

**Lower taxes:** In the 104th Congress, the Republicans passed a \$245 billion tax cut, including a \$500 child tax credit to move toward allowing families to spend their own money, to allow families to provide for their children. Unfortunately, it was vetoed by the President.

**Lower spending:** This Congress has cut spending \$9.3 billion in 1995, and \$23 billion in 1996 was eliminated from 270 programs. That is good. I think that is a real movement. The administration claims to have reduced the size of Government. Indeed they have—they claim, 200,000. The fact is that most was from the base closures, civilian employees of defense; the other was the termination of the savings and loan. Nevertheless, it reduced employees, and that is good.

**Balanced budget:** How many times before the last 2 years did you hear people talking about balancing the budget? Not very much. It has not been balanced in 40 years. Now, suddenly, everyone is for it. The discussion is not, do you balance the budget; the discussion is, how do you do that? Unfortunately, the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution was defeated here. Nevertheless, we now are on the road to a balanced budget.

**Ending welfare as we know it:** We have done that, something that has not been done for a very long time, providing the States more opportunity to do something about the entitlement aspect of welfare. Everybody wants to help people who need help. The question is, how do we help them to help themselves? That is what we have sought to do. It took three times to get it passed. Nevertheless, it is a success.

**Market-based health reform:** Portability, availability, limited medical savings account, the end to preexisting condition exclusions, combat fraud and waste in health care. A success.

Here is an interesting one, ensuring access to higher education. This Congress increased student loan volume by 50 percent, from \$24 billion to \$36 billion in 2002. Unfortunately, it was vetoed as part of the balanced budget amendment.

**Farm programs:** Many of us have been involved in farm programs for a very long time. Most everyone has said we need to move toward market orientation, toward the marketplace. Finally, we have done that over a period of 7 years. Agriculture is moving toward a market-oriented economy. It needs to be done. Finally, it is done.

We helped to end lawsuit abuse. Securities litigation was passed. Unfortunately, it was vetoed. Telecommunications was passed. A deregulation of telecommunications which give us some of the kind of new opportunities to communicate that we have never had.

**Unfunded mandates** is something that local governments have been talking about for a very long time. Unfunded mandates reforms were passed this time.

**Regulatory reform:** Unfortunately, the real broad one was killed. I think it should have been passed. A lesser one was passed.

Mr. President, we have done a lot of things this time. Line-item veto: A line-item veto in 40 years has not been done. This Congress passed a line-item veto.

**Congressional accountability:** People in this place, now, have to live under the same rules in their offices and in their conduct, the same as everybody else, in the laws they pass for others.

**Reduce congressional funding,** small business regulatory reform, gift ban.

Mr. President, I think this has been an extremely successful Congress. The choice with respect to the election is, do we want to continue in this direction, or do we want to go back to where we have been for 40 years in continuing to grow with the kind of Lyndon Johnson programs we have had? That is the choice. It is really the choice.

I think, in addition, and perhaps as important as anything, this Congress has changed the culture of Washington. For the first time, I think, in a very long time—certainly for the first time since I have been here in 6 years—the Congress really took a look at programs that exist and said, do they need to continue to exist? If so, can they be done more efficiently? Could they be done more efficiently by the States or local government? These are the kind of things that need to be examined constantly.

I have a bill that I hope gets consideration next year which would give us a biannual budget so we do not each year spend all of our time on appropriations bills. As you can see by the leader's comments this morning, we are still working on them, and we will not get them done at all this year. We do that every year. I hope, as most States do, we can go to a biannual budget. It is better for agencies. Then we can spend the last year with oversight, looking at programs, to see if indeed this is a better way to do it.

There are a great many things we can do, a great many things we have done. Mr. President, my whole point is, in this election, we make some choices. It is not always easy. It is not always easy to determine where the choices lie, of course. We see all the advertisements, and sometimes you wonder where they are. But I think we have a responsibility to ask, to seek, to point out where these things are. Where do you stand on the balanced budget amendment? Where do you stand on less Government rather than more? Where do you stand on less taxes rather than more? I think those are the basic issues that you and I need to decide. I urge we all do that.

