

Senator MOYNIHAN and others, his leadership has been instrumental in ensuring some modicum of balance in our funding for mass transit as opposed to roads and highways. He has been a leader in the ongoing effort to support Amtrak and the important cause of commuter and intercity passenger rail service, which can do so much to reduce traffic congestion and keep our air clean.

And no one has done more to promote transportation safety, on the road as well as in the air. FRANK LAUTENBERG authored the law to establish 21 as the legal drinking age, and to ban smoking on airplanes. And he is responsible more than anyone else for the landmark provision in this year's transportation appropriations bill lowering the legal standard for intoxication to .08 percent blood alcohol content. The drinking age law alone has saved an estimated 12,000 lives since its enactment in 1984. It's estimated that his ".08" measure will save an additional 600 lives each year in this country.

FRANK LAUTENBERG also understood that we must do more to protect law-abiding citizens from the scourge of gun violence. He authored the bill to close the gun-show loophole. He has fought for child-proof handguns. And his support for measures like the Brady bill was instrumental in bringing about a nationwide reduction in gun violence over the past 7 years.

Lastly, as ranking member of the Budget Committee, FRANK has played a valuable role in bringing about an end to budget deficits and putting our nation on the path to paying off our national debt. He has also worked to strengthen the solvency of Medicare and Social Security.

I said a while ago that FRANK LAUTENBERG proved to be a very successful businessman. He accumulated great financial wealth. No one would have faulted him if he just retired, having made that achievement and contribution for the private sector.

I think all of us, regardless of party and political persuasion, admire people who want to give something back and who are willing to jump into this arena of public life, running the risks that we all do when we place our name on ballots all cross this country. The fact that FRANK LAUTENBERG decided at the end of his private life to become a public citizen and make a significant contribution to his country stands as a wonderful model for others who have done well to follow and when they want to give something back.

Not everyone runs for public office, nor should they, but there are ways in which people can make contributions every day to improve the quality of life for people. FRANK LAUTENBERG is a living embodiment of that concept and that principle.

The colleagues I have talked about, the wonderful colleagues who have served so admirably and so well, DICK BRYAN, BOB KERREY, FRANK LAUTEN-

BERG, and my friend, Stan Israelite, are examples of public servants who I will miss terribly every day. These are good Americans who have made a difference in the lives of all of us as citizens in this country.

I will find time to talk about my good friends, CONNIE MACK and PAT MOYNIHAN, but I see my colleagues on the floor. I thank them for their indulgence. I talked a little longer than I anticipated. I thank the Senators for their patience.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWNBACK). The Senator from Oklahoma.

CONSULTING ON U.S.S. "COLE" ACTION

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, many on the Senate Armed Services Committee have been quite distressed over some of the uncertainties, some of the things that happened in conjunction with the tragedy of the U.S.S. *Cole*. Even though it is a delicate thing to talk about, there are people still around who believe that the President took some actions, such as sending the cruise missiles into Afghanistan and the cruise missiles into Sudan, without consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, without consultation with the Intelligence Committee, the Senate Armed Services Committee, the House Armed Services Committee, something that was done and nobody knew it was going to happen. There are a lot of people who believe that might have been politically motivated.

I think it is very appropriate tonight to urge the President that if something should happen that we would have to take some kind of action in the next few days, in that there are only 13 days until a national election, make sure there are no suspicions out there. I want to get on record urging the President to work closely on any proposed action that could take place as a result of the U.S.S. *Cole* tragedy, to work closely on the matter, in full consultation with all members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, with the top service commanders in chief, as well as the members of both the Senate Armed Services Committee, the House Armed Services Committee, and the Intelligence Committees. By doing this, we could preclude any types of suspicions, allowing us to participate in what would have to be a major decision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

FISCAL DISCIPLINE

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, one of the main reasons I ran for the Senate was to bring fiscal discipline to Washington. As the 106th Congress winds down this week, I look back with mixed feelings at the actions that have been taken over the last 2 years toward bringing our financial house in order. While for the first time we are not

spending the Social Security surplus or the Medicare Part A surplus, I believe we could have done a much better job in reining in Federal spending.

