

would discover oil. The last time I remember people standing on this floor saying there is no oil was when we were considering legislation to allow leasing on the North Slope of Alaska, when they said that it would only produce about 1 billion barrels at the most. Mind you, that would have been the largest deposit on the North American continent. But, as a matter of fact, we have already produced 10 billion barrels. Ten billion barrels came out of that bill that came before the Senate. The argument went for days. Finally, the tie had to be broken by the Vice President of the United States.

Now, we are in the same situation here. Mr. President, you are going to see more wildcats coming across this floor when ANWR is brought up than anything you have here. They have more things they can warn the public of. Look at that. They say we are trying to sell the Statue of Liberty. It is absolutely ludicrous again I say. I have never heard an argument stretched to that point.

This resolution does not authorize the sale of anything. All the President wants to do is count the money when it is authorized to lease or to sell something, and there already are a series of things authorized. The President is going to send up a bill to authorize the further sale of some of the assets on the Presidio at Monterey in California. As a matter of fact, it has already been leased. Do you know who it is leased to? Former Senator Cranston and the former leader of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gorbachev. They have leases there in the Presidio already.

Now, when you look at it, all the President is saying is that in the process of acquiring money from the sale or lease of assets that are authorized by law, we ought to count them in the budget process. This amendment would deny the President that right. It would mean that he could not count the \$1.4 billion that will come in the first 4 years of the leasing of ANWR.

I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his courtesy.

Mr. BUMPERS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Alaska, my amendment does not stop the leasing of ANWR. That is not what this amendment is all about. You can go ahead and lease ANWR. But do not score it in the budget. That has been the law of the land for 10 years.

All of a sudden we get this budget resolution presented to us and they say we are going to change the rules. If you can get \$2 billion for Presidio, count it, score it. You have \$4 billion in here, and next year you may not have \$4 billion in asset sales so you are going to have to find it elsewhere. Why, I say to the Senator, you might even have to pay royalties on hard rock mining next year.

Mr. STEVENS. Will the Senator yield for just one question? We are

closing almost 50 bases in the United States. Why should we not count as income those portions of the bases we are going to sell? This amendment would not allow that.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, there is not a Governor in the United States, including the person sitting in the chair at this moment, who is a former Governor, in my opinion, that will take an asset sale or one-time windfall and put it into his operating budget. My amendment does not prohibit the sale of those bases. It just says, let's not change the budget rules to mask the deficit by scoring the revenues derived from these asset sales.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, how much time does Senator BUMPERS have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-one seconds.

Mr. BUMPERS. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMENICI. How much time do I have, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair very much.

Mr. President, let me suggest there really are two arguments here. I think the paramount one is to get rid of any authority that the Energy Committee might have in its reconciliation instructions to direct that we begin leasing of ANWR. While asset sales generally seem to be the subject matter, I think that is the prime focus.

And let me suggest for a minute a bit of arrogance about the United States, a bit of arrogance about those who think we can just continue to lock up our assets because we are so wealthy it does not matter. How does \$180 billion worth of American assets called "oil" sound to average Americans—\$180 billion worth? We will buy it from other countries because we think we are so strong, so powerful, so economically self-sufficient we can just throw away our assets—\$180 billion.

Now, I know that people do not like to think of America as being arrogant about anything; we are humble people. But I submit, Mr. President, it is arrogance to think that we can throw away \$180 billion and say we will buy it from the Saudis. After all, it was only ours so why not just lock it up.

Now, if there was harm coming to ANWR, many who will vote against Senator BUMPERS would vote with him. But that argument about how much damage is going to be done there just will not play too much longer.

Now, let me make a second point. Let me make a second point on this issue. Mr. President, what happens if we fail to balance the budget and the American dollar keeps coming down? Do you know what might happen, I say to the Senator from Alaska? The Saudi Arabians may say, "Pay us in yen." How does that strike you? "We do not want your American dollars. They are not good enough."

Mr. STEVENS. For oil.

