

the budget. The budget does not do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 5 minutes under the order for the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

AN EMERGING CONSENSUS

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, let me congratulate my colleague from Pennsylvania. I think it is appropriate, at this very, very historic time—and I think we all understand the next 2, 3, 4, 5 weeks may be the most important weeks that any of us ever serve in this body, or in this Congress, and they may be some of the most important weeks for the future of this country—I think it is appropriate, and I think it is important we do have a full debate.

As the Senator from Pennsylvania so eloquently said, you cannot do that, really, unless you view different options, unless both sides are willing to debate the specific facts. Therefore, I think it is appropriate that the President's budget be literally on the table and that we look at that and look at the assumptions in there and look to see whether or not that budget does what the President says, and that is balance the budget.

There are those of us on this side who do not think it does. We think it is based upon assumptions that, frankly, are very optimistic and that are not based upon reality and that the savings, so-called savings that the President achieves he achieves in that manner, a changing of the accounting rules, in a sense, or changing of the assumptions, at least. So I think it is important we debate this.

We have, I believe, made some progress in this country in the tenor of the national debate. As I travel throughout my home State of Ohio—and, I imagine, my colleague from Pennsylvania finds the same thing in Pennsylvania—we are seeing emerging a consensus about the problems that exist and a consensus that this Congress finally has to do something about these problems.

There are three areas where I think really, today, there is a consensus.

A balanced budget: The American people understand we cannot continue to do what we had been doing in the past. They understand that. So the real question in this debate is, whose budget is realistic? Whose budget will, in fact, bring about a balanced budget, as we believe ours will, by the year 2002?

The second area where there clearly is a consensus is in regard to welfare reform. We saw this on the floor a few weeks ago as we looked at the overwhelming vote. Over 80 Members of this body of 100 cast a vote in favor of the final welfare reform bill that passed. There is a consensus in this country about welfare reform.

Medicare: A year ago, I do not think there was really an understanding

about the problems that we have, that we face in regard to Medicare. Today, while there is a debate about what we should do about Medicare, I do not think there is any longer a debate about the fact that something has to be done. The Medicare commissioners have said clearly that Medicare will, in fact, be bankrupt in a short period of time unless we take some very dramatic action.

So there is consensus on these three issues. As my colleague from Pennsylvania says, it is important that we get the facts out and we debate these facts on this floor.

Let me talk for a moment, in light of this, about the bill that is going to be coming in front of us. The American people may not have heard the term "reconciliation." It is kind of an inside-the-beltway term, but it is a term that is going to be used quite often in the next several weeks. This particular bill we are going to discuss is going to be the vehicle for this Congress to bring about the changes I believe people voted for last November. This legislation is bold, it is farsighted, and it is absolutely necessary for America's future. Furthermore, it is based on sound data. It is based on facts. It is based on good budget figures.

The American people decided last November they wanted a Congress that was finally willing to put America back on track towards fiscal solvency. I believe the American people are ready for this change. In fact, I believe the message of 1994, and frankly the message of 1992, was that the American people were demanding this kind of change.

We cannot ignore the basic truth contained in the report of the bipartisan entitlement commission. That commission said, if we do not change our present course, by the year 2012, every single penny in the Federal budget will be consumed by entitlements and interest on the national debt.

Mr. President, I ask consent to speak for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. DEWINE. If, in the year 2012, we want Government to have any money for discretionary spending—money to run the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, or the WIC program—it would then mean a tax increase, because there would not be any money left, no money left at all, if we continue to do what we have been doing.

In the days ahead, I intend to continue to talk about this issue, to talk about the need for this reconciliation bill.

At this point, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

BUDGET RECONCILIATION

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I listened with interest to this morning's discussion. I would say to my friend from Pennsylvania, I do not support

the budget plan the President sent to the Congress. I did not think it was a good budget when he sent it back in February. I do not support it now.

