

in against this budget. In his letter to the Republican leaders, President Clinton said:

I hope we can work together and avoid the situation in which I have no choice but to use my veto authority.

Director Rivlin echoed the President's sentiments on the misguided priorities in the Republican budget. She states:

If reconciliation and appropriations legislation implementing these policies were presented to the President, I would strongly recommend that he use his veto authority.

These are strong words but I believe they are right on target.

So I say one more time, that if my Republican colleagues want a balanced budget that is fair and reasonable, they will find in this Senator a fair and reasonable man who is willing to listen and willing to help. I say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, "The choice is yours."

I will be there to help when and if I can.

I reserve the remainder of my time and I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield 2 minutes to Senator BOND, the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, many very significant things have happened in this body during the 8½ years I have been here. Some have changed people's lives in America for the better and some have laid the groundwork for a better America in the future.

Notwithstanding, I believe that this budget resolution is the most important thing we have done for America since I have been a Member of the Senate, and probably the most important since the Vietnam war.

Why? Because we have committed ourselves to completing something the American people have wanted us to do for decades, but the Congress lacked the courage to go forward with it—that is making the very tough decisions to get our annual budget in balance and begin to lift the enormous burden of debt we have left for the next generation of Americans to carry.

Mr. President, this had to happen and we have to see it through.

Now we have the blueprint, but the tough part is just beginning. In the next 2 months, the authorizing committees and appropriations committees must do the heavy lifting of specifying in detail and in law, how we are going to squeeze down Federal spending to meet this ambitious plan. Make no mistake, this will not be easy. We are going to hear from every imaginable interest group and everyone of our friends. All will share the goal of balancing the budget, but all will also want us to protect their individual interest.

Here is where the American people want us to show some courage. For the good of the whole, we must resist the pressures that will come from those only interested in the few. These will be tough and important decisions, but I believe we will see them through.

When I became Governor of Missouri in 1981, I was faced with a similar situation. The State's budget was seriously out of balance. Most believed that the tough things we had to do would so anger the powerful special interests that I could not survive taking them on. Well, from that experience I learned something. People are willing to stick with you, even though a vocal minority make it their mission to bring you down, if you make the cuts fairly, and everyone contributes to solving the problem.

I believe this budget resolution meets that test.

This budget resolution allows Federal spending to grow, just at a slower rate. It does not rely on smoke and mirror accounting to achieve balance in 2002. And, it courageously confronts the entitlements, which we all know must be confronted if we are going to get the job done.

Also, I am pleased that the tax relief for families and economic growth are conditioned upon actually realizing the revenue dividend that will come from balancing the budget. This is a responsible way to make sure deficit reduction is a condition precedent to tax cuts and I'm glad the Senate's position prevailed on this issue in conference.

I hope that as the authorizing and appropriations committees begin their work, that we all will think of our children and the children of future generations. When the special interest cries begin, let's not forget what has already been done to future generations and ask ourselves, "Can we put this off any longer?" I believe the answer is no. Let's commit ourselves to seeing through this national priority and allow the good of the whole to override the good of the few. The American people will reward us for our commitment.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on House Concurrent Resolution 67 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 67) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by a majority of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of June 26, 1995.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, that means that this is before us officially and formally at this point; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. I think the Chair.

Mr. President, as now printed, the Statement of Managers in the conference report on the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996 (H. Rept. 104-159) contains several technical and typographical errors. Under the rules of the Senate, the conference report is not amendable so I submit the following list for the information of Senators and other interested parties only.

On page 40, in the table showing the aggregate and functional levels in the House resolution, the outlays in fiscal year 2000 for Function 350: Agriculture should be 9.0.

On page 48, the "Conference Agreement—Discretionary Totals" tables should end after the outlay line for "Nondefense". Following that line, the header "CONFERENCE AGREEMENT—Mandatory Totals" should be inserted.

On Page 49, at the top of page, the header should be "CONFERENCE AGREEMENT—MANDATORY TOTALS."

On Page 51, in the second sentence of the first paragraph, the word "separated" should read "separate".

On Page 56, in the table "Allocation of Spending Responsibility to House Committees", the Discretionary action outlay subtotal for the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee should be "-63".

On Page 94, at the end of the second sentence in the third full paragraph, "in the Senate" should be inserted.

On Page 94, in the third sentence of the third full paragraph, "Senate Budget Committee is" should be substituted for "Budget Committees are".

On Page 94, in the first and second sentences of the fifth full paragraph, the phrase "tax writing committees are" should be "Senate Finance Committee is".

On Page 95, in the first and second full paragraph, references to "205(e)" should be to "205(c)".

On Page 95, in the second full paragraph, references to "204(a)" should be to "205(a)".

On Page 98, in the last sentence of the explanation on the IRS Allowance the phrase "to this Congress" should read "in this Congress".

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for the mammoth task he is about to complete—to pass a resolution putting the United States on track to balance the Federal budget by 2002. The Foreign Relations Committee is committed to do its part to put the international affairs budget function on a trajectory for meeting the targets specified in the budget blueprint that

lies before us. That said, I respectfully request to ask my friend from New Mexico to engage in a colloquy to clarify for the RECORD the terms of the conference report on the budget resolution relating to the international affairs budget function.

