However, the status quo is, in fact, unacceptable, and I am encouraged that Senator DASCHLE, Senator DOLE, and other Republican and Democratic Senators continue to work for change. We must not give up this fight.

I hope we will have the courage this year to consider more than just a little change. I am encouraged by many of the things that I have heard, again from both Republicans and Democrats, about how we can alter our current Federal and our private sector programs. I hope, for example, we will consider changing the way eligibility occurs. Rather than proving that you are poor enough or proving that you are old enough or disabled enough or that you work for just the right boss, it would be better in my judgment, more efficient and simpler and fairer to simply say that if you can prove that you are an American or a legal resident, that is how you become eligible for our system.

Once eligibility occurs, however, we must make it clear that all Americans have to contribute, both financially and in a personal way to cost controls. Otherwise the system will not work.

I hope we will consider changing the rules so that health rather than health care is the goal of our system. Incentives should be present to providers and patients to become healthier and not sicker. This is particularly true for families with babies. The responsibility for care should not end after 1 day normal delivery.

I hope we reform insurance practices so that everyone can purchase health insurance regardless of health or job status, so that we make it more likely that in the long run we can achieve a system where all Americans are eligible for coverage.

I hope we reform the Government health programs, not simply by cutting payments to providers but by studying ways to provide more options to beneficiaries and allowing market forces to reduce costs, so that we make it more likely that we can achieve a system where all Americans are eligible for health coverage.

I hope we reform the Tax Code so that the self-employed have the same incentives as larger companies to purchase health insurance, so that we make it more likely that we can achieve a system where all Americans are eligible for health care.

I do hope we reform our tort system as well, so the fear of being sued does not dominate the relationship between the provider and the patient. But above all, I hope we do not forget the stories we all told last year about Americans and businesses who needed a changed system in order to have the freedom to pursue their dream without the fear of financial ruin. I intend to work and support reform that improves the current health care situation and makes it more likely that we can achieve a system where all Americans are eligible for health care. I am confident that if we continue working on this issue as a priority issue we can pass reform legislation this year that improves the short term situation and that makes it more likely that we can achieve, in the long term, a solution to the problem of access to and the high cost of health care for all Americans.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEMPTHORNE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for not to exceed 15 minutes.

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

A REGULATORY MORATORIUM

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I think it is vitally important, when we are engaged in debates that we have the facts on legislative issues that come before this body. I am concerned about a statement that was made by President Clinton on Tuesday, February 21, dealing with the issue of a regulatory moratorium, a moratorium which is cosponsored by 35 or 36 Senators.

The President stated—and I will quote, ''The House will be voting on an across-the-board freeze on all Federal regulations.'' Mr. President, that is not correct. Neither the House bill nor the companion bill in the Senate freeze all Federal regulations. Our bills contain a lot of exemptions, so the President's statement is factually incorrect.

He said, ''For example, it would stop the Government from allocating rights to commercial fishermen.'' That is not true.

He said, ''It would stop the Government from authorizing burials at Arlington Cemetery.'' That is not true. It was not true in the House bill, and it is not true in the Senate bill.

Mr. President, both bills have exceptions for routine administrative action. Certainly burials at Arlington Cemetery are routine administrative actions, as well as the Government allocating rights to commercial fishermen. These are routine Government actions. Actually, we have given the President eight exceptions to the regulatory moratorium. The President's statement says that it would stop good regulations, bad regulations, and in-between regulations—all regulations. Again, that is totally, completely factually misleading and inaccurate. I am bothered by that.

I think it is fine to be engaged in the debate, and the President has the option to veto this legislation if he chooses, but when he speaks against it he has the obligation to the American people and to the Congress to give the facts. Clearly, his statements are not accurate. The President even said our moratorium would cancel the duck hunting season. Clearly, again that is not the case. It will not cancel duck hunting season. The establishment of a duck hunting season is clearly a routine administrative action.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of all the exceptions that we have in the moratorium legislation be printed in the RECORD.

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

SEC. 5. EXCEPTIONS.

(a) Section 3(a) or 4(a), or both, shall not apply to a significant regulatory action if—

(1) the head of a Federal agency otherwise authorized to take the action submits a written request to the President, and a copy thereof to the appropriate committees of each house of the Congress;

(2) the President finds, in writing, the action is—

(A) necessary because of an imminent threat to human health or safety or other emergency;

(B) necessary for the enforcement of criminal laws;

(C) related to a regulation that has as its principal effect fostering economic growth, repealing, narrowing, or streamlining a rule, regulation, administrative process, or otherwise reducing regulatory burdens;

(D) issued with respect to matters relating to military or foreign affairs or international trade agreements;

(E) principally related to agency organization, management, or personnel;

(F) a routine administrative action, or principally related to public property, loans, grants, benefits, or contracts;

(G) requested by an agency that supervises and regulates insured depository institutions, affiliates of such institutions, credit unions, or government sponsored housing enterprises; or

(H) limited to interpreting, implementing, or administering the internal revenue laws of the United States; and

(3) the Federal agency head publishes the finding and waiver in the Federal Register.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, maybe somebody from the administration will read those exceptions and realize that we have given the President a great deal of flexibility and opportunity to exempt those regulations that he deems are important or necessary to protect public health and safety.