But I would say the budget that is coming, the reconciliation bill that is coming to the floor, is substantially worse than the proposal the President offered, even though I do not support the proposal of the President. We could have a vote on a proposal here in the Senate that does make some sense, that does balance the budget in the right way, that does not attack the Social Security trust funds. It can be done the right way, but the proposals here we are debating, in my judgment, steer this country in a direction that is not healthy.

The Senator from Nebraska a few minutes ago talked about the proposal that says to a lot of working families we are going to increase your taxes. And that is what this proposal will do.

Yesterday, the Treasury Department released an analysis indicating that about 50 percent of the families will find increased taxes as a result of this proposal. Then it says, if you are wealthy enough to get your income from stocks and bonds, you will get a tax cut. It will be beneficial to you. There is a beneficial approach for you. And the Senator from Nebraska says that is not what Members said they wanted.

Is it unusual for people to be skeptical when 97 percent of the members of a political party voted against the Medicare program saying, We do not want it, we do not think it is necessary, we do not support it, and then they now later say, "We are the ones that are going to save it." And people are skeptical about that? I think they have a right to be skeptical.

That is what the debate is about, the priorities. I do not think we ought to talk about a tax cut at this point this year. I think what we ought to do is balance the budget, do it the right way, and then when we have done that job figure out what we should do about the taxes. But some people here want to take the popular things first, and say, Let us serve the dessert first; that is, wait and serve dinner.

I watched with some interest earlier this week people who have been in Congress for 30, 35, 25, or 20 years come to the floor of the Chamber and cast their vote saying they would like to have term limits, and what is wrong with our country is that there are not term limits. Somebody who has been here for 30 years now votes for term limits, and says the problem with America is we did not have a limit of 12 years on their term. What are they telling the American people—stop me before I run again?

It is interesting to me that people say this is about changes and reform. In many respects, it is the business-as-usual crowd. Although the priorities are changing, the way they see it, the rich have too little, the poor have too much, and we are going to change that

with this reconciliation bill. We will take some from the poor and from middle-income working families and give some to the more affluent families.

But aside from that, we will debate plenty of that in the coming days. I want to point out to my colleagues that the day before yesterday the majority party came to the Chamber and said, We have from the Congressional Budget Office now a letter, and it says in the year 2002 with our plan we will have a budget surplus. They were very proud of that letter.

So I wrote a letter to the Congressional Budget Office, and said if you compute this the way you are supposed to compute it—which is honestly, and the law requires you cannot use the Social Security trust fund to compute that because those can only be used for Social Security—if you compute it without the Social Security trust fund, what do you have?

Yesterday I received a letter in return saying,

... including an estimated off-budget surplus of \$180 billion, which is the Social Security surpluses, the CBO would project an on-budget deficit of \$98 billion for the year 2002.

So in 24 hours this proposal has a slight surplus. Then it has a \$98 billion deficit in the year 2002.

But the point is the only way you can claim the budget is in balance with this kind of arithmetic is if you take money out of Social Security and use it. People say that has been going on for a long time. If that is the case, it is business as usual. This is change? No. It is not. This is business as usual.

I started in 1983 offering the first amendment in the Ways and Means Committee saying if you are going to put in the trust fund money you intended to save for the Social Security System, do not raid it, do not pollute it, do not take the money for any other purpose, but protect it, keep it out of the calculation of the operating budget deficit. I happened to lose in that vote in 1983, and I have tried a number of times since. The Senator from South Carolina actually succeeded in putting it into the law.

That is why I said to the Congressional Budget Office that you cannot add it up this way. If you add it up the right way, the Director of CBO says what you get is in the year 2002 a \$98 billion deficit. I am most anxious to hear people explain that to the American people.

Mr. SANTORUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I had a question for the Senator from North Dakota.

Does the Senator from North Dakota believe that the President's revised budget balances the budget in 10 years? Does the Senator believe that? He is running around the country saying he has a balanced budget that balances in 10 years.

Does the Senator agree with that?

Mr. DORGAN. No. But let me ask the Senator from Pennsylvania a question.

Does he believe that what he is bringing to the floor of the Senate balances the budget in the year 2002 in light of what the Director of CBO says she thinks, that we will have a \$98 billion deficit?

