

(Dollars in millions)

Selected states	FY 98 Allocation	Unused FY 1998 Funds*	Percent unused
Minnesota	28	28	99
Louisiana	102	74	73
New Mexico	63	58	92

*Source: Health Care Financing Administration (6-27-00).

4. EXTENSION OF USE OF FUNDS

It is widely recognized that the S-CHIP program began slowly because state legislatures and HCFA had to approve state plans.

Congress is expected to allow states with unused funds from FY 1998 and FY 1999 to keep those funds for an additional period of time as enrollment accelerates.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, with reference to how many civilian full-time equivalent employees have been reduced during the 8 years showing that 96 percent of it is military and 4 percent civilian comes from OMB, I ask unanimous consent that chart be printed in the RECORD.

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

TOTAL EXECUTIVE BRANCH CIVILIAN FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT EMPLOYEES: 1993-2000
(In thousands)

Fiscal year	Department of Defense	All other agencies	Total executive branch
1993	932	1207	2139
1994	868	1184	2053
1995	822	1148	1970
1996	779	1113	1892
1997	746	1089	1835
1998	707	1083	1790
1999	681	1097	1778
2000	661	1195	1857
Decrease from 1993-2000	-271	-12	-282
Portion of Total Decrease from 1993 to 2000	271/282=96%	12/282=4%	

Source: Office of Management and Budget, The Budget of the United States Government for Fiscal Year 2001, Historical Tables, Table 17.3, p. 282.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FITZGERALD). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, we concluded a short time ago with the argument by the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. GREGG, on his concerns about some aspects of the Older Americans Act. I thought we were going to resume a robust debate. That does not quite seem like it is going to happen, but I am going to have things to say. Right now I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that it be charged equally, and then I will take the floor and begin my rebuttal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. DORGAN, be recognized for 15 minutes to speak as in morning business.

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

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

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

The Senator has 15 minutes.

OUR COUNTRY'S ECONOMY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I want to speak for a few minutes today about the issue of this country's economy. I was reminded the other day, in one of the discussions with respect to the contest for the Presidency this year, that some say: Really, nothing has happened with respect to the last 8 years and this administration. It got me to thinking of where we have been and what we are experiencing in this country today.

As I have indicated previously, I believe we are blessed in this country. We have the strongest economy in the world and the longest economic expansion in this country's history. And this is not all accidental. Some say that had nothing to do with Government, it had to do with the American people. The American people were working very hard in the 1950s and the 1980s, and during other periods. However, you also need a set of sensible Government policies that reduce the Federal indebtedness, stimulate investment and do the other things that are necessary to allow this economic engine to run and to work right. So this is not an accident.

Let me describe where we are. At the moment, we are 115 months into the longest economic expansion on record. That is something all of us should feel very good about.

Let me describe what happened to us back in the 1980s. In the early 1980s especially, we began a significant amount of red ink, deficit after deficit after deficit, and it kept getting worse and worse.

As you can see from this chart, the deficits went up to \$290 billion in the Federal budget in 1992. Then, in 1993, Congress made some hard decisions. This President, a new President, proposed a controversial new economic plan. Some did not like it. Some still do not like it. It passed the Senate by one vote and passed the House by one vote. This new economic plan provided a different direction. The deficits got smaller and smaller, and then we began to see surpluses, and more surpluses, and more.

Is this a turnaround? Yes, I think so. Is it accidental? No. It happened, as you can see indicated on this chart, when a new President proposed a bold economic plan and, by one vote in the House and the Senate, we embraced a new direction and a new approach. You can see by this chart what the result has been. We went from the largest deficits in history to the largest surpluses in this country's history.

Jobs created. The Government does not create jobs. But jobs are created in a timeframe in which the Government, with a set of policies, provides for economic opportunity in the expansion of the economy. Under the Reagan administration, in 8 years, 16 million jobs were created; the Bush administration, 4 years, 2.5 million jobs; under this administration, in 8 years, 22 million new jobs. It is a wonderful record, with an economy that is working better than anyone ever could have anticipated.

The unemployment rate. This economy is full of good news for our country. You can see what has happened to the unemployment rate, beginning in 1992 and 1993, when this Congress set this country on a different course to an economy of reduced deficits, with more robust growth. Unemployment has gone down, down, way down. That is good economic news for America's families.

The inflation rate is down. As we can see, we have had a low inflation rate that has been stable throughout the 1990s.

The lowest poverty rate in two decades. You can see from this chart what happened when this economy began to kick into fifth gear and we began to see lower deficits and more economic growth. We saw lower unemployment, and now we see lower poverty rates.

