spending of \$4.650 billion for fiscal year 1983 outlays in function 800, general government. This number is \$150 million less than the Senate wanted. This function contains the budget for the legislative branch as well as funding for the Internal Revenue Service and the General Services Administration. The main difference between the House and Senate here is that the House had assumed a \$100 million savings in the budget for Congress which the Senate had not included.

FUNCTION 850: GENERAL PURPOSE FISCAL ASSISTANCE

There were no differences between the House and Senate in function 850, general purpose fiscal assistance. Spending will be \$6.5 billion in fiscal year 1983. The function includes such programs as revenue sharing and payments and loans to the District of Columbia.

FUNCTION 900: INTEREST

In function 900, interest costs, conferees agreed on a figure of \$113.2 billion which is \$2.2 billion less than in the Senate resolution. This resulted from the Senate accepting our assumption that the President's savings bond legislation will be passed and

ment on lower interest costs due to the lower deficit.

FUNCTION 920: ALLOWANCES

The Senate accepted the House resolution figures of -\$2.816 billion in function 920, allowances. The House assumes an additional 2 percent general employment reduction as well as savings from the disposal of Federal property. The spending level for fiscal year 1983 is sufficient to allow for a 4 percent Federal employee pay raise.

FUNCTION 950: UNDISTRIBUTED OFFSETTING RECEIPTS

The -\$43.1 billion for fiscal year 1983 in function 950, undistributed offsetting receipts, is \$3.8 billion less than in the Senate resolution. The House agreed to accept the House's assumption for rents and royalties on the Outer Continental Shelf.

Let me say a word here about reconciliation. Under the conference report, House committees will report back their reconciliation recommendations on August 1 to the Budget Committee. The House passed resolution called for \$1 billion in spending to be reconciled in fiscal year 1983. It did not require reconciliation in the outyears. The conference report does call for reconciliation in fiscal year 1984 and 1985 as well as 1983. This figure is \$7.2 billion over the 3 years.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge my colleagues to vote for this conference report. Failure to pass this is almost certain to result in no budget resolution for fiscal year 1983. The country needs and wants this House to pass a budget. We should carry out the wishes of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RUDD).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RUDD is allowed to speak out of order.)

RESPONSE TO NETWORK DOCUMENTARY ON FORMER FBI DIRECTOR HOOVER

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, on June 3 last, the television network, ABC, did what they called a news closeup, which was a documentary on former Director of the FBI John Edgar Hoover. My colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAN DANIEL) and myself will take a special order today to clarify some of the distortions that were contained in that program.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTI) for yielding.

□1245

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS).

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report.

I voted against the House version. I consider the conference budget bad, too. But it is a move toward the middle. Getting something less objectionable is the best we can expect under the circumstances, and thus I support the report with the greatest

lack of enthusiasm. Those of us who tried to find a middle ground in promoting the coalition—Aspin-Pritchard proposal are well aware of the difficulty in getting the House to move toward the middle. This conference report is a move in that direction.

Three weeks ago we witnessed the defeat of the three major budget proposals, including the coalition blueprint, as well as four other plans. Amazingly, though, each of the parties thought it had won because it had defeated the other. The second round of budget substitutes was thus conceived to attract the defecting Members at the philosophical extremes. The Republican proposal, Latta II, moved to the right, the Democratic plan left. Many of us who sought the middle ground had no option but to vote "no" on each. The Republican perception, in retrospect, appears to have been more politically astute; Latta II was adopted.

I do not believe any of us thought we would be negotiating in conference with what I consider to be a more moderate, more reasonable Senate version. But this is what has happened. Here are the details on why I find the conference agreement more moderate than Latta II, and acceptable, although just barely.

For education programs, the conferees accepted the higher of the House and Senate figures in most instances. The employment and training program area is one exception to this rule. Here the conferees accepted the lower House figure, or \$3.275 billion. The Senate had recommended \$3.794 billion.

In the elementary and secondary education programs, the House figure of \$2.958 billion was agreed to in education for the disadvantaged—chapter I. The Senate budget contained \$2.948 billion. For handicapped and vocational and adult education the House figures of \$1.075 billion and \$751 million, respectively, were adopted. The Senate recommended \$1.072 billion and \$749 million, respectively.

In the student financial aid programs we again find that the higher, House figures were agreed to. However, in the guaranteed student loan program the House contained \$3.264 billion in outlays, while the Senate contained \$3.267 billion. Though the House figure is slightly lower, and was adopted by the conferees, the difference between the two is negligible. In the Pell grant program, the House figure was also adopted, and in this case it was the higher level. The Senate contained \$3.366 billion while the House contained \$3.387 billion.

In the final analysis, the target levels for the education function are not subject to reconciliation. This means that any problem there might be with the figures, such as employment training programs, is not insurmountable.

In the health function, the conference report is much better than what

was passed by the House in the area of Medicaid. The House resolution contained \$13.330 billion in budget authority, while the Senate contained nearly a billion more, \$14.080 billion. The conferees agreed to the higher, Senate figure.

It is for the nutrition programs that there is the biggest improvement in the conference report over the House budget resolution. The food stamp program was funded at \$11.300 billion in the House, yet in the conference report funding was upped to \$11.850 billion. This figure is closer to the Senate level of \$12.150 billion than it is to the House level.

The unemployment compensation program received an increase of \$150 million in outlays in the conference report over what was contained within the House budget resolution. This funding level means that unemployment benefits can be extended for a longer period of time, providing relief to the many unemployed and laid-off American workers. Clearly, the conference report is an improvement over the House budget proposal.

This conference report is significantly better than the House-passed bill in the energy function. Despite the temporary glut of oil, the Government cannot totally retreat from its role in energy policy. While the marketplace has played a major role in spurring conservation and the development of alternative sources, there are clear justifications for the Government to continue to show its commitment to easing our dependence on foreign oil.

The Latta II budget resolution cut budget authority for energy programs by over one-half billion dollars from the President's fiscal year 1983 request. The President's budget all but terminated all programs for conservation and the development of renewables. Although I would have preferred to see the Senate levels for this function—a freeze at fiscal year 1982 program levels of \$5 billion in outlays—the conference agreed to a level of \$4.5 billion, a significant improvement on the \$3.8 billion level in Latta II.

The savings from the Senate level can be arrived at without touching important programs to promote conservation and renewables. The assumptions include a \$300 million offsetting receipt for nuclear waste management fees, \$60 million in Federal Energy Regulatory Commission user fees, and a cut of \$150 million in discretionary energy programs that can be more than made up by cutting funds for the Clinch River breeder reactor.

The conference agreement will also provide a half billion more in the environment and natural resources area. This will allow the Congress to appropriate adequate funds for EPA enforcement and research programs and many other important activities to protect our air, water, land, and the public health.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the conferees have provided an additional \$250 million for subsidized housing over and above the House-passed level for fiscal year 1983.

Finally, although the defense spending number in this report is too high for my liking, the conferees did adopt the House figure rather than the even less desirable Senate level. Again, if we return to conference, we might do worse. At least the small additional defense cut in Latta II as opposed to Latta I is left intact.

In conclusion, simple logic convinces me that if we turn the conference report down, the next budget that comes before us will be further to the right. Since the version that passed the House was to the right, the next version would have to move to the right to pass. Accordingly, I urge those of you who seek a more moderate budget to support this report. I assure you from my experience in the budget negotiations that if this budget resolution loses, the next one, from our perspective, will be much more of a loser.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge adoption of this conference report.

We have a great responsibility to the people of this Nation, to those who are seeking jobs, and to those who are making job-producing investment decisions.

This conference report responds to the mandate that was given to the leaders of Government in the election of November 1980. It provides for less taxes, less spending, a strong national security, and less growth in the size of Government.

The enforcement provisions are strong. They provide the necessary tools to implement the budget.

If we are going to have a fiscal policy that is meaningful to the people of America, that will be deserving of their confidence and will have credibility, we have to have adequate enforcement. It is in this bill.

It recognizes that tax revenues in a strong, growing economy will undoubtedly go beyond expectations. Therefore, we only reconcile the tax portion for 1 year.

But the spending cuts are reconciled for 3 years. This, again, is a response to the American public that wants the size and cost of Government reduced.

I think this conference report is a balanced program. It will reduce the Federal share of the gross national product of this Nation from 25 percent to 21 percent over the next 3 years. This is a very important feature because it says, in effect, that a greater share of what is produced by the people of this Nation will, in fact, be left to them for purposes of investing,

for purposes of using, or for whatever their choice is.

This slowing in the Federal spending by a total of 4 percent of the GNP over the next 3 years is very important to the future of this Nation.

Again, I would say this is a direct response to the mandate of the people we represent in this Chamber and I certainly urge your support of the conference report.

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

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. HAGEDORN. I want to compliment the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) on his fine summation of what has occurred here. I rise in support of the conference report, albeit reluctantly.

For many years I have voted against much of the Federal spending and I think much of the growth of the budget that has taken us to this point. I would have preferred a much lower deficit, as I cast votes in previous years.

But I think we have to live in the real world and the real world is we either adopt this budget resolution with this deficit or the alternative is going to be utter chaos. It is going to be much higher deficit spending and I think the people that reject this budget resolution today are clearly putting themselves on record for supporting higher spending, not lower spending—not lower taxes, but higher taxes.

I think, for those reasons, I am going to support the budget resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution does not go far enough or move fast enough toward balancing the Federal budget or reducing the national debt, but it is a far better alternative than taking no action at this time and delaying the budget process further.

