

been getting. And what we have been getting is nothing—gridlock, confrontation, yelling at each other, people getting red in the face, and nothing getting done.

I think the American people are fed up with that kind of politics, fed up with that kind of Government. I am fed up with it. It is time to change. We ought to do it now—before it is too late.

I yield the floor.

Mr. THOMAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair advise the Senator that he may proceed as in morning business.

#### BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the Chair. I will only take 5 minutes. I wanted to do a couple of things. I want to thank the Senator from Georgia for bringing some discussion today as a follow-up to this vote on the balanced budget amendment. I am very disappointed that that balanced budget amendment to the Constitution did not pass. I think there are obviously reasons that it should have passed. Obviously, it was very close to passage. The reasons, of course, have to do with responsibility, with morality of Government, with fiscal responsibility.

Everyone accepts the idea that we should not be continuously spending more than we take in. It has to do with the historic performance of the Federal Government for 25 years, or more, since we have balanced the budget last. Everybody gets up, and the first thing they say is, "Yes, I am for balancing the budget"—the same people who have been here for 25 years and have never balanced the budget. They say, "We do not need an amendment; we will just do it." Well, we have not just done it.

So I am very disappointed in that. I suspect that we will have some more opportunities to do that.

I come from a State where the constitution provides for a balanced budget. Frankly, it works very well. It is a discipline, and the government works within that discipline. It is one of the elements of good government—one of the elements that says, "All right. We want a program. Here is what it will cost. Are you willing to pay for it?" If you are not, if we are not, if I am not, then we should not do it. That is what this fiscal responsibility is all about.

I think the best instance of that, of course, is a property tax where we live. The school district says, "We need a new science building. Here is what it will cost." Is it worth it? You vote. Are you willing to pay for it, or are not you?

I want to talk about a change that needs to take place in the budget process. Last year we took the whole year and deferred getting the budget finished. Now we are in a year of budget-

ing, and we are spending such a large amount of our time on the budget. Congress has more responsibilities than simply the budget. Indeed, the budget is very important. The budget is sort of an outline of what we are going to do. But the Congress also has, and the Senate also has, many other responsibilities, such as oversight, such as seeing if bills that have been passed and are up for renewal have, indeed, been effective, whether they need to be changed, whether they need to be renewed. This is a big job, and we are supposed to be doing that. But instead, we are going back and forth spending the whole year practically every year on the budget.

I have a bill that has bipartisan support that asks for reform in budgeting and doing a biennial budget. I think there is a great deal of merit in a biennial budget. No. 1, it is better for the Government. It is better for the agencies. They at least have 2 years of planning for what they can do in their expenditures; 2 years in which they can plan how to manage their dollars. It is much better for the Congress. It is done in most legislative bodies—biennial budgeting. It has been supported by both sides of the aisle.

The resolution that we introduced this year is supported by Senator DOMENICI, who is head of the Budget Committee, and we think we can make this reform next year. I think, as we spend all of this time on budgeting, we spend the whole year practically on budgeting rather than some of the other things that we ought to be doing in addition to budgeting, it makes it more clear that there needs to be some reform. We need to have a biennial budget.

So, Mr. President, obviously, we are not going to get to that this year. There are relatively few working days left. That will not be one of the issues. I am not naive to think that. But I do say to you that I do not think there is anything more important in terms of restructuring our process than to take a look at biennial budgeting. I intend to bring it up again next year. I have been promised support by those who are much more knowledgeable than I about budgeting.

I recognize that there is always resistance from the appropriators. I was on the Appropriations Committee when I was in the legislature. Appropriators have a great deal of influence over all kinds of things because they control spending, and everybody is interested in how spending is done and how it affects their State. So appropriators are reluctant, of course, to lose the authority that they have every year by going through this process. I am sorry for that, but I think they to do a better job if they do it on a biennial basis.

