

assignments and understanding the program and how it all works, Howard Greene was there at my side to give me the assistance I needed and helped me find my way through that, which could be so confusing to a newcomer. Subsequently, as a member of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I had the opportunity to interact with Howard during appropriations hearings that he was called upon to attend as the Sergeant at Arms. I found that he was not only concerned about Senators and taking care of the needs of Senators, he was also very concerned about the people under his jurisdiction. The Capitol Police come to mind as one area where Howard focused primarily on the personal needs of the members of the Capitol Police.

When I made a suggestion in the subcommittee about something that could be done within the law that would make life better for the Capitol Police, Howard picked up on it immediately and said, "We will do that." A little while later, I checked back and said, "Has anybody followed through on this?" I needn't have done that checking back. It was Howard Greene who said, "We will do that," and the staffers looked at me and said, "Yes, Senator, that is in the bill."

So as he moves on to another circumstance and phase in his life, I want him to know that he goes with not only the good wishes of some of the old-timers around here, but a few of us newcomers as well recognize the service he has rendered, the friendship that he has offered, and the excellence with which he has performed his job.

I wish Howard the very best in whatever he now undertakes and tell him that the Senator from Utah will always look fondly upon Howard Greene as one of his friends.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I, too, would like to join with my colleagues this afternoon in paying special respect here on the floor of the U.S. Senate to our friend Howard Greene. He has served this institution with great dignity, with great candor, and certainly with great understanding and respect for the Senate of the United States and for each and every Senator.

He has respected and served and answered to not only the Senators on that side of the aisle, but he has been most respectful and most helpful also to the Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle.

Howard Greene is the type of individual who makes the U.S. Senate not only unique, but I think that because of his service to the Senate and his years involved with the Senate, the U.S. Senate is better today because of his years of very, very distinguished service. He is a part of the heart and the nerve and the sinew that makes the U.S. Senate what it is today, Mr. President.

I take great pride in being able to add this humble voice as a vote of con-

fidence for this fine man and as one who has worked with him and alongside him for a number of years. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to add my words of support and best wishes to this fine servant of the people of our country and the U.S. Senate, Howard Greene.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, each day the Senate is in session, at least one Member rises to pay tribute to a friend, a constituent, or a colleague who has distinguished himself, or has decided to leave Government service. Today, Most members of this body are taking to the floor to say "goodbye" to a gentleman who has not only been a fixture of the U.S. Senate for many years, but has grown to be a friend to most of us, Sergeant at Arms Howard Greene.

Howard is one of those unique individuals who has spent most of his adult life here on Capitol Hill. Beginning his career just outside this chamber as a doorkeeper, Howard worked hard and moved up the ladder of administrative jobs in the Senate, taking over the position of Secretary to the Majority at the beginning of the 104th Congress, later assuming the duties of the Sergeant at Arms. In every job he held, Howard distinguished himself as an individual of ability, dedication, and character, and he earned the respect of Members from both sides of the aisle for his thoroughness and commitment.

As the Republican Party had not held control of the Senate since the 1980's Howard had a challenging task before him at the beginning of the 104th Congress. No doubt, his encyclopedic knowledge of the history, traditions, and procedures of this great body aided him greatly as he administered to his tasks as Secretary to the Majority and Sergeant at Arms. I am certain that all would agree that the transfer of power from the Democrats to Republicans was smooth, and that the functions over which Howard had responsibility functioned efficiently and effectively during his tenure.

Mr. President, as you know, Howard Greene is about to end his service to the U.S. Senate. He can be proud of the work he has done as a part of this institution during his many years on the Hill, and I know that each of us wishes him good health, great success, and much happiness in the years to come.

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as in morning business.

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

DOLE ECONOMIC PLAN: VODOO II

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, last week, I delivered the first of a number of speeches on the fiscal follies of the Dole economic plan. I gave a brief history of voodoo economics in the

Reagan-Bush years, its failure, and the economic carnage it left in its wake. I hope that I was able to shed a little light on an issue of great concern to all Americans.

Today, I ask the American people to look at the Dole economic plan—advanced voodoo economics, if you will. And if it wasn't for all of the harm it would cause, the Dole plan would be pretty amusing to this Senator who has worked on the budget for a long, long time.