I hope he will reconsider his opposition to this moratorium. I hope my colleagues will support it because I think we have gone to great lengths to try to make sure that we would give flexibility where needed but also to stop unnecessary and expensive regulations and give us a chance to pass real regulatory reform with cost-benefit analysis to make sure benefits exceed costs.

I mention my concerns about the President's statements on the regulatory moratorium because he has also made misleading statements in regard to the budget and budget items.

The President of the United States a couple of days ago mentioned in an article that he had trimmed the Federal bureaucracy by 100,000 workers, and cut the deficit by $600 billion in his first 2 years in office.

I see similar claims by administration officials reported every day in the Washington Post and elsewhere. The public assumes these claims are correct.

Again, I think it is vitally important that we know the facts. I would like to point out to the President and our colleagues what the facts are. These numbers are also pointed out in a recent Wall Street Journal editorial because they check up on the President too. Have we reduced Federal employment by 100,000 since the President came into office? No. Since 1993 we have reduced FTE employment by 86,100. It is only if you use the baseline going back to the previous year that you can claim to have reduced it 102,500.

However, more importantly, what the President did not say is 63,500 of those 86,100 job cuts are in defense.

By 1996, projections are that we will reduce FTE employment by 156,900. Eighty-four percent of those cuts are reductions in defense. Six percent are in the Resolution Trust Corporation and FDIC because they have worked through the savings and loan mess. Therefore, 90 percent of the President's claims of Federal job cuts comes from Defense and RTC. That means we are only cutting about 15,000 in nondefense Government agencies.

So is the President really cutting the size of the Government? No. Has he cut the size of defense? Yes.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial by the Wall Street Journal entitled "Numbers Game."

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

[From the Wall Street Journal]

NUMBERS GAME

It's the season to cut government, or at least to claim to, so we perked up when we heard President Clinton declare in his State of the Union address that he had cut "more than 100,000 positions from the federal bureaucracy in the last two years alone."

As they say in detective work, interesting—if true. So we decided to pull out the new federal budget to check. What we discovered is that Mr. Clinton isn't lying, but he isn't telling the whole truth either. His speeches need an asterisk.

From 1993 to Fiscal Year 1996, the Clinton Administration will in fact have cut the federal government by 157,000 full-time positions. But there's a catch: 131,000 of those positions are civilian Defense jobs. Those cuts reflect the inevitable post-Cold War decline in military spending, not some brave retrenchment in the overall size of government.

There's another catch: Of the 26,000 positions to be cut from the non-Defense side of Leviathan, 9,500 come from the Resolution Trust Corp. and Federal Deposit Insurance Corp. Those two banking agencies grew like Topsy to manage the savings and loan debacle, but are now cutting back as the bailout ends. The RTC is even supposed to go out of business this year. The bottom line is that over the course of the Clinton presidency, the non-Defense, non-S&L part of the government will cut a measly 16,500 full-time positions out of some 1.2 million. In essence the domestic government is conducting business as usual.

Mr. Clinton also says he's making the federal establishment "the smallest it has been since John Kennedy was President." But again, excluding Defense, total executive branch employment will be 1,181,000 in 1996. Back in 1963, when JFK was President, total non-Defense employment was a mere 861,000. Maybe that should be the 1996 goal for Republican budget-cutters; they could say they got the idea from the President.

Mr. NICKLES. One final comment, the President's statement also claims that he cut the deficit by $600 billion in his first 2 years in office. That sounds very nice. It reminds me of another quote of the President during the State of the Union where he said:

We cut over a quarter-trillion dollars in spending, more than 300 domestic programs, more than 100,000 positions in Federal bureaucracies in the last 2 years alone.

Have we cut $1 trillion in spending? That bothers me because I do not think we have seen spending decline.

The President's statement said that we cut spending over a quarter-trillion dollars. He said that in the State of the Union Address.

I would like to share with my colleagues the facts. In 1992, the last year of the Bush administration, we spent $1.380 trillion. In 1993, we spent $1.4 trillion. In 1994, we spent $1.46 trillion. Spending went up every year.

I think we too often get into this discussion of baselines, and people get lost and their eyes fog over. Spending has gone up every year. The President says he cut spending from a baseline which is projected to be higher. Did he actually cut spending? Did the President cut spending in his first 2 years? Will he cut spending in his first 4 years? Have we seen any spending cuts?

The answer according to CBO is no. The President's statement was that he reduced the deficit by $600 billion in his first 2 years of office. Where did that come from?