Mr. President, I appreciate the time. I hope we will continue to talk a little bit about how we might change some of the processes in this Congress; that we talk about results rather than procedure; that, instead of saying we have been doing it for 200 years, maybe so,

but we ought to see what the results have been for having done that for 200 years. There are some things that should not be changed. There are some fundamentals that should not be changed. But there are some processes that are not producing the results that we want, and one of them is budgeting. The result is a \$5 trillion debt, the interest on which is the largest single line item in the budget.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to proceed under the 1 hour that has been reserved by the minority leader.

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

#### REPUBLICAN GRANDCHILDREN

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I have listened this morning to some of the discussion on the floor of the Senate. I felt I needed to come over and speak, at least for historical records, speak to the Republican grandchildren a bit, because the Republican grandchildren have been spoken to on the floor of the Senate about a range of issues. They have been described on the floor of the Senate as victims of legislative problems created this week by a vote on the constitutional amendment to balance the budget.

All grandchildren are affected by what happens in these Chambers, in the Chambers of the U.S. House and the U.S. Senate. Grandchildren will ask the tough questions in the years ahead about the country in which they live, the country in which they are growing up. They might ask some questions about what has made this a wonderful place. There are some who simply cannot concede this is a worthy place to live. They talk about how awful America is. America has gone to hell in a handbasket, they say. America has gone to the dogs.

It is interesting, we have people talking about building fences to keep people out of America because we have so many people who want to come here. This country is a remarkable place, with enormous challenges, to be sure. We have faced challenges before. We faced a Civil War and survived it and came back together. We faced the threat of Adolph Hitler. We faced the threat of a depression. We have survived all of those threats and all of those challenges. Do we have challenges now? Of course; enormous challenges, substantial challenges. But is this a remarkable, wonderful country that the rest of the world looks up to, the rest of the world wants to come to? Of course it is.

At the turn of the century, if you were living in America, you expected to live 48 years. That was the lifespan. Now, at the end of the century, you are expected, as an American, to live approximately 78 years. What accounts for that? A number of things. I have spoken previously about some of them, but let me just describe a few again, at the risk of being repetitious. Our grandchildren and the Republican grandchildren will read the history of these, of course.

The history is well documented of one thing that makes this a better country in which to live, one of the reasons we are living longer. Upton Sinclair did the research at the turn of the century and wrote a book about it. He did the research in the meatpacking plants in our country, in Chicago, and discovered in the meatpacking plants they had problems with rats. How did they deal with the problems of rats in meatpacking plants? Well they took loaves of bread and would lace the slices of bread with arsenic and poison, and lay them around the meatpacking plants and the rats would eat the bread and the rats would die and the dead rats and meat would all go down the same chute and come out the other end as something called mystery sausage and be sold in the supermarkets. Upton Sinclair wrote his book about what he found in the meatpacking plants and, guess what, the American people said, we want to be assured we are eating safe products. And guess what, the American Congress said we are going to make sure when meat is processed in this country it will be inspected. We are going to make sure we are not pushing meat and dead rats down the same chute and pushing it out of the plant and selling it to the American people.

A step forward? Sure. Government intervention? You bet, at the turn of the century, saying this country deserves to have a safe supply of food.

That is one thing that has made this a little better place. There are thousands of others. We constructed, some long while ago in this country, something called the National Institutes of Health and also created something called Medicare. The combination of funding in Medicare and the funding of research in the National Institutes of Health and the genius of some health care professionals around this country have created breathtaking technology that saves people's lives.

It allows people to live longer. People who get old and have trouble with their knees now get new knees. When they have trouble with their hips, they get new hips. When they have trouble seeing, cataract surgery. When their heart blood vessels get plugged up, they get open heart surgery. So we live longer and it costs more. But it comes about because of these breathtaking changes in health care, most of which came as a result of investment by, yes, this Senate, this Congress, the American people, saying we want to make life better for people in this country.

