

to count them, debt service costs and others. Add this up, and they are into Social Security by \$21 billion. They are raiding Social Security by \$21 billion and are trying to hide the raid by running television ads that some clever campaign consultant told them is their best strategy for avoiding their own responsibility. To try to avoid their own accountability, they are claiming the Democrats are instituting it. The problem with that: Democrats are not in control. Republicans are in control, and this is what they are instituting. They are raiding Social Security. The record is abundantly clear.

One of the last times I came to the floor was when the Republicans came up with the gimmick—and they have come up with a whole series of them to try to avoid the charge that they are instituting precisely what they claim Democrats are instituting—of having a 13th month. They came up with kind of a clever idea to get around the problem by declaring a 13th month in this country. The last time I checked the calendar, there were only 12 months. But the Republicans decided they would come up with a 13th month to make it look as though they were not raiding the Social Security trust fund surplus. That is a novel idea. I came to the floor and wondered, what would they call it? “Spend-tember”? Would they call it “Fictionary”? What would we call a 13th month?

Why stop there? Why not have 14 or 15 months? What would be the additional month that would be added? Would we have two Augusts or two Decembers? I favored two Octobers because I enjoy baseball; we could have two World Series. Maybe we could have two Decembers so we could celebrate Christmas twice.

I know it sounds far fetched, but this is the headline in the Washington Post: “GOP Seeks to Ease Crunch with 13-Month Fiscal Year.” That is the length to which they go to avoid accountability and responsibility. That is what happened.

That is not the only gimmick they came up with. They got the 13th month. They have the census emergency—the census we have been instituting for 200 years they claim is an emergency. They declared LIHEAP an emergency, the low-income heating program. We have had that program for 24 years. They proposed delaying earned-income tax credit payments to people. They were even chastised by their own leading Presidential candidate. He made it very clear they were way out of tune with the American people when they proposed that gimmick.

That is what is going on to cover this mismanagement and to cover this fiscal irresponsibility. The National Republican Congressional Campaign Committee is running television ads in my State claiming Democrats are raiding

Social Security. That dog doesn't hunt. That is not going to fly. We are going to respond very forcefully when people try to misrepresent the record.

As I began, I conclude: The major newspaper in my State called these ads “a new low in the campaign gutter. They are false on every level.”

That is the truth. I hope the National Republican Congressional Campaign Committee will stop running these ads because they are false. They are irresponsible. They are misleading. They ought to be stopped. That is the record. That is the fact. I hope people, as they evaluate candidates in this next election, will inquire: What is the record of candidates on the question of spending Social Security surpluses, on raiding Social Security trust funds?

I am prepared to answer that question. Every budget plan I have offered, every budget plan Senate Democrats have offered, has maintained the Social Security surplus. We haven't touched the Social Security surplus. We wouldn't engage in a raid of the Social Security surplus. That is true of the plan Senate Democrats offered in the Finance Committee. That is true of the plan Senate Democrats offered in the Budget Committee. For anyone to say anything else is an absolute falsehood. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHCROFT). The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I understand under a previous order the Senator from Wyoming controls 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GREGG. I ask the Senator from Wyoming to yield me 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE BUDGET

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I want to respond to some of the comments made on the floor relative to where we are going with the budget. I specifically want to talk about the issue as it relates to a committee of which I am chairman. The committee I chair is the Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary Subcommittee. The President of the United States opted to veto our bill. In his veto message, his representation was that we simply had not spent enough money. That was essentially what it came down to.

His representation on the other bills he has vetoed is also that we have not spent enough money as a Congress. In fact, in listening to the President and the proposals he puts forward, we find he is talking about spending billions and billions more than what the Congress suggested we spend.