If we fail to pass this budget resolution, Congress will, in effect, be telling the American people and the financial community that we are not making a serious effort to control spending and lower the Government's share of the private credit market.

The budget resolution we will be voting on is far from perfect, but it does begin to steer this Nation in the direction of reduced Federal spending and it does begin to control increases in the Government's entitlement programs. This measure makes some needed cuts in domestic programs, reduces to some extent the President's proposed defense increases, and maintains the individual tax cuts passed last year.

I have historically voted against budget resolutions which do not bring spending in line with revenues. I find it personally distasteful to vote for a deficit of \$103.9 billion during the coming fiscal year, but I believe those who vote against this conference report are posturing the Nation for higher spending in the long run.

I urge my colleagues not to use the budget process for political advantage. We have an obligation in Congress to look beyond the 1982 elections and deal responsibly with the economic future of our Nation.

Once this resolution is passed, Congress must discipline itself to abide by the reconciliation procedure in making the actual spending cuts. Without a budget, we can expect months of confused and unmanageable activity as Congress attempts to cope with the appropriations process.

We need to provide a sense of direction for our country, not an uncontrolled budget. I urge passage of the conference report.

Mr. REGULA. I thank the gentleman for his astute and correct comments.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL).

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

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 92. This budget resolution is probably not one's first choice. Certainly it is not one I would have drawn myself, nor voted for under other circumstances.

But, even though this budget resolution is nobody's cup of tea, it is the only one we have. Not only is it our only option, it is better for all interests than no budget resolution.

First, this country, and this economy, need a budget. If we fail today, it not only hurts our economy, but also it gives the House, both the majority and the minority a black eye. It is sad, but true, to have to admit that the people do not expect very much of us, but they do expect a budget resolution.

Second, a budget and a resolution are the only way we can control with reasonable fairness, a large portion of our rapidly increasing costs of Government. Without reconciliation, all containment efforts will have to be centered on the discretionary authorizations and appropriations. With no other way to hold down spending, this body is likely to act with a heavy hand on the regular appropriations bills.

For conservatives, the budget resolution is a "must" to cut entitlement spending. For liberals, it is needed to provide a blueprint for orderly spending controls, and to prevent the embarrassment of failure.

For all of us, and for our constituents, it is needed because the alternative is intolerable: high interest rates, continuing recession, and more unemployment.

For me, the budget resolutions' spending is too high. Its deficit is too high. Its taxes are too high. But it has some advantages. It continues the trend we began last year toward fiscal sanity and control of spending.

H 3738

Most of the functional differences between House and Senate figures were resolved closer to the House number. Even though much of those differences were made up by acceptance of House assumptions, the conference report is clearly closer to the House budget.

There will be some purists of the right and left who will not want to vote for this budget. But to them, I say, "We are not voting on perfection. We are voting for a budget, or no budget." The vote for a budget resolution is clearing the only reasonable vote.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PEASE). (Mr. PEASE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, last summer I stood on the floor of the House and pointed out that the \$42 billion deficit in the Republican budget last year was not an honest figure, that the budget deficit would be much higher than that. Indeed, we were now told that without action by Congress the deficit this year will be \$182 billion which surely has put our economy in a very serious condition.

I would just like to state for the record in relation to this budget resolution that while the stated projected deficit for next year is \$103 billion, the CBO has estimated it will be at least \$110 billion higher than that. Surely that does not do anything either to reassure the people about the caliber of the work that we do in this body.

We may fool ourselves, those of you who vote for the Latta budget today, into believing that the deficit will be only \$103 billion. But that is not going to fool the people on Wall Street who establish the interest rates for this country.

For that reason alone this budget conference report does not deserve a "yes" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. AU COIN). (Mr. AU COIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AU COIN. Mr. Speaker, along with the gentleman from Ohio, I have had allusions about what the outcome of the vote is going to be today. This budget resolution will pass. I know that the die is cast, the fix is in.

But I think before we allow to go unchallenged all of the flowery celebrations from the Republican side of the aisle, we ought to make a couple of observations right now about the effect of what the House is about to do.

I intend to vote against this resolution. I intend to do so for several reasons.

First, it is not true to say, as has been said on the Republican side of the aisle, that this resolution is needed to give the markets and the American

people a sense of credibility about this institution. After the House finally passed this small, mean-spirited budget resolution a few days ago the stock market dropped 25 points.

Interest rates on short-term Treasury notes increased by 600 basic points.

So what is the purpose we are trying to achieve here: general economic recovery? Evidence runs to the contrary.

But, then, if this resolution is not helping the general economy, we have to ask ourselves the next question: What are we doing to the people who are the victims of the cuts in this resolution?

What we are doing is punishing them. What we have here is not a question of failing to help the poor, failing to help the ordinary people of this country who need help. What we are doing here, by passing this resolution, is punishing them.

Make no mistake about it. That is what this resolution does.

I read in a national publication an interesting article which contended that there is not one but two deficits in the Latta resolution. The first deficit is the obvious one, the \$104 billion Treasury deficit. But the most pernicious deficit is the moral deficit, a deficit in the moral basis of this budget resolution.

The moral deficit occurs because the Latta resolution inflicts devastating damage on the poor and still it does nothing to help the general state of the economy.

I could not help but notice the remarks of the Republican leader in the newspapers only a few days ago in which he said that even though we might pass this resolution, after all the human carnage that is going to be caused, the country ought not to have a high expectation about general economic dividends to the country.

If that is the case, why are we punishing the poor and middle-income people in this way?

Why is it that it is only that the people-oriented part of the budget that gets the damage? Why is it only this part of the budget which gets the ax?

Why is it that civil defense, the mass evacuation plan, and the civil defense bomb shelter plan which calls for \$4.5 billion over the next 5 years is untouched by this resolution?

Why is it that nerve gas research and development and production is untouched by this resolution?

I cannot answer that question. The Republicans are going to have to answer that question.

They cannot do it today. It is going to be very interesting watching them do it over the summer and into the fall.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO).

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, this is indeed an interesting budget that we have before us today. I think it could best be described as probably the lowest common denominator in terms of what national policy should be for 1983.

A look back in history, to 1981, gives us an idea of what the shortcomings are in the budget we face today. Surely, I suppose that this will gain the majority of support in the House, and that I regret, and with that I lament the failure of this Congress to come to grips with what should be our proper priorities.

After a bankrupt economic policy was passed last year we find that there is no recognition or willingness to come to deal with reality today. This Congress and administration are living in a dream world. Are we actors and actresses living in that dream world rather than in the real world in which people that we represent are experiencing severe problems on account of the decisions that have been made?

Again, this 1983 budget puts forth a deficit, this year's deficit, 1982 of \$120 billion, a deficit twice as high as any deficit that we have had in history. Yet we hear discussion that this is an economically conservative budget.

This conference committee budget report projects for 1983 a budget, by CBO reckoning, of some \$114 or \$115 billion. That is conservative economics?

I think that this adequately points out the bankruptcy and the failure of the Reagan economic policy. It also points out the failure of this Congress to come to grips with reality and to temper the decisions that were made last year.

At whose expense are these changes and policies made? Surely there are cuts in this particular budget in spending. That we all recognize.

But this measure cuts deeply into social programs to the point of destroying work incentives. We cut deeply into programs that are counter-cyclical, that deal with the problems that the unemployed experience and the elderly experience. This budget pulls away the opportunity of a better education, housing, and health care for American citizens.

Where are the priorities in this budget? The priorities of this budget maintain the decimation of the tax code that occurred last year. We have a tax code that has been decimated, that is hemorrhaging with regard to the loss of revenue and accomplishing nothing economically.

The failure of supply side economics I think has been very graphically illustrated and yet this budget continues the massive buildup in defense spending that began last year.

The budget outlay in this budget contains over a \$30 billion increase, a

16-percent increase in defense spending from last year.

We go back and we tell our constituents that we are going to make an effort to cut into this Pentagon spending and to eliminate the waste. But yet we provide a 16-percent increase, almost equal to that which was provided last year at a time today when our economy and our deficits are the highest in history and our unemployment rates of 9.4 percent is the highest since the Great Depression. This Congress says no to all those who are suffering and only say yes to new unprecedented increases in Pentagon spending in an environment in which nuclear arms control is yet an elusive goal rather than a close reality.

So I ask my colleagues to vote no, vote against the political philosophy of this budget and the facts that are so vivid and evident in the reality of economic failure characterized again by this measure today.

□ 1300

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. FIEDLER).

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

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report.

The speech which was given a few moments ago by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTI) here on the floor has traditionally been given by the other side of the aisle, the chairman of the committee. I think that it underscores the fact that we are going through a period of important change in our history. That change is clearly reflected by this budget.

The fact that our deficit is not \$180 billion in this budget has not been any mean trick to accomplish. We have reduced it by some \$76 billion in the next year alone. We hope to be able to make significant additional reductions in the balance of the years that are affected by this budget.

Those changes have occurred as a result of a good deal of effort on the part of a large number of Members of the House and the Senate, and I think that, while the deficit is altogether too high for every Member here, it is certainly a lot better than it would have been had we not gone through this effort.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this conference report.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MYERS).

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

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I never dreamed that I would take this well in support of a budget that exceeds in a deficit of \$10 billion. But I rise reluctantly to support this because I see

where we have no other choice. When it finally comes down, we are going to cut spending, not through the budget process, that is obvious; we are going to do it reducing appropriations. This vehicle is necessary if we are ever to do the country's business, the people's business, by bringing those appropriation bills to the floor. We will have the real opportunity to cut spending on the appropriations. I hope Members will support us then. And, if not, the President can veto them. So it is necessary that we vote for this today. I do not like it.

