

year. It allows them to maintain their family needs for basic essentials, for sustenance.

The Republican budget is much different. It is punitive to working families and senior citizens. In reality, this budget resolution ought to be entitled "Extremist Budget, Part II." The huge Medicare cuts in this budget, combined with the proposed structural changes will truly make Medicare wither on the vine. If the Republican budget is enacted, Medicare will become a second-class health care system. The Republican budget also eliminates the guarantees of Medicaid coverage for seniors, disabled, children, and pregnant women.

This budget contains a Republican assault on education. Over 7 years this budget cuts \$60 billion in education and training, compared to the President's budget. This budget continues the Republican tragedy of the environment. The budget will cut environmental programs by 19 percent in the year 2002 and it will slow down toxic waste cleanups.

Finally, this budget continues the Republican war on working families. At the same time the GOP leadership is opposing an increase in the minimum wage, they are proposing to increase taxes on working families who earn under \$28,000 a year—harsh and unfair. That is why this budget resolution ought to be called the extremist budget part II.

Last year, the President vetoed the Republican budget because it contained huge cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment. This budget does very much the same, and President Clinton will veto this budget as well.

So as soon as our Republican friends show that they can put forth a balanced budget like the President's, one that protects our priorities, we will have a balanced budget—but not until then.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

(By unanimous consent, the remarks of Mr. SPECTER are printed at an earlier point in today's RECORD.)

TRIBUTE TO PAUL F. EATON, SR.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Madam President, if I may ask the Senate's indulgence. On the 16th of this month, my friend and sometime counselor, Paul F. Eaton, Sr., of Walton, NY, will celebrate his 87th birthday. This is, of course, a happy occasion for Paul, his family and many friends, in our upstate Delaware County.

Both Paul Eaton and I came to reside in the foothills of the Catskills as adults. Paul came to practice law in the early 1930's. And Liz and I bought our farm in the early 1960's. And we have all stayed. The beauty of the place and the welcoming nature of its people have kept us there.

Paul made Walton his home; he was elected village police justice and later mayor; served in the Office of Price Administration during World War II; has spent over a half century as trustee of St. John the Baptist Church; married Frances Kellogg, raised a family; remained a loyal Democrat; played golf; and practiced law.

And if I may say, Madam President, he has practiced law, and continues to practice law, in a manner that brings nothing but honor to that profession. Paul Eaton is a general practitioner. He draws wills, handles real estate closings, tries cases, and counsels his clients. His reputation as a skillful lawyer is matched only by his reputation for honesty and integrity. He is still at it. For while we will celebrate his birthday on the 16th, he will be in his law office on the 17th. This is as it should be. We wish him well. Happy birthday Paul. Madam. President, I yield the floor.

DEBATE ON BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

Mr. FORD. Madam President, on Friday the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] and I had an exchange about the inaccuracy of certain statements made by the Senator from Oklahoma regarding the debate over the balanced budget amendment. During that exchange, the Senator from Oklahoma inserted into the RECORD copies of the original versions of Senate Joint Resolution 41 from the 103d Congress, and House Joint Resolution 1 from the 104th Congress. The Senator from Oklahoma represented that these were the two resolutions that we voted on—Senate Joint Resolution 41, in 1994, and House Joint Resolution 1, in 1996.

The distinguished Senator from North Dakota indicated that the two resolutions we voted on were not identical, since language known as the Nunn amendment was added to House Joint Resolution 1 regarding judicial review, and that this was new language from the resolution voted upon in 1994. The Senator from North Dakota asked unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the language which was actually voted on by the Senate. After the Senator from Oklahoma twice reserved the right to object, the Senator from North Dakota withdrew his request.

I have since had time to review the RECORD, and found that Both resolutions inserted into the RECORD by the Senator from Oklahoma were incorrect. In other words, neither of the resolutions which he put into the RECORD were actually voted upon by the Senate. The Senator from Oklahoma put

into the RECORD the balanced budget amendment proposals as introduced, in order to claim the Senate voted on identical proposals. However, both resolutions were subsequently amended in different ways. The 1994 resolution was modified to limit judicial remedies to declaratory judgments and other remedies authorized by Congress. This modification was dropped altogether in House Joint Resolution 1, as introduced in 1995. However, this resolution was then also amended by the Senate through the Nunn amendment, which prohibited judicial review entirely.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions which were actually voted upon by the Senate in 1994 and 1996—neither of which were inserted into the RECORD by the Senator from Oklahoma—be inserted 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—FINAL VERSION ON WHICH SENATE VOTED

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. The power of any court to order relief pursuant to any case or controversy arising under this Article shall not extend to ordering any remedies other than a declaratory judgment or such remedies as are specifically authorized in implementing legislation pursuant to this section.

