

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

THE DEFICIT

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I have been following the debate between the two Presidential candidates and notice that the Vice President wants to take full credit for paying down the deficit. At the time that the legislation went through the Congress, the President's proposal was a tax increase, and it was a proposal to increase spending in 1993.

I served on the Budget Committee in the House and I expressed at that time in reality this was not a tax to cut the deficit; it was a tax to increase spending. As members of the House Budget Committee, we had pointed out at that time that it was going to create a \$2 billion deficit as far as the mind's eye could see.

So now we have the Vice President on the campaign trail taking credit for having eliminated the deficit. In reality, what it was, it was the Republican Congress. In 1993, when this was passed, Democrats controlled the Senate, Democrats controlled the House, and Democrats were in control of the Presidency. This passed by a very narrow margin in the House. Not one Republican voted for it. It came over to the Senate and would not have passed the Senate if at that time the Vice President, AL GORE, had not voted for the budget proposal which, in effect, was going to maintain the deficit at \$200 billion.

So I wanted to bring some facts to the floor in that regard. I thought it was important I do that.

This year, in July, just before we were ready to adjourn, the assistant minority leader pointed out that I made a comment at one time and my comment was, about the President's plan in 1992, which we were voting on:

In summary, the plan has a fatal flaw—it does not reduce the deficit.

Today I am standing up on the Senate floor to stand by my remarks because, if we look historically, that plan did not reduce the deficit. In fact, I repeat, AL GORE's record is that of a tax hike because he is the one who voted for this—his vote alone. AL GORE would like to have you believe that actually what he was doing was putting in place a plan to eliminate the deficit.

I point out there is no document in the Clinton-Gore administration that exists that shows the largest tax hike—and that is what this was—the largest tax hike in American history did, or would have, or could ever have balanced the budget—not one document.

I have here before me "A Vision of Change For America." This is dated February 17, 1993. This is the President's plan on how he was going to eliminate the deficit. If we look at that, on page 22 of that document, we see the projected deficit 5 years out, from 1993, is \$241 billion, despite all the rhetoric and how it is going to pay down the deficit with the tax increase.

Then, in September of the same year, in 1993, if we look on page 34 of the "Mid-Session Review" of the 1994 budget, we see the projected deficit out to 1998 is \$181 billion.

Then, if we look at the budget of the U.S. Government proposed for 1995, proposed in 1994, again, on page 13 of that particular document we see the projected deficit, 5 years out from the date of that document, is \$181 billion again. It is flat-lining out at approximately \$200 billion a year.

Then we have another document that was published in 1994, the "Mid-Session Review" of the 1995 budget. On page 3 of that document, it shows that the deficit, 5 years out from that date, is projected to be \$207 billion. This is deficit spending. This is where you are going in, on any one fiscal year, and you are spending more than what you bring in, in revenues.

Then, following out through the first couple of years since his proposal, we look at the document, "The Budget Of The U.S. Government, Fiscal Year 1996." If we look on page 2 of that particular document, we see the projected deficit for the year 2000, 5 years out, was \$194 billion.

Then, in the Mid-Session Review on that particular budget, Mid-Session Review of the 1996 budget, we see the projected deficit 5 years out on that document is \$235 billion in 2005.

If you recall, in 1996 we had the Republican Congress elected. Under pressure from the Republicans in the Congress, the President finally admitted that his plan was not going to eliminate the deficit. So, in working with the Republican Congress, a new plan was beginning to be put in place. That is what this chart reflects. It reflects two things. The red part is this projected deficit that was passed by the President and the Congress and put into law. As we can see, it is about \$200 billion deficit spending. This is a tax increase, the largest tax increase in the history of this country.

Then we see the Republicans come into power in 1996, and what happens, which is reflected by this black line, is that the deficits dramatically are reduced, and then we find, a little past 1997, actually we are beginning to get some surpluses until where we are at 2000, where we have the huge surpluses we are dealing with today.

I think the wrong person is taking credit for this. It is the Republican Congress that made a difference on deficit spending. It was not the largest tax increase in the history of this country which was passed in the Senate, here, by the Vice President. So this is a summary of what happened 2 years after the largest tax hike in history. Finally, Clinton and GORE admitted America was still 10 years away and almost \$1 trillion short of a balanced budget.

It is not just their documents I demonstrated with on the floor of the Senate. In their own words, they verify this. During the signing ceremony on the largest tax hike in history, not a

word was uttered by President Clinton about balancing the budget or saving Social Security or paying off the national debt. At that time, the Republican plan was we really needed to have dramatic changes if we were going to make a difference in saving Social Security, eliminating the deficit, and paying down the debt. But all the plan we got out of AL GORE and the administration was that we increased taxes and we would eliminate the deficit, and it was not working because they also increased spending.

