

SUSSEX COUNTY, DE: NO. 1 IN COUNTRY

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I am very proud to come to the Senate floor today to announce that the 1992 Census of Agriculture has named Sussex County, the southern most county in the beautiful State of Delaware, as the No. 1 poultry producing county in the United States. As my hometown newspaper, the Wilmington News Journal, so eloquently stated it: "Sussex County still rules the roost as the chicken-growin'est county in the nation."

Of course, being the No. 1 producer is nothing new for Sussex County—the county has officially remained the No. 1 producer since 1982. In fact, Sussex County has been the unofficial leading poultry producer since the industry got its start in Ocean View, DE, in 1923.

It all started with Mrs. Wilmer Steele when she placed an order for 50 chicks, intended for egg production, and ended up with 500. She decided to raise rather than return the extra chicks, and when they were big enough she sold approximately 400 of them to a local buyer. Three years later, she and her husband were raising 25,000 young chickens and selling them to the local population who were discovering the versatility of chicken meat. America is eating about 10 times as much chicken today as we were in 1925, numbers attributable to the fact that chicken is high in protein, low in fat, tasty, and very affordable.

Mr. President, we are doing everything we can in Delaware to maintain the productivity of the poultry industry nationwide. Today there is a disease, harmless to humans but deadly for chickens, affecting the productivity of Delaware poultry industry flocks. Avian diseases such as this affect flocks across the country on a regular basis. In an effort to prevent the economic damage done by these outbreaks, the University of Delaware, in cooperation with the Federal Government and private industry, is building a poultry research facility that will help the poultry industry solve this type of disease problem.

I have worked very closely with the poultry industry people in my State to get this facility up and running. The Delmarva poultry industry has an outstanding record of commitment to research and development in avian diseases and I am hopeful that the remainder of the funds needed to finish this project can be secured this year. The growers who are responsible for keeping Sussex County and the Delmarva Peninsula in the ranks of the top producers know the importance of this facility to the national production of poultry.

Mr. President, I would like to congratulate Sussex County for, once again, achieving No. 1 producer status and for providing the American public with healthy and affordable nutrition.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, under the previous order, the period for morning business is closed.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of House Joint Resolution 1, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1) proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

The Senate resumed consideration of the joint resolution.

Pending:

Daschle motion to commit the resolution, with instructions to report back forthwith, with Daschle amendment No. 231, to require a budget plan before the amendment takes effect.

Dole amendment No. 232 (to instructions to commit), to establish that if Congress has not passed a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution by May 1, 1995, within 60 days thereafter, the President shall transmit to Congress a detailed plan to balance the budget by the year 2002.

Dole amendment No. 233 (to amendment No. 232), in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time between 9:30 a.m. and 11:30 a.m. shall be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees. The Chair recognizes the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I will manage the time on this side until the minority leader appears. I yield to myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. President, this is not an insignificant or an unimportant issue. The Senate is debating the issue of whether to change the U.S. Constitution and, if so, how to change it.

The reason we are at this point today is because the country has had fiscal policy problems of a very significant nature. We have had very significant yearly budget deficits, and we are now bearing a very large Federal debt.

And the question is: What can or should be done about that? I guess most people here would not mind very much if we had a very large Federal deficit if it resulted from our having to fight a war to protect our liberty and freedom. I do not think anyone would complain much about floating bonds and going into debt to protect this country and to protect freedom and liberty. We would understand that.

I do not suppose anybody would complain very much about a Federal deficit if we spent several hundred billion dollars that we did not have and we cured cancer just like that. It would be well worth the price. I do not imagine anyone would complain very much of having borrowed to do that.

But that is not what we are doing today. We have operating budget defi-

cits year after year after year that represent a very significant imbalance between the amount of money we take in and the amount of money needed to routinely run the Government and do the things that this Government does, including all of the transfer payments and all of the programs. And that is the problem. It is not a new problem.

I understand that in this Chamber when you look at the division of the Chamber, some will stand up and decide to boast, "Gee, we're the conservatives, we're the ones who want to help the taxpayer and save the money and save the country, and you all, you're the liberals, you're the ones who want to tax and spend."

Total baloney, total nonsense. There is not a plugged nickel's worth of difference between the appetite for spending the taxpayers' money on that side of the aisle as opposed to this side of the aisle. That side of the aisle wants to spend it on military; we want to spend it on milk for hungry kids. The fact is, you look at the record in 15 years and I guarantee you will discover not any significant difference at all in terms of the appetite about how much money the two sides want to spend. Oh, they have different priorities, no question about that. They want to spend it on different things. But they all have the appetite for spending.

But we do not have an appetite to raise the money for that which we spend. So the question is, what do we do about that? The answer is, we cannot spend that which we do not have. We have to cut back. We have to deal with that honestly. We have to make tough choices, and that is why we come to this juncture.

Tough choices are choices that often persuade Members of this body and the other body in our legislative branch to gnash their teeth and sweat profusely and wring their hands and worry and not sleep because they are tough votes, they are awful choices. People think that somebody is going to be angry, maybe I will lose my job. If that is the attitude, one ought not serve here. These are not tough choices. These are issues you look at and decide what is right for this country, what makes sense, what must we do to fix what is wrong.

Every day that I serve in this Senate, I am proud of that service, and some days I rue the fact that there are many who decide that public service is unworthy and Government somehow is corrupt and evil and bad and cast those kinds of aspersions. I am proud of my service here. I think public service is a wonderful undertaking.

Mine comes, I suppose, from a family history and background. I was reading last evening something my brother, who is a journalist, had written about my ancestors. One of them was a great-grandmother named Carolyn and a great-grandfather named Otto. They got married in Oslo, Norway, and moved to Minnesota. They had eight children. Then Otto died, and Carolyn,

living in Minnesota with eight children and a husband who just died, apparently contemplated what to do in life.

What Carolyn did was respond to something that the Federal Government did. The Federal Government said to the people, "If you are willing to move into a homestead out on the Great Plains, we will give you a quarter section of land. If you want to go out and claim it, go farm it, go live on it, we will give you a quarter section of land."

So Carolyn with all these children, a husband just died, moved to North Dakota, Cherry Butte Township, ND, and pitched a tent on the prairie with her kids. This strong Norwegian woman homesteaded a quarter section of land and built herself a house and built herself a farm, raised a family and had a son who had a son who had me. And here I am.

I think of the strength of someone like Carolyn, and all of us have these folks in our background. Tough choices? I suppose that is a tough choice, losing your husband and deciding to move to pitch a tent on the winter prairies of North Dakota with your children to try to start and build a farm and make a go of it. That is a tough choice. These are not tough choices.

When we decide that we do not have the strength and we do not have the will to do the fundamental things that are necessary to protect and preserve and nurture this country's future, then something is wrong with all of us.

So I come to the floor today to say on this question there ought not be a serious question about whether we do something about this crippling budget deficit. That question ought not be asked anymore. Anybody who is still asking that question deserves to go out the other side of that door.

The question is what and how, and that is what the amendment is about today. The amendment we are going to vote on in a couple of hours does not say we do not want to balance the budget. It does not say we should not have a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. I have voted for a constitutional amendment to balance the budget in the past. I did not come here thinking we ought to do that, but I was persuaded over the years by Republicans and Democrats, yes, conservatives and liberals, who ratcheted up year after year deficit after deficit. I have been persuaded that any additional discipline, any additional incentive that requires balance is something I would support.

But we come today to vote on a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, and the question many of us ask is, is this just one more empty promise? Because, if it is, the pail is full of those, and the American people can hardly lift it anymore. Or does this have some strength and some meat? Is this honest? Is this going to lead to a plan that actually balances the budget?

Why do we ask? We ask because those who propose this, those who say let us

change the Constitution, let us improve on the work of Washington and Madison and Franklin and Jefferson and others who contributed to the Constitution, they say: "We want to do a couple things. We recognize there is a big deficit in this country, but we want to do a couple things. One, we want to cut the income by cutting taxes and, two, we want to increase defense spending."

It is logical for those who took simple arithmetic that if you are going to increase the biggest area of public spending and decrease your revenue, one might be willing, and probably required, to ask then how are you going to get to a balanced budget? What is your plan? Or is this another empty vessel, one more broken promise? Is this just politics?

We have offered an amendment that is called the right-to-know amendment, and we are just saying that in this country, if this is not an empty promise, if this is not an empty vessel, then somebody must have a plan that says we can cut taxes and increase defense spending and by the year 2002 find a balanced budget out there.

I hope we can find a balanced budget by the year 2002, and I plan to be part of the solution to do that. I may vote for this constitutional amendment to balance the budget, but I do not understand why anyone in this Chamber would vote against this amendment called the right-to-know amendment.

One prominent Member of Congress says, "Well, if the American people understood what this means, it would make their knees buckle." Does he know something that I do not know? Does he know what the plan is? Is there a mystery plan there someplace that he is aware of that is going to make people's knees buckle? If so, I wonder if he shared it with the Presiding Officer. He has not shared it with me. I suspect he has not shared it with you.

The question is, I guess, is there a plan out there someplace? Is there a mystery plan floating around that is going to make people's knees buckle? If so, let us hear it, let us have it, let us debate it, let us discuss it.

I remember a television commercial—one of my favorites—about chicken. The television commercial was a customer that came up to the counter and wanted to know what was in these chicken nuggets. The person at the counter said, "Well, its chicken."

"Well, what kind of chicken?"

"Chicken parts," they said.

"Well, what kinds of chicken parts?"

And the person behind the counter said, "Different parts."

I wonder what is in a plan in the minds of those who propose to balance the budget, mystery meat of some type?

Could they share it with us, maybe? How do you get from here to there? Does anybody who took arithmetic understand you cannot increase your biggest area of spending, cut your revenue, and get from here to there?

I do not understand what they are telling us. So we are saying if this is more than an empty promise, let us fill it up a bit. Let us say to the American people here is what we are going to do, and here is how we are going to do it.

If we are not willing to do that, what we are saying is this is business as usual. This is not about policy. This is not about substance. This is about politics. And if this is about politics, then this is not about balancing the budget. This is not about doing what we ought to do for this country's future.

So when we discuss the document that begins with "We the People," and we decide we want to change a few words here and there, we are going to try and sort of monkey around a little bit because we have had a lot of people over a long period of years who have not had the courage to say you can only spend what you take in, when we discuss that and decide that, I wonder if we cannot begin to discuss what that would mean in practical terms for the American people.

We are going to have a task here that is pretty ominous, actually. But I for one think it is a task we must undertake.

Last evening, I was looking through this sheet, which does not mean much to anybody. It is a sheet by the Congressional Budget Office that plots out for 10 years what our spending and taxing and deficits will be. What this sheet says, to the extent that you can forecast out 10 years—it is kind of like forecasting the weather in North Dakota, a little uncertain. But what this says is at the current rate, with the current plan, we are talking about the potential of adding \$4.3 trillion to the Federal debt—\$4.3 trillion. If anybody thinks that we do not have a problem, just look at all the projections and understand we do not have any alternative. We have to deal with this. However, we cannot deal with it just as a political issue. We have to deal with it in a real way.

Now, we are going to have an amendment following this one on Social Security. I do not want five reasons that someone would vote against either the right-to-know amendment or the Social Security amendment. I would just like one decent reason, just one. There is only one reason someone would vote against a right-to-know amendment, I suppose, and that is because they have no plan and you cannot get there from here. You cannot be saying I wish to increase spending, and I want to cut revenue, and I wish to balance the budget.

So we have a right to know. The American people have a right to know. How can you know something that cannot be accomplished? I guess that is why we do not have a plan. But if this is honest, if it is real, if it is not just an empty promise, then why would someone vote against this right-to-know amendment? Why? And the next

amendment, the Social Security amendment, saying we take Social Security out of paychecks in a dedicated tax and put it in a trust fund. We say we promise, in a promise between the people who work and the people who retire in a binding contract, we promise to maintain a trust fund as a solemn obligation. We promise that it will be used for Social Security.

Why—just one reason, not five—would anyone vote against an amendment that says you cannot use Social Security trust funds, you cannot raid Social Security trust funds to balance the budget? It has not added 1 cent to the budget deficit. In fact, it is running a surplus. To the extent that we now have national savings extracted from that system, we need them when the baby boomers retire. So I am not asking for five reasons, just one decent reason someone would vote against either of these amendments.

Now, we will in the coming hours this morning continue to discuss what all of this means in terms of balancing the budget and plans and the ultimate vote on the constitutional amendment. And I would like, if I can—I know that we are in a situation where we do not have very thoughtful or very interesting debates, unfortunately. I think it would be more fun if we all talked to each other on the floor and figured out what we are doing. Is it political for you and me? Is it policy?

The Senator from Utah is here, and I have listened to him at great length, and I would like to engage in a dialog with him if we could for a couple of minutes.

We propose that if we say as a body, maybe with my vote, that we should change the Constitution, it is a big step. If we say that and we should therefore balance the budget by the year 2002, we say we have an obligation to the American people, to the State legislatures, to everyone out there to decide to give them some skeleton of a plan. Here is the way it is going to happen in 7 years.

Now, some say, well, it cannot be done in 7 years. We have a 5-year budget. Well, why not give us five-sevenths of the plan? Just give us a part of it. We will take a fraction.

I would ask the Senator, if I could, without losing my right to the floor, what prevents some in this Chamber from believing the American people have a right to know?

Mr. HATCH. That is a good question. I do not think anybody knows except for one thing. We have had over 10 plans offered by colleagues on both sides of the aisle, some together as bipartisan plans that would lead us to a balanced budget by the year 2002.

The problem is not 1 of those 10 plans has 51 votes. And we have worked on trying to come up with some way of satisfying everybody from a balanced budget standpoint for the whole 19 years I have been here, and we have not been able to do that.

Our contention is that we will never do that unless we pass the balanced

budget amendment and put a fiscal mechanism in place so that literally we can balance the budget.

I just cite to the distinguished Senator a very interesting article that appeared in the Washington Times just this morning. It is entitled "Social Security and the balanced budget."

Now, the thrust of it is to criticize those who believe that you should exclude Social Security out of the balanced budget amendment; in other words, write a statute into the balanced budget amendment. But it does make a very interesting point here. This is by David Keating.

During the Vietnam war, an American officer was quoted saying we had to destroy the village in order to save it. Now the U.S. Senate may apply similar logic when it votes on a proposal to add a huge loophole to the Balanced Budget Amendment, supposedly to save Social Security.

Mr. DORGAN. All right, I get the drift.

Mr. HATCH. But the point I wanted to make—let me just take a second here. There was a point on this—

Mr. DORGAN. But I understand the point the Senator has made, and I do not want to—

Mr. HATCH. Let me conclude with just one more sentence to answer the Senator's question.

The fact is we have never been able to do it up to now, and there is no way that we should hold the amendment hostage, assuming we pass it by a two-thirds vote and send it to the States, there is no reason why we should hold it hostage until we take another 18 years to try to get together on a balanced budget without the balanced budget amendment being in place.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I understand the point the Senator from Utah makes. It is an interesting point. The reason I ask the question is this. The Senator's party controls the Senate. We understand that. I mean I was up election night and saw the results. I did not smile as broadly as the Senator did perhaps, but the fact is that is the way the system works.

Mr. HATCH. It is all relative.

Mr. DORGAN. Republicans control the Senate. Now, when we controlled the Senate, we passed a deficit reduction bill in 1993. It was a hard bill, in many respects, to get votes for. But we rounded up votes for it and, with 51 votes, passed a bill that, the statistics now demonstrate, cut the budget deficit by somewhere around \$600 billion.

We did not even get one accidental vote on the other side of the aisle. You think somebody would just make a mistake over there. But I tell you, it took every single vote that we could muster on this side of the aisle to do what was necessary. This is heavy lifting. The political vote, the easy vote is to vote "no" and walk away. But we did not. We did it. We voted to cut the deficit in a significant way, and I went home and took a lot of heat, and I was proud to stand up and say I am not part of the problem, I am part of the

solution. Even if it is controversial, even if some of you do not like it, I am going to cast my vote to try to fix what is wrong in this country.

The reason I make that point is this. You say that, well, you know, the reason we are not able to give you a plan is we do not think there is a plan out there that can get 51 votes.

Look, part of the responsibility of leadership when you run this Chamber is to come up with those votes—and I may join you on those votes. But at the very least, especially because of recent experience we have had where we could not even get one vote on that side of the aisle to do the heavy lifting, I think in this circumstance when you say let us change the Constitution, then you have a special obligation to provide the leadership to get the votes for a plan to say to the American people, here is what we stand for. It is not just words to change what Ben Franklin and Madison and others did. It is not just words. Here is what we stand for. Here is our plan. And here is what we are willing to vote for.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield on that?

Mr. DORGAN. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. HATCH. I respect the Senator and his Democratic colleagues for standing up and doing what they thought was right. We did not think it was right because we did not want to increase the taxes the way they did—or you did, the highest tax increase in history.

Mr. FORD. No, no.

Mr. HATCH. I know there are those who want to say the dollar is worth less and, therefore, Reagan's was the highest—therefore, they are both high. Both occurred because of people who felt the same way as people who voted last time.

But under the Daschle amendment, what it would do is it would hold things up. This is the one time in history where we have a chance of passing a balanced budget amendment, sending it to the States, letting the States make the determination whether they are going to ratify it, three-quarters of them, or 38 States, and make it part of the Constitution.

The Daschle amendment would basically hold that up until we come up with a balanced budget approach that passes 535 Members of Congress.

Mr. FORD. No.

Mr. HATCH. We think that is not the way to go. We believe we have to pass the balanced budget amendment, get it out to the States, and I assure my colleague, Republicans and Democrats will get together and we will have to come up with that glidepath in the year 2002. I think we will have to get a majority of both Houses to do it. That is the only way we are going to get there.

And my point about the last 19 years is that we have never been able to do it

in that time. I want to have the mechanism, the procedural route by which we can get there.

Mr. DORGAN. I understand that and I appreciate the point the Senator is making. I understand that is why they are likely to defeat this right-to-know amendment—which is a terrible mistake, incidentally, because the question of whether this is a real promise or a broken promise is really a judgment by the American people about: Is this simply more words and more posturing, more politics, or is there something here that is real?

The interesting point of all this is the American people, I think, are pretty resilient and pretty strong. You go through 200 years of history in this country, and they move right to left but they always come back to the strong center. And they have a good sense of what is right or wrong and a good sense of what ought to be done.

Mr. HATCH. I agree.

Mr. DORGAN. The fact is the American people are a lot more able to tolerate the kinds of medicine that need to be administered these days than most people here give them credit for. But I think they do want to know. They want to know if someone says: "Look, we have the votes. We want to go off and build star wars. We know that is out of fashion, but it is not out of fashion with us. We want a star wars program. It is \$30 billion, \$40 billion. We want to build it because we have the muscle."

Somebody back home will want to know, if you are going to build star wars, does that mean you are going to cut school hot lunch programs? They want to know what all this means, and those are simple issues. What are the priorities?

You can look back 100 years from now in this country and look at this country's budget and you can tell something about what our people were, what we felt was important, what we invested in, what we considered important for the future. You could tell that by what we decided to spend money on.

The American people, I think, given 18 or 20 years of promises—most of them empty—by both parties, given complicity in arranging this deficit by creating a situation where we spend more each year than we take in because we ratchet up all the entitlement programs to inflation and we ratchet down taxes on the other side so you create an imbalance—I think the people would want to say if this is not business as usual, if it is not really business as usual, why, then, are there not, this time, honest answers? Why are there not honest answers to the questions of what will this mean to us?

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DORGAN. What is this medicine about? I would say to the Senator from Utah, we have limited time. I probably consumed a few more minutes than I should have on my side. I would love to continue this. I hope we can have it when we do not have a time agreement,

at some other time, because I would like to talk through some of these things. With that, I would like to—

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator will yield on my time?

Mr. DORGAN. I will be happy to yield on the Senator's time, sure.

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

Mr. HATCH. I think the Senator is making a terrific case for the balanced budget amendment. I know he is a supporter of it. So I commend him for that as well.

He makes the case that we are going to spend billions on star wars, will that take away from school lunches? Right now we just fund both of them because we do not have to live within any procedural or any disciplined constraints.

The balanced budget, if we pass it, then becomes the discipline through which we are going to have to look at defense as well as everything else and we are going to have to somehow or other come to a conclusion among competing programs and make priorities. I think it would force us to do that. Of course, that is the whole argument for a balanced budget amendment, and I think the Senator is making a good case for it.

I guarantee I will work with the distinguished Senator and others to try to get to that consensus, but until we get the discipline in place, we will never get there and we know it and everyone knows it.

Mr. DORGAN. My intention was to make a strong case for the right-to-know amendment, and I hope we will get some votes on the other side of the aisle to pass that. That will make this constitutional amendment an honest amendment, give people some hope that instead of talking about it, we will finally get something done.

Mr. President, I have consumed some time on our side of the aisle. We have a number of other people who want to speak. I know we have been going back and forth.

I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, how much time remains on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEMPTHORNE). The minority has 36 minutes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, Senator FEINGOLD, have up to 10 minutes and the distinguished Senator from the State of Washington, Senator MURRAY, have up to 5 minutes of our 36 minutes.

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

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I also rise to support this amendment. I offered a similar version of the right-to-know amendment, the glidepath amendment, in the proceedings in the Senate Judiciary Committee. I thought

it was the best discussion we had in the committee after a couple of days of discussion. I thought the discussion on the right-to-know amendment was really the most thoughtful and the one that really crystallized the issue.

In at least two important ways, this is the truth amendment. First, in one sense the amendment is a truth test. If the supporters of this constitutional amendment are serious about balancing the budget, this amendment is the one that really provides that opportunity. The central concern I have had with the proposed balanced budget amendment is that it will actually undercut our efforts to reduce the deficit and balance the budget by just providing political cover for those who are unwilling to make these really tough decisions. Having voted for the balanced budget amendment, I fear Members will feel free to duck the real work of actually identifying and voting for real spending cuts and they will be able to continue to do this ducking of the issue as the States go through the rather laborious process of trying to see if they are going to ratify this thing in the next year or 2 or 7 years.