"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 2001 or with the second fiscal year beginning after its ratification, whichever is later."

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1, 104TH CONGRESS—
FINAL VERSION ON WHICH SENATE VOTED
BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE
CONSTITUTION AS AMENDED BY SENATOR NUNN
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 phone 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. The judicial power of the United States shall not extend to any case of controversy arising under this Article except as may be specifically authorized by legislation adopted pursuant to this section.

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 2002 or with the second fiscal year beginning after its ratification, whichever is later.

Mr. FORD. Second, Madam President, the Senator from Oklahoma and I had an exchange on the Senate floor because after I heard him quote from my 1994 floor statement, I believe he was quoting my statement in an inaccurate and distorting manner. The Senator from Oklahoma was quoting my statement in support of the Reid-Ford-Feinstein amendment which protected the Social Security trust funds, and making it sound like I was speaking in support of the underlying Simon-Hatch version of the legislation, which does not protect Social Security.

Madam President, after reading Friday's RECORD, I found that the Senator from Oklahoma's quoting of my 1994 statement was even more selective and misleading than I had first realized. I ask unanimous consent that my actual full statement, as reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 1, 1994, and the version quoted by the Senator from Oklahoma be printed in the RECORD.

Those who wish to read these can draw their own conclusions about whether I was quoted accurately.

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

SENATOR WENDELL FORD, ACTUAL FLOOR
STATEMENT, MARCH 1, 1994

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I have but a few minutes to speak this morning on behalf of the Reid-Ford-Feinstein balanced budget amendment. So I will concentrate my remarks this morning on trust.

The public trusts the Congress to keep the Nation's finances in order. Nowhere is that agreement and that trust more evident or more important than in governing the Social Security trust fund.

In the debate over our amendment and the Simon amendment, honesty and protection of the trust fund have played a very big role. Right now, surpluses in the trust funds are being used to hide the true amount of the deficit. The biggest example of this is in Social Security, but it is by no means alone in this distinction.

During the 1980's, we allowed the Federal trust funds to run up huge surpluses. We would collect a gasoline tax to fund highway construction but then not spend it all on highways, thus creating an accounting surplus. The problem is, we did spend money elsewhere creating masked deficit and budgetary illusions.

The Simon amendment will allow us to continue to do this. I have a speech in my folder that I made back in October of 1987 that addressed this very issue. This particular speech dealt with the Aviation trust fund. At the time, it represented a \$6 billion surplus.

Mr. President, I say to my colleagues that that is only peanuts when compared to Social Security. According to OMB, from 1985, when the Social Security System started to run a surplus, to 1993, it singlehandedly covered up \$366 billion in Government red ink. Social Security covered up \$366 billion in Government red ink.

If you think that is bad, wait until we look to the future. From 1994 through the year 2001, the date that Senator Simon's amendment would likely take effect, CBO projects another \$703 billion in budgetary chicanery, for a grand total of \$1.69 trillion worth of deception.

When compared with that, the deficit hidden by the other trust funds are small potatoes—only another \$35 to \$40 billion. Pretty soon though, as we have heard in the past, it adds up to real money. We pat ourselves on the back and claim to cut spending and do what is right for our electorate, all the while our Social Security trust fund is full of IOU's.

Well, I, and those who support our amendment, mean to do something about that. Our amendment respects the pact our Nation made with its people many years ago. It reinforces it, makes it stronger, safer, and more secure. Social Security is exempt from our amendment, thus securing and fortifying its position as a separate trust fund. If you do not believe me, just listen to the Gray Panthers, and they will tell you themselves. I have here three letters to that effect. AARP, the National Alliance for Senior Citizens, and the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, all endorse Social Security's treatment under this amendment.

Other trust funds will be treated honestly as well. They will be considered as a part of the capital budget that invests in infrastructure and development. Building highways and airports pays dividends in the future

through higher productivity and job opportunity and growth. Social Security and these other trust funds did not cause the deficit, and under our amendment they will not be used to hide the deficit either. This is honest budgeting and a workable balanced budget amendment.

