

of the proposed Republican tax cut goes to taxpayers with incomes of less than \$100,000. The 12 percent at the top, those earning more than \$100,000, they get 52 percent of the benefits.

Again, I think a lot of people wonder: Gee, how is it? I read that in this Contract With America, they had a \$500 tax credit for children. How could it be that a family earning \$30,000 a year only gets \$124 of benefit?

Well, you know why that is true, Mr. President? Because they have played a little trick. They played a little trick in this tax plan. They did not make that credit refundable. And so if you look at what people are paying now and the tax relief they will get, you find that it is a big hoax; it is a big trick.

A family earning \$30,000 gets \$124 of benefits. Those with \$200,000 of income get \$11,000 of benefit. That is fair? I do not think so. I do not think that is what the American people had in mind when they were told there was this Contract With America. I do not think they had in mind, when they talk about a 50-percent cut in the capital gains tax, that 75 percent of the benefit goes to the top 12 percent in this country; and that the other 88 percent of the people in this country get 25 percent of the benefit. I do not think that is what they had in mind.

Mr. President, this last chart shows what is happening to the deficit. I thought under the Contract With America, they were going to balance the budget. But let us look at, after the enactment of the Contract With America, what is happening with the deficit.

Do you know what one finds? The deficit is going up. The deficit is not going down. The deficit is going up.

I thought with this Contract With America, they were going to be reducing the deficit. I thought they were going to be moving toward a balanced budget.

They have now passed the whole Contract With America and the deficit is going up. What happened? What happened? They said in this Contract With America that they were going to reduce the deficits, reduce the debt, and balance the budget.

But after the Contract With America is passed, the deficit is not going down, the deficit is going up. It is because the same old voodoo economics does not add up. It does not add up.

Mr. President, this is going to be pretty sobering for the American people to find out that they put their trust in something and, once again, they are disappointed. It is time for us to honor the most basic Contract With America, the pledge we took to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States.

That is the real Contract With America that every Member of the House and the Senate have. And we have a duty and an obligation to secure the economic future of this country—a duty and an obligation. We ought to move immediately upon our return to

balance the budget of this country, to do it in an honest way without raiding Social Security trust funds and to secure a future for our children that is as full of promise and hope as what was turned over to us by previous generations.

Mr. President, I think the Contract With America has some good points—congressional accountability, the notion that we are no longer going to put off responsibilities on States that are beyond their ability to pay for. But this economic game plan is bankrupt. It does not add up. It is not fair, and it must be rejected. Then we must turn in a bipartisan way to doing what we all know must be done: to get our fiscal house in order, to get America back on track and to create economic opportunity for the people that we all represent.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HUTCHISON). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. COVERDELL. Madam President, it is my understanding that, under a previous order, each Senator is allowed to speak up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

BUDGET DEFICITS

Mr. COVERDELL. Madam President, I have been presiding, as you are, over the Senate for the last couple of days, and I would like to make some remarks about what I have heard from the other side, not the least of which we just heard from the good Senator from North Dakota.

First, I will say that the charts that he has described do one thing. They very clearly paint a picture of the enormous financial crisis that our country faces. It was just the other morning that I spoke before the Senate and I pointed out that within 10 years, Madam President—and that puts virtually every American I have spoken with at the table—all U.S. revenues will be consumed by just five things: Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, Federal retirement, and the interest on our debt. Every dime of U.S. revenue will have been expended by those five outlays in just 10 years. So it is going to be this generation that has to come to grips with this issue.

We cannot pass the baton to anybody else. It is going to happen on our watch. The clock has run out. It will be this generation of Americans that come to grips with this.

But as I listened to the Senator from North Dakota as he was analyzing what our side of the aisle is coming with, he left out a couple salient facts.

The first is that the new majority's budget has yet to be presented. He was talking about the tax cut provisions that have come from the House, but we do not yet have the budget that has been presented from the House or Senate Budget Committees.