Mr. DOMENICI. I will be delighted to enter into a colloquy with my good friend on this point.

Mr. HELMS. The House resolution contains an agreement to restructure the various foreign affairs activities by consolidating AID, USIA, and ACDA into the Department of State. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. HELMS. It is my further understanding that the Senate budget resolution also assumed major restructuring of the U.S. foreign affairs apparatus, including support for the consolidation of ACDA, USIA, and AID into the Department of State and any cost savings which it generates. Is that correct?

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes.

Mr. HELMS. So, in other words, the House and Senate budget conference report accommodates the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reorganization proposal to abolish the Agency for International Development, the United States Information Agency and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and fold their essential functions and personnel into the Department of State, and when the Senate decides to abolish these agencies the budget resolution will support it. Is that correct?

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes.

Mr. HELMS. I thank my distinguished friend from New Mexico for his support and look forward to celebrating his remarkable victory later today.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to Senator SIMPSON, from the great State of Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I have been here 16-plus years. There are a lot of people who do a lot of work in this place, but the senior Senator from New Mexico is, in my estimation, much like a true patriot. He practically has given his life to the budget and he has learned it, and I think we must respect him.

My good colleague from Nebraska, who came here when I did, has dedicated a lot of his energy and time. But, ladies and gentlemen, this is it. Either we start now or we leave nothing—nothing—for people between 18 and 45, because when they are 63, the cupboard will be picked clean: Medicare broke in 7 years, disability insurance broke in 2016, Social Security itself broke in the year 2031. Who is telling us that? Appointees of the President of the United States.

So this is it. No more fun and games. No smoke and mirrors. Step up to the plate.

Buy—the things are on me.

I have heard many criticisms of this budget from the other side of the aisle,

but even the harshest critics of the budget admit that its numbers are honest, indeed conservative, and there is no “smoke and mirrors” employed here to create an illusion of balancing the budget. To put it very simply, if we and future Congresses adhere to the requirements of this budget, we will get the job done.

I will only take a short time to review where we are with respect to the economic future of this country. We currently have a national debt approaching \$5 trillion. Early in the next century, the baby boom generation will begin to retire, and this will place untold strains on our working population. By the year 2013, under current law, the Social Security System will begin to experience a deficit, and we will have to cut benefits or raise payroll taxes to meet that challenge. Also under current law, by the year 2002, Medicare will be broke—flat broke.

I have heard it said—even the President has said it—that 7 years’ time is “too short” a time in which to force the budget into balance. I cannot understand this. Where in the world will we find the money to provide for the baby boomers’ retirement and health costs if we continue to use up the Federal budget with ever-increasing interest payments? If we do not balance the budget shortly after the turn of the century, we will never do it.

I have reviewed this budget conference report unusually carefully, even skeptically, because of the great importance that I attach to meeting this dire situation now, and meeting it properly. I have been greatly concerned about doing anything in the way of tax cuts that could undermine the objective of reaching a balanced budget.

My colleagues well know that I joined with 11 other Republicans in signing a letter urging Senator DOMENICI and the conferees to uphold the Senate’s CBO-certification provision. This would verify that we are on course to balancing the budget before permitting any tax decreases. I am greatly pleased that the certification mechanism is a component of this conference agreement.

It is, however, in slightly different form than it was in the original Senate version, so I believe it is necessary to review the substance of what we are talking about, in order to more fully explain my support for this agreement.

We have been told by various economists, and by the Congressional Budget Office, that certain benefits will accrue from balancing the budget. Economic activity will increase, investment in our economy will increase, growth will increase, and interest rates will drop due to a lessening of the pressures of debt. All of this will tend to bring in more revenue to the Federal Government.

It is reasonable to ask what we would do with that revenue if it did materialize. It seemed only proper that the revenue should be returned to fortify and strengthen the private economy

from which it came, to be given back to the hard-working American families who created it, rather than to give it to Government to spend.

This was the origin of the provision in the Senate budget resolution. Estimates were that a dividend of \$170 billion would be created if we did our work properly and balanced the budget. So we would—in the original Senate provision—therefore have permitted \$170 billion in tax decreases to be enacted if we were indeed on course to balance.

Now, let me sound a note of caution here, that note of skepticism—that ornerly Wyoming strain. It’s in each of us who is from the land of high altitude and low multitude.

It has not escaped my attention that even the CBO certification of an economic dividend would be something of a speculation. We would be projecting the economic benefit, and allowing ourselves to commit to returning it before it had all completely materialized. Future Congresses could “chicken out,” could fail to follow through with the spending cuts. CBO certification would not bind future Congresses. We would still have the chance to hand out the tax goodies, to fail to finish all of the spending cuts in the out-years, and make the debt problem worse.

But this is where my position on the Finance Committee comes in. I remind my colleagues that the work of making the promise of this budget resolution a reality will be done in the reconciliation process, and I am going to work doggedly to ensure that when the Finance Committee makes changes in our entitlement programs to meet the terms of this conference report, that we lock in all of that reduced growth carefully. Because if we do that, we will do a great deal to slow future Government spending—even if future Congresses fail to hold to our restraints on appropriations.

