

yielding back of the time, the Senate proceed to vote on adoption of the conference report.

This has been cleared on both sides, Mr. President.

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

FUTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1996

The Senate continued with the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have the question, if I might ask my friend?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. STEVENS. Because he is a good friend, as a matter of fact.

If we were to vote for your amendment, do you have any indication the President would support it as amended?

Mr. HOLLINGS. It makes no difference to me. I would hate to see a President want to veto that and say I want to raid the Social Security trust fund. He does know politics. I do not think he would hesitate signing that part of it. I can tell you that.

Mr. STEVENS. My question, respectfully, to my friend, is, has he discussed this amendment with the White House.

Mr. HOLLINGS. No. This gentleman is working on his own. This is no White House amendment. I can tell you here and now, if I wait on that crowd over there, we would not get it done.

Mr. President, there is one more thing to be recognized and that is the exception that makes the rule. That is, as I am critical of the media for just going fast asleep on this one, and battling the Greenspan unified nonsense, the one exception is USA Today just about a week ago—10 days ago, November 6, Monday.

I ask unanimous consent this editorial and an October 20 column by Lars-Erik Nelson be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From USA Today, Nov. 6, 1995]

THE BALANCED-BUDGET MYTH

OUR VIEW: BOTH PARTIES USE SOCIAL SECURITY TO HIDE THE TRUTH ABOUT THE BUDGET; AND IN TIME, THE PUBLIC WILL PAY.

Each day, the debate over balancing the budget produces another dire warning. The cuts are too deep! say the Democrats. Taxes must fall! say the Republicans.

But after they compromise and begin arguing over who won a few weeks from now, one truth will remain: Both sides will be lying, because neither is talking about a truly balanced budget at all.

The non-partisan Congressional Budget Office underscored that point recently. It pointed out that come 2002, when the budget will be "balanced" under Republican plans, the government will still be borrowing more than \$100 billion a year. This is done by writing IOUs from the Treasury to Social Security and other trust funds that Congress declares "off-budget."

The bill for this little game won't come due in the political life of President Clinton or much of today's Congress. But the public will pay it soon enough.

To understand, look ahead to 2005. That's just 10 years away, about the time it takes for an 11-year-old child to go from grade school through college.

That year a critical balance tips. Increased costs for Social Security will begin to deplete Congress' cushion. Because the Social Security trust fund is a fiction filled with nothing but government promises to pay, Congress will gradually lose its fudge factor.

By 2013, when the trust fund peaks, taxpayers will feel a hard bit. They'll have to start doing what the trust fund was supposed to do—pay for the retirement of 75 million baby boomers. The budget will plummet into a sea of red ink, with \$760 billion a year deficits by 2030. By then the government will have had to double the current 12.4% employer-employee payroll tax to cover Social Security obligations.

That's unaffordable. Yet, neither President Clinton nor leaders of either party in Congress acknowledge reform is needed to avert economic catastrophe. To do so would require Republicans to get off their tax-cut bandwagon and Democrats to accept deeper spending cuts. Both prefer the myths that a budget borrowing from Social Security is balanced and a trust fund filled with IOUs to be paid by today's 11-year-olds has value.

Those are frauds only fundamental reform can fix.

The leaders of Clinton's commission on entitlements—Sen. Robert Kerrey, D-Neb., and former Sen. John Danforth, R-Mo.—last year recommended raising the retirement age to 70 and converting a portion of the current payroll tax into a mandated personal retirement account. The Concord Coalition, a deficit watchdog, has called for cutting benefits to upper-income retirees. Other proposals include taxing all income for Social Security and subjecting all benefits to normal income taxation.

Which measures are best? Only a thorough debate of the various measures can decide. But first political leaders must give up their convenient budget myths and face the fact—a Social Security train wreck is coming, and sooner than they think.

[From the New York Daily News, Oct. 20, 1995]

BORROWING FROM SOC SEC TO AID THE RICH (By Lars-Erik Nelson)

Washington—See that Social Security deduction on your paycheck? It's the key to the Republican plan to "balance" the federal budget while giving tax cuts to the wealthy.

In 2002, the year Republicans have been promising a balanced budget, they will in fact come up \$108 billion short, according to the House Budget Committee's report. The Republican plan makes up the difference by "borrowing"—the late Sen. John Heinz (R-Pa.) called it "embezzling"—from the Social Security trust fund.

By law, Social Security deductions are supposed to be earmarked to pay benefits for future retirees. But for the past dozen years the Social Security surplus has been used to mask the real size of the federal deficit.

The Republican plan continues the embezzlement. In pure accounting terms, the Republicans are right: If the amount of money the government collects in a given year equals the amount that it pays out, the budget is in balance. But borrowing from the trust fund to cover current operating costs means raising taxes on the next generation—our children—to pay back the debt to the trust fund.

In addition, using Social Security deductions to balance the budget means that working people, who cannot escape that FICA deduction on their paychecks, make up the shortfall caused by tax breaks for the wealthy and for business.

"It's the largest transfer of wealth from labor to capital in our history," Sen. Daniel Moynihan (D-N.Y.) said yesterday. "We are using a 15% payroll tax [the combined burden on employer and employee] to pay the interest on Treasury bonds, which are generally not owned by blue-collar workers."

"These guys [the Republicans] don't have any intention of balancing the budget," agreed Sen. Ernest Hollings (D-S.C.). "All they want to do is to get credit for it, make room for a big tax cut and destroy the government."

Republican budget plans are still something of a moving target, with many details being worked out behind closed doors, often in consultation with business lobbyists. "You're really not supposed to understand this until it's too late," one of the lobbyists confessed with a grin yesterday.

But the general outline is clear. The budget plans call for increasing taxes on the lowest-income Americans—those earning under \$30,000 a year—primarily by curtailing the Earned Income Tax Credit for working people.

The way the tax cuts are skewed, the wealthiest 12% of Americans share \$53 billion in tax breaks; the remaining 88% of taxpayers share \$49 billion. Federal spending cuts also hit the low-earners harder than they do upper-income families.

More bad news: En route to their supposedly "balanced budget," the Republicans run annual deficits that will add another \$1 trillion to the national debt. That means that in 2002, interest costs—now running at nearly \$1 billion a day—will eat up even more of the federal budget, leaving less money for spending on everything else.

Moynihan tried yesterday to strike \$245 billion in GOP tax cuts and use the money to reduce the deficit, preserve the EITC and spare some of the proposed cuts in Medicare. he was defeated.

"This is simply the wrong time to cut taxes," Moynihan argued. Republicans did not listen.

As Ronald Reagan's conscience-stricken budget director, David Stockman, observed in identical circumstances just over a dozen years ago, "Now the hogs are really feeding."

Mr. HOLLINGS. Talking about the budget, the editorial says:

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office underscored that point recently. It pointed out that come 2002, when the budget will be "balanced" under the Republican plans, the Government will still be borrowing more than \$100 billion a year.

The truth is, it is over \$348. But then:

But after they compromise and begin arguing over who won a few weeks from now, one truth will remain: Both sides will be lying, because neither is talking about a truly balanced budget at all.

That is what I want to do, is repair the lying with this particular amendment. So both sides can be telling the truth and we are not any longer embezzling Social Security.

The title of this one is "A Balanced Budget Myth." There is one particular entity, now, that has the truth and they are after us. I hope all the media will wake up and get after us. Let us start talking sense, rather than who is on top and who is lost and who is popular and what the polls show.

I absolutely, since I have the time here, have learned one thing in 40 years of public service. That is, this political polling is a cancer. Yes, you have to

get it. The opposition gets it when you run for office. But if you try to administer, if you try to govern with a poll—I think of the Marshall plan. Mr. President, 14 percent favored the Marshall plan at the time it was adopted. It was overwhelmingly opposed.

I go back as a young House member in my own State legislature, when I offered the sales tax bill and education finance reform to start building up public education in my own home State. Sales tax, at that time, was totally unpopular. As of this minute, if you took a poll in South Carolina on the sales tax, I am convinced the majority, by far, would say they oppose the sales tax.

But, in the 45 years, from 1950 to 1995, not a single bill has been introduced in the legislature to repeal it. The polls would show overwhelmingly it is a popular thing, but the people know if they did repeal it the government would go broke. We would not have any BMW's coming from South Carolina. We would not be correcting the illiteracy. We would not be giving the youngsters an opportunity in public education.

So, let us get away from this cancer, in addition to the interest costs on the national debt, of how well the President or the Congress is up or down in the polls.