The Senator from North Dakota has come to the floor and said that the Re-

publicans have used gimmicks, that we have forward-funded, which we have, which is not a gimmick; it has been done in the Congress before on many occasions; that we have declared items emergencies, which we have. In fact, the Senator from North Dakota supported, I suspect rather strongly and with enthusiasm, the declaring of the agricultural situation as an emergency. It has been declared an emergency every year since I have been here, so I don't know why it is an emergency. But it has been declared an emergency. It is a way of funding agricultural issues, and there are severe strictures in the agricultural community today.

The Senator from North Dakota didn't mention where we are going to get the extra money the President asked for. Where are we going to get it? The Republicans have allegedly used gimmicks so we could not take it from Social Security—which we have not, by the way; we have managed not to take any money from Social Security. Where is the President going to get it from? The President is going to get it from Social Security because the only other option is to raise taxes and we have already seen a vote in the House of Representatives—415-0 I think was the vote—saying they were not going to raise taxes. So that is not an option. It is not even on the table.

The President makes these proposals: We are going to raise spending here; we want more money here; we want more money here. The Democratic Members, on the other side of the aisle, say: Hooray, hooray, more money for this, more money for that. When Republicans say, Isn't that coming out of Social Security? there is just this silence from the other side of the aisle.

Of course, it is coming out of Social Security because we have no other resource from which to draw those funds than Social Security. So there is a lot of gamesmanship coming from the other side of the aisle on this issue. There always has been, on Social Security, of course. There are literally generations, now, of Members of the other side of the aisle who have demagogged the issue of Social Security. As many of us have tried to put forward substantive Social Security responses, we have found this President, who allegedly wants to address Social Security, has failed to do so in a substantive way. But we hear now he wants to raid Social Security to pay for his new spending and they will not even admit to that. The statements from the other side of the aisle are hollow on that issue, to say the least. But let me go back to the specifics of this proposal.

The President has vetoed the Commerce-State-Justice bill, which has under it the Justice Department, the Commerce Department, and the State Department. It also has a lot of agencies such as the Small Business Administration, FCC, FTC, SEC, elements of

Government which are critical to the day-to-day operation of the Government and to our maintaining a sound economy and safe society. But the President has vetoed this bill. Why has he vetoed it? Basically, he has vetoed it because we did not spend enough money in some of the programs he wanted and because we did not include language he wanted in a couple of areas. He has vetoed it specifically on the allegations we do not spend enough money on the COPS Program.

Let's look at that for a second. This Congress authorized 100,000 cops to be put on the street under the President's request, in a bipartisan way. We have paid for every one of those police officers in this appropriations bill. Not only have we paid for every one of those police officers, we paid for an additional 10,000 or 15,000 police officers in this bill. So we can go up to 110,000 or 115,000 police officers under this bill.

What does the President say? He says that is not enough. He says he wants 130,000 to 150,000 police officers, even though there are only 100,000 authorized. That in itself is a bit of a reach, to ask for an extra 30,000 to 50,000 officers when they are not even authorized. But what is really inconsistent about this, and what really shows what a sham statement this is, the administration, although they have the money for 100,000 officers since we paid for 100,000 officers in our bill, has only been able to get out of the door enough money to fund 60,000 officers. In other words, down there in the White House they are now asking for another 30,000 to 50,000 officers when they cannot even undertake the day-to-day administrative event of paying for the full 100,000 we gave them in the first place. They are still 40,000 officers short from the original authorized number.

It takes 18 months to get this through the system, to get an officer on the street after they have agreed to pay for that officer. So they are literally a year and a half away at the minimum from even reaching the 100,000 level. So we said, OK, we agree more officers on the street makes sense so we will go over the 100,000 number; we will give you another 10,000 officers. Then the President vetoes it, saying he hasn't enough, when his administration has not even put out on the street the first 100,000. How blatantly political can this administration be? How hypocritical can this administration be? They did not veto this bill over police officers who were not there. They vetoed this bill because they want to put out a press release that they are vetoing bills. It had nothing to do with the actual substance of how many police officers we have on the street or how many police officers we paid for because we paid for every police officer they put out there, and we are willing to pay for another 40,000, another 55,000 if they could put them out. But they

cannot because they are not able to do it. It is pure hocus, this language that they want more police officers, and they vetoed it over the lack of funding in this account. It is just a pure political thing.