I have come to one conclusion: If we are ever going to have a balanced budget—and there is none in the foreseeable future—there is one way to do it, and that is to adopt a policy that industry discovered many years ago, an incentive program to tie congressional pay to a balanced budget. But if we could tie congressional pay to a balanced budget, we pay \$100,000 to Members of Congress in years that the budget is balanced and revert back to \$60,000 when there is a deficit, I am pretty sure in a couple of years we would have a balanced budget.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL), the distinguished Republican leader.

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, we have all grown very weary of budget meetings and budget debates; it is time we finished them.

I know there are a good many on this floor who do not feel particularly comfortable with the document we have before us. I am not entirely comfortable with it, either, but I feel good about it just the same.

Under very, very difficult circumstances the Congress has produced a budget—one with teeth in it; one whose goals can be met. It may not sound like much to some on the back bench or those who view these deliberations from editorial board rooms; but it is an achievement.

All of us tend to be apologetic about this effort and this product; but there is no reason to be. No one is happy with it, because it fulfills few of our political needs. However, it does meet our budgetary needs and it does fulfill the commitment we have made to face up to the monumental fiscal problems we have and deal with them.

Today the Government overspends, the people are overtaxed, our institutions are overborrowed and overregulated. For these chronic problems we have looked to the budget process for our political and economic relief. The budget process was never intended to provide such relief. Is it no wonder that there is not a swell of enthusiasm here today? We are always the first victims of our own excessive expectations.

The press may look upon this product with a skeptical eye. They will

imply that the goals we have set out in this document cannot be met, that this budget cannot be reconciled. But few thought earlier this year we would have a first resolution at all.

I say it can be reconciled. I predict the goals will be met.

We have a budget before us, as imperfect as it is, because the public out there wanted one. There was plenty of opportunity all down the line for this process to collapse in a heap of rubble. Budget negotiations broke down more times in the last 4 months than some cars I have owned, but no one gave up, even though the temptation to do so was great. We did not give up because we did not want to risk the wrath of an already disenchanted public. And the people want this budget reconciled. They want a budget implemented.

Think for a minute how the headlines would have read had we all sat on our hands and did nothing. Think for a minute what your constituents would have said if we had simply washed our hands of the whole budgetary mess and turned to more politically rewarding pursuits.

The American people do not expect us to solve all of our problems but they expect us to try. They expect us to act responsibly, not in our own best interests but theirs.

I hope we will never know how the markets would react to no budget at all. I hope we will never know what the American people would think or how they would react to that prospect. If anyone wants to take that risk, then vote no today, but be honest enough to tell the people who ask that there was no other alternative.

There is a damp and dreary atmosphere in this House; there is no drive, there is no enthusiasm, and there is no resolve. Maybe that is because we are a reflection of our society and our people and we are now reflecting their attitudes and their feelings. That is as it should be.

But we are more than mirrors of the people. We are also leaders. Each one of us is a leader, and it is time for us to shrug off the malaise and lead our Nation out of these doldrums as best we can. There is no one who will stand to gain politically this fall from a failure to lead, a failure to act, a failure to try.

Let me just say a word or two about the numbers in this budget. To some the deficit is too high. To others the deficit does not matter. To some the tax increases are too high. To others tax increases do not matter. To some the spending is too high while to others it is too low.

To me the deficit would be too high if we cut this one in half but we cannot.

This is not fantasy land.

Those who harbor frustrations over the numbers or feel a sense of defeat with what has been settled upon by the conference must think about what

at stake here—what is real and what we have done the best we can to represent as many views as we could on this side and the other. If I could provide all of you with a separate vote on your numbers I would. It might provide some personal satisfaction, but I would not want to deny anyone that opportunity.

But it would not contribute one thing to the resolution of our economic problems, our budgetary problems, or our fiscal policy. It would only serve to satisfy a political need. Sometimes that kind of cleansing is worthwhile. This, however, is not the time and this is not the place for it. This is the time for action—positive action.

This is time for leadership and courage and compromise. It is time that we all stood together and acted like the leaders and legislators we were sent here to be. It is time we took the first step toward bringing this Nation and its people out of the dreary fog and into the sunshine.

The American people have had to scrape and struggle and compromise to make things better during this period of difficulty. Are we going to be above all of that? Or are we going to join them in the struggle and do the best we can with what we have?

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds, before yielding back the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, let me just point out to the House that without this budget resolution there are expenditures out there, or outlays, of \$182 billion in deficit financing for fiscal year 1983. So let us keep in mind if you are thinking about voting against this resolution, that we take out about \$79 billion worth of that spending and it would all be deficit financing.

Mr. WORTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on the first budget resolution not because it is a perfect document but because it is essential that we have a budget in place.

Of late there has been a great deal of criticism of the budget process itself. I think that much of that criticism is unwarranted. The budget process is cumbersome and it can be confusing but it is still much better than passing appropriations bills without thought as to what kind of policies we are devising for the Nation.

The choices facing the conferees were difficult. While all of us agree that deficits must come down, agreeing where and how much is not an easy process. I am sure that just about every Member of this body would have done things differently if given the opportunity.

The budget is not the final word. While the conference report does contain binding reconciliation instructions except for certain programs such as guaranteed student loans, leeway does exist on how specific savings will be met.

Approval of the conference report brings us one step closer to putting our fiscal house in order. We are on the right course in curbing the waste, fraud, and abuse that have grown so rampantly in many Federal programs. I support those well-intentioned efforts to improve administration and enhance delivery. However, with regard to the savings that will be achieved ultimately in health care, programs for the elderly, and aid to education, I must insist that any other savings will not adversely affect the participants in these programs.

I honestly believe that it is possible to make the necessary reductions in Federal spending without abrogating our responsibilities to those who need and deserve assistance. The 97th Congress is now on record as one dedicated to fiscal responsibility. We must continue along that path but I am confident that in honoring that important trust we will do so with compassion and integrity.

● Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to comment on a statement which appears as part of the joint statement of managers to accompany the conference report on Senate Concurrent Resolution 92, the first concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1983, regarding the possible imposition of increased user fees.

In the explanation of the so-called deferred enrollment provision, the following statement is made:

In general, the conferees intend that increases in revenues and receipts through the imposition of user fees be used to reduce the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there exist several factors which challenge not only the accuracy but the impact, both programmatic and economic, of such a statement.

First, it runs contrary to our understanding of the legislative intent of the respective budget resolutions as considered in each House.

In consideration of the original budget resolution on the House floor, the report accompanying that resolution (97-521, pp. 43 and 241) stated that it was "the intent of the committee that should user fees and/or aviation and highway trust fund fees be increased pursuant to reconciliation directives contained in this resolution then these funds should be dedicated to corresponding programs and should support whatever increased program levels are established by Congress."

Through informal discussions with relevant members and staff, supported by the absence of floor debate dialog to the contrary, it is our further understanding that this original intent also applied to consideration of subsequent majority and minority budget substitutes.

Neither resolution directed increased user fees to reduce the deficit. In fact, the statement of managers accompanying the final agreement also states that "the budget may be implemented

without the imposition of the specific user fees assumed."

In addition, removal in the Senate resolution of the specific user fee increase directive was based, in part, I believe, on the concern that some Members had that these were targeted as "deficit reducers."

Second, by implication such a statement serves to undermine the integrity and prerogatives of the overall legislative process.

Currently, there is widespread uncertainty about the utility and impact of increased user fees in certain areas. Various proposals have surfaced from the administration, some with favorable reaction by the Congress. However, all, for the most part, remain in the formative stages still subject to congressional scrutiny through the committee hearing process.

To assume in this budget resolution enactment of certain user fees is one thing, but to also assume their application to offsetting overall Federal spending is another. In a very real sense, the latter undermines the very critical exercise of careful legislative determination of all the matters at issue—both programmatic and economic.

Lastly, the statement at issue raises both economic as well as programmatic considerations.

Balancing the budget through increased user fees is not sound economic policy. The attractiveness for doing so is obvious—these programs, for the most part, have been highly successful, with returns to the Federal Government far in excess of costs. They are not the cause of our current economic plight, nor are they the answer to it. Rather, they provide a stabilizing influence during times of continued reduction in appropriated Federal spending and reform of the so-called uncontrollables.

In addition, there is much to be said of the long-term economic contributions made by user fee programs. Most of these have their fundamental purpose in basic infrastructure programs which lie at the very heart of our Nation's productivity. They stimulate jobs, help insure our standard of living, protect our past investments, and encourage future ones.

Mr. Speaker, in all I believe I speak for many Members when I say that any increases in revenues and receipts through the imposition of user fees should not, as a general rule, be used to reduce the deficit.

● Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, the Honorable DON H. CLAUSEN, joins me in making the following statement:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to explain to my colleagues the legislative intent underlying two very important provisions included in the conference report (97-614) on Senate Concurrent resolution

92, the first concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1983. One of the provisions relates to user fees; the other relates to 90 percent self-financed trust funds.

The user fee provision (section 2(c)(10)(B)) adds language to the Ways and Means reconciliation section of the budget resolution to provide that if any of the increased revenues which the Committee on Ways and Means is directed to develop involve the imposition of new or expanded taxes to directly finance programs within the jurisdiction of any other committee of the House or the imposition of any new or expanded user fee within the jurisdiction of any other committee of the House, an appropriate referral pursuant to rule X of the House should be considered.

This provision is purely technical in nature and is intended to do nothing more than assure that current House rules relating to committee jurisdiction will be followed with respect to any new user charge legislation proposed pursuant to the concurrent resolution.

