



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 143

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1997

No. 15

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, February 10, 1997, at 2 p.m.

Senate

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1997

The Senate met at 11 a.m., and was called to order by the Honorable TIM HUTCHINSON, a Senator from the State of Arkansas.

PRAYER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today's prayer will be offered by the guest Chaplain, Rev. Jack Michael Loo, of the Church of the Master, in Mission Viejo, CA.

Almighty Living God, You have given us the gift of another day and have filled it with Your holy presence. We commit ourselves to honor You with the living of each hour. But no matter how noble our resolve, we confess our weaknesses and our frailties and declare our deep need of Your strength.

Strengthen our love for people so that every action we take on their behalf is driven by the same compassion that drives Your heart. Increase our faith so that no difficulty or discouragement keeps us from believing in what is right and Your ability to accomplish it through us.

Deepen our wisdom so that every confusing situation and perplexing issue gets tamed by Your enlightenment and knowledge. Mobilize our courage so that once we see what must be done, nothing, not even our own fears, will keep us from doing it.

This day may we know that we are Your people and You are our God. In the name of our Lord. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, February 7, 1997.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable TIM HUTCHINSON, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, to perform the duties of the Chair.

STROM THURMOND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HUTCHINSON thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah.

THE GUEST CHAPLAIN

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, we are pleased to welcome the Reverend Jack Michael Loo as guest Chaplain today.

For the past 4 years, Reverend Loo has been senior pastor of the Church of the Master in Mission Viejo, CA. Prior to that, he served as executive pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Hollywood, where Dr. Lloyd Ogilvie, our Chaplain, was senior pastor prior to becoming Senate Chaplain.

We want to express our personal gratitude and thanks to Reverend Loo for opening our session today with his excellent prayer.

I was particularly pleased that he said in spite of our fears we should stand up and do what is right.

We are grateful to have you here and are grateful for your prayer over this body. We appreciate the service which you give to your congregation and to the people throughout this country.

Thank you so much.

SCHEDULE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I will announce the schedule.

Today the Senate will be resuming consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 1, the constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget. The majority leader announced that there will be no rollcall votes during today's session. Under the order the time between now and 1 o'clock will be equally divided in the usual form. I will remind all Senators that by consent we will resume debate on Senator DURBIN's pending amendment at 3:30 on Monday. There will be 2 hours for debate at that time. Senators should be aware that there will be a rollcall vote on or in relation to the Durbin amendment beginning at 5:30 on Monday, February 10. On Monday, Senator WELLSTONE is expected to offer at least two amendments to Senate Joint Resolution 1. However, any votes ordered on those amendments will occur during Tuesday's session.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

S1119

of Senate Joint Resolution 1 which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require a balanced budget.

The Senate resumed consideration of the joint resolution.

Pending:

Durbin amendment No. 2, to allow for the waiver of the article in the event of an economic recession or serious economic emergency with a majority in both Houses of Congress.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, yesterday the President of the United States submitted his budget. I have to say that the President has come a long way. He now says that he agrees that the budget needs to be balanced by the year 2002. This budget is a legitimate departure point from which to move in developing a final budget package.

I was disappointed, however, to see that the President's 5-year cost of Government is almost identical to what he proposed a year ago. This does not look like the era of "big government is over." It is not even shrinking according to this budget. Even more disturbing, the budget deficit over the next 5 years is nearly \$200 billion higher than what was proposed just a year ago. And the deficit does not even decline until the year 1999. The bulk of the spending cuts contained in his budget occur after the President leaves office.

So he has left all of the hard decisions to the years 2002 and 2001. Seventy-five percent of any fiscal responsibility has to occur in the 2 years after he leaves office.

That is not what I call political courage. That is not what I call attending to the structural problems and the economic problems of this country. It is more of the same that we have had for the last 28 years.

These huge stacks here on the table to my right represent 28 years of unbalanced budgets. These are the actual 28 budgets. Keep in mind that only involves the last 28 years, since 1969, the last time we balanced the Federal budget. For most of the last 60 years we have not balanced the Federal budget. So this is just a small smattering. If we put them all up here for the last 60 years, they would reach almost to the ceiling.

Then we have this budget which came up here yesterday that has all the tough decisions made after he leaves office. The reason we elect Presidents is so they can make the tough decisions and help us to work in a bipartisan way so that nobody can scream at the other side.