I could go through a litany of things that have changed to make things better, but I will not go through the whole list. I want to say, as you fast-forward to a point in time at which we face these enormous challenges, but at a time in which Americans are living to an average age of about 78 years, a time in which, after 20 years, when we have doubled our use of energy in the last 20 years we have cleaner air and cleaner water—why? Why would we have cleaner air and cleaner water when we have doubled our use of energy in the last 20 years? Because the Congress said to polluters: "You are not going to be able to pollute anymore. You're going to pay a penalty if you pollute. We demand on behalf of our kids and grandkids that we have clean air and clean water in our country."

Is it perfect? No, but would anyone 21 years ago have predicted if we doubled our use of energy we would have cleaner air and cleaner water? No one would have predicted that. It has happened. Why? Because the Congress said to those who were polluting America's air and water, "You can't do it anymore."

Interference? Regulation? Yes. Are some people angry about it? Yes. Some of the largest polluters in our country are angry about it. In fact, they have office space over in the House of Representatives.

The majority party in the House said to those folks, "You all come in here and help us write new regulations that allow you to pollute. Let's retract what we have done on clean air and water regulations. We want to give you more freedom to pollute."

It is called Project Relief by the majority party. Thank God for the U.S. Senate that it has not gotten its way through this Congress, because some of us here value clean air and clean water.

I said I wanted to, for historical purposes, speak as well to Republican grandchildren, because we heard this morning about the burdens of Republican grandchildren.

Some grandchild is going to be asking grandpa some day on that side of the aisle: "Grandpa, I read in the books that the Social Security system was actually collecting enough money for Social Security; in fact, collecting more money than was needed in the late 1990's and the early 2000's, and yet, why isn't there money available for Social Security now when I reach retirement age?"

And that Republican grandpa or grandma, if he or she served in the Senate, would probably have to say: "Well, Grandson, that's because we decided that we would take that money that we promised we would save for Social Security and we would use it over here for something else. We wanted to say we balanced the budget, and we also wanted to build a star wars project and we wanted to provide tax breaks and we wanted to give fairly significant tax cuts, half of which would go to people whose incomes are over \$100,000 a year,

and we couldn't do all that unless we took the Social Security money and used it over here as operating budget revenues so we could claim we balanced the budget. So, Grandson, in short, those were our priorities."

Maybe they would say, "Grandad, what happened to the jobs? I went to school, I got my college degree and, Grandad, I don't understand, there's not a good job here."

Maybe the grandad would say: "Well, you know what happened to us is we felt we needed to help big business when we were in Congress. So what we decided to do is provide a big, juicy tax break to businesses who would move their jobs from the United States overseas."

And they are going to say: "Grandad, that doesn't make any sense, why would you do that? Why would you encourage people to move jobs out of the country? You knew I was in your family, you knew I was going to go through the school system, you knew I was going to need a job some day. Why would you encourage corporations to move American jobs overseas?"

"Well, that's just our philosophy," they would say, "because we think the big, big corporations are what make the world tick. It is our trickle-down/supply-side notion: If you make the big bigger and the rich richer, somehow everybody else would be better off. So we gave tax breaks to companies who would move jobs overseas."

I have a hunch some of these grandkids who were discussed earlier this morning on the other side of the aisle are going to be enormously puzzled.

They might look at the RECORD here—because we were told that the majority party had offered a balanced budget and were upset the President vetoed it—they might look at the RECORD and they would say: "But, dad, I don't understand. I looked at the RECORD, and you know what you all did? What you all did was you took a little program called the Star Schools Program, which was designed to target investments in math and sciences and certain star schools to enhance America's education system, and you slashed that at the same time that you said you needed to increase, by over 100 percent, a star wars program. Why was star wars more important than star schools?"

So the father is going to explain to the son or daughter that choice.