Then they said they vetoed it because they did not get enough money—no, not because they didn't get enough, because we did not give them the money for the U.N. We did not give them the money for the U.N.

Every dollar they asked for, for the U.N., is in this bill, every dollar for U.N. fees is in this bill. Every dollar for arrearages is in this bill. Yes, there is not the full money they asked for for peacekeeping, but every other account in the U.N. is fully paid for in this bill. Why can't they get it out? Why can't they send it up to the U.N.? Why can't they pay England the arrearages we owe them? Why can't they pay France the arrearages we owe them? That is where this money goes. It doesn't stay in the U.N. Most of it flows to other countries that have picked up our obligations. Because they have a bunch of activists down at the White House who are focused on a very narrow issue of international Planned Parenthood and are unwilling to release the money to fund the world organization known as the U.N., which is a major international organization, because they are willing to hold up funding over an extraordinarily narrow issue dealing with Planned Parenthood lobbying internationally. It does not have anything to do with the United States.

Not only that, but the language which they are holding up the funding over is language which was in existence, which this Government operated under during the Reagan administration and during the Bush administration. It is, to say the least, genuinely innocuous language. But they have activists down there at the White House, activists who are willing to take down the U.N. and our relationship with the U.N. over this narrow piece of language.

It is unbelievable they would blame the Congress, which has fully funded the arrearage issue, when it is just a small group of extreme activists serving at the White House who are tying up the release of this money. The money is there. The money is physically there. Every dollar, every cent, is on the table and ready to be sent to the U.N. to pay the arrearages. The only thing that stops us is, I suspect, one or two internationalists, activists at the White House who have decided to make a cause celebre for themselves over this really obscure piece of language which, by the way, as I mentioned, was the law of the land in the United States for the Reagan and the Bush administrations.

So the idea the Congress has in any way interfered with the ability to pay the arrearages is, again, pure hocus.

This is a classic example of the situation where the individual shoots his parents and throws himself before the court and asks for mercy because he is an orphan. The White House has decided to shoot its parents—in this case the U.N.—and then claim it has no role in the event and is pure when, in fact, it is the reason we cannot pay the arrearages. That is just pure hocus.

We now know the two major reasons they vetoed this bill; the COPS reason has no substance to it, and the U.N. language is their problem, not our problem. We put the money in. They are the ones who are holding this up.

Then they listed a whole series of little different items, one of which I found most interesting. In the Senate we took up two different hate crime proposals to move this bill through so we could actually get it to conference. Then in conference it became absolutely clear there was no way an issue such as hate crimes, as massive as it is, could be handled in our conference. We had two competing ideas. So we put them aside and sent them back to the authorizing committee. Ironically, the amendments were offered by the chairman and ranking member of the authorizing committee, so one would hope the authorizing committee could straighten this issue out and we, as appropriators, would not have to straighten it out.

What does the White House say? It says it wants the hate crimes legislation on this bill. This is an appropriations bill. This is a bill that funds the FBI, DEA, and the INS. Those are real law enforcement issues. They are going to undermine the ability of the FBI to do its job, the ability of the INS to do its job, the ability of the DEA to do its job, so they can get hate crimes legislation? They are going to undermine the ability of U.S. attorneys to do their jobs, the ability of U.S. marshals to do their jobs, the ability of the U.S. court system to do its job, so they can get hate crimes legislation? They are going to undermine the FEC, FTC, and the FCC so they can get their hate crimes legislation?

How outrageous. What sort of priority is this from this White House? What sort of priority puts language on hate crimes ahead of the FBI, DEA, INS, ahead of the U.S. attorneys, ahead of the U.S. marshals, the FCC, FEC, FTC—what type of priority is it when they know in order to get that language they have to go through an authorizing committee anyway? It is beyond belief they would put at risk the law enforcement agencies of this country in order to get hate crimes language, which in the first place is a State issue.