Mr. DOMENICI. For oil. Pay us in yen. We will pay them in yen and guess what will happen. Oil prices go up 300 percent in America.

Why should we not use our own rather than depend totally upon them?

I yield the floor, and if we have no remaining time, I assume we are finished with this amendment and it will be appropriately stacked tomorrow by our leader.

RURAL HOUSING GUARANTEED LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I wish to engage in a colloquy with Senator DOMENICI, the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, with respect to the rural housing guaranteed loan program.

In reviewing the report accompanying the Fiscal Year 1996 Concurrent Budget Resolution, I note that the Senate Budget Committee recommends "the reduction or elimination of certain subsidies provided by the federal government for a range of credit programs in the Small Business Administration, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Rural Housing and Community Development Service." Am I correct in understanding this to mean that the Budget Committee assumes no savings from the Rural Housing and Community Development Service's Section 502 unsubsidized guaranteed loan program over the next seven years?

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator from Rhode Island is correct.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I will oppose the Roth amendment which takes a meat-ax approach to eliminating federal jobs. The administration has made laudable progress by downsizing the government by more than a quarter of a million workers by the end of the year. Under the leadership of Vice President GORE, careful evaluation, systematic studies, and cost-benefit analyses have been used to shape a leaner more effective Federal workforce. Because it is not based on such studies and analysis, the Roth amendment, by contrast, could result in the slicing away of essential jobs, such as those needed to get out the social security checks, staff the veterans' hospitals, or to protect federal facilities and workers from another terrorist incident. Also, the Roth amendment, according to its author, assumes the elimination of the Department of Commerce, an action with which I do not agree.

AFDC

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I intend to propose an amendment that will enable us to improve our welfare system rather than dismantle it. Under my amendment, Aid to Families With Dependent Children will remain a Federal entitlement program.

The amendment I propose will, over 7 years, restore \$55 billion to income security programs, including Aid to Families With Dependent Children, Supplemental Security Income and Unemployment Insurance under the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee.

My amendment is deficit neutral. It is financed by using part of the fiscal dividend that will accrue to the Federal Government if we balance the budget.

The budget resolution reported out by the Senate Budget Committee reserves the fiscal dividend for tax cuts.

I fail to understand how we can justify tax cuts at the same time that we are, for example: withdrawing the Federal guarantee of support for dependent children; reducing government programs like Medicare and Medicaid by over 15 percent; and threatening an end to vital public services through the elimination of subsidies for AMTRAK.

As I stated on introducing the Family Support Act of 1995 last Thursday:

It is beyond belief that in the middle of the Great Depression in the 1930's, we provided for children a minimum benefit to keep them alive, and in the middle of a successful 1990's with a 7 trillion dollar economy we're going to take that away.

Senators who have been following the subject of welfare policy will recognize the bill I introduced last week as a successor to the Family Support Act of 1988, which was adopted in this Chamber just this side of 7 years ago, on September 29, 1988, by a vote of 96 to 1.

When President Ronald Reagan signed the bill in the Rose Garden on October 13, he thanked those who, as he said, shared the credit for "this landmark legislation", including Senator DOLE, Senator PACKWOOD, and Senator Bentsen, as well as Representatives Rostenkowski, HANK BROWN, Michel Frenzel, and Downey.

These members of Congress will be remembered, President Reagan said; for accomplishing what many have attempted, but no one has achieved in several decades: a meaningful redirection of our welfare system.

It will seem unimaginable to us today, but the Family Support Act was not a partisan political measure.

Together Republicans and Democrats passed a bill that was based largely on what we had learned during the 1980's about how to get welfare recipients into work. A number of States had used the flexibility we gave them in 1981 to do this, and there had been careful evaluation of their efforts. The Family Support Act of 1988 recognized a mutual obligation. The Government would provide training and child care, and help the parent find a job. But the parent had an obligation to do what was required.

The proposal that is envisaged in this budget resolution is vastly different. It gives up entirely on a national commitment.