Mr. SANTORUM. I happen to believe, as I think most Americans do, that the Social Security program is a Federal program. Maybe some people do not think it is. It is a Federal program, and it should be counted as a Federal program. We have the luxury—it is a luxury—over the next several years of having a surplus in the Social Security trust fund. But, as the Senator from North Dakota knows, that luxury is a short-lived luxury. Those of us who are going to be working to balance the budget, over the next several years and beyond, are going to have to start working with a Social Security fund deficit shortly, in the not too distant future, in about 15 years. So we are going to have the luxury now. But we are going to have to face the music.

I think the important thing is to begin that over a long period of time so that we can start dealing with those deficits. And I think it is important to look at the Government as a whole—look at all of the Federal Government programs.

The Senator from Nebraska just a few minutes ago was saying you should do what he wants to do on Social Security, which is eventually privatize Social Security and change it.

So there are a lot of things out there. We may have to deal with the Social Security issue. But all I am suggesting is that I think it is absolutely appropriate to use all Federal accounts, to look at it as a unified budget as it has been done in the past to see whether we balance the budget. Remember, it is a surplus now, but it will not always be a surplus. We will have to deal with this problem over the long term.

Mr. DORGAN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SANTORUM. Yes.

Mr. DORGAN. I wonder. The Senator, I think, understands that the Social Security trust funds are trust funds. If the Senator says we have a surplus now, he either assumes that there is going to be a surplus in the trust funds and not used for the operating budget deficit—in which case there is going to be \$100 billion deficit in the year 2002—or he is not going to have the money in the trust fund. Either one of the two is going to happen.

Mr. SANTORUM. If I may reclaim my time. As the Senator from North Dakota knows, Social Security issues the notes, and the notes are paid interest. And we are going to have to pay the interest back as we continually do now. We will have to continue to pay that back. If you want to make the Social Security trust fund argument, you have to make the highway trust fund argument, you have to make the aviation trust fund argument, and you have to make the unemployment trust fund argument. The Government is made up

of a bunch of trust funds in many, many respects. If you want to take them all out and say just because it is a trust fund it is not a Federal program, that just does not mesh with how we run our Government. The Government is segregated in the trust funds because we have certain taxes dedicated to those funds. That does not mean they are not part of the Government. Of course, these are part of the Government. If they were not, people would not pay the Social Security taxes because they would not have to because there would not be anybody there to enforce it. We are there to enforce it, to make sure that the IRS enforces the payment of those taxes. We can talk to a lot of businesses who have not paid their taxes. They will tell you that the IRS is in their pocket in 2 minutes making them pay that.

If you want to say that somehow is not a Federal program, or the unemployment program is not a Federal program, or the highway trust fund or aviation trust fund is not a Federal program, that all of those should be removed and we should balance the rest of the budget, that to me is a gimmick where you are trying to get around the whole issue. The real issue is are we going to make the changes in law to get this budget in the balance, not just for the next 7 years but into long-term when a lot of these funds are going to be running deficits? My feeling is that we have to make the tough decisions.

I am going to be proposing an amendment I think eventually, to offer it as the President's budget because the President does not make the tough choices. He does not even come close with surpluses, and all of these are fudged. Without them you cannot achieve a balanced budget. Yet, he runs around this country talking about his balanced budget. He has this budget that is going to balance over 15 years. There is not anybody in the Congress, there is not anyone who has studied this issue in the country, who has looked at these numbers who believes they balance. They do not. The only person that believes they balance is the President, and the only reason he believes it is because he wants to fool the American public into believing that he has some balanced budget, that he is accomplishing the same thing we are when the fact is he is not. And you have the Congressional Budget Office, which said back in June, after he introduced this second budget of his that came into balance, that his budget will produce in the next 7 years the following deficits: 196 in 1996, 212 in 1997, 199 billion—these are all billion-dollar deficits—a \$199 billion deficit in 1998, \$213 billion in 1999, \$220 billion in 2000, \$215 billion in 2001, and \$210 billion in the year 2002.

