

I remember walking onto the Senate floor in 1983 right in that aisleway when we thought everything had evaporated—collapsed. I met Senator MOYNIHAN coming in the door. And we stood here and talked for 2 or 3 minutes about we could not let this happen; there were too many millions of Americans who depended on Social Security. So together we got it back on track. And the end result is we did in effect rescue Social Security.

Now someone is going to be asked to do the same with Medicare. I would call on the President to stop running the TV commercials, to stop trying to scare senior citizens, to stop trying to frighten seniors with some of the ads paid for by union dues. Millions and millions and millions of dollars have been spent on political attacks and TV attacks on Republicans who want to fix, preserve, and strengthen Medicare.

Today is the day of reckoning. Today even the administration says, "Oh, well. We ought to fix this." We are going to fix it, or it is going to be bankrupt. And I believe it will be fixed.

So the President now I understand would like to work it out. He has had a whole year to bash Republicans, a whole year to scare senior citizens, and now he understands—at least the people around him understand—the seriousness of this shell game.

So I call on the President to come forward with real initiative so we can preserve the Medicare Program and join with us. As I said, our plan is not perfect either. Maybe we can come together. This is a very serious problem. It is not going to go away. It is not going to go away. The trustees' report is very clear on that particular area. It is not going to go away. We have to fix it. We have to stand up and be counted.

We cannot have it both ways. We cannot scare seniors on the one hand and fix it on the other. It is time to tell the American people the truth. It is time to tell the American people—to give the American people the facts.

So I would be prepared—I am certain my colleagues will be prepared—to work with the administration if in fact they want to work on a bipartisan basis. This is serious business—37 million Americans who want us to make progress to do it the right way—to preserve and strengthen Medicare.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. DOLE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I referred earlier to the BOB DOLE we know and love. I earlier remarked because he and I have worked to try to balance this budget over the years. More particularly I put in the RECORD a statement, and the vote and record made of the Greenspan commission upon which the Senator served where they recommended that Social Security after a period of years be off budget. Of course, the vote the Senator and I both joined in doing just that. In 1990 we put it off budget. The law was signed by President Bush. Now we have the Senator's amendment, and

he got my vote. If we just do exactly what he intends, I think here in section 7, "total receipts shall include all receipts of the U.S. Government except those derived from borrowing." That has been interpreted as borrowing from the public. Why borrow from Social Security? In other words, we owe Social Security \$530 billion. These budgets which have been put out by both sides all use Social Security. So by the year 2002 we will owe \$1.1 trillion.

So you can pick up not only my vote. By the letter we sent—I have talked to these Members; five of us, and at least more—pass this constitutional amendment by just protecting borrowing from the public but in conformance with the law which the Senator and I support; not borrow from Social Security. In other words really eliminate the deficit rather than move the deficit from the general Government over to the Social Security fund.

Mr. DOLE. Let me indicate first that I acknowledge the Senator's efforts over the years to face up to the budget problem. He has demonstrated it with his votes. I think in this case though—I do not have the amendment before me. I know what it says. I think if we do that over a period of years, others would like to do it right now—we phase it out. I think the Senator is saying he would prefer we do it immediately. We have been doing it the way proposed here for some time. Even in the 7-year budget plan we proposed, of course, we did not use Social Security.

So our view is—my view on this balanced budget which I will discuss tomorrow—is that we need to make it very clear precisely what we are doing because we need this discipline. We need to send this to the States, and give the States a chance to ratify it. If Kansas does not want to ratify it, or South Carolina, or Arizona, or Idaho, that is their right. But if three-fourths of the States do not ratify the amendment it does not become part of the Constitution.

I think the Senator from South Carolina also shares our views on Medicare. He is one Senator who will not stand here and let Medicare go belly up. I hope that there will be enough bipartisan support that whatever the problem is can be remedied and remedied very quickly.

Mr. HOLLINGS. If the distinguished Senator will yield, we would not do it immediately. In other words it would be part of the Senator's joint resolution, or balanced budget amendment, to the Constitution, and as the Senator's comments just indicated it would go back to the States for several years to be ratified. In the meantime, it would be in there and protected but it would not control immediately. And while they are ratifying we could be working, as the Senator indicated, to bring it into line without using Social Security funds.

So I do not see the harm done if we could just include that. We can pass the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. DOLE. I would be pleased to look at anything the Senator suggests. The Senator from Idaho, I believe, has about the same approach. At least it might be the same result obtained by the Senator from South Carolina. He will be our next speaker.

#### BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The Senate continued with the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. I yield such time from the time of the Senator from Wyoming as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, as we listen to this critically important debate on the balanced budget amendment, we hear all of the different figures. The fact that \$19,000 is owed by every man, woman, and child currently in America; the fact that we spend almost \$300 billion in interest on the debt—all of these numbers. But I have a hard time understanding this. How do you put that in perspective—how big is that—in the few moments that I am going to speak? Because I am going to make the formal part of my speech a part of the RECORD. But in the few moments that I am going to speak—that is 5 minutes—we will have \$5.5 million in interest payments.

So what does that equate to? That means that instead of paying that interest we could put 100 police officers on the street. It means that during those 5 minutes that I will be speaking we could instead use that \$5.5 million to immunize more than 45,000 kids in America. It means that we could provide a year of Head Start for almost 1,500 kids in America. That is what we are consuming just in the few moments that I will be speaking.

Today, as I walked over here, I saw all the Americans that are visiting this Nation's Capitol today. I think it is tremendous to see the citizens coming and seeing this Nation's Capitol. Just outside the door are the rich portraits that we have of George Washington and the Founding Fathers. We think about our history and what this country is founded upon. George Washington said in his farewell address to the Nation that he warned Congress to "cherish public credit and to use it as sparingly as possible avoiding occasions of expense." And Thomas Jefferson, who believed so strongly in a balanced budget, said that it was so important "as to place it among the fundamental principles of government. We should consider ourselves unauthorized to saddle posterity with our debts and morally bound to pay them ourselves."

Those are the principles upon which this Nation was founded.

So how have we abided by those words? Are we paying our debts as we

go? No. The last time that we had a balanced budget in the United States of America I was 17 years old. I now am the father of a 17-year-old daughter.

It has been a generation since we have had a balanced budget. We do not have the discipline, so we need to make it part of the Constitution.

Now I want to just step back, Mr. President, and address the big picture. Again, we mention all these numbers. But I just hope all Americans realize that while we try to get a two-thirds vote in the Senate of the United States, because it has passed in the House already, the balanced budget amendment, that does not mean we have accomplished a balanced budget for the country.

That simply means Congress is saying we will now put the question to the 50 States of the Union because we are the United States of America. We are not the Federal Government of America, so we place that question before the 50 States so that the people of America can affirm whether or not they feel we should have a balanced budget amendment.

It is hard for me to understand how this body can come to the conclusion that for some reason we must not ask that question of the American public. It is inconceivable especially when you look at the track record of how we have so poorly spent those finite resources, the dollars of the citizens of America, because it is not the Government's money. It is the people's money, and they should be brought into this process.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from North Dakota has the floor. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I am going to yield time to the Senator from Arkansas, [Mr. BUMPERS] as soon as Senator BUMPERS comes to the Chamber. Following that, I intend to make some remarks about this subject.

I see Senator HOLLINGS from South Carolina is in the Chamber. I listened intently to Senator HOLLINGS and always enjoy his presentations. He knows this subject. As the former Chairman of the Budget Committee he has been involved in this subject for a long, long time. And I think if one looks at the record of Senator HOLLINGS on taxing and spending issues, no one in this Chamber could credibly argue he does not want a balanced budget. No one has been a more vigorous fighter for a balanced budget in the Senate than Senator HOLLINGS from South Carolina. The point Senator HOLLINGS has made is there is a right way to do this and a wrong way to do this.

This is a copy of the Constitution. This copy is a little small booklet, the kind that Senator BYRD, our distinguished colleague from West Virginia, carries with him. He is fond of saying

this is his contract with America, the Constitution of the United States.

This, incidentally, was written over 200 years ago by 55 men—55 white men, to be exact—who convened in a small room in a place called Constitution Hall, the assembly room of Constitution Hall in Philadelphia, PA. Those 55 men spent the summer writing a Constitution for our country. I was selected to be one of 55 people who on the 200th birthday of the writing of the Constitution went back into the same room and held a celebration, a 200th birthday celebration of the writing of this remarkable document, the Constitution of the United States. And on the 200th anniversary, 55 of us went into that room, 55 men, women, minorities—a wonderfully diverse group of Americans convened in that room.

That little room up in Philadelphia has at the front of the room the chair where George Washington sat—yes, the very chair sat in by George Washington as he convened and chaired, presided over, the constitutional convention.

If you read the accounts of the deliberations, Ben Franklin sat over on this side, Mason, Madison, Thomas Jefferson was not there; he was in Europe. But he contributed through his writings enormously to the Bill of Rights of the Constitution. But you could not help, while sitting in that room celebrating two centuries of the Constitution of the United States, you could not help getting some goose bumps about what all of this is about.

This is the longest surviving, most successful democracy in the history of humankind. This democracy survives because the Constitution gives the power to the people. It is a country that belongs to the people.

The Constitution starts:

We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, ensure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

"We the people." This is quite a remarkable document in the history of humankind.

Some in this Chamber view this as a mere rough draft. We have had over 140 proposals in this Congress alone to change the U.S. Constitution. I do not see many people walking around here who look much like Ben Franklin or Thomas Jefferson. And I worry that this Congress on a dozen different initiatives believes it can improve on the work of our Founding Fathers, who created a document that provides timeless truths about how democracy can work to serve the interests of the people.