We have a problem in this country that we share with most of the rest of the western world, and that is the prob-

lem of the breakdown in family structure. As recently as 1960 the percentage of children born to single parents was about 5 percent. A manageable problem. It is now about 33 percent. The same trend is happening in Canada. The out-of-wedlock birth rate in the United Kingdom and France exceeds 30 percent, very close to ours.

And we do not know what to do about it.

Dr. Lawrence Mead, professor at New York University, now visiting professor at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton, testified before the Finance Committee on March 9 of this year. He asked:

Can the forces behind growing welfare be stemmed? Conservative analysts say that unwed pregnancy is the greatest evil in welfare, the cause not only of dependency but other social ills. On all sides, people call for a "family policy" that would solve this problem.

But we have no such policy. The great fact is that neither policymakers nor researchers have found any incentive, benefit, or other intervention that can do much to cut the unwed pregnancy rate.

What we do know is that the program we enacted in 1988, the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training [JOBS] Program, can have a modest, but important effect.

Dr. Mead told the committee that:

A tough JOBS program appears to be one reason why Wisconsin has reduced its welfare rolls, despite generous welfare benefits. Very likely, JOBS has operated to restrain welfare growth nationwide.

Lawrence Townsend, Director of the Department of Public Social Services of Riverside County, CA, who runs what is recognized as one of the most successful JOBS programs in the country, spoke to the Finance Committee on March 20:

* * * of the importance of the existence of a Federally mandated, properly focused, and adequately funded JOBS program. If designed properly, the JOBS program can be one of the best vehicles for assisting those who are AFDC-dependent to successfully traverse the road to self sufficiency.

The Family Support Act of 1995 builds on what we know. Evaluation confirms that the JOBS program works. As a result of evaluation we are learning how programs can perform better, by increasing participation requirements, and placing more emphasis on actual work.

States need more flexibility to test new policies. My bill allows States to set their own rules for assets and to design their own rules for eligibility for the Unemployed Parent program—welfare benefits for 2-parent families. It says that a decision on a waiver will be made within 90 days.

And we can fulfill our obligations to our Nation's children and still balance the budget in a reasonable timeframe if we eschew tax cuts.

Faced with a huge budget deficits I have consistently opposed tax cuts in any shape or form.

As I indicated 10 days ago on "Meet the Press":

I dropped (the President's) tax cut plan the moment I heard about it.

I oppose the tax cuts advocated in the Contract for America. The Contract for America's tax proposals were incorporated into the House budget resolution—a resolution that would eliminate the Federal guarantee on AFDC for dependent children while providing funding for a 7-year \$354 billion tax cut.

And I am opposed to the tax cuts implicit in the budget resolution now before the Senate. You may make the tax cuts appear costless by stipulating that tax reduction will be financed with the so-called fiscal dividend—estimated by CBO to be about \$170 billion.

But why should the fiscal dividend be reserved for tax cuts?

Who can have a greater claim on our conscience than poor children. I am simply asking the Senate to adjust less than one-half of 1 percent of total spending provided for in the budget resolution in favor of impoverished children. Have we really come to the point, at the close of the 20th century, when that is too much to ask?

In a series of speeches in February of this year I opposed the constitutional amendment to balance the budget. I stated then, and still believe, that we can and will balance the budget without a constitutional requirement.

I noted the progress that had already been made as a result of a \$500 billion deficit reduction program enacted in 1993—enacted I might add without one Republican vote in either the Senate or the House. As a result of deficit reduction measures enacted in 1993, the deficit has declined for three straight years—from \$290 billion in fiscal year 1992 to an estimated \$175 billion for the current fiscal year.

Let us proceed with good cheer knowing that we can get a balanced budget without ending an entitlement for dependent children.

MEDICARE/MEDICAID CUTS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, this debate is about priorities, fairness and choices. We agree on the bottom line. We agree on balancing the budget and bringing this deficit down. But we part company on how to get there.