"But, grandpa, what about the Head Start Program? Didn't all the evidence suggest the Head Start Program really did work where you make available to a 3- or 4-year-old child who comes from a low-income, disadvantaged family the opportunity to go into a Head Start Program? Didn't all the evidence show that that investment in that 3- and 4-year-old produced enormous rewards, enormous returns?"

"Yes; yes, they did."

"Well, then, why did you tell 60,000 children that they were no longer

going to be eligible for Head Start? If that was a good program, why did you tell 60,000 kids that they don't matter, that star wars was more important, or a tax break to a company that was going to move their jobs overseas was more important?"

Or maybe they will read the RECORD and they will say, "Well, grandma, I was reading about that budget debate you all had, and the one thing I don't understand is with all the problems you had with kids and youth crime, you cut 600,000 summer jobs for disadvantaged youth. Why would you do that? Why would you believe that summer work for disadvantaged youth somehow was not in this country's interest?"

And they are going to have to explain that, I guess.

But mostly they are going to have to explain, it seems to me, the contradiction between their assertion that their demand that they change the Constitution now in a way that misuses Social Security funds followed by an agenda that immediately brings to the floor a program that will cost up to \$60 billion more to create a star wars program, immediately bring to the floor a proposal that will cut gas taxes some \$30-some billion in 7 years, a proposal that will substantially cut taxes somewhere in the \$180 to \$200 billion range, much of which will go to upper income people, they are going to have to answer as to how that adds up. How does all that add up so that those children can understand that this was a menu that made sense, and, of course, it is going to be hard for any child to understand that because this does not make sense.

I want to reinforce this, not with my words, but I would like to reinforce it by quoting some others.

David Gergen, who worked for Ronald Reagan, George Bush, and Bill Clinton, writes the following, speaking of the Republican majority:

In their eagerness to satisfy one principle, fiscal responsibility, the Republicans would ask the country to abandon another, equally vital principle—fair play. This is a false, cruel choice we should not make.

When Bill Clinton achieved large deficit reductions—

And they have been reduced substantially—

we pursued the idea of shared sacrifice. Not this time. Instead, Congress now seems intent on imposing new burdens on the poor, the elderly and vulnerable children, while, incredibly, delivering a windfall for the wealthy.

Proposals passed by the House and Senate would rip gaping holes in the Nation's safety net, already low by the standards of advanced nations and once considered sacrosanct.

This from a fellow who has worked for both Republican and Democratic Presidents.

Another quote from David Gergen:

U.S. News reported last week the lowest 20 percent of the population would lose more income under these spending cuts than the rest of the population combined. At the other end, the highest 20 percent would gain

more from the tax cuts than everyone else combined.

No one disputes the basic contention that the burdens of benefits are lopsided. In a nation divided dangerously into haves and have-nots, this is neither wise nor justified.

Let me describe what he is saying, because I think it is important. Consider this room is the United States and then say, "All right, the 20 percent of you with the lowest incomes, you move your chairs over here," so we have the 20 percent with the lowest incomes sitting on this side of the room.

"Now we have a deal for you. You're going to have 80 percent of the burden of all the spending cuts. You 20 percent with the highest incomes, you all move your chairs to this side of the room, and we have something that is going to make you smile, because you are going to get 80 percent of our tax cuts."

That is the problem with this agenda.

Let me quote extensively from someone who has not worked with both Democrats and Republicans. This is a Republican, Kevin Phillips, a Republican political analyst, who has written extensively on economic issues, written a couple wonderful books.

He speaks of this agenda:

Remember, at the same time as the Republicans proposed to reduce Medicare spending by \$270 billion over 7 years, they want to cut taxes for corporations, investors, and affluent families by \$245 billion over the same period. This is no coincidence.

Kevin Phillips, a Republican political analyst.

Kevin Phillips:

Today's Republicans see federal Medicare outlays to old people as a treasure chest of gold for partial redirection in their favorite directions; towards tax cuts for deserving corporations, families, and individuals.