I am going to talk about that in the context of this debate, a debate today about how to change, or whether to change, the Constitution in order to deal with this issue of deficits and fiscal policy. But before I begin that discussion, I want to call on my colleague from Arkansas, Senator BUMPERS.

Senator BUMPERS, like a lot of Senators in this Chamber on both sides of the political aisle, is someone for whom I have deep respect. No one has served this country more honorably and provided better service in the cause of democracy than my colleague from Arkansas, Senator BUMPERS. He not only is, I think, probably one of the best orators of the Senate in many decades; he is a person with a remarkable depth of knowledge about these budget issues. He sees where we have been, where we are heading, what is important, what we ought to be doing for the future of this country.

So I am just delighted to yield whatever time he may consume. Let me yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas, [Mr. BUMPERS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEMPTHORNE). The Senator from Arkansas, [Mr. BUMPERS], is recognized for up to 20 minutes.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, first, I thank my distinguished friend from North Dakota for yielding. Second, I especially thank him for his very generous laudatory comments, all of which are true, of course, and to thank him for his very valiant, noble efforts in the cause of constitutional government.

He made an observation which I have made many, many times but frankly across the Nation seems to fall on deaf ears, and that is we are the oldest democracy on Earth. Our Constitution, which should be sacred to all of us, is the oldest organic, existing law in the world, and yet many of my colleagues want to treat it as an unfinished, rough draft. Every time we have a politically popular thing crop up in this country, everyone wants to amend the Constitution. Without denigrating specific colleagues, nor really denigrating the Senate as a body, I do not know a single person in the Senate that I want to defer to instead of James Madison, defer to instead of Benjamin Franklin, defer to instead of John Adams or John Jay.

Arthur Schlesinger, one of the pre-eminent historians of this country, has said, and I think with a great deal of acumen and accuracy, in 1787 the greatest gathering of minds ever assembled under one roof met in Philadelphia to craft this document which we solemnly swear, when we are sworn into the Senate, we will support and defend—the Constitution of the United States.

Is that a sacred, solemn oath we take, or is it something we do just for political reasons, because we have to, or because of legal reasons? I have heard it said in this body that 83 percent of the people in this country when asked, "Would you favor a constitutional amendment to balance the budget?" 83 percent of the people say yes. What they do not tell you is that 83 percent of the people of this country also say they are contemptuous of politicians who have to look at a poll in order to find out what they think.

The Senator from South Carolina, from Oregon, the rest of us, have a solemn duty to be educators as well as legislators. The people of my State did not all attend law school and study constitutional law. They have not all read "The Federalist Papers."

I am chagrined, irritated, and angry because in this body we want a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. We want a constitutional amendment to limit terms of Senators, as though the people of your State do not have enough sense to know who they want to vote for; or a constitutional amendment that would ban flag burning; a constitutional amendment that would require our children to recite certain prayers in school, and on and on it goes. This is just a snipe hunt. As a matter of fact, this amendment gives snipe hunting a bad name.

What does this amendment do? SAM NUNN, our distinguished colleague from Georgia, when we considered this before, very thoughtfully added an amendment saying the courts will not have any jurisdiction over this. I am not sure we can legislatively make that decision here, but assume we can; that answers the question "Will all Federal courts have jurisdiction?" Under the Nunn amendment, they would not. But let us just assume that, as my good friend from South Carolina is wont to say very often in this Chamber, we pass a budget resolution to say this balances the budget, pat ourselves on the back, give ourselves the good Government award, head on home and tell the constituents how great we are.

But, wait, some person that is aggrieved says, "Look, that budget resolution is based on flawed assumptions about revenues and expenditures. You have it all out of kilter." Would he have a right to go to court and demand that Congress do this thing right, the way the people of this country told them to do it? I do not know the answer to that.

Will the Congress be required to raise taxes and cut spending to achieve it? Can they do it all one way or the other? I suppose they could, but I am not at all sure. Numerous questions remain unanswered. How does this amendment force Congress to reach an agreement about which specific spending cuts or which tax hikes we should adopt?

Finally, if you go to court, do you have standing? And what if the Supreme Court says this is a political question, which they often do where politicians are involved; where does that leave it? High and dry, just like we were last fall.

Mr. President, I have listened to a good portion of this debate from my office on C-SPAN. I cannot believe people come to the floor and they say, "I do not have the courage to make the tough choices, to vote for a balanced budget; therefore, please vote for this constitutional amendment so the courts or the law will make me do it."

Frankly, I do not want to get too strident or partisan about this, but if I

were sitting on the other side of the aisle, that is exactly what I would be saying.

In 1993, every Member in this body, every single Senator, had a chance to vote for a meaningful deficit reduction package. It has been said over and over, but it bears repeating, that when we adopted that package in, I think, August 1993, not one Republican could find it in his heart to vote to reduce the deficit by \$500 billion. The Vice President sat in the Presiding Officer's chair and cast the tie-breaking vote. Two-hundred and fifty billion dollars in tax increases, \$250 billion in spending cuts. You cannot find a better way to start reducing the deficit. And OMB said, if you pass this, over the next 5 years the deficit will be \$500 billion less than it would otherwise be.

Mr. President, that turned out to be grossly wrong. The figure now, according to OMB, is \$846 billion.

Bill Clinton, to his eternal credit, I do not care whether you like him or do not like him, but I can tell you one of the reasons he is going to be reelected President is because he did not sit around waiting for a constitutional amendment to do something. He submitted a package of deficit reduction proposals to this body and we adopted it without one single Republican vote.

I inform my Republican friends who are all so enthusiastic about this amendment today, that deficit reduction package we adopted constitutes a reduction not of \$500 billion, but \$846 billion. So, my Republican friends, my question is this: Why not repeal it? You did not like it then. You are trying to kill the gas tax part of it now, which has to be the silliest thing I have ever heard. But I want to ask you, why not repeal it if it was that bad?

We lost two of the finest U.S. Senators ever to sit in this body because they voted for that package, and their opponents took advantage of it and said, "He is a taxer and spender." They lost their seats for doing the most courageous thing any Senator could do. People sit in their seats today who are spineless, who did not have the courage to vote for it.

So I say to my Republican friends, repeal it and then tell us where are you going to find \$846 billion, because that is what you have to find.

When Bill Clinton ran for President he made a promise to the American people and I thought it was fair. It was a political promise, of course. Any promise a politician makes is political. But he said: You elect me President and in the first 4 years I will reduce the deficit by 50 percent. We were looking at a \$290-billion-to-\$300-billion deficit that year, 1993, which turned out to be \$264 billion, and which has been going down every year.

Because of that bill in 1993, the deficit this year is not going to be 50 percent of the projected \$292 billion. The projection was that the deficit would be \$292 billion in 1996. Current figures place the deficit at \$125 billion, not a

cut of 50 percent, a cut of almost 60 percent.

I can tell you, this fall, if I were President Clinton, I would keep a chart, about twice the size of these I am using, with me every minute of every day to show the American people why they should be dancing in the streets, because a few courageous Senators screwed up their nerve and did what they were supposed to do.

What else does this constitutional amendment require? Nothing, in the year 2002.

It gives the States 7 years to ratify it. We do not have to do anything for 7 years.

You know, I think if I were a Republican, I would probably be taking the same tact they are. I would be so embarrassed about a lack of courage, a lack of responsibility in refusing to vote for something responsible, to bring the deficit down when the chance finally emerged.

So, what is their solution? Well, I do not know what kind of a tax cut Senator DOLE will propose. I have heard figures up to \$600, \$700 billion. I do not know what it is going to be. But here is their method of balancing the budget: build a ballistic missile defense system which will cost American taxpayers \$50 billion to \$60 billion and deploy it by the year 2003.

"What kind of a system is that going to be?"

The Republicans respond, "Don't know. Don't have any technology yet, but we can start spending the \$50 billion."

The people ask, "Where's the money coming from without raising the deficit?"

The Republicans reply, "Don't know. Find it somewhere."

What else? The gas tax, repeal of that 4.3-cent gasoline tax we passed in 1993. It will accommodate the big sport utility vehicles and the vans and the big trucks. It will encourage people to drive more and further pollute the environment, as well as losing about \$2 billion.

The people want to know, "Where is that \$2 billion coming from?"

Again, the Republican response is, "Don't know."

What else? Airline ticket tax. We conveniently let that lapse on December 31 of this year, and we have already lost about \$3 billion this year on the airline ticket tax.

"Why haven't we reinstated it?"

"Don't know."

What does it do? That loss of revenue raises the deficit by \$3 billion.

What other proposals do the Republicans have for balancing the budget? Well, there is a \$7 billion cut for small business. I can tell you, I yield to no one in my commitment to small business. I used to be a small businessman, and it was a struggle. I can tell you, they hurt me every time they raised the minimum wage. It did not hurt for very long. Back in those days, you had to do \$250,000 a year in order to qualify,

and I was not doing that much business.

So what are the Republicans going to do here? They propose \$7 billion in additional tax cuts for small business. It is tough for anyone to vote against that.

What else? Well, we are going to continue selling Federal lands that belong to the taxpayers for \$2.50 or \$5 an acre, beneath which lies billions and billions of dollars worth of gold; sell it to them for \$2.50 or \$5 an acre and not require them to pay the taxpayers 1 cent of royalty. This has been going on since 1872, and you cannot stop it. I know, because I have tried desperately for 7 years.

It is shameless and unbelievable. Republicans who do not have a mine within 500 miles of their States vote to defend this practice for the benefit of the biggest mining companies in America.