Although the conference did retain the Senate provision requiring a CBO certification before proceeding with revenue decreases, I was initially concerned upon reading that the total amount of the tax cuts in the conference report would be \$245 billion, somewhat higher than the \$170 billion figure which we understood to be the size of the dividend projected by CBO.

However, I am satisfied that this budget conference report will indeed bring us to a balanced budget if we adhere to its terms, and I intend to help Finance Committee chairman, BOB PACKWOOD, to do just that in the entitlements and tax area.

One key is that not more than \$50 billion of the tax cuts can be concentrated in the year 2002. If we enact more than that, then the budget will not be balanced in 2002, the target year. The tax cuts must be spread out over the 7 years properly in order to meet this objective, and I have every confidence that we in the finance committee can accomplish this.

As we pass this conference report, I would remind my colleagues again that

the real tough work of balancing the budget still awaits us in the future. We in the Finance Committee will still have to enact the restraints on entitlement programs, and this and future Congresses must adhere to the plan for reducing annual appropriations. Only if we do this can we have the balanced budget and the tax relief at the same time.

While no budget conference report can guarantee that this work will be done properly, I believe that the conference report gives us our best chance to do the job. The numbers are tough, realistic, conservative. If tax relief stimulates additional economic growth, speeds it to the rates assumed by President Clinton in his own budget proposal, then we will perhaps advance even faster toward the target of a balanced budget. That its a real possibility, given the tough assumptions used by CBO and our budget negotiators.

In all cases, it is clear that this budget is far preferable to the status quo, and this is why I will vote for it. The status quo would permit absolutely intolerable increases in spending, particularly entitlement spending. We cannot afford growth rates of 10 percent per year in these programs. But that is what we will continue if we defeat this agreement.

I therefore urge the adoption of this conference report and I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I understand we have very little time on our side.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOMENICI. I wonder if the Senator from Nebraska would yield me 5 minutes, if he has 5 minutes?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has 17 minutes 50 seconds.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, we had one cancellation. Therefore, I have some extra time that I do not have obligated. I am very pleased to accommodate my friend by yielding him 5 minutes from our time.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. President, first I want to thank Senator EXON. In spite of the remarks he made today about the budget of the Republicans that is before us today, and that is before the people of this country today, I believe he is a man of great respect. I happen to disagree with almost everything he said about this budget. But in 7 minutes I cannot go through point by point. I would just say it is an enormous exaggeration to say that this is aimed at harming rural America. Anyway we look at it, the only part that could even be considered is the health care reform package that we have here. Let me say to rural America, what we have done is save Medicare from bankruptcy, from going broke. And on Medicaid, what we have

done is said let us deliver that program more efficiently by letting the Governors and legislators have more to say about how we do that.

I can hardly believe that is going to harm rural America. We might even get fooled, and find that by saving Medicare we make it more efficient and better for seniors and by saving Medicaid, which we could hardly afford to pay for the next 7 years, by saving it and making it more responsive at the local level, we might even do better by rural America.

Having said that, Mr. President, most Americans start this weekend celebrating a great, great American holiday. That holiday is Independence Day, the Fourth of July. And it is more than symbolic that just before Independence Day, when we treat ourselves to the joy of freedom, of opportunity, that these Forefathers brought to us, it is more than a coincidence that a budget resolution before the Senate is going to free America up. It is going to say to the American people that future generations are free to earn more money and make a better living. It is going to free up the interest rates where they will come down instead of going up. It will make America's dollar stronger here and in the world markets, all of which means a better life for more and more Americans. And it means we are not going to force the young people of our country to pay our bills, whether they are bills for seniors, bills for education, bills for veterans.

We have asked everybody to look at this somberly and decide with us that we can do it better and do it for less. And for those who claim, as Senator ROCKEFELLER did here on the floor in those exaggerated words which some master of public relations wrote up for him, but when he comes down and talks about all it is doing, fellow Americans, we are saying the budget cannot grow at 5 percent a year. It can only grow at 3. You tell me. An American budget that is growing at 3 and instead of 5 percent a year, starting at \$1.6 trillion that we are doing something draconian. What those who are opposing it piece by piece are saying is they do not want to do anything. They would like to leave the deficit hang around our necks and hang around our young people's necks until it throttles them. They will work for the Government instead of their families. Is not that an interesting Fourth of July, to say bondage for our children instead of freedom because we do not have the guts to cut Federal spending?

And for those who come to the floor and claim we are going to hurt our senior citizens, we are going to make this program of health care solvent instead of sitting by and watching it get to a point where you cannot even pay the bills in 7 years. And we will do it in an orderly manner, and they will get as good or better health care when we are finished reforming it than they are today. There will be less Government. But who today wants more Government?

Are those on the other side who are chastising this budget with such strange words as "felonies" and "misdemeanors," what would they do? They talk about being for a budget. The only budget I know that was offered on the other side had the highest tax increase in the history of the Nation in it. Is that how we want to balance the budget? Sure. They call it "loophole closures." Loophole closures? The five largest loopholes belong to every American who has a house and it has been mortgaged. That is the largest of all loopholes. Then in order after that, for deducting health care expenses, that is the second largest. Is that a loophole that we ought to just close, or will not that be increasing taxes? How about charitable deductions? It is the fourth largest. It is a loophole. We can go on from there. One man's loophole is another man's or another woman's increase in taxes. So there is no plan.