Of course, supporters of the constitutional amendment deny this assertion. They proclaim loudly they will seek specific cuts and we just have to wait and see what they might be. This amendment to the balanced budget amendment, this right-to-know amendment, provides those who are genuinely interested in ensuring the Congress does its job with the opportunity to demonstrate their commitment to real deficit reduction. It does what the proponents of a balanced budget amendment contend they want to do. This amendment forces Congress to get the job done. It forces Congress to lay out over the next 5 or 6 or 7 years, exactly how we are going to accomplish this.

Except, Mr. President, the good thing about this amendment that cannot be said about the balanced budget amendment is that the right-to-know amendment does not allow delay and evasion. It does not let the 104th Congress off the hook by simply passing an amendment, a balanced budget amendment, that does not lay out a single spending cut. The last Congress made substantial progress in reducing the budget deficits that have been generated by the budget policies of the 1980's. That progress was made because the 103d Congress was willing to lay out and have a very difficult process of discussing specific items to reduce the deficit. It was not easy. It was not always popular. But it was specific and it worked and the economy is sound and ultimately the efforts of the President and the majority at that time have been accepted by the American people.

Now there is a new majority, a new leadership in Congress. As is so often the case when there is a change in the ruling party, that new majority promises great change. On the first bill we considered in this Congress we were told very bluntly there would be no

amendments no matter how reasonable, no matter how necessary, because, in the words of the new majority and in the words of one Senator, it was because this is about who runs this place.

But when is the majority going to show us how they plan to reduce the deficit? In other words, when are they going to show us how they are going to run the place when it comes to balancing the budget? That is part of running the place.

Why is it the new Congress, from which all things are supposedly possible, is apparently incapable of providing us with a plan to reduce the deficit? Mr. President, a majority of those supporters of this proposed amendment who were here in 1993—and I am referring to the balanced budget amendment—refused to support the deficit reduction package that was passed and that has resulted in progress.

I remember the discussion in the Judiciary Committee of the Senator from Wyoming, Senator SIMPSON, who referred to past votes when the Republicans were in the majority, which he called times when the rubber hit the road. He said the Democrats were not there to help.

In 1993, the rubber hit the road here; \$500 billion in deficit reduction was proposed and passed, and not one single Republican in either House chose to vote for those specific spending cuts.

That is, unfortunately, the only way this can be accomplished, identifying what has to be cut and actually doing it.

So I understand that nobody necessarily has to assign any particular plan. But if you are going to propose a balanced budget amendment I think you have a special burden to at least show us some plan with regard to how it is going to be accomplished.

Mr. President, I said there were two ways this was a truth amendment. The other is that this is the truth-in-packaging measure. The voters, local government, and the State legislatures that are asked to ratify this amendment are all entitled to know what supporters of the constitutional amendment mean to do before they modify the Constitution of the United States.

Looking at the Presiding Officer, one of leaders in this body of concern with State and local governments, this is exactly the kind of thing that this Senator has talked about—the fact that these folks have a right to know what we are up to out here, and that we do not lay an unreasonable burden on them in the form of the balanced budget amendment.

Unfortunately, though, the supporters of the balanced budget amendment have been very reluctant to provide that kind of information. They maintain that to reveal the whole horrible truth to the Congress and the public would make it impossible to pass the balanced budget amendment.

Mr. President, I find that kind of reasoning to be a gross underestimate of

the American people. And it is amazing. It even reveals a little bit of an antidemocratic philosophy, and is a little bit insulting to the American people. This is a critical point. I think, in contrast, supporters of this proposal, instead of giving the information, want to alter one of the greatest testaments to democracy in history, our Constitution, and they want to do it in a way, they freely admit, they say would be opposed by the people if they knew what was proposed. The obvious irony of this is also a form of hypocrisy.

Mr. President, though I oppose the proposed constitutional amendment, I am convinced that the failure of the supporters to provide a specific proposal and glidepath will actually undermine the efforts to have the amendment ratified. Even worse, it may jeopardize the real world, the real effort that is required to reduce the deficit. Without a broad-based consensus, no significant deficit reduction plan would stand. Any plan which would generate the opposition that the proponents so obviously fear would be overturned, and rightly so, in a democracy.

So, Mr. President, we will not achieve the broad-based consensus that we need by dealing dishonestly with the American people. We have made progress on the deficit. I for one believe the American people are ready to sacrifice and do more, if they are treated with respect, with honesty, and with open Government. I have seen this consistently over the last 2 years and when I was running for the Senate. I see it in each of the 72 counties of our State, where I hold a listening session in each county every year. Most recently, I have seen it in the willingness of so many of my constituents. The vast majority of my constituents say to me, "Don't take a tax cut and give it to the American people." They say, "Just reduce spending to reduce the deficit." This is the way the people are talking. They are ready to handle this problem, if we are open about it.

Mr. President, the people of this country are willing to make sacrifices to help clean up the mess that was not of their making. The very least we can do is to deal honestly with them. That is what this amendment does. It provides an honest approach.

To conclude, Mr. President, the Constitution of the United States is still our great national contract. Before we ask people to accept a change in that contract, they are entitled to read the fine print.

So I urge my colleagues on this important vote later today to support the Senator from South Dakota and provide the American people the information they need so they can go forward with some confidence on this issue.

I thank the Chair.

Mrs. MURRAY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized for up to 5 minutes.

Mrs. MURRAY. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, there is no more important aspect to this debate than the amendment put forward by my good friend from South Dakota, the minority leader.

Yesterday, the Budget Committee heard very important testimony from Dr. Laura Tyson, the Chair of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. Dr. Tyson explained how risky passing this resolution can be if we do not know exactly what is going to be cut, how much, and when.

She outlined for us how dangerous these drastic, irrational cuts can be to the current economic expansion. She described how our fiscal policy will be "handcuffed," that is her word, not mine, if this resolution becomes part of the Constitution.

I refer our colleagues, Mr. President, to her testimony before the Budget Committee yesterday. And, I ask unanimous consent that the text of an article by Dr. Tyson in yesterday's Washington Post be made a part of the RECORD.

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

IT'S A RECIPE FOR ECONOMIC CHAOS

(By Laura D. Tyson)

Continued progress on reducing the deficit is sound economic policy, but a constitutional amendment requiring annual balance of the federal budget is not. The fallacy in the logic behind the balanced budget amendment begins with the premise that the size of the federal deficit is the result of conscious policy decisions. This is only partly the case. The pace of economic activity also plays an important role in determining the deficit. An economic slowdown automatically depresses tax revenues and increases government spending on such programs as unemployment compensation, food stamps and welfare.

Such temporary increases in the deficit act as "automatic stabilizers," offsetting some of the reduction in the purchasing power of the private sector and cushioning the economy's slide, not be able to moderate the ups and downs of the business cycle on its own as well as it can with the help of the automatic fiscal stabilizers.

First, monetary policy affects the economy indirectly and with notoriously long lags, making it difficult to time the desired effects with precision. By contrast, the automatic stabilizers of fiscal policy swings into action as soon as the economy begins to slow, often well before the Federal Reserve even recognizes the need for compensating action.

Second, the Fed could become handcuffed in the event of a major recession—its scope for action limited by the fact that it can push short-term interest rates no lower than zero, and probably not even that low. By historical standards, the spread between today's short rates of 6 percent and zero leaves uncomfortably little room for maneuver. Between the middle of 1990 and the end of 1992, the Fed reduced the short-term interest rate it controls by a cumulative total of 5½ percentage points. Even so, the economy sank into a recession from which it has only recently fully recovered—a recession whose severity was moderated by the very automatic stabilizers of fiscal policy the balanced budget amendment would destroy.

Third, the more aggressive actions required of the Fed to limit the increase in the variability of output and employment could actually increase the volatility of financial markets—an ironic possibility, given that many of the amendment's proponents may well believe they are promoting financial stability.

Moreover, they do so quickly and automatically, without the need for lengthy debates about the state of the economy and the appropriate policy response.

By the same token, when the economy strengthens again, the automatic stabilizers work in the other direction: tax revenues rise, spending for unemployment benefits and other social safety net programs fall, and the deficit narrows.

A balanced budget amendment would throw the automatic stabilizers into reverse. Congress would be required to raise tax rates or cut spending programs in the face of a recession to counteract temporary increases in the deficit. Rather than moderating the normal ups and downs of the business cycle, fiscal policy would be required to aggravate them.

A simple example from recent economic history should serve as cautionary tale. In fiscal year 1991, the economy's unanticipated slowdown caused actual government spending for unemployment insurance and related items to exceed the budgeted amount by \$6 billion, and actual revenues to fall short of the budgeted amount by some \$67 billion. In a balanced-budget world, Congress would have been required to offset the resulting shift of more than \$70 billion in the deficit by a combination of tax hikes and spending cuts that by themselves would have sharply worsened the economic downturn—resulting in an additional loss of 1¼ percent of GDP and 750,000 jobs.

The version of the amendment passed by the House has no special "escape clause" for recessions—only the general provision that the budget could be in deficit if three-fifths of both the House and Senate agree. This is a far cry from an automatic stabilizer. It is easy to imagine a well-organized minority in either House of Congress holding this provision hostage to its particular political agenda.

In a balanced budget world—with fiscal policy enjoined to destabilize rather than stabilize the economy—all responsibility for counteracting the economic effects of the business cycle would be placed at the doorstep of the Federal Reserve. The Fed could attempt to meet this increased responsibility by pushing interest rates down more aggressively when the economy softens and raising them more vigorously when it strengthens.

Finally, a balanced budget amendment would create an automatic and undesirable link between interest rates and fiscal policy. An unanticipated increase in interest rates would boost federal interest expense and thus the deficit. The balanced budget amendment under consideration would require that such an unanticipated increase in the deficit be offset within the fiscal year!

In other words, independent monetary policy decisions by the Federal Reserve would require immediate and painful budgetary adjustments. Where would they come from? Not from interest payments and not, with such short notice, from entitlement programs. Rather they would have to come from either a tax increase or from cuts or possible shutdowns in discretionary programs whose funds had not yet been obligated. This is not a sensible way to establish budgetary priorities or maintain the health interaction and independence of monetary and fiscal policy.

One of the great discoveries of modern economics is the role that fiscal policy can play

in moderating the business cycle. Few if any members of the Senate about to vote on a balanced budget amendment experienced the tragic human costs of the Great Depression, costs made more severe by President Herbert Hoover's well-intentioned but misguided efforts to balance the budget. Unfortunately, the huge deficits inherited from the last decade of fiscal profligacy have rendered discretionary changes in fiscal policy in response to the business cycle all but impossible. Now, many of those responsible for the massive run-up in debt during the 1980s are leading the charge to eliminate the automatic stabilizers as well by voting for a balanced budget amendment.

Instead of undermining the government's ability to moderate the economy's cyclical fluctuations by passing such an amendment, why not simply make the hard choices and cast the courageous votes required to reduce the deficit—the kind of hard choices and courageous votes delivered by members of the 103rd Congress when they passed the administration's \$505 billion deficit reduction package?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, Dr. Tyson, probably more clearly than anyone I have heard in the past few days, explains how dangerous this resolution is and why the American people have a right to know what our budget will look like before we act on this measure.

Mr. President, the staff of the Budget Committee prepared an analysis of the balanced budget amendment which puts the abstract words of this resolution into perspective.

Now, as you know, Mr. President, the proponents of this resolution tell us we must have a balanced budget in the year 2002. But, they refuse to tell us how they will achieve that balance. They will not level with the American people about what they will cut and what they will eliminate. And, Mr. President, the American people have a right to know.

They have a right to know before we pass this amendment how this will affect them.

If we pass this resolution with an exemption for Social Security, defense, and some other sensitive programs and if we still enact all the tax cuts in the Contract With America, and all of that is possible, we will see a 50-percent across-the-board cut in all other programs.

Is this responsible budgeting, Mr. President? Is this rational? Is this common sense? If we put this resolution into action, Mr. President, agricultural programs could take a 50-percent cut. So could highway funds. We could lose half of our education and job training money, and we could lose half of our student loans.

If the Constitution is amended in this way, and Congress actually acts on it, the cleanup of the Hanford Nuclear Reservation is in jeopardy. This is not the way we return security to our Nation, Mr. President. And, it is not how we restore the glimmer of hope to our children's eyes.

The radical cuts this amendment will demand will likely fall squarely on the backs of the most vulnerable in our society—our children, our elderly, our disabled most in need of help.

And, Mr. President, at a time of uncertainty for all of our working families we find this resolution will hurt our workers. The economists at Wharton predict Washington State could lose 209,000 jobs the year after this amendment takes effect. They predict my State will experience a 15-percent drop in total personal income. And, they tell me hardest hit will be the manufacturing sector—especially the aerospace industry—which is already experiencing massive job losses.

Mr. President, it is time to level with the American people. If we are going to engage in a discussion of balancing the budget, let's get beyond the 10-second sound bites. Let us tell the American people how this budget will affect our lives, and their children's lives. Because, Mr. President, if we are going to change the Constitution of the United States the American people have a right to know exactly how this will affect their lives, their security, and their future.

I retain the balance of my time.

Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

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

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator from Utah for yielding the time.

Mr. President, as I indicated in previous remarks on the floor in this debate on another day, this really is the defining moment. This is the opportunity for us to move on balancing the Federal budget. If we do not do it during this time when we have the opportunity to pass this amendment, it will be the last time. The House has passed it 300 to 132. It is very close here in the Senate. Some would say that we do not have the 67 votes that are required as of now.

Here we are, out here talking about a right to know, so-called. Everyone knows that is a smokescreen. It is dilatory. It is a delay tactic to try to stop us from voting on this amendment or to try to obfuscate the issue so much that no one will understand what the real problems are.

Here is the real problem, Mr. President. This is the President's budget.

It is interesting that the color is green, and it should be because in this budget the President spends one heck of a lot of money. In this budget, the President adds, over 5 years, well over \$1 trillion more to the national debt. The annual deficits run over \$200 billion a year, on an average, for the next 5 years, adding over \$1 trillion to the national debt. That is what it says.

The other side says we need a right to know. Well, what about the President of the United States? Why does he not submit to us at least something that leads toward a balanced budget?

He basically has taken a walk and has presented this budget. It is green. You know, Mr. President, here is the color it should be—red—because it is red ink, more red ink, more red ink, more red ink, business as usual, politics as usual. We stand down here on the floor and we talk and talk and talk, and the debt goes up and up and up, and our children's future is at stake.

That is what this is all about, Mr. President. Let us face it, that is what it is all about. How can the President of the United States, with his party on the floor trying to delay this amendment by using this phony argument of the right to know, keep a straight face in presenting this budget? He ought to replace Jay Leno, for crying out loud. It is hysterical. It is so funny that no one could possibly take the man seriously. How can you say that?

If you want further evidence of what this thing is all about on this amendment—and I say to my colleague, the floor leader from Utah—I remind him because he was very much a participant in this debate a year ago, in February 1994, when we had the amendment up here and we lost it by three or four votes, as the Senator well remembers. The sponsor of this right-to-know amendment by the minority leader of the U.S. Senate was on the floor, and it is interesting to hear what he said because he supported the amendment in that debate and voted for the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. Here is what he said:

To remedy our fiscal situation, we must stop spending beyond our means. This will not require the emasculation of important domestic priorities, as some suggest.

He also said:

We are building a legacy of debt for our children and our grandchildren and hamstringing our ability to address pressing national priorities.

And then he said:

In this debate on a balanced budget amendment, we are being forced to face the consequences of our inaction. Quite simply, we are building a legacy of debt for our children and our grandchildren and hamstringing our ability to address pressing national priorities.

Here, Mr. President, ironically is what Senator DASCHLE, the minority leader, said on February 28 on the floor of the U.S. Senate about the right to know:

Congress and the President will have 7 years to address the current deficit and reach a consensus on our Nation's budget priorities. We will have time to find ways to live within our means and still meet existing obligations to our citizens, particularly the elderly.

So you have the sponsor of this amendment on the floor of the Senate 1 year ago in support of the balanced budget amendment and saying pass the amendment and we will lay out the plan and we will work together to lay out a plan to balance the budget. That is 180 degrees in reverse of where we are today with the Senator from South Dakota with his so-called right-to-know amendment.

When are we going to do this? The reason why we need the amendment could never be more obvious than it was when the President submitted that budget, because we will not do it without the amendment. I want to comment for a few moments on this issue of the right to know, because it is kind of fascinating. I hear about the public's right to know as if we have to know every single item, everything we are going to do before we pass the amendment. If Congress wanted to get a balanced budget, they would have done it, Mr. President, and we would not need the amendment. The reason we need the amendment is because they will not do it. That is the reason—because they will not do it.

Do you know what I think? I think the public has a right to know why every child born in America today, even as I speak, is born approximately \$18,000 in debt. I think that child has a right to know why that is happening in this country and what we are going to do about it. That is a right to know that I think we ought to have.

Also, I hear on the floor that we are going to make the tough decisions. Give me a break. That is why we need the amendment. We are not making the tough decisions, and the President did not make the tough decisions in this budget. He did not make the tough decisions. He took a walk. That is going to continue to happen until the national debt goes right through the roof. It is already fast approaching, or will be by the turn of the century, over \$6 trillion. Where does it stop, at \$12, \$13, \$15, \$16, \$20, \$100 trillion? That is where it is going to go if we do not stop. We just have to do it.

Why would anybody think the American people are going to trust us to make those decisions? Why should they? We have never done it. That is why 80 percent of them have said over and over again that they support an amendment. That is why they said it. That is why they want this amendment. And that is why those who do not want it are using these delay tactics and phony arguments, because they do not want to make the tough decisions.

In order to force us to do what we have been unwilling to do for the past 15 years or longer, we need this amendment.

Do you know what has been really lost in this debate, beyond the right to know? We are forgetting about the American people. They are the losers in this debate. Many of my colleagues say, oh, the Governors are against it, State legislators will not support it; there will be a lot of polls cited next week saying that. The only poll that the Framers of the Constitution ever thought about or knew about, as far as I am concerned, is whether or not 38 States deem this amendment essential and a majority of the House and Senate deem it essential. If they do, we will be bound by the Constitution that all of us swore to uphold to put our fiscal

house in order and, by doing so, we will bring some dignity to this body and restore fiscal sanity to this country. That is what it is all about, fiscal sanity and dignity.

How in the world can we call it dignified to roll up trillions of dollars more of debt on our children, basically saying I am not going to worry about it today, I am going to live the good life and do what I have to do, and I am going to pass my debts on to my kids. That is what we are doing with trillions of dollars.

My friends who oppose the amendment speak only of their ability to make the tough choices. "We will make the tough choices," they say. I heard one of my colleagues say how they made the tough choices. In fact, it was said this morning that they made the tough choices in 1993 in the President's budget. He said, "No Republican voted for this agreement."

I remind my colleagues that Republicans were not a party to the agreement. We did not have anything to do with negotiating the agreement. We were not invited to participate in it. I do not know what the discussion was like behind closed doors, nor do any of my Republican colleagues know. Do you know what they talked about in those meetings and discussions? They did not talk about cutting spending or balancing the budget. They talked about, should we raise the top tax rate 5, 8, 9 percent? What are we going to raise it to? They talked about raising taxes. They talked about, should we make tax increases retroactive for 6 months, 1 year, year and a half? How long can we go with a millionaires' surtax? Should it be \$500,000 or \$250,000. That is what was going on. There were no talks in those meetings about spending cuts or about tough decisions.

So that is one of the reasons why I believe my friends fear the constitutional amendment, those who are opposing it, because they know exactly what is going to happen. You will have to cut spending and cut the bloated bureaucracy and eliminate outdated programs, and you will have to make the tough decisions. That is the truth. They are not ready to do it. That is the bottom line.

I will close on this point. I was very much interested in the story in the Washington Post this week regarding Washington, DC. They announced they are \$722 million in debt. And Mayor Barry is telling us in the papers that home rule does not work. He is one of the most noted figures in the history of home rule in the District. He is now saying: I have to have the Federal Government take over some of the services, the prison system, and other programs that he says he cannot maintain. He is in debt.

Now, why has the Mayor changed his mind? Why has he changed his tune from the big government mayor that he was for all those years?

It is quite simple. He does not have the tax base any longer to maintain

the bureaucracy that had been created by him and his predecessors. The well is dry. They cannot raise any more taxes.

Indeed, we have the representative from Washington, DC, in the House saying we may want to eliminate income taxes altogether for people who live in the District. They cannot pay any more taxes. They are up to here. That is the problem.

That is not the answer. The answer is not raising more taxes. The answer is cutting spending. That is the issue. So he has given up. So the Mayor says, "Come in. Take these things from me. I can't deal with it any more. I do not have the tax base."

That, my friends, is exactly the predicament that we are going to be in in the very, very near future. We are going to go to the well once too often. There is not going to be any more money there. You cannot squeeze any more blood out of this turnip, out of the American people. They do not have it any more. They are fed up. They have had enough. You cannot get any more. And, therefore, the end is in sight. That is what is going to happen. That is where we are going to get to.

And when that point comes, what do we do? Are we are going to turn and say, "Take these programs"? The answer is no. We all know, when that comes, it is going to be too late and we will have bankruptcy, the equivalent of chapter 1, where we spend a whole bunch more dollars.

That is not what the American people want. The American people want us to be fiscally responsible, to make the tough decisions and pass this amendment so that the Congress and the President, both political parties, Democrats, Republicans, liberals, conservatives, sit down in a room and make the decision to balance the budget. Yes, we will differ on where the priorities are, but we have to do it. Now we do not have to do it. That is why we need the amendment.

So I urge my colleagues to move off this phony debate of right to know and exempting programs and get on to the business of passing this amendment sooner rather than later and stop the dilatory tactics.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I thank the Senator from Utah for yielding to me.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for his excellent statement. It was terrific.

Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to our courageous colleague from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President and my colleagues in the Senate, I am for the basic aim of this amendment, but I am going to vote against the amendment for two reasons.

One is, while I think we do need to spell out in broad outlines where we are going and how we are going to achieve a balanced budget before it

goes to the States, I do not believe this should be in the Constitution. We are talking about a procedural thing that should not be in the Constitution.