What else? Continue the shameless way we let our parks concessions. I urge my colleagues to listen to this story. Matsushita Electric Co. bought Universal. Universal, among other things, owned the Curry Co., which had the right to all the concessions in Yosemite, National Park. It is a beautiful, beautiful park. Everyone here has visited it.

As you know, since the memory of man runneth not, as we lawyers like to say, the people who own the parks concessions in Yellowstone, Yosemite, and Grand Canyon took in around \$500 million to \$600 million a year in revenue, and they returned about \$18 million to the Government.

I say to my colleagues, when we go home and tell the chamber of commerce, "Please reelect me, and if you do, I will treat your money just like it is my own," that we should consider this example. I want everyone in the U.S. Senate who would let a contract that produces for the person you contracted with \$500 million to \$600 million and you received \$18 million to stand up. I want everyone in the U.S. Senate who would sell his land that had \$11 billion worth of gold under it for \$2.50 or \$5 an acre and not receive a dime of royalty to stand up. I want all those Senators to stand up. You told the Chamber of Commerce you would treat their money and the public lands as if it were your own.

Finally, Matsushita bought Universal. There was a hue and cry in this country about a Japanese company owning the concessions at Yosemite. And \$100 million a year, I say to my colleagues, is what that one produces. And so the Japanese said, "Look, we don't need all this flack. We'll just return it to you."

So the Parks Foundation said, "Well, why don't we take it and we will relet the contract."

So they took it and they relet the contract and the company they selected last year returned \$20 million to the U.S. Treasury, more than all the others combined have been returning, because we negotiated a decent con-

tract. But if you tried to do that on all the national parks, we have a half a dozen on this side and about 50 on that side who will squeal like a pig under a gate: "Oh, you can't do this, you can't do that, that's jobs in my State."

So we tried cutting taxes and balancing the budget in 1981, Mr. President. Do you know what we got out of it? We went from a \$1 trillion debt to a \$3 trillion debt in 8 years. It was hogwash in the beginning and it still is. You cannot do it. We did not do it. You cannot cut taxes massively like we did in 1981 and hope to balance the budget. So what are we paying for? If we did not have to pay interest just on the debt that was accumulated in the 8 years of Ronald Reagan's Presidency—let me repeat this. I ask for 1 additional minute.

Mr. DORGAN. I yield the Senator 1 additional minute.

Mr. BUMPERS. If we did not have to pay interest on just the increased deficit that was accumulated when Ronald Reagan was President, we would not be standing here debating today because we would have a nice healthy surplus.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Amen.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, "thems the facts," and that is what brings us here today: using a constitutional amendment as a figleaf, a political ploy to keep from making the hard decisions just as they did in 1993, just as they will in 1996.

Finally, I am not voting to tinker with what James Madison did 207 years ago that has made us the strongest, longest living democracy in the world. I am not voting for something that nobody in this body can explain how it will work. It is nothing but utter chaos.

I plead with my colleagues, don't snap on this one. I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, how much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota controls 32 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas has spoken eloquently about this issue. I will try to add some to the debate.

I began the discussion talking about the Constitution of the United States, the constitutional convention that produced the framework for our democracy.

I will discuss what this attempt is here on the floor of the Senate. Is it an attempt to balance the budget, as is being alleged, or it is an attempt to simply change the Constitution? The reason I ask the question is there are plenty of people here in the Senate who seem to want to support every single proposed constitutional amendment that is offered. We have had thousands of proposed changes to this Constitution. We have changed it very, very rarely, and we have made it difficult to change.

One reason for doing that, as the Senator from Arkansas suggests, is it is hard to see people walking in this Chamber who resemble in philosophy and in spirit Thomas Jefferson, or James Madison, or George Mason, or George Washington. So we have made it difficult to change this document.

This country has taken on too much debt. That is clear. It is not the case, as some stand up daily in the Senate and say, "Well, the American people must pay their bills every day. They don't have any debt." That is not the case. This country has \$21 trillion in debt, \$21 trillion in debt. There is just over \$5 trillion is U.S. Government debt, over \$4 trillion of consumer debt, and \$4 trillion-plus, nearly \$5 trillion of corporate debt, business debt. It totals \$21 trillion in debt: mortgages for houses, lines of credit for businesses, Government debt, bonds, Federal debt. There is too much Federal debt. That is not being debated today.

The Senator from Arkansas pointed out that in 1993 we had a vote here in this Chamber about debt and deficits. The Senator asked the question: Who is willing to stand up and cast a hard vote, a really tough vote to reduce the Federal deficit? Who is willing to cast an honest vote, a vote that says to the constituents, "I'm standing here and I'm willing to cast a vote to cut Federal spending now; I'm willing to cast a vote to increase some taxes now because that must be done in order to reduce the Federal deficit?"

It was not popular. The political and popular thing would have been to say, "Well, if this is heavy lifting, if this is about really reducing the deficit, if this is about really increasing some taxes and really cutting some spending, count me out. I don't want to be part of anything that requires some political risk. Just count me out."

But there were a lot of people in this Chamber who said, "Count me in. Let me stand up for that. This isn't about rhetoric or changing the Constitution. This is about reducing the Federal deficit."

Do you know that we passed that bill by one vote, as the Senator from Arkansas said? We did not get one vote from the other side of aisle, not even one by accident. You would think occasionally someone would make a mistake in this Chamber. We did not get one accidental vote in this Chamber. I understand that as well. We had the majority and we had the ability and the responsibility to advance the legislation.

I said it before, and I will say it again, I am pleased I voted for that. It has substantially reduced the deficit. It is not easy to do. It is not popular to do. But it is the right thing to do.

The job is far from over. We have to continue the effort.

But I find it fascinating that folks come to this Chamber day after day, hold up the Constitution, and point their fingers across the aisle and say, "We demand you support us to amend

the U.S. Constitution to require a balanced budget, and if you don't, you don't support balanced budgets." I find it fascinating that those same people come to the Chamber in the very next breath and say, "By the way, we want to balance the budget, and we also want to build a new star wars program for \$60 billion." The question is, how are you going to pay for it? They say, "We don't know. We want to balance the budget, but we want to build star wars."

The majority leader was asked recently at a press conference when they said they wanted to build star wars—the question from the press was, "Senator, how much do you think this is going to cost? And where is that money going to come from?"

The answer from the majority leader of the Senate was, "Well, I'll leave that up to the experts." Translated: "I don't know. I don't care." Defend America, build a new star wars program. CBO says it will cost up to \$60 billion just to build it, let alone operate it; \$60 billion just to build it, from the same people who come here and say they want to balance the budget. You ask, "What is this going to cost?" They say, "I don't know. We'll leave it up to somebody else."

Can you imagine them shopping for a car. They look in a showroom and say, "I want that yellow one." Someone says, "Aren't you going to ask how much it costs?" They say, "I don't care. Leave it to the experts." They do not care about how much it costs. The same people that demand of us that we accept their prescription for the U.S. constitution because they say they want a balanced budget, those same people trot on the floor of the U.S. Senate with schemes to increase spending by up to \$60 billion for a star wars program, schemes to enact all sorts of tax breaks, most of which will benefit the upper income people in this country, and then they tell us, "Believe us. We really want a balanced budget." Nonsense.

What they want to do is amend the Constitution. If they wanted a balanced budget, they have had plenty of opportunities. They could have voted with us in 1993 in a proposal that honestly does the things that balance the budget. It will not be the Constitution that balances the budget. It will be the acts of men and women in the Senate to deal with spending and revenue issues that will balance the budget.

I will address a couple of issues that have been raised. Some say, "Well, this is the same amendment that has been voted on before. Some of you voted for it before and did not vote for it this time. What on Earth is going on?"

There is a pretty fundamental difference between this and what was voted on before. We have voted on constitutional amendments before in the Senate. I have voted for a constitutional amendment. I voted against a constitutional amendment, as has the Senator from South Carolina. I voted

for the constitutional amendment that says, let us balance the budget honestly and not misuse the Social Security trust funds to do it. I have voted against the constitutional amendment to balance the budget that would take into the Social Security trust funds a giant scoop and take the money and shovel it over here into the operating budget of the United States and misuse the money.

How would you feel about a business, any business in your town or any town, that says, "I'll tell you what. You're asking me about my financial performance this year. I'll tell you what. It's actually pretty good. I had to take my employees' pension money to bring it over on to the operating statement to make it income. I made it pretty good because I took my employees' pension fund. All in all, this year did I do pretty well? Yeah, I did, with the employees' pension funds being used."

Show me a businessperson who stands up and says that, and I will show you someone who is doing 2 years of hard tennis in a minimum security prison in this country. You cannot do that in this country. You cannot misuse pension funds.

Interesting. I was on a television program last night that I shall not name: "Crossfire." Mr. Novak asked the first question about the issue of the Social Security funds. And he says, as others have said, "Oh, that's a bunch of nonsense. What a hoax." Let us talk about the hoax.

Lots of folks out there today are working, and working hard. They got up early, they went to work, they worked all day, and they finished. Maybe at the end of the day today they got a paycheck. They looked at that paycheck, and it shows that some money was taken out of that paycheck to put in the Social Security trust fund—it is called FICA taxes—put in the Social Security trust fund. The promise of the Federal Government is very simple—this is not rocket science—the promise of the Federal Government is, "We'll take the money from your paycheck, and we promise you it goes into a trust fund—ergo the word "trust" is used—and the trust fund will be used when we need it, when the baby-boom generation retires."

I said yesterday that my colleagues will remember what the baby boomers are—the war babies. The war babies were the largest baby crop in American history. I am told that when folks came back from the Second World War, there was an enormous outpouring of love and affection. As a result, we had the largest baby crop in America.