And I want to close today, as I have done one other time or two other times, by quoting none other than a liberal professor from Harvard University, Laurence Tribe. Let me close my remarks by building on a statement that he made when we were speaking of the balanced budget. Listen carefully. He said:

Given the centrality in our revolutionary origins of the precept that there should be no taxation without representation, it seems especially fitting in principle that we seek somehow to tie our hands so that we cannot spend our children's legacy.

That is a pretty good statement of why we should balance the budget, or, conversely, what we have been doing. We have been spending our children's legacy, future, and opportunity.

So I say just before the Fourth of July, 220 years ago, the brave forefathers of this country crept onto a ship in Boston Harbor where, in order to protest a cruel system of taxation, they cut up boxes of British tea and dumped it into the water. That too was described as a revolutionary act, but it was one which helped to bring a better future for many people in America and for this young land.

So, Mr. President, it has been my privilege to lead the Republicans in a spirit of that Boston Tea Party. We are saying free our young people from this debt. We are saying that we want to declare war on deficits, and we want to give deficits the death penalty for, indeed, they are debt for our children, ultimately death for our growth and prosperity. And I am proud of this budget. When we get it implemented, almost every American will be also.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for the majority has expired. The Senator from Nebraska controls the remaining 13 minutes.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, I listened with great care to my good friend. We use that term around here, and people listening

might say: How can they be good friends when they carry on as they did? But we are good friends. We just happen to differ very strongly on this matter.

My good friend from New Mexico, the chairman of the Budget Committee, whom I have worked with for 17 years, complained about some of rhetoric and some of the phraseology that was used by those on this side of the aisle, attacking it. I listened very carefully to my good friend who used time that I yielded to him—

Mr. DOMENICI. For which I am most grateful.

Mr. EXON. To make some statements that I must at least indicate that I do not agree with. I thought that I had maybe concluded my statement. But I must make note of some statements that were made by the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee.

To say that this budget saves Medicare is doubly misleading.

So in the first instance, even by their own terms and by their own figures, the Republican budget will only postpone and not save the insolvency of the Medicare trust fund that we have heard so much about. They would only extend it for 3 years. That is hardly saving it. And I hope that everyone will understand that those are the facts and they are indisputable.

Secondly, and equally as important, they seek to save this program by dramatically slashing benefits. If that is a savings, and if that is saving this program, I would hate to see what they would do if they really wanted to attack the program.

The bottom line is that the average Medicare beneficiary will have to pay \$3,345 more over the next 7 years than he or she would have spent without the Republican budget. That is a fact.

I hear time and time again how this is going to save the Nation, how we are making sacrifices, how we have to help the younger generation. The younger generation, I assure you, Mr. President, is not going to be helped by the \$245 billion tax giveaway, most of which goes to the most wealthy Americans, those making over \$200,000. That is not a benefit to the younger generation.

I simply say that were it not for the \$245 billion tax cut mainly going to the wealthiest Americans, I am not sure that the chairman of the Budget Committee and myself, the ranking member, would be that far apart. I cannot swallow it, and I will not swallow it. I think it is wrong. You cannot save and protect the younger people and protect the older people and have a budget that works if you are going to have that large of a giveaway to the most affluent in our society.

I reserve the remainder of our time which will be assigned to the minority leader, Senator DASCHLE, when he comes to the floor. In the meantime, I would suggest the absence of a quorum with the time charged to our side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Will the Senator withhold his request?

Mr. EXON. I withhold the request in view of the fact the majority leader is in the Chamber.

How much time is remaining on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska controls 8 minutes and 44 seconds.

Mr. EXON. Eight minutes and 44 seconds is being reserved for the minority leader.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

If no one yields time, the remaining time will be deducted from the minority side.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I understand most of the time has expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. DASCHLE. Given that, I will use the 5 minutes and whatever additional time I may need by calling upon my leader time for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, the real disappointment in this budget is that it did not result in a debate between Democrats and Republicans in the conference itself but between the right and the far right, and the far right won. Rather than consensus, it represents confrontation. Rather than accomplishment, it represents missed opportunity. Rather than success, it represents avoidable failure.

For many of us, for the country, for the future, this budget represents disappointment. Why? Because it is more extreme in every way than what was originally voted on when we passed this resolution in the Senate—more extreme, more unfair, more unacceptable in every one of the criteria we laid out during the debate on this budget several weeks ago.

Our Republican colleagues say that they are worried about our children, but what do they do? They gut the very investments that this Nation has made in its children.

They say they want to fix Medicare, but what do they do? They gut the program and want us to believe that things will somehow get better.

They say they want to get people off welfare, but what do they do? They gut the very thing which keeps people out of welfare and taxes them right back onto the welfare rolls. Why? Not in the name of a balanced budget; not in the name of deficit reduction.

The reason they have made these choices is now there for all Americans to see. They want to find a way to pay for a quarter of a trillion dollar tax break, a tax break which in large measure goes to the richest people in America.