I must say that Bob Dole's supply-side plan reminds me of a 17th century scientist by the name of van Helmont who actually had a formula for making mice out of old underwear. At its heart, that's the Dole plan: taking bits and pieces of discarded economics and turning them into something unrealistic.

Last week, I had the privilege to join with Democratic colleagues at an important forum on the Dole economic plan. Benjamin Friedman, professor of political economy at Harvard University, warned, "The Dole-Kemp proposal is a reprise of a gamble that failed."

Former Budget Director Charles Schultze concluded,

A reasonable and prudent person would have to question severely the wisdom of repeating what the country did 15 years ago—enacting a large tax cut before budget balance is well in hand.

The Dole plan is mired in the same specious supply-side arguments and optimistic assumptions that made up the economic quicksand of 15 years ago. The original trickle-down economics delivered mediocre economic performance and a mountain of debt. Is there any reason to believe it will be different this time around? The answer is a resounding, "No."

Like the original voodoo, the Dole voodoo II relies on bogus assumptions to hide its disastrous deficit consequences. It's a Whitman's Sampler of candy-coated scenarios. The Dole plan includes a \$254 billion fiscal dividend for cutting the deficit; a \$147 billion growth dividend for expanding tax breaks; and an \$80 billion revenue dividend from projecting out a short-term blip in revenues. It hides the cost of back-loaded tax breaks and massive, unspecified spending cuts that no one believes will happen. As Mr. Dole ups the ante on his economic plan, he raises questions about its credibility.

In spite of the truth nipping at his heels, candidate Dole assumes that he if he says nonsense enough times it will be believable. He's wrong. The latest New York Times: CBS poll shows that 64 percent of the electorate does not believe that Mr. Dole will be able to deliver the promised tax cuts.

True to form, the Dole plan postulates that tax cuts largely pay for themselves through economic dividends. The Dole dividends are doubly implausible because most of the tax cut consists of items that have nothing to do with the economy's longrun capacity to grow. Most will do little or

nothing to stimulate savings, investment, or work effort.

The Dole tax cuts' effects on the economy are likely to be worse than the lackluster performance posted during the Reagan-Bush years. The first supply-side gamble was taken at the trough of the 1981-82 Reagan recession, the deepest since World War II. Not surprisingly, the 1981 across-the-board tax cut did boost the economy by stimulating spending, and not savings—boosting demand in the economy, not supply. As a consequence, much of the employment growth during the Reagan years resulted merely from people getting back jobs they lost during the recession.

Unlike the early 1980's, when the unemployment rate reached 10.8 percent, strong job growth over the last few years has brought our current jobless rate down to 5.1 percent. A shot of demand stimulus now would risk overheating the economy, push up inflation and interest rates, and do little to improve the already tight labor market.

Any benefit from a trickle-down tax cut now would have to come from improvements in the economy's long-run capacity to grow. The prior experience with Reaganomics is not reassuring, since growth slowed to its previous longrun pace once the economy's slack had been taken up.

The Dole plan also assumes that an unexpected jump in revenues this year will persist forever, even though CBO in its latest Economic and Budget Update argues that this blip may well be temporary.

In fact, it could be worse. I am deeply concerned about the effects of the Dole tax cuts beyond the year 2002. There is no cutoff point; they keep growing and growing. The farther out the tax cuts are projected, the less coherence the Dole plan has, and the wider the deficit projections become.

Like his supply-side predecessors, who stretched credibility like taffy, candidate Dole promises to balance the budget despite tax cuts totaling \$550 billion. This would require spending cuts far more extreme than those that the Republicans failed to pass over the past 2 years. And remember too, the number of programs that Dole has put off-limits: Social Security, Medicare, defense, veterans, interest on the debt, the New Mexico labs, military retirees, and the list keeps growing every day. Even George Bush's Budget Director, Richard Darman, said that the Dole plan was not realistic politically.

In most cases, the Dole plan leaves these huge spending reductions unspecified. In those instances where they are specific, however, the Dole campaign's own figures imply that some programs, like the Energy Department, should be cut by more than 100 percent. At least we can all agree that that will be a difficult task indeed.