Again, Kevin Phillips, a Republican analyst:

Further, [Kevin Phillips says] the revolutionary ideology driving the new Republican Medicare proposal is also simple. Cut middle-class programs as much as possible and give the money back to private-sector businesses, finance and high-income taxpayers.

Not a Democrat speaking; Kevin Phillips, a Republican analyst.

Again, Kevin Phillips:

If the budget deficit were really a national crisis instead of a pretext for fiscal favoritism and finagling, we'd be talking about shared sacrifice with business, Wall Street and the rich, the people who have the biggest money making the biggest sacrifice. Instead, it's the senior citizens, the poor, the students and ordinary Americans who'll see programs they depend on gutted, while business, finance and the richest one or two percent, far from making sacrifices, actually get new benefits and tax reductions.

Again Republican political analyst Kevin Phillips:

If the U.S. budget deficit problem does represent the fiscal equivalent of war—maybe it does—then what we are really looking at is one of the most flagrant examples of war profiteering this century has seen.

I know these are controversial and very strong, assertive statements—not from a Democrat—from a Republican political analyst about the Republican agenda.

Kevin Phillips again:

Spending on Government programs, from Medicare and education to home heating oil assistance, is to be reduced in ways that principally burden the poor and middle class, while simultaneously taxes are to be cut in ways that predominantly benefit the top one or two percent of the Americans.

Finally—Kevin Phillips—this is the last quote I will use from him. But as you can see, this Republican analyst has had a very harsh view of the Republican agenda.

In short [he says] aid to dependent grandmothers, children, college students and city dwellers is to be slashed, while aid to dependent corporations, stock brokers and general and assorted James Bond imitators survives or even grows.

Then William Kristol, who is the contemporary philosopher behind the Republican agenda these days, at least the principal spokesperson on television.

Someone needs to stand up [he says] and defend the establishment: In the last couple weeks, there's been too much pseudopopulism, almost too much concern and attention for the, quote, the people—that is, the people's will, their prejudices, their foolish opinions. In a certain sense, we're all paying the price for that now. . . . After all, we conservatives are on the side of the lords and barons.

William Kristol.

I would not even bother to come to the floor today except I sat and watched almost 2 hours of the other side saying, "Gee, our agenda's right for America. We have the right menu. We're doing the right thing. It's a bunch of other slothful people around here who can't get their acts straight. It's people who have changed their mind, people who won't stand and support a balanced budget."

I have heard almost more of that than we care to hear from people who say they want to change the Constitution but whose every action on the floor of the Senate is that they want to spend more money.

I say this to them, those who spoke this morning and others, when you come to the floor of the Senate next week, if it is a defense authorization bill you bring to the floor of the Senate next week—I think it probably will be; we have not yet been informed—if it is, and if you are intending to spend, I believe, between \$11 and \$13 billion—I think \$11 billion more than the Pentagon asked you the spend—would you also come to the floor of the Senate and tell the American people who you want to tax for the extra \$11 billion? Who is going to pay the extra \$11 billion? Why, do you think generals do not know enough about how many trucks they want to buy?

You say, we want to buy more trucks than the generals ask for, buy more ships than the generals ask for, more airplanes than the generals need. Last year you did the same thing. You said the Defense Department did not know enough. We insist on buying more submarines, trucks, ships, and planes than the Pentagon wants, needs or asks for.

I just encourage this: If you say you are for balancing the budget, the place to balance the budget is in individual spending decisions here on the floor of the Senate, not in the Constitution. If in the next piece of legislation that comes to the floor of the Senate, you have decided that the Pentagon needs to spend more money than they have asked to spend, tell us who is going to pay for that. How much are you going to increase the debt to accommodate that?

