

Federal Government will supposedly collect a lot more money. Well, we have seen that sort of dynamic scoring in the past. This theory held sway in 1980 and 1981, and the result—\$3½ trillion later—was massive hemorrhaging of red ink in our Government. That is the result of dynamic scoring.

Well, that is the kind of refereeing I do not want to see happening at CBO. I want scoring to be professional and to be nonpartisan. There is a question about the Consumer Price Index—do we put somebody at the head of CBO who believes the CPI radically overestimates inflation, as Alan Greenspan said? The consequence would be to reduce the deficit, if you can say the CPI is overstated. And you can cut Social Security payments and increase taxes, as well.

I am concerned about this appointment, and I hope it will be held at this point until other Members of the Senate can review the records and determine whether they think this candidate has the credentials and capability and the nonpartisan approach we would expect for somebody to head the Congressional Budget Office.

Mr. President, I yield to my friend, Senator CONRAD from North Dakota, for further comments on this issue.

#### CONCERN ABOUT CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE APPOINTMENT

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I thank the Chair and I thank my colleague, Senator DORGAN, as well. I think this is a very serious matter. The appointment of the head of the Congressional Budget Office is supposed to be nonpartisan. This is supposed to be done with both sides working together.

For the first time since I have been in the U.S. Senate, that is not what is occurring. Instead, the majority has decided they are going to put in the scorekeeper, the person who makes the forecast for the Federal Government, for the Government of the United States, and they are doing so on what appears to be partisan basis. That is a break from the past; that is a break from tradition; that is a break from what the law provides.

Mr. President, I think this is a very serious matter. If we are going to work collegially, if we are going to cooperate, if we are going to work together, then there has to be a basis of trust. Always in the past, part of that basis of trust is the person who is made the head of the Congressional Budget Office is somebody of very high professional standards, someone who is above being considered partisan.

I can say, in terms of the Democrats, since I have been here, they have had Bob Reischauer, Rudy Penner, Alice Rivlin, all of them broadly respected, all of them above partisanship. As a matter of fact, I cannot remember a concern that has been raised by the majority side while I have been in the Senate about CBO scoring on partisan basis.

But now, Mr. President, the majority has decided to impose on the Congress their choice, without the kind of agreement, without the kind of consultation, without the kind of, I think, nonpartisan working together that this position requires. And so, Mr. President, what is at stake? I can say that I am on the Budget Committee and the Finance Committee, and we are very dependent on what the Congressional Budget Office says the results of policies will be.

We now have before us someone, frankly, who does not have a national reputation, someone who is not of the stature that one would expect of someone appointed to be the head of CBO. And even more disturbing than that is that this is someone who has indicated they are willing to consider so-called dynamic scoring.

Well, what is dynamic scoring? It is largely make-believe. It is make-believe. It says if you cut taxes, you get more money. We tried that back in the 1980's in this country, and it was an absolute unmitigated disaster for this country. We saw people saying we could cut taxes, we can increase spending, and somehow it would all add up. It did not add up. It did not come close to adding up.

Instead of adding up, we got an explosion of the national debt; we got an explosion of deficits that have put this country in a deep hole that we have yet to climb out of and now it appears we are about to repeat the exercise.

I understand that this is a matter that should be handled in a different way. The appointment of the head of the Congressional Budget Office ought to be done together, both sides putting someone in place who is of the highest professional reputation, of the highest professional standards, and someone who both sides recognize will not do forecasts in a partisan, political manner. Unfortunately, Mr. President, that is not the suggestion for an appointment that we have before us.

I have joined my colleague from North Dakota in asking the President pro tempore that he not go forward with this appointment until and unless there is broad bipartisan agreement with respect to the appointment.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is their objection to the unanimous consent request?

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not object to the Senator's additional 2 minutes—let me amend that to add 3 minutes for the Senator from Montana and that this additional 5 minutes does not come off from the total time agreed upon for the Boxer amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object, I just want to make sure that the vote would now be 5 minutes later,

or at 3:35. If that is part of the agreement, that is fine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would observe that would be 3:37.

Is there objection? Hearing none, the Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me simply underscore, in my 2 minutes remaining, the point that Senator CONRAD just made. We are asking the President pro tempore of the Senate to withhold action on this appointment, to withhold action on this appointment to give the Senate and other Senators time to get some answers about this candidate.

We are not talking about just any appointment or a run-of-the-mill appointment or some general candidate being appointed to some office or another. The CBO Director is the referee who will score every economic decision, every financial judgment that will be made on legislation. And when they pick a referee—when I say "they," those who have effected this, the congressional majority—when they pick a referee who gives me the impression that this referee is on the home team, then I say, "Wait a second. That is not the kind of game we play."

We have very aggressive games around here that are played for real and for big stakes. We need to have referees who are fair and impartial and who do not owe their allegiance to either side.

This appointment is not—it is not—in the genre of an appointment of Mr. Reischauer or Mr. Rudy Penner, as an example, both of whom would be considered to have been generally nonpartisan and very well qualified. This appointment falls short on that.

And my interest is not in tarnishing this person. I do not know the person. But, based on what I have read, I certainly want to find out more about the person before this Senate would decide that this person shall become our referee.

That is the purpose of our making this request to the President pro tempore. I hope he and the majority would honor that request so that we can understand more about this candidate. And if this candidate does not meet the test of fairness, does not meet the qualifications test, then I think we ought to find someone who does and who would be acceptable on a bipartisan basis to this body. That I think is the fair way for us to proceed. I hope the President pro tempore will agree.

Mr. President, with that I yield the floor.

Mr. BURNS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

IWO JIMA

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, on this date 50 years ago, a formidable American armada moved even closer to another objective in the Pacific. While that was going on, long-range bombers