We have a job to do. Under this job, let us have truth in budgeting.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I will just repeat what I said a couple of times here on the floor. We talk about who is at fault in these various things, in the impasse we have that has furloughed so many hard-working people. I could not help but think the other day, when I heard the Speaker of the House talking about the kind of discipline they now have in the House and how they are able to move, "We told the American people we would do certain things and by golly we are doing them right on time"—et cetera.

One of the things they did was take over control of both bodies. And one of the things you are supposed to do, and get paid to do, is to pass appropriations bills on time—for example, all 13 by the end of the fiscal year in September. What they have not told the American people is that you have hired us to run the Congress, pay us over \$130,000 a year to do that, but we failed to get our work done on time in September. We passed and had signed into law only two of the 13 appropriations bills. Today there are only about 4 of the 13 that have been signed into law. That is why we are debating what kind of continuing resolution we might have.

I cannot remember a time in my 21 years here—and I have been in the Senate, first under Democratic leadership and then under Republican leadership then under Democratic leadership and then under Republican leadership—I cannot remember a time that the Congress has been so derelict in passing

and getting signed into law our appropriations bills. That is what has happened. That is why we are in the problem we are in.

Every appropriations bill begins in the other body. It is the other body that has a Speaker who talks of the tremendous control he has over the House and tells us how, now that we have this Contract With America, there is a new majority ruling and they will run things. They ought to at least run the trains on time.

The fact of the matter is, they were a dismal failure in just passing the legislation that Members of Congress are supposed to pass every year. There are certain things we have to do. You raise the flag up on the roof when you go into session. You turn the lights on. You show up for work. And you pass the appropriations bills.

Nobody has been over here filibustering the appropriations bills. Yet, probably it is the most dismal record of passing bills in anybody's memory in Congress. I think they virtually guaranteed we would have this shutdown. I can remember some years we might have gotten 10 of the 13 passed and we had to have a continuing resolution for a week or two, into October, to get the other 2 or 3 passed. But to have nine of them not passed by now? To have nine when you are 6 weeks past the date? If anybody was running a business and had employees who were that tardy, they would fire them all.

Then we hear on some of the things when he finally does take an interest, when the Speaker has taken an interest—he has taken an interest in one thing, in the farm programs. He has announced to the Senate, which passed a dairy compact 2-to-1, he is just going to take that out. It does not affect his little district in Georgia so, even though it affects all the Northeast, he is just going to take it out. All New England—he is just going to take it out, regardless of the fact the Senate passed it 2 to 1 with Republican and Democratic majorities on it. He will just take it out. He says next time around he will take out anything else that affects us.

Frankly, I would be happy to have the Speaker of the House come up to Vermont and see how hard dairy farmers work. In fact, I guarantee, so he will be in a good mood, he can ride in the front of the airplane and he can come out the front door of the airplane. We will have somebody greet him there. While he will not have the chauffeurs and bodyguards he might have here, I will personally drive him. He can ride right up front. We will give him an ice cream cone and give him anything else he wants. We will make sure we give great attention and deference to him, talk to him whenever he wants. I will shine his shoes, do whatever he feels is his due. He should come up and see just how hard farmers work in Vermont.

He should come up and see how hard farmers work in Vermont. He should come up and see how hard a lot of other people work in Vermont. He should see how hard the Immigration and Naturalization Service works in Vermont for all of us, Republicans and Democrats, and independents alike. He should see how hard the people who run our Forest Service work in Vermont, the people who have been furloughed because of temper tantrums over where he may sit on the airplane. He should see how hard the people who have to pay the mortgage, have to pay the tuition, and have to pay the children's dental bills. He should see how hard they work, those people now without a job because under his control and his leadership, the majority control, we have one of the most dismal records of passing appropriations bills that I can remember in my 21 years here.

During that whole time I have never, during Democratic Presidents, Republican Presidents, seen the Congress so lax in doing what we are paid \$133,000 a year to pass the bills that keep this Government running.

You could vote to change this way or that way. They have the majority. They can pass them in any form they want. But at least pass them. Do it. Get it passed. There has never been a situation like this.

So, in case you start wondering who is at fault, are we at fault? Is the Government closing down because the Speaker did not get the seat he wanted on Air Force One? Most of this country would feel pretty privileged to ride on Air Force One, if they just wanted to go to a funeral or something. Are we closing the Government down for that? Apparently, that is one reason. But the biggest reason even predates that. The biggest reason is people are supposed to keep these things running, and they did not get things done on time. They did not get their work done in time. They have not completed their work, and there we stand.

So I have heard those who are speaking here. The distinguished Senator from South Carolina, former Governor of his State, a good friend, Senator HOLLINGS, made a very good point here.

I simply close with this, Mr. President. Let us not talk about gamesmanship. Let us stop trying to say who is up in the polls this day, who is up in the polls tomorrow, who is going to be running in this Presidential primary, who is going to be running in that, and who is going to have their face on Time, or Newsweek, or U.S. News this week, or who is going to be on there next week. Let us at least do the Government's business. We will vote different ways on different issues. Republicans will vote differently than Democrats on some, and different Democrats will vote differently than each other. Some Republicans will vote differently than each other. But at least get the bills up and get them passed.

Let us do the things we are hired to do. Let us at least pass the basic bills

that run the Government as we are hired to do. The new majority may well change what they think the priorities are with the Government. They have the right to do that. But at least get it done.

This is sort of like having somebody who is going to repair the roof on your house before the thunderstorm comes, and they keep coming to you every day and saying, "We will be there. We will be there. Keep paying us. You paid us to fix the roof. We will get there someday. We will get there someday." In the meantime, thunderstorms come.

I ask my friend from North Dakota, is that not so?

Mr. DORGAN. If the Senator will yield for one brief question, I will make it a brief question.

He raises the point about the continuing resolution and where we are at the moment. I made a point on the floor earlier today about two little issues, actually two issues—one little, and one big—that sort of described the dilemma of this continuing resolution. One is a program called star schools, and the other is a program called star wars. I have some additional information.

I was wondering if the Senator from Vermont knows the information. I was unaware of it until I looked into it. Star schools is a tiny little program designed to improve math, science scores, to help schools advance, to help kids, and it is an investment in education to create star schools. It was funded at only \$25 million for the whole country. Under this continuing resolution, this program is going to go from \$25 million down to \$15 million. So it is going to lose 40 percent of its funding because the House wants to kill the whole program.

So this continuing resolution says on star schools you kick 40 percent of the funding out. But another program, star wars—the star wars program for which the administration requested \$371 million for R&D. That is all they requested. They requested no money for deployment. The Congress said in their bill let us stick in an extra \$300 million for deployment. We invest. You spend that.

So what happened in this continuing resolution? The continuing resolution means that the star wars gets \$300 million extra money, and Star Schools gets 40 percent less. If there ever is a vivid description of warped priorities, it is the juxtaposition of star wars and Star Schools. That is what this is about.

I ask the Senator. When people come to the floor and say, "This is a tiny little decision, it is 7 years, and the Congressional Budget Office," is it not true that it is much more than that? Because this continuing resolution, which is 15 pages long, also says to Star Schools, guess what? You are unworthy. We cut you 40 percent, and then allows generously \$300 million more for star wars. This is about big guys and little guys, about big interests and lit-

tle interests. That is what this is all about. Guess what? Is it not true that the big interests get rewarded and the little get penalized?

Mr. LEAHY. It is. I say to my friend that, if we wanted to simply pass a continuing resolution to have the Government continue, we could do that in a one sentence—in one sentence say we will continue the expenditures at whatever percentage until such a time as the appropriations bills are passed. But instead we have not done what the public is led to believe with a simple continuing resolution. But every single piece of special interest legislation that can be packed on in the back room somewhere with no debate. That is what this continuing resolution is. It is a continuing resolution that rewrites the farm bill. It rewrites our education bill. It rewrites health, and does all these things with no hearings, no votes—done in a back room.

Why not do what the American people pay us to do? Bring up each of the appropriations bills, and in those if they want to cut out the money for education and star schools or anything else, then have a vote so that people can look and say, "This Senator voted for the education bill. This Senator voted against the education bill. Here is their reason." Be accountable. But no. We do not do it.

If we are going to have star wars to defend against the Soviet Union, for those who have not been reading the newspapers and do not understand where the Soviet Union is today, then at least have a vote on it. Vote to spend hundreds of millions of dollars of our tax dollars, or vote against it. But stand up and be accountable.

What we are doing is saying we will take care of all these special interests. We will get rid of all these things people might want. But there will not be any fingerprints on them.

It makes me think of the days when I was a prosecuting attorney, and we would come in and realize the burglar had worn gloves. That is what happened here. The burglar is wearing gloves.