That is the Congressional Budget Office. They are the folks we have to deal with in trying to get a certification of whether we balance the budget or not.

Unfortunately, the President is running around using—I ask unanimous consent for 30 additional seconds.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Reserving the right to object, might I ask to be followed by 5 minutes following the presentation by the Senator from Pennsylvania, the same unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from North Dakota will be recognized.

Mr. SANTORUM. The point I am trying to make is the President in his first State of the Union Address to the Congress said that he would use the Congressional Budget Office numbers because they were the most reliable numbers. Now, he said he was going to do it. He is not doing it, and if he did use it, those numbers would not balance.

We have an obligation to the American public to play straight with them. The President is not playing straight. We are going to offer an amendment that is going to show the President that nobody here believes his numbers. Quit going around the country saying you have a balanced budget when you do not.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the indulgence of my colleagues but because we are not able to have a discussion back and forth very easily—I hope one day we could put an hour aside jointly controlled and have a discussion to figure out where are the facts. I would love to do that with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, but because of this discussion I want to take a couple minutes to try to clarify this.

It is not, as my colleague from Pennsylvania says blithely, well, this is all Government spending; it is a Government program, Government revenue. Therefore, it must be counted this way or that way.

Let me tell my colleagues what happened. In 1983, it was determined that we were going to have a problem with Social Security. Just after the Second World War, when the war ended, a lot of folks came back to our country, and I am told that they were very affectionate, had very romantic notions about seeing their loved ones again, and over a period of some years, with deep affection, this country produced the largest baby crop in the history of America: the war babies. And so when these, the war babies, the largest crop of babies in American history, reach retirement rolls just after the turn of the century in 2010 and 2015, we need to be prepared for that.

So in 1983 we prepared for it. We said we are going to build surpluses in the Social Security trust funds. This year we will collect \$70 billion more than we need to spend in Social Security. Why? Because we like to do that? No, because we are saving for the future.

Now, if instead of the \$70 billion that we collect this year above what we need to spend in Social Security, if instead of keeping it in the trust fund, we say we will use it over here as general revenue to balance the budget, have you saved it in the trust fund? Of course not. It is a fraud.

No business in this country would do what you propose we do. None. I am going to take the employees' retirement funds and use them in my operating budget. No one would do that. And that is why I asked the Congressional Budget Office to tell me, if you do not use the Social Security trust funds, then what do you have? What you have is a budget deficit of nearly \$100 billion in the year 2002.

I am telling you this is business as usual. This is parading around and masquerading as doing something you are not. You are not balancing the budget if you are misusing the Social Security trust funds. And do not tell me they are ordinary funds. They are collected from every worker's paycheck in this country and they are labeled Social Security taxes.

Mr. SANTORUM. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DORGAN. The wage earners are told they are going to be put into a trust fund, and they are told the trust fund is going to be used for only one purpose. Now, when it is used instead for the purpose of balancing the operating budget, that is misusing the trust fund. It is looting Social Security. It is fundamentally dishonest. And it is business as usual, regrettably.

Mr. SANTORUM. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DORGAN. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the Senator.

When the gas tax was enacted, did not the Congress and President, when they signed that, say that that money would be dedicated, every penny you pay at the pump for gas taxes is dedicated to the highway trust fund, to be used only for construction of highways and other purposes within that act? Is that not what the law says?

Mr. DORGAN. No. In fact, the law has been changed to take part of that and move it for other purposes.

Mr. SANTORUM. There is 2.5 cents—

Mr. DORGAN. If the Senator wants to win a debate we are not going to have, I say good for you. I will give you a medal. But we are not going to have a debate about the gas tax fund.

My interest is in having a debate about the \$70 billion this year in the Social Security trust fund that we deliberately collect above what we need to save for the future and the fact that they again will be misused. That is the question. We could have a debate about trust funds for others.

Mr. SANTORUM. If the Senator will continue to yield.

Mr. DORGAN. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. SANTORUM. Is there not a surplus in the highway trust fund?

Mr. DORGAN. Yes.

Mr. SANTORUM. Is that surplus being used to offset the deficit?