I will show you where it came from. CBO projected in 1993, just when President Clinton was elected—what they thought deficits would be for the next 6 years. If you add these years together, it totals $1.848 trillion.

Two years later, January 1995, CBO projected deficits of $1.287 trillion. You subtract the two and you get a little less than $600 billion. That is why the President said he reduced the deficit by $600 billion.

So we know the deficit is less than previously projected, but where did the reduction come from? Did it come from $250 billion in spending cuts? No. According to CBO—and these are not DON NICKLES' figures, they are CBO figures—if you add up all the tax and fee increases they total $262 billion. The President deserves credit for that—he did enact the largest tax increase in history. Spending reductions total $88 billion, and $213 billion in deficit reduction comes from technical reestimates, economic reestimates, and debt services.

With regard to spending reductions, in 1993 we had no spending reductions, we actually spent more than the baseline. In 1994, we had no spending reductions, we actually spent $9 billion more than the baseline. In 1995, we are going to have no spending reductions, we actually will spend $3 billion more than the baseline. In 1996, 1997, 1998, it is projected that we are going to go have some spending cuts, primarily from an extension of the freeze on discretionary spending.

So the President ends up with a total of $88 billion in spending cuts, primarily from the last two years by extending the discretionary freeze. My guess is he probably will not be President for these last 2 years, so that is an easy thing to do—that is, putting the spending cuts off until the last 2 years.

If you add the first 4 years together, you see more spending increases than you see in spending cuts in his Presidential term. We have spending increases of $9 billion and $4 billion and $3 billion, for a total $16 billion in spending increases, and we are projected next year to have spending cuts of $15 billion.

So spending actually went up under President Clinton's first term, if we give him credit for everything in his budget. He has presided over no spending cuts whatsoever—not a dime of spending cuts. This is according to CBO.

What about the balance of this $600 billion? Well, it is made up of technical, economic, and other assumptions. These are reestimates caused by lower than expected inflation or unemployment. If you add those things together—and the RTC spending less money than anticipated because we do not have as many bank failures—the technical number is $213 billion.

In the first 4 years, we have all tax increases and technical changes. That is all the deficit reduction. I am glad that we have it. I am glad that the deficit is not as bad as it was projected to be in 1993, but it is not because we cut a quarter of a trillion dollars in spending, as stated in the President's State of the Union.

We have to be factual in these debates. These numbers are taken directly from the CBO budget books. Why did they have a different baseline in 1993 and 1995? Here is the difference. I will submit this table for the RECORD so my colleagues can look at it. I do not mean to get too technical, but it is important to be factual. When you hear people talk about spending cuts we really need to be factual and give the American people the facts. I know my colleague from New Jersey said we are not cutting defense so much and that we need to keep more money in social programs. I respect that position, I just do not agree with it. I will include the chart to show what we have done in defense in the last 3 years. We cut defense in 1992 by 5 percent; in 1993 by 3 percent; in 1994 by 4 percent; in 1995 by 4 percent. So we have cut defense spending.

Mr. President, we have not cut domestic spending. Domestic spending has increased every single year. For the last 3 years, domestic spending has gone up. In 1991, it was 7 percent; in 1992, 10 percent; in 1993, 7 percent; in 1994, 5 percent; in 1995, 5 percent. We have mandatory programs exploding in cost. The only spending category that has gone down every year is defense. Programs like the earned income tax credit have been exploding in cost. In 1991, it cost $5 billion; in 1994, it cost $11 billion; in 1997, it is supposed to cost $23 billion—almost 5 times what it cost a few years ago.

We read in the papers where the IRS is not processing tax returns because they found that the EITC is just ripe for abuse. People are filing fraudulent claims. The growth rate on the earned income tax credit, for example, was 11 percent in 1991; 55 percent in 1992; 18 percent in 1993; 22 percent in 1994; 55 percent in 1995; 18 percent is the projection for 1996. It is just exploding in cost.

I ask unanimous consent for an additional 2 minutes.

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

Mr. NICKLES. Medicaid. People are concerned about Medicaid. Look at the growth rates. In 1990, Medicaid's total cost to the Federal Government was $41 billion. In 1994, it was $82 billion; it doubled. Between 1990 and 1994, the cost of Medicaid doubled to the Federal Government, with growth rates of 19 percent, 28 percent, 29 percent, 12 percent. It has been exploding in cost.

Some people want to keep those costs climbing. That is not acceptable. We cannot afford it and the States cannot afford it. So we need to change it. When we reduce that growth rate, I am sure that we are going to have people saying that we cannot afford it. We cannot afford not to slow the growth rate of a program like that. Food stamps in 1990 cost $15 billion, and in 1994 they cost $25 billion. The growth rate since 1990 in food stamps went up 17 percent, 25 percent, 21 percent, 11 percent. That is not sustainable.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD all of these tables on spending.