I have cast a lot of votes that I knew would be unpopular in this body in the last 20 years. But I am willing to stand up and do them. This is something being done by people who do not even have to vote. Let us vote on it. If we are going to fund a B-2 bomber, vote on it.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEAHY. In just a moment, because of my great respect for the Senator from Alaska. He and I serve on the Appropriations Committee. We usually get at least most of the bills passed by the end of September. That is my point.

I, of course, yield to the Senator from Alaska for a question.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the continuing resolution is even more fair than in the past. In the past we took the lower of the House or the Senate

figure. This time there is a 60 percent, in the event that defunded items are in the budget this year. That is much more fair than in the past during the time the Senator's party was controlling the Congress, and we had Republican Presidents. What is more unfair than in the past?

Mr. LEAHY. If I might respond to my friend, the point I make is this. I do not remember a time in this body—and he has been here longer than I—a time under either the Republican leadership in the Senate or the Democratic leadership, under Republican Presidents or Democratic Presidents, that we were so derelict in the number of appropriations bills that have passed—certainly by the middle of November—passed and signed into law. I can remember sometimes we had continuing resolutions for a few. But I can think of sometimes, certainly in the last 3 or 4 years, when we had all thirteen passed.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield again, I can remember distinctly the times back in the days when we had the Republican majority in the 1980's when we had the problems with regard to the House, and we had continuing resolutions that had all 13 bills in it.

As a matter of fact—

Mr. LEAHY. For how long? A week? Mr. STEVENS. It was the Armed Services bill—

Mr. LEAHY. For a week or maybe 2 weeks in October but never mid-November. Never mid-November.

Mr. STEVENS. That is my question to the Senator again. We gave the President a continuing resolution from October 1 until November 13. We are under the second continuing resolution now. As a matter of fact, the resolution before us is again short term. The Senator is making it look like—does the Senator wish the public to understand we have cut those programs in this bill? This does not cut them. It preserves their funding for 2 weeks.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I yielded for the question. I would say this: Before the Senator from Alaska came in, it was pointed out that we cut Star Schools very substantially in this continuing resolution and increased very substantially star wars beyond what the President—

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? It is just not true.

Mr. LEAHY. If I could, just for a moment. It is, if you read the continuing resolution. My point is this—and I think the Senator from Alaska would have to agree—never have we been down to mid-November—to mid-November—with so few—in fact, before Monday I think we had only 2 of the 13 appropriations bills signed into law, and on Monday we had signed 3 of the 13. I guess now we sent down another one. But does the Senator from Alaska remember any time under either Republican or Democratic leadership that we were down to mid-November with only two of the appropriations bills signed into law?

Mr. STEVENS. I would be happy to answer that if I may. In 1988, we had a continuing resolution that had all 13 appropriations bills. Three of them had not even been considered by the Senate.

Mr. LEAHY. Was that November 15?

Mr. STEVENS. This was November, yes. Yes. As a matter of fact, it was a time of the Nicaragua contra aid problem, if the Senator will remember. But we had all of them in the bill at one time. And at that time the Senator's party was in the majority.

Mr. LEAHY. But not down this late. Not down this late, I would say to the Senator from Alaska. Not this late into the session.

Mr. STEVENS. As a matter of fact, if the Senator will yield again, the Senator will recall there was a sequestration ordered that year. It was late. We finally had to pass a continuing resolution to suspend the sequestration under the Budget Act.

Mr. President, my question to the Senator is, he implies that we have raised star wars by this bill. We are going to bring to the floor—we just got the agreement now—the Defense Department appropriations bill for this coming year. It deals with the star wars issue. Because of the fact that bill is almost ready to go, it appears that it is higher than the other funding, but the other funding is in another bill. We are continuing the funding for the Star Schools for a 2-week period rather than leave them out altogether.

Does the Senator object to that?

Mr. LEAHY. We have also seen, I would say, Mr. President, in these continuing resolutions, we have even arranged a way to do the LIHEAP program. I will give you some idea of what happens when you do not pass your appropriations bills on time.

The LIHEAP program is to provide heating assistance for those of us in States with severe weather, none more severe than the Senator from Alaska, obviously. But in my own State we have 25- and 35-below-zero days. This is to give heating assistance to the people, aid in heating to the poorest people in our States, to help them weatherize their homes, or whatever else. Not only is the program cut substantially, but it is set up so you can pay out only $\frac{1}{365}$ per day. So, in other words, if you are in Montana or Alaska or Vermont and it is 25 or 30 below zero in January, you are told: Sorry, we do not have enough, but come back in June and we will probably be able to take care of you.

Mr. STEVENS. Will the Senator yield again?

Mr. LEAHY. Of course.

Mr. STEVENS. I remember the time when because of the controversy over the SST we carried through the continuing resolution to the following March. Does the Senator remember that?

Mr. LEAHY. On one bill.

Mr. STEVENS. As a matter of fact, in 1988—

Mr. LEAHY. On one bill.

Mr. STEVENS. When we had that, it was December when we had this.

Mr. LEAHY. I do not remember. I must admit that was before—

Mr. STEVENS. Does the Senator know Star Schools are forward funded? It is not affected by this bill at all.

Mr. LEAHY. The SST, I would say, was before I was old enough to be in the Senate so I will have to take the remembrance of the Senator from Alaska on that.

Mr. STEVENS. Senator THURMOND and I remember that very well. We stepped off the *Mayflower* and voted at that time.

Mr. LEAHY. The SST was before I had reached the constitutional age of 30 to be here.

Mr. STEVENS. Again, will the Senator answer my question? Does he know that Star Schools are forward funded; they are not affected by this bill at all?

Mr. LEAHY. I will tell the Senator to go back to the comments made earlier by the Senator from North Dakota who read the specific chapter and verse.

Mr. STEVENS. I wish I would get a chance to talk to the Senator from North Dakota about that.

Mr. LEAHY. I am sure the Senator will.

Mr. STEVENS. I hope the Senator will not mislead the public here as to the Appropriations Committee, on which we both serve so well. I think we try to do our best. And this bill is a better bill than previous continuing resolutions. It leaves out less programs as a result of its total breadth than have been covered by prior continuing resolutions. Under that circumstance, it should be readily approved by the President.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I say to my friend from Alaska, I have always enjoyed, and I think enjoyed more, serving on appropriations than any other committee. One of the reasons for that is my relationship with the Senator from Alaska. I know of nobody who works harder. I have no higher respect for anybody than he. And he and I have served on several subcommittees together. I probably now ruined his electoral chances in Alaska by saying nice things about him here.

The fact of the matter is there was no Nicaragua Contra debate, there was no sequestration debate, there were none of these things that stopped us from getting the appropriations bills through, bills that begin in the other body, at the time we are required to, expected to and paid to. That is the end of September.

But when I hear the Speaker of the House tell about how they are able to do all the things they are supposed to do, and they are running things on time and all, the fact of the matter is these bills begin over there and have not gone through at the speed they should, and were all the appropriations bills done, we would not have a Government shutdown. In those areas where

we have passed appropriations bills, there are no shutdowns.

All I am saying is let us stop worrying about who sat where on the way to a funeral or who got off which door. Let us get on with the business.

I think the Senator from Alaska may recall this. I started saying in August, in July, that Democrats and Republicans have got to sit down and start figuring out how to get these budgets through; that there will not be a Clinton budget exactly, there will not be a Gingrich budget exactly, there will not be a Stevens or a Leahy budget exactly. But all of us working together could get a budget that might make sense for the country.

I see my friend from New York is here, and he has been waiting at a time when others were waiting, such as my friend from Washington, so I yield the floor.

Mr. D'AMATO addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to strongly support and endorse the underlying resolution, House Joint Resolution 122, called the continuing resolution.

I doubt if the American people really know what a continuing resolution is, but let me say one thing. I have no doubt that the American people are absolutely fed up with what they see going on. I have no doubt that the American people do not want us to continue doing business as usual. Some want us to just continue our merry way—spend and spend, tax and tax for programs that they have decided are good for the American people whether they like them or not. We have colleagues here who have said we are going to give the American people health care whether they like it or not. That is the kind of attitude. That is why the people are angry.

People voted for change. They voted for change in 1992. They did. And in 1994, when they saw that it did not happen, they said, by gosh, we want you to change things. We want you to really keep your commitment.

