

preclude cuts in benefits for current retirees or those about to retire, and provide for the long-term fiscal soundness of the Social Security system. But if we ignore the long-term challenges facing the Social Security system, its future is at risk.

I think it is important to note that the Reid amendment does not make Social Security a constitutionally protected benefit. It merely excludes it from the calculations under this amendment. The challenge of finding a way to keep the Social Security program solvent into the 21st century remains, with or without the Reid amendment. Indeed, even a constitutional amendment that did purport to guarantee Social Security benefits would be futile. The only guarantee that future benefits can be paid is future economic growth. No amendment can guarantee people a slice of a pie that does not exist.

I do not view this amendment as a vote to make a particular Government benefit program a constitutional right. I certainly do not view it as the first step in an effort to place one program after another outside the bounds of the budget process, exempt from scrutiny. Social Security is a unique program with a unique demographic and financial situation. It has a large surplus today, and it will have even larger deficits in the future. My vote for the Reid amendment is in recognition of the fact that we need two solutions: a long-term solution for Social Security, and a long-term solution for the rest of the Federal budget.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, we have had a good debate on this amendment, as we promised the distinguished Senator from Nevada we would have.

I do believe now we have come to a point where we would like to conclude action on this very important legislation this week. We have been on it now, this is the 11th day, as I calculate. And I hope, I think, the votes are there. Or they are not there. The 67 votes are there or they are not there.

I think there is broad bipartisan support for protecting Social Security, though I must say, personally, sometime—the Entitlements Commission pointed out earlier—we will have to face up to some of these issues. Senator Danforth and Senator KERREY issued a report last December. But I think for the moment, everybody is willing to protect Social Security. We voted 83 to 16 to adopt a sense-of-the-Senate amendment stating we should not raise Social Security or cut Social Security benefits in order to balance the budget.

On Friday, we adopted a motion reaffirming that commitment by a vote of 87 to 10. We will be putting forward—and in fact, Senator DOMENICI is working on it right now—a 5-year plan to put the budget on a path to balance by 2002.

Our plan will not raise taxes. Our plan will not touch Social Security.

Everything else, every Federal program, from Amtrak to zebra mussel research, will be on the table, including agriculture, which talk show hosts always ask me about, since I am from Kansas. Everything will be on the table.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote to table the Reid amendment.

Mr. President, I move to table the Reid amendment. 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 table.

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. ASHCROFT] is necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 65 Leg.]

YEAS—57

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

NAYS—41

Akaka	Feinstein	Levin
Baucus	Ford	Lieberman
Biden	Glenn	McCain
Bingaman	Graham	Mikulski
Boxer	Harkin	Murray
Bradley	Hefflin	Nunn
Breaux	Hollings	Pell
Bryan	Inouye	Pryor
Bumpers	Johnston	Reid
Byrd	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Conrad	Kerry	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kohl	Specter
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Feingold	Leahy	

NOT VOTING—2

Ashcroft Moynihan

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 236) was agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

Mr. HATCH. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is an objection.

The legislative clerk continued with the call of the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate do hereby move to bring to a close debate on House Joint Resolution 1, the constitutional balanced budget amendment:

Bob Dole, Orrin G. Hatch, Larry Craig, Trent Lott, Bill Frist, R.F. Bennett, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Alfonse D'Amato, Jon Kyl, Fred Thompson, Ted Stevens, Olympia J. Snowe, John Ashcroft, Craig Thomas, Conrad Burns, Mike DeWine, Judd Gregg, Rick Santorum, Rod Grams, Lauch Faircloth.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, we have had, I think, now 10 or 11 days of debate. Nobody has been crowded. Everybody has been given all the time they need.

It seems to me, if we are going to continue with our work in the Senate—we have a number of matters we would like to bring up—we need to come to a vote one way or the other, a final vote on the balanced budget amendment. Knowing it takes 67 votes, and knowing there is bipartisan support, we have tried to approach it on that basis. I congratulate the Senator from Utah, Senator HATCH, and others, Senator SIMON and others who have been debating some of the very important issues—including Senator REID who has just completed I think 3 days of debate on an amendment.

What we would like to do—obviously we want to finish action on this measure by Thursday evening, this Thursday evening, if at all possible. That will be our intent. If not, we will come back on next Wednesday and finish it next week. I do not believe anybody—there was some misunderstanding on unfunded mandates. We thought we understood what was happening but then there was this big flap about there was not any committee report, even though

we thought we had it understood if it would be printed in the RECORD that would satisfy concerns. So in this case it was the intention of the leadership on this side to make certain that would not happen. We did not want any misunderstanding. We wanted to protect every Member's rights.