Mr. DORGAN. Yes, by law.

Mr. SANTORUM. Well, only a portion of it is by law. As the Senator knows, 2.5 cents—

Mr. DORGAN. A portion by law.

Mr. SANTORUM. Is dedicated to deficit reduction. The vast majority of that fund is dedicated for the purposes only of improving our highways and other things related to transportation. Yet, we use that surplus to offset the deficit.

Mr. DORGAN. Yes.

Mr. SANTORUM. Just like, as the Senator suggested, we use the surplus in Social Security to offset the deficit.

My question is, why are you not here with a resolution that also deals with it, and why did not the other side when they debated the Social Security issue take all the trust funds that were running surpluses? But why just pick out Social Security, if you are really serious and you want to have fairness, not say—

Mr. DORGAN. Let me reclaim the time.

Mr. SANTORUM. It is too small.

Mr. DORGAN. It is a good question. I happen to feel the same way about trust funds. But you do not worry about a mouse in the corner when there is a gorilla at the door. The 500-pound gorilla on this issue is the hundreds of billions of dollars of surplus in the Social Security trust fund. That is what you want to get at because accessing that money—to be precise, about \$1.2 trillion of that money—allows you to balance the budget, or claim you have balanced the budget. But it is dishonest. It is not balancing the budget.

The President did the same thing. I do not disagree with you to say, did he do it? Yes. It is wrong. It has been wrong since 1983, and the question is, when are we going to stop?

When do you stop coming to the floor and parading around with pocketfuls of money from the Social Security trust fund and claim you have done something to balance the operating budget deficit?

June O'Neill, the head of the CBO that you all hired, now says if you do not include those funds—and you should not—you do not have a balanced budget in 2002. What you have is nearly a \$100 billion deficit.

Now, we have a legitimate disagreement about priorities. I do not think we ought to have a tax cut. I do not think 50 percent of it ought to go to families over \$100,000 in income. I do not think you have to take \$270 billion out of Medicare. I do not think we have to build B-2 bombers or Star Wars or ships, planes, and submarines the Defense Department did not order.

We have a difference in priorities about what we should invest in and spend money on. I do not believe you

ought to kick 55,000 kids off Head Start.

But beyond those differences in priorities, nobody ought to disagree that it is wrong to take trust fund money to the tune of \$1.2 trillion and claim you have done something good for the American people. You have weakened this country. You have cheated old folks out of a future they delivered in Social Security trust funds, and I would hope one day we will stop this business as usual and tell the American people what this budget is about.

Is my time expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I thank you.

Mr. THOMAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). The Senator from Wyoming.

BALANCING THE BUDGET

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise also to talk about the budget because I think the budget is what is on our minds now, and properly so. I rise because we have come to a defining time when we will decide. And I am very interested in the colloquy that has gone on here. I congratulate my friend from Pennsylvania for raising this question about the President's budget. This is what we ought to be considering.

Let me say to my friend from North Dakota that the gentleman is not for a balanced budget in any time. We are not going to get a balanced budget if we follow that pattern because there is none there. We are following the pattern that has been followed.

Furthermore, I think it is unfair to say this money is being used. I do not know of any trust fund of any kind or any annuity which the proceeds are not invested. In this case, they are invested in the U.S. securities. And the reason they are invested is because the law requires that. They are not stuffed in the mattress somewhere. And from an accounting standpoint, they do belong to that trust fund. And the Senator knows that, of course.

But I want to talk a little bit about the President's budget.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for 1 minute?

Mr. THOMAS. Of course.

Mr. SANTORUM. I ask unanimous consent that the transaction of morning business be extended to 11:15 a.m., under the previous terms.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS. I certainly would not want to stop this exciting debate.

Anyway, we do need to talk about where we are going. Now, there has been a great deal of activity in the administration going about the country saying, "We have a balanced budget. We balance the budget in 10 years." And so that, then, in our minds is measured against the Republican proposal to have a balanced budget and do so in 7 years.