In this particular case this budget is filled with smoke and mirrors. What this means is that many of the tax cuts and spending increases contained in this budget are not even likely to occur or will not be offered until the last 2 years of the budget's projections, well after this President is gone.

Just as important as reaching a balanced budget in 2002 is reforming the

entitlement programs. This is what we are going to have to face. We are going to have to face the growing financing and deficit problems we see looming in the next century. This may sound far away, but it is only a few short years before we see the next century begin. We cannot be lulled into a false sense of security because we have not reached the crisis yet.

I had hoped that the President would take a leadership position and tackle these difficult programs. Unfortunately, the budget contains only short-term fixes. We see no sign of the structural reforms that are absolutely needed. We see more signs of business as usual.

By the way, while the President says that his budget balances the budget, the Congressional Budget Office—which he has touted himself as being accurate through the years and which certainly has not been what I consider a conservative Congressional Budget Office for all the time I have been here—the Congressional Budget Office says that his budget will not be balanced in the year 2002; and that the Administration is using economic assumptions that just are not realistic.

I want to applaud the President for providing some tax relief in the budget. It is a solid first step in giving some tax relief to the American people. But it is only a baby step, and really a tentative one at that, because all of the tax increases—and there are plenty of them in this budget that he submitted yesterday—are permanent. The spending programs are permanent. But, the tax cuts are temporary and are likely never to occur because they go away if he does not meet his standards.

So it is a big shell game again.

I get so doggone tired of it. It is almost unbelievable. It is just more of the same of what we have had over the last 28 years, and it is really another reason why we simply have to pass this balanced budget amendment.

The Presidents just do not seem to have the courage to stand up and do what really has to be done. I am really concerned about it. Well, I could go on and on on the President's budget, but I want to leave time for others.

As we open the debate today on the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, I have to refer again to this stack of unbalanced budgets. These are the actual 28, the last 28 years' budget packages.

I keep these budgets here, Mr. President, as a reminder of the generation of bipartisan budgetary failure. Here it is, 28 straight years of unbalanced budgets. There has not been one single balanced budget since 1969, not one in 28 years, and yet we have people on the other side come and say, "Oh, let's just have the will to do it. Let's just do it and the President will sign it."

Give me a break. That is not going to happen any more than it happened over the last 28 years. Paul Simon said, "Your hair will turn green before that happens, unless we have this balanced budget amendment."

I might say, Mr. President, there has only been one balanced budget in the last 36 years. If we had 36 up here, it would be much higher, the 36 individual budgets that have not been balanced. And there have been only eight balanced budgets in the past 66 years. Just think about it—58 years of unbalanced budgets. Only eight balanced budgets since 1930.

This sad history of budgetary failure is not a Democratic problem or a Republican problem. It is an American problem. Those of us who are proposing a constitutional amendment to require balanced budgets do not do so as Republicans or Democrats; we do so as Americans, Americans concerned about America and the future of our children and our grandchildren.

Let me just give you a few illustrations of how bad our debt problem has become. The national debt, as we all know, is now over \$5.3 trillion—\$5.3 trillion. That is a debt for each and every American of more than \$20,000. CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, projects that in the year 2002, total Federal debt will exceed \$6.8 trillion. That means roughly \$24,000 of debt for every person, every man, woman and child in America, with annual interest costs projected to be over \$3,100 per taxpayer. That is just what we have to pay on the interest against the Federal debt, \$3,100 for each taxpayer a year by the year 2002.

The national debt has increased more than \$4 trillion since the Senate last passed a balanced budget amendment in 1982. We passed it in the Senate. Tip O'Neill and the liberals in the House defeated it at that time.

The debt, which started this year at a baseline of \$5.3 trillion, has increased over \$550 million each and every day since then. Since we began debate this year on the balanced budget amendment in the Judiciary Committee, the debt has increased by more than \$10 billion—just since we began debate this year.

In 1996, gross interest exceeded \$344 billion. That is more than the total Federal outlays in 1975—all outlays—and is nearly \$50 billion more than the total revenues in 1975.

In 1996, gross interest consumed nearly 25 percent of the Federal budget and more than one-half of all personal income taxes.

In 1997, for the first time, we will pay more than \$1 billion a day in gross interest on the debt. That is more than \$41 million each hour and \$685,000 each minute that we are losing in just interest costs.

Net interest payments on the debt are currently the third largest budget category, amounting to 15 percent of the Federal budget, and it is the fastest growing item in the Federal budget.