Hopefully we have done that. Some just do not want the balanced budget to ever pass. They could care less if we ever vote on anything as long as we are eating up time. But we have the line-item veto, we have other measures that we would like to take up. So I hope, if the Senator from California intends to offer an amendment, we can get a time agreement. If not, we will have no recourse but to move to table amendments from here on to try to bring this matter to a conclusion. I think we have spent ample time. Some people have criticized us for spending too much time. I hope we could have some agreement to bring this matter to a conclusion by Thursday evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, the majority leader is certainly within his rights to offer the cloture motion. We understand his reasons for doing so. But I must say I am disappointed that he has seen the need to do so this soon. This is not just another bill. This is not just another amendment. This is a proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States for the first time in 200 years to directly affect the fiscal policy of this country.

We have only had the opportunity thus far to offer two amendments. As I have watched the debate I have been very pleased with the extraordinary participation on both sides on both issues. We debated the right to know for several days. We had a good vote. Unfortunately we did not get any Republican support for the effort to propose the right to know.

We then had a very good debate on the Social Security amendment that has just been completed. Again we had very little Republican support. But we have only had those two amendments, two very significant amendments. We have amendments relating to capital budgeting, additional amendments relating to natural disasters—issues that have a very consequential effect on how ultimately this amendment may be proposed to the Constitution. I certainly hope we could hold off on cloture votes and some effort to curtail debate, given the consequence of this amendment, given the legitimate concerns expressed, I think, by people on this side of the aisle with regard to just what ought to be a constitutional amendment on balancing the budget.

So I urge the leader, with all of the concerns he has with scheduling—legitimate as they are—to give us an opportunity to have the debate that this amendment deserves. As I say, we will debate a lot of issues in this session of Congress relating to virtually everything. But to have a debate longer on

unfunded mandates or on congressional coverage than we have on a constitutional amendment to balance the budget would certainly not serve the country and not serve this body.

I certainly hope we can continue to have the kind of debate we have had, now, for several good days on issues that are of direct concern to the American people and certainly affecting the people in this body as we continue to come to some conclusion on this amendment itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I am advised this is the 12th day, not the 11th day. I stand corrected. It will be 3 weeks Thursday we have been on this. I think we have spent far too much time on congressional coverage and unfunded mandates. It took 1 hour and 20 minutes in the House, we spent at least a week on congressional coverage. Unfunded mandates, we had people extending debate when they were for unfunded mandates. It passed 86 to 10. You kind of wonder what all the fuss was about. That took a couple of weeks. Now we are in almost 3 weeks on the balanced budget amendment.

What it will mean is we will not have any recesses this year. I can say very clearly, we can eat up all the time we want but it is going to come out of the calendar. It is not going to come out of anything else. If that is the wish of the membership—my view is we get paid for being here every day and we will be here every day. You can count on that, as I think one ad used to say, if we cannot move this legislation.

People are opposed to this amendment. They do not care if they talk for a week. They do not care how long they talk if they think they can kill the amendment and frustrate those who are for it on both sides of the aisle.

This is a bipartisan effort. I have not gone back to check to see the length of debates we have had in previous years on this amendment, but I doubt it has taken any more time or as much time as we have spent now.

So I would just say to the Democratic leader, I certainly understand the need for full debate. But I am prepared now to have a time agreement, if there is going to be an amendment by the Senator from California, for 2 hours for the Senator from California, 30 minutes on this side, and then have the vote.

If not, we will just have to move to table at the earliest possible time and that time will come sometime today or sometime during the night. So I hope we can work it out. Those who are opposed to the balanced budget amendment, we know they do not want to do anything but to frustrate the efforts of a clear majority in this body, hopefully 67 or more, who support the amendment.

So I ask the Senator from California if she intends to offer an amendment, and if so, if she is prepared to enter into a time agreement?

Mrs. BOXER. If we could have a quorum call then perhaps we can discuss it?

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

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

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank the Chair and thank my colleagues, Senator DORGAN and Senator BOXER, for agreeing to a brief comment by me and also a brief discussion with the manager of the bill, the senior Senator from Utah, Senator HATCH.