Second, to spell out down to \$100 million where we are going I think is just totally unrealistic in terms of where we are going to be 7 years from now. So I think it is an unwise amendment.

I would add, if we pass the balanced budget amendment—and my hope is that we will have the wisdom and the courage to do so—I will request—and I hope to be joined by Senator HATCH and others on this—I will request the leaders of both parties to either ask the Budget Committee or a special task force to put together in broad outlines how we can get to a balanced budget in the year 2002.

Now, CBO has outlined some things; the Concord Coalition has outlined some things. There have been other suggestions. But I think a task force that can be appointed immediately after passage and report back to the Senate is the way we should go. I do not believe we should put this kind of an amendment in the Constitution. I think it is just not constitutional in nature.

Second, I think to say where we are going to be 7 years from now in terms of \$100 million—and at that point it will be about a \$1.8 trillion budget—is just unrealistic. So I will be voting for the motion to table.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Utah for yielding.

Mr. President, I have been listening to the speeches and debate on this amendment and especially on this issue. I just want to go to the bottom line real quick.

We have to get away from these scare tactics that everything is going to be cut. I have had people come into my office and say, "We are going to lose our programs. Everything is going to be out because you will not tell us how you are going to do it."

Let me tell you, this is going to make us all set up a criteria to select those things to be funded that should be funded. How many programs have we got right now that are being funded that have not been authorized by this body or the other body or ever signed into law by the President of the United States? If that is one of those criteria, then we are going to see those folks who want to fund programs that have not been authorized or cannot pass the scrutiny of the Senate or the House and we get them out. We just go ahead and fund them.

A case in point is the National Biological Survey. We appropriate all

kinds of money for a program that has never passed this Congress. And if we do not have the criteria on which we fund and what we do not fund, we will never do it, we will never get it under control.

So the scare tactics are all baloney.

I thank my friend from Utah for yielding me the minute. You usually hear a lot of flowery speeches, but that is the bottom line when you go to taking up this issue.

Mr. HATCH. I thank my colleague from Montana for his cogent remarks.

I now yield 15 minutes to our distinguished chairman of the Policy Committee, the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. NICKLES. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I wish to compliment my colleague from Montana for his remarks. They were brief, but they were right on target.

I also wish to compliment Senator HATCH, Senator CRAIG, and Senator SIMON. I very much appreciate the bipartisanship which we have exhibited in trying to pass this constitutional amendment.

We have all been working for a long, long time to pass a constitutional amendment saying, "Congress, you cannot spend any more than you take in." It is long overdue.

Consider the remarks Thomas Jefferson made in 1798. He said, "I wish it were possible to obtain a single amendment to our Constitution." He further says, "I mean an additional article, taking from the Federal Government the power of borrowing." These are Thomas Jefferson's words and he was correct.

Mr. President, we have a heck of a problem. We are spending a lot more money than we take in and we have been doing it for a long time. We did it for many years under Republican administrations, under Democratic administrations, and under primarily Democrat Congresses. We had a Republican Senate in the interlude. But we have seen Federal spending escalate year after year.

Mr. President, I am going to put a lot of tables into the RECORD which represent the facts, the fact that Federal spending has been exploding.

In 1960, Mr. President, the Federal Government spent less than \$100 billion. In 1970, we spent less than \$200 billion. In 1980, we spent \$591 billion. So, we went from less than \$100 billion in 1960, less than \$200 billion in 1970, and less than \$600 billion in 1980. By 1990, Mr. President, we spent \$1.25 trillion.

I am bothered, Mr. President, when the President of the United States claims in his State of the Union Message that he cut spending by \$250 billion. The fact is that Federal spending has not been reduced; it has climbed every year. The only way that the President can say we have cut spending is by using the inflated baselines that only the Federal Government would

use. He is not accurate. Federal spending has gone up every single year.

In 1992, Federal spending was \$1.382 trillion; in 1994 it was \$1.461 trillion; in 1995 it will be \$1.531 trillion. The President's budget for next year is over \$1.6 trillion—And the spending continues to escalate. By the year 2000, spending exceeds \$1.9 trillion. Federal spending continues to climb every year, and it has under every President and every administration.

Revenues have been climbing as well, but not quite as fast. I really think we need some kind of restraint. I happen to think a constitutional amendment is the restraint we need. I wish we did not. Some of my constituents asked me recently, was it really necessary? I said it would not be necessary if we had a strong majority in both the House and the Senate that was willing to make the tough fiscal decisions that would have to be made to balance the budget.

We have not seen that kind of majority. Maybe with the new Congress we will have that kind of opportunity, but history has shown that we have not had it in decades. Most States have a balanced budget requirement. Some may allow exceptions, but most States have something in their constitution that limits the amounts of money that they can spend and/or the amount of money they can borrow.

So, Mr. President, I think it is vitally important we pass a balanced budget amendment. It has to be a bipartisan effort, and I hope we will have bipartisan support to make it happen.

Mr. President, some people have said, "How do you do it?" This is the intent of Senator DASCHLE's amendment on the right to know. Unfortunately, Senator DASCHLE's amendment amends the Constitution. This is not the proper way to do what he wants to do. I happen to agree that we should put out as much information on how we will get there as possible. I would also say that 7 year estimates are just guessing. No one knows what will happen in the economy between now and then, and certainly the economy makes a lot of difference on what the outlays will be and what the revenues will be. But to put something like his amendment in the Constitution is wrong. I just hope my colleagues before they vote on this amendment will read the amendment that is pending and read section 9. It includes about 11 or 12 paragraphs.

The rest of the balanced budget amendment is quite simple. The rest of the amendment, which is similar to an amendment we passed in the Senate in 1982, one which Senator DASCHLE himself has supported in the past, makes sense. It is logical. It would fit in the Constitution. Section 9 does not belong in the Constitution.

I hope that my colleagues will not support the right to know amendment. Does that mean that Congress should abdicate its responsibility and wait until the seventh year to do anything to balance the budget? No, we should take concrete steps each year to reduce our deficit down to zero.

I regret to say that President Clinton, in his latest budget submission, has not done that. I think he has raised the white flag on deficit reduction. His deficit stays at about \$200 billion in the foreseeable future, and beyond the year 2000 increases rather dramatically. The President's budget touches a little bit on discretionary spending, it increases it dramatically in some areas, cuts it in defense and some other areas, and does not touch entitlements.

Entitlements have been exploding. I think that is irresponsible. I think, basically, the President punted and said, "Congress, you take over. We will wait and see how you do and we will throw rocks at it." I think that is irresponsible.

Regardless of what the President does, we need to move toward a balanced budget. Regardless of whether or not we pass this amendment, we need to move to balance the budget. I hope we will. I hope we take concrete steps this year and each and every year to reduce the deficit, reduce the enormous debt load we have on the American people.

Mr. President, we do have enormous debt load. Federal debt in 1994 is \$4.6 trillion. Mr. President, per capita that is \$17,848 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. That is the amount of public debt we have today. Next year, 1995, that figure is \$18,800. So that figure has risen by over \$1,700 for every man, woman, and child in the United States, the amount of debt load increase they have all inherited.

I do not think that is acceptable. I think we have to manage something. Maybe this is not the perfect solution, but it happens to be one of the few that I think will work. We are sworn to uphold the Constitution, and we all take an oath that we will uphold the Constitution, I think we will show the courage to do so.

Unless and until we have that constraint, I am afraid we will fall back to business as usual, and business as usual is passing the Daschle amendment or passing another amendment that says we will exclude Social Security or gut this amendment some way or another and not pass it, and we will continue spending more money than we take in.

Why do we do that? Senators are a lot more popular if we spend money than if we take it. People do not like taxes. They like spending. Therefore, we spend more, tax less, and have big deficits. I do not think that is responsible, Mr. President. I do not think we can continue doing that.

How can we balance the budget? Can we do it? CBO says we will have to cut spending by \$1.2 trillion. The President's budget would cut spending by \$144 billion in the next 5 years. Mr. President, we will spend over \$10 trillion in the next 6 years. The President is talking about a marginal reduction of about 1 percent. Again, Federal spending under the President's program goes from \$1.5 to \$1.9 trillion. That is not a spending reduction. If

spending goes up by a dollar, we should say spending went up, not that we reduced the rate of both and therefore it is a spending cut.

Mr. President, we can balance the budget if we allow spending to increase, but spending cannot increase as fast. According to the baseline that CBO uses, spending is increasing right now about 5.26 percent. We can balance the budget keeping spending growth to 3.21 percent for the next 7 years. Then we can balance the budget. Let me repeat that: Spending can increase each and every year, by 3.26 percent.

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

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I will not yield. I have a few more points to make, and I will be happy to yield in a moment.

So, Mr. President, how do we do that? We have some programs growing astronomically. I will mention a few: Defense has actually gone down, but there are a lot of other programs that are growing very dramatically. Medicaid, for example, in the last 4 years has grown at 28, 29, 12, and 8 percent. We cannot continue that rate of growth.

Earned income tax credit, a program that this President is very proud of, the last 4 years has grown at 11, 55, 18 percent, 1994 at 22 percent, 1995 at 55 percent. That is an exploding entitlement program that this President expanded. I could go on. Food stamps in the last 4 years has grown 17, 25, 21, and 11 percent. Last year, zero percent. We can see it has exploded in growth. In 1990 we spent \$15 billion in food stamps; in 1994, \$25 billion in food stamps.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these tables be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL SPENDING CATEGORIES

[In billions of nominal dollars—Source: CBO]

Year	Outlays	Dollar Growth	Percent Growth	Percent of GDP
Mandatory				
1980	\$292			11
1981	341	\$49	17	11
1982	373	32	9	12
1983	412	39	10	12
1984	406	(5)	-1	11
1985	450	44	11	11
1986	460	10	2	11
1987	470	11	2	10
1988	494	24	5	10
1989	526	32	6	10
1990	567	41	8	10
1991	634	67	12	11
1992	712	78	12	12
1993	762	50	7	12
1994	789	27	4	12
1995	845	56	7	12
1996	899	54	6	12
1997	962	63	7	12
1998	1,026	64	7	12
1999	1,097	71	7	13
2000	1,173	76	7	13
Domestic				
1980	129			5
1981	137	7	6	5
1982	127	(9)	-7	4
1983	130	3	2	4
1984	135	5	4	4
1985	146	10	8	4
1986	148	2	1	3
1987	147	(0)	-0	3
1988	158	11	8	3

FEDERAL SPENDING CATEGORIES—Continued

[In billions of nominal dollars—Source: CBO]

Year	Outlays	Dollar Growth	Percent Growth	Percent of GDP
1989	169	11	7	3
1990	183	14	8	3
1991	195	13	7	3
1992	214	19	10	4
1993	229	15	7	4
1994	242	13	5	4
1995	253	11	5	4
1996	262	9	4	4
1997	274	12	5	3
1998	284	10	4	3
1999	295	11	4	3
2000	304	9	3	3
International				
1980	13			0
1981	14	1	6	0
1982	13	(1)	-5	0
1983	14	1	5	0
1984	16	3	20	0
1985	17	1	7	0
1986	18	0	2	0
1987	15	(3)	-14	0
1988	16	1	3	0
1989	17	1	6	0
1990	19	3	15	0
1991	20	1	3	0
1992	19	(1)	-3	0
1993	22	2	12	0
1994	20	(2)	-7	0
1995	21	1	5	0
1996	22	1	5	0
1997	22	0	0	0
1998	22	0	0	0
1999	23	1	3	0
2000	24	1	6	0
Defense				
1980	135			5
1981	158	23	17	5
1982	186	28	18	6
1983	210	24	13	6
1984	228	18	9	6
1985	253	25	11	6
1986	274	21	8	6
1987	283	9	3	6
1988	291	8	3	6
1989	304	13	5	6
1990	300	(4)	-1	5
1991	320	20	7	5
1992	303	(17)	-5	5
1993	293	(10)	-3	5
1994	282	(11)	-4	4
1995	270	(12)	-4	4
1996	270	0	0	4
1997	278	8	3	4
1998	285	7	3	3
1999	295	10	4	3
2000	304	9	3	3
Social Security				
1980	117			4
1981	138	21	18	5
1982	154	16	12	5
1983	169	15	9	5
1984	176	8	5	5
1985	186	10	6	5
1986	197	10	5	5
1987	205	9	4	5
1988	217	12	6	4
1989	230	14	6	4
1990	247	16	7	4
1991	267	20	8	5
1992	285	18	7	5
1993	302	17	6	5
1994	317	15	5	5
1995	334	17	5	5
1996	352	18	5	5
1997	371	19	5	5
1998	390	19	5	5
1999	411	21	5	5
2000	433	22	5	5
Net Interest				
1980	53			2
1981	69	16	31	2
1982	85	16	24	3
1983	90	5	6	3
1984	111	21	24	3
1985	130	18	17	3
1986	136	7	5	3
1987	139	3	2	3
1988	152	13	9	3
1989	169	18	12	3
1990	184	15	9	3
1991	195	10	6	3
1992	199	5	3	3
1993	199	(1)	-0	3
1994	203	4	2	3
1995	235	32	16	3
1996	260	25	11	3
1997	270	10	4	3
1998	279	9	3	3
1999	294	15	5	3
2000	310	16	5	3
Earned Income Tax Credit				
1980	1			0
1981	1	0	0	0

FEDERAL SPENDING CATEGORIES—Continued

[In billions of nominal dollars—Source: CBO]

Year	Outlays	Dollar Growth	Percent Growth	Percent of GDP
1982	1	(0)	-8	0
1983	1	0	0	0
1984	1	0	0	0
1985	1	(0)	-8	0
1986	1	0	27	0
1987	3	0	0	0
1988	3	1	9	0
1989	4	1	48	0
1990	4	0	10	0
1991	5	1	11	0
1992	8	3	55	0
1993	9	1	18	0
1994	11	2	22	0
1995	17	6	55	0
1996	20	3	18	0
1997	23	3	15	0
1998	24	1	4	0
1999	25	1	4	0
2000	26	1	4	0
Medicaid				
1980	14			1
1981	17	3	20	1
1982	17	1	4	1
1983	19	2	9	1
1984	20	1	6	1
1985	23	3	13	1
1986	25	2	10	1
1987	27	2	10	1
1988	31	3	11	1
1989	35	4	13	1
1990	41	7	19	1
1991	53	11	28	1
1992	68	15	29	1
1993	76	8	12	1
1994	82	6	8	1
1995	90	8	10	1
1996	100	10	11	1
1997	111	11	11	1
1998	123	12	11	1
1999	136	13	11	2
2000	149	13	10	2
Unemployment				
1980	17			1
1981	18	1	8	1
1982	22	4	21	1
1983	30	8	34	1
1984	17	(13)	-43	0
1985	16	(1)	-7	0
1986	16	0	2	0
1987	16	(1)	-4	0
1988	14	(2)	-12	0
1989	14	0	2	0
1990	18	4	26	0
1991	25	8	43	0
1992	37	12	47	1
1993	35	(2)	-4	1
1994	26	(9)	-27	0
1995	22	(4)	-15	0
1996	23	1	5	0
1997	24	1	4	0
1998	26	2	8	0
1999	27	1	4	0
2000	28	1	4	0
Food Stamps				
1980	9			0
1981	11	2	24	0
1982	11	(0)	-3	0
1983	12	1	7	0
1984	12	(0)	-2	0
1985	12	0	1	0
1986	12	(0)	-1	0
1987	12	0	0	0
1988	12	1	6	0
1989	13	1	4	0
1990	15	2	17	0
1991	19	4	25	0
1992	23	4	21	0
1993	25	2	11	0
1994	25	0	0	0
1995	26	1	4	0
1996	27	1	4	0
1997	29	2	7	0
1998	30	1	3	0
1999	32	2	7	0
2000	32	0	0	0
Medicare				
1980	34			1
1981	41	7	21	1
1982	49	8	19	2
1983	56	6	13	2
1984	61	6	10	2
1985	70	9	14	2
1986	74	5	6	2
1987	80	6	8	2
1988	86	6	7	2
1989	94	9	10	2
1990	107	13	14	2
1991	114	7	6	2
1992	129	15	13	2
1993	143	14	11	2
1994	160	17	12	2
1995	176	16	10	2
1996	196	20	11	3
1997	217	21	11	3
1998	238	21	10	3

FEDERAL SPENDING CATEGORIES—Continued

[In billions of nominal dollars—Source: CBO]

Year	Outlays	Dollar Growth	Percent Growth	Percent of GDP
1999	262	24	10	3
2000	286	24	9	3
AFDC				
1980	7			0
1981	8	1	12	0
1982	8	(0)	-2	0
1983	8	0	5	0
1984	9	1	6	0
1985	9	0	3	0
1986	10	1	8	0
1987	11	1	6	0
1988	11	0	3	0
1989	11	0	4	0
1990	12	1	9	0
1991	14	1	11	0
1992	16	2	16	0
1993	16	0	3	0
1994	17	1	6	0
1995	18	1	6	0
1996	18	0	0	0
1997	19	1	6	0
1998	19	0	0	0
1999	20	1	5	0
2000	20	0	0	0
Farm Price Supports				
1980	3			0
1981	4	1	43	0
1982	12	8	193	0
1983	19	7	62	1
1984	7	(12)	-61	0
1985	18	10	142	0
1986	26	8	46	1
1987	22	(3)	-13	0
1988	12	(10)	-46	0
1989	11	(2)	-13	0
1990	7	(4)	-39	0
1991	10	4	55	0
1992	9	(1)	-8	0
1993	16	6	68	0
1994	10	(6)	-36	0
1995	10	0	0	0
1996	9	(1)	-10	0
1997	9	0	0	0
1998	8	(1)	-11	0
1999	8	0	0	0
2000	8	0	0	0
Veterans Benefits and Services				
1980	14			1
1981	15	1	10	1
1982	16	0	3	1
1983	16	0	1	0
1984	16	0	1	0
1985	16	(0)	-1	0
1986	16	(0)	-1	0
1987	16	0	0	0
1988	18	2	12	0
1989	18	0	1	0
1990	16	(2)	-10	0
1991	17	1	9	0
1992	20	2	13	0
1993	21	1	7	0
1994	18	(3)	-14	0
1995	17	(1)	-6	0
1996	17	0	0	0
1997	18	1	6	0
1998	19	1	6	0
1999	20	1	5	0
2000	21	1	5	0
Federal Retirement and Disability				
1980	32			1
1981	37	5	17	1
1982	41	3	9	1
1983	43	3	6	1
1984	45	2	3	1
1985	46	1	2	1
1986	48	2	4	1
1987	51	3	7	1
1988	54	3	7	1
1989	57	3	6	1
1990	60	3	5	1
1991	64	5	8	1
1992	67	2	3	1
1993	69	2	3	1
1994	72	3	5	1
1995	75	3	4	1
1996	77	2	3	1
1997	81	4	5	1
1998	85	4	5	1
1999	90	5	6	1
2000	96	6	7	1
Other Mandatory				
1980	160			6
1981	187	27	17	6
1982	196	9	5	6
1983	208	13	6	6
1984	219	10	5	6
1985	241	22	10	6
1986	233	(8)	-3	5
1987	235	2	1	5
1988	255	20	8	5
1989	270	15	6	5
1990	288	18	7	5

FEDERAL SPENDING CATEGORIES—Continued
[In billions of nominal dollars—Source: CBO]

Year	Outlays	Dollar Growth	Percent Growth	Percent of GDP
1991	314	26	9	5
1992	336	23	7	6
1993	352	16	5	6
1994	368	16	4	5

FEDERAL SPENDING CATEGORIES—Continued
[In billions of nominal dollars—Source: CBO]

Year	Outlays	Dollar Growth	Percent Growth	Percent of GDP
1995	394	26	7	6
1996	412	18	5	6
1997	431	19	5	5
1998	454	23	5	5

FEDERAL SPENDING CATEGORIES—Continued
[In billions of nominal dollars—Source: CBO]

Year	Outlays	Dollar Growth	Percent Growth	Percent of GDP
1999	477	23	5	5
2000	507	30	6	6

HISTORICAL BUDGET ESTIMATES

[In billions of dollars]

Year	Revenues	Discretionary	Mandatory	Net interest	Deposit ins.	Off. receipts	Outlays	Deficit
1970	193	125	69	14	(1)	(12)	196	(3)
1971	187	127	83	15	(0)	(14)	210	(23)
1972	207	133	97	16	(1)	(14)	231	(23)
1973	231	135	112	17	(1)	(18)	246	(15)
1974	263	143	127	21	(1)	(21)	269	(6)
1975	279	163	164	23	1	(18)	332	(53)
1976	298	176	190	27	(1)	(20)	372	(74)
1977	356	197	207	30	(3)	(22)	409	(54)
1978	400	219	228	36	(1)	(23)	459	(59)
1979	463	240	248	43	(2)	(26)	504	(40)
1980	517	277	292	53	(0)	(29)	591	(74)
1981	599	308	341	69	(1)	(38)	678	(79)
1982	618	326	373	85	(2)	(36)	746	(128)
1983	601	354	412	90	(1)	(45)	808	(208)
1984	667	380	406	111	(1)	(44)	852	(185)
1985	734	416	450	130	(2)	(47)	946	(212)
1986	769	439	460	136	2	(46)	990	(221)
1987	854	445	470	139	3	(53)	1,004	(150)
1988	909	465	494	152	10	(57)	1,064	(155)
1989	991	490	526	169	22	(64)	1,144	(154)
1990	1,031	502	567	184	58	(58)	1,252	(221)
1991	1,054	535	634	195	66	(106)	1,323	(269)
1992	1,092	537	711	199	3	(69)	1,382	(290)
1993	1,153	543	761	199	(28)	(67)	1,408	(255)
1994	1,257	545	789	203	(7)	(69)	1,461	(203)
1995	1,355	544	845	235	(16)	(77)	1,531	(176)
1996	1,418	549	899	260	(9)	(73)	1,625	(207)
1997	1,475	548	962	270	(5)	(76)	1,699	(224)
1998	1,546	547	1,026	279	(5)	(79)	1,769	(222)
1999	1,618	566	1,097	294	(3)	(82)	1,872	(253)
2000	1,697	585	1,173	310	(3)	(84)	1,981	(284)
2001	1,787	605	1,245	325	(3)	(88)	2,084	(297)
2002	1,880	626	1,328	344	(3)	(93)	2,202	(322)
2003	1,978	647	1,417	365	(3)	(97)	2,329	(351)
2004	2,082	669	1,513	387	(3)	(102)	2,465	(383)
2005	2,191	692	1,617	412	(4)	(106)	2,611	(421)