Some say: That is just an accident; isn't it? No, it is not just an accident. This Congress, by one vote, embraced a new plan offered by a new President in 1993. It was very controversial, and it worked. The evidence is all around us.

We had people on the floor of the Senate who said: Pass this plan, and it will bankrupt our country. Pass this plan, and our country will experience a recession. Pass this plan, and there will be people unemployed in the streets.

They were wrong. Where we were headed was a very difficult circumstance for our country: Bigger and bigger deficits; slow, anemic economic growth. We changed the plan. The Clinton-Gore proposal in 1993 was passed by one vote in both the House and the Senate. We changed direction. And we see unemployment down, inflation down, poverty rates down, and more.

And now, as a result of economic growth and better opportunity, the federal income tax burden on middle-income taxpayers has decreased, as well as the percent of income paid in Federal income taxes.

With respect to the burden of Federal income taxes on middle-income workers, those with average income of \$39,000 in 1999, the Federal income tax

burden has actually decreased during this same period.

Federal spending as a percentage of the gross domestic product in this country is down. That is not an accident either. That relates how much we spend to what our economy is in terms of its total value of goods and services produced. Federal spending is lower as a percent of GDP.

Let's review the U.S. economy, since we passed the bill in 1993, that a new President, a new Vice President proposed that we pass to change direction. We were headed in the wrong direction. We saw deficit after deficit. It was getting larger.

Let me show the chart again, because I think it is important—deficit after deficit, getting larger each year. Here is where we were. As you can see, a \$290 billion Federal deficit in that 1 year, growing by leaps and bounds. We changed direction. The deficits got smaller and smaller and turned into surpluses. That is not an accident. That is a function of good public policy.

In 1992, we had the highest dollar deficit in history. Today, we have the largest dollar surplus in our Federal budget history. Economic growth, 2.8 percent annually in the 12 years before 1993, since 3.9 percent annually; job growth, 1989 to 1992, one of the worst 4-year periods in history, 2.5 million new jobs; in the 8 years since, 22 million new jobs. The unemployment rate average, 7 percent from 1981 to 1992; 4.1 percent in the last 8 years, the lowest in 30 years. Home ownership fell between 1982 and 1992. Now it is the highest in history. Median family income fell from 1988 to 1992. Now it has increased by \$5,000 since 1993. Welfare rolls increased 22 percent from 1982 to 1992; decreased by 53 percent between 1993 and 2000. The Dow Jones was at 3,300, and now it is over 10,000.

That is the consequence of having an economic plan that works. When people say, well, not much has changed, a lot has changed. In 1992, this country was headed in the wrong direction. Now it is headed in the right direction. In 1992, we had an anemic economy that was producing higher deficits, slower growth, more unemployment. Now we have an economy that is producing budget surpluses, lower unemployment, lower inflation, and the longest economic expansion in this country's history.

When I hear discussions on the campaign trail about where we have been and where we are, they need to be rooted in some basis of fact. You would have had to have been on another planet not to understand that the last 8 years have been truly significant.

I am not saying that one side or the other should claim credit for everything. I am saying this because I was here and I know it. This country was headed in the wrong direction, with fiscal policies that said you can have a very big tax cut, you can double defense spending, and somehow every-

thing will turn out all right. It didn't. It turned out with huge, growing, abiding deficits every year that sucked the strength out of this country's economy. It meant people didn't have jobs when they wanted jobs. It meant businesses couldn't expand when they wanted to expand. It meant our Federal budget deficit was swollen with red ink.

It wasn't working. It was a plan that didn't work. David Stockman told us in his book, shortly after helping concoct the plan in early 1981, that it wouldn't work. It didn't work. It put this country in a deficit ditch, a deep hole.

We had a new plan, a different plan. No, it wasn't the same old trickle down where you pour something in at the top and hope everybody down at the bottom gets damp somehow. It was a plan that percolates up, saying that this country's economic engine works best when everybody has a little something to work with, when everyone has confidence in the future.

Our economy rests on a mattress of confidence of a sort. If people are confident about the future, they do things that manifest that confidence. They buy a car, a house, do the kinds of things that manifest confidence in the future. If they are not confident in their future, they do exactly the opposite and the economy contracts.

No one has ever repealed the business cycle nor will they. We have economic expansions and contractions. But economic expansions occur when people are confident, and they are sustained when people are confident.