I note the State of Wyoming—the Senator from Wyoming is on the floor—is doing one heck of a job in pursuing that issue at the State level.

It is first a State issue. The irony of it is, he is undermining the entire law

enforcement community of the United States because he wants a new criminal act on the Federal books.

Is there a total disconnect at the White House? There appears to be. The veto of this bill—and there are a lot of other miscellaneous points—but the veto of this bill has nothing to do with the substance of this bill. It was done purely for political reasons so the President could look as if he was in charge or he could look as if he was standing up to the Congress.

The practical effect of vetoing this bill, however, is to undermine law enforcement across this country, to make it impossible for us to pay our U.N. arrearages, and to make it extremely hard for these agencies, which are so critical to the functioning of our country, to continue to function in an effective way.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and thank the Senator from Wyoming for the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Idaho, the chairman of the majority policy committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I especially thank the Senator from Wyoming for coming to the floor this morning to discuss with all of us some very important issues and building a perspective that I do not think the American people hear or have an opportunity to read or understand as it relates to the politics inside the beltway and what is good or not so good for the American people.

We just heard the chairman of a key appropriations subcommittee who spent the last 6 months crafting an appropriations bill to run a major portion of our Government while the President was out traveling around the world and traveling around this country not engaged and not focused on the budget. When the appropriations bill to fund these key areas of Government finally arrived at his desk, the President vetoed it and said: I didn't get my way.

I am always frustrated by an executive branch of Government that does not come to the Hill and sit down with us and work out our differences in the proper forum but chooses to set the stage of politics over the key issues that are substantive when it comes to law enforcement and safe streets and safe communities for our families and our country.

I have struggled with this President over the last several months, especially when he decided to allow terrorists out of prison. That is exactly what happened. I do not know of any other way to say it. This President personally decided that he was going to offer clemency to convicted terrorists. What were they convicted of? Violation of Federal

firearms laws. That is law enforcement. Those are Federal laws violated by people who killed others and violated Federal explosive and firearms laws. And this President says he is for law enforcement by putting more cops on the street, then he totally demoralizes or destroys the very foundation of law enforcement by saying: Arrest them and put them in prison and I will let them out because it is "politically correct" to do so.

Shame on you, Mr. President; shame on you and your politics at this moment because somehow you cannot have it both ways, at least I hope you cannot, but you are trying. You are also trying to make the use of a firearm a major political issue. Yet you offer clemency to those who violate the very laws you ought to be enforcing. Shame on you, again, Mr. President.

The Senate worked its will and did an excellent job with those appropriations bills. I do not deny the executive branch the right to participate. They have a legitimate role to play in the shaping of the budget. But in the final analysis, it is the Constitution that says it is the right and the appropriate role of the Congress to appropriate moneys, and it is the responsibility of the Executive to administer those moneys within the policy and the framework established for the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I am pleased you are finally going to lay off Social Security. Remember what our President said 2 years ago? Save Social Security; don't spend a dime of the surplus. Then this year in his state of the budget message he says: Well, gee, there is so much money there, why don't we spend a little of it. We will save 60 percent and we will spend the rest over the next 15 years and, oh, by the way, I also want to raise taxes during a time of unprecedented surpluses in our country because I have so many great ideas that I want for people, and I want to spend all this money and I want to raise your taxes to do it and I also want to spend some of the Social Security money to do so.

Thank goodness the Congress, the Republican Congress, stood up and said: No, Mr. President. The House passed a provision to provide a lockbox so that Social Security surpluses would be dedicated to Social Security and would pay down the liabilities of Social Security and strengthen the ability of that great system to support its obligations in the outyears.