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

CIVILIAN FTE CUTS UNDER CLINTON

COMPARED TO ''BASE YEAR'' LEVELS

The Federal Workforce Restructuring Act of 1994 established a ''base'' level of civilian employment from which the Act's 272,900 FTE reduction is to be measured.

61% of the workforce cuts through 1994 have come from defense, and by 1996 defense will account for 75% of all workforce cuts. Plus, an undetermined but probably large part of these workforce ''cuts'' are gained by contracting federal work at the same or higher cost.

Through the end of FY94, employment has been reduced from the ''base'' level by 102,500 as follows:

Agency	Jobs cut	Percent of total
Defense	63,000	61
Treasury	8,800	9
Agriculture	5,800	6
All other	24,900	24
Total	102,500	100

By the end of FY96, employment will have been reduced from the base level by 173,300 as follows:

Agency	Jobs cut	Percent of total
Defense	130,800	75
FDIC/RTC	9,300	5
Agriculture	7,600	4
All other	25,600	16
Total	173,300	100

COMPARED TO ACTUAL 1993 LEVELS

74% of the workforce cuts through 1994 have come from defense, and by 1996 defense will account for 84% of all workforce cuts. Plus, an undetermined but probably large part of these workforce ''cuts'' are gained by contracting federal work at the same or higher cost.

Through the end of FY96, employment has been reduced from the 1993 actual level by 86,100 as follows:

Agency	Jobs cut	Percent of total
Defense	63,500	74
Agriculture	4,600	5
Treasury	3,800	4
All other	14,200	17
Total	86,100	100

By the end of FY96, employment will have been reduced from the 1993 actual level by 156,900 as follows:

Agency	Jobs cut	Percent of total
Defense	131,200	84
FDIC/RTC	9,600	6
Agriculture	6,300	4
All other	9,800	6
Total	156,900	100

EXECUTIVE BRANCH EMPLOYMENT

[Changes from ''Base'' Levels—Numbers are in thousands, except percentages]

	Base*	1993	1994	1995	1996
FTE Employment					
Defense	931.3	931.8	868.3	834.1	800.6
Veterans Affairs	227.0	229.1	227.7	224.4	224.4
Treasury	166.1	161.1	157.3	161.4	162.2
Agriculture	115.6	114.4	109.8	108.9	108.1
Interior	79.3	78.1	76.3	76.3	76.2
Transportation	70.3	69.1	66.4	65.2	64.4
Health and Human Services	64.5	65.6	62.9	62.3	61.4
NASA	25.7	24.9	23.9	23.3	23.2
Tennessee Valley Authority	19.1	17.3	18.6	16.6	16.4
GSA	20.6	20.2	19.5	16.9	15.5
FDIC/RTC	21.6	21.9	20.0	16.3	12.3
All other	414.1	405.3	402.0	412.1	417.2
Total executive branch	2,155.2	2,138.8	2,052.7	2,017.8	1,981.9
Cumulative Change From Base					
Defense		0.5	(63.0)	(97.2)	(130.8)
Veterans Affairs		2.1	0.7	(2.6)	(2.7)
Treasury		(5.0)	(8.8)	(4.7)	(3.9)
Agriculture		(1.2)	(5.8)	(6.7)	(7.6)
Interior		(1.2)	(3.0)	(3.0)	(3.2)
Transportation		(1.2)	(3.9)	(5.1)	(5.9)
Health and Human Services		1.1	(1.6)	(2.2)	(3.1)
NASA		(0.8)	(1.8)	(2.4)	(2.5)
Tennessee Valley Authority		(1.8)	(0.5)	(2.5)	(2.7)
GSA		(0.4)	(1.1)	(3.7)	(5.1)
FDIC/RTC		0.3	(1.6)	(5.3)	(9.3)
All other		(8.8)	(12.1)	(2.0)	3.1
Total executive branch		(16.4)	(102.5)	(137.5)	(173.3)
Agency Cuts as a Percent of Total Cuts					
Defense (in percent)		−3	61	71	75
Veterans Affairs (in percent)		−13	−1	2	2
Treasury (in percent)		30	9	3	2
Agriculture (in percent)		7	6	5	4
Interior (in percent)		7	3	2	2
Transportation (in percent)		7	4	4	3
Health and Human Services (in percent)		−7	2	2	2
NASA (in percent)		5	2	2	1
Tennessee Valley Authority (in percent)		11	0	2	2
GSA (in percent)		2	1	3	3
FDIC/RTC (in percent)		−2	2	4	5
All other (in percent)		54	12	1	−2
Total executive branch (in percent)		100	100	100	100

*The Federal Workforce Restructuring Act of 1994 established a ''base'' level of civilian employment from which the Act's 272,900 FTE reduction is measured.