Indeed, one fact that does not seem to draw too much attention is the fact that Washington increased overall non-defense domestic discretionary spending in fiscal year 2000 to \$328 billion. That is a 9.3-percent boost over the previous fiscal year, and the largest single-year increase in nondefense discretionary spending since 1980. And I fear we will have another big increase in fiscal year 2001.

However, there is actually some good news to celebrate since the beginning of this Congress. As my colleagues may recall, President Clinton said in his State of the Union Address in 1999 that he wanted to save 62 percent of the surplus and spend the other 38 percent. Well, at the time, the entire surplus was the Social Security surplus.

It was Members on this side of the aisle in both the House and the Senate who exposed the President's plan as just another spending gimmick. We were also the ones who got busy advocating and fighting for a lockbox for Social Security and Medicare. For all intents and purposes, we were successful in fiscal year 2000 in doing so, and we will do the same in fiscal year 2001.

Now the Vice President is out there on the campaign trail bending the truth and taking credit for lockboxing Social Security and Medicare. Everyone should be aware that it was the Clinton-Gore administration that sent a veto threat to the Senate regarding the Social Security lockbox amendment that the Senate considered in April of 1999.

Let me recite the direct quote from the veto threat:

If the Abraham-Domenici amendment or similar legislation is passed by the Congress, the President's senior advisors will recommend to the President that he will veto this bill.

I suspect that senior advisors would include the Vice President.

Although Congress has agreed by consensus not to use the Social Security and Medicare surplus for more spending, Congress still has not been able to pass lockbox legislation. I am fearful, if things get tight in the future and we have a blip in the economy, Congress will revert to its old ways. So I am hoping next year that on a bipartisan basis we can pass lockbox legislation for the Social Security and Medicare surplus.

Probably the best news from fiscal year 2000 is that despite all the supplemental spending we did this past summer, we still achieved an \$87 billion on-budget surplus in fiscal year 2000. That is a lot more than the \$1 billion on-budget surplus we had at the end of fiscal year 1999. Without question, though, the American people are responsible for this surplus, and their success continues to generate better than expected revenues. However, Congress would have spent considerably

more money, had it not been for a handful of us in the House and Senate who were willing to take the heat for condemning massive spending increases and budget gimmickry. Because this \$87 billion on-budget surplus had not been spent, and not used for tax cuts, it is going to go to reduce the national debt.

In my view and in the view of many experts, using our on-budget surplus to pay down the national debt is the best way to ensure fiscal discipline and continue our economic prosperity. We need to continue that economic prosperity if we are going to deal with the problems of Social Security and Medicare in the future. We cannot be lulled by the booming economy and the fact that we have been able to utilize the \$87 billion fiscal year 2000 on-budget surplus for debt reduction.

In addition, the way things are going right now in Washington, we may not even see a fiscal year 2001 on-budget surplus. That is because the projected \$102 billion surplus is evaporating very quickly. With all the years of experience that I have had in public service, I have to say that I have never seen anything more fiscally irresponsible than the spending spree I have seen occur in Washington this year—but, in particular, these past weeks. The lack of willingness on the part of Congress to make the hard choices and restrain the urge to bring home the bacon is blowing a hole in the fiscal year 2001 surplus and a gigantic hole in the projected 10-year budget surplus.

I think back to 1997 when Congress passed the Balanced Budget Act, helping to put an end to the era of annual deficits. The Balanced Budget Act set spending targets for each fiscal year and was meant to teach Congress to prioritize its spending choices. Under the Balanced Budget Act, if Congress wanted to spend money, it had to find an offset to cover the additional spending. Fair enough, and it worked. It helped to balance the budget.

Today, with the surplus we have achieved and the surplus that everyone thinks we are going to have in the future, the discipline is gone. It is just an out-of-control feeding frenzy. Add the fact that the normal legislative process has gone out the window, and we are in a free fall. Right now, only a handful of individuals—the President and my colleagues who are on the Appropriations Committee—are making the decisions that will impact how much the Federal Government spends for the coming fiscal year. Once the decisions are made, they are packaged together, sent to the floor of the Senate and the House, and voted on: No debate, no amendments. In some circumstances, Members have not even seen the bills they are voting on.