I say we should get to the bottom line without putting our seniors, our students, our farmers, and our working families in the firing line.

I say we should choose quality health care for our seniors over unnecessary tax breaks for those who need it the least.

In the last couple of weeks I have heard my Republican friends say that their budget resolution does not cut Medicare. They say, "Only in Washington would someone say that reducing the rate of growth from 10 to 7.1 percent is a cut".

Well, to this I respond with the following: Only in Washington would they say to a senior citizen—We're not cutting your Medicare, just hand over \$900 more out of your pocket each year to pay for it.

But, while we're doing it—remember, it's not a cut.

Only in Washington would they propose the largest insurance rate hike on senior citizens in our country's history, at the same time they hand over a new \$20,000 tax break to those making over \$350,000 a year.

But, remember, it's not a cut.

Only in Washington would we propose soaking our seniors while we continue to needlessly funnel billions into the bloated, wasteful Pentagon.

But, remember, it's not a cut.

Mr. President, a constituent from Dubuque, Iowa hit the nail right on the head when she wrote me last week. "How can they reconcile these cuts," she said, "and give tax cuts to the more affluent * * * meanwhile nothing is being cut from the Pentagon."

Today, we spend five times more on our military than all of our potential enemies combined. If you couple that with what our allies spend—today, we are outspending our enemies ten to one. The United States and our allies spend about \$510 billion a year. While our potential enemies spend about \$54 billion combined.

And we can't find one thin dime to cut from the military? In fact, this budget increases the Pentagon by \$25 billion.

Mr. President, let us call this what it is. This is an assault on our senior citizens. A \$256 billion assault. By far, the largest Medicare cut in history.

We have a moral responsibility to bring down the deficit and balance the budget. But it is morally wrong to promise a huge tax cut to the wealthy at the same time we ask seniors to take a cut in their health care.

It is morally wrong to give a \$20,000 gift to the wealthy while we cut benefits for seniors who live on less than \$20,000 a year.

I hear a lot of talk about the Contract With America. What about our Nation's contract with senior citizens? What about keeping that commitment?

Medicare and Medicaid are a basic part of America's contract with seniors. And we ought not to break that contract to pay for a tax break to those who need it the least.

These cuts will hit Iowa particularly hard. Iowa ranks first in percent of citizens over age 85 and third nationally in percent of the population over age 65. The health care system in rural Iowa is already on the critical list—we have too, few doctors, nurses and other health care professionals and many of our rural hospitals are barely making it.

And, Iowa hospitals, doctors, and other health professionals depend heavily on Medicare payments. In some rural Iowa hospitals, as much as 80 percent of total patient revenues come from the Medicare system.

Iowa hospitals are financially strained and 75 percent of all hospitals lost money on patient revenue in 1993. But, according to a recent study conducted by Lewin-VHI, under the Repub-

lican plan, Iowa hospitals will lose on average \$1,276 for each Medicare case in the year 2000. And rural hospitals throughout the United States stand to lose \$866 per case in the year 2000—Iowa rural hospitals will lose even more.

But rural hospitals are not the only ones to lose. As rural hospitals go, so goes the rest of the health care system, so goes quality and access to care provided to all Iowans, and so goes our rural economy.

If the hospital closes it often means that the doctor's office closes, the pharmacy closes, and the nursing home goes. Pretty soon so does the local economy. It is a domino effect.

Listen to what a doctor in Sibley, IA, had to say:

In Sibley, we have a very viable, small rural hospital that gives total patient care. We are able to manage most patients efficiently and effectively. But with the proposed cuts in Medicare that the current budget is envisioning, we can see this as a terrible drain on our hospital's economy. The proposed cuts would put our hospital in a losing situation. Further cutting in the funding could certainly endanger the existence of this hospital. In Sibley, the Osceola Community Hospital is the only hospital in a 20-mile radius. This could certainly be a hazard to the health of the general area.

But Medicare is not the only item on the hit list. What about Medicaid? What about long-term care?