Now, President Clinton, for all his noble politicking—and he is good at it—has a happy facility of forgetting what he says. He will say just about anything to get your vote or to go up in the popularity polls, and then when it becomes a little tough, he goes the other way or conveniently forgets when the pressures from his party come up. When he ran in 1992, he was the new Democrat. He was going to change things. He was going to cut taxes for working middle-class families. That was his promise. Not only was he going to cut taxes, he was going to balance the budget in 5 years—not 7 years, not 10 years—5 years.

Promises made; promises broken. And that is why in 1994 you saw a revolution. People said, we are sick and tired of it. And we want people who are going to go down and do the job. All over the country they sent a message.

Wherever there was an open seat, they elected Republicans who said, yes, we are going to cut taxes, cut spending, we are going to let middle-class working families keep their money, and we are going to have less Government—that was the message—and balance the budget over 7 years.

Here you have a President that said, "I'm willing to balance the budget in 5 years." And yet he is having trouble saying, "Yes, I'll do it in 7." Here is a President who said we are going to use the real legitimate figures to ascertain what economic growth is, how much money we owe, how much money we do not. That is called the Congressional Budget Office, CBO. Most Americans do not understand, but here is the President, and he says, "I'm going to balance the budget in 5 years. And I'm going to give tax cuts to working middle-class families. We're going to use the Congressional Budget Office to be the official accountant for whether or not a budget is in balance," and now, 1995, he has forgotten that.

I am proud that those men and women who were elected for change are down here fighting for change. I do not think we are doing a good job in getting the message out. I think we are doing a terrible job. I think the President is beating our pants off. And the media loves him and they play his score. What do we hear? We hear the President sanctimoniously saying, "I have to tell you I'm not going to allow them to cut programs for the senior citizens, Medicare, Medicaid, and give tax breaks to the wealthy." That is hokum, Mr. President. That is just simply an overstatement and an exaggeration that comes down to being untruthful. It is disingenuous.

As a matter of fact, the cuts he has proposed in Medicare, or reducing the rate of growth, in many cases, parallel those that we have put forth, in many cases. Now, let us take a look at the so-called tax cuts for the wealthy.

We have proposed, and the President will not even come to the table to discuss it, a package of \$245 billion worth of tax cuts. Here is a famous Governor from my State, a Democrat, who said something many years ago that we should refer to. He said, "Let's look at the record." So we look at the record to see exactly where the so-called tax cuts go. We will find they do not go to the wealthy people. Indeed, 70 percent, \$171.46 billion, 70 percent, goes to family relief. I hear all of this jargon and all this talking and all the crocodile tears about "we care about families." Well, we do. We really do. And that is what this tax package puts forth, \$171.46 billion in tax relief for the working middle-class families of America.

And indeed, the child tax credit, if you are talking about one person, it is phased out at \$70,000; a couple it is phased out at \$110,000. So we are talking about giving relief for families under \$100,000. Most of them, the bulk of them, fall in this \$50,000 to \$70,000,

\$45,000 to \$70,000 area. They are not wealthy people. So 70 percent—and let me give you a breakdown.

When we talk about the child tax credit, that means if you have a child you will get back \$500 in taxes that you would otherwise pay. A family of three, \$1,500. That is pretty good. Families earning \$45,000 a year, that means they can keep \$1,500 that they can invest, that they can spend, that they can save. They will make a determination, not some bureaucrat down in Washington. I like that. That is \$147 billion of the total of \$245 billion that just goes to families who have children.

Mr. President, I heard a lot of talk about the marriage penalty. I daresay, many people will say, what are you talking about, a marriage penalty? Under the Tax Code, if a couple gets married, they can have the same incomes, they join, and they wind up paying more than if they lived separate and apart or lived together and were not married. It is called a marriage penalty.

We are talking about trying to bring American families together, helping families. Government cannot do it by way of stepping in itself. But it can relieve some of the inequities, some of the burdens. They can say, if you have children, you are to get \$500; if you are going to get married, we are not going to penalize you for getting married. We begin to phase it out. That is a small step. That is \$8 billion worth of relief.

Let me ask you, Mr. President, is a child tax credit for the wealthy or is it really going to most working middle-class families? Is phasing out the marriage penalty for the wealthy or is it going to working middle-class families who are being penalized for doing, I guess, that which we want to encourage—people getting married—as opposed to people living together who do not get married paying less taxes? We penalize people for getting married? There was this—ever since I was a kid I heard politicians talking about doing away with this, phasing it out. Here we start to do it. That is \$8 billion.

We talk about the homeless and we talk about abandoned children and we talk about those who need help. And almost \$2 billion, \$1.9 billion, in this family package—you know, you hear "family friendly"—this is a tax-friendly package. It is a tax-friendly package for families. And \$2 billion is to be provided for those families who want to adopt children. It seems to me we have had so much in the way of discourse and disagreement as it relates to children, those who are unwanted. And here we provide an opportunity for those families who are willing to take in children, to make it possible for them to pay the cost that otherwise, in many cases, would keep poor families and working middle-class families from adopting a youngster who would have no home, who would be in foster care, who would be a charge of the State. That is \$2 billion.

I do not hear anybody—Mr. President, why do you not tell the American people? Do you support giving credits for families who are going to adopt children or are you opposed to it? Are you opposed to a \$500 tax credit for children for working families? Are you for it or against it? Do you want to keep the marriage penalty in place? Are you for it or against it? Is that for the wealthy families or is that for middle-class Americans?

Student loans: We provide \$1 billion to help. I would like to see it more. And maybe if we got to compromise and sat down with the President, began the work, we would find some more money for students. Mr. President, \$1 billion.

Tax deductions for elderly parents living with their children: Do we want to see elderly parents placed as charges of the State who are poor or do we want to provide some incentive for youngsters to keep their elderly parents in their homes? That is almost \$1 billion.

We add that up, it is almost \$160 billion, Mr. President. Now, let me tell you, I said \$171 billion. And 70 percent of all the taxes go to families. I am a little bit short, \$11.8 billion short.

IRA's, individual retirement account: One of the things we do is we say, for those spouses who are taking care of children, who are taking care of the home, should they not be entitled to an IRA and not be able to put \$2,000 aside for their retirement for the days when they become elderly? Is that something that is used by the wealthy or is it something that will be used by working middle-class families? The vast bulk of that will be working-class families. So \$11.8 billion in individual retirement accounts is made available.

So, Mr. President, we come up to \$171.46 billion, and 70 percent of the so-called tax cut for the wealthy goes to families. If you make more than \$110,000, you do not qualify for most of that or any of that. Where does the balance go? Let me talk to you about some of the balance.

Long-term care insurance: a deduction. All right. Should people be permitted to go out and buy insurance for their long-term care if they have a catastrophe or do you want them to be Government charges? We provide \$5.7 billion. A 50 percent deduction for small business insurance, \$1 billion. That is \$6.7 billion. Small business being able to deduct expenses for purchases of equipment, \$3 billion.

Mr. President, I submit to you that when President Clinton says that we are cutting programs to advantage the wealthy, that is just not true. It is disingenuous. And I would debate with the President any time on the business of whether or not we should have a tax cut that is going to help create jobs, because let me tell you something, I think we do need that.

I think we need a capital gains tax cut. And we do provide for that, and it does and will help creativity, job expansion, capital formation. It will

bring about more in the way of jobs and more in the way of revenue. And, indeed, as Al Smith said, "Let's look at the record." It was John F. Kennedy who brought in a capital gains tax cut that produced revenue. Somehow our colleagues like to forget that. If you give business the opportunity to expand, reward people for investment, they will do exactly that, you will get more economic activity, you will get more jobs, you will get more growth.

So, Mr. President, with any reasonable calculations, more than 80 percent of tax cuts that we have provided will go to individuals earning less than \$100,000, and those tax breaks that go for capital gains tax cuts, I submit to you, in the fullness of time, will advantage more working people, more middle-class people, more poor people than bigger spending, than larger deficits.

I think that President Clinton has an obligation to sign the balanced budget act into law and stop playing political games with the economic well-being of our country, and that is exactly what he is doing. He will be taking a poll in about 2 hours, and his pollster will come in and tell him whether or not he is gaining on extending this politically. If they say he continues to gain, he is going to draw this out. At some point in time the people are going to really make it known they are holding him responsible, too, and maybe then he will begin to bargain in good faith.

I think that is a heck of a way to run Government or make policy. I submit to you that is exactly what is taking place. The American people want us to balance the budget, and what this continuing resolution says is we will give you until December 5 to do exactly that.

Listen to the great commitment it has. It is a commitment that anybody should be willing to sign off on. It continues Government basically at the same spending levels. Oh, you can make an argument that there is a little percent here or there that is out of whack, but it continues the essential programs that people want and need. Then it says in section 301(a):

The President and the Congress shall enact legislation in the 104th Congress to achieve a unified balanced budget no later than the fiscal year 2002 as scored by the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office.