As I have said, the Dole plan will merely build the current mountain of debt to new heights. And history does not provide much comfort to those of

us concerned about this horrible monument of fiscal irresponsibility. If past is prolog, we are in for more debt. Some have incorrectly claimed that President Reagan would have balanced the budget in 4 years as promised, save for the fact those Democrats were in control of the legislative branch. For three-fourths of the time that President Reagan was in office, he enjoyed the support of a Republican majority in the Senate. The record clearly shows that President Reagan failed to use the ultimate and readily available authority he had—the veto to cut spending. He clearly had more than sufficient votes to sustain a veto. Furthermore, neither Presidents Reagan nor Bush submitted a balanced budget certified by the Congressional Budget Office.

So what's the bottom line on the Dole economic plan? In the September 2, 1996, New Republic, Matthew Miller writes "It's a fraud, covered up through deception and double counting." That's pretty harsh but I have to agree. Bob Dole shouldn't gamble away the future of our Nation with a farfetched, losing proposition that in the end will only end up with more spending.

I simply say that the authority that the President has to cut spending should be used and the veto pen should always be their. It seems to me, Mr. President, that we should realize and recognize that we have had four straight reductions in the annual deficit of the United States.

It seems to me that we should not go hellbent for election with an economic plan that this Senator believes is doomed to failure.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. NICKLES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH). The Senator from Oklahoma.

SENATOR DOLE'S ECONOMIC PACKAGE

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I wish to make a couple comments in response to my colleague from Nebraska. He made a very strong statement against Senator Dole's economic package. Let me make a couple of statements in rebuttal to that.

The Senator quoted a poll which said that 64 percent of the American people do not believe there is really going to be a tax cut. A lot of people are very skeptical of politicians, in particular when they make statements as it pertains to taxes and you look back in history a little bit. George Bush said, "Read my lips. There will be no new taxes." And he passed a tax increase, and I believe it cost him his reelection.

Bill Clinton, when he was campaigning in 1992, campaigned on a tax cut, told people throughout the country there would be a tax cut, talked about a \$500 tax credit per child, or at least a tax credit for families, but it did not happen. As a matter of fact, in 1993, there was not only not a tax cut but the largest tax increase in history.

So a lot of people are very cynical when politicians talk about taxes,

maybe because for the last few years they have not seen people follow through with what they stated they were going to do. That quite possibly is understandable.

Candidate Bill Clinton in his book said there would not be an increase in the gasoline tax, but he actually did. He passed a gasoline tax increase, as we all know. He did not tell people there was going to be an increase on Social Security recipients, but there was.

So my point is, yes, there may be some people who are cynical, but that does not mean that just because Bill Clinton did not do what he said he was going to do Bob Dole will not. I have had the pleasure of serving with Bob Dole, and he is a man of his word, and he is very sincere. He is very sincere about cutting taxes and reducing the growth of spending. I will just mention that he doesn't even cut spending. He slows the growth of spending under his proposal. The facts are we are spending \$1.55 trillion right now, and under Senator Dole's proposal we are going to end up spending about \$1.8 trillion in the year 2001. But he does commit to balancing the budget. That is doable. We have done it. President Clinton, unfortunately, vetoed it.

Can you cut taxes and reduce the growth of spending and still end up with a balanced budget in a few years? Yes; you can. We have proved that you can.

I want to allude to one other thing that was mentioned. It is said, well, Senator Dole's tax cut is paid for by voodoo economics, or it is going to provide tax cuts to pay for itself. That is not the case. He took a very conservative assumption that the tax cuts proposed in his proposal would stimulate growth and that would pay for about 27 percent—not even half, 27 percent.

So I just make mention of the fact that some people assume this really does stimulate the economy and therefore pay for itself. Some people make that assumption. Senator Dole did not. He said it will stimulate the economy; the economy will grow a lot faster. It has grown a lot faster. The growth of the economy for the last 3 years has really been pretty anemic—about 2.2 percent compared to the last 10 or 12 years when it has been about 3.3 percent, about 50 percent higher. We can do better. We should do better. I hope we will do better.

I also heard a statement, well, very little is in Senator Dole's package that would stimulate the economy. I disagree. Allowing people to keep more of their own money, when you are talking about the child credit—Senator Dole's package has provision for a \$500 tax credit per child. That is very family friendly. That says families, if you have four kids and you are making \$60,000, maybe two people working, you are going to have \$2,000 more of your own money to spend at the local restaurants or at schools or for your family. That is going to help those businesses. Those businesses are going to