Mr. President, time is short and a vote on the Reid-Ford-Feinstein balanced budget amendment is near. Unfortunately, I fear that it is not near passage but defeat. Standing beside that defeat will be a good faith effort of those who are truly concerned about the world that we leave for future generations. Standing beside that defeat will be the last attempt of this Congress to face reality and tackle an ever-crippling debt and deficit problem. Standing beside that defeat will be faith in Government. I support the efforts of my friend and colleague from Illinois to take on this persistent fiscal dishonesty, but his version of the amendment will go down to defeat as well.

The Reid-Ford-Feinstein amendment is the only amendment that could stand the chance of final passage. We all know that. Yet standing by the defeat of yet another balanced budget will be my colleagues from the other side of the aisle. Instead of getting what they could, they will go home proud of taking the supposed moral high ground. If that is what they want, they can have it. What I want and what 70 percent of our Nation's people want is a sound financial future. What they will get is more of the same under the Simon amendment, for standing tall at the end of the day will be disenchantment, dishonesty and fiscal irresponsibility.

I hear so much about "if 40-some-odd Governors can operate a balanced budget, why can't the Federal Government."

Well, I give them an opportunity. I operated under it. It worked. We had a huge surplus when I left the Governor's office. We had an operating account. We had a capital account.

They say operate like you do at home. At home you have income, your salary. That is your operating account. You buy a car within your means. You pay that out of your operating account. You buy a home. You pay that out of your operating account. But your operating account is always balanced. And we have a time period in which to pay it off.

They say, "Oh, we will never implement that legislation." How do you know we will not? I have seen some amazing things come out of this Chamber. I have seen people work and do the right thing.

I think implementation of this amendment will work. I think we can make it work. But on the other hand, if we want an issue, fine. Stay with Senator SIMON and Senator HATCH. Stay with them and then have an issue when you go home.

But do you want a balanced budget amendment? There are enough votes with those who are supporting that amendment that we can get one.

Oh, I hear all this, "The House is going to make us do it." I have never seen us make the House do anything. I have never seen the House make us do anything. So when they pass their balanced budget amendment, what is it going to do? It is going to die between here and there. That is what is going to happen to it. It is going to die between here and there.

"Oh, we will be forced into it." Nope. The House will not do that to us. We will not do it to the House. So if you want a balanced budget amendment operated like Nebraska was operated, like Kentucky was operated, I will guarantee you that we can do the right thing.

That is what it is all about here today, to do the right thing. We have an operating budget. We are going to pay this in 10 years.

The slice is in here. We have IOU's in the Social Security. We are going to buy it. It is in operating. We buy it, pay it off. So Social Security is sound. I do not understand why it takes a brain surgeon to understand how you operate a budget the way the States do.

And so, Mr. President, I would hope that we would reconsider between now and 3 o'clock this afternoon that this is an opportunity to pass a balanced budget amendment that will work and will give us a financially sound future, not only for ourselves but for our children and our grandchildren.

I hear my distinguished friend say he is going to do it for his unborn grandchildren. I have five. The Senator is no "Lone Ranger". I am just as worried about my grandchildren as he is. And I think I have a pretty good idea I have had to work under it. I had to operate it. I understand how it works. There are few in this Chamber who do. You will find that most of those will vote for this amendment because it works.

Do it like the Governors do; pass the Reid amendment. Do it like you do at home and operate your own budget; pass the Reid amendment. It is just that simple, Mr. President.

I do not know how much time I have remaining, but I will reserve it.

SENATOR INHOFE: QUOTATION OF MARCH 1, 1994
STATEMENT OF SENATOR FORD, JUNE 7, 1996

So when the Senator from Kentucky came in—I had not quoted him, but I will now. He said this back on March 1, 1994. He said, "I support the efforts of my friend and colleague from Illinois"—talking about Senator SIMON, who is a very courageous guy, and one I complimented probably more than I have ever complimented anyone else on the floor yesterday. Senator FORD said, "I support the efforts of my friend and colleague from Illinois to take on this persistent fiscal dishonesty. I hear so much about if 40-some-odd Governors can operate a balanced budget, why can't the Federal Government? I operated under it"—this is Senator FORD, who was a Governor of Kentucky—"and it worked. I think implementation of this amendment will work. I think we can make it work. I do not understand why it takes a brain surgeon to understand how you operate a budget the way the States do. This is an opportunity to pass a balanced budget amendment that will work and will give us a financially sound future, not only for ourselves but for our children and our grandchildren."