Putting aside the legalese, that means the President would be committed, he will be making a commitment that he is going to work for a balanced budget over the next 7 years. That is the basis on which we go forward. We do not say it is our numbers, our programs, he has to agree with all our tax cuts and tax programs. But we do say we have to have an honest method of accounting, not pie in the sky.

By the way, I have been here when I have seen pie in the sky. I have been here when Dave Stockman cooked the books and projected economic growth that was unrealistic and interest rates that could absolutely not be achieved. If you want to balance the budget, pre-

dict a 4-percent economic growth when, indeed, it is 2.3. That will bring you in tens and tens of billions of dollars of extra revenue. Therefore you say, "I balanced the budget."

You predict the interest rates are going to be lower and you predict billions of dollars. That is why we insist we use an honest scorekeeper, not your scorekeeper or mine—an honest one. If, when the President took office, he said he was going to use the Congressional Budget Office to be that official scorekeeper, what is wrong today? What has changed? Promises made, promises broken. The President says, "When I'm elected, I'm going to cut middle-class taxes." He raised them. Then he had to say, "I made a mistake."

Did he make a mistake when he said we will use the Congressional Budget Office as the official scorekeeper to determine whether or not we are really going to have a balanced budget? What did he mean and when did he mean it? Was he just kidding us when he made that promise to the American people, when he came before and addressed the Congress and said, "We are going to use the CBO"? Was he kidding then and is he serious now, or is he kidding now and was he serious then? Is he jockeying for partisan political advantage, and I fear he is? I think the American people know that.

The American people are not exactly throwing bouquets at us, because I think we have done a poor job in explaining what we are trying to do here. I really do. Whether or not I got off the back of the plane, the beginning of the plane, the side of the plane, they would not even let me on the plane. So what? And let me tell you, I went on a different plane and they did not even want me to go on that plane. They did everything they could to keep me from going. And that is a fact. That is a fact.

You want to talk about partisanship, well, let us put the partisanship away. Let us do the business of the people. I want to tell you something, if this goes on much longer—the American people are fed up. They want a balanced budget, they want us to cut taxes, they want us to give future generations the economic opportunity that they are entitled to. They expect us to make the tough decisions, and if we continue this nonsense, they are going to say "a plague on both your houses," and they will be right. That means we have to stand tall and call them the way we see them, and we also have to be open and ready to deal with the President, but to deal with him honestly, and he has to deal with us honestly and not the political sloganeering.

So, Mr. President, I support the commitment to go forward, to extend, yes, and to continue spending for a limited period of time basically at the same rate for the next 2 weeks provided that the President says he agrees he is committed to balancing the budget using real numbers, using the Congressional Budget Office as the real referees, not my favorite guy or his favorite guy,

not someone who is going to cook the books to disadvantage one side as opposed to the other, but an honest scorekeeper. The American people are entitled to that.

I ask the President of the United States, "You tell us why you have changed your mind now, why you want a new referee, your referee to call the game your way? Are you really serious about doing the business of the people and bringing in that impartial referee and getting down to doing the business of the people?" That is what they expect.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I want to commend the Senator from New York for his comments. They are right on. I think he hits the nail right on the head. This is about the future of our children. This is about balancing the budget.

I am glad as a member of the Finance Committee he took on all these assertions to talk about tax cuts for the rich. The Senator from New York is right. These are tax cuts for middle-income families.

The only thing that would not be targeted for tax cuts for middle-income families would be capital gains. The Senator from New York correctly said capital gains reductions are job-creating engines that employ middle-income families. So whether you are giving them a tax break or you are giving them an opportunity to get a job, it is targeted toward families of middle income.

We, obviously, do not do a very good job getting our message out. I keep hearing over and over again—I talk to folks from Pennsylvania who are in the Capitol, I talk to them as they call into my office, whatever the case may be. I explain to them what we do, what we are trying to accomplish here, and they say, "Why doesn't anybody report that?" Well, talk to the national media why they do not report what is in this bill.

The reason we are so passionate about sticking up for a balanced budget over the next 7 years and the reason we care so much about what we are doing here and why we invested all this time in putting this bill together is because we honestly believe that when we pass this into law, the American public will approve in overwhelming numbers what we do. If we thought this was bad policy, I can guarantee no one would be standing here taking on every sacred cow in Washington, DC.

It is amazing to me some suggest this is being done on our side for partisan political advantage. Let me assure you—and if you do not believe me, look at the poll—let me assure you, there is little partisan political advantage in trying to reform Medicare, in trying to reform Medicaid, in trying to make decisions on education. There is no partisan advantage here.

The advantage is it is the right thing for America, for our children, and for our future. This has nothing to do with politics. It has everything to do about the future of this country. It has everything to do about deeply held, passionate policy beliefs about what direction this country should take.

That is what we are debating here. I know this is all sort of seen from the outside as sort of a squabble between the President and Congress and Republicans and Democrats. I assure you that this is not partisan politics. This is a fundamental difference of opinion about what is right for America. We believe what is right for America, which is in the continuing resolution, is a balanced budget—not talking about it, not saying we like it, not saying that, gee, we would like to get there some day, but doing it. Doing it for our children.

I look up in the galleries and walk around here, and there are students around all the time. Sometimes I have to look down. I do not know how Members around here who keep voting for more and more spending, more deficits, more and more passing the buck to future generations, can stare at a kid today and say, "You pay the bill. I get the votes, you pay the bill." That is what is going on. It has been going on here on both sides of the aisle for 25 years. We are trying to say today: Enough. Enough. Let us do the right thing.

This is not hard, Mr. President. Balance the budget using real economic assumptions. How hard is this? You said you wanted to do it. Everything in this resolution, you have made public statements saying you want to do. You want to balance the budget in 7 years. You said that.

Now, I know promises do not mean as much down at the White House as they do up here. See, we believe our promises should be kept. Those of us who ran—and Senator ABRAHAM was here and the Presiding Officer, Senator THOMPSON, ran in 1994—made a promise. We said we were going to come to Washington and change this town, and we were going to, first, balance the budget. We happen to believe promises are made to be kept, not just to get elected. There is a difference here. My dad always told me you do not make promises to get what you want and then go do what you want. You make promises and you give your word. Remember when a handshake used to mean a contract in this country? You gave your word and that meant everything. We did not need all these lawyers filling out all these forms. You gave your word.

There was a day when people listened to a politician who gave them their word, and they actually believed them. Think about that. You watched him give a speech, and you actually believed what they were saying was actually what they were going to do. Nobody believes that anymore. No wonder we have politicians here and politi-

cians down at the White House who just say whatever the polls tell them to say today. No wonder people are sick and tired of this place. No wonder they have no faith in our institutions. Promises do not mean anything.

I think promises do mean something. You ask me why we are stuck in cement over here or standing firm. Because promises mean something. We are going to stand firm. We are going to get a balanced budget. We will get a balanced budget over the next 7 years. We will. I do not know how long it will take, but we will because it is the right thing to do. It is the right thing to do.

The plan we put together, while I agree with it and I think it is an excellent plan, is not everything I want to do. We have a few things on the agriculture side we are not particularly crazy about. Would I do it differently? Absolutely, I would. But we did the best we could. Now, is all that stuff negotiable with the President? Of course, it is.

Mr. GREGG. If the Senator will yield for a question on that point, I was just listening to the President speak.

Mr. SANTORUM. I am sorry I missed it.

Mr. GREGG. He said—and maybe he does not understand this. He said that in order to sign this continuing resolution, "I would have to sign on to the Republican budget."

Now, as I understand this continuing, all it says is that he must agree, or should agree, to join with the Congress in promoting a proposal that reaches balance by 2002, the practical effect of that being he can put forward his proposal and we can put ours forward, and we can reach an agreement.

Is he right, or is my understanding of this right?

Mr. SANTORUM. Some might find this hard to believe, but the President is not being forthcoming in this issue. I know you find it incredible that he is not owning up to the facts.

I asked the chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI, that question earlier. By voting for or signing on to the Republican balanced budget plan, the specifics—the tax cuts, the reductions in the growth of Medicare, the changes in Medicare—does all that then come with signing this? He said, "No, it does not." It says two things. I will read you this. And remember, those of you listening, the President of the United States just said—would you repeat exactly what he said, or paraphrase it?

Mr. GREGG. Without your yielding to the floor—

Mr. SANTORUM. I yield for a question.