FEDERAL DEBT
[In millions of dollars]

Year	Gross Federal debt	Held by the Government	Held by the public	Amount subject to the debt limit
1940	50,696	7,924	42,772	43,219
1945	260,123	24,941	235,182	268,671
1950	256,853	37,830	219,023	255,382
1955	274,366	47,750	226,616	272,348
1960	290,525	53,685	236,840	283,827
1965	322,318	61,540	260,778	314,126
1970	380,921	97,723	283,198	372,600
1971	408,176	105,139	303,037	398,650
1972	435,936	113,559	322,377	427,751
1973	466,291	125,381	340,910	458,264
1974	483,893	140,194	343,699	475,181
1975	541,925	147,225	394,700	534,207
1976	628,970	151,566	477,404	621,556
1977	706,398	157,295	549,103	699,963
1978	776,602	169,477	607,125	772,691
1979	828,923	189,207	639,716	827,615
1980	908,503	199,212	709,291	908,723
1981	994,298	209,507	784,791	998,818
1982	1,136,798	217,560	919,238	1,142,913
1983	1,371,164	240,115	1,131,049	1,377,953
1984	1,564,110	264,159	1,299,951	1,572,975
1985	1,816,974	317,612	1,499,362	1,823,775
1986	2,120,082	383,919	1,736,163	2,110,975
1987	2,345,578	457,444	1,888,134	2,336,014
1988	2,600,760	550,508	2,050,252	2,586,869
1989	2,867,537	678,210	2,189,327	2,829,770
1990	3,206,347	795,990	2,410,357	3,161,223
1991	3,598,993	911,060	2,687,933	3,569,300
1992	4,002,669	1,004,039	2,998,630	3,972,578
1993	4,411,489	1,100,758	3,309,717	4,378,039
1994	4,644,000	1,212,000	3,432,000	4,605,000
1995	4,942,000	1,325,000	3,617,000	4,902,000
1996	5,280,000	1,443,000	3,838,000	5,240,000
1997	5,641,000	1,563,000	4,077,000	5,599,000
1998	6,001,000	1,684,000	4,317,000	5,959,000
1999	6,392,000	1,803,000	4,589,000	6,349,000
2000	6,814,000	1,923,000	4,891,000	6,771,000

FEDERAL DEBT PER CAPITA
[In dollars]

Year	Gross Federal debt	Held by the Government	Held by the public	Amount subject to the debt limit
1940	384	60	324	328
1945	1,963	188	1,775	2,028
1950	1,691	249	1,442	1,682
1955	1,662	289	1,373	1,650

FEDERAL DEBT PER CAPITA—Continued
[In dollars]

Year	Gross Federal debt	Held by the Government	Held by the public	Amount subject to the debt limit
1960	1,614	298	1,316	1,577
1965	1,666	318	1,348	1,624
1970	1,869	479	1,390	1,828
1971	1,979	510	1,469	1,933
1972	2,093	545	1,548	2,054
1973	2,222	597	1,624	2,184
1974	2,289	663	1,626	2,248
1975	2,544	691	1,853	2,507
1976	2,930	706	2,224	2,895
1977	3,264	727	2,537	3,235
1978	3,559	777	2,782	3,541
1979	3,766	860	2,906	3,760
1980	3,998	877	3,122	3,999
1981	4,333	913	3,420	4,353
1982	4,907	939	3,968	4,933
1983	5,865	1,027	4,838	5,894
1984	6,633	1,120	5,512	6,670
1985	7,637	1,335	6,302	7,665
1986	8,829	1,599	7,230	8,791
1987	9,681	1,888	7,793	9,641
1988	10,637	2,252	8,386	10,580
1989	11,618	2,748	8,870	11,465
1990	12,857	3,192	9,665	12,676
1991	14,243	3,605	10,637	14,125
1992	15,697	3,938	11,760	15,579
1993	17,126	4,273	12,849	16,996
1994	17,848	4,658	13,190	17,698
1995	18,808	5,043	13,766	18,656
1996	19,906	5,440	14,469	19,755
1997	21,072	5,839	15,230	20,915
1998	22,217	6,235	15,983	22,062
1999	23,459	6,617	16,842	23,301
2000	24,795	6,997	17,797	24,638

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I could go on. Medicare, in the last 4 years is compounded at 13, 11, 12 percent. This year it is expected to compound at 10 percent. Those are rates greater than 3.2 percent.

I admit, we will have to slow the rate of growth in a lot of programs if we will balance the budgets. Will it be easy? Not necessarily. The point is that Federal spending will continue to grow and we can still balance the bud-

et. It will not be able to grow as much or as fast.

Again, I have heard people say, wait a minute, to balance the budget we will have to reduce spending \$1.2 trillion. Over the next 7 years we will spend about \$15 trillion. Can we afford \$1.2 trillion? I think we can reduce the rate of growth and not spend \$15 trillion.

I think we have to do it, Mr. President. I think passing a constitutional amendment to balance the budget will make us do it. If we do not pass it, I am afraid we will be back to business as usual. I hope that is not the case. I really do hope we will be serious. I hope that we will be serious and make a concerted effort to balance the budget, make the tough decisions, cut spending, cut entitlement programs, reduce those programs that are growing to astronomical levels, and try to live within our means. We have to do it.

I just have a couple of comments concerning the pending Daschle amendment. It says:

In order to carry out the purpose of this article, Congress shall adopt a concurrent resolution setting forth a budget plan to achieve a balanced budget (that complies with this article) * * *.

And so on. And it says in section C:

New budget authority and outlays, on an account-by-account basis, for each account with actual outlays or offsetting receipts of at least \$100,000,000 in fiscal year 1994.

This does not belong, Mr. President, in the Constitution. This does not fit. It does not work. And it will not work.

I will read from Senator DASCHLE's comments that he made last year on February 28. He said:

To remedy our fiscal situation, we must stop spending beyond our means. This will not require emasculation of important domestic priorities, as some suggest.

And then he says:

Congress and the President will have 7 years to address the current deficit and reach a consensus on our Nation's budget priorities. We will have time to find ways to live within our means and still meet existing obligations to our citizens, particularly the elderly.

I happen to concur with that. However, his amendment does not concur with the statements last year. His amendment does not belong in the U.S. Constitution, with all respect to its supporters. I may concur with their desire for Congress to set out a glidepath. The glidepath is this: Let us limit Federal spending to 3.2 percent, and if we want spending in some areas, like Social Security, to grow at 5 percent, that is fine; we have to find some other spending areas to be reduced to offset that amount. We can do that, if we will just show the courage to do it. Unfortunately, Congress has not shown the courage in the past.

Mr. President, I will conclude with, again, complimenting the sponsors of the balanced budget amendment, Senators SIMON, HATCH, and CRAIG, and many others who worked tirelessly to make it happen. We passed a similar amendment in 1982—I wish it would have been adopted by the House—in 1982, we were spending about \$746 billion. We are spending more than twice as much today, in 1995, as we did in 1982.

So I think we need this balanced budget amendment. It is regretful we did not pass it a decade ago, or maybe in Jefferson's time. We would not be in the plight we are in, with our children inheriting a debt of over \$18,000 per person. So I hope that the Daschle amendment will be either defeated or tabled, and I hope that we will pass a constitutional amendment to balance the budget identical to that of the House and then allow the States to go forward with the ratification process.

I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I intend to yield time to the Senator from Illinois. Let me for 30 seconds on my time indicate that which sounds deceptively simple is just plain wrong. As someone said, as happens often, you can simply limit to 3 percent growth and you solve the problem. If you limit Social Security to 3 percent growth, you effectively—Social Security recipients would not have the cost-of-living adjustments—but you tell the 6 million new people who become eligible,

"There is no money for you; you don't get your Social Security benefits." It sounds simple.

Mr. NICKLES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DORGAN. I do not have the time, as the Senator did not, either. Let me yield 10 minutes, if I might, to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. NICKLES. Will the Senator from Illinois yield for 30 seconds?

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I cannot yield because there is precious little time left in the debate. I would like to take this opportunity to state my support for the right-to-know amendment.

Mr. President, I am a strong supporter of the balanced budget constitutional amendment, and I am an equally strong supporter of the American people's right to know what balancing the budget will mean for them, for their future, and for their children's future.

Frankly, I do not understand why the right-to-know amendment should be the least bit controversial. I cannot believe that any Member of this Senate would argue that the American people should not know how the Government spends their money. I cannot believe that any Member of this Senate would argue that the American people should not know—in advance—what programs will need to be cut, or consolidated, or terminated, in order to balance the budget. I cannot believe that any Member of this Senate would argue that the American people should not have the right to make their views known on the options for balancing the budget before we are committed to any particular set of options, and that includes options for changes in tax laws, as well as spending cuts. Most of all, I cannot believe that any Member of this Senate would seriously argue that the American people should be asked to make a decision on an issue as important as the balanced budget constitutional amendment without knowing in detail—before they decide—what balancing the budget will mean, both for the United States in general, and for themselves.

It seems to me that we have an obligation to give the American people the absolute truth about the Federal budget, and about the choices we have to make to bring it back to balance—and to keep it there. If we think balancing the budget is important—and I, for one, believe that it is critically important to meeting our responsibility to future generations—then we have an obligation to present the facts to our constituents, to let them know what the options are, and the consequences they entail. In a democracy, the only way to build broad, sustainable support for the hard decisions that adopting a balanced budget constitutional amendment will force is to talk sense to the American people and to tell them the truth.

The people know the truth when they hear it—and they want to hear it. They know that, all too often in the past, budgetary issues have been presented to them as if they were the marks in a three-card monte con game.

Americans don't want to put up with that any more. They want the truth—now. They know they haven't been getting that truth, but they also know that in our democratic system, they deserve that truth, and they are entitled to it.

What the right-to-know amendment is all about is seeing that they get the truth. It calls for nothing more than treating the American public with the respect they deserve. It does nothing more than ask the Congress to do what common sense requires—to simply tell the truth about what it means to balance the budget, and about the changes that balancing the budget will bring. Most importantly, it means putting an end to the kind of budgetary gamesmanship that has contributed so greatly to the rise in public cynicism about Government, and its ability to tell the truth.

Just yesterday I was talking to an auto worker from Decatur, IL. He recounted a joke that goes something like this: "How can you tell the government official is lying?" The answer is: "Because his lips are moving." That response is a telling indictment of the Government's stewardship of the budget and the kind of cynicism that is out there about what we do. In 1981, the American people were asked to believe in supply side economics, a plan that told the American people that cutting taxes would lead to faster economic growth, generating additional Federal revenues that would painlessly balance the budget. Of course, the only thing that it actually generated was staggering deficits that led to a quadrupling of the national debt from \$1 trillion to over \$4 trillion in just 12 years.

And the American people were told that Gramm-Rudman budget discipline would lead to a balanced budget. That effort also failed, because, like supply-side economics, it was more a cosmetic fix. It made the Congress look good and look like it had the discipline to make hard choices concerning the budget. But it was not based on telling the American people the truth about the Federal budget, or about what it would really take to balance it.

That is why the right-to-know amendment is so important now. If the balanced budget constitutional amendment is not to be seen as another budgetary gimmick, as another way to avoid the decision, or as another attempt to concentrate on process in order to again postpone the real decisions that must be made, the American people need to know that Congress is prepared to act, realistically and forcefully, based on budgetary realities rather than political illusions. And the only way they will be convinced of that is if they are made a full partner in the decisionmaking process.

There are those who fear that telling the American people the truth will undermine support for the balanced budget amendment, and there are others who hope it will. But there is no reason to fear the truth. The only thing we should fear is the consequences for our country and our democracy if we do not tell the truth.

Yet, there are those who continue to twist and turn in order to avoid meeting their obligation to the American people—to avoid telling the truth about the budget—and thereby put the balanced budget constitutional amendment unnecessarily at risk. These continued attempts at evasion make the right-to-know amendment, and the facts it will provide, even more necessary.

After all, according to the Congressional Budget Office, it will take over 1.2 trillion dollars' worth of budget changes to reach a balanced budget by the year 2002. And that is just the beginning, because balancing the budget that year will not ensure that it is balanced from then on, and that is what the balanced budget amendment requires.

The fact is that, as difficult as it will be to balance the budget by 2002, that task looks almost insignificant when compared to the challenge of keeping it balanced. I served on the Bipartisan Commission on Entitlement and Tax Reform. That Commission's interim report, adopted by an overwhelming 30 to 1 vote, found that, without major reform in entitlements, the Federal Government will almost double in size by 2030 as a percentage of the economy, and the Federal deficit that year would exceed 18 percent of the economy.

Think of that. Not only would the Federal deficit in 2030 equal virtually one-fifth of our GDP that year, but interest expense alone would consume over \$1 of every \$10 our economy generates.

The Commission report also made it very clear that growth in spending on discretionary programs subject to annual appropriations is not what is driving the growth of Federal spending. As a percentage of overall Federal spending, discretionary spending has dropped from over 70 percent of the budget in 1963 to only 28 percent of the budget now.

What is growing is entitlement spending, spending for activities like Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, and the like. Entitlements consumed only 22 percent of the Federal budget in 1963, but by 2003, together with interest on the national debt, they will account for 72 percent of overall Government spending.

The report of the Congressional Budget Office entitled "The Economic and Budget Outlook: Fiscal Years 1996–2000," confirms the findings of the Entitlement Commission. It found that nondefense discretionary spending has basically not grown at all, as a percentage of GDP, since 1960. Over that same period, however, the CBO report

found that entitlement spending has more than doubled.

Some might say, however, that looking only at percentages of the economy masks very large spending increases. The actual numbers tell much the same story. For example, based on CBO's latest estimates, Federal spending increased by a total of \$70 billion between fiscal 1994 and fiscal 1995. Ninety-five percent of that increase was due to growth in entitlement programs and interest expense. In fact, those two budget areas actually increased by a total of \$88 billion, well over the \$70 billion net overall increase in Federal spending this year.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that every American has a right to know these budget facts, and that every American has a right to know what Congress plans to do about them. Yet, it is also very clear that the American people have not been told these facts, either by the media or by the Congress or the administration. Instead, the American people have been led to believe, as a recent poll by the Wirthlin Group found, that "cutting welfare, foreign aid, and 'congressional perks'" would "do a lot towards balancing the budget."

Most Americans, however, harbor substantial doubts about what they know about the budget. According to a recent memo done for the Republican Conference by the Luntz Research Cos., entitled "Communications Strategy for the Upcoming Budget Battle":

Again and again, focus group participants complain that they don't have anywhere close to the information on the budget that [Members of Congress] do. Survey respondents always overestimate their knowledge on nearly any subject, and only 22% believe they know either "a lot" or "a good amount" about the budget process.

What that means is most Americans know that they are missing a lot of important information about the budget. Most Americans do not know, for example, that AFDC spending—and I have heard a lot of talk about programs for the poor—in real dollars per beneficiary, is down by roughly 40 percent since 1970. Most Americans do not know that foreign aid is only about 1 percent of the Federal budget, and that the value of congressional perks much, much smaller than that. But every American has a right to know these and the myriad other important facts about the budget, and every American has a right to know how Congress plans to change the budget if the balanced budget constitutional amendment becomes the law of the land. Americans have a right to know in advance so that they can determine whether those plans make sense, whether they will work, who will be affected, and why.

There are those who argue against providing details at this point, on the ground that it is somehow premature. Timing, however, did not prevent the new House majority from laying out its tax proposals in great specificity, proposals that the Treasury Department

estimates will cost \$375 billion over the next 7 years, and increase the size of the budget gap over that period by almost 40 percent.

Why is it, Mr. President, that now is the time to be specific about tax cuts, but now is not the time to be specific about the changes on the spending side of the equation that will be required to pay for those tax cuts and still balance the budget by the year 2002?

Americans have the right to know the specifics. It is time to put aside talking about waste, fraud, and abuse, and pork barrel spending as if the budget could be balanced by eliminating those sins. It is, instead, time to come clean with the American people and tell them what balancing the budget will really mean. I do not say that to suggest that we abandon our efforts to deal with waste, an inefficiency. Far from it. Tackling those issues must continue to be a priority. But it is time to acknowledge reality, and the reality is that dealing with waste, fraud, and abuse is not, and cannot be, in and of itself, a complete strategy for dealing with the budget deficit. It is only a component of a strategy, and not even the biggest one.

It is time to stop diverting the American people's attention from the major policy options that absolutely must be examined if the budget is to be balanced. If we are serious about balancing the budget, if we want to meet our obligation to future generations—and if we want the American people to support the tough decisions that will be required—then we have to stop the budget gamesmanship now, and enter a real partnership with the American people.

The American people need to know the dimensions of the budget problems we face, and what the realistic options are to address those problems. They need to know that it would take a 13-percent across-the-board cut in every Federal program, including Social Security and Medicare, to balance the budget by 2002—and that more cuts would be needed thereafter to keep it balanced unless the rate of growth of entitlement spending can be cut.

They need to know that it would take an 18-percent cut in every other program but Social Security to balance the budget by 2002, if that program is taken off the table, and that further cuts would be needed in those other programs to keep the budget balanced after 2002. And they need to know that even taking Social Security off the table will not keep Social Security viable in the long run, because that does nothing to restore the actuarial balance in that program that the Social Security trustees say is now out of balance. They need to know that we must act to keep Social Security available for future generations—and that the sooner we act, the easier it is to accomplish. And they need to know that maintaining Social Security's viability can be accomplished without cutting

the benefits of any current beneficiary by even a nickel.

They need to know that it would take a 32-percent cut in all other Federal programs, including defense, to balance the budget by the year 2002, if both Social Security and Medicare are taken off the table—and more cuts in those programs thereafter to keep it balanced, because both Social Security, and particularly Medicare, are growing faster than our economy or Federal revenues. And they need to know that it will take a cut of 36 percent in all other Federal programs if defense is also taken off the table.

They need to know that it is not the programs benefiting the poorest Americans that are driving the growth of the Federal budget. They need to know that the real engines of growth are rapidly rising health care costs, and the fact that the baby boom generation is moving toward retirement.

Perhaps most of all, they need to know what some of the options for balancing the budget might mean for them. Would the proposed path toward the balanced budget mean rougher roads, or higher subway fares? What would it mean to their children, to their opportunity to get a good grammar school and high school education, and to their chances to go to college. What will it mean to their ability to buy a home and to obtain a mortgage? And what would it mean to older Americans who need access to affordable health care? Would they face additional gaps in coverage, higher premiums, higher deductibles, or some combination of all of these? Would older Americans be able to choose to pay somewhat more in taxes to keep Medicare solvent, or would the only choice they are offered be private insurance—even if that option were to be more costly. Will COLA's—cost of living adjustments—be set based on the facts and the best measurement of inflation we can make, or will COLA's be determined on a more political basis?

Americans also want to know whether the result of Federal actions to balance the budget means higher State and local taxes for them. After all, the Federal Government currently provides more than 21 percent of the State of Illinois' budget, and provides major support for the budget of towns and cities across my State. An analysis done by the Treasury Department at the request of the chairman of the National Governors Association found that across-the-board cuts in Federal spending to balance the budget could lead to tax increases in my State of over 10 percent—and in some States, the tax hikes necessary to make good the loss of Federal funds could be as much as 25 percent.

In the 1970's and the 1980's, both the Presidents and the Congress failed in their obligation to face our long-term budget problems. They flinched from making the necessary decisions because those decisions were politically difficult and because it was easier to

talk about fiscal responsibility, than to act to achieve it. However, if we had balanced the budget in 1980, there would be no need for even a single dollar of program cuts this year. The budget would actually be in surplus. Dealing with the rapid cost increases in Medicare and Medicaid would be much easier than it will be now. The Government would have a far greater ability to act to address problems that need our attention, because it would not be spending over \$200 billion a year just on debt service.

The failures of the 1980's brought us to where we are now, and those failures make the job of restoring fiscal discipline more difficult now. The lesson of that failure is that we cannot afford further delay. That is why I was critical of the President's budget that was released yesterday. It avoids facing our budget problems. It avoids telling the American people the truth about those budget problems, and what it will take to solve them. It does not meet the responsibilities that leadership entails.

But the fact that the President did not act aggressively does not lessen the responsibility of the Congress to act, particularly when Congress is attempting to add a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. We must begin to act—now—whether there is a balanced budget constitutional amendment or not.

And that is the real importance of the right-to-know amendment. It properly focuses attention where it absolutely must be focused—on the decisions involved in implementing a constitutional amendment—on what is involved in turning the promise of a balanced budget into a reality. The work is not done if and when the balanced budget amendment becomes a part of the Constitution, and the truth is that the real work cannot wait until a constitutional amendment is ratified.

The ongoing Mexican financial situation gives us a glimpse of the future if we do not tell the truth to the American people about our budget problems and get their help in beginning to solve them now. Mexico was financing economic growth with foreign capital, and was therefore vulnerable to a loss of confidence. The result of that loss of confidence is creating economic recession in Mexico, and real hardship for millions of Mexicans.

The United States economy is much larger and stronger, and much more resilient than Mexico's. We do not face the same kind of sudden collapse. But the U.S. national savings rate has been declining for many years now. We are financing an increasing portion of our Government debt, and private economic investment with foreign capital. And the result will likely be even higher interest rates in the United States, and increasing pressure on the incomes of most Americans, if we do not begin to act now. On the other hand, if we do begin to move toward a balanced budget, OMB Director Alice Rivlin, in her "Big Choices" memo,

tells us that we can turn the anemic 3.7-percent national savings rate into a 6.1-percent savings rate by the year 2000. And that higher national savings rate would mean more opportunity and a brighter future for our children—and their children.

As important as it is to our futures, and our country's future, to restore discipline to the Federal budget—to balance the budget—how we get to that balance makes a difference. Some options work better for the American people than others. How we choose to get to a balanced budget makes a big difference.