Our annual net interest payment on the debt is more than the combined budgets of the Departments of Commerce, Agriculture, Education, Energy, Justice, Interior, Housing and Urban Development, Labor, State, and Transportation.

I think these basic facts should make it plain why the balanced budget amendment is an idea with appeal for Republicans and Democrats, for liberals and conservatives.

There are liberal Democrats who see the money we waste on interest payments that could be used in better ways to help the disadvantaged. There are conservative Republicans who see the wreckage we are doing to the opportunities for our citizens and our people by strapping debt, interest, and future economic and tax burdens on them.

We are all concerned that our resources are being misallocated because the Federal Government is spending willy-nilly, with thoughtless borrowing, rather than making deliberate choices.

As we close this week of debate, I thank my colleagues who have participated in the debate who have expressed why we, Republicans and Democrats, are concerned about the debt the Government piles up just like the stack of these unbalanced budgets here, and why we, Republicans and Democrats, believe the only answer is the constitutional requirement that the Government act more deliberately in its spending decisions without always taking the easy recourse to borrow.

This is a proposal that can unite us as Americans across party lines. Let me mention again that every Republican Senator is a cosponsor of this amendment. That is a great signal. But equally important is that seven courageous and bold Democrats have also signed on as original cosponsors. I wish to pay special tribute to those Democrats who support this and who have spoken in support of a constitutional amendment either in the Chamber or by signing on as cosponsors. Senators BRYAN, GRAHAM of Florida, KOHL, BAUCUS, BREAU, MOSELEY-BRAUN, and ROBB have stood up for America and its future, and I applaud them for standing for principle and our children.

Mr. President, I am also pleased to say that six other Democrats have voted for this in the recent past and have promised to support it in their most recent campaigns. I welcome their support for this most important insurance policy that this stack of budgetary failures will not grow too much higher and, more importantly, that our American future will be brighter. If all of these folks honor their commitments to their constituents, all 55 Republicans and all 13 Democrats who have said to their constituents they will vote for it, we will pass the balanced budget amendment this year and it will be a great day for all Americans.

I thank the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I truly appreciate this opportunity to speak in behalf of the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, and in this

regard I especially thank several of my colleagues: Mr. HATCH, the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee—and I associate myself with all of his remarks—Mr. DOMENICI, the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, and Mr. CRAIG, the Republican policy chairman, for their longstanding leadership and efforts in behalf of this legislation that I feel, in effect, would simply protect the financial and economic future of our children and their children.

For those who have had the perseverance and the tenacity to pursue this goal, it has at times been a very lonely trail. Whatever success we might achieve, and that I hope we will achieve, it has been in large part due to the efforts of these Senators and their leadership role, and the American people should certainly be aware of that.

I have read some interesting commentary in regard to this effort. Our opponents predict dark budget clouds for Social Security and any other programs deemed essential by Senators regarding their particular and parochial interests; but contrary to that dire prediction, if we total the sum of the balanced budget parts, I see and predict a very bright future. I see a nation with 6.1 million more jobs in 10 years. I see lower interest rates that will directly affect the daily lives and pocketbooks of every citizen in terms of the amount of the hard-earned income they pay now for living essentials—health care, housing, education, loans, food and transportation.

If you ask the American people, with a 2 percent drop in interest rates, how would you like 6 months of groceries free as compared to what you are paying now, or corresponding savings in your health care premium costs, mortgage payment or student loans, and if you compare those savings in their pocketbooks with the marginal reductions in the amount of growth in Federal programs in this city, why, put that way, the American people support a balanced budget. They are six jumps ahead of Washington.

So the question is how, how do we achieve a balanced budget? In his State of the Union Address, President Clinton said, "Don't give me a balanced budget amendment. Give me a balanced budget."

I agree with that. I must say I do agree. But with all due respect to the President, many of my colleagues and I have done just that but to no avail. During the last session of Congress, we sent two balanced budgets to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, and despite exhaustive effort and despite a lot of rhetoric to the contrary, in reality I think they were dead on arrival. However, I must say that passing the balanced budget amendment in the House last year and two budgets that were in fact in balance, despite the Presidential vetoes, this action did provide the kind of fiscal backbone and tenacity not seen in the Congress for decades. In my own case, I was very proud

of our efforts within the House Agriculture Committee, as chairman, in enacting farm program and food stamp reform that also produced an estimated \$350 billion in savings over the life of the budget agreement.