If we look at the President's comments at the signing of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993, on August 10 of 1993—this is from a book entitled "Public Papers of the President, William J. Clinton," 1993, volume 2, page 1355. If you read through his comments and examine his remarks, not once was a word uttered about balancing the budget, saving Social Security, or even paying off the national debt. Thus, AL GORE's tax hike was actually no act of heroism. What it really was, was a tax-and-spend vote instead of a tax to end the deficit.

So I wanted to address that issue here on the floor of the Senate.

In summation, Mr. President, no Clinton-Gore budget document from February 13, 1993, through July 28, 1995, ever shows a balanced budget resulting from Mr. GORE's record tax hike. No Clinton-Gore budget document from February 13, 1993, through July 28, 1995, ever shows a Social Security surplus being saved from Mr. GORE's record tax hike. And no Clinton-Gore budget document from February 13, 1993, through July 28, 1995, ever shows debt reduction or elimination resulting from Mr. GORE's record tax hike. Yet AL GORE now claims and lectures as if he actually created this surplus.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

ADOPTION TAX CREDIT FOR SPECIAL NEEDS CHILDREN

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I was on the floor yesterday and said that I would be back every day speaking about this issue. I think one of the more important issues that we need to address before we leave town. Nobody is too sure when that is actually going to happen. Some of us were expecting to be back home, having finished the people's work, weeks ago. Even as I inquire on both sides of the aisle, there is not any sense of when we will get home. I will stay here as long as it takes to get the job done, and I am not complaining.

One of the things I hope we can get done in some way, somehow, through some rule, some procedure, or some bill before we leave is to fix something so we will not be embarrassed about what we have not done. I will explain.

A few years ago, 5 years to be exact, a wonderful new provision was put in the law called the adoption tax credit.

I am the cochair, along with Senator CRAIG, my wonderful colleague from Idaho. This is a wonderful coalition of Democrats, Republicans, conservatives, liberals, but we have all come together on the issue of adoption, promoting it as a wonderful way to build families, to strengthen communities, to give children hope, to put parents together with children whom they have always wanted to have, dreamed, and worked for, who will love them and raise them because governments do not do a very good job of that. The fact is, there are literally millions and millions of children in this world who are desperate for someone to love them and provide a home.

Congress, in a bipartisan expression, overwhelmingly put into effect a wonderful tax credit because adoptions, unlike pregnancy, are not covered by insurance. There are not the same benefits, unfortunately, in the labor market or in business for pregnancies and adoption.

Recognizing the somewhat disadvantage on families who build their families through adoption, the Congress rightfully put in place a \$5,000 credit for families.

There is a recent Treasury report that says the credit is being used by thousands of families. This report, which was filed in the last 2 weeks, goes into some very clear and interesting detail about who is using this credit, how much the expenses related to adoption are.

For those who are not familiar, since our children are adopted, I can say from personal experience that there are expenses associated not only with the legal act itself but with agency expenses. In the United States, that can range anywhere from a low of \$2,000 to a high of \$15,000 or \$20,000. For international adoptions—and there are many Members and staffers who have adopted who can give personal testimony—that can range anywhere from a low of \$5,000 to \$30,000. It is an expense with which many moderate- and middle-income families have difficulty.

Despite those difficulties, there are families all over this Nation who have adopted not one not two children. I met a family recently from Philadelphia that has adopted 20 children, some of them with special needs. This is not a family that inherited a fortune or is heir to a great fortune. This is a working family struggling to put food on the table, but because they felt compelled to give hope and prayer to some children, they have opened their home to 20.

I do not expect there will be many people who will adopt 20. I am one of nine, and my mother did a pretty terrific job of raising nine of us. I have two children, which is what I can handle at this time.

This adoption tax credit is working to a certain extent. We are ready to extend it because it runs out this year. We want to do that, and we want to increase it. Right now, it is \$5,000 for a

regular adoption and \$6,000 for a special needs child.

The problem is—and I urge my colleagues and those who are interested in this issue to hear me—that under the current Tax Code, special needs children—special needs children are defined as those who are in foster care. There are 100,000 of them whose parental rights—the rights of their parents—have been terminated. These children are freed for adoption. There are another 400,000 children of all ages, races, and background in foster care, either on their way to being reunited with their family, which is always our hope if that is possible, or on their way to an adoptive family.

If we do not make a change in the bill on which we will be asked to vote sometime in the next few days, or if we do not make a change in the phraseology about this tax credit, we are going to leave behind 100,000 children. If the train is leaving the station, it is as if you are waving goodbye to 100,000 children in this Nation, some of the most vulnerable children, children the system has failed, children whose parents abandoned them, abused them, or grossly neglected them. The system has already failed them once, Mr. President. I do not have the heart and I do not think we have the heart to fail them again.