The problem is that it does so to an even greater degree than the original budget resolution.

My colleagues have already stated the facts. Medicare is cut \$270 billion, \$14 billion more than the Senate bill, the largest cut by far in the history of the program.

Medicaid is cut by \$182 billion, \$6 billion more than the Senate bill. Over 40 percent of the real cuts in this budget come from two programs: Medicare and Medicaid. This extreme budget more than doubled the cuts in student loans. Instead of a \$4 billion reduction in the availability of student loans as called for in the original budget resolution, the figure is now \$10 billion. It still asks American families to cough up \$21 billion in new taxes. And while the Senate version at least—at least—had a sense-of-the-Senate provision urging that 90 percent of tax cuts go to families with incomes of less than \$100,000, that disappeared completely in the extreme budget conference report we have before us now.

Mr. President, we have had the opportunity to analyze just exactly what this budget conference report will do. We have asked a number of budgetary authorities to examine the figures, and this is the report that we have now been given:

The average middle-class family will see \$900 in loss to their pocketbooks over the course of this budget resolution. Those making under \$75,000 will lose \$900. And what about the wealthiest 1 percent of others in this country? They will see an increase of \$20,000 as a result of this budget resolution.

Mr. President, I think it is very important to look at how this breaks down in terms of the demographics in this country just to see who wins and who loses once this budget resolution goes into effect. Those who make less than \$75,000, 77 percent of the American families, as I said, will lose \$900. Those in the \$75,000 to \$100,000 category, 12 percent of the population, will lose \$600. Those who fall in the category that most Members of Congress fall in, \$100,000 to \$200,000, we will see a \$200 increase in our income over the course of this budget resolution. That 3 percent of the population whose incomes fall between \$200,000 and \$350,000 will see a \$9,000 increase in their incomes. And, finally, those with incomes over \$350,000, 1 percent of the country's population, will see \$20,000.

Mr. President, the American people are catching on. They are beginning now to understand. The more they see, the less they like. The closer they look, the more concerned they get. And that has been in evidence with virtually every poll that has come out in the last several weeks. The Time/CNN poll, which is probably the most demonstrative of this fact: Which one of the following do you think should be the top priority for Congress in the next 6 months? people were asked, and without equivocation 42 percent said protecting Medicare from the deep cuts that are proposed in this budget are by far and away the most important thing that we could do.

Which of the following budgets do you favor, the Republican plan or the President's plan, the plan proposed by President Clinton? Nineteen percent of those who responded said they would support the Republican plan; 37 percent said they would support the President's plan.

Asked whether or not the Republican proposals to reduce Government programs will generally help or hurt various people, 71 percent of the American people said wealthy Americans are going to benefit from the Republican budget as it has been proposed; 57 percent of all of those who responded to this poll said that the middle class are going to be hurt and hurt badly.

In poll after poll, Mr. President—the Gallup poll on June 5 and 6, the NBC/Wall Street Journal poll, again, in the latter part of this month—each and every one have come out as unequivocally as the American people can through the data that has been presented to them, each and every American has said without equivocation, do not do this. You are hurting those very people that you claim to be protecting. You are hurting the future of this country. You are devastating the investments in our people, and you are doing so, as we have seen with this chart, to benefit the people who do not need help at all.

Mr. President, this budget will probably pass today. And when it does, it will pass with great disappointment. We can do better than this. Democrats have proposed specific alternatives to do just that. The American people expect more of us than what we have before us right now. Extreme budgets like this do not merit our support. And many of us believe that we can do better. Many of us believe that when the vote is cast today, we have no recourse but to vote "no" because we know we can do better.

But this is the easy part. This is the blueprint. The tough choices come next. When those tough choices are made, it is imperative that we move from the far right to the middle, away from deep cuts in Medicare, away from gutting education, away from tax breaks we cannot afford, and toward a future we all want. It is not too late, Mr. President. It is now past time to do the right thing. I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Leaders' time was reserved; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, first I want to thank all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. We have had a good debate. We will be voting here in just a few moments, and the conference report will pass.

I am just sitting here thinking about President Clinton and what he said on June 4, 1992, about balancing the budget on the Larry King Show. President Clinton was asked if he would submit a

balanced budget soon. "I would present a 5-year plan to balance the budget." In an earlier question, he said he balanced the budget 11 times in Arkansas. Of course, that was required by law. If we had a balanced budget amendment, we might have a balanced budget out here in 2 or 3 years. We have one in 7 years. The President started off with 5.

Then he sent us a budget earlier this year and we had a vote on it, 99-0, opposing the President's budget. Not a single Democrat would vote for it. And then in June the President had a 10-year plan. I mean, if 5 years was too painful and 7 years was too painful, let us try 10 years. If it is too painful, we will try 12 years, 15 years, 20 years. Before long it does not make any sense at all.

So I want to congratulate my colleagues and my colleagues in the House for passing the conference report and what I believe will happen here in a few moments. I listened to my friend from New Mexico, Senator DOMENICI, talk about July 4th and Independence Day, to gather and celebrate our independence and our freedom. And I really believe, though maybe not every American will talk about the budget resolution on July 4th; I am not certain many will unless they are having a problem, we will talk about it—it is historic—because it is a little bit unexpected, I assume, in some cases, but it is going to bring about more freedom and more independence for all Americans. And the first freedom is going to be freedom from crushing debt.

