

And you, who remember only a face,  
Do not forget the outstretched hands, and  
the legs that run so easily in the earth.  
Remember that even the road to terrible bat-  
tles always passes by gardens and win-  
dows, and children playing, and the  
barking dog  
Remember the fruit that fell and reminded of  
its leaves and the branch  
Remind the hard ones that they were soft  
and green in springtime  
And do not forget that the first too was once  
the palm of an open hand and fingers.  
May Yitzhak be forever.

REMARKS OF ISRAELI COUNSEL GENERAL  
ITZHAK LEVANON

A master in the skies, the Albatross was  
soaring high in the air. Remaining airborne  
on motionless wings, and gliding abreast the  
strongest winds with little effort. He was  
watched from the land, flying majestically  
towards new horizons. The sky was clear and  
the winds favorable. The Albatross showed  
self-confidence, determined to reach new  
heights, disregarding the dangers. None  
would dare to defy him on his royal journey.

Suddenly three gun shots fatally hit the  
Albatross. He swung in the air, refusing to  
bend and hit the ground. He looked toward  
the sky, which he has just conquered a few  
moments before and whispered: why?

Rabin was like this. He flew high in the  
sky, defied strong winds, knew which direc-  
tion to head and covered long distances in a  
short time. He too asked himself, lying on  
the ground, why? Why should a leader who  
dedicated his entire life to the welfare of his  
own people, die like the Albatross died? This  
question is still on the lips of every Israeli,  
two years after his assassination, and will  
remain so for years to come.

Rabin's fatalism reminds me of another  
leader in the Middle East—Anwar Sadat. He  
too disregarded the warnings. He too be-  
lieved that he was doing only what was right  
for his people and therefore, there was no  
cause for one of them to harm him. But both  
were so trusting, and both paid the price.

I remember his face, full of happiness and  
satisfaction that evening in Montreal, after  
a poignant speech at the General Assembly  
where he spoke in all frankness about his  
fears and his hope for the peace process.  
When we arrived in this room he laid his  
eyes on his wife Lea, and, with a typical  
Israeli expression said to her "Nu?" You  
could see the joy in his face and how, with  
his timid smile, he wanted to say 'I am  
happy that they hear my words,' and how he  
felt that he was not alone in his struggle. In-  
deed, battalions were behind him.

Senator Edward Kennedy recently wrote to  
me about Rabin, and the absence created by  
his death, describing him in the following  
words: "The cause of peace lost one of its  
greatest champions of our time, perhaps of  
all time, and I continue to miss his leader-  
ship."

After Rabin's death, many poems were  
written. I have chosen one of them, which in  
my judgment reflects the feelings of most  
Israelis, *The Tears*, by Smadar Shir:

There are left wing people and there are  
right wing  
There are religious and there are secular  
There are Sephardi and there are Ashkenazi  
There are Israelis and there are Arabs  
There are clever people and there are dumb  
But for all of them there is the same tear  
and the tears are still warm, aching  
and painful  
These tears are for a great man, who fell  
down while trying to reach peace be-  
tween all these people.

Many disagreed with Rabin's ideas. Others  
criticized him, but none can argue the fact

that for most Israelis he was like a god-  
father, the one who took care of everything.  
He was the mind which thought, the author-  
ity which made decisions, the man who en-  
dorsed responsibility and the leader who did  
not worry about damaging his standing if it  
benefited his people. Rabin was a leader, but  
he was also the commander, the diplomat,  
the politician, and most of all, the father.

May the soul of this great man be blessed  
forever.

Thank you.

HONORING STEVEN CHOTIN

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President,  
today I honor Mr. Steven Chotin, one  
of Colorado's leading citizens, for his  
many contributions and outstanding  
dedication to our great state.

On the heels of his 50th birthday, I  
would like to take this opportunity to  
formally recognize my friend, a long-  
time motorcycling partner, for his  
philanthropic and civic activities of  
the past few decades. Steven has been a  
legend in a variety of charitable causes  
in Colorado, giving of his time and en-  
ergy generously, as well as financially,  
to The Denver Center for the Perform-  
ing Arts, The Colorado Symphony, The  
Allied Jewish Federation of Denver,  
National Jewish Hospital, Shalom  
Park and many other worthy endeavors.

Mr. Chotin has served on the boards  
of numerous community and charitable  
organizations, including Fresh Start, a  
program committed to paving a way  
out for Denver's inner-city youth.  
Equally renowned are Steven's activi-  
ties in civic and business affairs. As  
head of The Chotin Group Corporation,  
National Mortgage Corporation and  
Merchants Mortgage Corporation, he  
has succeeded in providing gainful em-  
ployment to a significant number of  
Denver area residents.

I am sure I speak for all Coloradans  
in extending Steven my congratula-  
tions and appreciation for leaving such  
an indelible mark on our state by the  
young age of 50. I wish him many more  
years of happiness and fruition as a  
Colorado resident.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROB-  
ERTS). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk pro-  
ceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COL-  
LINS). Without objection, it is so or-  
dered.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, I  
ask unanimous consent I may speak as  
in morning business for 20 minutes.

