

especially it deals with choices, and that is the purpose of my sense-of-the-Senate resolution. The choice that says what we would like to do at this point is balance the budget and provide a tax cut.

I have no objection to a tax cut provided that we have done the heavy lifting to balance the budget first. But the Congressional Budget Office says that with the reconciliation bill there exists a \$105 billion deficit in the year 2002, and still the majority party wishes to proceed with a tax cut, half of which will benefit those families with incomes over \$100,000 a year, \$50 billion of which over the 7 years will benefit those families with incomes over a quarter of a million dollars a year.

My point is very simple. With the number of people out there in this country living on very modest incomes, especially senior citizens, the bulk of whom live on less than \$15,000 a year, we are saying to them, "Tighten your belt, buckle up, you are in for some tough times, because we are going to change the programs that you count on because we cannot afford to do otherwise."

And then we say to the wealthiest families in America, those who earn over a quarter of a million a year and more, guess what. We are going to stop at your house with an envelope, and guess what is in the envelope. A very significant tax cut. So start grinning; it is coming your way. Why? Well, it is about pals and pals. It is about choices. It is about the wrong choices. My sense-of-the-Senate resolution is very simple. It says let us at least make a decision to limit this tax cut to those families that earn less than \$250,000 a year and say to those with a quarter million dollars a year or more income, we think you are doing great; you do not need a tax cut, and use the savings, \$50 billion in 7 years, to offset some of the cut that is going to be impacting and hurting senior citizens in this country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? If no one yields time, time will be deducted from both sides equally.

Mr. BINGAMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 4 minutes as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Again, we are under a unanimous-consent order between 5:40 and 6 o'clock. Any unanimous consent would have to use part of that time.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I would ask that my 4 minutes be charged equally to the two sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from North Dakota controls 40 seconds. The rest would have to come from the other side.

CLINTON ANDERSON CENTENNIAL

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, 100 years ago, New Mexico was 17 years from becoming a State and Grover Cleveland was in his second term as President, the x ray was discovered, and O. Henry, who was a writer of great importance in this country, was charged with embezzlement. Also, 100 years ago was the time that Senator Anderson, Clinton Anderson of my home State of New Mexico, was born. Senator Anderson was a man who would mean a great deal to this institution, to this country, and to my home State of New Mexico.

Mr. President, 100 years ago today he was born in Centerville, SD. As a young man, he contracted tuberculosis and moved to New Mexico for treatment of that disease. I should note, Mr. President, that many other of my State's distinguished residents did the very same thing. The dry air of New Mexico revived more than one set of eastern lungs, and Senator Anderson's were among these. He recovered from his illness. He worked in journalism. He was active in Democratic politics. He was elected to the House of Representatives in 1941, served until 1945, when President Truman asked him to become Secretary of Agriculture. In 1948, he ran for the Senate and came to this body in the famous class of 1948 that included Margaret Chase Smith, Lyndon Johnson, Hubert Humphrey, Paul Douglas, Russell Long, Robert Kerr, and Estes Kefauver.

He served for 24 years, creating a very distinguished legislative record, as many of his illustrious classmates did.

One of the finest studies of this outstanding Senator was written by Senate historian, Richard Baker, entitled "Conservation Politics/The Senate career of Clinton P. Anderson." Dr. Baker perfectly described Senator Anderson's technique as a legislator. He said in that book, and I quote:

Anderson saved his shots. He was not accustomed to launching trial balloons. When he spoke, his colleagues listened. When he decided that New Mexico could gain no more by prolonged debate, he settled for the best package available. And when he attached to a legislative measure the full weight of his intellect and prestige, doubting solons set aside their skepticism, and he prevailed.

Mr. President, however many of us have the honor of representing New Mexico in the Senate, Senator Anderson provides a benchmark against which we will be measured. I am proud to have known him. My uncle, John Bingaman, was active in getting him elected and reelected to the Senate and felt when he died we lost a great public servant.

Today we honor the fact of his birth and the value of his life. For us in New Mexico and in the Senate, his are the shoulders we stand on as we move into the future.

Mr. President, I thank you for the chance to speak, and I yield the floor.

JERUSALEM EMBASSY RELOCATION IMPLEMENTATION ACT OF 1995

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ROTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, here we go again. It is not enough that President Clinton has admitted that he and his allies have raised taxes too much, but here his allies in Congress are already seeking to undermine real tax relief for middle-class Americans.

These folks cannot have it both ways. What Senator DORGAN's amendment amounts to is little more than business as usual. At home and on the campaign trail, the President and his allies talk about change—real change—but here in Washington they continue a game that has been playing out for three decades, a game that has led our Nation into a debt that is almost \$4.9 trillion, a game that has run us into \$200 billion deficits, and a game that has done little, if anything, to improve the conditions of the most vulnerable among us.

Why do they persist? Because they want it both ways. In some quarters this is called talking out of both sides of the mouth. Even the Washington Post has identified this symptom. According to the Post, the Democrats have fabricated the Medicare tax cut connection because it is useful politically. In an earlier editorial, the Post opined that

The Democrats are engaged in demagoguery, big time. And it's wrong. . . . [The Republicans] have a plan. Enough is known about it to say it is credible; it's gutsy and in some respects inventive—and it addresses a genuine problem that is only going to get worse. What Democrats have, on the other hand, is a lot of expostulation, TV ads and scare talk.

What my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will not tell the American people is that under the plan we are proposing, using Medicare savings for tax cuts would be illegal. The law requires that money saved on the Medicare Program will stay in the Medicare Program. Remember, these are trust funds, the assets of which may not be used for any other purpose. And to say otherwise, as the Post points out, is little more than politically motivated scare tactics.

The sense-of-the-Senate amendment completely undermines the progress we have made toward saving Medicare. Without our plan, the trust fund is bankrupt in 2002. It is that simple. Without our plan, the Government will not be able to live up to its obligations. We assure solvency of the program until the year 2020. This gives us a sufficient time to focus on the needs that will arise when the baby-boom generation reaches the age of eligibility.

It is important to note that Senator DORGAN's plan is not even based on the

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