I favor the balanced budget amendment and have on three votes since I have been in the U.S. Senate in the past 14 years. I think it is very important that the Government of the United States live within its means, just as every other government has to—the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and every county in my State, every city and every other State in the Union, just as we must all do so as individual citizens. But I have a considerable problem with the amendment which we just voted on where I voted in favor of excluding Social Security from the computation.

Although I know my vote was on the losing side I wanted to express myself briefly on the subject and perhaps have a comment or two with Senator HATCH.

I have consistently voted to exclude Social Security from a constitutional amendment, going back to a vote on July 29, 1982, August 4, 1982, March 12, 1986, and March 1, 1994. I have also voted to keep Social Security off budget, a subject which was explained by my late colleague, the distinguished Senator John Heinz.

The concerns that I have are when we have a trust fund established for a specific purpose and specific contributions as a very basic principle of law, those funds ought to be used for no other purpose. And when the Secretary of the Treasury, James Baker, invaded the trust fund, I took the floor and said that, if this were a matter within the jurisdiction of the district attorney's office when I was district attorney of Philadelphia, this would be an appropriate matter for criminal prosecution because it is fraudulent conversion. You have a trust fund established for a specific purpose and when that purpose is violated by having the funds used for something else it is in fact a fraudulent conversion.

When we have a balanced budget amendment, I think it is very important that we not spend more than we take in. It is not truth in accounting where you have other funds, a trust fund like Social Security, figured into the accounting process, or we have the accounting processes on other trust funds, such as the airport trust fund

and the highway trust fund where again, in my judgment, they ought not to be used in the computation of the balancing of our budget. Those are not funds for general revenue purposes. They ought not to be taken into consideration because they are set up for a specific purpose, like Social Security, the highway trust fund or the airport trust fund. I believe there is a very, very basic fundamental principle of law of such a nature that I would put it in the constitutional amendment recognizing the very high level of legal procedure which is embodied in a constitutional amendment.

I thank my colleague from Utah for being willing to have a brief discussion. The essence of my question to Senator HATCH is, is it not true that under the law the Social Security trust fund is set up for a specific purpose, to receive revenues, contributions made by citizens, contributions made by employees and employers for the specific purpose of paying benefits to those employees when they have reached the eligibility status at age 62 or 65, or whenever?

Mr. HATCH. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SPECTER. Will the Senator from Utah agree with me that the truth in accounting to have a balanced budget would be that we ought to calculate the revenues, the taxes which the U.S. Government receives and deduct from that the expenses of the U.S. Government without including the artificial raising of the revenues which are Social Security revenues, or for that matter even the highway trust fund or the airport trust fund?

Mr. HATCH. I would agree with the Senator—certainly as to the Social Security trust fund—as does the Senate. We voted last week 87 to 10 to direct the Budget Committee to find ways of balancing the budget without touching Social Security.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank my colleague for that answer. I appreciate the vote we had last week. I supported the amendment by the distinguished majority leader, Senator DOLE, to have that direction. But my followup question is: Is there any assurance that that direction will be carried out?

Mr. HATCH. There is assurance by the vote on the unfunded mandates bill concerning a resolution to this effect, which Members are on record as favoring overwhelmingly; and, the vote last week on the Dole motion to refer to the Budget Committee which was also overwhelmingly supported by both sides of the aisle; and the assurance that has been made on the floor by many that the implementing legislation will also work to establish what the distinguished Senator would like to have established, which is the protection of the Social Security trust fund.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank my colleague for that answer. When it comes to the unfunded mandates, I would suggest that is a significantly different category.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator will yield so I may add a little bit more.

Mr. SPECTER. I so yield.

Mr. HATCH. Nothing under the balanced budget amendment will keep us from segregating accounts or running a surplus equal to or exceeding the value of the trust fund surplus. We have other trust funds like the crime trust fund, the highway trust fund, as the Senator has mentioned, and things can and will continue on as they have in the past; that is, we protect Social Security as we have always wanted to do, and I believe will do. So the amendment does not stop us from doing it as we have done in the past.

Mr. SPECTER. I agree with my colleague that it does not stop us from doing that, but the concern I have is that it does not tell us to do that.

Mr. HATCH. It does not; it does not require us to make any changes in the protections Social Security now enjoys.

Mr. SPECTER. I ask the distinguished Senator from Utah one other question about a field that I have had perhaps more experience than some, having been a district attorney for Philadelphia for 8 years.