It can be done. They said it could not be done, but it can be done. And with our reform of farm program policy passing by overwhelming margins—318 in the House, 74 in the Senate—we also proved there is bipartisan support for true reform and budget savings.

We also achieved very considerable budget savings in discretionary spending at the conclusion of the appropriations process, all 13 major spending bills—something unique to the last Congress. So we made some progress. But that was last year. And last year, despite our successes and a reduced deficit, we fell short of the final goal, a budget that is truly, truly in balance. However, the real problem is that while there is considerable talk about accepting responsibility and standing foursquare for a balanced budget, there are serious differences of opinion as to how to bring the budget into balance.

I don't know how many times I have heard my Kansas constituents say, "Pat, why can't you and Senator Kassebaum and Senator Dole—Bob and Nancy—work together and bring this budget into balance?" Well, which programs would be cut? In most cases, I know, our constituents certainly come to Washington and say, "Yes, I want to balance the budget; yes, I know we have to quit this business of mortgaging the future of our young people, our children and their children; but, you know, my program is a little different. My program really represents an investment." And, in many cases, that is true. But, do we have the political wherewithal to address the real entitlement question, and that is our individual freedom and the future of our kids and their kids? In that, if you total up all the spending, you reach a certain level, as evidenced by all of the budget reports on the floor of the Senate, where that is the key question, not each individual program.

So, do we have the political wherewithal to save and restore Medicare and other entitlements? In this regard, the President and many of our friends across the aisle stated over and over again they are for a balanced budget, but not that budget, that budget meaning any cuts in their favorite and priority programs. And I must say, despite the fact that a Republican Congress and the President were within \$10 a month difference last year in regard to preventing Medicare bankruptcy, \$10 a month, some even say \$7, because of the fact we were not able to reach agreement and the fact that the Democratic Party made a conscious decision to make Medicare a top issue in last year's campaign, I am not overly confident any budget agreement can be worked out without a great deal of difficulty—unless we have to—unless there is some outside discipline that

will force Congress to get the job done. The lure of political opportunism may be just too great. The coming debate in regard to Social Security is a classic example.

I have here the report in regard to the balanced budget amendment legislation we are considering. On page 33, the minority views begin. And I note, as I thumb through some of the commentary, that it is merely a repeat of what many of us on this side of the aisle experienced in 30-second spots.

So the real question is, does the Congress have the fortitude and the perseverance and the tenacity to truly balance the budget? As has been said by many of my colleagues, despite very good men and women of both parties with the best of intentions, it is now the 28th year in which a majority in Congress has failed in efforts for the Federal Government to live within its means and to prevent the mortgaging of our children and their children—28 years. There is the evidence right down there, right next to Senator CRAIG. As a matter of fact, I think it stacks so high that we are in violation of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration code, and maybe the fire code.

So we all agree that we must make progress toward a balanced budget. Then during the course of our political deliberations, we most generally agree to disagree on how to achieve this goal. I think it is clear that, if there is anything to be learned during the time we have regrettably experienced ever-increasing deficits and political discord, it is that we need a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution to simply get the job done.

Now, the minority says in the beginning of their views:

The real question this year is not whether to reduce the deficit but by how much and what cuts to make in order to bring the budget into balance. That is the real work that lies before us.

And amen to that. And I credit the minority for starting off with that paragraph.

But, as has been said before, we now have the President's budget, and in that regard I am going to quote from today's issue of the Washington Post. This is an independent observation, not known for conservative views—some conservative views. When they shine the light of truth into darkness, it is usually to the left-field bleachers as opposed to the right-field bleachers. But the Post says this morning:

"For the first time in 30 years, we'll be able to tell the American people that we have brought fiscal sanity back to their Government," declared Clinton's Budget Director, Franklin D. Raines, at a news conference.

And the Post goes on to say this, and this a wake-up call to the American people:

But, in many respects, [the President's] fiscal 1998 budget falls well short of the administration's soaring rhetoric. On issues such as deficit reduction, Medicare, tax cuts and welfare, congressional Republicans and

many independent budget analysts charge [the President's] plan is crafted less to impose fiscal discipline than to gain political advantage in the budget battle to come.

That is the Washington Post. That is not some Republican on Senate floor.