Mr. GREGG. He said that to sign this continuing resolution would mean that he would have to commit to the Republican budget proposal.

Mr. SANTORUM. Let me read what this continuing resolution says. Do you want to know who is telling the truth, what promises mean?

Section 301: The President and the Congress shall enact legislation in the 104th Con-

gress to achieve a unified balanced budget not later than the fiscal year 2002 as scored by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office.

The unified budget in subsection (a), shall be based on the most current economic and technical assumptions made by the Congressional Budget Office.

That is all it says.

Mr. GREGG. If the Senator will yield for another question.

Mr. SANTORUM. Yes.

Mr. GREGG. Therefore, when the President cited that to sign this continuing resolution, he would have to sign on to the Republican budget, he was wrong. What he should have said was, to sign this continuing resolution means I have to commit to a balanced budget by the year 2002, under any terms I want. That would have been his reason for rejecting this.

Mr. SANTORUM. That would be the only reason you would reject this.

Mr. GREGG. I will ask another question. Earlier today, I heard the Chief of Staff, who used to be the head of the OMB and the Budget Committee in the House, state that the reason they oppose this continuing resolution was because it meant massive cuts in the Medicare Program.

Now, it is my understanding—and I wish the Senator would clarify this for me—first, that this budget resolution deals with discretionary spending, am I not correct? And it deals with Medicare entitlement spending, and this continuing resolution has no impact of any nature on any Medicare spending that is presently occurring, because Medicare spending is an entitlement program, is that correct?

Mr. SANTORUM. The Senator from New Hampshire is exactly correct. To explain, a continuing resolution needs to be passed because we have not gotten it enacted here in the Congress or signed by the President. Discretionary spending—that means spending that is not mandatory, which we have to spend. These are programs that we have to appropriate money for every year. If we do not appropriate that money by October 1, we then have to pass a resolution to continue spending, because if we do not, no spending is permitted. That is on discretionary programs.

Medicare is not a discretionary program. Medicare is a mandatory program. That means the money is spent, whether we have a budget or not. And so when someone says that they will be signing off on reductions in Medicare by signing a continuing resolution, a spending bill, they either fundamentally misunderstand how Government works in this town—and I know the former chairman of the Budget Committee understands how the budget works—or there was a deliberate attempt to mislead and, I would go further, to scare seniors.

There is nothing here—I will read the operative part one more time:

The President and the Congress shall enact legislation in the 104th Congress to achieve a unified balanced budget not later than the

year 2002, as scored by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office.

Enact legislation. It does not say enact Senate bill such and such, or enact the Republican reconciliation or budget bill. It has enact legislation. Very broad. It does not nail anybody down to anything.

Mr. GREGG. May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. SANTORUM. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. GREGG. If I am to understand this correctly, when the Chief of Staff of the President comes out on the portico of the White House and says to the national press, "The reason we oppose this continuing is because it means cuts in Medicare," he either, one, does not understand how the continuing resolution works—which would be difficult to believe in light of his history as head of OMB and head of the Budget Committee—or alternatively, he is continuing this rather jingoistic theme of trying to scare seniors without substance, which appears to be the policy of this White House relative to this budget process, is that correct?

Mr. SANTORUM. I think the Senator from New Hampshire is correct. I finished last night reading Harry Truman's biography written by David McCullough. Every time I look at the current occupants of the White House and see them get up there and say these kinds of things and deliberately mislead to scare people—this is not enlightening. This is fear. This is just misleading people for fear.

This is from the White House. There are people all over the world who look on the White House as a center of freedom, as sort of this ground that democracy first took hold.

Here we are—have we reached that, have we really reached that low in this country that we cannot sit and have an honest discussion? Do you know what this continuing resolution asks for? An honest discussion. An honest discussion. That is all this is.

A balanced budget in 7 years, sit down and negotiate, using real numbers—not trumped-up numbers, not numbers that wish away problems, but real numbers. An honest discussion.

We have a President who will not even agree to an honest discussion on things he says he wants. We have a President who says he wants to balance the budget. We balance the budget. We want it balanced. We have a President that says he wants to end welfare as we know it. In the budget bill that we have, we end welfare as we know it—frankly, pretty close to what the President had suggested.

We have a lot of things in there that the President actually proposed himself. We really did reach out. I think we—as we did in the Senate bill—got 87 votes on the Senate floor for the welfare reform bill. I think we can get that many for this. We save the Medicare system, which, according to his trustees, his office, is going to go bankrupt in 6 years, 7 years.

He even suggested change. Sure, we can negotiate how much, what to do, but we both agree it has to be brought up. He wanted a middle-income tax cut for families. We provide it. You heard the Senator from New York, a middle-income tax cut for families.

If we were talking massive buildup in defense, huge tax cuts on the wealthy, slashing a bunch of programs, if we were miles apart on this thing, then I think we could have sort of the logjam we are in now. We would be miles apart. Folks, we are not miles apart.

For those who see this as sort of the reason we tried to get elected here, to try to bring this fiscal sanity to Washington and to see that the sides on this issue are so close, yet if you listen to the national media you would think that he is in California and we are in Maine and we are not even talking the same language.

But we are not that far apart. That is the frustrating thing. Not only are we not that far apart, but we are willing to negotiate to come closer.

I know the polls are bad. As I said before, we took on sacred cows. When you take on sacred cows, you have someone standing up at the House—at the White House—out there using that position to scare people, using the Presidency of the United States to scare 81-year-old people. Boy, the power of the White House, the bully pulpit. The moral compass for the world. We are now out to scare people who rely on Social Security and Medicare to make ends meet.

Mr. President, I want to turn now briefly to the Hollings amendment.

I know he has offered this amendment, and I know he sincerely feels very strongly about this.

I find it absolutely incredible for the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from North Dakota, who was just on the floor every day talking about how the Social Security are being used to "balance the budget."

No. 1, I do not know how you can stand here and talk about, through an accounting measure, the Social Security trust funds are being used when in fact nobody is taking the money out and using it. In fact, that money that is in the Social Security surplus, the trust fund, is being invested in Government bonds and earning interest, right now. And at the same time, right now, the President of the United States is raiding—raiding—the pension funds of Federal employees—raiding them. Not using them for accounting purposes to balance the budget, but literally reaching in there, taking the money out to pay for debt service—raiding the money. Not paying interest, taking the money, physically taking the money.

Now, I have heard a lot of demagoguery around here, but when you say we are in the right because we are not going to use the Social Security trust fund for accounting purposes to determine whether we have a balanced budget or not, that is one thing; but when you have your President at the same

time you are making that argument literally raiding trust funds, raiding pension funds—it is like a CEO who is running a corporation and the bank will not lend him any more money. What does he do? He raids the pension fund. Do you know what happens to CEO's where banks will not lend them any more money and that CEO goes into the pension fund and raids the pension fund? They go to jail. They go to jail. We do not raid pension funds in this country. We have a Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation set up so they do not raid pension funds. Now we have all this whining and gnashing of teeth about using accounting measures to determine whether we balanced the budget on Social Security. And the President is raiding pension funds.

Where are the protestations? Where are the people grieving for the Federal employees who are having their pension funds raided? Where is the other side saying, "Oh, the President should not be doing this."

Mr. HOLLINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SANTORUM. Wait until I am done.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I protested.

Mr. SANTORUM. You had a chance to vote on that. Senator MOYNIHAN offered an amendment to the debt limit, and in the debt limit we had a provision in there saying we could not do that. We had a provision in there saying you could not raid pension funds to keep the debt going.

Guess what? No protestations over there. They voted to strip it out. And the President vetoed it.

Oh, yes, you can protest. Put the votes down. Put the votes down. Where are the protestations? Raiding pension funds, that is what we are doing.

Let me just summarize it. We have a President, a Chief of Staff of the White House, at the White House today, at the United States of America's White House, out there scaring seniors; at the same time, raiding seniors' pension funds, who are Federal employees. Do you know what they are telling them? Do you know what they are trying to do? "Please trust us, we know what we are doing. Please trust us, we know how to balance this budget. We are protecting you."

Give me a break. Come to the table. Let us work this out. This is an embarrassment. The more this goes on the more embarrassing it is going to get. You are not solving problems, Mr. President. It is time to be President, not to run for President. It is time to be President. It is time to solve problems.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SANTORUM. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. DOMENICI. I wonder if we could get a unanimous consent and have a vote on this particular amendment. I do not know how much longer you would like to speak, but Senator MURRAY would like to speak for 6 minutes.