Would my colleague agree with me that on the general principle of law where you have a trust fund set up for a specific purpose, such as contributions and specific beneficiaries, that if someone takes money from that trust fund for a purpose other than specified it is in fact a fraudulent conversion?

Mr. HATCH. I agree generally, except the Government is doing that every day as they give IOU's to the Social Security trust fund and take the money and use it for other expenditures in the Government; that is the law, and that is how the trust funds are dealt with under current law: the trust fund loans money to the Treasury in return for Treasury bonds. But I think the Senator makes a good point. I do not know whether we should call it fraudulent conversion as such. But I think we can certainly call it a fraud on the taxpayers to take moneys out of the Social Security trust fund that are dedicated to those who have paid into the trust fund on a monthly basis, and dedicated to those who deserve those funds.

Mr. SPECTER. I would accept my colleague's statement that it is a fraud on the taxpayers which is about the same thing as a fraudulent conversion, which I think is the technical term.

Mr. HATCH. The technical term would be a fraudulent conversion.

Mr. SPECTER. That would be a fraudulent conversion.

I find it is of great interest that my friend from Utah said except that Government does it every day, a multitime offender. It is not a 3-time loser or 33-time loser. It is a 33,000-time loser, maybe a 33 million-time loser, or 33 billion-time loser. That is the concern I have.

I have a very deep concern that there is not truth in accounting when, instead of taking our revenues and expenditures to balance the budget, we

add other funds which are set up as a trust fund. It seems to me that this is such a very basic principle of law, trust law, criminal law, that it is worth embodying in the Constitution.

And then, of course, you have the concerns which the senior citizens of America talk about; whether they are being treated fairly and whether their trust funds are being segregated so that they will have funds when they seek to retire. That is an enormous concern with many, many of the elderly who worry about every political statement which is made and every 30-second campaign ad, let alone a constitutional amendment for a balanced budget which does not isolate and protect their funds.

I thank my colleague from Utah for engaging in this discussion. I thank my other colleagues for interrupting the regular schedule.

Mr. President, I support the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Nevada. In order to fully protect the earnings of our senior citizens and the generations that follow, I believe we must keep the Social Security trust fund set apart as it was meant to be.

I have consistently supported the interest of older Americans and future generations as a U.S. Senator. In March 1994, the Senate considered a substitute balanced budget amendment offered by Senator REID which would have, among other things, exempted Social Security from budget calculations. After very careful consideration, I decided to vote for that amendment. I believe the Social Security trust fund is a self-financed program that must be preserved and protected. It is supported entirely by employer and employee-paid payroll taxes, and more importantly, it is a contract between Americans and their government. In addition, by law the fund must be self-supporting because it has no claim on general tax revenues.

My Senate voting record on the Social Security issue has been consistent. When the Senate considered a balanced budget amendment in 1982, I voted in favor of an amendment offered by Senator MOYNIHAN to exempt Social Security. A few days later I voted for another amendment authored by Senators Cranston and MOYNIHAN to exempt Social Security, and veterans' benefits, which our senior citizens depend upon. When the Senate considered a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution in 1986, I voted against tabling a Metzenbaum amendment to exempt Social Security. As I mentioned, in March 1994, I voted for the substitute amendment offered by our colleague from Nevada, Senator REID. And most recently, in January of this year, when the balanced budget amendment was being considered by the Senate Judiciary Committee, I voted against tabling an amendment to exempt Social Security authored by Senator FEINSTEIN.

I have voted several other times on the Senate floor to preserve the integrity of Social Security. In 1990, I voted in favor of an amendment by Senator Heinz to remove Social Security from inclusion in deficit calculations. In that same year, I voted for an amendment offered by Senator HOLLINGS to exclude Social Security trust funds from inclusion in budget deficit calculations.

I believe there is a prevailing view that we ought to leave Social Security alone and not subject it to budget cuts. I appreciate the need to reduce the Federal deficit while keeping Social Security fiscally sound because confidence in the stability of the program is of great importance to current and future retirees.