Right here, in 1993, this new President, President Clinton, and Vice President GORE said: We have a different plan. We are going to change directions. We don't want to be in the same deficit ditch we have been in all these years. It is going to be tough. It is going to be controversial, but we want you to be with us to make these changes. Enough of us were. As I indicated, by one vote in the Senate and one vote in the House, we changed direction.

The American people had an assessment that was different than the assessment they had in the past. They became confident that Congress finally was going to do something to tackle these deficits, not just talk about them but tackle them, to get this country's fiscal policy back under some amount of control.

People's confidence increased. The result was that our economy began to rebound. It produced more economic growth than anyone thought possible. It produced lower unemployment than virtually anyone thought possible, and we have economic strength and opportunity across the entire country as a result of it.

Some areas have been left behind; I understand that. My point is, even as we work on those remaining areas, this country has done very well. It is not an accident. I get a little fatigued hearing people say nothing has happened in the last 8 years.

What has happened is this administration, the Clinton-Gore administration, inherited a weak, anemic economy, and we turned it around. Was it easy? No. We paid a price for the votes we cast to do it. It wasn't easy. It wasn't the best political choice. It wasn't the most popular choice. But it was the required choice to say what is happening in this country isn't right and we need to change it.

Changing it has meant that virtually everything in this country has improved. Welfare rolls are down, home ownership is up, unemployment down, inflation down. Almost every indices of economic health in this country shows strong, sustained improvement. That is not some historical accident. It is not. It is a function of a Congress, a President, and Vice President teaming up to make tough choices, to say we are moving in the wrong direction and, with as much strength and courage as it takes, we are going to turn that steering wheel and move the country back in the right direction.

When people said, we blame you for the votes you cast in 1993, even back then, just after the vote, I said: You can't blame me. I demand that you give me credit for that vote. As unpopular as it might be, it was the right thing for this country to do. I am proud to have participated in it. I feel exactly the same way today. Do not dare to blame me for that vote. I voted to change direction because this country was headed in the wrong direction.

This country is now headed in the right direction. We have a lot of challenges ahead of us and a lot to do. One of my great worries is that those people who now say, oh, by the way, we are going to have 10 years of surpluses, don't understand the lessons of history. We don't have 10 years of surpluses. We have economic uncertainty ahead, unless we maintain a fiscal policy that makes sense. A trillion and a half dollars in tax cuts before even the surplus exists will put us right back into the same deficit ditch we had been in for so long back in the 1980s and early 1990s.

We dare not squander this opportunity. We need a fiscal policy that makes sense, one on which we can rely, one that says to the American people, our first priority is not to give tax cuts with money we don't have. Our first priority, when we have better economic times and have a budget surplus, is to use part of that surplus to pay down the Federal debt. If during tough times you run up the Federal debt, as we did, during good times you ought to have the common sense to pay down part of that Federal debt, as we should.

This is the story. This is where we have been, and this is where we are. I worry very much that the kind of proposals offered by some here and by Governor Bush running for President—about \$1.5 trillion in new tax cuts, most of which will go to those who need it least—will put us right back into the same deficit we have been in too long. We have worked too hard to squander our economic strength now.

THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT
AMENDMENTS OF 2000—Continued

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, the business before us is the Older Americans Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. DEWINE. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is under the control of Senator JEFFORDS of Vermont.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 108 minutes remaining.

Mr. JEFFORDS. How much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. DEWINE. One minute, and then I will ask that my colleague from Iowa be recognized.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, the business before the Senate is the Older Americans Act. Specifically, we have Senator GREGG's amendment. I rise, very reluctantly, to oppose that amendment. In a moment, I will explain to my colleagues why I believe that amendment is unnecessary and why I believe it simply must be turned down if we are going to pass the Older Americans Act this year.

Before I do that, I want to allow my colleague from Iowa, who has come to the floor and has a major provision in this bill, to talk about this provision. I compliment him on it. He has been the lead sponsor in the Senate on a separate bill. We incorporated his bill into the Older Americans Act. The provision he will explain to the Senate is one of the new provisions of the Older Americans Act in this bill and it is a major contribution. I thank him for that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I have a question for the Senator from Ohio. He has the floor. I thought we would be alternating in the spirit of comity. What was the preference?

Mr. DEWINE. I was trying to accommodate Mr. GRASSLEY, whom I asked to come over here about this time. It is my understanding he has about 10 minutes. I would be happy to have you proceed at any point. At some point, I am going to talk about the Gregg amendment and why I think it should be opposed. I will be on the floor, so it doesn't matter when I do it.