When that largest baby crop in America retires after the turn of the century, we will have a maximum strain on the Social Security system. One of the sober things that was done in the 1980's in this Congress was to say, we will accrue more money in the Social Security trust funds each and every year in order to save for the time

we will need it when the war babies retire.

The result is this year \$69 billion will come in in excess of what is needed this year in the Social Security system. That is forced national savings, to be available when the war babies hit the retirement rolls.

Regrettably, the majority party says in their budgeting scheme—and I should say also it has happened under Democrats; and it is wrong under either party—that we want to use that money and use it as an offset to show it as revenue in order to balance the Federal budget. We are not going to have the trust fund; we are going to put it over here under operating revenues and use it to balance the Federal budget.

Now, it is interesting. Senator HOLINGS changed the law and he prohibited them from actually putting in writing what they are doing. So the result is this. I have here the budget that was passed by the majority party that they claim was a balanced budget. It, of course, is not in balance.

Here is a page from their budget resolution that they wrote—we did not write, they wrote. It says "Deficits," in the year 2002: \$108 billion. Why would they put a bill on our desk that says "Deficits," \$108 billion in the year 2002, and stand up and crow that they balanced the budget? Why is that the case? Because they intend to use \$108 billion in trust fund money, almost all from the Social Security trust fund, in the year 2002 to show this as a zero balance.

The Senator from South Carolina prevents them from doing that by law, so they cannot really put it in writing. All they can do is intend to do it. You misuse the money and put in writing that there is still a \$108 billion deficit. I do not know how that goes over in your town, but I come from a town of 300 people and they tend to look at the fine print and they tend to understand what is happening. You cannot misuse the Social Security trust fund like that and claim you balance the budget by taking money out of trust funds. That is not the right thing to do.

I have said that there have been three stages of denial on the floor of the Senate about this issue. I am still trying to figure out who claims to be right. Three Senators—and I will not name them—three separate Senators have stood up on different occasions and said the following three things. First, there is no Social Security trust fund. It does not exist. Second, there is a Social Security trust fund, and we are not misusing it. We promise. And third, there is a Social Security trust fund. We are misusing it. We promise to stop by the year 2008. Those are the three stages of denial on the Social Security issue.

I think the three of them ought to have a meeting with the rest of their caucus and figure out, which is it? Is there no trust fund? Are you not misusing it? Are you misusing it and promise to stop later?

Of course, we all understand the real answer. I was part of a group in 1983 that constructed the 1983 reform package for Social Security. It was one of the sober things we did in that decade. We decided to create savings in the Social Security system to be available when we need them at the turn of the century. Well, we will not have saved anything if we stay on this road. And we certainly will not have saved anything if we allow the majority party to convince enough people in the Senate to enshrine in the Constitution a requirement that the Social Security funds be used to balance the budget.

Now, we have had, essentially, the same vote on similar documents on two different years. In 1994 Senator SIMON, whom I admire greatly, who has been a proponent of this amendment, said on the floor of the Senate, "We guarantee we are not going to use the Social Security trust funds."

I said to him that I happen to know that the constitutional amendment that you originally offered included a provision to prevent the use of Social Security trust funds. I said, "Is that right?" And he said yes. That was his original position, but he changed it because it had to be bipartisan and the other side would not accept that provision. He said: We will guarantee we will provide a statutory remedy to prevent the Social Security trust funds from being used. We had a vote. I thought that was fine. We will have a guarantee.

The next year, in 1995, a similar resolution comes up, not identical, but similar. Instead of providing a guarantee that they will not use the Social Security trust funds, we had a vote that guaranteed they would use the Social Security trust funds and would enshrine that in the U.S. Constitution.

What a charade. I would not vote for that in 100 years. What a total charade. Then people say, "Well, it was the same." It was not the same. The difference between promising not to use it and guaranteeing you will use it is a difference of about a \$600 billion misuse of Social Security trust funds.

I want to finish these comments by talking just for a moment about something Abraham Lincoln said. When they were dedicating the battlefield cemetery at Gettysburg in November 1863, there were going to be two speakers. Of the two speakers they invited, one was Dr. Edward Everett, known to be one of the greatest orators of his day. He had been president of Harvard University. He had been a U.S. Senator, had been a Secretary of State, and was known to be one of the greatest orators of his time. He was invited to speak at this dedication of this battlefield cemetery. Of course, Abraham Lincoln was invited to speak at this battlefield cemetery dedication too.

Dr. Edward Everett was introduced and he stood up, and the history book records he spoke 2½ hours. After 2½ hours he sat down. Then the President of the United States was recognized,

and he spoke for 2 minutes. After he sat down and was on his way back to Washington, he wondered to his aide whether what he said would be long remembered. He felt Dr. Edward Everett, one of the great orators of his time, had spoken at great length for 2½ hours, and he had gotten up and given just a couple of minutes.

Of course, the result of that day is that Lincoln's address, the Gettysburg Address, as brief as it was, has become perhaps the best known and most admired statement given in the history of our Nation. At the end of his statement, as brief as it was, was the following:

The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that all these dead will not have died in vain; that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

This is truly government of, by, and for the people. This document, a document we debate today, a document that some propose we change now, this document provides the framework by which self-government works in America. This is not an idle debate. This is not a vote anyone dare take lightly.

I stand with my colleagues today to say I stand second to no one in this country who believes that we need to set this country back on course, fix the things that are wrong, celebrate the things that are right, and believe in America's promise. But I will not be one of those who blithely follow the windsock, who need to know the direction of yesterday's poll or today's poll or tomorrow's poll to figure out what I shall do next in proposing changing America's basic document, the U.S. Constitution.

Mr. BUMPERS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DORGAN. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I was particularly taken by the observation of the Senator from North Dakota about the Gettysburg Address, because Dr. Edward Everett was considered the greatest orator in America. After he spoke for 2, 2½ hours on a very hot, steamy day, Lincoln found it very difficult to stand up and follow a man of such oratorical skills and national renown. On the train on the way back to Washington, he thought that he had been an abominable failure. He could not imagine people taking his words very seriously after that oration. Of course, the rest is history. But I just want to point out to the Senator from North Dakota that Garry Wills has written a great book, just on the Gettysburg Address, really more than I

want to know about the Gettysburg Address, but it is a fabulous book which goes into great detail about the events of that day.

I would like to share one final observation—and I know the Senator from North Dakota is as well acquainted with these figures as I am—when you stop to consider that there have been 83 or 84 resolutions to amend the Constitution introduced in the U.S. Congress since January 1995, 83 proposals by Members of this Congress to tinker with that sacred document. There have been 2,300 proposed constitutional amendments since I came to the Senate. They were like snowflakes falling when I began serving during the days of busing and the segregation fight was still raging. And since the Nation adopted the Constitution, 17,000 have been proposed. I say that to my distinguished colleague to simply point out the contempt with which so many of my colleagues hold that sacred document.

Well, I have voted for one constitutional amendment since I came to the Senate 22 years ago. I regret that. But I can tell you, my record will be intact when the roll is called on this amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from California, Senator FEINSTEIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Senator from North Dakota and I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, on May 23—13 days ago—there were three votes on budgets. There was one for the Republican budget, which received a party vote; there was one for the President's budget, which received a party vote; and there was one more on a budget put forward by the centrist coalition.

Now, one of the things that became very clear in budget balancing in this body is that there are different points of view on both sides of the aisle. Republicans do not tend to support a Democratic budget, and Democrats do not tend to support a Republican budget. This was borne out.

Well, for some 6 months, under the leadership of Senator CHAFEE and Senator BREAUX, 11 Republicans and 11 Democrats sat down around a table and said, "look, we know we have to balance the budget. How are we going to do it, and what does each party need to do?"

Believe it or not, we produced a document that came five votes short of being adopted by this body. With five more votes, we would not have needed a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, and we would have balanced the budget within 7 years. I believe it is still possible to do succeed.

I support a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. I even sponsored one, with a number of my colleagues, last year. But, in my view, if Congress does not have the will to



actually balance the budget, it may, at some point, need castor oil. And that is all this amendment is. I heard people on the floor this morning make the statement that now is the time to bite the bullet. Now is the time to make the hard choices.

Does this constitutional amendment restructure Medicare? No.

Does it restructure Medicaid? No.

Does it bring on welfare reform? No.

Does it provide for ballistic missile defense? No.

Does it have the tax increases to pay for one? No.

Does it have a tax cut in it, which so many want? No.

Does it solve any problem at all? No, it does not.

It does one thing. It says that the people of three-quarters of the State legislatures will vote and decide whether there will be a constitutional amendment to balance the budget by the year 2003.

The bill before us today is the same bill rejected by this body last year. I voted against it then because I do not believe it is the right amendment for this country, and I will vote against it today for these same reasons.

Let me give you a couple of these reasons. A constitutional amendment cannot possibly be ratified right now in time to do any good. It would take the 3-year period that I described. The Medicare trustees announced yesterday the Medicare trust fund will actually reach insolvency in 2001—a year earlier than originally projected. This is a loud and clear message—or should be—that we do not have the luxury of waiting any longer to balance the budget.

Additionally, the amendment before us says that, for all time, the Social Security trust fund will be stolen to balance the budget. This body would send to the States a constitutional amendment that would utilize the Social Security trust fund, for all time, to balance the budget.

I think it is painfully clear to all of us that there is no way to achieve the goal of balancing the budget in 7 years without using, to some degree, funds that really should, by law, be set aside for Social Security. Our earlier speakers, including Senator DORGAN, Senator HOLLINGS, and others know it as well as anyone in this body. Every plan put forward to balance the budget this year includes Social Security funds to some degree or another.