Let me give an example of the kind of situation this provision would address. Twice this Congress, the administration has submitted proposed legislation calling for the imposition of new deepwater port user fees. Both administration bills were introduced by request in the House and both bills, H.R. 2959 and H.R. 5073, were referred only to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation. If the Ways and Means Committee, in responding to its reconciliation directive to raise revenue were to propose deepwater port user fees, it would be the intent of this provision to assure that the Public Works Committee would receive a sequential referral of the appropriate portion of the legislation.

There are similar but somewhat different problems with respect to current administration proposed legislation calling for new inland waterway user fees. And I suspect that other authorizing committees may be in a similar position concerning other types of user fees, such as Coast Guard fees.

This provision simply assures the authorizing committees with jurisdiction over programs covered by the new fees their rights under House rule X. It does nothing more. It neither requires new user fees, nor does it prevent them. Rather, it merely provides that if, in responding to the reconciliation instructions contained in this budget resolution, the Ways and Means Committee chooses to recommend new or expanded user fees within the jurisdiction of any other committee of the House, then the latter committee's rights to a sequential referral under rule X of the House would be assured.

The second provision (section 4(b)) addresses one of the important procedural requirements included in the budget resolution: the so-called de-

ferred enrollment provision. That provision would prohibit final enrollment of any spending bill which exceeds the budget resolution committee spending allocations.

As you know, under the budget resolution, nondefense discretionary spending is, for the most part, held at the fiscal year 1982 appropriated level. Accordingly, the committee allocations under the resolution would reflect these amounts. However, also included in the resolution is a reconciliation directive to the House Ways and Means Committee to increase aggregate revenues for the next fiscal year. A technical but very real problem that I foresee is that if revenues are increased—specifically trust fund revenue programs—and spending is held at the fiscal year 1982 level, then spending bills which could support these increased program levels would not be able to be enrolled.

Therefore, section 4(b) of the conference agreement proposes to address this specific problem by exempting from the deferred enrollment requirement 90 percent self-financed trust fund spending bills if, and only if, Congress increases revenues for these programs. It is important to note that the exception applies only to the selected trust fund bills which historically apply earmarked revenues for a dedicated purpose.

It does not affect the social security trust funds. It is limited only to 90 percent self-financed trust funds for which revenues are increased and only to the extent that such increases exceed the committee allocations.

Let me share with you, again, an example of how this provision might come into play.

Most Members are aware that the Secretary of Transportation has been advocating an increase in revenues paid by highway users in an amount equivalent to a 5-cent increase per gallon in the Federal excise tax on motor fuels. Four cents would go into the highway trust fund, and 1 cent into a public transportation trust fund which our committee has requested the Committee on Ways and Means to establish for public transit capital spending.

In the budget process, allocations of budget authority in amounts commensurate with such increases have not been requested. This has been because of the uncertainty over a number of proposals to increase revenues from sources now dedicated to the highway and airport trust funds. This caution was well advised, as events proved, since the President decided just a couple of weeks ago to defer the matter of dedicated highway revenues as far as fiscal year 1983 is concerned.

However, that uncertainty persists. Notwithstanding the President's decision to defer the highway revenue issue, no one can predict with any confidence the outcome of the current budget deliberations or the fate of proposals to increase revenues from a

long list of potential sources. If revenues for the highway and airport programs were raised, the constraint against enrollment of authorizing legislation commensurate with those increases would tie the hands of the Congress to no constructive purpose.

Section 4(b) would preserve the latitude of not just the Public Works Committee but that of the entire House in dealing with authorizing legislation involving those programs for which new or increased revenue sources ultimately result from the budget process.

This section is simply intended to keep the situation open, rather than see it locked up at this point in the budget process. Aside from that, Members would not be committing themselves to anything. Nothing in this provision would raise trust fund revenues. Nothing in this provision would govern the use of the increased revenues if taxes for such trust funds were, in fact, increased. Finally, nothing in this provision would commit any Member to any level of authorization in any bill dealing with trust-fund-financed programs.●

● Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, this resolution, and the immediate consideration of it, represent a travesty—a travesty of justice and a travesty of procedure. We are being asked to vote blind, unable to determine what this conference agreement means and what it would do in practical terms.

As late as noon today, the staff of the Subcommittee on Housing was not able to get complete information on what this resolution would mean for housing programs—even though housing is one of the most basic elements of the resolution, and even though the housing sector is about the most hard-pressed industry in the Nation today.

What I have been able to learn about the meaning of this report is so disturbing that I can well understand why its sponsors want to bring it in under the cover of haste and secrecy. It so brutalizes the poor, so miserably fails to address the genuine needs of the Nation, of the economy, or of simple, crying human need that no one could say that it represents a budget of decency, compassion, or even elemental good sense.

With respect to housing, I have been able to learn that the conference report gives us an illusion that there will be some new budget authority to construct additional assisted housing units—but I stress that it is an illusion.

The conference agreement says that there would be some \$10.4 billion in budget authority for assisted housing. That gives the illusion of a program, but the reality is something else. When you examine budget authority against outlay authority, you find that there is only \$7.6 billion for outlays—which in fact is \$300 million less than would be needed just to fund existing commitments. In other words, you not only get no actual new construction,

get an absolute requirement to re-
and a great deal of authority that
exists. What is worse, you get a
requirement to cut operating subsidies
public housing by something like
million in outlays. The meaning
that is that for purposes of calculat-
rent in public housing, assisted
housing, food stamps would have to be
counted as income. By some slight of
hand, that which is not income sud-
denly becomes cash. What was sup-
posed to go for food, suddenly must
now go for rent. What is more, the res-
olution would require the rent in-
creases that were assumed by Gramm-
Latta II to be accelerated. You get
nothing for new starts for public hous-
ing, you move housing authorities
closer to bankruptcy, and you inflict
punitive new expenses on the people
who live in public housing—people
who by and large have no means what-
ever of raising their incomes. They
simply are condemned to deeper
poverty by this conference report.

The resolution also would kill the
programs that today produce decent
housing for the poor people in rural
America.

It would do this by making the subsi-
dized interest rate in the rural pro-
grams rise by better than 400 per-
cent—up to 9½ percent or more, as
against today's interest rate of 2.7 per-
cent. That change will make it impos-
sible to continue making loans for
housing to help poor families in rural
areas. They will simply have no way of
making the payments that would
become necessary. Even the middle-
class citizens of this country cannot
afford a mortgage that is close to 10
percent—yet this conference agree-
ment makes the cavalier and impossi-
ble demand that a poor farmhand pay
the kind of mortgage that a bank vice
president would find hard to manage.
Similarly the bill would drastically
raise the cost of the GNMA tandem
mortgage program—again killing a key
source of reasonably priced mortgage
money.

I cannot tell you what all the details
of this conference agreement are, with
respect to housing. There is not
enough time allowed for me to speak
in even the most sketchy way. There is
not enough information for me to
even know what I should know, either
as a subcommittee chairman or as a
Member of the House. What I do
know makes it clear that this report
takes a bad situation and makes it
worse, takes injustice and compounds
it, and takes good programs and kills
them. It takes in the gullible by pro-
jecting housing construction programs
for which there is no outlay authori-
ty—making what appears to be some-
thing positive into something that is
in fact not only nothing but less than
nothing. This is not a report to be
proud of. It is not one that responds to
any need. It is not one I can support.
Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speak-
er, on June 10, while the House was
debating the relative merits of the

Jones and Latta substitutes, I used the
example of postal rate subsidies to il-
lustrate the stark philosophical differ-
ences underlying the two proposals.
The Latta substitute called for the
total eradication of subsidies for the
blind, the handicapped, charitable or-
ganizations, religious institutions,
schools, libraries, rural newspapers,
and other groups which serve public
purposes which are ever more neces-
sary in these hard economic times.
The Jones substitute would have con-
tinued these rate subsidies at a reason-
able, though reduced, level. Nonethe-
less, the House saw fit to adopt the
Latta substitute.

We are now presented with a confer-
ence report which has some money in
it for postal rate subsidies. But it is an
amount so small and so inadequate as
to be the equivalent of tossing a bone
to a stray dog. The \$400 million as-
sumed in the conference report for
fiscal year 1983 revenue foregone rate
subsidies is nearly \$700 million less
than the needed amount. And the
public service appropriation, which
helps pay for costly services such as
Saturday mail delivery and rural post
office maintenance, is wiped out alto-
gether.

Many Members have made favorable
comments to me about the clarity of
the illustrative rate examples I used in
my floor statement during our debate
on June 10. My purpose then, and my
purpose now, is to make absolutely
certain that each Member of this
House knows exactly what it is he or
she is voting for in this sensitive and
vital portion of the budget. I have
asked the Postal Service to compute
the total percentage increase in rates
which will have been incurred by the
nonprofit organizations and other sub-
sidized mailers during calendar year
1982 assuming the conference report's
\$400 million revenue foregone figure is
adhered to and appropriated by Octo-
ber 1, 1982.

Total calendar 1982 percentage rate increase
assuming conference report figure

Types of mail:	Percent
In county: Rural Newspaper	119
Second-class nonprofit: Veterans' magazine; Church bulletin; Uni- versity publication; Labor Press...	115
Classroom: Classroom publication..	91
Third-class nonprofit: Fund-raising letter (e.g., Salvation Army; Crip- pled Children's Society; Ameri- can Cancer Society).....	155
Fourth-class library rate: Book be- tween libraries.....	97

I must also report that—despite the
evident intention of the architects of
the conference report—it is not at all
certain at this point that the "free for
the blind and handicapped" rate will
emerge unscathed from this year's
orgy of budget cutting.

