

could not come at a better time. Government has become a looming presence in the lives of the American people. Each year the people are asked to turn more responsibilities over to the Federal Government for Government regulation, for Government support. From the time they get up in the morning until they go to bed at night, there are very few aspects of American daily life that are not touched now by the hand of government.

So government has been forced to grow just to keep up. Consider that government spending at the Federal, State, and local level has jumped from 12 percent of the national income in 1930 to 42 percent today, and the burden for keeping these ever-ballooning bureaucracies in operation has fallen on the taxpayers, of course, through more and higher taxes.

The increase has been dramatic. Between 1934 and 1995, individual Federal income taxes as a percentage of gross domestic product rose 1,114 percent.

Today, the typical American family faces a tax burden from all levels of government of 38 percent, and most middle-class American families are turning more money over to the government than they are spending for their family's food, clothing, shelter, and transportation combined. Families with children are now the lowest after-tax income group in America, below elderly households, single persons and families without children.

A significant number of families are relying on a second job just to pull themselves above the poverty line and to meet their annual tax obligations. The majority of families who have reached a middle-class standard of living are families with two incomes. They are still trying to pursue the American dream, but the ever-increasing tax burden keeps pushing it out of reach.

According to the Gallup organization, 67 percent of the people say they are handing over too much of their own money to the Federal Government. They might feel differently if they were getting a fair return on the investment, but Americans see their hard-earned dollars being wasted by the Federal Government. They look at the services they are getting in return and they feel like they have been taken to the cleaners.

It has always been easy for past Congresses to be generous with somebody else's money. This Congress, however, is no longer willing to let the Government gamble away the taxpayers' hard-earned dollars. In fact, we are going to keep those dollars out of the Government's hands in the first place. The centerpiece of our balanced budget plan is the \$500 per child tax credit, and I am proud this desperately needed provision remains at the heart of our legislation. The tax credit alone will allow 28 million taxpaying households to keep \$23 billion of their own money each year.

In my home State of Minnesota, the tax credit would return \$477 million

every year to families who work hard, pay their bills, and struggle every day to care for their children without relying on the Government.

In addition another 3.5 million households nationwide will find the \$500-per-child tax credit tax liability has eliminated their tax liability entirely; 3.5 million households. President Clinton has promised a middle-class tax cut of his own, but, again, it is virtually nonexistent in his 1997 budget. Let us look at what he calls for.

To qualify for the President's version of the child tax credit your child has to be under the age of 13—meaning that just about the time you need that tax relief the most, it would dry up. In addition, it would only be \$300 per child for 3 of its 5 years, and then it would be abruptly terminated 2 years early. The \$122 billion in tax relief Congress is offering in our budget resolution is real tax relief. It is not a paper gimmick.

The second plank of the legislation before us is the promise to balance the budget by the year 2002. Every year the Federal Government is spending billions and billions more than it takes in. Because of 4 decades of fiscal insanity, the national debt has today eclipsed \$5 trillion and continues to rise. Just the interest alone on a debt that massive is accumulating at the rate of \$4 million an hour. If our national debt were shared equally among all Americans, each of us would have to pay up \$19,000 for every man, woman, and child in this country. Every child born today in the United States of America comes into the world already saddled with a debt of more than \$19,000. The share for an average family is \$75,000.

So the first, most important result of a balanced budget would be to free our children and grandchildren from the economic burden they will inherit from this generation, a burden they did not ask for and one they certainly do not deserve. Because we have been able to begin reining in spending over the past year, our budget reaches balance in 6 years, not 7 as we first proposed a year ago. By contrast, the President's 1997 budget plan never achieves balance. It achieves an annual budget deficit of \$84 billion by the year 2002. Our plan achieves its goals without dramatic cuts of any kind—except in the deficit.

Spending on Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, welfare programs, and the earned income tax credit will all continue to grow to meet this Nation's needs over the 6-year life of our budget.

Keeping promises may be considered out of style here in the Nation's Capital City, where promises are a dime a dozen among the professional politicians, but back in Minnesota a promise is something a person does not back down on, even if it was made by a politician.

With our budget resolution and its meaningful tax relief, its protections to ensure the solvency of the Medicare Program, its reform of the welfare system, its commitment to a balanced

budget by the year 2002, this Congress is keeping the promises that we made to the American taxpayers.