Instead of improving the system, the Republicans are proposing a \$175 billion cut in Medicaid. That will deal a heavy blow to the 6 out of 10 people in nursing homes who are receiving help from Medicaid.

These people have used up whatever savings they had before they qualified for Medicaid. They are hard working middle-class families that, because of an illness in the family, have lost their life savings.

They are not looking for an easy way out or handout. They continue to share in the cost of their care—they use their Social Security and pension income to pay as much of the bills as they can.

But the Republican budget resolution would cut an estimated \$299 million in long-term care spending in Iowa through the year 2000—a 15.3 percent cut in long-term care spending.

Under these cuts, an estimated 5,300 Iowans are expected to lose their eligibility for Medicaid long term care benefits in 1996—and that could grow to 28,500 by the year 2000. That's a 48 percent reduction in the number of long-term care recipients by the year 2000.

I also hear a lot about our children in this budget debate. What about kids? This budget resolution places the health care of millions of children at risk. Thirteen percent of Iowa's children are covered by Medicaid and many of these children are very sick or have severe disabilities.

These cuts are going to hurt hard working Iowa families. Let me give you just one example.

Deb and Doug live in Lake View, IA, and in 1982 their son Jon was born en route to the hospital—2 months pre-

mature. Jon spent 6 weeks in intensive care in Blank Children's Hospital in Des Moines. When Jon was 9 months old he was diagnosed with severe cerebral palsy and severe developmental delays. Today, Jon is doing great. He is growing up in rural Iowa with his dad, mom, and big brother.

Both Deb and Doug work—Doug during the day and Deb at night so one of them can always be home to care for Jon. But, Jon is able to stay home because Medicaid help pays for Jon's health care and other services that will help him become an independent working adult.

Deb says that Jon would not be the happy healthy kid he is today if it wasn't for the help he received through Medicaid. Under this budget resolution there are no guarantees that Jon, or others like him, will continue to receive the health care services that he needs to live a full life.

The budget resolution before us means that fewer children in working families and children with severe disabilities will have access to health care. Last year, 82 percent of the people who lost their health care coverage were children. Our children deserve a chance. Our children are our future and if we don't take care of them now we will pay later—in lower productivity and greater health and education costs.

Mr. President, I will end where I began. This is a debate about choices and the future. The future for not just the next generation of children, but this generation, too.

Let us work to cut the deficit without cutting the future for seniors, working families, students, and kids. Let's make the right choice.

AMENDMENT NO. 1123

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, during my campaign, I promised the voters of Michigan to both oppose any effort to raise their taxes and to support badly needed tax cuts—especially for the hard working middle-class families in our State. While not perfect, I intend to support the amendment before the Senate because it first provides for a balanced budget and also provides significant tax relief primarily targeted at American families. Indeed, I plan to support any reasonable proposal for middle-class family tax relief brought to the Senate until some form of family tax cut is adopted.

Although I support much in this amendment, there are certain provisions which I would change given the opportunity. For example, while I support restraining the growth of mandatory spending, the underlying resolution already slows the growth of Medicare as much as most Governors are willing to support.

Furthermore, while I agree that it is possible to reduce discretionary spending further than the pending budget resolution provides, I do not think it is advisable to do so on a proportionate across-the-board basis. Rather, I believe additional program eliminations

and consolidations in targeted areas is the proper course to follow.

Given these reservations, I intend to work to see that other spending reductions—focused primarily on corporate welfare—are used to help pay for tax cuts in the event this amendment passes.

A final concern I have is with the overall distribution of benefits resulting from this amendment. I disagree with those who would set up a quota system for tax cuts, measuring the value of each provision by how uniformly it distributes its benefits. At the same time, it is easy to forget that it is middle-class Americans and their families who pay most of the taxes the Federal Government consumes, and I believe they should be the primary beneficiaries of tax cuts. Thus, if this amendment or any other tax reduction proposal is adopted, I intend to work with the Finance Committee to ensure that middle-class Americans are made the focus of any tax cut passed by the Senate this year.