However, today we are considering a constitutional amendment. The amendment would permanently use Social Security trust funds to balance the budget. It allows absolutely no flexibility to protect the solvency of the trust fund for future generations who will depend on it. That is not right because, all during this period, Americans will be working and paying payroll taxes for their Social Security retirement. Workers will pay their 6.2-percent FICA tax to contribute to their retirement and employers will match that 6.2 percent. People have a right to

know that this trust fund will be there when they retire.

This amendment, by locking into the Constitution the requirement that Social Security funds are used to balance the Federal budget, in perpetuity, abrogates that contract with American taxpayers.

Under this amendment, Social Security funds could wind up being used to pay for general governmental programs, just as Senator DORGAN spelled out. It is like taking the pension fund, if you operate a company, and putting it on your operating budget. You just would not do it.

Furthermore, I mentioned earlier that this constitutional amendment would have to pass muster with three-fourths of the States. If you think the debate in Congress has been difficult on this issue for the last few years, just wait until the voters of 50 States, or the legislatures of 50 States, start debating the permanent inclusion of the Social Security trust funds in the Federal budget under this balanced budget amendment. I venture to say that the likelihood of its ratification is dim, at best.

Well, what is the upshot of all of this? The upshot is that we have the vehicle to balance the budget, without altering the Constitution, and we should just do it.

I want to read this list. This is the first time I have ever seen this in the time I have been here. Forty-six Members—22 Republicans and 24 Democrats—voted for a centrist budget. The Republican supporters are: BENNETT, BROWN, CAMPBELL, CHAFEE, COATS, COCHRAN, COHEN, D'AMATO, DEWINE, FAIRCLOTH, FRIST, GORTON, GREGG, HATCH, HATFIELD, JEFFORDS, KASSEBAUM, LUGAR, SANTORUM, SIMPSON, SNOWE, and SPECTER.

These 24 Democrats voted with the 22 Republicans: AKAKA, BINGAMAN, BOXER, BRADLEY, BREAUX, BRYAN, CONRAD, FEINSTEIN, GRAHAM, INOUE, JOHNSTON, KERREY, KOHL, LEAHY, LEVIN, LIEBERMAN, MOYNIHAN, MURRAY, NUNN, PELL, PRYOR, REID, ROBB, and SIMON.

With the centrist budget amendment, we were five votes short of achieving the tax cut Republicans wanted, and minimizing the cuts in vital programs that Democrats wanted. We came within five votes of achieving significant savings for a wide variety of Federal programs. In Medicare, we made enough changes to assure the solvency of the trust fund until 2007, and made some necessary changes in part B, as well. We took steps to meet the needs of Medicaid, restructuring the program, and provide welfare reform while retaining a Federal safety net. We also adopted a balanced tax cut, for individuals and businesses, including education, capital gains reform, research and development tax credits—all put together in a package that both parties could buy into.

I was really very disappointed that there were not five other Members of this body who could stand up and we could get the job done.

I do not believe that a constitutional amendment, particularly one that includes the Social Security trust fund, is ever realistically going to be ratified by three-quarters of the States. There are enough people in this Nation who pay those FICA taxes who do not want to see their FICA taxes used for anything other than their retirement.

Therefore, I respectfully submit to this body that the centrist coalition, which balances the budget in 7 years, uses the Congressional Budget Office numbers, does not make unnecessary and precipitously deep cuts in important programs, represents the Nation's best interests and is really the way to go.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, how much time is available?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has one-half minute remaining.

Mr. DORGAN. How much time is remaining to the Senator from South Carolina?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-seven minutes.

Mr. DORGAN. I yield whatever time I have to the Senator from Oregon, and I believe the Senator from South Carolina would like to yield as well.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues from South Carolina and North Dakota.

Mr. President, colleagues, as of now everyone knows what is going to happen when the Senate votes on this measure. The script on this issue has been published. It is played, and it is almost like yesterday's news. There probably is more likelihood that Michael Jordan is not going to show up for the playoffs than there is going to be a surprise on this issue.

I am here today to say that it does not have to be this way, my colleagues. I have introduced along with Senator HOLLINGS, Senator DORGAN, and Senator DASCHLE a constitutional amendment to balance the budget that is identical to the measure introduced by Senator DOLE, save for one change. Our measure simply says that you cannot go out and raid the Social Security trust fund. You cannot go out and take \$600 billion, money that belongs to working people, to young people, to seniors, and use it to balance the budget.

I call our effort—and it has really been led by Senator HOLLINGS for all these years. I think that we are the straight bookkeeping crowd. We are the crowd that wants some truth in budgeting. We are the folks who are saying it is time to end this accounting fiction which has been perpetrated, as Senator HOLLINGS has said, in direct contravention of section 13301 of the Budget Act.

The Budget Act is clear. There is no ambiguity about it. It says that you cannot use Social Security funds to mask the overall Federal deficit. You cannot do it. Both political parties unfortunately have done it.

So what we want to do in our straight bookkeeping kind of effort is to try to make sure in the interest of both the cause of balancing the budget and protecting the Social Security program that we do what the law requires, and we do what is in the public interest.

I happen to think that, if you do it as we propose, what is going to happen is you are going to have to make tough choices on both the budget and Social Security more quickly.

I have come from a round of town meetings—and I am sure all of our colleagues have—at home. One of the things I heard consistently is that lots of folks feel that the Congress has put off the tough choices—put them off until after the election, put them off for years. If you do what we propose, you bet you have to make some tough choices, and you have to make them earlier. Maybe we are going to have to say no to some pork barrel spending programs.

I believe that if you wall off the Social Security program, as we propose, that you do not let the surplus be used for balancing the budget, and you are going to see when the Social Security stands, as it should, separate from the Federal budget that we have to make some changes there too. We have a Social Security advisory commission that is going to report fairly shortly. They have a number of recommendations. They are going to be tough for people to swallow. But let me say that at a time when more young people think that they are going to see Elvis than think they are going to get a Social Security check that we are going to have to make some tough choices with respect to Social Security.

So with our proposal—by making sure that the overall deficit is tackled responsibly and tackled more quickly—by walling off the Social Security program, as the Congress intended in the Budget Act, we believe that the country will get the discipline and tough choices that are needed, and get them earlier.

I want to announce also this afternoon that it is my intention, after further consultation with the minority leader, Senator DASCHLE, and Senator DORGAN, to ask unanimous consent after the Senate has voted on the measure of the majority leader—it is my desire and my intention—to ask unanimous consent that our measure, a constitutional amendment to balance the budget without raiding Social Security, be considered immediately after the vote on the measure offered by the majority leader.

I think it is time to talk about a constitutional amendment to balance the budget that has some legs. I think that we have had enough of this exercise in failure. The script has been written. We do not have to conclude this debate with a debate that fails. We can conclude it in a manner that will bring us real truth in budgeting, will ensure that the books are kept, and will allow

us to have a constitutional amendment to balance the budget.

So let me be clear on this. I and those that support this measure are willing to write into law that there would be a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. This is not a statute. This is a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. And it is identical to the measure offered by the majority leader save for one respect.

It is my intent to ask unanimous consent to have that measure considered immediately after the vote on this measure offered by the majority leader. I hope that measure will be considered. I believe that, if it is considered, we will get a minimum of 70 votes on that particular measure.

My source for that appraisal is that on February 10, 1995—Senator HOLLINGS was here, I was not—but on February 10, 1995, on a measure that in effect recommitted a constitutional amendment to balance the budget to committee to do exactly what Senator HOLLINGS and I propose now—that particular measure got more than 80 votes.

I would like to conclude my remarks in really a bipartisan kind of fashion by picking up on what the majority leader said early this week.

The majority leader said early this week, "If the President wants a balanced budget, we will have a balanced budget." I am here to say that, if the majority leader wants a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, we will have a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. It is a measure that will get a minimum of 70 votes on this floor. It is a measure that will write into law a specific constitutional amendment to bring about the discipline the American people want, and it will be bipartisan. But it also will be one that will keep faith with our working people and with our seniors who are paying those whopper payroll taxes—15.3 percent between the worker and the employer. Millions of Americans pay more in payroll taxes than they pay in income taxes. They want a balanced budget, but they do not think we ought to do it by raiding the Social Security Program. The measure we hope to get a recorded vote on after the measure proposed by the majority leader would give us a chance to meet the desires of the American people for a balanced budget but one that also ensures that their Social Security is protected.

I thank my good friend from South Carolina for yielding me this time.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLINGS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, let me thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon. First, I will surprise him by thanking him for the telecommunications bill. I welcome him to the Senate and thank him for introducing a

constitutional amendment for a balanced budget that does not move the Government's deficit over to the Social Security trust fund.

But more particularly, with respect to the telecommunications bill, I wish to thank him for his work. We passed that bill by an overwhelming majority here in the House and in the Senate. It came out of the conference committee and we reconciled the differences—which was a very difficult job. And, just before Christmas the distinguished Vice President appeared on NBC News, where he was being interviewed, and proclaimed, "We now have the information superhighway, and I got everything I want."

Well, that really put the Speaker of the House into a tizzy, and we, the conferees, were told that our telecommunications bill was dead. Between that time, some 10 days before Christmas, and the first week of February, Congressman BLILEY and I had to hold the fort, but we worked in a bipartisan fashion. We did not change a single word.

What really occurred is that our colleague, Senator WYDEN, won the special election out in Oregon, causing the Speaker of the House to say, "Heavens, we have to show we can do something." I said we have an overwhelming majority ready for the telecommunications bill in the House and in the Senate, and that is how we got it.