Then when the next bill comes following that, which you say is not star wars, but which in fact is a new \$60 billion program—the Congressional Budget Office says \$30 to \$60 billion—you show me a program that comes in at the low end, I will show you every program that comes out in the high end. When you bring the next one on the floor to spend \$60 billion on a new star wars program, you tell us, again, how much you favor a balanced budget and you tell us who you intend to have pay for that. Or do you intend to charge that?

I do not have today the charts that show the budgets that were submitted by President Reagan and President Bush in 12 years. But I will bring that to the floor at some point because the implication of the debate on the floor of the Senate is that somehow it is the Democrats that want to spend money. No one has asked for more deficits, no one has requested higher deficits in the history of this country than the combination of Ronald Reagan and George Bush in the budgets they have asked for Congress to pass. No one.

I am not talking about accidents. I am talking about deliberate requests, asking Congress for budgets that create deficits that have been the highest in the history of this country. I will bring those to the floor and demonstrate that. So it is not a case where one party is all right and one party is all wrong. The only reason I stand to respond to 2 hours of constant finger pointing is that people need to understand that what the Republicans have complained about this morning is they have not been able to get their agenda through the Congress because this President has vetoed an agenda that their own Republican colleagues and their own Republican authorities have said is a terrible agenda. It is, take from the have-nots and give to the haves. Some of us are unwilling to go along with that. I know that that forces some of you to complain.

So I come to the floor to say it is not the way you suggested. It is not a case where you can point fingers across the aisle and say, "They're at fault. They're responsible." We have plenty of blame on our side of the aisle. Democrats have plenty of blame to spread around on our side of the aisle.

Let me take some credit for being part of a party that says, we want to build a Medicare program in this country, and we did it. No thanks to some people who are still bragging they

voted against it. Medicare has made this a better country and a better life for a lot of people in this country. I am proud to be a part of a party with a legacy that is a wonderful legacy that has made life better in this country.

But we also have some responsibility. We have created too many programs. I do not disagree with that. We have been concerned about solving problems. Sometimes we create a program that we think will solve a problem, and it does not work. We have not, in my judgment, been aggressive enough in getting rid of those programs.

But I do not believe the record will show that those this morning, who spend 2 hours pointing fingers, are going to come to the floor of the Senate in the next couple weeks with a menu of proposals that really balances the budget, especially without misusing the Social Security trust funds. They are going to come instead to the floor of the Senate with proposals to increase Federal spending, increase Federal spending on a star wars program and increase Federal spending on defense programs. They will make a case where it is necessary. I will not discredit them for doing it. They have every right to do that. I will not question their motives. I will not discredit them. We disagree on the agenda. I will not discredit them.

If you are going to propose new spending programs, you have a responsibility to tell us who will pay for it. The majority leader was asked at a press conference in the last week, when they propose this so-called star wars program, how much will it cost and who will pay for it? The answer was, "We will leave that to the experts." That is the kind of answer that has given us the debt that we have and the deficit that we have in this country.

I want to make one additional point, and then I know my colleague from Kentucky wishes to say a few words.

We have \$21 trillion in debt in this country. I heard one person today say, "I started a business and I had to balance my budget." I bet—and I do not know anything about that person's business—I bet \$1,000 that person started that business with debt, had debt financing. How many people in here paid cash for their house? How many people bought a car with cash?

Mr. President, \$21 trillion in debt in this country, almost \$5 trillion in corporate business debt, \$4.3 trillion in household debt, including home mortgages, a little over \$5 trillion in Federal debt. Is the Federal debt too high? You are darn right—far too high. Do we need to do something? You bet. This is a very serious problem. But what you do to solve the deficit problem is what we started doing in 1993 and we did not get one vote for it on the other side of the aisle. We cut spending in a real way, and we increased taxes.

I understand, some people would not increase a tax under any condition, even if their kid did not get education. They say, "I am against taxes." I am

perfectly willing and was willing in 1993 to vote for a piece of legislation that substantially cut the Federal deficit. Yes, it increased the 4.3-cent gas tax. I did not like that. I would have preferred we not do that. I am glad I voted for it because it reduced the deficit substantially.