We tried to pass it in the Senate, and guess who opposed it. The Democrats. They filibustered it and would not allow a vote and constantly said: We are all for Social Security. Why would they not guarantee that its moneys would be assured a lockbox provision? The American people said they wanted it. The seniors of America, recognizing the importance of Social Security to

their very existence, said that is the right thing to do, but the President said: No, I want to spend about 30 percent or 40 percent of the Social Security surplus over the next 15 years.

Just in the last month, it is fair and important to say the President has finally agreed that he will leave Social Security surpluses alone and, thank goodness, Mr. President, you have agreed with us because that would have been a phenomenal fight because we were committed and dedicated, even though it was filibustered in the Senate by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, we are going to protect the Social Security surplus. Period. End of statement.

Let's talk about the rest of the budget we are battling. A couple of weeks ago, I was amazed to see the President kind of quietly come out and then not so quietly say: We need more money to spend besides the record surpluses we have.

I have served Congress and the people of Idaho longer than I want to admit—19 years. I am amazed that only last year did I begin to see a slight surplus and this year a substantial surplus. Never at a time of surplus have I ever heard of a President asking for a tax increase. But this President did because of all these great new social ideas, that somehow is going to help people by taking more money away from them and then giving it back to them in politically correct ways.

I am not sure that ever helps the American family to take money away from them and then try in some form to decide what is the right way to give it back. We said: No, Mr. President.

Finally, just this last week, after having tried for well over 6 months, the President is slowly backing away from the tax idea, although yesterday he came through the backdoor again and said: Well, let's adjust some fees and let's see if we can come up with a little more revenue. Shame on you, Mr. President. America's taxpayers are being taxed at an all-time rate—high rate. While you are saying it is only a tobacco tax, a tax is a tax is a tax.

And, of course, while I do not smoke, and I wish that others would not—there are many who do who should not—yet we are going to tax them. Well, we are not going to tax them because I don't think this Congress will stand for it.

I have always understood the politics of surplus is more difficult than the politics of deficit spending. When I first came to Congress in 1980, we had deficits, and they grew very rapidly over fights on budget priorities. But it was not until 1994, when the American people said: Enough of deficits. I'm sorry; a Democrat-controlled Congress is out of control, with a President who wants to spend more money, and we're going to change those dynamics, and they elected a more conservative Congress, a Republican Congress.

We said we were going to balance the budget by the year 2002 and we would shape a process that would take us there. Thank goodness for a strong economy and for a fiscally responsible Congress and a monetary supply that stayed in sync. We are now at a balanced budget. We had it last year. We now have a balanced budget and surpluses this year. And I see more wrangling over budgets and spending priorities than I have ever seen in all my years here.

I understand the politics of surplus are difficult. But why shouldn't we be giving back to the American people some of their hard-earned money? It is their money. But, no, we have had a President who has insisted on constantly spending it. We put a marvelous tax package together this year, going right at middle America, to enhance the lives of our citizens, to improve the condition of America's families and communities, and this President vetoed it because he wants to prescribe how the money gets spent because somehow we have a White House that says: I know better. I know I can outthink the American family. I can shape a school system better than the American family and the American community because somehow I abide by this unique knowledge of knowing how to do it better.

I disagree with you, Mr. President. Thank goodness, we have a Congress that does. That does not mean we are not going to work out our differences. The President has a right to participate. But I do not think he has a right to do one thing and say another, and do another thing and say something else. And that is what he has done with law enforcement. That is what he is doing in education. That is clearly what he has done on Social Security. That is what he is now trying to do with the budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank my colleague from Wyoming for acquiring this time to speak on these key issues. It is very important the American people see the difference. Politics should not be the business of hypocrisy. It ought to be the business of fact. Saying one thing and doing another should not stand. Yet we have had about 7 long years of it with this President.

Mr. President, I say no to those kinds of attitudes and reactions, and I think it is important that some of us speak out on it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seven minutes 10 seconds.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, it has been an interesting morning to listen to the Senator

from North Dakota talk a little bit about the economy and about spending. There are interesting figures in terms of growth. I do not happen to have one of the charts. I guess it is getting to be where you have to have a chart to speak, but I hope not.