In assembling its blueprint for wiping out the deficit by 2002 and beyond, the administration offers dozens of new spending initiatives, including almost \$60 billion of additional entitlement programs [I thought we were going to scale those back], while providing sketchy information about spending cuts.

Clinton is relying heavily on new fees and deferred spending reductions to reach balance. About 75 percent of all the proposed spending cuts would take effect after 2000, a strategy that would put off most of the pain—most of the discipline, if you will—until after President Clinton leaves office.

A respected columnist, second to none, the dean of the political writers in Washington, David Broder, added this in today's issue of the Post:

The numbers in the latter document [I am talking about the budget] are immensely revealing. After pages of pat-myself-on-the-back rhetoric, the gauzy camouflage is pulled aside. And you can learn that there's really not that much wrong with this budget except that it adds another \$1.2 trillion to the statutory national debt in the next 5 years, fails to start addressing the baby-boomer retirement problem, further squeezes the share of money available for needed domestic programs, shifts burdens to the States, shortchanges the cities and stagnates investments in nonmilitary research and development, the real seed corn for the future. Other than that, it's a fine, forward-looking budget plan.

That is by David Broder and I think it deserves significant attention for those involved in this debate as well as all of the American people.

Mr. President, with the fall of the Greek Republic as an example, there is an often-quoted and pessimistic theory that a democracy cannot exist as a permanent form of government. The argument and prediction is a democracy can only exist until the voters discover they can vote themselves largesse from the Public Treasury. From that moment on, the majority always votes for the candidates promising the most benefits, with the result that a democracy always collapses over a loose fiscal policy.

That was predicted about the Greek Republic. It happened. If that prediction is true, it is a terrible prospect for our future.

Mr. President, I don't buy it. I think the American people are willing to sacrifice and invest in the future if we but set the example and get the job done.

I must say, when we look at our most recent history, and the fact our best efforts fell short during the last session of Congress—and, goodness knows, we worked hard—I believe this debate, this legislation and this time represents our very best opportunity to set our Nation's fiscal house in order.

In his State of the Union Address, President Clinton said, "we need action." And I agree. It is, indeed, time for action.

And for action that gets the job done, we need a constitutional amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, let me make note of the comments of the Senator from Kansas. They are so appropriate and so well directed at what we can do here as it relates to controlling our spending and modifying programs that do just that and produce long-term benefits.

The Senator from Kansas last year, of course, was a major player and author of the Freedom to Farm Act while he was chairman of the House Agriculture Committee. That very act changed the whole dynamics of Government policy as it related to farm programs and Government's relationship to production agriculture.

He spoke of the net savings in the tens of billions of dollars that will result over an extended period of time. I would guess that less than a few years ago, many Senators and many Members of the U.S. House would have said, "That can't be done; you cannot sever that relationship." And yet, we have severed it.

Agriculture continues to prosper every bit as well as it did tied directly to the Government and Government programs and, we believe, in the long term will prosper more, simply because it is not relying on farming-to-Government programs but, in fact, is now looking at the market and producing to the market, as we had hoped it would.

That was one major benefit in change that occurred in the 104th Congress.

Another one that occurred that is, in the long term, going to substantially get us to the point by 2002 of a balanced budget, of course, was the welfare reform.

So when the kind of pandering that occurs here on the floor, often from the other side, that there is no way to balance the budget, or, if you balance it, you must begin to exempt major portions of the budget because they are too sensitive, too important and no constraints must be put upon them of the kind that a constitutional amendment would place upon them, so, therefore, they must be exempt, I would argue just the opposite, that all it forces us to do is make tough choices, priorities, where should the dollars be spent.

Of course, we all know we are going to build and maintain a strong human safety net in Government policy for the citizens of this country who are poor or disadvantaged or need an opportunity. That is exactly what has been and will remain a concern of this Congress always.

All we are asking, and what I think we are causing to happen, is what the American people have been asking now for well over a decade. Out of fear—now fright—that this Congress cannot control a Federal debt, they are saying, "Balance your budget."

Of course, the Senator from Kansas and I, the day before yesterday, referenced this large stack of 28 consecutive budgets that are piled here beside me, to recognize that 14 of them have deficit spending, with all the intent to deficit spend and no intent to balance. And 14 of them have the intent to balance, where the Congress collectively, in producing the budgets, said it is our intent that these budgets lead to a balanced budget.