That deficit has been coming down, way down, and I am glad we did what we did. We did not even get one vote on the other side of the aisle by those who try to reach 10 feet in height and crow about how much they want to reduce the deficit. They care so much they want to enshrine in the Constitution of the United States a practice taking trust funds from the Social Security trust fund and use them over here to balance the budget.

Let me finish with this point. I heard this morning, again, that they have passed a balanced budget and sent it to the President. I would like one Member of the majority party to explain this chart to me—just one, just once. One Member explain it just once.

This is the chart that you say is a balanced budget. Mr. President, \$108 billion in deficits in the year 2002. Either you balanced the budget or you did not. If you did not, why do you call it a balanced budget? If you did, why is \$108 billion here?

Now, I see our friend from Wyoming has entered the Chamber, and we will probably have a discussion about Social Security, which I am delighted to have because we have not had an opportunity previously to have any substantial time on the floor to address the issue. I hope maybe we will today because I have a fair amount of time and a fair amount of interest. I say at the start that I do not discredit his motives at all, but we have a deep disagreement about a vote I cast, to say to people you pay higher payroll taxes, you pay higher payroll taxes, and those payroll taxes will be dedicated to paying for Social Security. The fact is, you will enshrine in the Constitution a requirement they be used in the operating budget.

I know the Senator from Kentucky wants to say a few words first, and I would like to let him speak. I do not have any place to go. I am happy to have a discussion with the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DORGAN. Briefly, but I would like to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. INHOFE. One quick question. Earlier today I quoted you. Did I inaccurately quote you in any way?

Mr. DORGAN. I would not have any idea what you said. I did not hear you.

Mr. INHOFE. It was a statement made. Put it this way: Is it not true in 1994 you voted for and supported and totally supported the balanced budget amendment that was then before this body? Is that not the same exact balanced budget amendment you voted against yesterday?

Mr. DORGAN. I am pleased the Senator has asked the question. The circumstances are quite interesting about this. I think the Senator from Kentucky will probably respond to it.

In 1993, we had a balanced budget amendment on the floor of the Senate. I raised the same question there that I raised 10 years previously, in 1983, in the Ways and Means Committee, about using the Social Security trust fund. If you will go back and read the dialog, you will read that the Senator from Illinois and others with whom we had a substantial discussion about this, said, "No, no, we do not intend after we pass this amendment to use Social Security trust funds to show a balanced budget. In fact, we intend to do something statutorily to prevent that."

Two years later, instead of a promise by the promoters of the constitutional amendment that they would not use the Social Security trust fund, there was a guarantee by a vote of the Senate that they would use the Social Security trust fund.

So you ask, is it the same vote? No. One was a promise they would not use them, and the second was a guarantee by a vote of the Senate that they would.

No, it is not the same vote, not the same circumstances. The difference might seem small to some, but when you come from a town of 300 people, \$700 billion is a mountain of money.

I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. FORD. How much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has 27 minutes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I yield myself 7 minutes.

#### BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT VOTE

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I am glad the junior Senator from Oklahoma is on the floor. I regret, once again, the junior Senator from Oklahoma has resorted to a personal attack and distortion of my record on the balanced budget amendment.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FORD. Senator, I did not come over here and bother you. I will be glad—

Mr. INHOFE. You suggested I impugned your integrity.

Mr. FORD. You certainly have, and I will explain it.

Mr. President, I do not yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky does not yield.

Mr. FORD. Just a little while ago, the junior Senator from Oklahoma quoted from a floor statement I made on March 1, 1994. He represented, by holding up two copies of the legislation—you do not understand that or see that in black and white, but you watch it on television—that I was speaking in favor of an identical version of the balanced budget amendment which was defeated yesterday.