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

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distin-  
guished Chair.

THE BUDGET

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President,  
last week in remarks on the floor I re-

ferred to the Congressional Budget Of-  
fice's report, "Economic and Budget  
Outlook for the Fiscal Years 1999 to  
2008." And at that particular time,  
Madam President, I pointed out that  
even the Congressional Budget Office  
had projected deficits not only of \$188  
billion for the present year and \$170 bil-  
lion for 1998, but of \$200 billion for 1999,  
the year in which everyone in this  
town has been screaming we will reap a  
budgetary surplus.

Now we have the President's budget.  
Madam President, this morning we not  
only received that budget, we saw in  
this country's newspapers of record  
such headlines as "On Budget Eve,  
Congress Feels Surplus Fever." This  
particular article reports that the dis-  
tinguished Speaker of the House, Newt  
Gingrich, stated, "We are on the edge,  
if we will have discipline, of a genera-  
tion of surpluses."

So we have the President talking  
about balanced budgets as far as the  
eye can see in his State of the Union  
Message. And we now have the distin-  
guished Speaker talking about sur-  
pluses as far as the eye can see for the  
next generation.

Would that it were so. Would that we  
did not have any increase in the na-  
tional debt. Would that we had no in-  
crease in the deficit. Would that we  
had no increase in the interest costs of  
the carrying charges on our national  
debt, which are now projected, Madam  
President, to be \$1 billion a day, or \$365  
billion a year. That is one thing that  
everyone can agree on: that the inter-  
est on the federal debt is going up, up,  
and away.

Let me emphasize the matter of the  
debt before I home in on the matter of  
Social Security and the spending of  
surpluses. In 1981, we had a national  
debt of \$995.5 billion. We had not  
reached a trillion-dollar debt.

For the first 200 years of our history,  
including the costs of all the wars our  
nation fought during that time—the  
Revolutionary War, the War of 1812,  
the Mexican-American War, the Civil  
War, the Spanish-American War, World  
War I, World War II, Korea, and Viet-  
nam—we did not reach a trillion-dollar  
debt. But in the last 16 years, we have  
reached now a \$5.5 trillion debt, with  
interest costs of a billion dollars a day.  
Interest on the debt used to stand at a  
mere \$95 billion; it now stands at \$365  
billion. So we are spending \$270 billion  
more on interest alone than when we  
supposedly were going to balance the  
budget back in 1981.

I remember when our distinguished  
President Ronald Reagan ran on bal-  
ancing the budget and was elected in  
1980. He came into office in 1981 and  
said, "Whoops. This is way worse than  
I ever expected. Instead of balancing  
the budget in a year, it's going to take  
me 3 years."

Even after passage of the Gramm-  
Rudman-Hollings Bill, we ran into the  
highest deficits we ever had heard of.  
The deficits and debt went up, up, and  
away under Reaganomics. Of course,

the whole idea of Reaganomics, which George Bush called voodoo economics, was that cutting tax revenues some 25 percent would spur people to spend more, thus leading to increased government revenues from sales taxes and income taxes. This in turn, proponents of so-called Reaganomics said, would enable us to grow out of the federal deficit and national debt. In contrast, of course, we have grown into them.

As a result, we now spend a billion dollars a day on interest to service the federal debt. The first thing at 8 o'clock every morning that the Government does is go down to the bank and borrow a billion dollars—every Sunday morning, Christmas morning, every holiday, every day in the year. It borrows and spends this billion dollars to pay the carrying charges on the debt. This money doesn't go for anything constructive: no highways, no foreign aid, no defense money. It's just waste added to the debt.

This is the dilemma we find ourselves in. This is really the bottom line. But it has never been emphasized in this body. And momentarily, seeing that I had an opportunity to emphasize this on the floor of the Senate, I said to myself: "Now's my chance to sober everyone up, because we are spending more and getting less." And everybody wonders why they are not getting adequate Government services. The reason we are not is because we are spending \$270 billion more on interest than we were spending in 1981. We are spending more for absolutely nothing—a total of \$365 billion for nothing.

And now we have the President's budget. And as is the usual custom, the Administration says one thing and does another. I will never forget Attorney General John Mitchell's admonition, "Watch what we do, not what we say." That could be the mantra of Con-

gress and the White House today: "Watch what we do, not what we say."

Of course, if you look in the very first part of the President's budget, you can see projected on page 10 of the budget for next year, 1999, a \$9.5 billion surplus. Isn't that grand? Isn't that wonderful? There it is: a \$9.5 billion surplus on page 10.

But, Madam President, let us, if you please, go all the way back to page 367 of the President's budget. You have to go search through the whole budget. I don't know that anybody has done this, but I have learned how to search out the truth in these budgets. On page 367 you will find a chart similar to the one by the CBO titled "Projections of the Federal Debt by Fiscal Year." You will find the Federal Government's financing and debt. And when you look in the very, very small print, you will see it under the title "Total Gross Federal Debt."