Yet, of course, we now have evidence, by the President's budget coming to us yesterday, that in all the rhetoric and all the time that he expended and all the good intentions that he expended in the State of the Union Message this week, referencing a balanced budget many, many times, that his budget isn't balanced, won't even balance unless you do major cuts and major tax increases, largely because he is habitually the kind of public leader that we have had for so many years, who wants to constantly add new programs without making the tough choices of deleting programs so that you can add.

I am not suggesting the programs the President spoke of are not contemporary and necessary. When he spoke to education the other night, I applauded a fair amount of what he said. But I am willing to stand here and make the tough votes to suggest spending ought to decrease somewhere else if we as a country are going to shift our priorities in spending to education.

We now have an amendment before us that would impact the whole intent of a balanced budget amendment to our Constitution, and those are tough choices, prioritizing and doing exactly what the American people expect us to do, and that is balance the budget. If 51 of us can say, "Oh, we can't balance the budget, the environment is too extreme at the moment, economically at this point in the country or the priorities of spending are we just have to bypass this national mandate, this constitutional mandate and do it only by 51 votes here in the Senate," then I suggest to you this amendment wipes away the full intent of a balanced budget amendment and causes us, if that were to become part of the balanced budget amendment, to gimmick up the Constitution by simply doing exactly what we do now.

So we are telling the American people that the amendment that is before us is one where, "Oh, we have given you a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. Rest assured we have given you what you wanted, but more importantly, we have now simply re-prescribed business as usual."

It is with those frustrations that I think we are now suggesting that this is an amendment—the amendment to the constitutional amendment, the one before us—is one that does not deserve to be in the Constitution, because it would be false pretense to argue it any other way.

Yesterday, there was a fascinating article from Investors Business Daily

that I thought was very reminiscent of the very arguments we are placing here on the floor. The President had expressed concern about the ability to react promptly in a recession and, of course, the amendment we have before us would argue that that is what it allows. When the President said that, I said, "Mr. President, we have provided for that. We have a three-fifths vote in the amendment now." It is a tough vote. It is not always easy to come by, but it is a necessary vote to force us to the reality.

Let me suggest that Congress, in 1962, passed 12 economic stimulus bills because of a recession. All 12 bills received 60 votes or more in the U.S. Senate. In 1993, in a stimulus package, there were similar kind of votes.

What I am suggesting is that the record is replete with a voting pattern that says if we are truly in a major economic emergency and there is need for economic stimulus, that the very marker we have put in the proposed constitutional amendment that we are debating on the floor is the proper mark and not 51 votes.

So what Investors Business Daily said yesterday was:

The idea that deficit spending could smooth out the rough spots in a business cycle comes from John Maynard Keynes. Recessions, he believed, started when all the buyers in the economy suddenly stopped spending. . .

The evidence shows that public works programs have done nothing to solve recessions, a 1993 article by economist Bruce Bartlett in The Public Interest magazine pointed out.

Spending packages aimed at fighting recession have never been enacted before a recession ended on its own.

In other words, they always came after all of the indicators were in place that the recession was over.

Recessions are usually defined as two straight quarters of falling GDP. So no one actually knows a recession is happening until six months after it starts. No one knows it's over until three months later.

That is the reality of how we define "recession." Yet, the amendment that we have before us to amend the resolution would argue that we know better.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the editorial called "Prospective Balanced-Budget Blather" be printed in the RECORD.

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

PERSPECTIVE BALANCED-BUDGET BLATHER,
FEBRUARY 6, 1997

Without deficits, recessions would be longer, deeper and harder to pull out of, the common wisdom says. Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin echoes that in opposing a balanced-budget amendment. But it's not true.

The idea that deficit spending could smooth out the rough spots in a business cycle comes from John Maynard Keynes. Recessions, he believed, started when all the buyers in the economy suddenly stopped spending.

Sellers usually respond to such a decline in demand by cutting output and jobs, rather than cutting prices, the Keynesian view went. That threw more people out of work, and further reduced aggregate demand.

Only government could turn this cycle around, by pumping money into the economy. It did so by hiring people for public works programs, for example.

But because the government collects less in taxes during recessions, those public programs had to be paid for with debt, Keynes argued.

The evidence shows that public works programs have done nothing to solve recessions, a 1993 article by economist Bruce Bartlett in The Public Interest magazine pointed out.

Spending packages aimed at fighting recession have never been enacted before a recession ended on its own, as the chart shows.