I know there are many issues, big bills and important issues, but for 100,000 kids in America, Serina being one of them, if we do not fix this problem, which I think is the intention of this body, then we are going to leave children like Serina behind. Let me tell you a little about Serina.

Serina was taken into foster care immediately upon her birth. Her mother was a 16-year-old foster child herself who was addicted to crack cocaine. Because of her mother's drug addiction, one might say we could blame the mother, but since the system failed her and left her in foster care without a real mother and real father, then I am not sure who is to blame, but this child was born with cerebral palsy because babies do not take crack cocaine very well, as well as other multiple problems, including addiction, a history of herpes, encephalitis, seizure disorders, including epilepsy. She has two biological siblings, one of whom was also adopted by her adoptive parents.

The family that adopted Serina, knowing full well these conditions, knowing full well the difficulties involved in raising this child—the doctors said she could never walk; she could never hear; she could never function. She is doing all of these things beautifully. She, under our current Tax Code, gets nothing. Her parents get nothing for the adoption because she is a special needs child, as is obvious. There are no expenses necessarily associated with her adoption. These are not the kind of children that agencies regularly place. There were no legal fees. There are no adoption agency fees.

We are about to pass a bill that is going to leave behind 100,000 of the

most vulnerable, most needy children and their families who are doing God's work.

I am happy these other children—a little girl from Guatemala and a little boy from the United States—are able to use the current adoption system. Their parents, too, have done a wonderful job giving these children an opportunity for life, love, and success. The adoption credit is working for them. I say hooray and let's continue it. But, please, let us not leave behind the special needs children of our own country, American citizens, children born in the United States.

We say in the adoption caucus—and I am proud to be one of the leaders—that there are no unwanted children; there are just unfound families.

If our Tax Code can help people build homes, can help businesses start up, and can help very wealthy people support their products internationally, if we can give millions and hundreds of tax credits to special interests, I most certainly think the Members of this body—the House and Senate; Republicans and Democrats—can find the will to add not one dollar but to change a phrase in the law so all children and all families can benefit from this adoption credit.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time. But I will be back on the floor later today and every day, if not today, until we leave here. If I have to read the names of every one of the 100,000 children waiting, I am going to try to do that, until I get some response that this tax credit we are about to pass is going to include the children who need the help the most and their families. If I have to read all 100,000 names—this I hold in my hand is just a few—I am prepared to do it.

I thank the Chair and yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. President, I ask how much time is left in morning business so I can ask unanimous consent that I have time after the Senator from Missouri has spoken. Could the Presiding Officer tell me what the time limit at this point is?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority has 13 minutes; the minority has 14 minutes 20 seconds.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the Senator from Missouri speaks, we extend the time for the majority and the minority equally by 15 minutes each; 15 minutes for the majority, 15 minutes for the minority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I thank the Chair.

AMERICA'S BRAVE SERVICE MEN AND WOMEN AND VICE PRESIDENT GORE'S RECORD ON FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to address two issues that are related; first, to express support for one of the most lethal and effective foreign policy instruments we know; that is, our brave service men and women who are standing guard on distant shores. We were reminded of that recently by the terrorist attack on the U.S.S. *Cole* in Yemen. It was yet another reminder that our forces are on watch 24 hours a day in farflung places many of us have never heard of. Their presence and service is a crucial component of foreign policy.

The effort of the sailors aboard the U.S.S. *Cole* in saving the ship is a testimony to the honor, courage, and commitment the Navy expects from every sailor wearing the Navy uniform.

Our thanks and our congratulations go to them; our sorrow, of course, for those who were lost; and our sympathies and prayers go with their families.

But in light of the danger in which these fighting men and women of the United States are placed, it is important we assess our foreign policy, and that we take a look at the record of what has happened in the past.

What have the two candidates done? Where would the Vice President lead us, based on his experience to date?

When you talk about experience with respect to Vice President GORE's foreign policy, I am reminded of that old saw that "experience is what you get when you expected to get something else." His record of experience has been a very bad one, and one that will put at risk other sailors and other U.S. military in the future. You don't need to look too far to share these concerns.

First, let me call attention to a Wall Street Journal editorial page article, "Gore's Hidden Weakness: Foreign Policy" from Monday, October 23. There Robert Zoellick expresses concern over the supposed foreign policy experience that Vice President GORE would bring to the White House.

In the article he said that in the Chernomyrdin agreement:

... he blessed Russian exports to Iran of weapons that could only be targeted against the U.S. Navy, which protects the world's energy lifeline.