The Senator from New Mexico closed his debate by talking about the children and the grandchildren. And I think most people are concerned about that. Let me share with you some very wise words, which I will quote:

If the nation is living within its income, its credit is good. If, in some crisis, it lives beyond its income for a year or two, it can usually borrow temporarily at reasonable rates. But if, like a spendthrift, it throws discretion to the wind, and is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending . . . if it extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay . . . if it continues to pile up deficits, then it is on the road to bankruptcy.

Now, those are not the words of this Senator. They are not the words of the Senator from New Mexico, Senator DOMENICI, or the chairman of the House Budget Committee, Congressman KASICH. They are instead the words spoken 62 years ago by President Franklin Roosevelt. So this is not something new that cropped up here in the last few years. It has been a concern for a long, long time.

He was absolutely right. So we have thrown discretion to the winds. We have had more spending, more taxes, more spending, more taxes. President Clinton gave us the biggest tax increase in the history of the world in 1993 and is proud of it.

So I suggest there is just a different philosophy on that side of the aisle: Do not touch any spending; if you have a problem, raise taxes. They believe it,

and that is probably the way it ought to be.

We have a different philosophy, and we believe it. We believe taxes have been extended to the limits of Americans' power to pay. We have the deficit about as high as we can pile it, and we are well down the road to bankruptcy, as Roosevelt predicted 62 years ago, unless we begin to change directions, and that is precisely what we are doing today. We are going to change directions, avoid bankruptcy, and set a course for a balanced budget by the year 2002. Here it is right on this chart.

President Clinton's budget has deficits as far as the eye can see in the range of \$200 billion, his budget proposed June 10. Our budget, the Republican budget: Balanced by the year 2002. We do it without cooking the books, without smoke and mirrors, without throwing seniors, children, and the less fortunate out on the street, though it has been suggested by some here today that we are heartless, we lack compassion, we do not care about anybody.

We do it by making tough decisions, by slowing the rate of growth of Federal spending. Yes, it eliminates some of the bureaucracies, and a few others will have to learn to make do with less than they receive now. But the vast majority will actually be receiving increases, just not as much as they have been accustomed to. The rate of growth is going to be slowed, as most Americans would suggest we should do.

We are going to achieve about \$894 billion through reductions in Government spending and savings. Still, Government spending will increase \$1.5 trillion this year to \$1.876 trillion in the year 2002, as the Senator from New Mexico also indicated just a few moments ago.

Let me repeat those numbers, because it is going to continue to grow: From \$1.5 trillion this year to \$1.876 trillion in the year 2002. Now, that may come as a surprise to some who may have believed what they have been hearing from some on the other side of the aisle.

If you believe what they said, you would think the Republicans are shutting down the entire Government once and for all and every Federal program, taking money from education, taking money from Medicare, taking money from Medicaid, taking money from rural America. That is not the truth. That is not accurate.

It is not what we proposed. I do not care how often they repeat it, repeat it, and repeat it, and how often the media picks it up, picks it up, picks it up, and spins it. It is not going to sell with the American people.

So freedom from crushing debt, number one; freedom from excessive taxation, number two.

On this Independence Day, the American people can also celebrate the fact they will have the freedom to save and spend more of their hard-earned money as they see fit. Whoever said the Government had a monopoly on taxpayers'

money, on what you make, whether you are a wage earner or in some other business or some other vocation?

So we have a \$245 billion tax relief package. The House wanted more. This was the figure we agreed upon. It is large enough to accommodate the family tax credit, which the Presiding Officer has been so interested in in the past several years when he was in the House and also now in the Senate.

We believe the American families are overtaxed. Maybe the Democrats do not believe that, and they certainly have every right to say that everywhere they go, "You are not taxed enough; we want to tax you some more."

We believe our tax system should encourage rather than discourage investment in job creation. We believe we ought to overhaul the tax system. So we have a tax commission headed by our former colleague, Jack Kemp, to talk about economic growth and tax reform. They will report to the Speaker and majority leader later this year. It is a 15-member commission.

So is it wrong to have \$245 billion in tax relief for overtaxed Americans? I do not believe so.

Marriage penalty relief, opportunity to increase savings and investment, capital gains rate reduction, and I do not believe the Democrats will oppose if we have some estate tax relief for small family-held businesses and farms and ranches across America where if somebody dies, the Government ends up with half the estate. We want to correct that. So it seems to me that we are on the right track.

They do not take effect unless and until the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office certifies that we are absolutely on the path to a budget that is balanced in the year 2002. That is the safety valve; that is the safety valve. They do not take effect until that has been certified, as the chairman has pointed out time after time.

So freedom from crushing debt, freedom from excessive taxation, freedom from big Government. We are going to make the Government leaner and more efficient and more cost-effective and return more power to the States and the communities and our other citizens.