EXECUTIVE BRANCH EMPLOYMENT

[Changes from 1993 Actual Levels—Numbers are in thousands, except percentages]

	1993	1994	1995	1996
FTE Employment				
Defense	931.8	868.3	834.1	800.6
Veterans Affairs	229.1	227.7	224.4	224.4
Treasury	161.1	157.3	161.4	162.2
Agriculture	114.4	109.8	108.9	108.1
Interior	78.1	76.3	76.3	76.2
Transportation	69.1	66.4	65.2	64.4
Health and Human Services	65.6	62.9	62.3	61.4
NASA	24.9	23.9	23.3	23.2
Tennessee Valley Authority	17.3	18.6	16.6	16.4
GSA	20.2	19.5	16.9	15.5
FDIC/RTC	21.9	20.0	16.3	12.3
All other	405.3	402.0	412.1	417.2
Total executive branch	2,138.8	2,052.7	2,017.8	1,981.9
Cumulative Change From 1993				
Defense		(63.5)	(97.7)	(131.2)
Veterans Affairs		(1.4)	(4.7)	(4.7)
Treasury		(3.8)	(0.3)	(1.1)
Agriculture		(4.6)	(5.5)	(6.3)
Interior		(1.8)	(1.8)	(1.9)
Transportation		(2.7)	(3.9)	(4.7)
Health and Human Services		(2.7)	(3.3)	(4.2)
NASA		(1.0)	(1.6)	(1.7)
Tennessee Valley Authority		1.3	(0.7)	(0.9)
GSA		(0.7)	(3.3)	(4.7)
FDIC/RTC		(1.9)	(5.6)	(9.6)
All other		(3.3)	6.8	11.9
Total executive branch		(86.1)	(121.0)	(156.9)
Agency Cuts as A Percent of Total Cuts				
Defense (in percent)		74	81	84
Veterans Affairs (in percent)		2	4	3
Treasury (in percent)		4	−0	−1
Agriculture (in percent)		5	5	4
Interior (in percent)		2	1	1
Transportation (in percent)		3	3	3
Health and Human Services (in percent)		3	3	3
NASA (in percent)		1	1	1
Tennessee Valley Authority (in percent)		−2	1	1
GSA (in percent)		1	3	3
FDIC/RTC (in percent)		2	5	6
All other (in percent)		4	−6	−8
Total executive branch (in percent)		100	100	100

EXECUTIVE BRANCH EMPLOYMENT

[Changes from 1993 Actual Levels—Numbers are in thousands, except percentages]

	1993	1994	1995	1996
FTE Employment				
Defense	931.8	868.3	834.1	800.6
Veterans Affairs	229.1	227.7	224.4	224.4
Treasury	161.1	157.3	161.4	162.2
Agriculture	114.4	109.8	108.9	108.1
Interior	78.1	76.3	76.3	76.2
Transportation	69.1	66.4	65.2	64.4
Health and Human Services	65.6	62.9	62.3	61.4
NASA	24.9	23.9	23.3	23.2
Tennessee Valley Authority	17.3	18.6	16.6	16.4
GSA	20.2	19.5	16.9	15.5
FDIC/RTC	21.9	20.0	16.3	12.3
All other	405.3	402.0	412.1	417.2
Total executive branch	2,138.8	2,052.7	2,017.8	1,981.9
Cumulative Change From 1993				
Defense	(63.5)	(97.7)	(131.2)	
Veterans Affairs	(1.4)	(4.7)	(4.7)	
Treasury	....	(3.8)	(0.3)	(1.1)
Agriculture	(4.6)	(5.5)	(6.3)	
Interior	....	(1.8)	(1.8)	(1.9)
Transportation	(2.7)	(3.9)	(4.7)	
Health and Human Services	....	(2.7)	(3.3)	(4.2)
NASA	....	(1.0)	(1.6)	(1.7)
Tennessee Valley Authority	....	1.3	(0.7)	(0.9)
GSA	....	(0.7)	(3.3)	(4.7)
FDIC/RTC	....	(1.9)	(5.6)	(9.6)
All other	....	(3.3)	6.8	11.9
Total executive branch	....	(86.1)	(121.0)	(156.9)
Agency Cuts as A Percent of Total Cuts				
Defense (in percent)	....	74	81	84
Veterans Affairs (in percent)	....	2	4	3
Treasury (in percent)	....	4	−0	−1
Agriculture (in percent)	....	5	5	4
Interior (in percent)	....	2	1	1
Transportation (in percent)	....	3	3	3
Health and Human Services (in percent)	....	3	3	3
NASA (in percent)	....	1	1	1
Tennessee Valley Authority (in percent)	....	−2	1	1
GSA (in percent)	....	1	3	3
FDIC/RTC (in percent)	....	2	5	6
All other (in percent)	....	4	−6	−8
Total executive branch (in percent)	....	100	100	100

SOURCE OF DEFICIT DECLINE, SINCE PRESIDENT CLINTON TOOK OFFICE

[Details may not add due to rounding. Amounts which reduce the deficit are shown in (parenthesis)]

	Clinton term				Out years—105th Congress		Total
	103d Congress		104th Congress				
	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	
CBO deficit baseline (Jan. 1993)	310	291	284	287	319	357	1,848
Tax and fee increases	0	(28)	(46)	(56)	(66)	(66)	(262)
Spending increases/(cuts)	4	9	3	(15)	(36)	(53)	(88)
Technical, economic, and debt service*	(59)	(70)	(65)	(9)	5	(15)	(213)
CBO deficit baseline (Jan. 1995)	255	203	176	207	224	222	1,287

*=Includes technical re-estimates, economic changes, and debt service savings.