The right-to-know amendment ensures that every American has the opportunity to get a good, hard look at the plans for balancing the budget, and, indeed, at all of the available options. It takes the abstractions involved in the balanced budget amendment, and makes them concrete and real.

The right-to-know amendment calls on Congress to meet its obligation to American democracy. It is nothing less than a recognition of our fundamental moral responsibility to our country, because it seeks to ensure that the American people have the information they need to be able to meet their own responsibilities as Americans.

No one can make good decisions without good information. In a democracy, that means not only must Congress and the President have good information, but so must the American people. For that reason alone, it should have universal support in this Senate. It is the only way to demonstrate that Congress is serious about wanting to balance the budget, that Congress wants the American people to be real partners in the decisions required to make that happen, and that Congress is committed to doing what is right—telling the whole budget truth to the American people.

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

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I ask if the Senator will yield for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN. I have 12 minutes and two additional statements.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I conclude by saying, Mr. President, the balanced budget amendment is going to require some real hard decisions by all of us, decisions that will affect our States, decisions that will affect our constituencies, and it seems to me that we have an obligation to tell the truth beforehand so people get a sense of exactly how this will work.

Taking Social Security off the table, taking Medicaid off the table, taking defense off the table, doing the kinds of changes that will come up in amendments after we get past this one, will, I think, require some hard decisions. It seems to me that with the right-to-know-amendment the people will have the truth. They can evaluate our actions more accurately and more effectively. They can hold us accountable for what we do.

With that, Mr. President, I thank the Senator from North Dakota and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. GORTON. I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. President, at the outset of this debate, I observed that Members of the Senate divided into three distinct groups in connection with the proposal now before us.

The first was those who believe that the present budget and financial system of the Government of the United States is broken, broken seriously and requires major surgery in order to fix it. The evidence which we, a majority, in this body have cited is the fact that in 30 years we have had but one balanced budget. In the last 20 years, the total debt has multiplied by more than 10 times to almost \$5 trillion, a tremendous burden on the people of the United States of America; that even at the present time, at a time of relative prosperity, we are running deficits of \$200 billion a year, adding that amount to our total debt. The cure, it is the belief of the substantial majority of the Members of this body, is the balanced budget amendment in the form in which it passed the House of Representatives.

The second group in this debate are those who claim allegiance to the concept of a balanced budget but not in this fashion, not through the provision for such a budget in the Constitution of the United States.

Now, I believe that the overwhelming challenge to that second group is if not this way, what way? What indicates to them in the history of the last 30 or 40 years that either a President of the United States or a Congress of the United States without any external discipline whatsoever will change the course of action of several decades and work toward a balanced budget without external discipline?

So far, this second group has been quite silent about what there is that has so profoundly changed in America that we will now get what we have lacked over the course of the last 30 years. In fact, it seems to me that it is more the duty of that group to show us how they would reach the goal than it is of those who believe that a constitutional amendment is necessary and who are the subject of the demands in this motion by the distinguished Democratic leader.

Third, of course, is the group that does not believe in a balanced budget at all, who feel that the present, the status quo is perfectly appropriate. There are relatively few in number in this body who candidly advocate that position but one certainly can credit their candidness. Probably a number of those in the second group really fall into the third group with the balanced budget as a low priority or no priority at all.

That third group, however, got a wonderful new recruit on Monday. On Monday, the President of the United States, William Clinton, joined them by presenting to us a budget with a \$200 billion deficit and projections that are very optimistic from the perspective of inflation and economic growth, projections that never bring the budget deficit to significantly less than \$200 billion a year, with a deficit that increases after the turn of the century, so that another \$1.5 trillion will be added to the debt. That budget, that Presidential budget is the best single advertisement for the passage of this constitutional amendment in its original form.

The Daschle motion, the motion of the distinguished Democratic leader, is designed to justify doing nothing, to retain the status quo. I cannot imagine that any of its proponents really believe we ought to include in the Constitution of the United States two pages of detailed instructions which will become irrelevant if the constitutional amendment is actually passed. They cannot believe it.

But beyond the inappropriateness of putting such language in the Constitution of the United States is the unconstitutionality of the motion itself because our Constitution tells us that this Congress passes proposed constitutional amendments which are then submitted to the States for their ratification. Under the Daschle motion, no such thing will happen. The submission to the States is conditioned upon Congress passing a series of laws before that submission takes place.

The Daschle motion is, therefore, not only bad policy, not only bad aesthetics by putting terrible language in the Constitution of the United States, it is itself blatantly unconstitutional.

Both for reasons of policy and for reasons of constitutionality, the Daschle motion should be decisively and swiftly tabled so we can move on to a debate over the merits of the constitutional proposal itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). Who yields time?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the pending resolution to amend the Constitution to require a balanced budget.

I have not always supported the balanced budget amendment. When this measure was considered by the Senate in 1982 and again in 1986, I felt that Congress could and would address deficits without the aid of a constitutional amendment. Several years ago, however, I realized that I had overestimated Congress' ability to deal responsibly with the budget. We have not balanced the budget in 25 years.

When it came time for the tough spending cuts ordered by the Gramm-Rudman deficit reduction law, Con-

gress did not have the will to follow through. So in 1992, for the first time I supported a balanced budget amendment in the Senate.

Public debt is not inherently bad. It was both necessary and wise for the Federal Government to borrow heavily during World War II. In the three decades following the war, the United States gradually paid down this debt. Beginning in the 1970's and worsening in the 1980's, however, the Federal Government reversed this trend by borrowing more and more to pay for current expenses. The huge deficits we have been running for the past 15 years have not been to finance public investments that will yield benefits in the future. We have been borrowing primarily to pay for current consumption. We're not borrowing to build roads; we're borrowing to put gas in the car.

Contrary to popular belief, Congress is never faced with the option of raising taxes or borrowing money to finance Government. Spending can only be paid for through taxes—it is simply a question of whether we raise taxes today or tomorrow. Borrowing invariably means that future generations will face a heavier tax burden. In fact, the Office of Management and Budget last year published an analysis of the growing tax burden. The report forecast that, without changes in Federal law, the average net tax rate for future generations would eventually reach 82 percent of their lifetime earnings. Clearly, such a tax burden would be unacceptable.

The real harm caused by Government borrowing is that it draws down the pool of savings available for investment. Rising standards of living are possible only through investments in infrastructure, in plants and equipment, and in education. Savings by American families and businesses provide the capital for these investments. But deficits draw down, or crowd out, the national pool of savings. This year, for instance, the first \$200 billion in savings will not go to investments in new plants and equipment but to feed the deficit.

As more and more of our savings are devoured by the deficit, investments for the future decline—and with them, the rate of economic growth in the country.

So the deficit is a double hit on future generations. We are not only asking them to finance our current spending; we are handicapping their ability to meet this obligation—by crowding out investments for the future. We are not only eating their seed corn, we are asking them to pick up the dinner check.

This travesty simply must end. As nearly every economist in the country agrees, the surest way to increase investment in the future is to cut the deficit. And, the surest way to cut the deficit is to pass the balanced budget

amendment. All other remedies have failed.

Repeated deficits have done serious damage not only to the economy but to Congress' standing with the public. The low esteem in which Congress is held is directly related to our fiscal irresponsibility. For the sake of the integrity of this institution, we cannot continue to promise the American people long-term deficit reduction and do little about it. Actions do speak louder than words.

We have tried every conceivable legislative option to force a more responsible budget policy. With few exceptions, these efforts have failed. A constitutional amendment appears to be the only solution left. As others have said, it may be a bad idea but one whose time has come.

Amending the Constitution should not be proposed lightly. It is a very serious matter. However, the balanced budget amendment is consistent with the historic role of the Federal constitution in safeguarding the rights of those who may be under-represented in the political process. In this case the under-represented individuals are future generations who are being asked to pay for our profligacy.

Numerous arguments have been made in opposition to the balanced budget amendment. Some have argued that the balanced budget amendment is a gimmick that will not work, while at the same time arguing that it will wreak havoc by imposing draconian cuts. The balanced budget amendment is neither a gimmick nor a merciless ax hanging over all Federal programs—and it is certainly not both.

The balanced budget amendment is not an easy political vote. The easy votes have been the routine ones to spend beyond our means. The proposed amendment will not—with certainty—end deficit spending, but it will undoubtedly make it more difficult.

When the 1990 budget agreement required a supermajority to exceed annual caps in discretionary spending, no one argued that the supermajority requirement was a gimmick. It was recognized as an essential step toward fiscal responsibility. When all the smoke is cleared on the balanced budget debate, it is undeniable that deficits will be harder to continue under a constitutional amendment. If you want to make it more difficult for Congress and the President to pass the tax bill on to future generations, you should support the balanced budget amendment.

The amendment does not tie Congress' hand to the point that it could not respond to a national crisis. With the approval of three-fifths of the Congress, deficits would be permitted. In times of war or dire economic circumstances, three-fifths of the Members of the Congress can be expected to recognize the need for deficit spending.

Unfortunately, Congress has too often viewed deficits not as a necessary tool in dire circumstances but as a convenient way to spend beyond our

means. We have turned the exception into the rule and have become hooked on deficit spending. It has been easier to reach for the deficit brew than to abstain and act responsibly. The practical effect of the balanced budget amendment will be to put this elixir a little higher on the shelf and further out of Congress' reach.

In closing, I would like to make three points that I think put this debate into context.

First, 37 States have balanced budget amendments. Complying with these requirements is not always convenient. But over the long term, forcing governments to balance their budgets promotes good and disciplined government.

Second, the fact that taxpayers are willing to finance only \$1.4 trillion of the \$1.6 trillion worth of current Government services, begs the question of whether the public really wants as much Government as currently exists.

Last, we should not lose sight of the fact that there is no free lunch here. Every dollar the Government borrows is a dollar unavailable for job-creating investment in the private sector. Also, every dollar the Government borrows today is a dollar tomorrow's taxpayers will have to repay. At its most basic level the balanced budget amendment stands for the simple principle that we should pay today for the Government we use today. If we are unwilling to put the money on the barrel ourselves, by what right can we ask future generations to put their money on the barrel?

The balanced budget amendment offers the best hope of ending the fiscal child abuse in which we have been engaged. The bruises may not show right now, but the pain is going to last a lifetime. We owe it to our children and their children to balance the budget. I have no illusions that this will be an easy task, but if we do not in earnest set this as our goal and accept it as our responsibility, it will never happen. The debate today is not about how do we get there, it is about where are we going.

Thomas Jefferson once said that whenever one generation spends money and taxes another to pay for it, it is squandering futurity on a massive scale. Let us end this squandering and pass the balanced budget amendment now before our task becomes even more difficult.

Mr. President, now let me speak briefly about the pending amendment, the so-called right-to-know amendment.

The word "gimmick" has been thrown around here quite a bit in this debate, with the opponents of the balanced budget amendment arguing it is simply a gimmick rather than a serious effort to balance the budget. I respectfully suggest if there is a gimmick stalking the Chambers these days, it is the so-called right-to-know amendment. It is designed to kill the balanced budget amendment and nothing else. Some of its principal sponsors

supported the balanced budget amendment last year, and there was no mention on their part of a right to know at that time. Curiously, suddenly it has emerged.

Any one of us can produce a balanced budget plan by the year 2002. Indeed, some of us have. I joined last year with Senators Danforth, Boren and JOHNSTON, to offer the only bipartisan alternative to the President's budget. Our plan called for cutting spending on the basis of \$2 for every \$1 in taxes. It was a serious and detailed plan. Unfortunately, it gathered more critical acclaim from the Concord Coalition and others than it did from Members of the Chamber.

But the issue pending before the Senate is not how we are going to get somewhere. It is about where we are going. Are we truly committed to balancing the budget? If so, let us take the first step by passing this amendment. The process of figuring out how we achieve the goal is going to be difficult. Everyone in the Chamber understands just how it is that no serious debate can take place in an atmosphere of partisan sniping, where one side is trying to score points through fear mongering, by saying the other side is trying to attack Social Security or veterans or some other group.

Three years ago, Senators NUNN and DOMENICI offered a plan to cap entitlement spending the way we already cap discretionary spending. I supported it. Unfortunately, there were only 28 votes in favor of that approach.

A second-degree amendment was offered by the Democratic leader to exempt veterans' programs. It was effective. Very few Senators wanted to vote against that amendment. It was effective in terms of short-term politics, but it served to underscore what is wrong with Congress and why the American people are basically fed up with Washington. Every thinking person who has looked at the Federal Government knows entitlement reform is the key to any serious deficit reduction, yet the political fires are stoked to the point where no one dares to discuss openly what we know privately to be essential—entitlement reform.

During the debate on the Nunn-Domenici plan, we were told, do not undertake broad entitlement reform, that is really not where the problem is. The problem is with health care spending. We need health care reform.

After a year of debate in this Chamber, after the President submitted his 1,435-page proposal for health care reform, the best that could be said was that it was deficit neutral. Yet before we were told, "Wait until we get to health care reform, that is where the savings are, forget about entitlement reform," and when the plan finally came up it was at best deficit neutral. It certainly did not reduce the deficit.

It is a mistake both in terms of politics and policy. The atmosphere around

here has become so poisoned that honest debate has become nearly prohibited, and that is neither in the country's nor the Senate's best interest.

The President's budget calls for \$200 billion in deficits as far as the eye can see. We all understand why it does not call for a long list of specific cuts, because he would be attacked, just as Republicans are when we produce lists of spending cuts. We need an environment like the one Chief Justice Earl Warren sought when the Supreme Court took up the case of *Brown v. Board of Education*, dealing with racial segregation in public schools. The Chief Justice, knowing this would be a landmark and controversial case in the country's race relations, first sought an agreement among the Justices for unanimity in their decision. He did not want such an important decision to be decided by a split Court.

I have no illusion that the Members of Congress could unanimously agree on a difficult deficit reduction package, but I do think we ought to learn from Chief Justice Warren's approach in terms of securing an atmosphere where debate can be undertaken without fear of being punished for candor. The budget deficit is rivaled only by the candor deficit. Until we can openly discuss these issues without fear of charges of heresy, is any serious progress ever going to be made? The balanced budget amendment is necessary to create that atmosphere, and I urge my colleagues to reject the attempt to subvert and derail this effort by the so-called right-to-know amendment.

I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I yield the remaining 11 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Do I understand the Senator from Connecticut desires time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, first of all, I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. I will ask for just 2 minutes, if that is appropriate, if the Chair will notify me so I do not eat into the time of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. President, I rise to support the right-to-know amendment offered by the distinguished Senate minority leader, Senator DASCHLE.

The first headline to greet me yesterday morning was "Republicans Vow Leadership They Say Clinton's Budget Lacks."

Mr. President, I look forward to their leadership on this vitally important matter. We have not seen any yet, but I am sure it is right around the corner.

I look forward to providing as much scrutiny of Republican deficit reduction efforts as has been accorded to the

President's efforts. To my Republican friends, I say it is time to see your cuts. The 104th Congress has now been in session for 36 days, and we have yet to see any specific cuts.

THE CLINTON RECORD

Twenty-seven days after President Clinton assumed office he submitted a detailed budget plan that contained more than \$500 billion in deficit reduction. He did not say "I want to see the Republicans plan first." Instead he did what he was elected to do—he led.

He made difficult and painful choices. The choices were so hard, in fact, that not a single Republican Member supported his deficit reduction initiative. The House Budget Committee chairman, Representative JOHN KASICH, proposed an alternative plan that cut the deficit by \$15 billion less than the President's plan.

Despite the doom and gloom predictions of our Republican colleagues, the President's plan has substantially reduced the deficit and helped the economy. President Clinton has reversed the trend of the Reagan/Bush era. Then the national debt was growing faster than the economy. Now the economy is growing faster than the debt. And the combined rates of unemployment and inflation have reached a 25-year low.

HEALTH CARE

Last year, the President exercised considerable leadership again by tackling the principle cause of rising deficits, skyrocketing health care costs. The President offered a comprehensive plan to reform our health care system and contain rising health care costs that are fueling deficit growth. Forty percent of the increase in spending is due to increasing medical costs.

Last February, CBO reported that:

Once the administration's proposal was fully implemented, it would significantly reduce the projected growth of national health expenditures * * * from 2000 on national health expenditures would fall below the baseline by increasing amounts. By 2004, CBO projects that total spending for health would be \$150 billion—or 7 percent—below where it would be if current policies and trends continued.

Unfortunately, the President's efforts were thwarted.

The President remains committed to reining in rising health care costs and reforming our system in a comprehensive manner. Health care, however, is not even mentioned in the Contract With America.

FISCAL YEAR 1996 BUDGET

On Monday, the President submitted his 1996 budget and recommended an additional \$81 billion in deficit reduction. That savings, and the President's tax cuts, are fully funded with specific spending cuts.

REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP

Mr. President, we have heard much from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle about their desire to achieve significant accomplishments in the first 100 days of this session. We are now 36 days into that benchmark and

we have yet to see the Republicans spending cut plans.

We have heard much talk, and seen very little action. The GOP has reversed the advice of a great Republican leader, Theodore Roosevelt. Instead of speaking softly, and carrying a big stick, they are shouting loudly and carrying a fig leaf. A constitutional amendment provides their cover.

Congressman KASICH said recently, "You can't have people who are afraid to break china when you've got to go at this with a sledgehammer."

Let us see what the sledgehammer will produce.

RIGHT-TO-KNOW AMENDMENT

Mr. President, that is the purpose of this amendment. It is no more and no less than a truth in budget advertising amendment. It says simply that we must be honest with the American people.

Before we pass a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution, we should tell the American people how we intend to accomplish this task. I cannot imagine this effort being at all controversial anywhere but Washington, DC. It simply says if you are going to talk the talk of balanced budgets, you have to walk the walk of how you get there. So far, that is exactly what is not happening.

RENEGING ON PROMISES

Several weeks ago, in response to President Clinton's demand that any tax cuts be deficit neutral, our Republican colleagues promised that spending cuts would precede tax cuts. The message was clear: Before we pass broad new benefits, we must assure the American public that they will be paid for. This promise has since been abandoned to concerns of kneebuckling constituents.

MORE PROMISES—NO DETAILS

The Contract With America promises to balance the budget by 2002. CBO estimates that this will cost \$1.2 trillion over 7 years.

The contract also promises \$200 billion in tax cuts over 5 years, and \$700 billion in cuts over 10 years. Fifty percent of the tax cuts, I might add, would benefit Americans with incomes in excess of \$100,000 a year.

Before attempting to pay for these promises, the GOP proposes to take more than half the budget off the table. Republicans want to increase defense spending and remove Social Security, while at the same time continuing to pay interest on the debt. Less than half the budget would then remain on the chopping block.

Removing these items would require a 30-percent across-the-board reduction in everything else.

That means a 30-percent across-the-board cut in: Violent crime programs, veterans pensions, Medicare benefits, child nutrition, headstart, health programs, low-income energy assistance, student loans, research and development, and so forth.

Let us analyze further for a moment what these cuts may well mean in human terms:

A 30-percent across-the-board could mean:

A \$5,175 increase in Medicare premiums and out-of-pocket costs for seniors.

An elimination of nursing home coverage or optional services like home care and prescription drugs.

Some 6.6 million less children with health care coverage through the Medicaid Program.

A drop of a third in NIH biomedical research grants severely impeding research on cancer, AIDS, heart disease, and other illnesses.

Veterans disabled in their service to our country could expect their average monthly benefit check to decline from \$819 to \$574.

A middle-class family relying on Government loans to send a child to college could owe over \$3,000 in additional interest.

As many as 3,000 teachers could lose their jobs, dramatically increasing class sizes.

Over 200,000 American families could lose the child care subsidies that enable parents to work or attend school.

Approximately 1.8 million households could lose the Federal assistance that enables them to pay their heating bills during the winter.

Over 150,000 jobs could be lost through cuts in highway funds.

Almost 2 million pregnant women and young children could lose infant formula and other nutrition supplements.

Over 30 million meals on wheels for homebound seniors might not be delivered.

Over 38 million meals might not be served at seniors centers.

The average interval between inspections of food manufacturing facilities could increase from 6 to 11 years.

Over 200,000 dislocated workers could be denied retraining and job replacement services; 40,000 violations of workplace safety regulations uncovered by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration could remain uncorrected.

Mr. President, it is clearly impossible to achieve significant deficit reduction without pain.

That is the whole point of this amendment. Before we promise to balance the budget, and enact new tax cuts, the American public deserves to know exactly what kind of pain to expect.

The President has revealed his cuts. Democratic members have made painful choices and tough votes. It is time for the Republicans to reveal how they intend to fulfill their own promises.

NO DETAILS

On spending cuts, the Republicans are essentially saying to each other, like Connie Chung, "Whisper it, just between you and me." They do not want a serious debate by an informed public of all the implications of this constitutional amendment.

It is true that 80 percent of the American public supports a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution, as long as it remains a slogan or a simple statement of principle. But what happens to that 80 percent figure when people are presented with various spending cut options?

A Washington Post-ABC news poll is telling:

Only 59 percent still support the balanced budget amendment if it would mean cuts in welfare or public assistance to the poor.

Only 56 percent still support it if it would mean cuts in defense.

Only 37 percent still support it if it would mean cuts in education.

Only 34 percent still support it if it would mean cuts in Social Security.

Mr. President, before we amend the fundamental charter of our Nation, the U.S. Constitution, we must be open and frank with the American people about our plans.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to inform the electorate of the important budgetary choices this body intends to make in the years ahead.

Let me briefly say it is no secret to my colleagues here that I am opposed to this amendment to the Constitution. My intention would be to vote against all amendments that are offered to it. This amendment, however, I think, deserves support. It simply asks us to know what I think most persons would like to know: Before their Congressmen or Senators vote on something as significant and profound as to change the organic law of the country into which we will incorporate economic theory—and it is always open to speculation and guesswork in such an organic law—to have some idea as to how this is all going to be achieved.

It is, as one would enter into contract negotiations—since that is a subject of some heated debate now in this city, between baseball owners and players—as if someone would suggest: Look, sign the contract. We will talk about the details afterwards.

You would be ridiculed if you made such a proposal.