I know it is sometimes difficult to
translate statistics such as "percentage
postal rate increases" into something
vivid and meaningful in a real-life
sense. And so, just to be sure that
every Member knows what he or she is
voting for or against today, I want to

share with you some of the dramatic
communications received in recent
days by my Committee on Post Office
and Civil Service. These communica-
tions, from a cross section of mailers,
demonstrate the impact of the rate in-
creases suffered earlier this year be-
cause of the Reagan administration's
fiscal year 1982 budget cuts, and pro-
ject the additional real-life damage to
be done by adoption of this conference
report. First, here is a sample of reac-
tions from publishers of second-class
nonprofit publications:

From Dr. John Stapert, Church Herald,
Grand Rapids, Mich., Associated Church
Press/Evangelical Press Association
Joint Liaison.

The Church Herald is one of America's
oldest church publications, now 156 years
old. It has a circulation of 67,000, serving
the Reformed Church in America.

THE IMPACT OF THE JANUARY 10, 1982 RATE
INCREASE

For the Church Herald, postal rates in-
creased 110 percent on January 10, 1982.
Prior to that, it cost us approximately \$2250
to mail each issue. Since then, the cost has
been approximately \$4650 per issue.

There was no way to recover these funds
with our former subscribers or former ad-
vertisers. Subscriptions for 1982 had already
been sold. Advertising rates had been an-
nounced the previous October, and advertis-
ing contracts for space in 1982 had already
been signed. Thus, there was only the possi-
bility of absorbing these higher postal rates
on short notice.

Fortunately, the Church Herald had a
small financial surplus from the previous
year. This surplus was completely consumed
by early June, 1982. The rest of our modest
reserve, accumulated over the past 38 years,
would carry us only into mid-September,
1982 on our present publication schedule.
Were we to continue on our present sched-
ule, we would go bankrupt in the fall of
1982 and cease publication.

Hoping to avoid that, we have cancelled
two issues this summer and another in the
fall. Barring further rate increases, and
making the aforementioned cancellations,
we will probably still be publishing at
Christmas, 1982.

The January 10, 1982 rates are also forc-
ing us to make plans to become a monthly
magazine rather than bi-weekly beginning
in January 1983. This means we will be com-
municating within our denomination and to
our subscribers only 12 times rather than 26
times during 1983.

Making these adjustments also costs us
money for we must schedule additional
meetings of our governing board and pay
premiums to our suppliers in order to
change our publication schedules. Again,
there are no effective ways of recovering
these expenditures from subscribers and ad-
vertisers to whom we have previous commit-
ments at lower rates.

THE PROPOSED OCTOBER 1, 1982 POSTAL
INCREASE

A 30 percent increase in our postage on
October 1, 1982 would threaten the *Church
Herald's* demise this fall in spite of the siz-
able adjustments mentioned above. Again,
there would be no hope of charging our sub-
scribers or advertisers for those higher rates
either because they would be applied on
such short notice.

If we could survive 1982, we could imple-
ment higher subscription and advertising
rates beginning January 1, 1983. This will
make publication more costly and therefore

will make communication more difficult within our Church.

In order to accommodate the rate increase already in effect and an additional 30 percent increase, we would need to charge \$1.55 more per subscriber for postal rates alone. For our congregations, which normally enter subscriptions for all of their member families, this would mean \$1.55 times 100 or 200 subscriptions—a burden which many congregations are finding impossible to bear.

OTHER PERIODICALS

The Reformed Church in America has already ceased publishing one of its periodicals, RCAgenda. This was done solely because the burden of higher postal rates was impossible to carry. This denomination also publishes a bi-weekly newsletter, and it is making plans to become monthly.

The Associated Church Press and the Evangelical Press Association surveyed their members a few months ago about the likely impact of postal rate increases such as we experienced this past January 10. On the basis of that research, we are forecasting that 10 percent of our member publishers will cease publication by the end of 1982 because of higher postal rates. Other observers have suggested that the failure rate may be 15 percent this year.

That is without taking into consideration the possibility of a 30 percent hike on October 1, 1982. Such a hike can only spell disaster for religious publications throughout the land.

From Alan Caplan, American Jewish Press Association, Philadelphia, Pa.

To assess the damage done by the postal increases of January 10, 1982 to the Jewish publications in the Delaware Valley can be summed up in one word—disastrous. The Jewish Publication Group of Greater Philadelphia experienced increases of over 70 percent in January, 1982 postal costs while overall postal costs to us in the past four years have gone up for non-profits approximately 500 percent. This extreme is, I am quite sure, in the norm for other mailers and we as non-profits can least afford the increases. In a pool taken of many non-profit publications in the Delaware Valley, if the proposed additional 30 increase occurs in fiscal year 1983, many of these religious publications would be forced to cut back on numbers of issues, numbers of members, quality of material and, in an alarming number of cases, these publications would virtually cease to exist.

We find it extremely difficult to comprehend that intelligent leaders of this country will allow this to happen.

From Father Gerard Orlando, Sign Magazine, Union City, N.J.

With the May, 1982 issue of Sign Magazine, which has been in publication for 61 years, we finished publishing the magazine any longer simply because we could not absorb the last two postal hikes. We are still very interested in using the mails to pick up the slack of the social programs which our Federal Government has had to abandon but to do so we have to use the mail. While President Reagan asked us as a religious organization to try to fill in the void of the social programs which cannot any longer be funded by the Federal Government, we cannot do so as a non-profit corporation unless we get a break with the mails.

From Dick Pomeroy, the Pilot, Boston, Mass.

Our costs in 1981 were at an annual rate of \$75,000. The projection for the first part of this year before the October increase is

\$129,020 per year. With the 30 percent increase in October, it will go to \$167,700 per year. What that represents is an increase over last year's cost of \$92,650. Our mailing costs will have substantially more than doubled.

With the increase in October, it is doubtful that the Pilot will be able to continue publication.

From Richard Nare, the Messenger, Covington, Ky.

The decrease in revenue foregone appropriations has had a grave effect upon the Messenger of Covington, Kentucky. Prior to the January, 1982 postal increase, a single 20-page issue with approximately a 34 percent advertising ratio cost \$505.20 to mail. Although we presort the carrier routes, following the January, 1982 increase, that same issue had a mailing charge of \$1,114.27. In order to compensate for the deficit created by the inflated rates, we have already cut our publication frequency down to 45 issues from 50 and increase our subscription price from \$10 to \$11. This action was taken despite the fact that this was the third year in a row for a price increase. Although we took that action, our first quarter is still showing a loss.

If rates are increased by another 30 percent, that same 20-page issue will carry a postal charge of \$1,443, or almost triple the rate paid less than a year ago. Such an increase will probably cause us to suspend publication.

From Rev. Robert G. Peters, the Catholic Post, Peoria, Ill.

The January, 1982 postal raise increased the annual second class postage costs of the Catholic Post of Peoria, Illinois by approximately 147 percent, or \$69,000-\$70,000 a year for a circulation of about 40,000.

In an attempt to stay alive, we raised the subscription price by \$2.00 a year, a move that has already caused us to lose 1,500 subscriptions.

The proposed raise of 30 percent would mean a further raise of approximately \$35,000 a year, putting into question the viability of the paper.

Such a 30 percent raise would mean that our postal costs that were \$45,000 a year in December, 1981 would be \$150,000 a year by 1983.

From John F. Fink, Our Sunday Visitor, Huntington, Ind.

For Our Sunday Visitor, the 30 percent increase in the postal rates would mean an annual increase of \$188,430. After the January, 1982 postal rate increase, Our Sunday Visitor raised its subscription prices to cover the additional cost. As a result, we have so far had a circulation loss of 20,000 (from 300,000 to 280,000) with many subscriptions not yet up for renewal.

On other matters on some other publications, since the January price increase, both the Sign and Catholic Mind have ceased publication after more than 70 years of history. Some weeklies have switched to bi-weekly, including the Cleveland, Ohio and Amarillo, Texas dioceses, and some other weekly newspapers have switched to monthly magazines, including Pensacola and Tallahassee, Florida. Quite a few are watching losses pile up or circulations decline as a result of severe price increases and are now considering alternatives, ranging from ceasing publication, change of frequency or format or severely reducing the size of the publication.

From Ed Barmann, Cleveland, Ohio.

The January 10, 1982 increase in non-profit second class postal rates dealt a dev-

astating blow to the three papers of the Catholic Press Union, Inc.—the Catholic Universe Bulletin of Cleveland, Ohio; the Catholic Exponent of Youngstown, Ohio; and the Catholic Chronicle of Toledo, Ohio. Our postal bill jumped from \$4,000 to \$8,000 a week on that date. We increased our subscription rate from \$10 to \$11.50 a year, but because we could not make up the deficit, we began on April 30, 1982 to publish every other week. The switch has undoubtedly weakened the impact of our three diocesan papers in northern Ohio. (The Universe Bulletin had published weekly for 108 years.) Now, with the possibility of an additional 30 percent increase in postage rates on October 1, 1982, the future of our publications becomes very much in doubt.

From John Gallagher, the Advocate, Newark, N.J.

This most recent postal increase proposal is not only an outrage, it is intolerable. We will not take this latest slap in the face of religious journalism lightly. We intend to launch a massive campaign to educate and mobilize the 1,400,000 Catholics in our area of this latest attempt to put non-profit organizations out of business. We can no longer absorb these increases by simply passing them on to our already overburdened subscribers and advertisers. This time, we will challenge both the Congress and the Postal Service by attempting to unite with our Protestant and Jewish brethren to safeguard our First Amendment rights. We will not tolerate this latest discrimination and callous disregard of religious and grass roots communities throughout the United States.