I think also we ought to point out it is going to be freedom from worries of Medicare survival. I was on the 1983 Social Security Commission, a Commission appointed by Senator Howard Baker, the majority leader at that time; by Ronald Reagan, a Republican President; by Tip O'Neill, a Democratic Speaker of the House. Social Security was on the verge of bankruptcy. We had a bipartisan Commission. We rescued Social Security, and it is going to be in good shape, at least until the year 2020 and maybe beyond.

We want to do the same with Medicare, because if it goes bankrupt, you cannot pay part A or part B, you cannot pay the doctor, you cannot pay the hospital in about 5 or 6 years. We have

an obligation to America's seniors to correct it.

We have had a lot of political rhetoric on this floor, but it is less than somewhat since President Clinton's budget proposal acknowledged that we were right; we must slow the rate of growth of Medicare if we are going to protect, preserve, and improve it.

There are always those who try to scare the American seniors, always those who engage in class warfare, always those who say we are going to slash Medicare. What are they going to do? What are all those people out trying to scare America's senior citizens going to do? Nothing. What are they going to do in 4 or 5 years when we cannot pay the hospital bill or the doctor bill of some senior in Minnesota, Kansas, New Mexico, or wherever in America?

So it seems to me we are on the right track. We are trying to avoid the bankruptcy of Medicare. We are not going to allow Medicare to go bankrupt. We are not going to allow Medicare to be cut to the bone. Indeed, under this Medicare proposal in our budget, we are going to increase beneficiary spending from \$4,860 a year to \$6,732 by the year 2002—a big increase.

Finally, I think what we are doing here in a broad way is safeguarding our freedom and independence.

I hope that under this resolution—and this is just the start; the hard part comes after we pass the resolution—Americans will also know that their freedom and independence, which was purchased by the sacrifice of countless Americans who risked and lost their lives, will remain secure. That is what this debate is all about: The future of America, going into the next century in the year 2002. This budget resolution maintains our commitment to national security second to none.

So I am pleased with the work that has been done by the budget conferees and by the Republicans on the Senate Budget Committee and the House Budget Committee.

There is a saying that has been around about as long as America has. There are two ways to get to the top of an oak tree: One is to climb and the other is to find an acorn and sit on it and it will grow into a tree some day and you will be up on top.

We are going to do it the first way. We have been sitting on the acorn too long in this Congress hoping that somehow our deficits could be reduced and a balanced budget would be magically sprouted and we would be sitting on top of the world. Americans for a long time, because they have been ahead of us, hoped that we would find a different course. We chose a different course—a balanced budget—to get to the top by climbing the tree, and there is a lot of climbing left to do.

Mr. President, let me salute Senator DOMENICI for his tireless efforts in making this moment possible. He has the toughest job around here. The taxpayers of America have no better

friend than the senior Senator from New Mexico.

I also want to thank the Senate budget conferees for their dedication and hard work: Senators BROWN, GORTON, GRASSLEY, GREGG, LOTT, and NICKLES, and thanks as well to Speaker GINGRICH and House Budget Committee chairman JOHN KASICH and their conferees, because this has been a one-party effort. The other party did not want to participate. They like to raise taxes. They do not want to reduce the rate of growth of spending anywhere, and that is precisely what we did.

So I believe we have reached the right result. It is not perfect. A lot of hard work is left, but we are ready for it. I hope that everybody will vote aye on the conference report.

CLOSING THANKS

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, there are a number of people I want to briefly thank for bringing this year's budget resolution to completion.

We all know, however, that this is not the end of the budget process—it is just the first step. But a very critical and important first step.

Let me first begin by thanking my friend and leader, BOB DOLE and the Republican Conference Chairman Senator COCHRAN for allowing me to serve as chairman of the Budget Committee this year.

To my fellow Senate Budget Committee members—and particularly the ranking member, Senator EXON—thank you for the long hours we spent together earlier this year in hearings, debate, and markups.

Not too many Senators realize that the Budget Committee also marked up and reported unfunded mandates and line-item veto legislation while also working on the budget. The committee has been busy.

I want to pay particular thanks to three members of the Budget Committee—Senators BROWN, GORTON, and GREGG. Thank you for chairing three critical working groups earlier this year on discretionary, entitlement, and privatization issues.

Those groups' input was critical to the design of the resolution.

Let me also thank the three freshmen of the Budget Committee—Senators ABRAHAM, SNOWE, and FRIST. I cannot remember a time when freshmen on the Budget Committee were more active—in field hearings, participation, and just plain old input into the design of a resolution.

Finally, behind the scenes throughout has been the committee's staff—both majority and minority. They have worked tirelessly for the past 6 months to bring us to this conclusion today. But their work is not finished. They now must help to oversee that the resolution is implemented and enforced.

There are a number of staff that should receive special recognition. I will insert into the RECORD a list of the committee staff. While small, the staff has been very effective in their work product and helping us as Senators do our job better.

Let me give special recognition to Austin Smythe and Jennifer Smith, the committee's counsels, for their hard work in getting this product drafted and before the two Houses today. There is no question that without their dedication this product would never have been possible.

I want to also pay special tribute to Anne Miller, without her hard, consistent, and careful scrutiny of the numbers this product also would never have been possible.