Here, what we are merely suggesting is that as we go down this road, which will incorporate for the first time a real straitjacket into the Constitution of the United States, what are the implications of this? What does it mean to people out there who pay the taxes and fund all these programs? They, it seems to me, are really the ones who have a right to know how their tax dollars will be used or not used in the future.

The suggestion, somehow, their knees would buckle if they knew because it is painful is no reason to reject the desire to find out exactly how this is going to work. And for that reason I strongly support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I oppose the proposed balanced budget con-

stitutional amendment, because it is unnecessary and unwise to write a balanced budget requirement into the Constitution.

It is obvious why the Republican majority has scheduled consideration of the balanced budget amendment now, so early in this new Congress.

The Republican majority wants to pass the constitutional amendment before more pressure builds for them to explain how they would achieve the balance. The more the American people understand this leap-before-you-look strategy, the less the people like it.

The House Republican majority leader has already admitted to this strategy. Congressman ARMEY, a strong supporter of the proposed constitutional amendment, said that if Members of Congress know what it takes to comply with the requirement, "their knees will buckle." He also is reported to have said that "putting together a detailed list beforehand would make passing the balanced budget amendment virtually impossible."

Instead of devoting the time and effort to craft a responsible budget, the Republican majority asks us to amend the Constitution now, ask questions later. But the Constitution has served this Nation through wars, economic depressions, and other crises far worse than the current budget deficit. Amending the Constitution should be the considered option of last resort, not the expedient course of first resort.

For that reason, I commend Senator DASCHLE's amendment to insure that the constitutional amendment will not take effect unless Congress first passes a resolution specifying in detail how the budget would be balanced by 2002. The American people and their elected representatives in the State legislatures have a fundamental right to know how this constitutional amendment would affect their lives.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that a total of \$1.2 trillion in deficit reduction will be required to balance the budget by the year 2002. And that total does not include the tax cuts called for by the Republican Contract With America, which would raise the total of cuts required to \$1.5 trillion.

If Social Security, defense, and interest on the national debt are excluded from the deficit-cutting calculations, all other Federal programs will have to be cut by 22 percent to achieve a balanced budget in 2002. And if the tax cuts in the Contract With America are included, all other Federal programs will have to be cut by 30 percent. That's a 30-percent cut in spending on Medicare, Medicaid, veterans benefits, student loans, farm benefits, and all other Federal programs.

The American people have a right to know if that is how the Republican majority will balance the budget.

Across-the-board 30-percent cuts would have a disastrous impact on children, the elderly, and hard-working families throughout the United States. Here are just a few examples:

Over 220,000 children would be unable to enroll in Head Start early childhood programs.

Over 200,000 families would lose the child care subsidies that enable parents to work or attend school.

And 1.9 million students would lose the opportunity for remedial education through title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Also, 3,000 teachers would lose their jobs, dramatically increasing class sizes in many school districts.

To achieve the necessary cuts, the House Budget Committee has already proposed that the Federal Government should stop paying the interest on student loans while students are in college or professional school. Middle-class students on the full available amount of such loans would owe over \$3,000 in additional interest at the end of 4 years of college. Instead of \$17,000 in loans to pay back, they would have to pay back over \$20,000.

The challenge that we are facing in higher education is not how we are going to raise the burden on middle-income families to send their children to school, but how we are going to dampen that burden, lessen that burden, so that their young members of their family are going to be able to go to school. The fact, even as we are here this morning, is that efforts are being made within the Republican Budget Committee and by the Republican chair of the Appropriations Committee to raise the cost of those loans significantly for future years.

If those same needy students were to attend medical school and continue to borrow the full amount available, they would owe over \$16,000 in additional interest at the end of medical school. A debt that would be \$51,000 under current law would climb to a debt of \$67,000.

If Pell grants are slashed by 30 percent, eligible students would receive a maximum of \$1,560, a fraction of the \$8,000 it now costs to attend many State universities. Many students could not even afford community college at this reduced level of support.

What we have seen in the 1980's to 1992 is a dramatic shift from the grant programs for the children of working families to go to schools and colleges which they were qualified to go to and to which they wanted to go—three-quarters for the grants and one-quarter for the loan. Now it is three-quarters for the loan and one-quarter for the grant.

Now the Republicans are talking about increasing the costs of those particular loans and indenturing young sons and daughters of working families for years to come. That will only be increased dramatically with a balanced budget amendment.

If the cut is achieved by reducing the number of students receiving Pell

grants rather than the amount of the grant, 1.1 million students would fail to receive the Federal aid they need to attend college.

Senior citizens would face drastically higher medical bills. Medicare beneficiaries would pay an additional \$1,320 more in premiums and out of pocket costs.

Monthly benefits for disabled veterans would drop from \$819 to \$574 a month.

A 30-percent cut in Federal support for biomedical research would reduce the number of annual research project grants awarded by the National Institutes of Health from 6,000 to 4,200. This cut would severely damage research on cancer, AIDS, heart disease, and other illnesses affecting millions of Americans. The promising current effort to identify a genetic basis for diabetes would be set back.

The greatest opportunity for breakthroughs that we have had in the history of this country is out at the NIH. There is a difficulty, even with the administration getting an additional \$500 million for additional grants. More than 90 Nobel laureates won because of NIH support over the history of the NIH with extraordinary opportunities for breakthroughs in cancer and many other diseases that affect families all across this country.

The effect of a balanced budget amendment, in cutting back what is called discretionary funds—we are not talking about exempting NIH. No; no. We are talking about cutting discretionary funds, whatever that means. Make no mistake about it. You are talking about cutting NIH; you are cutting cancer research; you are cutting heart disease research; and you are cutting AIDS research. That is going to be a direct result with a balanced budget amendment.

Why not give us the opportunity to find out from those that support a balanced budget amendment whether they are going to include the NIH? Let us have a debate on it. What is wrong with that? Why not say: Are you going to include NIH, or are you going to be willing to cut back on other kinds of spending? Or, do you want to enhance some fees in terms of other parts of the country, mining fees or grazing fees? But we are denied that opportunity, and the Daschle amendment would require that kind of a factor.

Approximately 1.8 million households would lose the Federal assistance that enables them to pay their heating bills during the winter. Alternatively, the assistance available to all eligible households would be cut to only \$120 each year, barely enough to pay a single month's bill.

Nearly a quarter million senior citizens who rely on the Meals on Wheels Program for their nutrition would be denied that assistance. There are some 32,000 seniors every single day who get Meals on Wheels in my State of Massachusetts. You are talking about cutting thousands off of that particular

list. Over 700,000 senior citizens who benefit from the congregate meals program would lose that assistance. Large numbers of these senior citizens, unable to feed themselves, would no longer be able to live at home and would be placed into institutions.

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration would be able to carry out 12,000 fewer inspections each year. Some 40,000 violations of workplace safety regulations that OSHA uncovered last year might remain uncorrected. A similar number of violations uncovered by the Mine Safety and Health Administration might remain uncorrected.

Over 200,000 dislocated workers would be denied retraining and job placement services. An additional 200,000 teenagers seeking summer jobs would be refused that opportunity.

The average number of food inspections by the Food and Drug Administration would fall from 10,000 to 7,000.

The average interval between inspections of food manufacturing facilities would go from 6 years to 11 years. The average frequency of blood bank inspections would decrease from once every 2 years to once every 3 years.

The process for reviewing new pharmaceutical products would lengthen from approximately 20 months to 30 months initially, and get longer as the backlog carries over from year to year.

Those are but a few of the examples of the impact of the 30-percent across-the-board cut in Federal spending that would be required under the Republican proposal for a balanced Federal budget by 2002.

If that is what the Republican majority have in mind to comply with the proposed constitutional amendment, the American people have a right to know it.

The Treasury Department has also estimated the impact of the proposed constitutional amendment on the States.

An across-the-board deficit reduction package that excluded Social Security and defense would require cuts in Federal grants to States of \$97.8 billion and cuts of an additional \$242.1 billion in other Federal spending that directly benefits State residents. We can ask whether the States have a full understanding and awareness of this as they begin this debate.

According to the Treasury Department, State taxes would have to increase an average of 17.3 percent, just to offset the loss of Federal grants.

If that will be the impact of the proposed constitutional amendment, then the States have a right to know it.

Asking the States and the American people to support this proposed constitutional amendment without telling them what it means is bumper sticker politics at its worst. The American people deserve facts, not slogans.

I urge my colleagues to support the right-to-know amendment. Sunshine is

the best disinfectant. It is understandable that the Republican majority prefers to keep Congress and the country in the dark about this proposal. But if it cannot stand the light of day, it does not deserve to pass.

We have the election of Republicans, and they have leadership positions in the House and Senate of the United States. I hope that at least they would feel honor bound to be able to describe to the institutions and the American people what their vision is in terms of a balanced budget.

That is all this amendment does. If we are going to have a balanced budget, why not let the American people understand exactly what is going to be involved, both at the Federal level and at the State level? This particular amendment would give that kind of information to the American people. I think the amendment is flawed without this amendment.

I hope that the amendment will be agreed to.

I yield back whatever time remains.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I enjoyed listening to my dear colleague from Massachusetts, and almost everyone, I think, knows of my affection for him. But we know what is going to happen if we do not do this balanced budget amendment. He and his friends are going to continue to spend us blind, which is what they have been doing for most of the last 60 years.

The fact of the matter is everyone knows that this country is in real trouble and they know who has basically put the Great Society programs into effect, many of which, if not all of which, were well-intentioned—they know who has caused the entitlements to grow to now. If you put interest in the entitlements, which it should be, 72 percent of the total Federal budget, it is running out of control. And if you add in the factor that most of them do not support any type of fiscal discipline to bring the Federal Government into some sort of a balance, and now they come to us and say: Well, now that you have the balanced budget amendment on the floor, you ought to tell us how you are going to do it, knowing that we have all kinds of plans already on the boards, some of which I agree with and some of which I do not, but nevertheless budgets that would get us to balance without the draconian 30-percent cut that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts is talking about, this 30-percent cut across the board that my friend from Massachusetts has been presenting is highly exaggerated.

Congress could adopt many types of these plans or parts of these plans into a consolidated whole, if they want to, and we can reach a balanced budget without cutting 30 percent across the board. In fact, I do not think anybody would argue against that provision.

But while we have been talking here in the Congress—we are now in our 10th day since we started this—our balanced budget debt track we reach each day, \$4.8 trillion is the baseline; that is our debt which we started with before we started this debate. We are now in our 10th day, and we are now up to \$8,294,400,000 in additional debt just in the 9 days since we started here.

All I hear from my friends is you should not be able to enact a balanced budget amendment until you tell us how you are going to reach a balanced budget, and you cannot submit it to the States until you do. They know once we put this fiscal discipline into place, the game is over. And they know that they are going to have to start to live within their means. No longer can they spend themselves into the Senate or keep themselves in the Senate by spending and telling the people how much we are doing for them while we are spending them into bankruptcy.

I cannot sit here and simply ignore the fact that the liberals, who have spent us into bankruptcy, are the ones who are fighting against this amendment. We have irresponsible debt in this country. We have runaway spending. We have a destructive welfare system that not only is too expensive but it is destroying families. We have an antisavings Tax Code that is eating us alive. We have a huge Washington bureaucracy. We are killing the American dream, and we are killing our children's future.

We have to cut the waste. We have to cut the fat. We have to do it through a discipline that only the balanced budget amendment will bring to us. And if we do not do that, I just worry about the country, and so does everybody else. This is not a game around here. For those who are against the amendment to come and say, now, after they have been in control for most of the last 60 years, and never having reached a balanced budget for the last 26 years, to come to us and say, you have to explain how you can do it and satisfy 535 Members of Congress before you can put the discipline into place that will get us there, it seems to me is pure sophistry.

We need the discipline. That is what is missing. Remember Gramm-Rudman-Hollings? We all thought that statute was going to do the job. It did do a little bit until we amended it and set the goals farther out there, and amended it again, and now we have done away with it altogether because it was a simple statute. It was well-intentioned, and a lot of people thought it might work, and it did to some degree, but it was tossed out when they decided to spend more around here.

The Democrats against this balanced budget amendment were in charge last year, and they have been in charge since 1986. They have never presented a balanced budget, nor have they presented a plan. Certainly the President's program is not a plan either to get us to a balanced budget. His budget, very clearly, is not a plan to get us there.

Now we come down to the Daschle amendment, this right-to-know amendment. I have seldom seen a more frivolous trivialization of the Constitution than what this amendment would do, because it would write a section 9 into the balanced budget amendment that would put new language into the constitutional amendment—new language for the first time, all kinds of budgetary terms, all kinds of language that really would allow loopholes galore, which would institutionalize even committees in the Senate and the Congressional Budget Office.

Look at this language and you have to say, constitutional language? That is with a big question mark. I do not see how anybody can argue this is what we ought to do for the Constitution, even though they talk about the right to know. Aggregate levels of new budget authority. In the Constitution? Major functional category, account-by-account basis, allocation of Federal revenues, reconciliation directives, section 310(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. That can be changed by a simple majority vote? Talk about trivialization. Omnibus reconciliation bill. What in the world does that mean? That is going to be written into the Constitution so they can continue doing business as usual? Congressional Budget Office. They are going to go write that into the Constitution, the Congressional Budget Office? For all of its good intentions, it has been wrong more than it has been right on budgetary matters. Economic and technical assumptions. And then they are going to write the Committee on the Budget into this Constitution?

Let me just end. This is a trivialization of the Constitution. It does not make constitutional sense. It would destroy the balanced budget amendment. It would destroy the one time in history since the House, for the first time, has passed the balanced budget amendment, the one time in history when we really have a chance to restore discipline to this process. It would put language into the Constitution that is totally unworkable, unless you want to keep spending.

I thought it was appropriate for some of those who did come out here and speak right before this important vote. The opponents are apologists for the status quo. They are the people that have been here 30, 40 years. They are the people that have been around here and have seen it go the same way every time, and they say we ought to have the guts to do it. Yet, when they had control, they could not do it because there was not a fiscal discipline in the Constitution that required them to do it, or at least gave incentives, which is what this amendment does, to get to a balanced budget.

Are we going to stick with the old order around here, the old way of doing things, the status quo, that now has us \$4.8 trillion in debt, plus another \$8.294

billion in the 10 days we have been debating this? Are we going to stick with the people who brought us to this and let them come in here with this phony trivialization of the constitutional amendment and say all of a sudden, in just a short period of time, you Republicans, before you pass a balanced budget amendment and submit it to the States, you have to show us how you are going to cut the budget? The fact of the matter is that we will show them once the discipline is in place, because we will all have to show them. The Democrats who support this amendment will be right there with us helping us to show how this can be done. But you cannot do that in less than a year or so, and we have to get the balanced budget amendment in place before we do.

The Daschle proposal raises a lot more questions than it will answer. For example, it would require a statement of new budget authority and outlays only on accounts which were over \$100 million in 1994. What about accounts which were under \$100 million in 1994 but have grown over that? What about new accounts? This proposal would also require an allocation of Federal revenues among major resources of such revenues. But what qualifies as major? This proposal would further require a detailed list and description of changes in Federal law required to carry out the plan. Such information is currently in a document separate from the budget resolution. That document for President Clinton's 1993 budget plan was over 1,000 pages long. His budget plan will keep deficits at around \$200 billion well into the future, for 12 years into the future, and then we do not know what will happen. That is assuming if the rosy economic circumstances continue that they are claiming will be the case.

Do we really want to increase the already mammoth budget resolution? In addition, the provision is vague and incoherent. The Daschle proposal literally requires that we predict over the next 7 years not just the changes in law Congress may ultimately pass, but the date that Congress will pass them.

The Daschle proposal creates additional problems by making constitutional reference to statutory law, as I have just shown on this chart. It is ridiculous. Incorporate 310(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 by reference. What happens if Congress amends that section? Does that qualify as a constitutional amendment by a simple majority vote? Similarly, as we have said, the CBO is explicitly referred to in this proposal. That means that the Constitution will now have to refer to four branches of Government: judiciary, executive, legislative and, of course, the Congressional Budget Office.

Here we are in the new Congress trying to reduce the Federal bureaucracy, and the Daschle proposal attempts to enshrine a part of it in the Constitution. Those of us on both sides of the

aisle who have worked for years to pass this constitutional amendment have consistently heard from our opponents that we are trivializing the Constitution with this budget matter. Talk about trivializing the Constitution.

The Daschle proposal would have us add a new section to the Constitution that is longer and extraordinarily more detailed and technical than the proposal that has been the subject of hearings, committee debate, vote, and a committee report. It adds new terms to the Constitution like "concurrent resolution." I have gone through those terms. They will no longer have just lawyers pouring over the document; we are going to need a slew of accountants to tell us what the Constitution means as well.

I think we ought to vote this amendment down. It does not deserve to be in the Constitution.

Mr. President, I have stated many times during this debate that the balanced budget amendment represents the kind of change the American people voted for in November. The American people know that the mammoth Federal Government must be put on a fiscal diet. In contrast, the proposal offered by the distinguished minority leader, with all due respect, is offered in the defense of the status quo and business as usual.

THE RIGHT TO STALL AMENDMENT

The Daschle motion to recommit has been termed by the opponents of the balanced budget amendment the right-to-know motion. But it has rightly also been called the right-to-stall proposal. It purports to put off the requirement of a balanced budget until Congress actually agrees to a balanced budget, by adopting such a budget plan.

Mr. President, this proposal actually will give to Congress a constitutional right to stall the requirement of a balanced budget by mere failure to balance the budget. Mr. President, the very reason we need a balanced budget amendment is because Congress has failed to balance the budget for decades. The Daschle right-to-stall amendment would make that abject failure of responsibility the explicit condition of avoiding the acceptance of that responsibility. If there is a better manner to lock in business as usual, a better way to constitutionalize our borrow and spend status quo—our ever-steeper slide into the debt abyss—I admit I cannot think of it.

Consider, Mr. President, that the proponents of the right-to-stall amendment want to use Congress' historical inability to balance the budget as a reason—a constitutional reason—to deny the American people, to deny future generations, the requirement they want to force Congress to act responsibly, get its fiscal house in order, and live within its means. Talk about a recipe for inaction. The right-to-stall proponents say "if Congress cannot balance the budget, they should not have to." They say, "if Congress has been and is unable to balance the budget in

the absence of a balanced budget requirement, we should not impose a balanced budget requirement on it." Is this what the American people want? Do they want Congress' failure to fulfill its responsibility to be a reason to drop the requirement? Does this even make any sense?

If my colleagues supporting the Daschle proposal had been in the First Congress, we would never have adopted the first amendment in the Bill of Rights. Just imagine James Madison defending the free speech clause of the first amendment from some of my colleagues: Does this mean you cannot yell fire in a crowded theatre? they would ask. Does it protect obscenity? If not, what is the line between obscenity and protected free speech? We cannot accept the free speech clause without these details spelled out, they would say. Does the free speech clause protect the American flag from desecration? If so, we cannot accept the first amendment. Some of my colleagues made that clear when they turned down the flag-burning amendment twice a few years ago.

What about the religion clauses, the free exercise clause and the establishment clause, of the first amendment? Would supporters of the Daschle proposal, had they been in the First Congress, demanded an accounting of just when and how the Government can aid religious schools? Would they have insisted on knowing all of the circumstances under which citizens or local governments can put a Menorah or a creche on public property? Would they have turned down the first amendment because the First Congress could not fulfill the ludicrous task of answering these questions? Or would they have accepted the principles contained in the first amendment and allowed those principles to develop, as they have over the years?

Just imagine when the following clause in article I, section 9 came before the Constitutional Convention of 1787 in Philadelphia: "No money shall be drawn from the treasury, but in Consequence of appropriations made by law * * *" Oh no, my colleagues would have said, tell us how much the appropriations will be over the next 7 years or we cannot adopt this provision and this Constitution.

What about the clause in article I, section 8, giving Congress the power to regulate foreign and interstate commerce? Oh no, some of our colleagues would have said in Philadelphia in 1787. We cannot give Congress the power to regulate commerce until we know the tariffs and interstate regulations Congress will enact over the next 7 years.

Here and now, let us adopt the principle of a balanced budget with the careful exceptions of war time or when a supermajority consensus is reached for a pressing national purpose, on a rollcall vote. Then, after we adopt the principle, we can implement it over the next 7 years, adjusting the budget to

take into account changing circumstances during that time.

After all, this is a constitution we are amending, not budget legislation. In fact, as I read the Daschle proposal, it requires that we pass a resolution laying out the details of a plan starting in fiscal year 1996 even though that requirement is contained in an amendment that does not become effective until 2002.

To require that a constitutional provision be fully implemented before it is adopted puts the cart a long way before the horse. After all, the whole problem is that Congress has not been able to balance the budget in the absence of a constitutional requirement to do so.

It seems to me that the people who really have the burden of showing us how they will balance the budget are the ones who claim we do not need the balanced budget amendment. We say the budget cannot be balanced without a constitutional requirement. To those who think we can balance the budget without the balanced budget amendment, I say show us how. If you cannot show us the way to a balanced budget without the amendment, this suggests one of two things. Either you agree with us that it cannot be done without the constitutional requirement, or you are simply arguing against balancing the budget at all.

CONFUSING PROCESS WITH SUBSTANTIVE CHOICES

Mr. President, the right-to-stall amendment confuses the difference between choosing rules and making choices within the rules. Yesterday, I mentioned a letter to the editor in the Wall Street Journal by Prof. James M. Buchanan, a Nobel Prize-winning economist, who explained that important distinction. I would like to quote it again because I believe it points up a basic fallacy in the reasoning of the objection of the right-to-stall proponents. Professor Buchanan states:

The essential argument [of the Daschle amendment proponents] against the balanced budget amendment reflects a basic misunderstanding of the difference between a choice of rules and choices made with rules. The Clinton-Democratic argument suggests that proponents of the amendment should specify what combination of spending cuts and revenue increases are to be implemented over the 7-year transition period. This argument reflects a failure to understand what a choice of constitutional constraint is all about and conflates within-rules choices and choices of rules themselves.