Sources: CBO Reports (March 1993, September 1993, January 1994, April 1994, August 1994, January 1995)—Prepared by the Office of U.S. Senator Don Nickles.

FEDERAL SPENDING CATEGORIES

[In billions of nominal dollars—Source: CBO]

Year	Outlays	Dollar growth	Percent growth	Percent of GDP
Mandatory				
1980	292	....	....	11
1981	341	49	17	11
1982	373	32	9	12
1983	412	39	10	12
1984	406	(5)	−1	11
1985	450	44	11	11
1986	460	10	2	11
1987	470	11	2	10
1988	494	24	5	10
1989	526	32	6	10
1990	567	41	8	10
1991	634	67	12	11
1992	712	78	12	12
1993	762	50	7	12
1994	789	27	4	12
1995	845	56	7	12

FEDERAL SPENDING CATEGORIES—Continued

[In billions of nominal dollars—Source: CBO]

Year	Outlays	Dollar growth	Percent growth	Percent of GDP
1996	899	54	6	12
1997	962	63	7	12
1998	1,026	64	7	12
1999	1,097	71	7	13
2000	1,173	76	7	13
Domestic				
1980	129	....	....	5
1981	137	7	6	5
1982	127	(9)	−7	4
1983	130	3	2	4
1984	135	5	4	4
1985	146	10	8	4
1986	148	2	1	3
1987	147	(0)	−0	3
1988	158	11	8	3
1989	169	11	7	3
1990	183	14	8	3
1991	195	13	7	3
1992	214	19	10	4
1993	229	15	7	4
1994	242	13	5	4
1995	253	11	5	4
1996	262	9	4	4
1997	274	12	5	3
1998	284	10	4	3
1999	295	11	4	3
2000	304	9	3	3
International				
1980	13	....	....	0
1981	14	1	6	0
1982	13	(1)	−5	0
1983	14	1	5	0
1984	16	3	20	0
1985	17	1	7	0
1986	18	0	2	0
1987	15	(3)	−14	0
1988	16	1	3	0
1989	17	1	6	0
1990	19	3	15	0
1991	20	1	3	0
1992	19	(1)	−3	0
1993	22	2	12	0
1994	20	(2)	−7	0
1995	21	1	5	0
1996	22	1	5	0
1997	22	0	0	0
1998	22	0	0	0
1999	23	1	3	0
2000	24	1	6	0
Defense				
1980	135	....	....	5
1981	158	23	17	5
1982	186	28	18	6
1983	210	24	13	6
1984	228	18	9	6
1985	253	25	11	6
1986	274	21	8	6
1987	283	9	3	6
1988	291	8	3	6
1989	304	13	5	6
1990	300	(4)	−1	5
1991	320	20	7	6
1992	303	(17)	−5	5
1993	293	(10)	−3	5
1994	282	(11)	−4	4
1995	270	(12)	−4	4
1996	270	0	0	4
1997	278	8	3	4
1998	285	7	3	3
1999	295	10	4	3
2000	304	9	3	3
Social Security				
1980	117	....	....	4
1981	138	21	18	5
1982	154	16	12	5
1983	169	15	9	5
1984	176	8	5	5
1985	186	10	6	5
1986	197	10	5	5
1987	205	9	4	5
1988	217	12	6	4
1989	230	14	6	4
1990	247	16	7	4
1991	267	20	8	5
1992	285	18	7	5
1993	302	17	6	5
1994	317	15	5	5
1995	334	17	5	5
1996	352	18	5	5
1997	371	19	5	5
1998	390	19	5	5
1999	411	21	5	5
2000	433	22	5	5
Net interest				
1980	53	....	....	2
1981	69	16	31	2
1982	85	16	24	3
1983	90	5	6	3
1984	111	21	24	3
1985	130	18	17	3
1986	136	7	5	3
1987	139	3	2	3
1988	152	13	9	3
1989	169	18	12	3
1990	184	15	9	3
1991	195	10	6	3
1992	199	5	3	3
1993	199	(1)	−0	3
1994	203	4	2	3
1995	235	32	16	3
1996	260	25	11	3
1997	270	10	4	3
1998	279	9	3	3
1999	294	15	5	3
2000	310	16	5	3
Earned Income Tax Credit				
1980	1	....	....	0
1981	1	0	0	0
1982	1	(0)	−8	0
1983	1	0	0	0
1984	1	0	0	0
1985	1	(0)	−8	0
1986	1	0	27	0
1987	1	0	0	0
1988	3	1	93	0
1989	4	1	48	0
1990	4	0	10	0
1991	5	1	11	0
1992	8	3	55	0
1993	9	1	18	0
1994	11	2	22	0
1995	17	6	55	0
1996	20	3	18	0
1997	23	3	15	0
1998	24	1	4	0
1999	25	1	4	0
2000	26	1	4	0
Medicaid				
1980	14	....	....	1
1981	17	3	20	1
1982	17	1	4	1
1983	19	2	9	1
1984	20	1	6	1
1985	23	3	13	1
1986	25	2	10	1
1987	27	2	10	1
1988	31	3	11	1
1989	35	4	13	1
1990	41	7	19	1
1991	53	11	28	1
1992	68	15	29	1
1993	76	8	12	1
1994	82	6	8	1
1995	90	8	10	1
1996	100	10	11	1
1997	111	11	11	1
1998	123	12	11	1
1999	136	13	11	2
2000	149	13	10	2
Unemployment				
1980	17	....	....	1
1981	18	1	8	1
1982	22	4	21	1
1983	30	8	34	1
1984	17	(13)	−43	0
1985	16	(1)	−7	0
1986	16	0	2	0
1987	16	(1)	−4	0
1988	14	(2)	−12	0
1989	14	0	2	0
1990	18	4	26	0
1991	25	8	43	0
1992	37	12	47	1
1993	35	(2)	−4	1
1994	26	(9)	−27	0
1995	22	(4)	−15	0
1996	23	1	5	0
1997	24	1	4	0
1998	26	2	8	0
1999	27	1	4	0
2000	28	1	4	0
Food Stamps				
1980	9	....	....	0
1981	11	2	24	0
1982	11	(0)	−3	0
1983	12	1	7	0
1984	12	(0)	−2	0
1985	12	0	1	0
1986	12	(0)	−1	0
1987	12	0	0	0
1988	12	1	6	0
1989	13	1	4	0
1990	15	2	17	0
1991	19	4	25	0
1992	23	4	21	0
1993	25	2	11	0
1994	25	0	0	0
1995	26	1	4	0
1996	27	1	4	0
1997	29	2	7	0
1998	30	1	3	0
1999	32	2	7	0
2000	32	0	0	0
Medicare				
1980	34	....	....	1
1981	41	7	21	1
1982	49	8	19	2