I am comfortable that both those committees are going to come with budgets that move toward balance and do not add to the deficit. After all, it was the new majority that had to fight through this body the rescission cuts from the House which were \$17 billion and, as the majority leader noted this morning, on the Senate side late last night, \$16 billion. I might add, that is a stark contrast from what the President came to Washington to do, which was to add \$16 to \$19 billion just 2 years ago straight to the deficit if it had not been defeated by our side of the aisle. So he failed to address the fact that the new budgets have yet to be seen.

The second point he left out is that the only budget that has been given that we have seen has been given to us by the President of the United States. We do have that budget. That budget adds \$200 billion to the deficit for as far as the eye can see. If he had put the President's proposal on his chart, it would have had to have reached clear to the top of the ceiling. The President has totally ignored the deficit—totally ignored it.

The President was in Atlanta just this past week, and the President and the Secretary of the Treasury both said—this is an unbelievable statement—but they both said that the United States is actually operating in an operational surplus. That is a stunning statement from the President, the Chief Executive of the United States of America, that we are actually operating—he told a group of 2,000 students that we are actually operating with a surplus.

He went on to say—asterisk—“that is, if you do not count the interest on the debt.”

Of course, most people I go to work with every day and who live in my hometown and my State recognize that if they go to the bank and they ask for a loan and the loan officer says, “Your financial statement just won't allow the loan,” they would say to the loan officer, “Yeah, but if you don't add all the interest I am paying on my mortgage, I'd be in great shape,” you would either be laughed out of the loan office or thrown out of the loan office.

Madam President, I am just going to leave two points: One, the Senator from North Dakota completely overlooked that the budget they presented is \$200 billion in debt for as far as the eye can see; that this administration, through the budgets that they have offered and the actions they have taken, are doing the equivalent of adding \$2.2 trillion to the debt—\$2.2 trillion to the debt. He left that completely out of his remarks.

And the second point I want to make is you cannot talk about what the new

majority planned until the new majority puts its budgets on the table. They will be here soon, and they will move to a balanced budget by the year 2002.

I might also add, if the Senator from North Dakota had voted for a balanced budget amendment, we might be on a near course to getting this job done. I yield the floor.

Mr. KERREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

U.S. INTELLIGENCE AND MEDICAL COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP

Mr. KERREY. Madam President, I rise to issue a challenge that I hope will be answered with the creation of a stimulating partnership between business, medicine, and the Government, in this case the Federal Government. An important relationship is developing today between U.S. intelligence and the medical communities.

Technology to support intelligence analysis is being adapted to improve significantly a doctor's ability to detect breast cancer in its earliest stages. Over 46,000 women die each year. The early estimates are, with this technology, that up to one-third of these women could be saved as a consequence of this technology conversion.

The technology being developed is simple to describe but very difficult to achieve. Daily, intelligence analysts deal with the problem of detecting changes in photographic images they are reviewing. As they watch foreign airfields, they want to know arrivals, bed-down, and departures of aircraft. As they watch foreign seaports, they want to know the arrivals, unloading, and departures of ships carrying cargo of interest. Computer software can be of great assistance in automatically detecting these sorts of changes at airfields and at seaports. It is this intelligence technology that is being adapted for the medical community.

Early detection of breast cancer currently relies heavily on the judgment and professional experience of doctors who review mammograms and magnetic resonance images. A significant part of their judgment is based on comparing previous images with the current image of a woman's breast. As in the intelligence world, detecting change is fundamental to understanding what is going on.

Through some exciting developments managed by the National Information Display Lab at the David Sarnoff Labs in Princeton, NJ, computer analytical techniques are being developed for the medical community. Relying on the technology developed for intelligence, they are adapting the technology to combat a dreaded disease that attacks 1 in 8 women in America today.

Madam President, I want to emphasize that the tens of thousands of lives that already have been saved as a result of intelligence technology by providing more effective national defense will be complemented by the thousands

of lives that will be saved through the earlier detection of breast cancer.

This is an excellent example of the sound investment of taxpayers' dollars being paid off by saving thousands of lives in both national defense and medicine.