So I think it ought to be stated for the record that the Senator from Oregon was instrumental in ensuring passage of the telecommunications bill. And perhaps tomorrow if the Republicans really want a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, we will obtain one. All that is required is a specific language in section 7 of the resolution excluding Social Security funds from deficit calculations. The present language includes Social Security funds. So there is no argument about the form, the present language already has exceptions in section 7: "Total receipts shall include all receipts of the U.S. Government except those derived from borrowing."

That has been interpreted as borrowing from the public. But how about borrowing from yourself, borrowing from the Social Security trust fund. All they have to do is change "from borrowing" to "from the public and Social Security trust fund." That is all we have to add. I and several Senators on this side of the aisle formally informed the distinguished majority leader in a letter last year that we would support a balanced budget amendment that protected Social Security. I waited all year long for a joint resolution that I could amend. We in the Senate are used to putting an amendment on anything so you can get a vote. But oh, no. A constitutional amendment can only be offered as an amendment to another joint resolution. So, I waited and then the flag burning joint resolution came up in December.



And so I said I have an amendment. In fact, I had two. I had one constitutional amendment that would have allowed the Congress of the United States to control expenditures in Federal elections. It would have overturned the flawed decision of Buckley versus Valeo.

My other amendment was a real balanced budget amendment that protected Social Security, identical to the balanced budget amendment that the Senator from Oregon will ask unanimous consent to consider tomorrow. I will be in there supporting the Senator, and I hope we can work it out. I hope it is not true that they want to pass up this opportunity, because it is right here.

I am tired of the media saying the balanced budget amendment failed by one vote, when they know differently. That is technical reporting, because the truth of the matter is that they could easily have picked up at least five votes if they had agreed to add language excluding Social Security.

So I will be working with the Senator, and I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon on his leadership. I thank publicly, of course, the Senator from Arkansas, for coming to the floor. I also want to thank Senator DORGAN of North Dakota. He understands all these particular problems and issues, and he is the most eloquent, I know, in the Senate on all of them. He gives categorical leadership and very common-sense observations, and you can follow his rationale. I happen to agree with most of it all the time. The Senator from California, Senator FEINSTEIN, has been a leader in trying to do something about a balanced budget.

But let me go, Mr. President, to statements made earlier before I forget them. The distinguished Senator from Texas, Senator HUTCHISON, got right to the point saying, why don't we do something. She kept talking about generations in the future and everything else like that.

We tried to do something, not pass it off in a 7-year passing of the buck. This constitutional amendment is really putting off the tough decisions. It is not biting the bullet or making any hard decisions. Heck, you can say anything in rhetoric, in language. But should know from hard experience that actions speak louder than words.

I came in as a Governor of a State, where the budget I inherited was totally in the red. We had in the constitution of 1895, still do in the constitution of the State of South Carolina in 1895, "thou budget shall be balanced." But that didn't mean anything. There a number of accounting gimmicks that they employ like borrowing and moving trust funds.

And so at this particular point, Mr. President, I want to ask unanimous consent to list the 48 States with a balanced budget requirement, the type of requirement, whether it is constitutional or statutory. They are all supposed to be balanced at the end of year.

The chart lists the balances in the general funds and in the transfer funds. So the States, even with the constitutional requirement, do not a balanced budget give.

I can tell you here and now, if I say it once—I have the time, fortunately—I say it again: A constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget does not a balanced budget give. They play the gamesmanship.

I ask unanimous consent to have this printed in the RECORD, so we will have those documents in there to show the game that the States are playing.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATES WITH BALANCED BUDGET REQUIREMENTS

State	Type of requirement	Balanced budget for FY 1995	Ending general fund balance (in millions)	Transfer fund (in millions)
Alabama	Constitutional	Y	54	0
Alaska	Statutory	Y	0	2,136
Arizona	Constitutional	Y	270	223
Arkansas	Statutory	Y	0	0
California	Constitutional	Y	683	313
Colorado	Constitutional	Y	484	484
Connecticut	Constitutional	Y	81	0
Delaware	Constitutional	Y	374	79.1
Florida	Constitutional	Y	129	282
Georgia	Constitutional	Y	224	288
Hawaii	Constitutional	Y	90	0
Idaho	Constitutional	Y	3	33
Illinois	Constitutional	Y	331	0
Indiana	Statutory	Y	679	419
Iowa	Statutory	Y	292	116
Kansas	Constitutional	Y	357	5
Kentucky	Constitutional	Y	261	100
Louisiana	Constitutional	Y	146	0
Maine	Statutory	Y	4	10
Maryland	Constitutional	Y	133	286
Massachusetts	Constitutional	Y	179	425
Michigan	Constitutional	Y	0	1,003
Minnesota	Statutory	Y	1,057	500
Mississippi	Statutory	Y	115	268
Missouri	Constitutional	Y	473	24
Montana	Constitutional	Y	47	NA
Nebraska	Statutory	Y	176	21
Nevada	Constitutional	Y	102	100
New Hampshire	Statutory	Y	0	24
New Jersey	Constitutional	Y	952	263.3
New Mexico	Statutory	Y	0	59
New York	Constitutional	Y	158	157
North Carolina	Constitutional	Y	892	423.6
North Dakota	Statutory	Y	31	0
Ohio	Constitutional	Y	70	828
Oklahoma	Constitutional	Y	195	45
Oregon	Constitutional	Y	496	39
Pennsylvania	Constitutional	Y	429	66
Rhode Island	Statutory	Y	5	45
South Carolina	Constitutional	Y	589	164.8
South Dakota	Constitutional	Y	0	11
Tennessee	Constitutional	Y	138	101
Texas	Constitutional	Y	1,852	9
Utah	Constitutional	Y	61	66
Virginia	Constitutional	Y	17	80
Washington	Statutory	Y	559	0
West Virginia	Constitutional	Y	64	64
Wisconsin	Constitutional	Y	127	78.2

#### Notes:

1. Vermont has no balanced budget requirement and reported a \$15 million deficit.
2. Wyoming has no balanced budget requirement and reported a \$26 million surplus.
3. 35 states have constitutional requirements; 13 States have statutory requirements.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Senator COATS of Indiana said the amendment will enforce the discipline, force us to meet our responsibilities. Of course, that is not the case at all. On the contrary, I have been trying to do that. I tried freezing, I say to the Senator. He is nice to stay around so I have someone to talk to. Usually they just go ahead somewhere else. At least I can talk to C-Span. And now I see the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

I want to read an article. I will not read the whole article, I will just read from this, referring to "Ace in the Hole" in the New Yorker, in the June

10 issue that has just come out. This is an article, "Ace in the Hole," by John Cassidy. I commend it to my colleagues for their reading.

Despite some suggestions to the contrary—notably by the Heritage Foundation, a conservative think tank—this year cannot be compared with 1992, let alone 1980 or 1932. In the first quarter of 1996, inflation-adjusted growth in national output, which is the broadest index of economic performance, 2.3 per cent on an annualized basis; over the full course of the Clinton Administration, such growth has averaged around 2.5 per cent a year. This record is about average for the post-1973 era but well above the growth rate of 1.6 percent eked out during the Bush Presidency. A number of other measures also suggest that the economy is doing significantly better than it was four years ago: two of the most widely followed are the "misery index," which is the rate of inflation added to the rate of unemployment, and the size of the federal budget deficit.

At the moment, the unemployment rate is 5.4 per cent, and the inflation rate is 2.9 per cent. Added together, these numbers produce a misery index of 8.3, which is an extremely low number. The last year it was lower was 1968, when the unemployment rate was 3.6 per cent and the inflation rate averaged 4.2 per cent. For much of the nineteen-seventies and eighties, the misery index well into double digits. As recently as 1992, it stood at 10.4.

Perhaps the most important, and least heralded, achievement of the Clinton Administration is the improvement it has wrought in the national finances. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the federal budget deficit for the 1996 fiscal year, which began last October, will be about \$145 billion. This is a large number, but it is only half the size of the deficit that the federal government recorded in 1992, which was \$290 billion. And these raw numbers don't tell the full story. In ranking budget deficits, economists usually look at them in relation to the size of the economy. Measured in this way, the federal deficit this year will be about 1.9 per cent of the gross domestic product, according to the C.B.O. This figure is down from 4.9 per cent in 1992; indeed, it is the lowest such figure recorded since 1979, the year before Ronald Reagan was elected, when the budget deficit was just 1.7 percent of G.D.P.

That takes us to our distinguished friend, Senator Muskie, who was chairman. We had a Democratic House and Senate. Senator Muskie was chairman of our Budget Committee, and I was right in there behind him. I took over in 1980. So we were working and had more or less succeeded, under President Carter, in reducing the deficit from what we had inherited from President Ford. However, in came President Reagan with Reaganomics and the fiscal disaster that we are now experiencing.

I tried, during the early 1980's, what they called the Fritz freeze. They gave it a name because I was so intent. I said every Governor would come in and he would say let us just take spending the way it is now and let us just take this year's budget for next year. There would be no cuts, there would be no increases. That way we would save \$50 billion at the Federal level.

We tried the freeze. We tried to hold the line. We could not get it done. I tried with Gramm-Rudman-Hollings.

And then I came with a value-added tax in 1987. There is no question that I have been trying to head off annual deficits with about \$180 billion in revenues from a 5 percent VAT.

I went to Darman in 1989, after we could not get it past the Budget Committee in 1987. In 1989, when President Bush took office, I met with Dick Darman. I had been a close friend of his father's, Mr. Morton Darman. We had a good, heart-to-heart talk.