From Father Camplon, Tennessee Register, Memphis, Tenn.

In the spring of 1982, the Tennessee Register raised subscription charges 15 percent to meet the additional costs of postal delivery. So far, circulation has fallen almost 10 percent. Investigation of that decrease indicates that we simply are pricing ourselves out of the market at a very rapid pace. As observed in the May 18, 1982 editorial of the Chattanooga Times, the postage rate increase for second class non-profit mailers is tragically impeding the non-profit press precisely at the time when the institutions it represents are being asked to motivate the private sector to serve human needs more extensively.

From John E. Markwalter, editor, the Southern Cross, managing editor, Georgia Bulletin, Catholic Banner, Waynesboro, Ga.

GEORGIA BULLETIN, NEWSPAPER ARCHDIOCESE OF ATLANTA, GA., 23,000 WEEKLY

Postage increase last January of 145% from approximately \$27,000.00 per year to approximately \$66,000.00 per year. Archdiocese underwrote loss until June 30, 1982. Subscription increase set for July 1, 1982, from \$8 to \$10 per year. 30% increase in postage would increase cost by \$20,000.00 per year to approximately \$86,000.00. Paper attempted to cope with subscription increase but can't increase again. Would decrease frequency or fold.

SOUTHERN CROSS, NEWSPAPER DIOCESE OF SAVANNAH, GA., 14,000 WEEKLY.

Postage increase last January of 150% from approximately \$16,000.00 per year to approximately \$40,000.00 per year. Subscription increase from \$8 to \$10 on March 1, 1982. 30% increase in postage would add additional \$12,000.00 to annual costs bringing postage to \$52,000.00 a year. Paper attempted to cope by increasing rates in March. Can't increase again so soon. Would

H 3744

consider delivering in bulk to parishes. Cut frequency or fold.

CATHOLIC BANNER, NEWSPAPER DIOCESE OF CHARLESTON, S.C., 12,000 WEEKLY.

Postage increase last January of 150% from approximately \$13,500.00 per year to approximately \$34,000.00 per year. Diocese underwrote loss through June 30, 1982 to keep paper a weekly. Subscription increase set for July 1, 1982 from \$8 to \$10. 30% increase would add approximately \$10,000.00 in postage bringing annual total to \$44,000.00. Paper attempting to cope with July 1 increase. Can't increase more. Paper would cut frequency or fold.

The initial increase last year was staggering and has consumed much energy and time of our small staffs. We haven't had time to do proper job with editorial side as people double on business end. This is true of smallest weeklies as there is not profit to begin with and while rest of inflation is leveling these gigantic postage increases are our main worry as we strive to survive.—

1984

Mr. Speaker, next, I want to share an excerpt from a letter which we received from the Classroom Publishers Association.

The Classroom Publishers Association comprises a group of publishers who publish classroom magazines, teaching aids, kits and books and religious school materials. The acceptance and value of classroom periodicals in the classroom can be substantiated by the 18 billion copies distributed to students over the last 50 years. These materials are utilized in public schools, parochial schools and religious instruction classes. This group of publishers provide 30,000,000 classroom and religious school periodicals each week aimed at supplying pupils, teachers, Sunday schools and school boards with current materials for instruction in social studies, religion, current affairs, civics, citizenship, language, arts, science, homemaking, health, physical education and a variety of other subject areas.

The library rate which is utilized for mailing educational materials into the classroom and libraries has increased 500 percent since 1970 and implementation of the full-phased 1987 rate now would increase that to 720 percent. Classroom periodical per-piece postage rates have increased 285 percent since 1970 with implementation of the full-phased 1987 rate.

FISCAL 1983 BUDGET COMPROMISE

The compromise reached by the House and Senate conferees on the budget for fiscal 1983 would authorize only \$400 million for revenue foregone appropriations for the U.S. Postal Service. This would mean no phasing monies for classroom and library rate publications and a \$213 million cut in revenue foregone appropriations for the "continuing" appropriation which helps to defray some of the institutional costs of the Postal Service for these preferred rate publications.

This means the postage for a typical piece of classroom mail (according to USPS figures) would rise from 5.5 cents per piece on January 1, 1982 to 10.5 cents on October 1, 1982. This is a staggering increase in 1982 of 91 percent which would cause great hardship and economic damage to the few remaining classroom publishers. Further, the postage for a typical book mailed to a school under the library rate (according to USPS figures) would rise from 33 cents on January 1, 1982 to 65 cents on October 1, 1982; a tremendous 97 percent increase.

Let me be specific in the case of Scholastic, Inc., one of the largest classroom publishers in the U.S. and a renowned leader in

the field. Scholastic absorbed over \$1 million in unscheduled postal increases in 1981 and would now be forced to absorb over \$4 million in unscheduled postal increases in 1982. The company's pre-tax profit in 1981 was \$2.3 million and was not expected to be appreciably higher in 1982. Subscriptions for classroom magazines have already been set and bound for the school year 1982-83 which ends in June, 1983. Thus, Scholastic must absorb the over \$4 million in unscheduled postal rate increases with devastating impact to the companies profitability.

Further, it should be noted that Scholastic has had to curtail and eliminate worthwhile educational publications already because of existing postal expense. Examples are the Campus Book Club and the College Bound Book Service.

It is tragic that 30 million school children are being deprived of affordable, responsible, contemporary paperback books and periodicals because of unexpected and unscheduled postal rate increases.

Mr. Speaker, here is a telegram we received from the executive director of the St. Louis Public Library.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

This is a confirmation copy of a telegram addressed to you. Fourth-class library postal rate essential to services of St. Louis Public Library. With increasing elderly population, books by mail is heavily used by those who cannot visit a library. For many it is truly a lifeline. We use the fourth-class library rate more than 10,000 times each year to supply housebound, senior citizens and disabled with books by mail. St. Louis Public Library urgently requests that Congressman Ford press for a continuation of library rate.

JOAN COLLETT,

*Librarian and Executive Director,
St. Louis Public Library.*

Mr. Speaker, I received the following information from the American Library Association concerning just two of their member libraries.

• The U.S. mail provides one of the primary methods which public libraries use to serve rural populations as well as the handicapped, homebound, elderly and people without transportation. For example, Ohio Valley Area Libraries (OVAL) provide Mail-A-Book, a cost-effective method of making available public library service to all residents of a ten county region who have difficulty getting to a public library. This is the largest of about two hundred such library books by mail programs in the United States. The user selects books, mails in a postal card request, and receives the books with return mailing instructions and postage. In 1980, more than 19,000 people used OVAL's Mail-A-Book service, borrowing 220,744 books. Based on studies of five counties conducted by OVAL in 1980, 20 percent of those who use some library service in OVAL use Mail-A-Book. For 79 percent of Mail-A-Book users this is the only library service they use. In the past year, services to OVAL's Mail-A-Book users have suffered due to the rise in the library postal rate, the increase in the third-class nonprofit bulk rate, and a \$45,000 cut to its program grant of LSCA title I funds for 1982.

In the first four months of 1982, OVAL has spent \$13,616 on postage for 15,834 book packages at the library rate. The proposed 51 percent increase will jump the cost for the same mailings to \$20,584.

The Des Moines Public Library (Iowa) currently spends \$5,000 per year on 4th class lib. rate postage for ILL packages sent all over Iowa. The proposed 51 increase in lib. rate would increase this to \$7,550. The

library would probably have to start charging the library patron for postage. However, they already charge users postage for loan of films. Based on that experience they estimate that 35 percent of library users will do without needed books and articles on ILL if they must pay the postage.

One of the state's regional resource libraries operates out of the Des Moines PL. They have found that for large bulky items such as video discs and tapes sent to other libraries, it is now cheaper to use United Parcel Service than USPS.

The regional resource library also operated a Mail-A-Book program which was dropped for the 1981/82 fiscal year because of projected postal increases.

Indiana University has written me the following letter providing one of the most comprehensive and outstanding explanations of the real-life impact of nonprofit postal rate increases.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
ALUMNI ASSOCIATION,

Bloomington, Ind., June 21, 1982.

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD,

U.S. Representative, Chairman, Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Cannon House Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN FORD: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the House/Senate Budget Resolution for FY '83 and its severe impact upon the 250,000 organizations in America who depend on non-profit mail to perform their missions.

I respectfully submit that the proposed level of funding for revenue foregone, now down to \$400 million for FY '83 from \$789 million in 1981 and \$619 million in 1982, will have a consequence not intended by the Congress.

If the private sector is to respond to a national appeal for greater voluntary support, to offset other reductions in federal funding, it is these very non-profit organizations who will provide much of the stimulus. Their principal means will be direct mail.

Much more is at stake than a narrow special interest and a few cents in additional postage.

I would like to refer to only one of many examples of impact, to Indiana University where I am Director of Alumni Communications.

My testimony before the joint postal committee hearings last March related how our university and other state-supported institutions in the Midwest faced reductions in traditional levels of state funding. Severe fee increases and program cutbacks have already been required to sustain academic offerings.

Only our 285,000 I.U. alumni represent a substantial alternative resource if we are going to preserve for future generations the same academic excellence and educational opportunities we have enjoyed. If we are going to reach this resource as never before, we must also communicate our needs as never before.

The opposite condition has been imposed upon us.