Basically, it is a take-it-or-leave-it attitude. Since these bills contain the bacon, most Members go along and simply vote for them. For those Members who do, they will run home, bragging about how they got this or that

for their districts or for their State, failing to understand that their constituents know there is no such thing as a free lunch. Make no mistake, the American people will fast appreciate the spending spectacle that is going on here in Congress. If you think they were mad in 1998 when Congress went on a similar spree—and I remember that because I was campaigning for the Senate in 1998 and I caught all kinds of flak from people because of what Congress had done—wait until they get wind of what is happening right now. And they will. We will definitely feel their wrath. But more important, we will experience their disappointment in letting them down.

This Senator is not going along with the “pork-a-thon.” I have voted against most of the appropriations bills that have come before the Senate, not because I am opposed to the Federal Government spending money on what is necessary, but because Congress has been unwilling to prioritize spending and unwilling to make the hard choices within the framework of the 2001 budget resolution.

In case my colleagues are not aware, let me explain briefly how big the increases are in the various appropriations bills.

The fiscal year 2001 Interior appropriations bill spends \$18.8 billion, a 26-percent increase over fiscal year 2000; the Transportation appropriations bill, spends \$16.8 billion in discretionary spending, a 23-percent increase over fiscal year 2000; the VA-HUD appropriations bill spends \$82.5 billion, a 14-percent increase; the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill spends \$15.6 billion, a 13-percent increase; the Energy and Water appropriations bill spends \$24 billion, a 12-percent increase; the Agriculture appropriations bill spends \$15 billion in discretionary spending, an 8-percent increase, and that is not including agriculture emergency spending.

For fiscal year 1999 to fiscal year 2001, nearly \$23.25 billion in agriculture emergency spending has been provided by the Government—\$23.25 billion in emergency spending. That is more than double the approximately \$10.75 billion in emergency spending for the entire 10 year period before. In other words, in 3 years, we have doubled the emergency spending for agriculture over what we spent in the 10 previous fiscal years.

In April, the Senate spent over 50 hours debating and amending a budget resolution for fiscal year 2001. An agreement was reached on an overall spending amount of \$600.3 billion in budget authority. I worked with Senators like PHIL GRAMM to add new points of order to bring more discipline to the process. But in light of recent events, I wonder what was the 50 hours of effort over? I find myself asking, Why should we have a budget resolution if we are just going to ignore it? Why even have a budget process if we are just going to operate as if the rules did not exist? Congress and the White

House are spending money like drunken sailors, and we need to get on the wagon before it is too late and we spend it all.

CBO's projections over the next 10 years estimate that Federal spending will grow with the rate of inflation, but this does not reflect reality. In fiscal year 2000 alone, we increased discretionary spending by 8.3 percent, a rate much higher than the actual inflation rate. When you compare that with the spending increases of 14 percent, 23 percent, and 26 percent in just fiscal year 2001 alone, then you can see the kind of trouble we are getting ourselves into.

Add up all the numbers, include the appropriations bills that have passed and those that are anticipated to pass; include as much as \$265 billion worth of tax reductions for the next 10 years; and, of course, we cannot forget there are going to be additional interest costs that will be generated by Congress simultaneously increasing spending and lowering taxes. Just add it all up. When you do, you will find that Congress and the Clinton-Gore administration will have reduced the 10-year projected budget surplus by more than \$600 billion. In a worst case scenario, the Concord Coalition estimates that Congress' accelerated pace of spending could wipe out up to \$1.46 trillion of the non-Social Security surplus projected for the next 10 years—over a trillion dollars is what they project. What a terrible thing we are doing to the next administration and to the citizens of this Nation.

After the 106th Congress' drunken spending spree is over, the American people and the future President will be waking up to a tremendous hangover.

FISHERMEN'S PROTECTIVE ACT OF 1967 AMENDMENTS

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on the bill (H.R. 1651).

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1651) entitled “An Act to amend the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 to extend the period during which reimbursement may be provided to owners of United States fishing vessels for costs incurred when such a vessel is seized and detained by a foreign country, and for other purposes”, with the following amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike “**SEC. 401. USE OF AIRCRAFT PROHIBITED.**” and all that follows through “**SEC. 402.**” and insert “**SEC. 401.**”.

Mr. VOINOVICH. I ask unanimous consent the Senate agree to the amendment of the House.

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