Thank you very much, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Michigan will withhold.

APPOINTMENT BY THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader, pursuant to Public Law 102-246, appoints Julie Finley, of Washington, DC, as a member of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board, effective June 30, 1996, vice Edwin L. Cox.

APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, in accordance with 22 U.S.C. 1928a-1928d, as amended, appoints the following Senators as members of the Senate delegation to the North Atlantic Assembly during the second session of the 104th Congress, to be held in Vouliagmeni, Athens, Greece, May 16-20, 1996: the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN]; and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA].

APPOINTMENT BY THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to Public Law 94-201, appoints the following individuals as members of the Board of Trustees of the American Folklife Center: James F. Hoy, of Kansas, and Charles E. Trimble, of Nebraska.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

The Senate continued with the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, at this time, I yield to the Senator from Missouri such time as he may need, up to 15 minutes, to speak on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, my sincere thanks to the acting floor manager and to the Chair.

A comment was made a few minutes ago when I was on the floor that maybe some of the newer Members of the Senate did not really understand how we have to balance the budget in the Federal Government.

I am one who is not new around here, and I would like to say that I appreciate very much the interest and enthusiasm and commitment brought by the acting floor manager, the previous speaker, the Senator from Minnesota; the previous acting floor manager, the

Senator from Tennessee; and the occupant of the chair, a junior colleague from Missouri, all of whom have shown great dedication to the need to balance the budget and to come to this body without any preconceived notions that the old ways are the only way we can do it.

Frankly, we have broken new ground. I do a little bit of sowing of seeds, and I know how difficult it is to break new ground. If you have tried breaking up sod that has not been broken up before, you realize that is not an easy task. We have benefited a great deal by the fact that we brought in people and we have in this body new Members who represent their constituents and who believe, as our constituents overwhelmingly do, that there is no reason why the old way of spending more and more than the Federal Government takes in is good enough for the future.

Mr. President, we have put \$5 trillion of debt on the backs of our children. Each year's deficit, if it is running \$100 or \$200 billion, adds to that debt. The interest rates build up, and our children are going to be looking at a time when they are working to pay tax dollars that could go almost exclusively to pay interest on the debt that our generation has run up because we are unable to balance the budget.

Today, we are involved in what I consider to be maybe not the most exciting but perhaps the most important series of discussions and debates we have had on this floor. How do we get our national budget back on track? How do we ensure that continuing deficits do not bankrupt the Federal Government, do not allow vital programs, like Medicare part A, to go broke and do not ruin the economy by bringing back high rates of inflation, stagflation, high unemployment, and stagnating wages?

It is very important that we be clear and that our colleagues and the people we serve understand what we are talking about.

My good friend from Nebraska, the ranking member on the Democratic side on the Budget Committee, has said that there is little difference between the numbers in the Senate committee-passed budget and the President's budget. He gave us the admonition, "Let's be honest," and I agree with him. I do not agree on the numbers that he presents, but I agree with him on the need to be honest. We both agree on the need for the St. Louis Cardinals to improve their record, but that is for another day's discussion. We do have many things in common, just a different set of figures that we are using.

What we are working from are two different sets of numbers. I came to this floor yesterday with the very simple proposition that numbers do not lie. Or do they? It is the numbers that count. We heard in the 1992 campaign, "It's the economy, stupid," but when you are talking about the budget, it is the numbers that count.

The President and his staff and the Office of Management and Budget have given us the numbers to work with. This is the budget supplement; this is the appendix. This has all the numbers the President is recommending. This puts forward the President's priorities. They are different from the priorities that have been included in the numbers in the budget passed by the Senate Budget Committee.

Even though some may say they are close, I think there are very significant differences. That is why we have these debates. We do have an independent scorekeeper to keep us honest. I well remember President Clinton's stirring call in 1993 at the State of the Union Message that we needed to find a way that we could agree on what our proposals did, and he said we should use the Congressional Budget Office as the independent, objective professional scorekeeper, and that is what we have done. In the budget proposal passed out of the Budget Committee under the direction of Chairman DOMENICI, we have produced a budget that reaches balance, according to CBO, in the year 2002.

The President sent us initially a budget which he obviously was not sure whether it was going to get to balance, because in his budget message, he included some fail-safe mechanisms. There is nothing wrong with fail-safe mechanisms, but when it comes to the point that you have to use these fail-safe mechanisms, it is important to recognize what they do.