FEDERAL SPENDING CATEGORIES—Continued

[In billions of nominal dollars—Source: CBO]

Year	Outlays	Dollar growth	Percent growth	Percent of GDP
1983	56	6	13	2
1984	61	6	10	2
1985	70	9	14	2
1986	74	5	6	2
1987	80	6	8	2
1988	86	6	7	2
1989	94	9	10	2
1990	107	13	14	2
1991	114	7	6	2
1992	129	15	13	2
1993	143	14	11	2
1994	160	17	12	2
1995	176	16	10	2
1996	196	20	11	3
1997	217	21	11	3
1998	238	21	10	3
1999	262	24	10	3
2000	286	24	9	3
AFDC				
1980	7	....	....	0
1981	8	1	12	0
1982	8	(0)	−2	0
1983	8	0	5	0
1984	9	1	6	0
1985	9	0	3	0
1986	10	1	8	0
1987	11	1	6	0
1988	11	0	3	0
1989	11	0	4	0
1990	12	1	9	0
1991	14	1	11	0
1992	16	2	16	0
1993	16	0	3	0
1994	17	1	6	0
1995	18	1	6	0
1996	18	0	0	0
1997	19	1	6	0
1998	19	0	0	0
1999	20	1	5	0
2000	20	0	0	0
Farm Price Supports				
1980	3	....	....	0
1981	4	1	43	0
1982	12	8	193	0
1983	19	7	62	1
1984	7	(12)	−61	0
1985	18	10	142	0
1986	26	8	46	1
1987	22	(3)	−13	0
1988	12	(10)	−46	0
1989	11	(2)	−13	0
1990	7	(4)	−39	0
1991	10	4	55	0
1992	9	(1)	−8	0
1993	16	6	68	0
1994	10	(6)	−36	0
1995	10	0	0	0
1996	9	(1)	−10	0
1997	9	0	0	0
1998	8	(1)	−11	0
1999	8	0	0	0
2000	8	0	0	0
Veterans Benefits & Services				
1980	14	....	....	1
1981	15	1	10	1
1982	16	0	3	1
1983	16	0	1	0
1984	16	0	1	0
1985	16	(0)	−1	0
1986	16	(0)	−1	0
1987	16	0	0	0
1988	18	2	12	0
1989	18	0	1	0
1990	16	(2)	−10	0
1991	17	1	9	0
1992	20	2	13	0
1993	21	1	7	0
1994	18	(3)	−14	0
1995	17	(1)	−6	0
1996	17	0	0	0
1997	18	1	6	0
1998	19	1	6	0
1999	20	1	5	0
2000	21	1	5	0
Fed. Retirement and Disability				
1980	32	....	....	1
1981	37	5	17	1
1982	41	3	9	1
1983	43	3	6	1
1984	45	2	3	1
1985	46	1	2	1
1986	48	2	4	1
1987	51	3	7	1
1988	54	3	7	1
1989	57	3	6	1
1990	60	3	5	1
1991	64	5	8	1
1992	67	2	3	1
1993	69	2	3	1
1994	72	3	5	1
1995	75	3	4	1
1996	77	2	3	1
1997	81	4	5	1
1998	85	4	5	1
1999	90	5	6	1