Faced with a combined 70.2 percent increase in second and third class mail rates last January 10th, the Alumni Office at Indiana has already reduced its annual (1981) mailing volume of over 4.8 million pieces by twenty percent. The major newsletter going to all alumni has been reduced from four to two issues per year. (The cost of postage for this newsletter now exceeds the cost of printing.) Second class permits were reluctantly dropped for all publications to gain further savings.

My testimony included an estimate that, after pre-sort discounts, our postal bill would increase by \$39,000 over the 1981 total of \$175,340. Experience to date has validated this estimate. Based on a postal estimate of a 7.4¢ rate for third class by Oct. 1st, a 95 percent increase since Jan. 9, 1982, we would face additional cost of \$52,000 as a result of the new fiscal year 1983 budget for revenue foregone.

As we prepare for a \$150 million capital campaign and a call for alumni volunteers in areas such as student recruitment, job placement, and fund raising, we are faced with the prospect of continuing reductions in communications when greater efforts are obviously called for.

Our example at Indiana University is only one of many in higher education. We have been in contact with a number of other colleges and universities throughout the country concerning the impact of the new non-profit rates. We found that the problem varies only in scale by size of school, but not in severity. The same must be true of other components of the non-profit community such as charities, community and civic groups, religious affiliations and others.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that when Congress in its wisdom established a special mailing category and funding support for non-profit groups it also recognized that its funding represented an investment, not a subsidy. It recognized that funds so expended would be repaid many times over by the voluntary contributions of many millions of citizens for the betterment of society.

It is and has been an investment in the spirit of volunteerism that has been unique in America since our early history. It is and has been an investment, not in non-profit groups per se, but in the continued willingness and ability of our people to freely help themselves and others less fortunate than they.

The wisdom of that investment has never held greater import for society than today. Help us so that we might be better able to help ourselves.

We rest our case with good faith in the Congress. It is in your hands.

Respectfully submitted.

WALTER A. SCHAW,
CAE, Director of Alumni
Communications, Indiana University.

Mr. Speaker, finally, here are just a few impact reports from users of third-class nonprofit mail:

The Foundation for the Junior Blind, Los Angeles, Calif., paid \$48,000 in postage last year to send a 1.3-million-piece fundraising mailing. Because of the rate increase incurred earlier this year due to the administration's fiscal year 1982 budget cuts, that figure jumped to \$75,000. In October, assuming the conference report's revenue foregone figure, it will cost about \$110,000 to make the same type of mailing.

The Braille Institute of America will pay an additional \$11,227 in third-class postage this October. The American Foundation for the Blind will pay an extra \$42,000. Children's Aid International an extra \$26,000. The members of the American Arts Alliance will have a total increase of \$1.3 million in its calendar year 1982 third-class postage bill.

With regard to the reports I have just summarized, I can only note with bewilderment this administration's

continuing insistence that private-sector charitable, educational, and religious organizations will be expected to make up for the enormous cuts in social and educational programs. By raising these postal rates so drastically within so short a time span, the administration is reducing—not enhancing—these organizations' ability to bear this increasing burden.

Every extra dollar which an organization such as the Salvation Army must spend on postage is a dollar which cannot be spent on services to the needy. Yet without direct mail fundraising, these organizations could not long survive. Such is the vicious circle in which we continue to be entrapped by this conference report. ●

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my opposition to the conference report on the first budget resolution. It is said that conference reports by their very nature are products of compromise. I believe that with this legislation we have clearly crossed the line between compromise and concession and having done so, the losers will once again be the American people.

We have come a long way simply to end up almost in the same place. That is one way of evaluating the congressional budget process for 1982. It began with the submission of the President's February budget—it was perhaps at this juncture where we found the greatest unanimity of feeling—everyone was against it. Then we proceeded to the Senate consideration and passage of its budget resolution. The House had to go through the process twice to emerge with a final product, a product I might add that I voted against.

Now we have before us a conference report which is more regressive than the Latta proposal approved narrowly by this House last month. It cuts deeper into key social programs—produces a deficit over \$100 billion, provides for a minimal amount of new revenues and increases defense spending in a disproportionate fashion.

More specifically:

Deficit: House budget \$99 billion—Conference Report \$104 billion.

Medicare: House budget cut of \$3.2 billion—Conference Report cut of \$3.6 billion.

Education: Conference Report provides new cuts of \$187 million in discretionary programs in education.

The conference report where it did conform to the House-passed budget did so on the more negative points. The conference report retains such onerous cuts as a \$200 million reduction in the SSI program which provides life-sustaining benefits for the poorest members of our blind, disabled, and elderly population. The conference report retains the freeze agreed to in the House-passed budget for a host of nontitlement programs providing social and human services to millions of needy citizens of all ages. The freeze would be in effect for 3 fiscal years. Let us assume with considerable optimism that inflation is

kept at a 7-percent level—a freeze over 3 years still means a net reduction of more than 20 percent in real dollars for programs.

On the opposite side of the coin—the conference report retains the 16-percent increase provided for defense for fiscal year 1983 and an aggregate increase of 48 percent by fiscal year 1985.

The conference report makes smaller reductions in programs such as medicaid and food stamps, as well as AFDC but again in the aggregate sense we are talking about cuts totaling more than \$2.3 billion for these programs, most of which direct their aid to the poor and truly needy.

Despite the fact that unemployment is at a post-World War II record level of 9.5 percent—the conference report slashes almost \$1 billion in job training programs as well as providing no funding for extended unemployment benefits, emergency public works, and other antirecession programs.

Finally with respect to the all-important issue of revenues the conference agreement adopts the revenue target of the House version—namely increases of \$21 billion in fiscal year 1983—the lowest total of revenues except for the President's original budget. I find this to be an artificially low target to set when one considers the massive drain of revenues which will occur as a result of the tax cut—especially the business tax cuts which have some hidden retroactive features associated with them. We should have been more aggressive in our efforts to raise new sources of revenues and I hope the Committee on Ways and Means will work to increase the revenues they are able to raise without directing it toward the already over-taxed middle class.

I am greatly distressed over the direction that this budget will be taking us. It is not a budget which will promote recovery—rather it will extend misery for millions. It is a budget which will promote \$100 billion deficits while claiming to be committed to reducing Federal spending. It is a budget which I will not support and only hope that it will be rejected.

As I said during the time of House consideration of the Latta budget—there must be a time when we say enough is enough. We cannot continue to turn back the hands of time and progress. A vote for this conference report means that thousands of college students who were eligible for student loans—for a higher education will no longer be. It will mean that the medical needs of indigent elderly people previously covered under medicaid will no longer be covered. It will mean that daily meals provided to thousands of elderly in senior centers and in their homes may be terminated. It will mean cruelty in human terms—the further shredding of an already porous safety net promised by this administration.

Almost 50 years ago when this Nation was in the throes of a severe economic period—President Franklin Roosevelt delivered a speech which contained words which to me have great relevance today and which represent the opposite of what we are doing today.

These unhappy times call for the building of plans that build from the bottom up and not from the top down that put their faith more in the forgotten man at the bottom of the economic pyramid.

Mr. MATTOX. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report and the first budget resolution for fiscal year 1983.

This budget is based on the same discredited economic theory that brought us face to face with a potential deficit of \$182 billion for fiscal 1983. I would think that we would want to reject such an approach—not continue with it. But instead of changing policy, the budget now before us just gives us more of the same—huge deficits.

Just think about the deficit in this budget for a minute. The report says that the deficit will be \$103.9 billion. But this figure is arrived at only by rejecting the assumptions used by the Congressional Budget Office and the Senate, and adopting instead the questionable assumptions used by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. We have already been led down the garden path once by such questionable assumptions; we should not foolishly go down the same path for a second time. Using the more objective assumptions of the CBO—and, I would emphasize, the Senate before the conference—the fiscal 1983 deficit is likely to reach \$114 billion.

I ask my colleagues: Do you want to vote for a \$114 billion deficit?

I urge you to reject this budget. It is time to return to fiscal responsibility and fairness in the budget process.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant support of the conference report to accompany Senate Concurrent Resolution 92, the first budget resolution for fiscal year 1983. I am not satisfied with many of the features of this conference agreement.

I am concerned that we are not providing enough funds for necessary educational purposes and I am also concerned by the deep cuts in social programs. Further, I urge the House Armed Services Committee to carefully examine all Department of Defense proposals. I am a strong believer in defense spending but I am fearful that we just might be throwing money at the Pentagon that they cannot spend wisely.

With these several complaints, one might wonder why I rise in support of the agreement. Basically, I support the report because I believe we must have a budget for fiscal year 1983 and this is the only practical vehicle for arriving at that goal. Initially, I supported the budget amendment containing the deficit for fiscal year 1983. After this proposal was not accepted, I voted

for the amendment containing the lowest deficit figure. I am not happy with a conference report containing a deficit in excess of \$100 billion.

We must, however, have a budget. Should this conference report be defeated, we would sink into a budgetary morass from which we might never recover. I support this conference report because there is no feasible alternative. Let us adopt the report and move on to the business of authorizing and appropriating programs for fiscal year 1983.

Mr. EVANS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. While there are very serious shortcomings in this plan, the report as a whole deserves the support of this House.

We need to approve this budget as a first step toward returning our economy to full recovery. While there are no instant solutions or quick-fix answers to the problems of unemployment, high interest rates, and economic stagnation, approving this budget resolution is an important factor in turning our economy around.

One way we can signal our resolve is approving a budget that will, in a phased-in yet determined way, bring us toward a balanced budget. If we fail to act today, the result will simply bring an increase in the pressures to abandon the course that has been set, and return to the failed policies of the last 40 years. While such a change could appear to give some very short-term relief to a few hard-pressed sectors of our economy, it is clear that the overall result of abandoning the economic recovery program that has been in place a scant 8 months will be true economic disaster.