The National Information Display Lab, or NIDL, is an inspiring arrangement that needs to be duplicated by other Government/private-sector relationships. NIDL provides the bridge between Government/civilian-sector requirements and Government/civilian-sector technology. By understanding both requirements and technologies, NIDL is able to help close the gap between the Government and the private sector. Perhaps the most significant part of NIDL's story is their funding. NIDL relies on Government funding to begin to develop technology, which is then spun off to the commercial world for civilian and Government applications.

On Tuesday of this week, Madam President, the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, Senator ARLEN SPECTER, and I announced intelligence community funding to begin the technology transfer for breast cancer research. The community is providing \$375,000 to the NIDL to push the technology ahead. We are all aware of the intelligence community's keen sense of urgency, great technical expertise, and excellent planning skills which will ensure that the push forward has an effective start.

I also want to personally thank President Clinton for making all of this happen. His commitment to breaking down the walls between defense technology and commercial technology, and his passion to attack the Nation's health problems with every weapon in our arsenal are the reasons this project is going forward. Once he knew that intelligence systems could bring earlier detection of breast cancer, this Government acted with determination and dispatch.

I began, Madam President, by saying that I was issuing a challenge. The challenge is this: Will all the interested parties—Government, medical, and commercial—now pick up the ball that has been put into play and carry it forward so that within 12 to 24 months—I emphasize this, Madam President, because this start will not come to completion unless we set a deadline and say that within 12 to 24 months, we are going to carry this technology forward into the clinical labs and clinics of this country, so that within this period of time, more women's lives will be saved through the earlier detection of breast cancer. The National Information Display Lab must be put on a sound financial basis, and everyone must help. I hope the challenge will be met.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak in morning business for up to 15 minutes.

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

GUIDE TO SMALLER GOVERNMENT

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, I have several matters I would like to call to the attention of the Senate.

First, in this morning's Wall Street Journal, we have "A Bureaucrat's Guide to Smaller Government."

The following was sent in by a Federal employee who asked to remain anonymous so she can keep her cushy Government job.

She describes the way in which she talked to her other Federal employees or fellow Federal employees, asking them, "How will you know that the Government is truly shrinking?" They came up with their top 10 list.

These are the top 10 ways we can know that the Government is truly shrinking:

(10) When the Equal Employment Opportunity [EEO] office has a layoff.

She says:

Our EEO chief gets paid more than \$70,000 a year to coordinate "diversity" events and spout aphorisms at meetings. When that sacred cow gets a real job, I'll know the change has come. Which brings me to * * *

(9) No more paid time off for diversity or charity events.

She says employees can get away with murder because of the Federal culture. It lacks an urgency to produce.

A lazy but savvy employee can spend most of his or her workweek attending such vital events as Earth Week, Women's Equality Day, AIDS Awareness Day, or helping in the annual United Way shakedown.

She says:

I'll know the cuts have had an impact when agencies like mine no longer can afford to have an \$80,000-a-year employee take "a few months off" to work on the United Way fund drive.

(8) When upper management is replaced for not making cuts fast enough.

(7) When the entourage for agency heads disappears.

She says:

My agency has about 600 people—small by Federal standards. Even so, the guy who runs the place has a scheduler who's paid \$70,000 a year, a public relations staff to write his speeches and press releases, and a clutch of assistants and advisers * * *. A Congressman or Senator can get by with fewer helpers. Why not a bureaucrat?

(6) When the newspaper subscriptions stop. Scientific or trade journals are one thing, but why does the Federal Government need to buy thousands of subscriptions to The Washington Post or the New York Times?

(5) When somebody gets canned—and quickly—for running a business from his desk.

This one struck me, interestingly. She says:

I saw my first answering machine in 1979 on the desk of a Federal employee who was running a real estate business "on the side." Moonlighting on the job is still lucrative, as the chance of being punished, let alone fired, is very small. If the White House caves in to union pressure and won't push for streamlined firing procedures, then the Hill should do it and get these thieves off the payroll.