In conclusion Mr. President, we must protect Social Security or we run the risk of jeopardizing the futures of young and old Americans alike. I believe this amendment will enable us to balance the budget in a way that will protect the hard earned savings Americans have set aside for their twilight years. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 10:30 a.m. Senator BOXER be recognized to offer an amendment regarding disasters and that the time prior to the motion to table be limited to 3 hours 15 minutes to be divided in the following fashion, with no second-degree amendments in order prior to the motion to table: 2 hours 45 minutes under the control of the distinguished Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] and 30 minutes under the control of the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH]. I further ask that at the conclusion or yielding of time today the majority leader or his designee be recognized to make a motion to table the Boxer amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I agree with this. I think it is an excellent time agreement. I want to clarify because a couple of my colleagues would like to speak as if in morning business. If they should go over the 10:30 time by just a few minutes—I do not think it is their intent to speak too long—we can adjust this so that we still have the time. We may be starting later than 10:30.

Mr. HATCH. I am certainly amenable to that, as long as the majority leader is.

I ask unanimous consent that those who are talking in morning business, if they go beyond the hour of 10:30—and I hope they will not—that the time will be adjusted so that the distinguished Senator from California will still have her 2 hours 45 minutes and I will still have 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object, I want to thank the Senator.

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

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator will yield, as I understand it, there is a definite time when this is to take place and that will start at 10:30 and there will be 3 hours and 15 minutes for the debate. The definite time is scheduled for a 3:30 vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as in morning business for the next 10 minutes.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, it is my intention to yield to my friend, Senator CONRAD from North Dakota, when I finish speaking. But for 1 minute, let me yield on a matter of national importance to my friend from Connecticut, Senator LIEBERMAN.

#### UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT BASKETBALL

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank my friend from North Dakota. This is a matter of national importance.

Mr. President, I have had the honor for the last 6-plus years to stand and speak on many occasions on behalf of the people of Connecticut. Today, I stand to crow on behalf of the people of Connecticut because of the extraordinary accomplishments of the University of Connecticut men's and women's basketball teams.

Mr. President, Connecticut, a small State, is proud of its many firsts: The world's first written Constitution; the world's first warship and nuclear-powered submarine; the world's first American dictionary was published in Connecticut.

But another first today: The first time that a university's men's and women's basketball teams were rated No. 1 in the country at the same time.

Connecticut is a small State, but these extraordinary athletes and their fine coaches have made us all feel 10 feet tall today. We congratulate them. We know it has not come easily. They have worked hard and played by the rules.

In the spirit of the amendment under discussion, they are an extremely balanced team, and they have been rewarded with the victory and recognition they have now received.

Mr. President, I thank my colleagues. I hope this debate moves expeditiously during the day so that it will allow Senator DODD and I to go to the UConn-Georgetown game at the arena tonight.

#### A NEW DIRECTOR FOR THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let the record show that my colleague from Connecticut crowded, as he said he would.

It is probably appropriate that he talked about basketball because he will understand that one important element of the game is a referee. Nobody would go to a basketball game and wonder about the results, if he did not think the referee was going to be fair. Give me a referee, and I will win any game I ever played.

I want to talk about referees for a second, though. One of the most important appointments that we are going to make in Congress is going to be the appointment of somebody to head the Congressional Budget Office. This person will, in effect, be the referee on budget issues, tax issues, economic issues. The referee. How can our referee, the Congressional Budget Office, discharge its obligation effectively? Well, by having the confidence of the Members of the Senate that the CBO will do so impartially and in a manner that is eminently fair.

For that reason, the law with respect to the Congressional Budget Office says that the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall be chosen "without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of his fitness to perform his duties." That language is not an accident. That is written into the law for a very specific purpose. This is a critical appointment, and the appointment must be of someone of great substance, first of all, and second, somebody who will be respected as fair, nonpartisan.

We understand that the majority has decided to appoint Prof. June O'Neill to that post. I will not stand here and in any way try to tarnish the reputation of Professor O'Neill. I have never met her and I do not know her. I come to express great concern about this appointment and to say, along with my colleague, Senator CONRAD, I am sending a letter to the President pro tempore asking that he not effect this appointment of Professor O'Neill to head the CBO.

Senator EXON, the ranking minority member of the Budget Committee, said in his letter to the chairman of the Budget Committee: "It has been our recommendation that we should seek additional applicants before reaching a decision."

They are not comfortable with this appointment, and I am not comfortable with it for several reasons. I do not know much more than what I have read, but if what I read is accurate, then I am very concerned with the notion that they are finding someone who believes that when you score issues, they ought to be scored dynamically.

What is dynamic scoring. This theory says that if you cut tax rates, economic activity will increase to such an extent that the Government will actually collect more revenue. If you cut capital gains taxes, for instance, the