Ms. MIKULSKI. My suggestion is that Senator GRASSLEY proceed and then our colleague, Senator MURRAY, proceed. She wishes to speak for 10 minutes. How about if those two speak—GRASSLEY followed by MURRAY—and then, if it is appropriate, unless other Members want to speak, the Senator and I can engage in debate on the amendment.

Mr. DEWINE. That is fine with me.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Iowa 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today in support of H.R. 782, the Older Americans Act Amendments of 2000. I join my colleagues in commending Chairmen JEFFORDS and DEWINE and other members of the committee for their hard work and endless energy in bringing this important measure to the floor.

In its 35th year, the Older Americans Act continues to meet its mission of helping seniors stay independent and part of their community. The wide array of services available under the act serve as the life-line to millions of seniors across the Nation.

Seniors in both rural and urban areas rely heavily on one or more of these services: nutrition services such as home-delivered meals; meals served in congregate settings; transportation services to medical appointments; legal assistance; protection from abuse through the ombudsman program; pension counseling services; in-home services; and volunteer and employment opportunities for older persons.

As chairman of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, I am particularly pleased that this bill contains the National Family Caregiver Support Program. Over the past 3 years, Senator BREAU and I have convened a number of hearings to examine the important role that family caregivers play. More than 20 million Americans are caring for an aging or ailing family member. To put this number in perspective, there are fewer than 2 million seniors living in nursing homes. So simply by looking at the numbers, we can conclude that the bulk of caring for our Nation's elderly is carried out by family and friends in the form of informal caregiving.

The story of Barbara Boyd, a state legislator from Ohio who testified before the Special Committee on Aging last year, provides a good example of what a caregivers job entails. Ms. Boyd cared at home for her mother who had Alzheimer's disease and breast cancer. Her mother had \$20,000 in savings and a monthly Social Security check. That went quickly. Her prescription drugs alone ran \$400 a month. Antibiotics, ointments to prevent skin breakdown, incontinence supplies, and other expenses cost hundreds of dollars a month.

Ms. Boyd exhausted her own savings to care for her mother, and exhausted herself. She isn't complaining. Family caregivers don't complain.

The contribution of family caregivers is enormous. Economically, family caregiving is worth billions of dollars. Emotionally and physically, caregiving is often an overwhelming task. Caregivers know what it entails to juggle personal and professional demands with the responsibilities that accompany caregiving.

This is why the Family Caregiving Support Program, now a part of the Older Americans Act bill before us, is

critically important to families caring for loved ones who are ill or who have disabilities. The program uses existing resources to meet a pressing need. In this case, the already successful network of aging centers will administer the program.

It will serve millions of caregivers throughout hundreds of communities nationwide by providing: respite care; information and assistance; caregiving counseling and training and supplemental services to caregivers and their families.

Our country is aging, and that demographic shift creates new needs, and this legislation helps us meet those needs. The Older Americans Act not only serves as a critical safety net, but it embraces important principles that we should uphold in policies that serve our nation's elderly.

The act calls attention to the need to prepare our nation's aging population for its own longevity by enhancing health promotion opportunities, improving flexibility for states and area agencies on aging, by modernizing programs and services, and in calling for a White House Conference on Aging in 2005.

Finally, the act provides authorization for the thirteen area agencies on aging in my home state of Iowa. In 1999, these funds enabled the agencies to serve nearly 293,000 elderly Iowans. The services the act funds are critical to older Americans in my state and throughout the country.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of a letter I recently received from Representative BOYD be printed in the RECORD.

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

OHIO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Columbus, OH, October 16, 2000.

Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY,
Dirksen Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR GRASSLEY: We have in the state of Ohio term limits, and I am at the end of my fourth term. I will certainly miss the House, but I know my work is not done. I will continue to advocate for the elderly, especially Alzheimer's and caregivers. There is a rumor that I will be in other areas of "expertise", which are Welfare Reform, Human Services, and healthcare. It is my understanding that I have a great advocacy being voiced in my interest in public policy in the state of Ohio.

My passion will always revolve around the issue of caregiving. I have found that I remain a voice on the issue and a sounding board for those who are heartbroken.

October 21st will be two years since Mother passed, and there is not a day that dawns that I do not think of her. She, in her last years, taught me more than I ever learned in college. Everyday I marvel at the fact that I did what I set out to do during those five and a half years. Truly, my heavenly father watches over me.

If there is ever an opportunity to serve on a national level, on a board or committee on caregiving, please keep me in mind. I will be sure to keep in touch with you.