Commerce Department figures released yesterday indicate that, for the first time in over 6 months, our economy is beginning to expand. This expansion of our gross national product is necessary to provide the wherewithal to fund the many and important programs that provide assistance to those Americans in need.

I believe we must continue the Federal Government's important obligations to the poor, the sick, the elderly, and those Americans with special needs. This budget before us sets spending targets for broad functions that include important people programs such as health, nutrition, and education efforts. Through the coming months we must fulfill our responsibility to those Americans who need assistance by providing adequate funding in the more specific appropriation bills that set program-by-program funding levels.

Today's economic conditions demand that we take difficult, yet responsible actions. Clearly, continuing the broad thrust of the economic recovery program we began last year represents our best hope. That program is a sound one, involving restraint in the growth of spending, lower taxes, responsible monetary policy and regula-

tory reform. We cannot return to those failed policies of the past that brought our economy to its knees—policies that lowered productivity, inhibited growth, savings and investment, and tied us more and more to government subsidies and government control.

I urge my colleagues to pass this conference report so that we may get on with important work ahead.

Mr. RATCHFORD. Mr. Speaker, the House today puts to a vote the first budget resolution conference report. The budget will remain an important issue for Congress throughout the entire year, as this first resolution is only an outline of spending and tax levels.

More specific details will be filled in later, but I think we can already get a pretty good idea of what the American people may expect from the Federal Government during the next fiscal year. Severe cuts are coming in areas such as medicare, which is vital to millions of older Americans; student loans, which give young men and women from middle- and low-income families the opportunity to pursue a college education; in energy conservation and development; and in other people programs.

Mr. Speaker, many constituents have asked me what priorities I have for the fiscal year 1983 budget. I set several goals: reduce the deficit; cut special-interest spending programs; eliminate special breaks in the Tax Code; and slow down the record rate of growth for defense spending. These are, and will continue to be, my guidelines for a fiscally responsible budget.

Unfortunately, the conference report that was ironed out last week and which is being voted on today falls far short of the goals I have set. Many of my constituents share the goals I have set out, and I do not believe the conference report represents the needs and desires of the people of my district.

I regret that a more equitable, responsible resolution could not have been drafted.

At this time, I would like to insert into the RECORD a copy of my most recent weekly column, which outlines in greater detail my objections to the direction we are taking on the 1983 budget.

WASHINGTON.—Like the doctor who reports to his patient that he has good news and bad news, so Congress is telling the American people that the budget prognosis has its merits and faults.

The good news takes several forms. Congress is almost ready to get the first step of the long budget process finished, and while this first budget resolution is but a general blueprint for spending and taxation—with many of the specific details to be filled in later—the resolution does give us a strong indication of what the Fiscal Year 1983 budget priorities will be.

The other encouraging sign is that the projected budget deficit will be lower than that of the Administration's budget plan which was introduced last February. The

anticipated deficit of about \$104 billion is still unacceptably high, but it represents an improvement over the Administration's earlier offering, and the projections of deficits as high as \$180 million for the next fiscal year alone. Clearly, reducing the deficit must continue to be an important fiscal objective, and developing creative ways to reduce deficit spending is a top priority on my list.

In fact, during the budget debate in the House, I voted for an innovative and responsible spending approach which would have balanced the budget by fiscal year 1985 and kept it in balance thereafter. The so-called "pay as you go" program I argued and voted for in the House would have required Congress either to make revenue-raising decisions or cut spending whenever it chose to increase spending in a particular area. By forcing Congress to look at its spending decisions with these other considerations in mind, I think we could make the government's fiscal policy once more responsible and restrained. The "pay as you go" plan barely failed in a House vote, but I don't think we have seen the end of it or other innovative spending plans.

On the budget that passed and the subsequent House-Senate conference agreement, though, the news is not all good. As one of my congressional colleagues said, no "safety net" remains, except for special interests like the tobacco lobby. Narrow programs like tobacco supports, public works construction projects, and other "pork barrel" programs have been kept in the budget, costing taxpayers billions of dollars each year they are allowed to remain. Our economy and our taxpayers cannot and should not have to pay for the largesse we bestow upon sugar, peanut, and tobacco growers, breeder reactor developers, and the people who benefit from huge, costly public works projects.

What's worse, the maintenance of these special-interest spending items comes at great expense to the elderly person dependent on Medicare, the middle-income student who needs a loan to pay for part of a tuition bill, and the laid-off factory worker who has neither the resources to provide nourishing meals to his family or the opportunity to be retrained for a new skill. On the revenue side, it's disheartening that a total of \$23 billion in revenues projected to be raised in fiscal year 1983 was agreed upon with few indications of how the funds will be raised. If Congress doesn't go after the special breaks for the oil industry and some of the money lost through tax leasing and other loopholes in the revenue code, then the bulk of that \$23 billion is bound to fall on middle-income taxpaying families, the people who need tax relief the most. I can't support added tax burdens on the wage earners already paying the lion's share of federal taxes, particularly if the inequities currently in the tax code which I have outlined are allowed to remain.

All the numbers of revenues, expenditures, and deficits being tossed around these days are important, but they are not the only consideration in evaluating the usefulness of the federal budget. The figures have to reflect the economy's real needs, the elements required by people and business to create a strong, healthy economic and social climate.

In my view, the compromise being reached doesn't quite live up to these expectations. The special interests are still claiming too much in the budget, and the average American is being given the short shrift in this first round of budget politics.

Mr. Latta. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 160]

Addabbo
Akaka
Albosta
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Annunzio
Applegate
Aspin
Atkinson
AuCoin
Badham
Bailey (MO)
Bailey (PA)
Barnard
Barnes
Beard
Bedell
Bellenson
Benjamin
Bennett
Bereuter
Bethune
Bevill
Biaggi
Bingham
Blanchard
Bliley
Boggs
Boland
Bonior
Bouquard
Breaux
Brinkley
Brodehead
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Brown (CO)
Brown (OH)
Broyhill
Burgener
Burton, John
Burton, Phillip
Butler
Byron
Campbell
Carman
Carney
Chapple
Cheney
Clausen
Clinger
Coats
Coelho
Coleman
Collins (TX)
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corcoran
Coughlin
Courtner
Coyne, James
Coyne, William
Craig
Crane, Daniel
Crane, Phillip
D'Amours
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, R. W.
Dannemeyer
Daschle
Daub
Davis
de la Garza
DeKard
Dellums
DeNardis
Derrick
Derwinski

Dickinson
Dixon
Dorgan
Dornan
Dougherty
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Dwyer
Dymally
Early
Eckart
Edgar
Edwards (AL)
Edwards (CA)
Emerson
Emery
English
Erdahl
Ertel
Evans (DE)
Evans (GA)
Evans (IA)
Evans (IN)
Fary
Fasell
Fazio
Fenwick
Ferraro
Fiedler
Fields
Findley
Fish
Flippo
Brooks
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (TN)
Forsythe
Fountain
Fowler
Frank
Frenzel
Frost
Fuqua
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gillman
Glickman
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gore
Gradison
Gramm
Gray
Green
Gregg
Grisham
Guarini
Gunderson
Hagedorn
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hance
Hansen (ID)
Hansen (UT)
Harkin
Hartnett
Hatcher
Hawkins
Heckler
Hefner
Heftel
Hendon

Hertel
Hightower
Hiler
Hillis
Holland
Hollenbeck
Holt
Hopkins
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnston
Jones (NC)
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kennelly
Kildee
Kindness
Kogovsek
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lantos
Latta
Leach
Leath
LeBoutillier
Lee
Lehman
Leland
Lent
Levitas
Lewis
Livingston
Loeffler
Long (MD)
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
Lungren
Madigan
Markey
Marlenee
Marriott
Martin (IL)
Martin (NC)
Martin (NY)
Matsui
Mattox
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McClory
McCollum
McCurdy
McDade
McDonald
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKinney
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Mineta
Minish

Mitchell (NY)
Moakley
Moffett
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison
Mottl
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Napier
Natcher
Neal
Nelligan
Nelson
Nichols
Nowak
O'Brien
Oakar
Oberstar
Oxley
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Patman
Patterson
Paul
Pease
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Peysner
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pritchard
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rallsback
Rangel
Ratchford
Regula
Richmond
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts (KS)

Roberts (SD)
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rousselot
Roybal
Rudd
Russo
Sabo
Santini
Savage
Sawyer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Seiberling
Sensenbrenner
Shamansky
Shannon
Sharp
Shaw
Shelby
Shumway
Shuster
Siljander
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (AL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (PA)
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
St Germain
Stangeland
Stanton
Stark

Staton
Stenholm
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Stump
Swift
Synar
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas
Traxler
Trible
Vander Jagt
Vento
Volkmer
Walgren
Walker
Wampler
Washington
Watkins
Waxman
Weaver
Weber (MN)
Weber (OH)
Weiss
White
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whittaker
Williams (MT)
Williams (OH)
Winn
Wirth
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)
Zablocki
Zerfetta

□ 1315

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 391 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

Under the rule, further proceedings under the call are dispensed with.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 92, FIRST CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 1983

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of Monday, June 21, 1982, the previous question is ordered on the motion.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. JONES).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 210, noes 208, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 161]

AYES—210

Anthony
Aspin
Atkinson
Badham
Bailey (MO)
Bailey (PA)

Barnard
Beard
Bedell
Benedict
Bennett
Bereuter

Bethune
Bevill
Bliley
Breaux
Broomfield
Brown (OH)