Mr. President, I want to give you and the Chamber a page number. I see the staff. They can go back and go through it. It was page S2058 of the March 1, 1994, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I wish the Senator from Oklahoma would have actually read my full statement. He would have found out that I was not speaking about the underlying constitutional amendment from which he quoted me, but rather about something called the Reid-Ford-Feinstein amendment.

Guess what that amendment did? It created a firewall so that the Social Security trust fund could not be counted to balance the budget. That was my position. It was the Reid-Ford-Feinstein amendment.

The junior Senator has misrepresented my record by quoting from that statement in support of an amendment in the form of a substitute and acting as if I was speaking about a constitutional amendment which does not protect Social Security.

On March 7, 1994—

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield? The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. FORD. I guess it is all right.

Mr. INHOFE. I ask the distinguished and honorable Senator from Kentucky if he did, in fact, vote for Senate Joint Resolution 41 in 1994?

Mr. FORD. You have my record there. Tell the public.

Mr. INHOFE. Yes, you did. It is identically the same. You voted—

Mr. FORD. And it is the same question you asked the Senator from North Dakota. The reason we did, they were excluding Social Security. We had a firm commitment they were excluding Social Security.

Now we have a guarantee that you are going to use Social Security.

Mr. INHOFE. It is an identical resolution.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, if he is going to talk, I want it on his time, not on mine.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me respond. The Senator is under a misimpression, I am sure. He does not understand this. You are asking if this is identical, and the answer is, no, it is not identical. I believe it is not identical. Let me ask you this. As an example, does the latest resolution referred to include the Nunn amendment, and if it does—

Mr. INHOFE. I have the two resolutions right here. They are exactly the same. I ask the Senator to show me or read to me where they are different.

Mr. DORGAN. I believe the Senator is absolutely wrong, demonstrably wrong. As an example, does the Senator recall that Senator NUNN required an addition to the amendment to be made, during the latest go-around, before he would vote for it and that there was an addition made by Senator NUNN? Do you recall that?

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two resolutions that we voted on—Senate Joint

Resolution 41, in 1994, and House Joint Resolution 1, in 1996—be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

S.J. RES. 41  
(103d Congress)

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, (two-thirds of each House concurring therein),* That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years after the date of its submission to the States for ratification:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Total outlays for any fiscal year shall not exceed total receipts for that fiscal year, unless three-fifths of the whole number of each House of Congress shall provide by law for a specific excess of outlays over receipts by a rollcall vote.

"SECTION 2. The limit on the debt of the United States held by the public shall not be increased, unless three-fifths of the whole number of each House shall provide by law for such an increase by a rollcall vote.

"SECTION 3. Prior to each fiscal year, the President shall transmit to the Congress a proposed budget for the United States Government for that fiscal year, in which total outlays do not exceed total receipts.

"SECTION 4. No bill to increase revenue shall become law unless approved by a majority of the whole number of each House by a rollcall vote.

"SECTION 5. The Congress may waive the provisions of this article for any fiscal year in which a declaration of war is in effect. The provisions of this article may be waived for any fiscal year in which the United States is engaged in military conflict which causes an imminent and serious military threat to national security and is so declared by a joint resolution, adopted by a majority of the whole number of each House, which becomes law.

"SECTION 6. The Congress shall enforce and implement this article by appropriate legislation, which may rely on estimates of outlays and receipts.

"SECTION 7. Total receipts shall include all receipts of the United States Government except those derived from borrowing. Total outlays shall include all outlays of the United States Government except for those for repayment of debt principal.

"SECTION 8. This article shall take effect beginning with fiscal year 1999 or with the second fiscal year beginning after its ratification, whichever is later."

H.J. RES. 1  
(104th Congress)

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein),* That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years after the date of its submission to the States for ratification:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Total outlays for any fiscal year shall not exceed total receipts for that fiscal year, unless three-fifths of the whole number of each House of Congress shall provide by law for a specific excess of outlays over receipts by a rollcall vote.