In fact, Congress often enacts these packages the very month the recession is over. They are usually nothing more than pork-barrel spending dressed up as compassion.

Recessions are usually defined as two straight quarters of falling GDP. So no one actually knows a recession is happening until six months after it starts. No one knows it's over until three months later.

Even then, it takes Congress time to pass a law for extra spending. And it takes still more time for that money to make its way through the economy.

So even if Congress could tell when a recession was starting—unlikely, given the records of most economic forecasters—it still wouldn't have more than a small effect.

And Keynes was wrong not just in practice, but in theory as well.

He based his whole theory on the notion that government experts acted rationally, while the average person did not. Central planners could know enough and act quickly enough to save people from the consequences of their own bad decisions—clearly not the case.

There are programs, such as unemployment insurance, that kick in automatically when recession hits, without having to wait for Congress to act. The amount those programs actually increase during recession could be easily handled within a balanced budget, however.

Between 1980 and 1984—which includes years of deep recession—real spending on jobless benefits rose \$47.4 billion above its level in 1979, an economic peak. That increase was just 1% of government spending over those four years.

Recessions have been less severe in the postwar period, many economists argue, largely because of the greater role Government has played in easing recessions. But it is not certain that they are less severe, and it is even less certain that this is due to government.

On the surface it seems true. From 1920 to 1938, recessions averaged 20 months, with a 14.2% decline in real GNP. Since 1948, they averaged 11 months, with 2.4% drop in real GNP. Unfortunately, it's hard to compare the two periods, because the prewar data are quite crude.

National Bureau of Economic Research economist Christina Romer, in a key 1986 American Economic Review article, tried to compare apples with apples. She adjusted the more recent data so that it was calculated much like those of the prewar period.

And she found the evidence of a change in the length, frequency and severity of business cycles was weak.

Even if recessions are less severe, it may have little to do with government. The growing importance of the service sector, where employment tends to be stable, could be one reason. And technology has helped ease the sharp boom-bust cycle of the farm and factory sectors.

Legitimate gripes about a balanced-budget amendment are easy to come by. But Rubin's is not one of them.

Mr. CRAIG. It is important to recognize that while the politics of the argument are interesting, the record would

suggest that it does not fit, that Congress has always responded to recessions after they were over. And, in fact, what ended up usually was pork-barrel spending that became a part of the total budget program that went on.

Between 1980 and 1984—which includes years of deep recession—real spending on jobless benefits rose \$47.4 billion above its level in 1979, an economic peak. That increase was just 1% of government spending over those four years.

Recessions have been less severe in the postwar period, many economists argue.

That is exactly the point of those figures, the argument that somehow we straitjacket our Government by a balanced budget not able to respond to times of recession, and the facts simply do not bear it out, the economic facts, not mine, but those of the economists who study this.

So when Secretary Rubin fears straitjacketing, what Secretary Rubin fears is that the American people will once again have control of their budget and the spending of the Federal Government and that we take it out of the hands of politicians and force them to stay within parameters and make the tough choices and to stop mounting the huge Federal debt that we are currently having.

That is the essence of a balanced budget amendment. That is why we are here on the floor, because the American people have asked us to do this. I am one of those who believes so strongly that the record is replete with the facts that we as politicians cannot do it.

Some of us can make those tough votes; others cannot for various reasons. It is true that, as never before, special interest groups come to Washington for a piece of the pie. So it is easy to give it away and make the pie bigger. The only problem is we borrow hundreds of billions of dollars annually to make the pie, expecting future generations to pay for the ingredients. Therein lies the great discrepancy, why we are here.

It is an important issue. We must fight to make sure that we retain it and that we pass the balanced budget constitutional amendment resolution and disallow the kind of amendments that would weaken it or make it hollow at best. We cannot put that kind of language in our Constitution.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DODD addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be able to proceed as in morning business and the time I use not be deducted from the debate on the pending business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. I thank the President.

Mr. President, I have a couple of items that I would like to address, if I may, here of a different nature than

the debate on the constitutional amendment for a balanced budget. Myself, I will have some remarks later in the day on that subject matter, but I would like to take a little bit of time, if I could, to raise several issues.

(The remarks of Mr. DODD pertaining to the submission of Senate Congressional Resolution 6 are located in today's RECORD under "Submission of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.")