POSITION ON VOTE

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, due to an unfortunate miscommunication, my vote on the Harkin amendment to restore education funding, which was the second of two back-to-back amendments, was not recorded. There is no one in the Senate who is a stronger advocate for education programs than I am, and I am disappointed that this error occurred. If it had been recorded, my vote would have been "yea."

RAISE TAXES ON WORKING FAMILIES TO PAY FOR TAX CUTS BENEFITING THE WEALTHY? THAT'S THE REPUBLICAN PLAN

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, in the Republican budget resolution, there is only one explicit tax provision. It is not, as many Americans might guess, a measure to provide tax relief. Rather, it is a tax increase, and an egregious one at that. It is egregious because it targets those on the lowest rungs of the economic ladder, the families that are working harder than ever and yet are still struggling to support themselves and their families.

This provision would reduce payments under the Earned Income Tax Credit [EITC] by \$17 billion over 7 years. More than 12 million low-income working families would see their tax bills go up by more than \$1,500—and the money they have left over for food, housing, clothing and medical care go down.

Make no mistake, however. The Republicans do plan further action on taxes. They plan to take the savings they achieve from cutting tax credits to low-income working families, cutting education, cutting Medicare—and use those savings to fund a tax cut which will largely benefit the wealthiest members of our society.

Some of my Republican colleagues have argued that they are not raising taxes on low-income workers, that they are merely reducing the rate of growth in the EITC program. This semantic exercise does not change one

simple fact—this budget resolution will mean fewer dollars in the pockets of these workers.

As we debate the proper level of funding for the earned income tax credit, we should remember that the number we set will have a very real impact on millions of American families and over 31,000 families in my State. I'd like to introduce you to two South Dakota families to illustrate my point.

Karen Olson and Paul Lovestrand are a married couple who live in Rapid City, which is located in the western part of my home State. They have three small children—aged 4 years, 2 years, and 7 months. Paul works 60 hours per week as a baker at the Sixth Street Bakery and Deli, Karen works two part-time jobs—catering for the same deli and cleaning a dentist's office.

Despite their hard work, Karen and Paul do not have any savings. They have qualified for the EITC for the past 2 years, receiving \$600 this year. Karen and Paul relied on their EITC payment to cover the cost of a needed plumbing job and a repair to the steps of their house that was required by their insurance company. Without the EITC, they would have had to cut back in other areas to pay these repair bills.

Nancy and Ted Lewis also live in Rapid City. They are married with two small children—aged 3 years and 6 months. Both Nancy and Ted are college-educated, but they have had trouble finding work since moving to Rapid City nearly 3 years ago. Ted holds down two jobs—he teaches English at Western Dakota Technical Institute and works at a sign-making store. Nancy is trained as an art teacher, but cannot find work that would pay more than the cost of child care.

For the past 3 years, Nancy and Ted have qualified for the EITC, receiving the maximum amount this year. They have relied on their EITC payments for major car repairs, children's clothing and overdue bills. The EITC also allowed them to repay a loan they took out when Ted was between jobs and rent money was scarce.

Karen and Paul and Nancy and Ted are playing by the rules. They are working hard and raising their children in a stable family environment. But even though they are doing everything right, their wages are not high enough to provide for all of their families' needs.

For years, Democrats and Republicans have agreed that the Federal Government should give families like Karen and Paul's and Nancy and Ted's a helping hand. By lessening their tax burden, the EITC makes it a little easier for them to make ends meet. In other words, the EITC rewards those who choose work over welfare.

But now my Republican colleagues have decided that the EITC program is out of control and fraught with fraud and error. These excuses are being used to justify a cut in funds for the program that President Ronald Reagan

called "the best antipoverty, the best pro-family, the best job creation measure to come out of the Congress."