Let's go back to the second half of the 1970s, when we had a Democrat-controlled Government. All spending grew 12.2 percent annually; nondefense discretionary spending grew 15 percent.

In the first half of the 1980s, all spending grew 10 percent, but nondefense discretionary spending was only 2.8 percent. Defense was where the money went—10 percent.

Then we scoot on down to currently. All spending grew in the second half of the 1990s, with this Republican-controlled Congress, 2.8 percent totally; nondefense discretionary spending was 1.4 percent.

If our goal over time is to control the size of Federal Government, if our goal is to be efficient, if our goal is to control spending, then these are the numbers; these are the figures. Really, spending is the key.

Of course, our friend on the other side of the aisle talked about having the largest tax increase in the history of the United States—which was true in 1993 with the Clinton tax increase. But what we really ought to talk about is the size of Government.

There is a great deal of talk about going into Social Security. Let me read this short letter dated September 30 from the Congressional Budget Office.

Dear Mr. Speaker: You requested that we estimate the impact of the fiscal 2000 Social Security surplus using CBO's economic and technical assumptions, based on a plan whereby net discretionary outlays for the year will be \$592 billion.

That is the cap we put there.

CBO estimates this spending plan will not use any of the projected Social Security surplus for the year 2000.

We keep talking about that differently. That is the way that is. So one of the things that is interesting—I will not take long today, but we have differences of view here. We have differences of view in the country. There is nothing wrong with that. That is what the political system is about: To bring together people who have different views about attaining goals, even, indeed, different views about goals. So we ought to have legitimate arguments. That is what this system is about.

But we ought not to spin it off into things that we are not really able to document. We ought not to spin it off into motives and different kinds of political things. We ought to talk about the basic differences we have, and then decide whether we want more Federal Government or less; decide whether we want to spend more, send more of the decisions back to the State and local

governments as opposed to one size fits all on the national level.

These are the real issues.

Mr. President, we ought to be talking about some of the positive things we have done this year.

Surplus: 2 years in a row with no deficit, for the first time in 42 years. Pretty good stuff. We even have a non-Social Security surplus this year. We reduced Federal spending as a percentage of growth.

Unfortunately, we still have taxes as the highest percentage of gross national product we have had since World War II. Those things are hard to reconcile. Growth now is a little over 2 percent, compared to 10 percent in the early 1980s.

So these are the kinds of things we have done. We passed tax relief here. Unfortunately, the President chose to veto it.

Our budget goals, of course, for the rest of the year are: No Government shutdown; no new taxes; pay down the debt; protect Social Security. We are going to do those things. We are going to do it in the next 10 days.

Social Security: We talked a lot over the last few years about "save Social Security first," but we have a plan to do that with individual accounts, taking the money off the table and letting it belong to the people who have paid it in, to earn additional money by having it invested in equities.

Those are the things we are prepared to do and have done.

Education: We have done a lot this year for education. We have increased spending for education, more than the President asked for. We have more flexibility in educational decisions so that parents and school boards and States can make those decisions.

I can tell you what is needed in Greybull, WY, is quite different than what is needed in Pittsburgh. And that is the way it ought to be. We have done that. We have done a number of things.

National security: For the first time, more money is going to defense than we have had before. We have had more deployments over the last few years in foreign countries than ever, and yet this administration has reduced the dollars that go there. We have changed that.

Health care, the Patients' Bill of Rights: We passed it here. Hopefully, we will get it passed.

A balanced budget on Medicare changes: We are working on that.

Rural provisions in Medicare: We will get that done.

Financial modernization is ready to come to the floor for the first time since the 1930s.

We have a lot of things to talk about and be proud of in this session. I am very pleased we have done it. Despite the partisan rhetoric and the tactics, we have had achievements in the budget, in Social Security, in education, in