

Senate Finance Committee proposal. It is based on the Clinton administration assessment of the House plan. How in the world are we supposed to make an intellectual judgment call when the amendment Senator DORGAN asks us to vote on mixes apples and oranges, citing what only can at best be called partisan economic data.

Let us restore intellectual honesty to the debate. According to the Joint Committee on Taxation, 70 percent of the benefits of the Finance Committee tax bill will go to families making under \$75,000 a year. Seventy percent. Our bill provides a \$500 per child tax credit to our hard-working families. It eliminates the marriage penalty for many, creates a credit for adoption expenses, and helps with student loan payments. We also provide much-needed incentives for savings and investment. These are all middle-class provisions that go to help the people President Clinton has admitted to raising taxes on. What we are doing is trying to help the President and his allies correct a mistake. Let us make it right for the American people.

Mr. President, I move to table the pending Dorgan amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time under the unanimous-consent agreement has expired.

The question now occurs on agreeing to the motion to table the Dorgan amendment numbered 2940.

Mr. ROTH. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be. There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS], and the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM] are necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COCHRAN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 495 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Abraham	Coverdell	Gregg
Ashcroft	Craig	Hatch
Bennett	D'Amato	Hatfield
Bond	DeWine	Hutchinson
Brown	Dole	Inhofe
Burns	Domenici	Jeffords
Campbell	Frist	Kempthorne
Chafee	Gorton	Kyl
Coats	Gramm	Lieberman
Cochran	Grams	Lott
Cohen	Grassley	Lugar

Mack	Roth	Specter
McCain	Santorum	Stevens
McConnell	Shelby	Thomas
Murkowski	Simpson	Thompson
Nickles	Smith	Thurmond
Pressler	Snowe	Warner

NAYS—40

Akaka	Feinstein	Mikulski
Baucus	Ford	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Glenn	Moynihan
Bingaman	Graham	Murray
Boxer	Harkin	Pell
Breaux	Heflin	Pryor
Bryan	Hollings	Reid
Bumpers	Johnston	Robb
Byrd	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Conrad	Kerry	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kohl	Simon
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Exon	Leahy	
Feingold	Levin	

NOT VOTING—8

Bradley	Helms	Kerrey
Daschle	Inouye	Nunn
Faircloth	Kassebaum	

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 2940) was agreed to.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes as in morning business.

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

RECONCILIATION

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, a few hours ago this afternoon the Senate Budget Committee reported to the Senate the reconciliation bill for 1996 through the year 2002. We will soon begin to debate that bill—perhaps the most momentous debate that this Senate will engage in this year or perhaps any year during the course of the last decade.

The design of that bill is, of course, to see to it that the budget of the United States is balanced in the year 2002, precisely the time at which the constitutional amendment on a balanced budget would have required such a balance, had it been passed and submitted to the States by this Senate.

Hidden in the debate over the budget, however, is one vitally important proposition. That is, that this budget does not lead us to balance on the basis of figures submitted by my distinguished friend, the chairman of the Budget Committee, by the majority leader, by a party caucus, or by any other such partisan individual or organization.

The certification that this budget will be balanced comes from our Congressional Budget Office, an office set up literally decades ago in order to provide us with the most objective advice possible with respect to the budgetary implication of our actions.

In fact, just 2 short years ago, the President of the United States reported that we ought to end debate over assumptions and projections and all operate off baselines provided by the Congressional Budget Office. I regret that

the President has abandoned that salutary course of action.

It is not relevant for the purposes of my argument here this evening, Mr. President. What is relevant is the fact, first, that the Congressional Budget Office has said to us, if you pass this bill, if you follow these policies, you will, in fact, reach balance by the year 2002. As a result, we, the Congressional Budget Office, can tell you that the economy of the United States will be healthier, much healthier, as a result of adopting those policies.

The figure the Congressional Budget Office gives in this regard is that we will have a dividend of \$170 billion in increased revenues from our present tax system as a result of the fact that we are going to balance the budget, increased revenues that come because the economy will grow more rapidly because interest rates will be lower. These will be reflected in the budget itself.

Of course, it is this \$170 billion dividend, together with changes which close corporate loopholes—corporate welfare as it were—that provide the great bulk of the \$245 billion tax cut for middle-income and working Americans, which is an integral part of this reconciliation bill.

The dramatic differences which will be debated later on this week have to do with whether or not we want that dividend, whether or not we want to adopt difficult and tough policies that will result in a stronger or better economy, or whether we prefer the status quo at a slower rate of growth, a higher interest rate, and a higher rate of inflation. It is just that simple.

Now, Mr. President, in addition to repudiating the ideas that were causing this dividend to take place, Members on the other side of the aisle do not want to give a tax break to middle-income Americans under any set of circumstances. They would much prefer to continue the policies of the past—slow growth, no tax reductions, no balanced budget now or ever.

The President's budget, by contrast, according to the same Congressional Budget Office, will never result in deficits significantly below \$200 billion a year.

Finally, Mr. President, we will have, during the course of the debate over this reconciliation bill, a paradox. The President, the official line is that these spending reductions are too great, that we should not give working Americans tax reductions. We simply ought to continue the status quo.

Grace notes from some on the other side in connection with this debate will be that we really have not balanced the budget at all, we have not gone far enough, we should not be using a unified budget, we should ignore all of the taxes collected under the Social Security system and paid out under that Social Security system.