Consider an analogy with an ordinary game, say poker. We choose the basic rules before we commence to play within whatever rules are chosen. Clearly, if we could foresee all of the contingencies beforehand (for example, how the cards are to fall), those of us who know in advance that we shall get bad hands would not agree to the rules in the first place. Choices of rules must be made in a setting in which we do not yet know the particulars of the within-rule choices.

Applied to the politics of taxing and spending, the constitutional amendment imposes a new rule of the game, under which the ordinary interplay of interest groups—majoritarian politics will generate certain

patterns of taxing-spending results. By the very nature of what rules-choices are, outcome patterns cannot be specified in advance.

The opponents of the proposed balanced budget amendment should not be allowed to generate intellectual confusion about the difference between choices among verus within rules. There are, of course, legitimate arguments that may be made against the amendment, but these involve concerns about the efficacy of alternative rules, including those that now exist, rather than a specific prediction of choices to be made under any rule or choices made during the transition between rules. [Wall St. Journal, 2/6/95, p. A13.]

Mr. President, Professor Buchanan is obviously correct. Proponents of the balanced budget amendment recommend a rule change. Opponents argue against the amendment on the basis of either possible choices under the new rule which could hurt well-organized special interest groups or the failure to specify which well-organized special interest groups will be hurt under the new rule. Either objection is, as Professor Buchanan points out, intellectually confused as an objection to the new rule. The proponents do not advocate any particular outcomes, just a new way of making those choices. The right-to-stall motion offered by the Democrat leader does not move the debate forward.

In fact, Mr. President, the Daschle right-to-stall amendment is nothing more than a way to stop Congress from adopting the resolve to force itself to act responsibly and balance the budget and live within its means in the future.

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S DEFICIT REDUCTION RECORD

This brings me to the President. If President Clinton gets his way and defeats the balanced budget amendment this year as he did last year, what is his purpose? Does he not want a balanced budget? Does he stand for the status quo of ever higher taxes and even higher deficits? Let us look at his record.

The President's 1993 deficit reduction tax plan has failed to control even the growth of annual budget deficits, which continue to rise during the later years of the plan, surpassing \$200 billion as early as 1996, reaching the record level of \$297 in 2001, and topping \$421 in 2005.

The President's so-called deficit reduction plan, which included massive tax increases on working people, retirees, and other Americans, neither stopped the growth of the national debt nor balances the budget.

Now, the opponents point to President Clinton's tax plan of 1993 as the great epitome of budgetary courage we should follow. But, Mr. President, that was no plan to balance the budget. I would ask my colleagues, did the 1993 tax bill balance the budget? Does the President propose a path to a balanced budget?

Now look at the President's budget released this week. It projects \$200 billion yearly budgets as far as the eye can see—and that is the best case scenario with the most optimistic assump-

tions. There is no budget balancing leadership here.

Mr. President, those who say we can balance the budget without the balanced budget amendment are the ones who should show us how they propose to do it. They are the ones who say, regardless of history, we can balance the budget now, without a rules change. But I continue to ask in vain, how do they propose to do it, Mr. President? Why should we trust they will do better under the status quo than they have for the last 26 years? Mr. President, I ask again, where is their plan?

Mr. President, this will not do. We should adopt the binding resolve to accept our responsibility, and then fulfill it. We should not avoid responsibility on the ground that we have so far failed to act responsibly. We should not be able to deny the American people and future generations the responsible rule of fiscal discipline on the grounds of our historical lack of discipline.

Mr. President, let us take the first step first, and let us get our house in order by adopting the balanced budget amendment.

The fact is that if House Joint Resolution 1 passes in its current form, we can and will balance the budget. It is not the lack of plans that has prevented us from balancing the budget; it is the lack of will.

We don't claim to have the perfect, painless way to balance the budget, but there are quite a number of options for us to examine and draw from, at least in part. In fact, as I stated previously in this debate, over the last few years we have seen a number of plans released from both sides of the aisle, from both bodies, and from outside organizations. [I will just hold up a few of them]: The Concord Coalition zero deficit plan; the Republican alternative to the fiscal year 1994 budget, and the Congressional Budget Office's illustration of one path to balance the budget in their Economic and Budget Outlook 1996-2000, just to name a few.

Even the current White House Chief of Staff submitted a balanced budget proposal during his tenure in the House.

Other ideas include limiting the growth of spending to 2 percent without touching Social Security, or cutting 4 cents a year off of every dollar of planned spending except Social Security.

Furthermore, there are many proposals out there to reduce spending significantly and reduce the deficit: The Dole 50-point plan; the Penny-Kasich deficit reduction plan; the Brown-Kerrey bipartisan cutting plan; the prime cuts list prepared by Citizens Against Government Waste; the Kasich budget alternatives for fiscal year 1994 and fiscal year 1995; and the Brown deficit reduction plan.

I do not think that any one of these proposals is necessarily the ultimate solution. Yet, they all have some ideas worth considering. I certainly believe that we could evaluate and analyze

proposals in these plans as well as other ideas that I guarantee will be forthcoming from both sides of the aisle if we pass this amendment.

Let me say it one more time: The problem is not the lack of ideas, it is the lack of will. House Joint Resolution 1, in its current form, will provide that will.

THE UNWORKABILITY OF THE DASCHLE PROPOSAL AND THE TRIVIALIZATION OF THE CONSTITUTION

Furthermore, the Daschle proposal raises more questions than it would answer. For example, it would require a statement of new budget authority and outlays only on accounts which were over \$100 million in 1994. What about accounts which were under \$100 million in 1994 but have grown? What about new accounts? This proposal would also require an allocation of Federal revenues among major resources of such revenues. But what qualifies as major?

This proposal would further require a detailed list and description of changes in Federal law required to carry out the plan. Such information is currently in a document separate from the budget resolution. That document, for President Clinton's 1993 budget plan, was over 1,000 pages long. Do we really want to increase the already mammoth budget resolution?

In addition, this provision is vague and incoherent. The Daschle proposal literally requires that we predict, over the next 7 years, not just the changes in law Congress may ultimately pass, but the date that Congress will pass them.

The Daschle proposal creates additional problems by making constitutional reference to statutory law. It incorporates section 310(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 by reference. What happens if Congress amends that section? Does that qualify as a constitutional amendment?

Similarly, the Congressional Budget Office is explicitly referred to in this proposal. That means that the Constitution would now refer to the four branches of Government: Congress, the Supreme Court, the President, and the Congressional Budget Office.

Here we are in the new Congress, trying to reduce the Federal bureaucracy, and the Daschle proposal attempts to enshrine a part of it in the Constitution.

Those of us on both sides of the aisle who have worked for years to pass this constitutional amendment have consistently heard from our opponents that we are trivializing the Constitution with budget matter. Talk about trivializing the Constitution. The Daschle proposal would have us add a new section to the Constitution longer and extraordinarily more detailed and technical than the proposal that has been the subject of hearings, a committee debate and vote, and a committee report. It adds new terms to the Constitution like concurrent resolution, aggregate levels of new budget authority, account-by-account basis,

allocation of Federal revenue, reconciliation directives, section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act, omnibus reconciliation bill, Congressional Budget Office, and economic and technical assumptions. We will no longer have just lawyers pouring over this document, we'll need a slew of accountants.

THE DASCHLE PROPOSAL IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

Perhaps the most significant reason for opposing this proposal is that it is unconstitutional. Article V of the Constitution provides for two—and just two—ways to amend the Constitution: By a proposal passed by two-thirds of both Houses of Congress, or by a proposal of a constitutional convention called by two-thirds of the States. In either case, three-fourths of the State legislatures must ratify the proposal before it becomes part of the Constitution.

The Daschle proposal is infirm because it places a condition subsequent to the explicit methodology for amending the Constitution contained in article V. Article V mandates that whenever two-thirds of both Houses concur, a proposed amendment must be promulgated to the States for ratification. The Daschle proposal, on the other hand, delays sending the proposed amendment to the States after passage by Congress until Congress acts again, this time by a simple majority on a budget resolution. It is black letter law that Congress may not alter, expand, or restrict, procedures established and explicitly mandated by the Constitution. See *Immigration and Naturalization Service v. Chadha*, 462 U.S. 919 (1983) (the Supreme Court held unconstitutional the one-House congressional veto as violative of the bicameralism and presentment to the President requirements of the Constitution).

Now Senator DASCHLE defended his proposal by referring to the 7-year time requirement in House Joint Resolution 1 itself as an example of a condition that Congress has historically set to the amendment process. Indeed, the Supreme Court in *Dillon v. Gloss*, 307 U.S. 433 (1939), did hold that the 7-year limit that appears in the text of an amendment is a constitutional condition placed on the ratification process.

Senator DASCHLE, however, misstates my argument. Article V sets forth the exclusive conditions for promulgation of a constitutional amendment. The 7-year time limit is a condition on ratification. Promulgation and ratification are, of course, distinct acts, and the two should not be confused.

Under article V, once Congress has passed an amendment by the necessary two-thirds margin in both Houses, the amendment must be promulgated to the States for ratification. There is nothing in either the text of article V nor in our constitutional history that suggests that Congress can play slick games with the States by passing an amendment but keeping it from going to the States. The act of promulgation is a ministerial act that must be per-

formed once the two-thirds vote has been obtained.

By contrast, there is ample reason why Congress should be permitted to include additional conditions on ratification, such as the 7-year time limit. Article V itself makes clear that it is up to Congress to specify the mode of ratification. There is also substantial precedent in our constitutional history for Congress to specify time limits on ratification.

In conclusion, the promulgation of a constitutional amendment is distinct from its ratification. The Daschle substitute is unconstitutional in that it would place an additional condition on, and thereby delay, Congress' promulgation of the balanced budget amendment. Under article V, once Congress passes an amendment, it shall be promulgated to the States. The Daschle substitute violates this provision.

Mr. President, for the forgoing reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the Dole amendment and vote to table the Daschle proposal.

I would like to point out that, look, we would like to resolve these problems. We hope there are enough Senators here who are willing to stand up for this one time in history, Democrat-Republican, bipartisan amendment that would put us on the fiscal path we should be on. We would not have to worry about all those moneys being laundered through the Federal Government and getting back to the people. Senator KENNEDY said they are meant for. I think it is time to get real about budgeting and spending and real about balancing this budget and real about what is best for this country. The only way we are going to do that is by passing the balanced budget amendment intact, without statutory language added to it.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 11:30 having arrived, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes of my time to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BREAU. I thank the minority leader for yielding.

I would just say this, as we come down to the critical point of the vote: You would think that when someone proposes a balanced budget amendment, they must have a plan to get to it after the balanced budget amendment passes. The only thing I am suggesting is that they should share that information with the American public. They should share it with the States.

If there is a secret plan that they have to balance the budget, does it include massive cuts in Social Security? Or does it include massive reductions in veterans' pension plans? Or does it include the dismantling of the highway assistance programs for the States? I am not sure what it includes.

But if there is a secret plan to reach this balanced budget, I would suggest that it should be secret no longer. If it

is good enough to balance the budget in the year 2002, let the States see it. Let them have an opportunity to vote knowing how we are going to balance that budget.

How can we send this amendment to the States and not let them know what the plan is as to how we are going to achieve it?

Oh, perhaps, maybe there is a golden secret plan they have that does nothing with regard to cutting Social Security and does not increase taxes and increases defense spending and yet still balances the budget. Maybe they have that type of a plan. But let us see it.

I mean, somebody over there who is proposing this must have a plan on how to get to the end result. How are you we doing to ask the States to be able to pass this amendment unless they know what that plan is?

And that is what the right-to-know amendment is all about. I think the people of America have a right to know how they are going to do this. How are we all going to do it, because it is a collective effort. It is going to be a partnership between the Federal Government and the States. And the States are not going to be able to vote unless they see what plan they are going to be voting on. I think we need a right-to-know amendment. I think America needs it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, let me thank the Senator from Louisiana for his comments this morning.

Like this Senator, the Senator from Louisiana was in the House of Representatives in 1981. I am sure he, like I, remembers the ease with which we passed the tax package of 1981. The President and the Republican leadership at that time convinced the Congress and the American people to cut taxes, to increase defense spending, to protect Social Security, and to balance the budget by 1984. There were no details, very few specifics, just a promise and the words "trust us." The vote was overwhelming.

I will never forget that morning on the floor and the overwhelming vote. Everyone applauded. We all went home.

But 10 years later, the American people saw an increase in the national debt to \$4 trillion, four times what it was when we had cast that vote in 1981.

I also remember the difficulty we encountered in 1993, as we passed the President's economic package. That did not pass overwhelmingly. That passed by a margin of 50 to 49, amid doom and gloom predictions of recession and mass unemployment and negative market reaction. We heard it all. It was a very, very tough vote. I vividly remember that morning, as well.

But the difference between 1981 and 1993 was more than the difficulty in passage. Rather than vague predictions with rosy scenarios of 1981, the 1993 proposal put details into black and white—details involving cuts, details involving revenue, details requiring

major changes in the way we do business; hundreds and hundreds of pages of black and white details. It was controversial. And we fought over many of the details in this document for days. No one can forget that.

But, do you know what? It was effective. And in the end, the 103d Congress passed a 5-year deficit-reduction plan that reduced the deficit by \$500 billion. Instead of asking the American people to trust us, we showed them, up front, line-by-line, what our intentions were. And the results—well, the results speak for themselves.

Mr. President, those are the two models from which we can choose today. The only difference is that today the issue is far more serious—more serious because the debt has now risen to \$4.5 trillion; more serious because this is the first time in history that we may be adding an amendment to the Constitution affecting the fiscal policy of this Nation.

The question for the American people is really very simple: After those two experiences, will the Senate roll the dice, will it roll the dice and say, "trust us again," or will we do what we know we must do? Will we show in 1995, as we showed the American people in 1993, exactly what must be done? That is the issue.

The Senator from New Hampshire, my good friend, this morning mentioned my willingness to support a balanced budget amendment last year and took issue with us for not arguing the right-to-know amendment then.

Well, the reasons are easy for anyone to understand. First, we had just passed our own version of the right to know. It was right here. The print was hardly dry. Second, we were not faced then, as we are today, with the exact situation with which we were faced in 1981—promises of tax cuts, promises of increases in defense, promises to protect Social Security, and promises to balance the budget in a designated period of time, but no promise to explain how it is going to be done.

If the Senate is unwilling to promise the American people a blueprint, I guess I would have to ask: What is it they are trying to conceal? What is it we are trying to conceal from Social Security recipients whose pensions are affected by the decision we are going to make in the next couple of weeks? What is it we are trying to conceal from the Pentagon and our allies about the true commitment to the military strength of this Nation in the coming years? What is it we are trying to conceal from veterans and military retirees about our true intentions with respect to their future?

What about States? What are we trying to conceal about the real impact this decision will have on them, on the Governors, and on their fiscal health?

And, very honestly, what about us? What about us? What are we trying to conceal from ourselves, and how is it possible that we can commit ourselves to repeating the clear mistake of the

past? How can we set a goal and have no idea—none—how we are going to get there?

Tax cuts, defense spending increases, protection for Social Security—all these are doable in the abstract. It is only in the context of a constitutional amendment to balance the budget in 7 years that the job becomes nearly impossible.

Assuming we pass the Contract With America, assuming that we protect Social Security, our job is to cut \$2.2 trillion in 7 years. That is our goal—\$2.2 trillion. That means we have got to cut \$300 billion for each of the next 7 years.

Pass the Contract With America, protect Social Security, balance the budget by the year 2002. And we are going to ask our colleagues in the next 7 years, each and every year, to cut \$300 billion. And every year we delay, the task becomes even more overwhelming the next year.

But that is only part of the story, because if we actually take Social Security off the table, if we take defense off the table, and because we must exclude interest payments, we are left with a mere 48 percent of the budget with which to work. That is really what we have left—48 percent. If you take those three items off the table, that is all we have left, 48 percent of the entire Federal budget from which we now must cut \$2.2 trillion in 7 years.

Well, do you know what the American people are saying? The American people are saying: "Right. Show me. Show us how you are going to cut all that and how you are going to cut funding for the States. Show us how you are going to cut my farm programs and other programs directly affecting rural America. Show us how you are going to deal with education, nutrition, health and housing, and as you do, do not even think about saying any of this is going to be easy or painless."

Mr. President, I bet there is one thing for which there is universal agreement within this Chamber. That is, there is a lot of skepticism out there, and, frankly, I think there is skepticism for a good reason.

Too many times, Washington has said one thing and done another. We cannot afford, on something this important—this important—to let that happen again. We cannot afford to add to the deep-seated skepticism about this institution or its actions. Not now. Not on an issue this important.

My Republican colleagues have lodged three basic objections to the right-to-know-amendment. The House majority leader said recently, "Once Members of Congress know exactly, chapter and verse, the pain that the Government must live with in order to get a balanced budget, their knees will buckle." The majority's apparent solution is to hide the truth and sidestep the pain. But the right-to-know-amendment says we have tried all that. We did it back in 1981, and \$4 trillion

later, we now must come to the realization that we have to end business as usual. That will not work again.

The second objection is that they cannot be precise about a 7-year budget process. Yet, the current law requires already that we offer 5-year estimates. What is so much more mysterious or unknowable about years 6 or 7 than years 4 and 5? All the health reform proposals last year were evaluated over a 10-year budget projection. The Congressional Budget Office already has the ability to give us 7-year budget estimates. We should use them. I have not heard one credible economist tell Members that this cannot be done, that we cannot lay out a budgetary glide-path for 7 years.

The third objection is especially ironic. It asserts that the right-to-know-amendment is somehow unconstitutional because the Constitution does not specifically sanction Congress to set conditions on an amendment before it goes to the States for ratification. But neither does the Constitution specifically sanction the 7-year limit for ratification that is found in the underlying amendment.

I have not heard any of my colleagues argue that their amendment is unconstitutional because it includes the customary but not constitutionally sanctioned time limit. As everyone here knows, the Constitution has just two requirements: First, that we pass the amendment by a two-thirds vote in both Houses; and second, that it be ratified by three-fourths of the States. That is all it says. Period.

Mr. President, the issue is pretty simple. If we are going to build a sturdy house of real deficit reduction, do we have a blueprint? Are we going to ask this body to lay out the blueprint by which that will be done? Or do we just start pounding away, hoping we have the materials to build that house, hoping we know where the budget-cutting rooms really are, hoping we can do it all in 7 years, hoping that somehow we can build a house of real deficit reduction without the details.

The American people would never build their house without a blueprint. They know we cannot, either. By a margin of 86 to 14 percent, they are saying, "Show us. We have a right to know if you are going to affect Social Security. We have a right to know if you are going to cut defense. We have a right to know if you are going to cut veterans programs. We have a right to know how you plan to cut \$2.2 trillion from 48 percent of your budget in 7 years. We have a right to know if you have learned from the mistakes of the past. We have a right to know if you are really serious."

So today, Mr. President, the Senate has an opportunity. It is an opportunity to end business as usual, an opportunity to be honest, an opportunity to affirm that when it comes to an amendment to the U.S. Constitution, the American people have a right to know.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the majority leader is in a meeting and is having a difficult time getting here, and has asked that I take a few minutes before he gets here. He may have to use some of the leader's time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas was to be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Senator from Utah will be recognized.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I particularly enjoyed the comments of the distinguished minority leader of the Senate. He is a very fine man. I am sure he is very sincere in what he is talking about. And he is a good friend. I do not have any desire to make this a partisan thing. This is a bipartisan constitutional amendment. We are fighting to try to get this country's fiscal house in order.

To have people come here now and say, "Just show us a blueprint," and to use that tax vote a year ago, when they increased taxes on the American people—and they did get the deficit down to a little below \$200 billion, but this was nothing, and they all know that that very bill that they passed and they are taking such credit for, touting it as their fiscal responsibility, that bill had the deficit jamming upward in 1996 and thereafter to the point where we get to a \$400 billion deficit after the turn of the century.

That is hardly something I would brag about, increasing taxes against the American people, the largest in history, and then a jump in spending, starting in 1996. Now, the President has come in and he has tried to reduce that jump in spending, but even his budget admits, until the year 2007, we will have at least a \$190 billion deficit a year.

Now, we have had 38 years since the balanced budget amendment has been introduced. Since we passed it when I was Constitution chairman back in 1982 in the Senate, we have had 13 years. And every time we turn around, somebody is saying, "Well, show us how you will get to a balanced budget before we pass a balanced budget amendment," or, as in this amendment's case, "Show us how you will get there before you can submit the balanced budget amendment, once passed, to the States," putting another requirement into the Constitution that really does not deserve it to be there.

Now, look, this is a game. It is a game by those who personally do not want a balanced budget amendment, although some who will vote for this will do so out of loyalty to the leader on the other side. It is not a game to us. The distinguished Senator from Illinois and I are not playing games. We have worked to bring the whole Congress together on a bipartisan consensus—Democrat and Republican—constitutional amendment, and we in-

tend to get it there. This type of an amendment to the basic constitutional amendment would gut the whole amendment, and everybody on this floor knows it.

I yield a couple of minutes to the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, let me thank the Senator from Utah for yielding. Let me express my thanks for the leadership that he and the Senator from Illinois have taken on this issue, along with myself and others, to bring to the floor and to build the consensus that is clearly here in a strong majority to pass a balanced budget amendment.

Now, within a few moments, we will have a vote on the Daschle motion. We have been debating this amendment and the Daschle motion in part for a week and a half, without a vote. I think the American people expect Members to move in an expeditious fashion through this issue, to a time when we can vote up or down on it, and send it to them to make the decision.

Article V of the Constitution is very clear. We have the right to propose amendments, and when we do, they must go straight to the States. In all fairness, the Daschle amendment has to be called not the right to know, but the right to stall, and stall and stall, and deny the American people the opportunity to express their will through their State legislators as to whether they want a balanced budget amendment, as to whether they want a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution to be the 28th amendment to our Federal Constitution.

So while Senator EXON or Senator HOLLINGS may have offered similar amendments to the unfunded mandates issue, they were entirely different. That was a statute. That was an issue that can be changed year to year, day to day, as the Congress meets. This is an amendment to our Constitution. Nowhere has there ever been within the Constitution such a prescriptive process as so designed by the Senator from South Dakota. It is not the right to know, it is simply the right to stall, in an effort to defeat this amendment or to deny the American people the right to express their will.