Thanks to Cheri Reidy, Denise Ramonas, and Carol McGuire on taxes and appropriations crosswalks.

Special thanks to Peter Taylor who has been the chief economist on the committee for the last few years. Peter will be leaving to join the Joint Committee on Taxation after the recess.

Thanks to Keith Hennessey for all his work on Medicare and Medicaid, and Ricardo Rel on agriculture issues.

Thanks to Brian Riley, Mike Ruffner, Lisa Cieplak, and Jim Hern for the work on transportation, welfare, education, and housing issues.

Thanks to Roy Phillips and Greg Vuksich for their continued work on defense and foreign affairs funding issues.

Behind them all, getting the briefing books put together and copies, copies, copies—stand Christy Dunn, Andrea Gatta, Miekio Nakabayashi, Karen Bilton, and Beth Wallis.

And finally, we all need our communications people and I have one of the best in Bob Stevenson and his excellent assistant, Melissa Longoria.

Trying to keep all these people coordinated has been the job of my staff director—Bill Hoagland.

Thank you all. Now get back to work and implement it.

SENATE BUDGET COMMITTEE REPUBLICAN STAFF

Bill Hoagland, Majority Staff Director.
Carole McGuire, Assistant Staff Director.
Austin Smythe, Assistant Staff Director.
Anne Miller, Budget Review.
Cheri Riedy, Sr. Analyst for Budget Review.

Jennifer Smith, Counsel.
Jim Hearn, Sr. Analyst for Government Finance and Management.

Lisa Cieplak, Sr. Analyst for Education, Social Service & Justice.

Mike Ruffner, Analyst for Income Security and Veterans.

Keith Hennessey, Economist for Social Security and Health.

Ricardo Rel, Sr. Analyst for Agriculture and Natural Resources.

Peter Taylor, Economist.

Brian Riley, Sr. Analyst for Transportation and Science.

Roy Phillips, Sr. Analyst for Defense.

Denise Ramonas, General Counsel.

Brian Benczkowski, Asst. to General Counsel.

Greg Vuksich, Sr. Analyst for International Relations.

Bob Stevenson, Communications Director.

Melissa Longoria, Asst. to Communications Director.

Christy Dunn, Asst. to Staff Director.

Andrea Gatta, Staff Assistant.

Karen Bilton, Staff Assistant.

Beth Wallis, Staff Assistant.

Miekio Nakabayashi, Staff Assistant.

Mr. President, even though we are under a time constraint, I want to say

thank you, once again, to one person. There are many, but I have to tell you, we would not be here if it were not for the staff of the majority of the U.S. Senate. Mr. Hoagland, we thank you. Every member of this institution thanks you. Anybody that has dealt with you in this arena thanks you. You know more than anyone around, and your temperament and approach has been marvelous.

Mr. President, 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.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I echo what has been said. I echo my thanks to Bill Hoagland and the great staff on the Republican side on this matter. They worked very hard. We are also indebted to Bill Dauster, who is over here, and the members of his staff. Both staffs did a tremendous job. I think the chairman of the committee would agree.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report accompanying House Concurrent Resolution 67.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

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

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 296 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Abraham	Frist	McCain
Ashcroft	Gorton	McConnell
Bennett	Gramm	Murkowski
Bond	Grams	Nickles
Brown	Grassley	Packwood
Burns	Gregg	Pressler
Campbell	Hatch	Roth
Chafee	Hatfield	Santorum
Coats	Helms	Shelby
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

NAYS—46

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

So the conference report was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

COMMENDING C. ABBOTT SAFFOLD (ABBY) FOR HER LONG, FAITHFUL, AND EXEMPLARY SERVICE TO THE U.S. SENATE

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, it's my sad duty today to announce to my colleagues the retirement of Abby Saffold, who has served as Secretary to our caucus since her appointment to that post by then-majority leader, Senator BYRD, in 1987.

Together with the majority leader, Senator DOLE, Senator FORD, Senator LOTT, Senator BYRD, Senator THURMOND, and all other Senators, I send a resolution to the desk to express the gratitude of the Senate to Abby Saffold for her years of service to the Senate of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 143) commending C. Abbott Saffold (Abby) for her long, faithful and exemplary service to the United States Senate.

Whereas Abby Saffold has faithfully served the Congress in many capacities over the past 28 years, 25 of which were spent in service to the Senate;

Whereas Abby Saffold was the first woman in the history of the Senate to serve as Secretary for the Majority and the first to serve as Secretary for the Minority;

Whereas Abby Saffold has at all times discharged the important duties and responsibilities of her office with great efficiency and diligence;

Whereas her dedication, good humor, and exceptional service have earned her the respect and affection of Democratic and Republican Senators as well as their staffs: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate expresses its appreciation to Abby Saffold and commends her for her lengthy, faithful and outstanding service to the Senate.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to C. Abbott Saffold.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, Abby's service to the Senate covers a quarter of a century. Her service to the Congress runs from 1967. When she became Secretary to the majority in 1987, she was the first woman to hold that post in the history of the Senate.

The Democratic caucus has been extraordinarily fortunate to have Abby's services for so long. It is no exaggeration to say that Abby has prevented more than one disaster from becoming a debacle. We, who rely on her, know