There are other issues, of course. The issue of character, I think, is one. I think we have to ask ourselves, what do we expect of leaders in terms of character? As we look back, character has been an important factor, has been a key factor, and continues to be.

Mr. President, we have some choices. The choices, frankly, are rather clear. We can go back where we were or we can continue the kinds of things that have been done in this Congress in the last 2 years, and it does need an opportunity to continue. You can't change 40 years of history and turn things around in 2 years. Despite the difficulties, it is my view that this Congress has done exceptionally well and will go down in history as one who has sought to turn the direction of this country. I hope that we continue to do that.

I yield the floor.

Mr. INHOFE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

#### THE POSITIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF CONGRESS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, we hear so many negative things, and it is kind of enjoyable to talk about what has been accomplished sometimes. The Senator from Wyoming has been very articulate in expressing those positive things. I remember in 1987 when I was first elected to the other body. We had as our class project at that time to repeal the earnings test. I have always felt there is nothing more un-American than to tell the people in America that once you reach a certain age, you have to become nonproductive, and if you are not nonproductive, then we are going to take away some of your Social Security. Well, we tried for about 10 years to get that done, and it was not until we had a Republican Congress that we were able to have a major reform. We haven't totally repealed it, but we will phase into a position where we actually will be telling the people of America that you are not going to be punished if you decide to be productive past a certain age.

Many years ago, I was the mayor of a major city in America, Tulsa, OK, and every time I go and talk to mayors now, I say, "Tell us what the major problem facing your city has been." They don't say it's crime in the streets and welfare. They say it's unfunded mandates. I can remember so well as the mayor of the city of Tulsa when the Federal Government would come and tell us certain things that we had to do, and if we didn't do it, they are going to be taking money away from us, or if we did it, we would have to pay for it ourselves. Consequently, it would be up to us to allow Congress in Washington, with all of the lofty attitudes that they seem to portray here, to say that we have done these wonderful things for the people of America, and to say that some political subdivision underneath them—the cities, or counties, or States—had to pay for them.

We passed an unfunded mandates bill where we are not going to be faced with that anymore. I would like for it to have been retroactive, but it could not have been. So that has been resolved. It is a major reform, and it was done by this Congress. I am very, very proud of

that. I counted the reforms we have passed, and I would challenge anybody to find a 10-year period in history when there have been more reforms passed by Congress than we have passed.

Congressional accountability—the fact that we now have to live under the same laws that we impose upon other people in the rest of the country. I spent 30 years in the private sector. I understand what it is like to have to live under an overregulated society, and, yet, Members of Congress historically have been exempt from most of those impositions. Now they are going to have to live under the same laws that we pass for other people. I think that is a major accomplishment of this Republican Congress.

The line-item veto: As long as I can remember, we have talked about that—about reforming the line-item veto. A lot of my friends say, well, I would like to have the line-item veto, as long as we know we have a conservative in the White House, or the other side of the fence would say they would like to have a line-item veto as long as we have a liberal there. But I suggest to you, Mr. President, that they miss the point when they say that, because all a line-item veto does is force the President and Congress to be accountable. Republicans and Democrats in the White House, for decades, have been able to say, well, I didn't want that law, but I had to either sign that because veterans benefits are in there, or something else was in there, and consequently they go ahead and sign something that they say they are opposed to. This forces them, or him, or her, Democrat or Republican, to be accountable, so that if there is 1 thing out of 25 things in a bill that he doesn't like, he can veto it and send it back, and that makes us accountable.

So the whole idea there is accountability. We have passed that. I feel very good about it and think that is a major improvement. Back before I was in the U.S. Senate, I represented an all-urban area, primarily one county in the State of Oklahoma. So I did not have much of the agricultural areas and interests in my district. But I found, as I traveled around the State after becoming a Member of the U.S. Senate, where I had largely an agricultural State, the people who are in the farm communities in Oklahoma—and I suspect it is that way throughout the Nation—really have felt that we have had a failed agricultural policy in this country, that we have imposed upon our farmers things that they must do. Yet, they are not free to plant what they think the market will bear and what will best take care of their needs.