In this book, "Budget Supplement: A Vision for the Future," page 13, it says:

In case the new assumptions produce a deficit in 2002, the President's budget proposes an immediate adjustment to the annual limits or caps on discretionary spending, lowering them enough to reach balance in 2002. The President is committed not only to proposing a budget that reaches balance according to CBO, but reaching an agreement with Congress to enact such a budget.

I think that is very forthright and that is good. The problem is that the numbers presented by the President to CBO do not really reach a balance in the year 2002. There are almost \$77 billion in cuts or increases in revenue that have to be made in the final years to get to a balance.

So the CBO, in scoring the President's budget, has assumed what the President put into his budget, and that is, he will put a tax increase for families in it, as well as a \$53 billion cut in discretionary spending outlays in the years 2001 and 2002.

Let us be very clear about it. The President's budget has said, if CBO does not score us as reaching balance, then here are the automatic steps that must be taken to get to balance. CBO found, in fact, the budget did not get to balance; therefore, CBO said, we will impose the cuts he proposed as an automatic offset to the deficit. That, Mr. President, is what we need to talk about.

Some of my colleagues earlier today on the other side have presented budg-

et charts showing the spending initially proposed by the President. It does not look like much difference. But those are not the charts that reflect what happens when the CBO performs its duty under the President's budget to cut spending to bring it to a deficit of zero in 2002.

I remind my colleagues on this side and the other side that if we are talking about the President's budget, any time a colleague puts up a budget showing the President's number, if I am on the floor, I will ask if that budget reflects the CBO cuts as directed by the President in his budget message. For those of my colleagues who may be here, I invite them to do the same thing, because I think it is very, very important that we talk about apples and apples. If we are going to get to a balanced budget as the President says, then how we get there is the vitally important number that we have to consider as we go forth and vote on these competing proposals for the budget for the next 6 years.

These are the numbers the President has proposed. These are the numbers in these books. Mr. President, unless and until he sends up to this body and to the House another set of books and releases them to the press to say that they have come up with a new budget, then this is the budget we have to work with. These are the figures that he has presented to us.

Let me take my colleagues through a description of some of the things what the Clinton budget, as scored by CBO, would actually do and see how it measures up to some of the claims that are made for it in the text.

In the description of the budget plan, a little book called, "A Citizen's Guide to the Federal Budget," this book says, "The President's 1997 budget would reach balance over the next 7 years by cutting unnecessary and lower priority spending." Remember that; "lower priority spending" is going to be cut.

It goes on to say, at the bottom of page 31, or down in the lower part of it:

The budget saves \$297 billion in discretionary spending, cutting unnecessary and lower priority spending, but investing in education and training, the environment, science and technology, law enforcement and other priorities that will raise living standards and improve the quality of American life.

Mr. President, I also serve as chairman of the Senate appropriations subcommittee dealing with a number of these important areas. I think it might be well to take a look at some of these more interesting areas and also some of the areas funded in other budgets which are handled by other subcommittees on which I serve.

Let us start off with the Food and Drug Administration. It is vitally important for ensuring safety in the food supply and drugs. This green line across the top shows what the Senate Budget Committee reported out. Essentially that is a flat line. That is tough. That is holding their feet to the fire.

That is making them absorb inflationary increases, additional workload. That is tough, but that is doable.

But take a look at what happens to this spending when CBO implements its cuts. It drops from over \$850 million down to just below \$700 million, just above \$650 million, by the year 2000. This is, I would say, about a 30 percent cut in the Food and Drug Administration. That is 25 percent. This is in the body that is supposed to keep our food supply safe and make sure we get good quality, reliable, efficacious drugs. That is something I challenge. Can we afford to cut the FDA that much? I do not think so.

Let us take another one. This one is very important. We are talking about the research that is done to deal with diseases and promoting cures for many of the diseases we have and the things that are of great concern to many people—the National Institutes of Health.

The President starts off with a nice little increase, but you can see by the year 2000, that has to fall off the table. That is almost a \$2 billion cut in the budget of NIH to reach balance by the year 2002. Overall it is a 14 percent cut. Are we not going to need the research done by the National Institutes of Health in the year 2001 and 2002? I think we will. I am optimistic that we are going to discover cures. But I do not think we are going to make all the progress we can possibly make and then be able to shut down research at NIH. So I question the priority of slashing the NIH budget.