He went on to say:

... Russian technicians continued to help Iran develop "laser isotope separation technology" used to enrich uranium for nuclear weapons.

This was to a country that the State Department called "the most active state sponsor of terrorism." We would have hoped that our Vice President, in his agreements with Mr. Chernomyrdin, would have been trying to build a market economy based on the rule of law. He should have prodded them to close down the corrupt commissions. But what we seem to have seen, as a result, or what has followed

on that agreement, was a Soviet-style bureaucracy that never made any progress.

There was an admission that the IMF money went to foreigners and Russian speculators.

Quoting the editorial further, the former chairman of Russia's security commission said:

"I cannot explain why the Western governments didn't pay serious attention." And Anatoly Chubais, Mr. Chernomyrdin's deputy, said pithily: "We conned them out of \$20 billion."

And the editorial writer, Mr. Zoellick, says:

Mr. Gore's Russian record is more than a litany of costly mistakes. The vice president was unable to either perceive the true nature of Russia's transformation or to design creative U.S. policy to match the circumstances.

I think we ought to be alarmed. We ought to be alarmed at the record that Vice President GORE has written as he takes credit for our foreign policy with Russia.

Is it really credit, when we find that the Russians continue to export arms to Iran? Would it alarm Americans that Iran, which relies on Russian arms sales to maintain its own military, sends arms also to Hezbollah's guerrillas in Lebanon, which uses those same arms against Israeli soldiers in settlements?

Yesterday, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations began hearings to probe the recent press reports that Vice President AL GORE and the Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin made a secret agreement 5 years ago promising the Clinton White House would not enforce the law requiring sanctions for Russian sales to Iran.

Is this what we can expect, secret deals with Russia that have not stopped the sales of dangerous weapons to Iran? We are still seeking disclosure to the appropriate committees of Congress of the details of the Gore-Chernomyrdin agreement.

They have not come forward even to give the committees of jurisdiction the details on that agreement. What is going on? Why is it being hidden?

I think we all ought to be very much concerned about what appears to be a series of deadly mistakes covered up—covered up—and kept out of the view of the congressional committees.

Now, portions of the 12-page agreement between Vice President GORE and Mr. Chernomyrdin appeared in the October 17 edition of the Washington Times. In there, it appeared that the U.S. Vice President committed our country to "avoid any penalties to Russia that might otherwise arise under domestic law." The final document reads: "This aide memoire, as well as the attached annexes, will remain strictly confidential."

This secret Gore-Chernomyrdin agreement, and the Clinton-Gore administration's promise not to implement U.S. laws requiring sanctions for

Russian weapons proliferation to Iran, was first reported in the New York Times on October 13 of this year. It said there that:

In exchange for the Russian promises, the United States pledged not to seek penalties against Russia under a 1992 law that requires sanctions against countries that sell advanced weaponry to countries the State Department classifies as state sponsors of terrorism. Iran is on that list.

The law they are referring to, of course, is the 1992 Iran-Iraq Non-Proliferation Act. That was sponsored by the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. AL GORE, along with Senator MCCAIN.

Let's be clear. This law requires the President impose sanctions on countries that sell advanced weaponry or assist in nuclear weapons programs in countries sponsoring terrorism. Russian cooperation with Iran's nuclear program was a major concern behind enactment of that legislation. How do you get around that?

The White House has attempted to downplay the impact of Vice President GORE's deal by arguing the weaponry transferred was "antiquated."

I see nothing antiquated about laser isotope separation technology, which was described in the Wall Street Journal article, being used to enrich uranium for nuclear weapons.

It is my understanding that some of the weapons sold to Iran by Russia included the Kilo-class submarine, which is difficult to detect and track in the shallow waters of the Persian Gulf because they generate very little noise while operating on battery power. In the event of a crisis, these submarines would present a credible threat to U.S. forces, allied vessels, and merchant marine traffic. They also aid wake-homing torpedoes and antiship mines. If these weapons pose a significant threat to U.S. ships and forces in the region, then these transfers appear to me to meet the threshold for sanctions under the Gore-McCain Act.

Make no mistake, were tensions to escalate between the United States and countries in the Middle East, these weapons could have a catastrophic effect on our sailors and other military personnel on ships in the region. We just saw what a small simple boat loaded with explosives could do. What other reminders do we need.

The Vice President defends his actions claiming that none of the weapons included met the standard for triggering sanctions. Yet the Washington Times uncovered a letter sent last January to the Russian Foreign Minister by Secretary of State Madeleine Albright admitting:

Without the aid memoire, Russia's conventional arms sales to Iran would have been subject to sanctions based on various provisions of our laws.

In classified documents obtained by the Washington Times, a 1995 letter, apparently written by Mr. Chernomyrdin to Vice President GORE, said: