



BUDGET COMMITTEE

Judd Gregg, Ranking Member
<http://budget.senate.gov/republican>

Contact: Betsy Holahan (202)224-6011
Jeff Turcotte (202)224-2574

FACT SHEET

Senator Gregg's Amendment to Reduce Wasteful Spending is Nearly Identical to Daschle Rescission Amendment from 1995

"My amendment to reduce wasteful federal spending is almost exactly the same as the rescission amendment offered by Senator Daschle in 1995. With the exception of the fact that the Daschle amendment allowed the President to send at least 13 rescission packages per year and my amendment allows only four annually, these two amendments are virtually identical. In 1995, the Daschle amendment was offered as an alternative to the line-item veto – just as my amendment is not line-item veto, but rescission authority. I hope that my Democratic colleagues will offer the same level of support for this fiscally responsible proposal now as they did back in 1995."

-- Senator Judd Gregg, January 19, 2007

BACKGROUND

Senator Judd Gregg, ranking member of the Senate Budget Committee, on Jan. 10th offered an amendment, *A Second Look at Wasteful Spending*, to the ethics reform bill (S.1) that would help to restore fiscal discipline by giving the President the opportunity to force Congress to take a second look at wasteful spending - including both discretionary spending and new mandatory spending – as well as targeted tax cuts. **Per an agreement reached last week with the Democratic leadership, the amendment was withdrawn from the ethics bill and will be offered to the minimum wage bill this week.**

Under the Gregg amendment:

- The President can send to Congress up to 4 rescission packages per year.
- Congress would be required to fast track the President's recommendation within 8 days.
- Unlike the previous 1996 line-item veto authority, *A Second Look at Wasteful Spending* requires Congressional affirmation of the President's rescission package.
- Savings from rescissions passed by Congress must be used for deficit reduction.

- Allows any member to offer a motion to strike any rescission proposal of an amount of discretionary budget authority, an item of direct spending or a targeted tax benefit that has the support of 11 other senators.
- The authority sunsets after 4 years – giving Congress the ability to evaluate merits of rescission authority after President Bush and his successor have had the opportunity to use.

The Gregg amendment has 30 Senate co-sponsors and is supported by the White House and a large number of business and fiscal watchdog organizations (U.S. Chamber of Commerce, The Business Roundtable, National Federation of Independent Business, The Bond Market Association, Citizens Against Government Waste, Americans for Tax Reform, National Taxpayers Union, Concord Coalition, The American Conservative Union, Center for Individual Freedom, Traditional Values Coalition, 60 Plus Associations, FreedomWorks, Americans for Prosperity and The Club for Growth.)

THE GREGG AMENDMENT IS NEARLY IDENTICAL TO A DASCHLE RESCISSION AMENDMENT OFFERED IN 1995

1. Both Gregg and Daschle rescission amendments have fast track procedures.
2. Both require Congressional affirmation or rejection of proposals sent by the President under a simple majority required by both the House and Senate.
3. The Gregg amendment allows the President only a very limited number of times (4) to send proposals packaged to Congress for fast-track consideration. The Daschle amendment allowed the President to submit at least 13 proposals.
4. Both versions require that rescission savings go for deficit reduction.
5. Both versions include authority to rescind targeted tax benefits.
6. Both versions allow the President to defer or suspend funds for a maximum of 45 days.

*** 20 Current Senate Democrats Supported the Daschle Amendment in 1995***

EXCERPTS OF SENATOR GREGG'S JANUARY 17TH SENATE FLOOR COMMENTS ON SIMILARITIES BETWEEN GREGG AND DASCHLE RESCISSION AMENDMENTS

Mr. Gregg: The enhanced rescission language which I have proposed essentially tracks the proposal that was put forward by Senator Daschle as their alternative to the line-item veto. It has the same essential purposes, except it's weaker, quite honestly, than what Senator Daschle proposed.

It allows the President to send up a group of rescissions, in our case four. Under the Daschle proposal, he could have sent up as many as 13 different packages. Those rescissions, if a member introduces them, must be voted on in a time frame -- same thing as the Daschle proposal was. Both Houses must act on the rescissions, not just one House, for the rescissions to survive, and must be acted on with a majority -- same thing as the Daschle proposal. The President is limited in the amount of time that he can hold the money; the time frame under the Daschle proposal was, I believe, the same as under our proposal - 45 days.

There is some sunlight between the two, because the Daschle proposal allowed motions to strike specific instances if there were 11 Senators agreeing to the motion to strike. I've said, I'm open to that as a concept were we to get into a process of amending the proposal I proposed, but that is an element of difference. But there is very little else that's different between what I'm proposing and what Senator Daschle proposed as his rescission package. This is not a line-item veto. It reserves to the Congress the authority to make the final call. All it gives to the President is the ability to ask us to take another look at something.

The Daschle amendment was so far from a line-item veto that the most effective spokesperson in opposition to line-item veto in this Senate in my lifetime and probably in anybody else's lifetime co-sponsored the Daschle amendment. That was Senator Byrd. So I would ask Senator Byrd to take a serious look at what I've offered here and say, aren't we really dealing with apples and oranges?

Yes, I can understand there's opposition to the line-item veto. That's fine, that's his position, it's been well said for years. The argument of the importance of protecting the power of purse is a good one. It's critical, but this rescission language doesn't affect that. It doesn't affect the power of the purse and is not a line-item veto, and is so far from it that it basically tracks the Daschle amendment.

In fact, I would like to ask unanimous consent that the Daschle amendment be entered into the record.

The Presiding Officer: Without objection.

Mr. Gregg: This amendment, which on March 23rd [1995], Senator Byrd rose and said, "I'm hundred percent behind the substitute by Mr. Daschle, and I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor."

The Daschle-Byrd amendment is essentially what I have offered as the *Second Look at Waste* amendment.

###