

have the potential to be widely inaccurate; and we all agree with that. But the fact is, we do know there is a dynamic that occurs when we change our tax policy, and the experts are telling us that dynamic will be beneficial to making our economy more flexible and more resilient.

So the question is, Do we take this stand now? Do we do what is necessary to give a boost to the economy, realizing it may take a period of years for the real strength of it to build us back to where we have made our posture stronger, do we sit tight and do nothing now and hope the economy grows out of it on its own or, as some will probably suggest, do we spend ourselves into prosperity? Does the Federal Government take the position that we need to have a lot of spending, a lot of stimulus in the economy, and we should just not concern ourselves with the deficit but spend ourselves back into a strong position economically?

As you might guess, I strongly reject that "spend ourselves back into prosperity" argument. It will probably never be said that way today or throughout this week. But I encourage people who follow this debate to note, when amendments are proposed, do those amendments drive up the deficit or do they not? Do those amendments drive up Federal spending or do they not?

Let's go back to that first chart with the lines, because as we debate amendments on this budget, the amendments will generally have one of two or three impacts. They will either be deficit-neutral, which means they could increase spending by increasing taxes or they could reduce taxes, which is reduce this line, or they could increase spending, which is this line.

I think it is very important for people to pay attention to the amendments that are offered because this whole week I hope we do not get any amendments on the floor that would drive the deficit up with more spending. I would hope we would recognize the deficit increases that are caused by the tax reductions can be addressed with an understanding of the dynamic impact they will have over time.

Just a couple of other arguments I want to address.

It has been said the proposals of this budget spend the Social Security trust fund. I understand what is being said there. Let me clarify what the situation is because I do not believe Americans should go away from this debate believing that somehow the Social Security trust fund is being robbed. The fact is, regardless of whether the tax cut is eliminated from this budget or whether it is put into this budget, the Social Security trust fund, at the end of the 10-year cycle, will be about \$4.1 trillion. It will be the same trust fund no matter what happens. Because what occurs is that, in the Social Security trust fund, the excess that comes in from payroll taxes that is not spent out into the Social Security system is

a part of that surplus. That surplus is turned into Federal debt instruments.

Then, what are those Federal debt instruments used for? Spending, or for tax relief, or for whatever is a matter for Congress to address. But the fact is, those Federal debt instruments are there, and they are still there to protect Social Security.

My last point. Some have said we should not do anything because we are possibly going to be going to war. Again, the argument there seems to be that tax relief is not wholesome for the economy; therefore, we should not be doing anything to destabilize the economy.

I believe what I have said indicates where I come down on that point, that the fact is we must do something to stimulate and strengthen this economy. The medicine we need is in the President's proposal and is made possible by the projections of this budget.

Although we will face some very expensive and very difficult budget decisions, if the United States goes to war in Iraq, that simply increases the need for us to do our best to make this economy strong and to do what we can, through our tax policy decisions, to put us in the best posture to have a flexible, resilient economy in these difficult world circumstances. So for all these reasons, I encourage this Senate to support this budget.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I wish to speak as in morning business and I will use my leader time to do so.

SALUTING SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, about 3 months ago, a remarkable discovery was made. In an abandoned storeroom in the subbasement of this Capitol, two Senate staffers discovered the long-lost, handwritten payroll records of the Senate from 1790 to 1870.

The ledger contains a vast wealth of information about the birth and the history of this Senate. It also contains authentic signatures of John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, and Aaron Burr. Historians say it is very likely the only document in the world signed by all three of those giants of American history.

Three days after it was found, I was able to hold that ledger in my hands. Every page I turned revealed more legendary names: James Monroe, George Mason, Abraham Lincoln, Daniel Webster, Henry Clay, John Calhoun. It was a rare privilege to be able to hold such a tangible link to the giants of this Senate. For the last 16 years, I have had the privilege to be able to serve with—and learn from—a living link to those giants: the incomparable senior Senator from West Virginia, ROBERT C. BYRD.

Today, we celebrate yet another milestone in Senator BYRD's extraor-

dinary career. As of today, Senator BYRD has served in Congress for 50 years, 2 months, and 14 days. Since the beginning of our Nation, only two Members of Congress have served longer than Senator BYRD.