I said, "By 1992, if President Bush doesn't get on top of this monster, it is growing so, he is going to need the Secret Service." I said that in a jocular fashion, but politically that is what happened to him. "It's the Economy, Stupid." I will put in the chart. There have been intermittent figures, but the real deficit then was \$403.6 billion. That is without using those trust funds, \$403. So we were up, up and away.

I got a nice note from the President, President Bush, that he just did not think it was timely and he wanted to get himself more stabilized in office.

Again, when President Clinton took office, I went. I will never forget the conference that we had. When I suggested a VAT for the deficit and the debt, President Clinton said, "I got a call last night from Lane Kirkland. The AFL-CIO has its annual meeting at Bal Harbour, in Florida. He said that he would go along with a VAT for the deficit and the debt." And I said, "Heavens above, Mr. President, that's who opposed me."

I came before the Finance Committee and testified for a value-added tax. I had the experts there and everything else to answer all the econometric issues and questions. It was the AFL that said, "Wait a minute, this is regressive, regressive, a heavy burden, and everything else." Of course, every industrialized country has a value-added tax. Our competition in Europe has a VAT. You cannot be a member of the European Economic Community unless you have a value-added tax. Out in the Pacific rim, every country there has a value-added tax. In Korea, for example, it is 25 percent. So the competition is economically succeeding. They have 5 percent in Japan. They will be the largest economy, according to Eamon Fingleton in "Blindside," by the year 2000. They are presently a larger manufacturing nation than we are here in the United States.

So I said it would solve our deficit in the balance of trade because it is rebatable at the bottom, at the border. So if you produce something here today in Washington, this desk and chair, for \$500, you will pay all the corporate taxes, all the income taxes, all the sales taxes and everything else. If you ship it to Paris, France, they will add on a 17 percent VAT and sell it. But, if you produce that same chair and desk in Paris, France, they add a 17 percent value-added tax, a VAT at the time of manufacture, but when it leaves the port at Le Havre to come to

Washington, DC, they subtract or rebate the 17 percent.

So you can see the tremendous advantage to move the industry offshore. We have been talking about slave labor, about child labor, about 27-cents-an-hour labor down. But let's talk about the advantage they have in Europe and in the Pacific rim where they employ value added taxes.

I have introduced this legislation again in this Congress. That particular bill now, Mr. President, is S. 237. It is in the Finance Committee.

When the distinguished Senator from Texas, Senator HUTCHISON, says, "Let's do something now," let's go to the Finance Committee that the majority of the Republicans control. I will testify. We will get the expert witnesses, and we will get something done. We do not have to wait 7 years on States to find out whether or not we are going to meet our responsibilities.

I really resent the idea of us like a crowd up in the grandstand hollering, "We want a touchdown, we want a touchdown, we want a touchdown," when we are the team, we are on the field.

Mr. WYDEN. Will the Senator yield just for a question?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Yes.

Mr. WYDEN. It seems to me that what you are saying is this is just about budget discipline.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Yes.

Mr. WYDEN. This is about making tough choices, and you can make them in a variety of ways. I said the other day that I thought some of what was going on in this town was like a hot-fudge-sundae approach to dieting. You can have tax cuts, you can have new weapons systems and then somehow say the books are going to balance. It is like having six or seven hot fudge sundaes a day and still lose weight.

I think what you offer in your important remarks is, this is about budget discipline, and you are going to suggest a variety of ways to do it.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Exactly. I thank the distinguished Senator. Let's make the record on the hot fudge sundae.

At the present time, the Dole agenda—and I repeat this and I got into it this morning—was the repeal of the 4.3-cent gas tax. That is \$30 billion. The missile defense system is \$60 billion. The across-the-board tax cuts, \$600 billion.

So that is what we are up against; \$690 billion that is in the Presidential campaign and, whoopee, "I have to get elected because I can cut the revenues another \$690 billion. And, incidentally, I get another \$600 billion from the Social Security trust fund." When the smoke has cleared, we are down well over a trillion bucks.

What a charade. What a fraud. How can anybody be serious and stand up here? But they all have the same song. Let me go quickly, because we are going to run out of time.

They all come in here with the same stock phrases—Thomas Jefferson, chil-

dren and grandchildren, first balanced budget in 30 years, largest tax increase in history. The largest tax increase in history, one more time—I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD "Fiddling with the Numbers," by Judy Mann.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post]

FIDDLING WITH THE NUMBERS

(By Judy Mann)

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman, the Republican meteor from New Jersey, had the unusual honor for a first-term governor of being asked to deliver her party's response to President Clinton's State of the Union message last week.

And she delivered a whopper of what can most kindly be called a glaring inaccuracy.

Sandwiched into her Republican sales pitch was the kind of line that does serious political damage: Clinton, she intoned, "imposed the biggest tax increase in American history."

And millions of Americans sat in front of their television sets, perhaps believing that Clinton and the Democrat-controlled Congress had done a real number on them.

The trouble is that this poster lady for tax cuts was not letting any facts get in her way. But don't hold your breath waiting for the talk show hosts to set the record straight.

The biggest tax increase in history did not occur in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993. The biggest tax increase in post-World War II history occurred in 1982 under President Ronald Reagan.

Here is how the two compare, according to Bill Gale, a specialist on tax policy and senior fellow at the Brookings Institution. The 1993 act raised taxes for the next 5 years by a gross total of \$268 billion, but with the expansion of the earned income tax credit to more working poor families, the net increase comes to \$240.4 billion in 1993. The Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982, by comparison, increased taxes by a net of \$217.5 billion over 5 years. Nominally, then, it is true that the 1993 tax bill was the biggest in history.

But things don't work nominally. "A dollar now is worth less than a dollar was back then, so that a tax increase of, say \$10 billion in 1982 would be a tax increase of \$15 billion now," says Gale. In fact, if you adjust for the 48 percent change in price level, the 1982 tax increase becomes a \$325.6 billion increase in 1993 dollars. And that makes it the biggest tax increase in history by \$85 billion.

Moreover, says Gale, the population of the country increased, so that, on a per person basis, the 1993 tax increase is lower than the one in 1982, and the gross domestic product increased over the decade, which means that personal income rose. "Once you adjust for price translation, it's not the biggest, and when you account for population and GDP, it gets even smaller."

He raises another point that makes this whole business of tax policy just a bit more complex than the heroic tax slashers would have us believe. "The question is whether [the 1993 tax increase] was a good idea or a bad idea, not whether it was the biggest tax increase. Suppose it was the biggest? I find it frustrating that the level of the debate about stuff like this as carried on by politicians is generally so low."

So was it a good idea? "We needed to reduce the deficit," he says, "we still need to reduce the deficit. The bond market responded positively. Interest rates fell. There may be a longer term benefit in that it

shows Congress and the president are capable of cutting the deficit even without a balanced budget amendment."

Other long-term benefits, he says, are that "more capital is freed up for private investment, and ultimately that can result in more productive and highly paid workers."

How bad was the hit for those few who did have to pay more taxes? One tax attorney says that his increased taxes were more than offset by savings he was able to generate by refinancing the mortgage on his house at the lower interest rates we've had as a result. The 1993 tax increase did include a 4.3-cent-a-gallon rise in gasoline tax, which hits the middle class. But most of us did not have to endure an income tax increase. In 1992, the top tax rate was 31 percent of the taxable income over \$51,900 for single taxpayers and \$86,500 for married couples filing jointly. Two new tax brackets were added in 1993: 36 percent for singles with taxable incomes over \$115,000 and married couples with incomes over \$140,000; and 39.6 percent for singles and married couples with taxable incomes over \$250,000.

Not exactly your working poor or even your average family.

The rising GOP stars are finding out that when they say or do something stupid or mendacious, folks notice. The jury ought to be out on Whitman's performance as governor until we see the effects of supply side economics on New Jersey. But in her first nationally televised performance as a spokeswoman for her party, she should have known better than to give the country only half the story. In the process, she left a lot to be desired in one quality Americans are looking for in politicians: honesty.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Chair. So we know from all the quotes from the Wall Street Journal, the New York Times, and everything else that the largest tax increase was back in 1982 under the chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Kansas.

The first balanced budget in 30 years—I showed the two letters that we put in from the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, June O'Neill. One day in October of last year on the present 1996 budget, she had a slight surplus, and then 2 days later when we reminded her of section 13301, she said it is a \$105 billion deficit.

The distinguished Senator from North Dakota did it in more dramatic terms. Here, again, my colleagues should look at this year's budget resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 57. Turn to page 5: Fiscal year 2002, deficits, \$108.3 billion.

Come on, how can you keep on saying the first balanced budget when the document itself shows a deficit. You talk about backloading. The President had a backloaded budget. Almost two-thirds of the cuts in that particular phony budget was to occur after the second Presidential election, the last 2 years. Two-thirds of it. It ought to be ashes in their mouths.

So there they are with their first balanced budget in 30 years. All the children and grandchildren—come on, it is us.

You can look at these particular charts and you can see at a glance, even with the President halving the deficit—and he is the only President

who has—spending on interest costs continue to rise. The interest costs during the last 4 years has gone up \$50 billion. That is just interest costs; that is spending on automatic pilot.

We have increased these costs, forcing the American people to pay more and get less. We are getting hit now; I cannot fully fund women, infants, and children feeding and Head Start and title I for the disadvantaged and student loans and get the economy rebuilt, do the bridges, the highways, expand the airports, and strengthen our economy. I talked about that early this morning. Why can I not do it? Because my money is going to interest costs on the national debt.