A quick look at these arguments shows they are without merit. First, the program is not out of control because it is growing at the rate set by the Congress. In 1993, an expansion of the EITC was approved. Once this expansion is fully phased in next year, the rate of growth level out so as to correspond to the rate of inflation and population growth. Indeed, the credit will decline as a percentage of GDP beginning in 1997.

Second, the claims of some Senators that a whopping 35 to 45 percent of all EITC payments by the IRS are made erroneously are simply not true. It is true that an IRS study of 1,000 returns filed electronically in January 1994 found that approximately 25 percent of the EITC benefits claimed were in error. The IRS concluded that many of these errors were unintentional but that some significant fraud also existed.

What the critics will not tell you, however, is that the Clinton administration has acted swiftly and aggressively to correct this problem. Specifically, 12 measures to simplify the EITC and reduce erroneous or undeserved claims have already been adopted. The critics conveniently leave out another very important fact. The study that they rely on was conducted before any of the administration's anti-error provisions were put in place.

Mr. President, there can be no justification for this rollback of the EITC, other than a desire on the part of my Republican colleagues to find ways to pay for their tax cut plan, which will largely benefit the wealthy. Putting the burden of paying for that ill-advised plan on low-income families is simply inexcusable.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, when I was elected to the Senate in 1992, I came to Washington committed to taking bold action in order to balance the Federal budget and eliminate the national debt. I knew that the tough decisions necessary to reach these goals would require tremendous political courage by individual Members of Congress. Frankly Mr. President, it was not until the Republican Party assumed control of the Congress last November and Senator DOMENICI assumed the chairmanship of the Budget Committee that I began to see the sort of courage necessary to put America's financial house in order.

Despite having control of the White House and both chambers of Congress from 1992 to 1994, the Democrat Party failed to offer a plan to balance the budget. Instead, President Clinton gave America its largest tax increase ever and proposed a government takeover of health care. This is just the type of behavior which voters have come to expect from President Clinton. When faced with an impending financial disaster his administration offered this

Nation higher taxes and bigger government as the solution. Well, with the support of his congressional allies, President Clinton got his tax increase, but his big-government approach to health care crashed and sank on the rocks of old-fashioned American common sense.

That was the last Congress. What plan has the President offered during the 104th Congress to balance the budget? In the words of Senator DOLE, President Clinton has been AWOL on the budget—"absent without leadership." I just don't understand it. Every time that President Clinton stares a balanced budget in the eye, he blinks. First, he actively fought against the balanced budget amendment, and then he refused to offer his own plan for bringing the Federal budget into balance. Moreover, when his cabinet informed him that we are facing an imminent Medicare crisis, the President did nothing. Perhaps, that is what he does best: nothing.

When President Clinton does meekly act to fulfill his constitutional responsibilities, such as proposing his own budget plan, even his own party cuts and runs. Last week the Senate rejected the Clinton budget by a vote of 99 to 0. No one voted for the Clinton budget. No responsible Member of Congress would dare vote for a budget which would have increased the deficit from \$176 billion this year to \$276 billion in the year 2000 by which time we would have added \$1.2 trillion to the national debt. And yet this is what President Clinton proposed.

President Clinton may be content to sit in the Oval Office at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue and blithely ignore the current budget crisis and the daily mounting debt, but I for one did not leave 45 years of hard work in the private sector to come to Washington and turn a blind-eye to our Nation's fundamental problem. That is why I have come to the Senate floor today to assure my colleagues that I am wholeheartedly committed to working with them to balance the budget, and go beyond that to paying down the principal on our \$4.7 trillion national debt.

A child born today would have to pay \$187,500 over his or her lifetime just to pay interest on the national debt. For those concerned about the impact of the proposed budget on children, this per child cost imposed by the national debt should be the real focus of our concern for children.

We all know that the steps necessary to balance the budget will not be easy. It will require each of us to summon up the courage to cut or eliminate government programs which in times of a budget surplus we might otherwise support.