For the last 44 years—more than half his life—Senator BYRD has served in this Senate—longer than all but one other Senator. I come to the floor today to congratulate Senator BYRD on reaching this historic milestone and to thank him for the many lessons he has taught me and for the kindnesses he has shown me over these many years. I also thank Erma Byrd, Senator BYRD's wife. I have heard Senator BYRD say often that he could not do this job were it not for her support and her love. I thank Mrs. Byrd for sharing so much of her husband with their State, and our Nation, for so long.

At the beginning of our Nation, there was another couple who shared a great passion for democracy and public service. Their names were John and Abigail Adams. On July 3, 1776, the day the Declaration of Independence was signed, John Adams wrote to Abigail about the world-changing events that had occurred that day in Independence Hall in Philadelphia. In that letter, John Adams wondered whether future generations would understand how much the signers of the Declaration had risked so that the Americans who would come after them could know freedom.

Somewhere, I think, John and Abigail Adams must be smiling down on Senator BYRD. In these anxious days, when some argue that the United States must curtail some of our Constitutional rights, or rewrite the balance of powers in our Government, ROBERT BYRD reminds us that principled compromise is a worthy goal—but our basic constitutional principles themselves must never be compromised.

ROBERT CARLYLE BYRD seems as much a part of West Virginia as the Appalachian Mountains themselves. In fact, he was born, in 1917, in North Carolina. After his mother died of scarlet fever, his father gave him up before his first birthday. He was adopted by his aunt and uncle, who took him to West Virginia's coal country. His family had little money.

After graduating from high school and working for a time as a butcher in a coal company store, he yearned for a political life. He began that political life in 1946, when he was elected to the West Virginia state legislature. Six years later, he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives. And 6 years after that, he was elected to this Senate. Two years ago, he was elected to his eighth term in the Senate. Only one Senator—Strom Thurmond—ever served longer in the Senate. He is one of only a handful of Senators ever to cast 15,000 votes in this body.

Over the years, ROBERT BYRD has served as majority leader, minority leader, President pro tempore and

President pro tem emeritus of the Senate, not to mention Democratic whip and chairman and ranking member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. He is the preeminent historian of the Senate and the author of the definitive history of this institution. He is a legendary orator. His speeches cover everything from the great issues of the day to the framers of the Constitution and the need for civility in the Senate to the virtues of the King James Bible and even the greatness of dogs. He is a master of the Senate's rules and traditions. Two years ago, he offered to share his knowledge of those rules with newly elected Senators. Most of the new Senators took advantage of those priceless tutorials. So did a few Senators who had been around for a lot longer.

All of his life, ROBERT BYRD has been driven by the desire to know and understand more. He was already serving in the Senate when he earned a law degree from American University in 1963, after a decade in night school. He received his bachelor's degree from Marshall University in 1994.

Besides great constitutional issues, another development that always provokes eloquence from Senator BYRD is when one of his fellow Senators marks a personal milestone. I was deeply touched by his beautiful words to my family and me on the birth of my first grandchild nearly a year ago. I know those words were not easy ones for a man whose heart still breaks over the death of his own grandson 20 years ago. And my family and I treasure them.

Last November, the New York Times ran a profile on Senator BYRD on the occasion of his 85th birthday. The article described how, during the debate on the homeland security bill, Senator BYRD would come to this floor every day and, for hours, voice his concerns about what he regarded as serious flaws in the bill.

The reporter asked Senator BYRD: "Why are you spending so much time—and irritating some of your fellow Senators—prolonging a battle you're sure to lose?" Senator BYRD replied, "To me, that question misses the point, with all due respect to you for asking it." "To me," he said, "the matter is there for a thousand years in the record. I stood for the Constitution. I stood for the institution. If it isn't heard today, there'll be some future member who will come through and will comb through these tomes."

To that, I will add a prediction of my own: Years from now, Americans will read the name "ROBERT C. BYRD" and they will read the words of this extraordinary Senator. And when they do, they will feel that same respect and gratitude I felt when I held that ledger in my hands and looked at the names of some of the giants of our past. ROBERT C. BYRD is a vital link to the patriots who created our democracy . . . I am honored to know him and serve with him, and to call him my teacher and friend.