President Reagan promised a balanced budget in 1 year. He came in and said, "Whoops, this problem is way worse. I'll do it in 3 years." But, Mr. President, instead he added almost \$270 billion in forced spending for nothing.

The interest cost on the national debt after 217 years of history in 1981 was \$74.8 billion. Let's call it \$75 billion. Now it is projected at \$344 billion.

He has added almost \$270 billion in unnecessary spending that we get nothing for. We cannot get funds for prisons or the environment. In fact, it just was pointed out, if he had done what he promised—and they all say "President Clinton promised; President Clinton promised; President Clinton promised"—if Reagan had carried out his particular promises, what would we have done? We would be talking about a surplus around here.

So the unmitigated gall of this crowd that comes aboard—the freshmen. It reminds me of a saying in the Navy during World War II, "When in danger, when in doubt, run in circles, scream and shout."

And they come down and get their 2-hour session. I do not know if I have all the time to go down through, because I was making notes. We need to focus on the problem at hand. It is not Social Security which is presently in surplus. It is not Medicare that the distinguished majority leader saw fit to come in and talk about. Medicare is in surplus until 2001, they say, which is what it was when President Clinton came to office.

So we have not gone backward. We had gotten it up to 2002 when Senator EXON and I voted for the 1993 \$57 billion cut in Medicare. That is what we did in 1993.

So we have been cutting spending and making progress. As Senator HUTCHISON says, we ought to really do something. They all come in with "children and grandchildren, children and grandchildren," that is on some silly pollster's chart; it is like parrots at a pet store. Then quoting Thomas Jefferson. Ha. They ought to quote Lyndon Baines Johnson. He was conscientious. He was being blamed for the Great Society, the War on Poverty, and the war in Vietnam.

I pointed out how Senator DOLE voted back in 1968 as a House Member

for, what, a 10-percent surcharge on income tax for individuals and corporations, \$6 billion in spending cuts, \$200,000 in employees' cuts, extended excise taxes, and everything else. But we did it. We balanced the budget.

We do not have to go to what Thomas Jefferson said and a constitutional amendment that puts off everything, passing the buck to the legislatures, and the people generally arguing again for another 7 years with interest costs of \$353 billion. I can tell you now the interest cost will be over \$500 billion by the time they get their so-called constitutional amendment if they can get it.

Mr. President, right to the point, do not quote Jefferson on that. Quote Jefferson on what he said: If between a free press and a free government, I would choose the former. Jefferson's point was, you can have a free government, but unless you have a free press to keep the politicians honest, it is not going to stay free long. That is what is occurring. The free press has joined in the conspiracy with the politicians in making the news, getting polls, reporting ahead of time, making more news. You cannot get them to report the true deficits that we have, the true interest costs that we have, the true initiatives that we make and have made.

There is the "Balance the budget. Who stands for a balanced budget?" when the only gentleman in this city that has done something about it, and cannot be blamed, is President William Jefferson Clinton. You can blame me. I have been here. I am in my 30th year. You can blame the Senator from Nebraska or some of the Senators that have been here before 1992.

January 1993 is when President Clinton came to town. We are the ones who gave him the spending on automatic pilot, this horrendous debt, the horrendous interest costs. What does he do? He faces up to the task. He brings in his Vice President and he gets every Democrat to vote for \$500 billion in spending cuts, increasing taxes on liquor, beer, cigarettes, and increasing taxes on gasoline, increasing taxes on Social Security.

Who is really serious about Social Security? The Senator from Pennsylvania came here and said, "You are trying to hide. You're trying to hide," he said, "hide behind Social Security." Who is hiding? Old Joe Louis said, "You can run, but you can't hide." The Senator from Pennsylvania.

We made it crystal clear. We have it written in the law. What you are trying to do is hide, in section 7, the repeal of that law. You are the one that is hiding. You are the one that wants to move the deficit from your political accounting in the Government over to the Social Security trust fund and decimate the program. That is exactly what has been going on.

Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has 6 minutes.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I would gladly yield to the distinguished ranking member of our Budget Committee. I thought he was eloquent. I thought he made a masterful statement that was common sense. Out in the Midwest they think that way. I would be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska if he would like a little bit of time in the remaining few minutes I have.

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. I thank very much my great friend and colleague from South Carolina, whom I have admired ever since I came here 18 years ago. I served under him on the Budget Committee, and I served under him in his chairmanship of the Commerce Committee. We have worked together for so very long on the budget problems of the United States of America. But I simply say that I wish everybody who serves in Congress had his head screwed on as correctly as does the Senator from South Carolina.

During all of this rancorous debate about who is to blame, I am reminded once again of that time—it must have been in 1979—when Jimmy Carter was President of the United States. I believe the Senator was on the Budget Committee and Senator Muskie served as chairman. I remember well the statement that the Senator made when the President of the United States called us down to the White House. The President was very alarmed by the fact that the deficit for that particular fiscal year was likely to go over \$100 billion, and if we did not arrest what we were doing, we were going to exceed in the next year or two \$1 trillion—the horrible \$1 trillion figure—on the national debt. I do not know what the interest on the debt was at that time, but obviously it was small compared to what we are now paying.

So the Senator from South Carolina is accurate in explaining what he did with regard to the remarks that have been made on the floor of this Senate today.

We are not here to find fault. We are here trying to solve a problem. But the problem we have been sinking into over the years goes back to the time when supply-side economics was ushered into this body, when Ronald Reagan became President of the United States.

As the Senator from South Carolina just said, President Ronald Reagan, who is an honorable man, said when he came into office that he was going to balance the budget in 4 years. The facts of the matter were that the budget went out of balance in those 4 years faster than it has gone out of balance any time in the whole history of the United States of America.

The facts of the matter are, while there has been so much criticism of the President of the United States today, it should be remembered and written indelibly, so it will not be forgotten, that under this President we have had

3 successive years of deficit reduction, from a figure of about a \$300 billion shortfall in the budget each year, down to about \$130 billion. That is what Bill Clinton has done.

So Bill Clinton is the one who has accomplished reducing the deficit faster than any President, probably going back to Harry Truman or Lyndon Johnson. We still have a major problem on our hands. It goes back, and all of this crying and moaning today goes back to that period in the early 1980's when the United States of America was under \$1 trillion in national debt and was under \$100 billion a year in the annual deficit.

That rose appreciably. And as the Senator from South Carolina has said time and time again, if we had not run up those deficits that were run up under Ronald Reagan, the budget would be balanced today, would be in surplus today, and we would not have all the concerns that we do have about future solvency of Social Security and Medicare.

So I simply say that the reason I am not going to vote for the constitutional amendment to balance the budget, as I elaborated on to some extent earlier today, is the fact, Mr. President, that this is a sham. This is a political sham where the U.S. Senate is being used as a tool in the Presidential race. Unfortunately, that is not the way to run the Government and that certainly is not the way to run our budget. I do appreciate very much the Senator yielding me time.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. According to the timekeeper, Senator EXON had 2 minutes reserved for him; so using those 2 minutes, there would still be 2 minutes left.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I yield the balance of my 2 minutes to my friend from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator.

In the 2 minutes I will read from the daddy rabbit of Reaganomics where they start talking about growth now, David Stockman:

The root problem goes back to the July 1981 frenzy of excessive and imprudent tax cutting that shattered the Nation's fiscal stability. A noisy faction of Republicans have willfully denied this giant mistake for fiscal governance and their own culpability in it ever since. Instead, they have incessantly poisoned the political debate with a mindless stream of antitax venom while pretending that economic growth and spending cuts alone could cure the deficit. It ought to be obvious by now that we can't grow our way out.

With the time left I see the distinguished colleague from Texas, the senior colleague from Texas. I know we will hear a lecture about who is in the wagon. It is the contention of the Senator from South Carolina that it is the Senators and Congressmen in this wagon. We have been in the wagon for 15 years, spending \$270 billion for nothing, having a wonderful time, and now

with this so-called balanced budget amendment we will get from a wagon into a limousine to ride around the countryside and tell them how we bit the bullet and something will happen two Presidential elections from now.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I yield the senior Senator from Texas 2 minutes.

Mr. GRAMM. Let me say to my dear colleague from South Carolina that I do not want to talk about who is in the White House. I want to change who is in the White House. Today I want to talk about drought.

#### THE DROUGHT

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, we have 45 million bushels of feed grain in emergency reserve in the United States. We pay \$10 million a year in rent to store that feed grain. We have a major drought in many parts of the country. Obviously, much of it is centered in my part of the country. I thought last night we had worked out an agreement whereby we could pass a resolution calling on the Secretary of Agriculture to release this emergency feed grain to let it flow into the market and flow to people who are being forced to liquidate their livestock herds because they cannot obtain food.

It is my understanding that we have now worked that out. I think it is very important this resolution pass tonight. This is not going to make it rain in Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas. It is not a solution for the kind of divine intervention that we need in eliminating the drought, but it is a small step in the right direction. I hope this resolution tonight will pass. I was disappointed the Democratic leader objected to it yesterday. We could have sent good news out last night. I hope we can do that tonight.

In addition, Senator HUTCHISON and I hope, tonight, to pass a resolution on haying on conservation reserve land. If you will remember, the President wisely, in an action that I applauded, allowed people to put livestock on conservation reserve land. We want to let them hay it in drought areas. I think that is also a step in the right direction.

I thank the distinguished Senator for yielding.

#### BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The Senate continued with consideration of the resolution.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the amount of time the Senator from Texas used not count against the total remaining time Republicans have on the balanced budget debate.

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

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, for a good number of hours today the Senate has been involved in what is an important debate, the issue of a balanced budget amendment to our Constitution.