FEDERAL SPENDING CATEGORIES—Continued

[In billions of nominal dollars—Source: CBO]

Year	Outlays	Dollar growth	Percent growth	Percent of GDP
2000	96	6	7	1
Other Mandatory				
1980	160	....	....	6
1981	187	27	17	6
1982	196	9	5	6
1983	208	13	6	6
1984	219	10	5	6
1985	241	22	10	6
1986	233	(8)	−3	5
1987	235	2	1	5
1988	255	20	8	5
1989	270	15	6	5
1990	288	18	7	5
1991	314	26	9	5
1992	336	23	7	6
1993	352	16	5	6
1994	368	16	4	5
1995	394	26	7	6
1996	412	18	5	6
1997	431	19	5	5
1998	454	23	5	5
1999	477	23	5	5
2000	507	30	6	6

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, these are just facts. These are not altered, these are not gamed in any way to try and make any particular point, except to show that spending has been exploding. We cannot continue to increase spending. That is why I believe we have to pass a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. I hope my colleagues will vote for it. I hope my colleagues will pass it. I know it is going to force us to make difficult decisions. And if we do not, Congress will unfortunately continue to find excuses not to make the tough decisions, and we will see the deficits continue to climb. I hope we will take the responsible action on Tuesday and pass a constitutional amendment to make us balance the budget.

I yield the floor, and I thank my friend from Arkansas.

WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? THE VOTERS HAVE SAID YES

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, as of the close of business on Thursday, February 23, the Federal debt stood at $4,837,336,500,173.73 meaning that on a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes $18,362.61 as his or her share of that debt.

FINANCIAL AID TO MEXICO

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, when President Clinton announced a financial package to aid Mexico in its current economic crisis, Speaker GINGRICH and I announced our support. Mexico was, and is, of vital importance to the United States. In my view, we could not stand by and watch Mexico financially melt down if there were any realistic chance to help.

Earlier this week, an agreement was signed between the United States and Mexico, and its full details were released to the public. I have analyzed it, with the help of staff, outside advisers, and other Senators. I find it somewhat surprising and, at its core, disappointing. My message should not be misinterpreted—I do want United States efforts to assist Mexico to work. I hope we can help Mexico achieve the financial stability that they so desperately need. However, I must reluctantly point out the shortcomings of the agreement reached this week.

In my view, the basic mistake Mexico made last year was allowing events to get to the point where the only apparent choice was to devalue the peso. Perhaps the Government believed that a little devaluation would be a good thing.

Common sense should have recognized that Mexico's decision to break its promise to the Mexican people to keep the peso stable against the dollar would precipitate a breech of trust—a stampede to get out of pesos and into dollars.

The Treasury Department needs to be very careful in the use of funds from the exchange stabilization fund. For example, I am not convinced that thrusting the United States into the middle of a Mexican banking crisis is prudent or necessary.

The primary focus of the stabilization plan is not aimed at reversing the fundamental mistake of devaluation—not now and not over time. The measures described in the agreement to firm up the price of the peso seem almost an afterthought. They do not address the problem of extinguishing the excess pesos that have been coming off the Mexican printing presses, even as recently as last week. The heart of the problem is restoring confidence in Mexican pledges by moving toward restoring the value of Mexico's currency, and I hope it is not too late. I hope that administration officials will still focus on the main target: extinguishing pesos and restoring confidence in the Mexican currency. This should be the first priority, not raising interest rates.

It appears my concerns are shared by the markets. When it was first announced that the United States would help Mexico, the Mexican stock market went up and the peso strengthened. Yet when the exact terms of the deal were made public, the peso weakened and the stock market resumed its slide.

In the coming days and weeks, Congress will examine many issues in the Mexico situation—what advice the administration gave, when officials knew about the devaluation, allegations of conflict of interest, and other issues. I am also working with the administration to send a group of Senators to Mexico in the near future to get a first-hand assessment of the situation. A central part of that assessment will be looking at whether the administration's proposed medicine will cure the disease.

RESPONSE TO ADMINISTRATION'S OIL IMPORT STUDY

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I rise today to express my concern for a lack of response by President Clinton to a recent report by the Department of Commerce. This report indicates our