How about some of the other priorities? I have a responsibility for acting on, in our appropriations subcommittee, the budget for EPA. You all heard a great deal about the President and his support for EPA. Who would have believed just a few months ago that the President's budget would leave EPA with less money 6 years from now than it got from Congress last year, and well below the budget proposal we are presenting this year? As I have said many times over, numbers do not lie.

This is what happens to funding under our Senate-passed budget resolution. We hold EPA at a flat line. We want to work to improve the way that EPA does its business. We think that there are new ideas that are being developed both within EPA and by groups supporting EPA that can give us tremendous progress as we shift more responsibilities to State and local governments and maintain a vitally important monitoring function at the national level and using more flexible means of achieving goals.

The President said it well in his budget: "If industry can come up with a better way, a cheaper way of doing it, let's do it the most effective way." We can live with it. But take a look at what happens to the President's budget under the numbers presented by the President and as scored by CBO. This EPA budget takes a very sharp drop from just above \$7.2 billion to below \$6.4 billion by the year 2002.

This is a tremendous slash for the environment. He said, I thought, in his message in here that one of his priorities is making sure we take care of the environment. I do not think his budget does that. He says, "We need to invest in education, training, the environment, science and technology." I think our budget does a lot better job of doing that than his does.

Oh, yeah, by the way, science and technology. Our subcommittee also finances the National Science Foundation. We provide funding for it. Look what happens to the funding in the National Science Foundation. The Senate budget includes a slow but steady upward path. The President's budget gives us a little bump up here and then it drops off the table again because it has to. The President himself ordered that cuts be made to bring the budget in balance in the year 2002. Under CBO scoring that is the only way it is going to get to balance.

Finally, I addressed yesterday the budget of the Veterans' Administration, the agency which provides care to the medically indigent veterans and those veterans who have been injured in the service of their country, a very, very important group of people who depend solely on the Veterans' Administration.

These people would see the money devoted to their health care cut by almost 25 percent. The Clinton budget cuts \$12.9 billion out of the VA budget by the year 2002. We maintain essentially level funding. That is a cut that the veterans of this country cannot live with, and we in good conscience cannot live with.

I mentioned to this body yesterday that the President's people have said, "Don't believe these numbers." The Secretary of the Veterans' Administration, Jesse Brown, when he testified before my subcommittee, said, "The President has assured me that these will not be the numbers. He is going to negotiate with us." A representative of the White House Office of Management and Budget was quoted in the papers in our home State saying these numbers that are being presented, we are misrepresenting, because we took the numbers out of the book and out of the CBO. He said, "Those are just rough general guidelines. Don't believe them."

So it is the official policy of the administration not to believe the official policy. Until they send us up new numbers, send us a new budget, that is what we have to work with. That is what the priorities are: Cutting veterans, cutting national science, EPA, NIH.

Mr. President, that is not the way to get to the balanced budget we need. We can do so by following the plan outlined by Chairman DOMENICI. I urge all my colleagues to look at the contrasting numbers and make up their mind. I hope they will support the budget supported by the Senate Budget Committee.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now stand in recess until the hour of 3:30 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:30 p.m., recessed until 3:30 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. KEMPTHORNE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR BOB DOLE

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I just had the opportunity to listen to the majority leader make his announcement of his future. I wanted to come to the floor this afternoon to salute BOB DOLE's 35 years of dedication to this institution and to his country. No one has given more, and no one has greater admiration in this body than does BOB DOLE.

I congratulate him on his decision. I believe it was the right one. Obviously, it is never easy to leave this institution. But he does so with our good wishes. While we will have the opportunity to serve with BOB DOLE for at least the next several weeks, we wish BOB, his wife Elizabeth, and his daughter, Robin, well as they pursue their future.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, as a matter of fairness, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be charged equally to both sides.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SENATOR DOLE'S ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I just watched Senator DOLE make his announcement. I want to join with Senator DASCHLE in his comments. I have worked with BOB DOLE from my days in the House and have come to have great respect for the huge contribution he has made here in the Senate and to our country. I think sometimes we get so partisan here that we forget the contributions that people are making.

Let me add one other thing, because media coverage is so negative all the