By the way, on December 2, 2009, Senator BYRD will become the longest-serving member in the history of Congress. I look forward to celebrating that day with him and to the many days I hope to be able to serve with him and learn from him between now and then.

I yield the floor.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE U.S. GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I rise to respond briefly to my colleague who spoke previously on the question of the budget before us. He put up a chart that showed just the effects in 2004 and said that the tax cut was not the biggest reason for the decline in our fiscal condition. But let us recall that the chart he put up was for 2004 alone.

The President's proposals are not 1-year proposals. They are multiyear proposals. Two thousand four is one of the years where the tax cuts have the least cost and the least effect. The reason for that is the tax cuts that have already been passed and the tax cuts the President has proposed are back-end loaded.

The biggest cost comes toward the end of the 10-year period. When we look at the whole 10-year period of 2001 going forward, what we see is a much different picture than our colleague from Idaho showed.

There we see that the biggest single reason for the decline in our fiscal condition is the tax cuts. We can see, just as a reality test, the tax cuts already passed, including the interest cost, are \$1.7 trillion. The tax cuts going forward, the President has proposed, including interest costs, are \$1.96 trillion. That is a total of nearly \$3.7 trillion. The decline in our fiscal circumstance is \$7.7 trillion. So just as a reality test, the biggest single reason for the overall decline in our fiscal condition is the tax cuts.

The next biggest is the spending that occurred because of the attack on this country, 27 percent. Twenty six percent is also revenue decline, revenue decline not attributed to tax cuts but because there was an overestimation of revenue. The smallest part of the reason for our declining fiscal condition is the economic downturn.

Our colleague from Idaho also said that this budget balances by 2013. It does on a so-called unified basis. That is when you put all the money in the same pot—all the money from whatever source going in the pot, all the spending coming out of that pot.

I have never believed that that is the right way to handle Federal revenue and Federal spending because, for example, the Social Security trust fund ought to be treated differently. All the money should not go in the same pot. You should not be taking operating expenses out of Social Security revenues.

We didn't put on a payroll tax to raise revenue to pay for the other functions of Government. We raised payroll taxes in order to pay for Social Security benefits.

In the year 2013, the amount of money from the Social Security trust fund that will be used to pay the operating expenses of the Federal Government will be \$331 billion.

That doesn't strike me as a balanced budget. No private sector firm could take the retirement funds of their employees and use them to fund the operating expenses of the company. If you tried to do that, you would be on your way to a Federal institution, but it would not be the U.S. Congress.

On the issue of who benefits from the tax cut, the Senator showed percentage reductions for various income categories. But if we look at who gets the dollars, we get quite a different picture. This is from the Department of Treasury. It shows those earning \$30,000 to \$40,000 get, on average, \$252. Those earning over \$200,000 get \$12,500. And if you earn over \$1 million, you get an \$88,000 tax cut. It is true that the wealthy pay a higher proportion of taxes in this country than do the rest of us, but they don't pay that much more.

Our friends always want to exclude payroll taxes. The fact is, 80 percent of American taxpayers pay more in payroll taxes than they pay in income taxes. So that has been left out of the calculation completely.

Finally, on the question of what do we do about our circumstance, I was glad that our colleague put up a chart that showed the revenue of the Federal Government and the spending of the Federal Government. It is both of those elements that create deficits. So if you have a tax cut that costs \$100 billion, that adds \$100 billion to the deficit just like if you spent \$100 billion.

In this budget proposal, even though we are already in record deficit, they propose cutting another \$1.4 trillion. With interest costs, that will be an additional deficit of \$1.7 trillion. I don't think you can stand up and be against deficits and, on the other hand, vote to explode them. You either walk the walk and talk the talk, or else you wind up where we are headed, which is into deep deficit and deep debt.

The fact is that we are not making the choices that are going to be necessary. If we are going to have that level of tax cut, then you have to cut the spending to offset it, unless you want to put it on the charge card, create deficit.

Finally, the Senator from Idaho indicated that some of us are advocating doing nothing. Well, I am not advocating doing nothing. I am advocating that, with our country in the position of record deficits, on the brink of war, with not a dime of war costs in this budget, it would be wise for us not to add new spending unless it is for national defense or homeland security—not to add additional tax cuts, unless it