Then we will vote on the Hollings amendment on a motion to table.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator MURRAY be granted 6 minutes and Senator SANTORUM 6 minutes, after which we proceed to a rollcall vote on a table. I ask it be in order at this point to ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BUMPERS. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. DOMENICI. Senator, I thought I had gone over and talked to the leader and I thought when I came to the floor, it had been agreed.

Senator MURRAY was the only one on your side that would speak before we voted on this, or I would not have imposed that. We have been on this for a long time. Your side has a lot of time.

How much time would you want? We have another amendment from your side, too, shortly, right now, on this issue. How much time would you need?

Mr. BUMPERS. Senator, I know you want to get this amendment disposed of. I do not want to be an impediment to it. I will take 8 minutes and remove my objection.

Mr. DOMENICI. Can we add 8 minutes for Senator BUMPERS and then proceed with the rest of my request?

Mr. SANTORUM. Give me 3 more minutes to respond.

Mr. DOMENICI. To be equal, we will add 3 minutes to Senator SANTORUM.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask it be in order that I seek the yeas and nays on a motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. And do we have a motion to table, that the yeas and nays have been ordered on?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays will be ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Could I have it in order now, even though there is time, that I ask for the—I move to table.

I move to table and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Federal Government is now in its third day of shutdown, and just like 3 days ago, there certainly is no end in sight and it seems like we in Congress are destined to flounder for a couple of more days because the majority is insisting on debating a continuing resolution that the President has vowed he will veto.

Listening to the rhetoric of the last hour it seems to me this is more about putting somebody into somebody's face than it is about solving problems. It seems like it is more about drawing lines in the sand and calling names than it is in making sure that this country gets moving again.

I have to ask the question, why are we doing this? Why are we not putting

together a proposal that we can all agree on, that will get the Government running again, restore public services, and put people back to work?

I heard my colleague from Vermont a short time ago say it does not take 15 pages of paper with a lot of additions. It only takes one sentence to get us back to work again.

I have to remind my colleagues the American people are tired and impatient. They want solutions, not politics and rhetoric. They want to know that Government works for them. They want to feel secure and have faith in their elected officials.

Unfortunately today they are probably watching us in disbelief. They cannot believe we are unable to solve the country's problems.

That concerns me. I want to move forward. I want Congress to get its act together and balance this budget. And the longer we take to do so, the more disaffected our constituents become. We just reinforce in their minds the belief that Congress is unaware of their real needs and concerns. They look at us and they say, "How can those people really understand how difficult it is for me to pay the rent, put food on the table for my kids, or take care of my elderly parents? All they can do in DC is whine and squabble about where they sat on an airplane."

As we muse about Presidential politics and other hi-jinks, we better not forget what this Government shutdown really means. We have all heard the numbers. We know that 30,000 people a day are unable to apply for Medicare. And we know this Government shutdown is costing us \$200 million a day in lost productivity.

But the shutdown comes a little closer to home when we put human faces on those numbers. One woman, an attorney from Seattle, called my office yesterday. She is trying to adopt a child in China. For months she has been filling out paperwork and dealing with bureaucratic redtape.

She finally got her plane ticket but because the United States Consulate in China is closed, she cannot get her baby's visa. So she was forced to postpone her trip.

She has no idea when she will finally be united with her new baby daughter. She is a real person. And she is hurting because of what we are doing on this floor.

Last weekend I was in central Washington for the opening of the Yakima Valley Veterans Center. Many of the people I talked to wanted to celebrate the opening of the new center, but because of the pending Government shutdown they were too worried about whether or not they were going to receive their veterans benefits. Today's Spokesman-Review paper ran an article about a young man in Spokane, WA, who quit a stable computer-based job to take his dream job. He was going to become a physical fitness director aboard a cruise ship. The young man was offered the job unexpectedly on

November 4. He scrambled to get his paperwork taken care of and a passport in time to sail by November 25.

Unfortunately, this Government is shut down. He cannot get his passport and time is growing short.

I want to read that young man's words into the RECORD. They could not be more to the point. He said:

This is a dream in my heart that finally manifested. The Government is getting in the way of people's dreams. I've got airplane tickets. Everything is settled. Everything but this last hurdle.

These few people provide just a few examples of what a Government shutdown really means. They are angry and concerned. They have bills to pay, families to care for, business to conduct, and dreams to fulfill. Instead, we are telling them, "not now."

So, Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to act wisely. Let us move on. Let us put together an honest and reasonable continuing resolution that will get this country back on track.

My view is pretty straightforward. As a Member of the Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee I know I have a job to do. The job is to pass a budget plan and 13 appropriations bills. So far, this Congress has done neither. In fact, just yesterday the House failed to pass the Interior bill for the third time. There are five other bills that have not even made it to this floor yet.

Instead of getting our work done, we are debating a bill we know will be vetoed. It will be vetoed because it stacks the deck against working families and senior citizens in favor of unneeded tax breaks. We are not moving the process forward one bit; we are ensuring that it will go nowhere.

I say it is time to get our work done. We can balance the budget. We can stay true to our priorities. And we can do it without interrupting the lives of regular, everyday people in our States.

All we need to do is pass a clean interim spending bill and then get on with our business of finishing the overall budget.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I saw an article this morning where the Speaker of the House was asked, "What is sacred about 7 years?"

I thought that was a good question. I have been curious about that myself.

And the Speaker said, "Well, it was just intuition. All major decisions are based on intuition."

I do not like the idea of one man's intuition determining the fate of the country. His intuition may not match mine. It may not match anybody's. Frankly, I think intuition is always a fine thing, if a man is getting ready to make an investment. I think his intuition is important in a lot of ways. But when it comes to putting in concrete the time in which the Congress will have to balance the budget, I do not want anybody's intuition. I would like to see some hard figures.

In this particular case, this amendment deals with Social Security. Everybody says we are going to balance the budget by the year 2002. If everything went swimmingly, according to every projection, we would still, in the year 2002, have used \$650 billion in Social Security trust funds.

I am not quarreling with that. The Republicans can come back and say, "You did it. This President has done it."

That is all well and true. But it still means there is \$650 billion that was used that has to be paid back, just as certainly as the national debt has to be paid back.

I think I have to say the tax cut in this bill is the most repugnant part of it. What in the name of all that is good and holy are we doing cutting taxes \$245 billion in the name of deficit reduction? We tried that in 1981.

The Washington Post editorial this morning, which has been cited a number of times here today as though it came right out of the Holy Bible, talks about how the Democrats have been demagoging the Medicare issue, and that Medicare really is in trouble, and that the cost of Medicare continues to go up. That is true. I do not quarrel with the idea that the Medicare system is in considerable trouble and needs to be fixed. I think \$270 billion in cuts out of Medicare over the next 7 years is unacceptable.

The thing I find most unacceptable about it is that it is being used to provide a \$245 billion tax cut. And for whom? The wealthiest people in America who have not asked for it. But the people who really need it do not get it.

A Post editorial this morning obliquely suggested that the addition of \$3 trillion worth of debt during Ronald Reagan and George Bush Presidencies was somehow or other Congress' fault, with no mention of the fact that neither one of them could ever find their veto pen when they were in the President's office. President Reagan never vetoed one single spending bill, Mr. President—not one. All he did was send out millions of letters saying, you know, "I cannot spend a dime that Congress does not appropriate." Congress cannot appropriate anything unless they have 67 votes to overcome his veto. But he looked through his desk drawer time and again and could never find his veto pen.

The U.S. Government now owes four times as much money as it did when he took office. It took 200 years to get to \$1 trillion. It took 12 years to get to \$4 trillion. The Nobel award-winning economist at MIT said it was the most irresponsible economic policy in the history of the world.

On that tax cut, Mr. President, I made this point yesterday, but I am going to make it every day that I can get the floor. You hear this unctuous, solemn business about the tax credit for our children. There are 5 million households in this country that have 11 million children in them. With those 11

million children and those 5 million households, the parents—not the children—will get a partial or full \$500 tax credit. There are 8 million households in this country with 11 million children that will not get one single thin dime.

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

Mr. BUMPERS. You bet.

Mr. SANTORUM. Why would 8 million households not get it?

Mr. BUMPERS. Because they have not paid income tax.

Mr. SANTORUM. Thank you.

Mr. BUMPERS. A family with a man and a wife and three children making \$25,000 a year do not pay any income tax. A man and wife with three children making \$100,000 will pay \$10,000 to \$20,000. They get the full \$1,500 refund. The people who need it, the man and wife with three children making \$25,000 a year, do not get one red cent.

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

Mr. BUMPERS. Yes.