I recognize that such questions about government programs are difficult, but as the national debt continues to grow out-of-control at a rate of \$20 million per hour, the questions only become more difficult. That is why last week I

introduced a welfare reform bill which addresses the root causes of welfare dependency and runaway welfare costs. It is also why I agreed to co-chair the Senate Task Force on the elimination of federal agencies which today will announce plans for abolishing the Department of Commerce. Plans for eliminating the Departments of HUD, Energy and Education are in the offing.

We must not lack the courage to act together to take bold actions such as limiting the growth in welfare spending, abolishing unnecessary agencies, and reforming Medicare. To do otherwise, will be to tell our children and grandchildren that the generation which fought and won World War II and the cold war has now chosen to abdicate its generational responsibility. A legacy of debt is grossly inconsistent with the self-reliant pioneer values which have built this great nation and made it the world's lone superpower.

When debate time on the budget resolution has expired and the time for voting occurs, the eyes of the world and our children will be focused on the United States Senate. They will wait to see whether, like the House of Representatives, Members of the Senate possess the courage and vision to support a resolution which provides for a balanced budget.

We have already seen the reaction of the world's financial markets when the balanced budget amendment died in this Chamber not long ago. If we repeat that profile in cowardice we will no doubt reap the whirlwind. We will signal to the rest of the world and more importantly to our children that nothing has changed in Washington—the business as usual spending spree continues and we have no intention whatsoever to make serious spending cuts.

I commend Chairman DOMENICI for his outstanding leadership in drafting a long overdue plan to end our Nation's experiment with fiscal irresponsibility. In my short career in the Senate, I can think of no vote more important than this one. Our votes on this budget resolution will clearly define where each of us stands on the most important issue facing our Nation. I intend to stand with those who want to balance the budget by 2002. I intend to stand with those who believe that America's families are desperately in need of tax relief.

The people of North Carolina who sent me here expect and deserve no less.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

TRIBUTE TO COL. JOSEPH W. CORNELISON

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I rise to recognize the dedication, public service, and patriotism of Col. Joseph W. Cornelison, U.S. Army, on the occasion of his retirement after 26 years of faithful service to our Nation. Colonel Cornelison's strong commitment to excellence will leave a lasting impact on the vitality of our modern war fighters, commanding admiration and respect from his military colleagues and Members of Congress.

Colonel Cornelison, a 1969 graduate of the U.S. Military Academy, is serving his last day of a 21 month assignment as the special assistant for Environment and Installations, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs.

He holds a master's degree in public service from Western Kentucky University, and has his juris doctorate from Georgetown University Law Center.

From April 1970 to August 1971, Colonel Cornelison was a forward observer, fire direction officer, and artillery liaison officer, 173d Airborne Brigade, Republic of Vietnam. He ensured the effective delivery of direct artillery support to an infantry unit in combat. He then served as battery commander, assistant division personnel officer and assistant battalion operations officer for 101st Airborne Division [Air Assault] in Fort Campbell, KY. As commander, he conducted a tactical standdown of a field artillery battery in Vietnam and redeployed its personnel and equipment to the United States. In the personnel position, was a key player in the assignment of several hundred officers and undertook review of an array of regulatory requirements to identify those that could be eliminated because of redundancy, obsolescence or insufficient value. He also organized and executed an advanced training program for newly assigned personnel.

From August 1977 to July 1978, Colonel Cornelison was the law clerk to the Hon. Oliver Gasch, judge of U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. He assisted the judge in management of his civil docket which included hearings, researching and briefing issues and drafting opinions. He then served as trial counsel, chief of administrative law, and officer-in-charge of Bamberg Branch Office for the 1st Armored Division in the Federal Republic of Germany. In these three positions, he progressed from serving as prosecutor in criminal trials to providing legal support on issues associated with command to serving as city counsel to a major military community.

Colonel Cornelison went to serve as assistant to the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of the Army, Headquarters, Department of the Army, Washington, DC from June 1982 to December 1983. He developed improvements to debarment and suspension procedures and increasing emphasis on