TRIBUTE TO PAMELA HARRIMAN

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, all of us in this country were deeply saddened by the tragic death of Pamela Harriman in Paris a few days ago. Regardless of party or political persuasion, this was a remarkable woman who spent a lifetime, from the basement of 10 Downing Street with that most revered of leaders of the 20th century, Sir Winston Churchill, to representing the United States in the Embassy in Paris. Hers was a remarkable life in many ways.

As we have been reading about the legend of Pamela Harriman over the past few days not enough attention, in my view, is being paid to her profound legacy to this country. Most of us—I think all of us, maybe with some exception in this Chamber—were born in this country. We did not make the choice to be Americans. We were fortunate enough that our parents or grandparents or great-grandparents came to this country, and we were the beneficiaries of those decisions.

I have always thought it was somewhat different for people who made the choice, the conscious choice to become an American. Pamela Harriman made that choice to be an American and contributed mightily to this country. She was engaged in the political process. She was a partisan. And I say to my friends on the other side, I think that is healthy when people become engaged and not only have ideas and values and beliefs, but are willing to act on them. And for those of us who are Democrats, we will be eternally grateful for her support and her willingness to be engaged in the political life in this country. For people, regardless of political persuasion, she was a great individual who represented our country in Paris with great distinction.

There was a column presented the other day, Mr. President, by Richard Holbrooke in the Washington Post which I think captured in many ways the feelings of many of us about Pamela Harriman's service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that column by Richard Holbrooke be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 6, 1997]

PAMELA HARRIMAN'S LAST MISSION

By Richard Holbrooke

If, as Soren Kierkegaard said, "Life is lived forward but understood backward," then the arc that Pamela Harriman traveled can best be understood by beginning at its end, with

her ambassadorship to France. The four years she spent in Paris in service to her adopted nation gave a different meaning to what had gone before it, not only to her biographers but also to herself. In retrospect, everything that preceded Paris will look different because, after a life in which she was identified closely with a series of important men, she did something important so splendidly on her own.

She spent her last hours before she fell ill in a characteristic whirlwind of activity. Less than an hour before her fatal attack, she was discussing on the telephone with her friend Undersecretary of State Peter Tarnoff some highly technical problem concerning the Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe. This was not the public Pamela Churchill Harriman, the one the press always described as "beautiful and glamorous," but the intensely serious public servant, handling personally a matter most ambassadors would have left to someone else. Then, after discussing the CFE with Tarnoff, she went swimming at the Hotel Ritz and, as she got out of the pool, collapsed without warning.

Because Pam was the daughter of a Dorset baron, I often asked her, teasingly, how she had managed to overcome the disadvantages of her birth. But in a sense, I meant it; had she followed the normal trajectory for a girl of her generation and limited education, she would perhaps have lived out the last few years of a fairly predictable life as, say, a duchess dowager in some stately English home. Instead she began a 57-year voyage almost continuously in the public eye.

The standard stories always emphasize the men in each phase of Pam's life, and there was truth in this; she herself talked of it occasionally with her close friends. But the role men played in her life can be misunderstood. It is true that she loved, and was loved by, an extraordinary group of men. But Pam absorbed more than the luxuries of life from her close proximity to men in power. From each of them she learned something new and gave something back. It was with Averell Harriman, a major figure in both foreign policy and the Democratic Party for half a century, that she returned to the world of public affairs, this time not as the British daughter-in-law of Winston Churchill but as a proud new American citizen. She became increasingly involved in Harriman's two major concerns: the Democratic Party and American foreign policy. Thus, when President Clinton made the decision to send her to Paris in 1993, she was more prepared than either she or most of us realized.

Unlike many political appointees, she was determined to understand the most complex details of her job. At the same time, she remained a perfectionist, equally determined to present a flawless facade. When, as her "boss," I tried to get her to take more time off, to relax more, to do less, she simply said, "I can't do that. I'm not built that way."

Her efforts produced results not only for her personally but for the nation. In the famously difficult relationship between Washington and Paris, Pam achieved a level of access to the highest levels of the French government that was unique. While the press focused on the strains in the relationship, these were never as serious as reported, and in any case they would have been far greater without Pam's ability to bring officials of both nations—most of them younger than her son Winston—together under her roof to work things out. It was one of her enduring beliefs that if she could get the right people together in a room she could get them to agree, or at least reduce their disagreements. That she was so often right, in the face of the usual bureaucratic passivity or pessimism, was a tribute to her determination and tenacity.