Mr. SANTORUM. Does a family of three making \$100,000 a year qualify for the EITC?

Mr. BUMPERS. Do they qualify for what?

Mr. SANTORUM. Does a family of three earning \$100,000 qualify for the earned income tax credit?

Mr. BUMPERS. Certainly. I hope so.

Mr. SANTORUM. Does a family making \$320,000 a year qualify?

Mr. BUMPERS. They used to qualify for it. I do not know whether they are going to or not. That is another \$32 billion.

We are not just depriving people of an education. We are not just depriving people of school lunches. We are not just putting another million children in poverty under the welfare bill. We are not just savaging the Medicaid Program for the poorest children in America to have health care. We are also savaging a program that even Ronald Reagan said was the best thing that was ever invented to keep people off welfare. We said "no." No. If you are working for \$4.25 an hour and trying to keep body and soul together and stay off welfare, in the past we have said, if you will stay off welfare, we will give you a couple of grand at the end of the year. We are savaging that program.

Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania on one thing. I do not like taking pension funds. Do you know why we are taking pension funds? Because the Senator from Pennsylvania will not send a debt ceiling to the President that simply said we spent the money, let us pay for it. No. You want to put habeas corpus and regulatory reform on the debt ceiling, of all things. Of course the President vetoed it. I would never have voted for him again if he had not.

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

Mr. SANTORUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, just by way of quickly responding to the

earned income tax credit under the conference report that will be coming out, no one, with the exception of families who have no children, no family that has children will get less money under it than they would have gotten under current law. No family will get less money under the earned income tax credit next year than they would have under current law. Some will get more because some qualify also for the tax credit for children. That is in the bill.

So do not talk about slashing the EITC, [the earned income tax credit], for working families. We do not. In fact, the increase that is projected that is in law under the President's 1993 Budget Act—those people at least get that much, and some will get more. Particularly families who are in the \$15,000 to \$20,000 to \$25,000 range will actually get more because some of them actually do pay taxes.

I will be happy to yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, what is the situation on time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 3 minutes 20 seconds.

Mr. THOMAS. The other side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No time.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, it would be interesting, would not it, to look in on this recent conversation, this recent debate if you came from somewhere and you knew nothing about the background of what was going on here? I suppose you would say, "Gosh. What is this all about? What is the issue here?" We are talking about all kinds of things. We are talking about Medicare, slashing Medicare, when in fact it does not slash Medicare. We are talking about raising premiums on Medicare when in fact it does not raise premiums at all. They stay where they are.

You would say, "Gosh. What is happening? What is this?" You would hear this morning the Senator from Nebraska saying this resolution is ridiculous. It deals with balancing the budget. I think you would go on to say there are some principles. What is ridiculous about a principle of balancing a budget that this body has not balanced for 30 years?

It would be interesting to sort of sum up the years that the opposition on that side of the aisle has been in this place and never has balanced a budget. They talked about it. They say now we are for a balanced budget. For 30 years they have not balanced the budget.

You would say, "Gosh. What is going on here?" Everyone who has risen has said, "I am for balancing the budget." And it has not happened. I guess they would say, "What is wrong?" People who ran in the last election particularly said we have a priority to balance the budget. That is what we are talking about doing here.

I guess you might also be surprised at how difficult it would be if you were a newcomer looking at it, and saying, "Gosh. What should be so difficult about balancing the budget?" You do it in your family, and I do it in my family. You do it in my business because you have to. Do you do it in government? Is that not financially and fiscally responsible as we move into a new century? Is it not responsible to balance the budget rather than continuing to charge it to your children and your grandchildren? Is that what it is about? If that is the issue, why are we talking about all of these other things?

A balanced budget is not extraneous. Someone rose this morning and said, "Oh, gosh. This continuing resolution has extraneous materials on it." Balancing the budget is, after all, the key issue. All we are asking is that the President certify that in 7 years he will join us in balancing the budget, and use the Congressional Budget Office numbers that the President Message said in his State of the Union Message we all needed to use so we all work in the same place. It is not a new idea.

The minority leader, who a short while ago objected to the idea of CBO, stood up not 2 weeks ago and said we all will do whatever accommodation to use CBO numbers.

So I think you would say, gosh, what is it? You would probably soon recognize that part of it is philosophical. There is a difference in view. There is a legitimate view among liberals that we ought to have more Government and more spending. That is a legitimate view. I do not share it. I do not think the majority of people here share it. Nevertheless, there is a populace view that is there.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SNOWE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 578 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Abraham	Frist	McCain
Ashcroft	Gorton	McConnell
Bennett	Gramm	Murkowski
Bond	Grams	Nickles
Brown	Grassley	Pressler
Burns	Gregg	Roth
Campbell	Hatch	Santorum
Chafee	Hatfield	Shelby
Coats	Helms	Simpson
Cochran	Hutchison	Smith
Cohen	Inhofe	Snowe
Coverdell	Jeffords	Specter
Craig	Kassebaum	Stevens
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Thomas
DeWine	Kyl	Thompson
Dole	Lott	Thurmond
Domenici	Lugar	Warner
Faircloth	Mack	

NAYS—46

Akaka	Feinstein	Lieberman
Baucus	Ford	Mikulski
Biden	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Graham	Moynihhan
Boxer	Harkin	Murray
Bradley	Heflin	Nunn
Breaux	Hollings	Pell
Bryan	Inouye	Pryor
Bumpers	Johnston	Reid
Byrd	Kennedy	Robb
Conrad	Kerrey	Rockefeller
Daschle	Kerry	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kohl	Simon
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Exon	Leahy	
Feingold	Levin	

So the motion to table the amendment (No. 3056) was agreed to.

Mr. GRAMM. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. LOTT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. THURMOND. Order in the Senate, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chamber will be in order. May we have order in the Chamber, please?

The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. THURMOND. Madam President, life does not often provide second chances, but the Congress is giving President Clinton just that. With this continuing resolution, we are providing the opportunity for him to right the terrible wrong committed by vetoing the previous continuing resolution and shutting down the Government. This resolution will allow the U.S. Government to reopen and remain open while Congress and the President resolve outstanding issues on the remaining appropriations bills and the Balanced Budget Act.

As a Presidential candidate, and early in his Presidency, President Clinton told the American people that he wanted to balance the budget. Here is his chance to fulfill that pledge, since he has failed to send a balanced budget plan to Congress. President Clinton said he wanted to use Congressional Budget Office numbers. Here is his chance to commit to that. President Clinton recently stated that he raised taxes too much. The Congress will give him a chance to correct that mistake and fulfill his pledge for a middle-class tax break.

Madam President, President Clinton's veto of the previous continuing resolution brought the Federal Government to a standstill. Here is his chance to right that wrong. President Clinton must put aside his reelection concerns and focus on his responsibility to govern. By agreeing to this continuing resolution, he can do the right thing, restore full Government services and put the hundreds of thousands of Federal workers who are facing the holidays without a paycheck back to work immediately.

Congress and the President previously approved a continuing resolution which funded the Government through November 13. The Congress

sought to extend it earlier this week, for the purpose of avoiding a shutdown of the Federal Government. We are giving President Clinton another chance to keep the Government operating and to fulfill his promise to balance the budget.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate minority leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 3057

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, subject to the majority leader's intention, as I understand it, we may set this bill aside. But given the informal agreement we had this morning, I now send the second Democratic amendment to the desk—I guess it is the third Democratic amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] proposes an amendment numbered 3057.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the first word and insert the following:

Section 106(C) of Public Law 104-31 is amended by striking "November 13, 1995" and inserting "December 22, 1995.

SEC. 2. (a) The President and the Congress shall enact legislation in the 104th Congress to achieve a unified balanced budget not later than the fiscal year 2002.

(b) The unified balanced budget in subsection (a) must assure that:

(1) Medicare and Medicaid are not cut to pay for tax breaks; and

(2) Any possible tax cuts shall go only to American families making less than \$100,000.

Mr. DASCHLE. I yield the floor.

Mr. HATFIELD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

APPROPRIATIONS BILLS

Mr. HATFIELD. Madam President, I would just like to give the body a brief report on the process of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and where our bills are at the moment.

I would like to, first of all, indicate that the Senate Appropriations Committee reported all 13 bills to the floor by September 27. The Senate has acted upon 12 of those 13 bills. I, first of all, say they were reported by September 15, and we acted upon 12 of the 13 in the body by September 27. Right at the moment, four of those bills have been signed into law by the President. We have concluded the conference on three more, and we expect to conclude our conference on VA-HUD and the District of Columbia within either hours or within the next day or two.

So we can say that that is the movement.