Mr. FORD. Lastly, Madam President, let me just note that every provision of the Constitution is subject to interpretation. I am sure that the Senator from Oklahoma does not agree with every Supreme Court decision interpreting the words of the Constitution—even though it may involve different interpretations of the same language.

In 1994, the distinguished Senator from Illinois, Senator SIMON, gave specific assurances that he would work in support of, and even cosponsor, implementing legislation to require Congress to balance the budget without counting the annual Social Security surplus. He even submitted a memorandum from the Congressional Research Service with the opinion that it would be legal and appropriate for Congress to pass such legislation. This memorandum is reprinted in the March 1, 1994, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD along with the debate

By contrast, in 1995 we saw proposals from leading proponents of the bal-

anced budget amendment spelling out how much of the Social Security surplus they would count year by year.

As I stated last year and again last week, this was an enormous shift in the interpretation of the resolution and a major factor in my decision to not support the balanced budget amendment without further assurances about Social Security.

It is my hope that debate on the Senate floor in the future will be conducted at a level which respects the opinions of fellow Senators on all issues. It is the least that our constituents expect of us.

FATHER BILL KENNY

Mr. REID. Madam President, one of the pleasures of working with this body is the opportunity to recognize the outstanding contributions that individuals have made in our respective States and in our country. I rise today to recognize such a person, Father Bill Kenny of Las Vegas.

Frequently, people are recognized for an heroic action on a specific occasion, or for a moment of self-sacrifice that may have saved the lives of people who were put in harms way. Father Kenny's achievement is different; he is a man who has devoted his entire life to helping others, and on a continual, daily basis, he gives his energy, his time, and his spirit to his community, to his parishioners, and to his church. On June 19, Father Kenny will celebrate the 25th anniversary of his ordainment as a Catholic Priest, and I am delighted to take this occasion to congratulate him on a lifetime of self-sacrifice.

Father Bill Kenny is truly an example of the American dream in action. Bill came to Las Vegas as a young boy and attended St. Joseph's Catholic School and Bishop Gorman High School. As a young altar boy, Bill often thought about becoming a priest. Inspired by his uncle John, a priest who also served in Las Vegas, Bill entered the seminary and afterwards completed his studies at the theological college of the Catholic University of America on a 3-year scholarship. He earned his B.A. in 1966 and his M.A. a year later, after which he was assigned for one year to the North American College in Rome, a residence for American students who study at the Pontifical Gregorian University. He resumed his studies at the theological college, and in 1971, he returned to Las Vegas for his ordination.

He was first assigned to serve as associate pastor at St. Annes and then, in 1976, at Our Lady of Las Vegas. The diocese intuitively knew that, in Father Kenny, they had a man of extraordinary talent and, in October of 1978, Father Bill was asked to start a new parish in a growing section of the city; he became the founding pastor of Christ the King Catholic Community, a parish that, under his tutelage, has grown to over 5,000 members.

I have had the good fortune to attend services at Father Kenny's church and

to witness, first hand, the care and compassion he has engendered within his parish. I participated in one of the most moving ceremonies of my career when Father Bill invited me to take part in the opening of the national AIDS Quilt exhibit which he generously housed in the church's parish hall. We read the names of those whose lives were represented in the squares of the quilt, and I know there wasn't a dry eye in the crowd.

This is just one example of the compassion that Father Bill demonstrates on a continual basis; I know that there are at least 5,000 more stories that reflect the influence that he has had on someone's life. I am glad that Father Bill chose to come back to his home in Las Vegas to fulfill his mission with the Catholic church, I am proud to have him as my friend, and I congratulate him for his 25 years of exemplary service to the people of Nevada. We are all better because of him.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, at the close of business yesterday Monday, June 11, 1996, the Federal debt stood at \$5,134,653,489,857.86.

On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$19,372.70 as his or her share of that debt.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:29 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3268. An act to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, to reauthorize and make improvements to that Act, and for other purposes.

At 2:30 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 848. An act to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for assistance for highway relocation regarding the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park in Georgia.

H.R. 3029. An act to designate the United States courthouse in Washington, District of Columbia, as the "E. Barrett Prettyman United States Courthouse."

H.R. 3060. An act to implement the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty.

H.R. 3186. An act to designate the Federal building located at 1655 Woodson Road in Overland, Missouri, as the "Sammy L. David Federal Building."

H.R. 3364. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse at 235 North Washington Avenue in Scranton, Pennsylvania, as the "William J. Nealon Federal Building and United States Courthouse."

H.R. 3400. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse to be