Well, the Freedom to Farm Act was passed, and I find, as I go around—as I did, as a matter of fact, only Monday of this week. I had, I think, seven town meetings throughout agricultural areas in Oklahoma. They all think it is very good.

Do you know what else they think, Mr. President? They want to do some-

thing about property rights. Well, that is one area where we have not been successful. I would like to say that we are able to pass all of the reforms that we wanted to pass. Unfortunately, several of them were vetoed by this President. The reform that will go down, I think, in history as the most significant reform that the public is aware of would be welfare reform. I have to remind you that President Clinton vetoed this bill twice. We passed a welfare reform bill that was based on what he campaigned on for President in 1992. He vetoed it, and then he vetoed it a second time. But just as we are getting into the final stages of the Presidential election year, he has signed it. At the same time, he has whispered to his friends on the left that if he is reelected, he will change some of the reforms that we have in the welfare bill.

There are three things I have often said that make us globally non-competitive, Mr. President. One is that we are overtaxed. The other is we are overregulated. Third is our tort laws in this country. I was proud to be a part of the success in changing our tort laws as it pertains to just one manufacturing item: airplanes and airplane parts. I have about a 39-year history and background in aviation. So I know a little bit about that. Prior to 1970, we made almost the entire world supply of airplanes in the United States—a major export item. And then, over the 10-year period of the 1970's, and up through to the present time, we quit making single-engine airplanes in America. We quit making them only for one reason, which is that you can't be globally competitive and offset the cost of all these lawsuits. So we have lawsuit after lawsuit against manufacturers of airplane parts and of airplanes where maybe it has worked perfectly well for 50 years, but all of a sudden there is an accident and they will go back and get a multimillion-dollar judgment against the manufacturer, and, consequently, our manufacturers either went broke or quit making small airplanes.

I remember the case of Piper Aircraft. They said to the bankruptcy court, "We can move our plant and all of our equipment to Canada and make the same airplanes and supply the same market and do so at a profit because of the fact that they don't have the tort laws we have in this country." So we passed a bill. Even though the President made a commitment to veto any kind of meaningful tort reform, he signed it because we had so much pressure out there. People realized this is a major manufacturing area that could benefit all of America.

In Oklahoma alone, we can identify 4,000 jobs as a result of that one tort reform. Well, it would only stand to reason that if we can put America back into making airplanes by having tort reform, insofar as the manufacture of airplanes and parts is concerned, why not spread that across the entire manufacturing base? So we did. We passed

a bill that would make America competitive again, and the President vetoed it.

So I think we have a lot of things that we wanted to do. There was the \$500-per-child tax credit, which the President vetoed. There was regulation reform, and some of the marriage penalties that we were going to correct, and the President vetoed it.

In spite of that, we have been a very productive House and Senate, and I am very proud of the major reforms that have passed. I only regret that we were unable to get them all passed because of the vetoes of the President, and perhaps that will change in the near future.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### SENATOR PAUL SIMON

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to our departing colleague, PAUL SIMON.

All of us have an image of what a U.S. Senator ought to be. It will not surprise anyone that not all who serve here measure up. PAUL SIMON is someone who clearly measures up. He is thoughtful, hard-working, and committed. He has a clear philosophy and the integrity to stand up for it. PAUL's manner is open. His approach is thoughtful and considerate. He is one who cares more about solving problems than making himself look good.

I think of him as a part of a long line of Senators from Illinois that are epitomized by Paul Douglas. Perhaps I should say that in my mind Paul Douglas is epitomized by PAUL SIMON because both of them brought great integrity and intellect to this body.

It is not unusual for PAUL SIMON and I to be on opposite sides of an issue. But, I have never found him to be unwilling to listen or unwilling to be objective. He is the kind of person who comes here to serve, who displays integrity in office, and places the integrity of his person above selfish interests.

It has been a great privilege for me to work with PAUL SIMON. He is someone I admire now and I will admire him for the rest of my life because he embodies, the best that is in us. He has brought this body a nobleness which is in short supply. As one who hopes the Republican Party will win the seat in Illinois, I will still be sad to see PAUL SIMON go. He has enriched this body. He has enriched all of