The Senator from Utah has made that evident time and time again. I have and our colleagues have joined Members on the floor to debate this issue.

Certainly we are now at a point, within a few moments, of voting, the very first vote in over a week and a half, while the other body has already moved several other pieces of legislation.

I am not at all convinced that just stalling and stalling and stalling, as has been proven here, is the way to solve this problem. Thorough debate is, and I am all for adequate and thorough debate on this issue. Now it is time to vote and move on to other portions of it in a timely fashion, and then allow

the American people to make the decision on how we govern, not the elite few.

I yield back to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise to give my strong support to the right-to-know amendment.

The American people have a right to know what a balanced budget means.

If a balanced budget amendment is added to the U.S. Constitution without a plan for how to balance the budget, we will leave the American people in the dark.

Mr. President, I will not defend every line item in the Federal budget. I believe we must look at the mission of programs. If a program achieves its mission and helps people, it should continue. If not, it should be scrapped.

However, before we adopt a balanced budget amendment, we should know exactly what it is that we are doing. We need to know just how these programs are going to be affected. What cuts are going to be taken. How deep. What programs. And most importantly what the consequences will be to the health, safety, and security of the American people.

My first question is how a balanced budget amendment will affect Medicare.

Achieving a balanced budget in 2002 will require cuts of between 20 and 30 percent in Medicare—between \$75 and \$100 billion in 2002. What will this mean for seniors?

Medicare already pays less than half of older Americans' health costs. In the year 2002, older Americans are expected to spend more than \$4,600 on health care premiums and other out of pocket health costs. But a balanced budget amendment could make seniors pay \$1,300 more. What will that \$1,300 mean? It could mean forcing older Americans to choose between health care and eating, or between health care and heat.

Could a balanced budget amendment restrict access to health care providers? We do not know. If the cuts are taken out of payments to providers, those providers may decide not to see Medicare patients. This could leave millions with no access to health care, especially in rural areas. We have a right to know.

Could a balanced budget amendment mean raising the eligibility age for Medicare up to age 70? We do not know. Unemployed individuals in their fifties and sixties already find it difficult to obtain health insurance. Many struggle with no insurance, hoping they will not

get sick before they reach age 65, when they will at least have access to Medicare. If we raise the Medicare eligibility age, many more seniors could be forced into poverty, unable to pay their medical bills. We have a right to know.

Will the balanced budget amendment force elderly Americans into managed care plans so they are no longer able to choose their physicians? We do not know. We—and they—have a right to know.

There are many other agencies and many other programs that the American people depend upon to protect their health, their safety, their economic security. Law enforcement, traffic safety, education—now will they be affected? What is the plan? Do we not owe it to the people we represent to explain to them how they will be affected by the balanced budget amendment?

I applaud this effort by my colleague Senator DASCHLE, the Democratic leader. His amendment would satisfy the American people's right to know. I am proud to cosponsor and vote for this amendment, and I urge each of my colleagues to join me.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, Senator DASCHLE has put before us a common sense addition to the balanced budget amendment, that requires us to tell the people of the States—the people who will decide on ratification of the balanced budget amendment—what the effects of their decision will be.

Should we and the people who will be asked to ratify this permanent change to our Constitution not be given the facts we need to understand its effects?

It seems to me that to oppose full disclosure is to say that we want this decision—that is a fundamental change in our Nation's charter—to be made in the dark, in ignorance.

Two years ago, we voted for a budget plan that laid out a course of action that identified the specific changes that would be needed to cut half a billion dollars from our deficits over 5 years.

That plan was clear and detailed; it was of course subject to both honest disagreement, and, unfortunately, some partisan distortion. But it has cut the deficit for 3 years running, for the first time since the Truman administration.

We told the American people what we were going to do, and we did it. We cut over \$500 billion from our deficits over 5 years.

And a strong economy that followed passage of that plan has brought our deficits even lower.

Like all of us here, I hope that the most recent action of the Federal Reserve Board will not be the one-two punch that wipes out the benefits of that plan—a blow that both flattens the economy and increases our deficits with higher interest rates.

Our plans here in Congress, like the plans of private citizens and businesses across the country, now hang on the hope that the Federal Reserve has not gone too far.

But that is a topic for another day.

Some of my friends here who voted against cutting the deficit back then, and some of my newer friends, who do not like the way we did it, now act surprised to see that deficits will rise again in the future, even though no one—certainly not the administration—ever claimed they would not.

We all knew that fundamental health care reform and other actions would be necessary to turn the deficit trend down permanently, and not just over the life of the 1993 budget plan.

But the fact is that we passed that budget plan with the narrowest possible margin in each House of Congress.

As for those who now complain, their own plan was less specific than ours and still could not promise as much deficit reduction as we have actually accomplished.

So let us not be distracted from our duty of being honest about the future by arguments about the past.

With the release of President Clinton's budget plan, we hear again from those who voted against deficit reduction in 1993 that they could do better.

Well, Mr. President, I believe them. That is why I challenge them to tell us how they would do better, as specifically as the plan they are attacking.

If an amendment to the Constitution is needed to keep building on the accomplishments of the last few years, to force us to confront the continuing deficits that are predicted through the end of this decade, then it only makes sense for us to prepare a document that sets forth the choices that will be necessary to bring the budget into balance.

Right now, we are confronted with an interesting situation. A new majority in Congress, that promised a new legislative agenda, now tells us that they cannot commit themselves to bring the budget into balance until after the Constitution is changed to force them to do it.

It is certainly within the competence of our budget committee and Congressional Budget Office to provide us with the specifics of a budget path that will bring us to balance by the year 2002.

Of course projections are only our best scientific estimates of future economic activity. But virtually all of my friends who support the balanced budget amendment have made good use of projections of future deficits under current law.

Those estimates are the best view we have of the future, even if we cannot be certain that all of our assumptions will hold true.

So let us drop that argument right now—we all accept that it is possible to make useful estimates about our economic and budget future.

It is because we accept such projections that we are here today, contemplating an amendment to our Constitution.

The particular problem this year is that this amendment is part of an economic plan—as announced in the so-called contract—that, taken all together, raises serious problems.

If we cut taxes, increase defense spending, and promise not to push any new costs off onto the Governors and mayors, the road to the balanced budget looks rocky indeed.

It may be, Mr. President, that you cannot get to a balanced budget from here, if the contract is your road map.

There is powerful evidence—the one-vote margins in both Houses for the 1993 budget package—that votes for deficit reduction are difficult to find.

How much more difficult will it be if we reduce our revenues, and keep major segments of the budget safe from the requirements of the balanced budget amendment?

Well, we know that it will be difficult, but we cannot know just how difficult until we see some numbers about where the axe is going to fall.

Mr. President, I would like to echo the astute observation of a new member of the judiciary, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. FEINGOLD].

During the debate in the Judiciary Committee on a similar proposal, Senator FEINGOLD responded to the suggestion that this was a transparent ploy to kill the balanced budget amendment.

I want us all to reflect on that charge for a moment—that an attempt to find out just how a permanent addition to our Constitution will work is nothing but a ploy by those who oppose it.

Mr. President, when I took on the task as floor manager for this important proposal, I did so because I am genuinely torn between my concern for our fiscal future and my concerns about the effects of this balanced budget amendment on our Constitution and on our economy.

I did not anticipate that honest questions about the effects of a permanent change in our fundamental charter would be dismissed as insincere or disingenuous.

But I ask my colleagues to consider Senator FEINGOLD's response to that charge. He said that the American people would be more likely to ratify this amendment if they knew for sure what was in it, than if they had to buy it sight unseen.

Those of us who have faith in the people who will make the final decision on this amendment believe—whether we support or oppose it ourselves—that it is our constitutional duty to establish a record of debate and evidence before we send this amendment to the people.

Not often enough, I am afraid, does this chamber live up to its claim to be the world's greatest deliberative body. Certainly, we should aspire to fulfill that role as we debate a change in our Constitution.

And certainly, the American people deserve to know what the new majority

party has in mind when they say that they can comply with the terms of the balanced budget amendment.

If we truly believe that amending the Constitution is the right thing to do, then let us give the American people the facts they need to make that choice themselves.

Certainly, that is not too much to ask.

In addition to the very real benefits of being honest with the American people, and restoring some of their faith in our ability to solve problems, there is another substantial benefit of accepting Senator DASCHLE's amendment.

If we accept this amendment, we will have the assurance that we have in place a plan to get us from where we are today to a balanced budget by the year 2002.

By itself, that is no small accomplishment.

I cannot believe where we now find ourselves in this debate—where the call for a specific set of goals that provide a path to a balanced budget is denounced as a delaying tactic, a distraction.

And where those who call for an amendment to the Constitution that will go into effect in the next century say that a promise to take action in the future is more serious than a call for action now.

That does not make sense to me.

If we accept this amendment, we will still have to send the amendment to the States. Let us assume for a moment that the American people lose their enthusiasm for the balanced budget amendment. What happens if we put all our eggs in that one basket?

Will we wait for the year or more that ratification is likely to take before we decide what to do next?

Or would we be more prudent, more serious, more committed to real deficit reduction if we were to also pass a binding budget resolution that sets a course for a balanced budget regardless of the outcome of the ratification process?

I believe that the answer to that question is clear. The more serious approach is to pass the actual law that compliance with the balanced budget amendment would require, not simply to pass an amendment with the promise that at some future date we will get down to the real work of balancing the budget.

And there is a further substantial advantage to what Senator DASCHLE's amendment offers—a commitment to start now on the very difficult journey ahead of us.

Without a plan that starts now to build on the real progress of the past 3 years—without such a plan in place from the beginning, we will have established a collision course between our Constitution and our economy.

In a game of chicken, we will approach the year the balanced budget amendment comes into effect, without the capacity to comply with its mandate.

If we wait until the last minute, when huge budget cuts will be required—over \$300 billion for the deficit in 2002—we will swerve, and avoid the economic crash that deficit reduction on that scale would cause.

At that point, the balanced budget amendment will not keep us from extending the year of reckoning yet further into the future. As we all know, it will not make deficit spending—at any level—unconstitutional.

Let's we forget, Mr. President, the balanced budget amendment makes deficits difficult, not illegal.

And if we make use of the established procedure in the amendment to permit continued deficits—probably rightly, if the cost would be a disastrous recession—we will only add to the frustration and anger of the American people.

The balanced budget amendment will be not just another empty promise from Washington, but the most cynical one of all—one that we were willing to put into the Constitution, but not into action.

And so Mr. President, to avoid making a mockery of our constitutional duties, to avoid a collision between the Constitution and the economy, to provide the American people the facts they need to make an informed decision, we should adopt this right-to-know amendment.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise in support of this amendment to require us to pass a detailed plan on how we will balance the budget before we act to send this proposed balanced budget amendment to the States for ratification. This amendment makes good sense because it requires us to consider in the here and now—not at some undefined time in the future—just what steps we will take to get our books in order. I support getting us to a balanced budget. And I support tough cuts in programs to get us there. But taken alone, I am not convinced that a balanced budget amendment will get us to make those tough cuts. Taken alone, I am not convinced that a balanced budget amendment will get us in balance by the year 2002. In fact, taken alone, I am concerned that the balanced budget amendment may have the unintended consequence of taking us further, not closer to, the goal of a balanced budget.

That is why I support this right to know amendment. What I do not support is an amendment which might make us all feel better but will not make us behave better with taxpayer dollars. Taken alone, the balanced budget amendment is long on the atmospherics and short on the details—the amendment does not take Social Security off the table, it does not provide for a continued strong national defense, it does not require us to choose difficult cuts over increased taxes. And although I know it is not intended to be I am fearful that this amendment is potentially dangerous to our economic

health. I say potentially dangerous because I am fearful that this amendment may lull us into a false sense of security—that we have balanced the budget just by saying we will do so.

Mr. President, this Chamber has just spent long hours debating the unfunded mandates bill. The idea behind that bill is that we should not pass on costs to other levels of government, particularly if we have no clear idea what those costs will be. In a certain sense if ever there was an unfunded mandate it is asking the States to ratify the balanced budget amendment without fessing up to what that amendment will cost. By refusing to give the details on how we will achieve the goal of a balanced budget, we are hiding the costs, and pushing the tough decisions we must make into the future. We may also be pushing the costs of getting our financial house in order onto our States and our localities. At least one Treasury study shows that a balanced budget amendment would reduce Federal grants to Connecticut by \$1 billion a year. Treasury estimates that if Social Security and defense are off the table, Connecticut would be faced with truly draconian cuts in education, job training and the environment.

If those are the decisions we intend to make, then let us debate them. If they are decisions that we would prefer to avoid, let us figure out what we can support in a rational and thoughtful way. What we really need to do, is figure out how we intend to get to a balanced budget and map out that strategy. If we are serious about balancing the budget, the least we can do is provide those details and start working toward our goal. Because I believe that it is both desirable and possible to come up with a workable roadmap to a balanced budget, I strongly support the right-to-know amendment which calls for a 7-year approach to get us to a balanced budget by the year 2002. This approach makes good sense and prods us toward action sooner rather than later.

The consequences of waiting are daunting and quite frankly, the balanced budget amendment gives us the excuse to wait. If we wait until the year 2002, when this amendment would go into effect, the Congressional Budget Office [CBO] has estimated that we would need to cut \$322 billion—that is billion with a “b”—out of the Federal budget in a single year. That would create national, local and personal chaos. What we need to do is start acting now by making the kind of tough spending cuts that will bring us closer to our goal of a balanced budget and by implementing policies that will help our economy to grow in a healthy way.

Standing in front of the mirror and announcing that you are going to lose 10 pounds does not take the weight off, dieting and exercise does. That is what this Chamber must pledge to do. As Hobart Rowen noted a few weeks ago, “By itself, such an amendment would cut neither a dollar nor a program from the Federal budget.”

As anyone who has read the resolution mandating a balanced Federal budget can tell you, it is sketched with a very broad brush. It excludes nothing from the requirements of a balanced budget—not Social Security, not defense, not veterans’ benefits. Nor does it leave higher taxes off the table. And it allows 40 rather than 50 percent of the House and Senate to hold up the entire Federal budget in the event that there is a Federal deficit. I have spent a tremendous amount of time exploring ways to bring that deficit down. At the same time, I do not support increasing the power of large States with lots of Members of the House. By decreasing the number of House Members needed to hold up the budget we would be doing just that. When you come from a small State like mine, changing the rules in this way just does not sit well.

I want us to balance the budget in a responsible and thoughtful way. For this reason, I support drawing up a 7-year plan toward that goal. Regardless of what happens in this particular debate, I hope that all of us in this Chamber will pledge to work together to make that happen.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I rise in support of this commonsense amendment to the balanced budget proposal. No matter what our beliefs are on the wisdom of this amendment, we should at least ensure America’s right to know who will be hurt and what will be cut if we pass a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

It would seem to me, Mr. President, that notwithstanding any Senator’s position on this legislation, this amendment—which simply requires that we be honest about the impact of our actions—is little to ask in the face of such a monumental constitutional change.

Frankly, I cannot imagine that we would consider passing any piece of legislation, regardless of the subject, without doing our best to understand as much as possible about its potential impact on the general public. Is that not, in fact, our fundamental responsibility as legislators? Is that not what we were sent here to do?

Is that not what we just asked in the legislation this body passed not more than a week ago that required the CBO to advise us of the impact on State and local governments of the unfunded mandates bill?

I have to say, Mr. President, I am somewhat confused. The same Senators who insisted on knowing the nature and the exact impact of that legislation are now arguing that we do not need to know the financial impact of our actions. Are we not supposed to know what we are doing here?

I ask you, are we not obligated—as a body—“to protect the people,” as Madison said in his Journal of the Federal Convention “against the transient impressions into which they themselves might be led.”

And here we are, legislating by impressions. That is exactly what we are

doing if we do not show the people what this means.

We do not need to know the contents. We do not need to know how it works or what it does, we just need to buy it, we are told.

Mr. President, is this the modern day equivalent of the “traveling salvation show” complete with snake oil and magic elixirs that cure all of our ills? We do not need to know what is in it. Trust us. It works.

Have we lost our perspective here? Have we lost all touch with reality? I wonder if anyone in this Chamber can go home to his or her constituents and say, “Ladies and gentlemen who elected me, I have absolutely no idea what this legislation will do. However, I’ve been assured that everything will be fine. Trust me, and thank you for your continued support.”

And yet here we are suggesting that we pass this constitutional amendment and worry about the details later. By God, let us be honest with our constituents.

If achieving a balanced budget by 2002—with half of the budget protected from cuts—will cost my State, annually, \$1.9 billion in Federal grants, then let us be honest about it.

If a balanced budget will cost Massachusetts \$248 million in highway trust fund grants, \$459 million in lost funding for education, job training, the environment, and housing, then let us be honest about it.

If—over 7 years—it will cost over \$1 billion in Medicaid, and almost \$2½ billion in Medicare, then let us be honest.

Mr. President, what are we afraid of? If we support it, let us talk about it. If we believe in it, let us defend it. But I implore you, let us be honest about the impact of what we do here. It is our job. It is our obligation. It is our only mandate from the people who sent us here.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have been informed that the majority leader is in meetings which he cannot interrupt.

(At the request of Mr. HATCH, the following statement of Mr. DOLE was ordered to be printed in the RECORD):

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let us be clear about one thing. Whether or not the Senate votes to approve the balanced budget amendment, Republicans intend to offer a detailed 5-year budget plan that will put us on a path toward a balanced budget by 2002—a test that President Clinton’s latest budget makes no attempt to meet.

The Daschle amendment is a poorly crafted, last-ditch effort to thwart the will of the American people who overwhelmingly support a balanced budget constitutional amendment. The distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator HATCH, and the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI, and others have already made that point.

The Daschle amendment is an effort to change the subject. Rather than debate the value of making a balanced Federal budget a national priority, most opponents of the balanced budget amendment would prefer talk about potential cuts that might affect their pet programs.

This bait-and-switch effort will not work.

This Congress will put forward a plan to control Federal spending and move us toward a balanced budget without touching Social Security and without raising taxes. Everything else, every Federal program from Amtrak to zebra mussel research will be on the table. For those who want an idea of how we would try to achieve this goal, look at the Republican alternative budgets that have been introduced in each of the past 2 years.

Mr. President, it is ironic that on April 1, 1993, the vast majority of those who now support the Daschle right-to-know amendment voted to adopt a budget blueprint paving the way for President Clinton's massive tax increase before President Clinton submitted the legally required details of his plan to Congress. They voted to adopt a budget blueprint that called for a massive tax increase without knowing the specifics.

This debate is different. It is a lot simpler. The central issue is whether or not we should vote to make balancing the budget a national priority. We are debating whether or not future generations of Americans—our children and our grandchildren—deserve constitutional protection. That is what this amendment is all about.

This year, we have a real chance to approve a balanced budget amendment and send it to the States for ratification. It is the best chance we have had in years. Every single vote matters.

Several Senators who voted for a balanced budget amendment in the past are now under tremendous pressure from the special interests and others who are addicted to Federal spending. The special interests are trying to convince past supporters of the balanced budget amendment to switch their votes. I hope that every Senator who supports the balanced budget amendment will continue to stand firm, do what is right for our children and our grandchildren, and vote for the balanced budget amendment.

Let us get on with the real debate.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I would like to just read a few of the distinguished majority leader's remarks because I think they are very appropriate.

I will read these for and on behalf of the majority leader:

* * * Mr. President, it is ironic that on April 1, 1993 the vast majority of those who now support the Daschle right-to-know amendment voted to adopt a budget blueprint paving the way for President Clinton's massive tax increase before President Clinton submitted the legally required details of his plan to Congress. They voted to adopt a budget blueprint that called for a massive tax increase without knowing the specifics.

This debate is different. It is a lot simpler. The central issue is whether or not we should vote to make balancing the budget a national priority. We are debating whether or not future generations of Americans—our children and our grandchildren—deserve constitutional protection. That is what this amendment is all about.

This year, we have a real chance to approve a balanced budget amendment and send it to the States for ratification. It is the best chance we have had in years. Every single vote matters.

Several Senators who voted for a balanced budget amendment in the past are now under tremendous pressure from the special interests and others who are addicted to Federal spending. The special interests are trying to convince past supporters of the balanced budget amendment to switch their votes. I hope that every Senator who supports the balanced budget amendment will continue to stand firm, do what is right for our children and our grandchildren, and vote for the balanced budget amendment.

Let us get on with the real debate.

On behalf of the majority leader, I move to table the Daschle motion, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the Daschle motion to commit House Joint Resolution 1. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 62 Leg.]

YEAS—56

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

NAYS—44

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

So the motion to lay on the table the motion to commit House Joint Resolution 1 was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as if in morning business, and that at the conclusion of my remarks the Senate proceed to a quorum call.

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

BUTTE, MT

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, my statement today is the second in a series on Butte, MT, and the attractions it offers the Micron semiconductor company. I would like to focus today on Butte's top-notch higher education facilities, particularly in technical fields.

Foremost among these is Montana Tech. Under the dynamic leadership of Montana Tech president, Lindsay Norman, Montana Tech has grown and developed into one of the best small engineering and science schools in the country.

A former vice president of Chase Manhattan Bank in New York, Mr. Norman really understands business, and has made it his mission to ensure that Montana Tech's programs reflect the needs of the private sector.

As I pointed out yesterday, a recent survey of college presidents voted Montana Tech the best small college science program in the United States—the best, No. 1. Other surveys show that this is no fluke. Money Guide magazine rated Montana Tech one of the top 15 best buys in college education in the southwest and mountain States. And last year, U.S. News & World Report ranked Montana Tech the No. 1 educational value among western regional universities.

Let me repeat. The U.S. News & World Report ranked Montana Tech the No. 1 educational value among western regional universities.

Established in 1895 as the Montana School of Mines, Montana Tech historically focused on mineral and energy-related engineering programs. It now offers undergraduate and graduate programs in a multitude of science and engineering disciplines, including computer science, environmental engineering, hydrogeological engineering, and mathematics.

Montana Tech also offers a broad range of courses in the humanities and social sciences. In addition, the college has an active continuing education program which offers night courses for adults.