Implicit in that argument is that we have not gone far enough, that we have

not cut spending sufficiently. There will be a great deal of confusion on the part of the American people when they hear on one side the argument that we have not gone far enough because we do not bring the budget to balance in the year 2002, in spite of the words of the Congressional Budget Office—without any suggestion, I may say, as to how we should do so—and, on the other side, the argument we are simply going to far.

I hope this debate will be worked out during the course of, simply, the balance of this week. But the bottom line is that this Senate, the majority in this Senate, are going to vote for a budget which not only brings us into balance as quickly as a constitutional amendment would have brought us into balance but will also pay off \$170 billion less in deficits than would otherwise take place. That \$170 billion is itself only the tip of the iceberg above water. That is how the Federal Government benefits. The people of the United States will benefit two, three, four times as much, in higher incomes, in better jobs, in a brighter future and in more opportunity.

So I commend my friend, the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, for his work in getting us to the verge of this great success and look forward to a significant and vitally important debate in this Senate on the future of this country.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 1322

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the pendency of S. 1322, the only amendment in order be one substitute amendment to be offered by Senator DOLE and others. I further ask that following the disposition of the above-listed amendment, the bill be advanced to third reading and, at 11 a.m. on Tuesday, there be 30 minutes of time remaining to be equally divided in the usual form, with 10 minutes under the additional control of Senator BYRD, with a vote to occur on passage of S. 1322, as amended, at 11:40 a.m. Tuesday, and that paragraph 4 of rule 12 be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection to the request?

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, this side of the aisle has no objection.

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

Mr. GORTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

THE BUDGET

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I enjoyed listening to my friend from the State of Washington. It seems like the only hearings we are going to have on this budget are on the Senate floor. It is very difficult not to have people in to hold hearings and have markups on many pieces of legislation.

Mr. President, it is a little bit interesting to look at all the figures that are coming out. Everybody has different figures. CBO says one thing and they give you a certification. Then we get numbers from someplace else. Then the Budget Committee comes up with theirs, and I am tickled to death with the work of the Budget Committee except I do not think they ought to give the tax cut.

Now we see almost 50 percent of the taxpayers of this country are going to have their taxes increased by not allowing the tax credit that they have had in past years that encouraged people to work, to bring people above the poverty level.

So, you can say all you want to about how great this is. There is a hymn, "How Great Thou Art." There is nothing about "thou art" in this budget.

So I hope we will look at it very closely. I am disappointed we did not have an opportunity to dig into the details because, as I have brought up, the devil is in the details. We have not seen all the details yet, and I hope at some point during the debate some of the details will come out.

I do not know whether or not anybody else is seeking the floor, Mr. President. If not, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

JERUSALEM EMBASSY RELOCATION IMPLEMENTATION ACT OF 1995

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is S. 1322.

AMENDMENT NO. 2941

(Purpose: To provide for the establishment of the United States Embassy in Israel in the capital of Jerusalem, and for other purposes)

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I send a substitute to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] proposes an amendment numbered 2941.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Each sovereign nation, under international law and custom, may designate its own capital.

(2) Since 1950, the city of Jerusalem has been the capital of the State of Israel.

(3) The city of Jerusalem is the seat of Israel's President, Parliament, and Supreme Court, and the site of numerous government ministries and social and cultural institutions.

(4) The city of Jerusalem is the spiritual center of Judaism, and is also considered a holy city by the members of other religious faiths.

(5) From 1948-1967, Jerusalem was a divided city and Israeli citizens of all faiths as well as Jewish citizens of all states were denied access to holy sites in the area controlled by Jordan.

(6) In 1967, the city of Jerusalem was reunited during the conflict known as the Six Day War.

(7) Since 1967, Jerusalem has been a united city administered by Israel, and persons of all religious faiths have been guaranteed full access to holy sites within the city.

(8) This year marks the 28th consecutive year that Jerusalem has been administered as a unified city in which the rights of all faiths have been respected and protected.

(9) In 1990, the Congress unanimously adopted Senate Concurrent Resolution 106, which declares that the Congress "strongly believes that Jerusalem must remain an undivided city in which the rights of every ethnic and religious group are protected".

(10) In 1992, the United States Senate and House of Representatives unanimously adopted Senate Concurrent Resolution 113 of the One Hundred Second Congress to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem, and reaffirming congressional sentiment that Jerusalem must remain an undivided city.

(11) The September 13, 1993, Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government Arrangements lays out a timetable for the resolution of "final status" issues, including Jerusalem.

(12) The Agreement on the Gaza Strip and the Jericho Area was signed May 4, 1994, beginning the five-year transitional period laid out in the Declaration of Principles.

(13) In March of 1995, 93 members of the United States Senate signed a letter to Secretary of State Warren Christopher encouraging "planning to begin now" for relocation of the United States Embassy to the city of Jerusalem.

(14) In June of 1993, 257 members of the United States House of Representatives signed a letter to the Secretary of State Warren Christopher stating that the relocation of the United States Embassy to Jerusalem "should take place no later than . . . 1999".

(15) The United States maintains its embassy in the functioning capital of every country except in the case of our democratic friend and strategic ally, the State of Israel.

(16) The United States conducts official meetings and other business in the city of Jerusalem in de facto recognition of its status as the capital of Israel.

(17) In 1996, the State of Israel will celebrate the 3,000th anniversary of the Jewish presence in Jerusalem since King David's entry.

SEC. 3. TIMETABLE.

(a) STATEMENT OF THE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES.—

(1) Jerusalem should remain an undivided city in which the rights of every ethnic and religious group are protected;

(2) Jerusalem should be recognized as the capital of the State of Israel; and