But there is a substantial difference between the two. One is that the Republican budget does indeed balance in 7 years, as certified by CBO. The President's budget, what he has talked about for a 10-year balance, does not balance at the end of 10 years. So that is really the issue. And probably we will become involved in great detail about it.

But you really start with the question, Are we committed to the notion that we need to balance the budget? We have not been committed for 25 years to do that. As a matter of fact, we have heard this same debate for 25 years, the same excuses for 25 years, the same idea that we cannot do it for 25 years. In the meantime, the debt has increased to \$5 trillion. In the meantime, the interest paid on that debt will become the largest single-line item in the budget, larger than defense.

So we do not really have now a choice. We can talk about the idea of Social Security being off-budget. I happen to favor that. The fact is that it is not. The fact is that it has not been. And the fact is that the folks on that side of the aisle would not balance the budget if it is on, let alone if it is off. It would make it much more difficult.

The President promised a 5-year balanced budget as a candidate. That did not happen. Instead, we had the largest tax increase in history in the 1993 budget.

The original budget by the administration this year was brought to the floor, defeated 99 to 0. So the administration sent down a new budget. It uses OMB numbers, not CBO numbers which the President told us a year ago, 2 years ago, that these are the numbers we all ought to use. We all ought to be on a level field. And I agree with that. CBO's are the numbers.

So the budget does not balance. There are a number of other problems. The proposition backloads cuts. The cuts come in after the year 2000. Eighty-five percent of the cuts come in in the next century. That is not a very tough approach to budgeting. It leaves the tough work for later, increases the deficit by 31 percent during this 10-year period. Well, the Republican budget eliminates it. It adds \$2 trillion to the debt.

So that is the comparison that we make. We really need to come down to dealing with the fundamental changes that have to be made and that, indeed, will be voted on in the next 2 or 3 weeks.

Protecting Medicare—we have to make some changes. There is a trust fund there. The trust fund will go broke in the year 2002. The trustees say so. You have to make some changes if you want some different results.

Reform welfare—we need to do that. We needed to do it for a very long time. We have the opportunity to do it.

Balance the budget—perhaps the most important. We have an opportunity to do that. There is legitimate debate about how you do it, legitimate

debate about the cuts you make or the reductions you make in growth. But there is not really a legitimate debate about whether or not you financially and morally are responsible to balance the budget of the United States.

The real question is, what kind of a Government do we pass on to our kids? What kind of a financial situation and Government do we hand on as the new century comes on us? And those are the decisions we will answer in the next 2 weeks.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator in Minnesota.

DEBATING THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I want to join in and congratulate my colleague from Pennsylvania for bringing this issue to the floor today.

I just want to make a few statements in support of his effort, to put the President's so-called balanced budget on the table for debate, because I think we do need a healthy debate on both sides of the issue.

I would like to read from what the President has had to say in the last 2 weeks in his radio addresses, when he talks about continually maintaining that he does have a balanced budget.

He said on October 7, "I am deeply committed to balance the Federal budget." A week earlier, on September 30, he said, "I strongly believe we must balance the budget." He said, "Let's be clear. Of course, we need to balance the budget."

Well, of the three budgets that the President has put on the desk this year, none actually balances, according to the CBO, even his 10-year plan which he again touts as a balanced budget. It still leaves \$200 billion-plus deficits as far as the eye can see. So the President really does not have a balanced budget at all. But at least we would like to have the opportunity to talk about it.

We would like to give the other side of the aisle an opportunity to put those figures on the table. Let us debate them. Let us talk about them. Let us let the American people see the difference between the Republican plan and the Democratic plan.

As you remember, back in 1993—this week the headlines have been talking about the budget of 1993 again. In fact, the President has been coming from both sides of the issue again, flip-flopping on whether he raised taxes too high. Yes, he did raise them too high. Did he make too many cuts? No. It was the spendthrift Democrats, that he could not stop their spending. So he had to raise taxes in order to balance the budget.

If you look back at that balanced budget in 1993, the President has said many times we did not get one Republican vote in favor of that budget. And he is right, not one Republican voted for the President's budget.