Of course, they have highlighted other elements of the budget, such as "Debt Outstanding End of the Year." They have highlighted in bold, black letters the "Debt Subject to Statutory Limitations End of the Year." But it is in very small letters that they provide the "Total Gross Federal Debt." But if you squint your eyes, you can see that the debt goes from \$5,543.6 billion in 1998 to \$5,738.1 billion in 1999.

So the President, in his own budget—although you have to be a detective to find this—projects a deficit that, if adopted, ipso facto will be \$194.5 billion.

This is the situation that confronts us. But today one has to read in all the papers and magazines about this "surplus fever and tax cuts"; and you have to listen to the debate on the floor. "No, I think we ought to spend more for this program or that program. No, I

think we ought to have tax cuts. That's what we ought to do with the surplus."

Madam President, the only way that anyone can possibly project any kind of balanced budget or surplus for next year of \$9.5 billion is to use the trust funds—not just those of Social Security, because there is another \$113 billion of Social Security being used—but the \$90 billion in other trust funds.

The easiest way to figure whether or not you have a deficit is to see whether or not you make more money than you spend each year. This works for families; it works for everyone. We must look at whether the Federal Government receives more money than it spends. Of course, if it spends more than it receives, it has a deficit. And that is why you must look at the bottom line of the national debt, where you will see that we actually spend \$194.5 billion more than we take in.

But the greatest gimmick and the actual fraud, Madam President, is the so-called unified budget. Supporters of this sham argue that President Lyndon Johnson and the Congress balanced the budget this way in 1968-1969. This is absolutely false; absolutely false. President Lyndon Baines Johnson did not use any surpluses in order to balance the budget.

Madam President, I have a chart that shows the state of the national debt under President Johnson. In fact, it provides the debt under all the Presidents, beginning with President Truman in 1945 and continuing to February, 1998. I have here the United States' total budget. I have the borrowed trust funds. This is in the chart and I ask unanimous consent that this be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### HOLLINGS' BUDGET REALITIES

[In billions of dollars]

President and year	U.S. budget (outlays)	Borrowed trust funds	Unified deficit with trust funds	Actual deficit with without trust funds	National debt	Annual increases in spending for interest
Truman						
1945	92.7	5.4	-47.6	--	260.1	
1946	55.2	-5.0	-15.9	-10.9	271.0	
1947	34.5	-9.9	4.0	+13.9	257.1	
1948	29.8	6.7	11.8	+5.1	252.0	
1949	38.8	1.2	0.6	-0.6	252.6	
1950	42.6	1.2	-3.1	-4.3	256.9	
1951	45.5	4.5	6.1	+1.6	255.3	
1952	67.7	2.3	-1.5	-3.8	259.1	
1953	76.1	0.4	-6.5	-6.9	266.0	
Eisenhower						
1954	70.9	3.6	-1.2	-4.8	270.8	
1955	68.4	0.6	-3.0	-3.6	274.4	
1956	70.6	2.2	3.9	+1.7	272.7	
1957	76.6	3.0	3.4	+0.4	272.3	
1958	82.4	4.6	-2.8	-7.4	279.7	
1959	92.1	-5.0	-12.8	-7.8	287.5	
1960	92.2	3.3	0.3	-3.0	290.5	
1961	97.7	-1.2	-3.3	-2.1	292.6	
Kennedy						
1962	106.8	3.2	-7.1	-10.3	302.9	9.1
1963	111.3	2.6	-4.8	-7.4	310.3	9.9
Johnson						
1964	118.5	-0.1	-5.9	-5.8	316.1	10.7
1965	118.2	4.8	-1.4	-6.2	322.3	11.3
1966	134.5	2.5	-3.7	-6.2	328.5	12.0
1967	157.5	3.3	-8.6	-11.9	340.4	13.4
1968	178.1	3.1	-25.2	-28.3	368.7	14.6
1969	183.6	0.3	3.2	+2.9	365.8	16.6
Nixon						
1970	195.6	12.3	-2.8	-15.1	380.9	19.3
1971	210.2	4.3	-23.0	-27.3	408.2	21.0
1972	230.7	4.3	-23.4	-27.7	435.9	21.8
1973	245.7	15.5	-14.9	-30.4	466.3	24.2
1974	269.4	11.5	-6.1	-17.6	483.9	29.3

HOLLINGS' BUDGET REALITIES—Continued  
[In billions of dollars]

President and year	U.S. budget (outlays)	Borrowed trust funds	Unified def- icit with trust funds	Actual defi- cit with- out trust funds	National debt	Annual in- creases in spending for interest
Ford						
1975	332.3	4.8	-53.2	-58.0	541.9	32.7
1976	371.8	13.4	-73.7	-87.1	629.0	37.1
Carter						
1977	409.2	23.7	-53.7	-77.4	706.4	41.9
1978	458.7	11.0	-59.2	-70.2	776.6	48.7
1979	503.5	12.2	-40.7	-52.9	829.5	59.9
1980	590.9	5.8	-73.8	-79.6	909.1	74.8
Reagan						
1981	678.2	6.7	-79.0	-85.7	994.8	95.5
1982	745.8	14.5	-128.0	-142.5	1,137.3	117.2
1983	808.4	26.6	-207.8	-234.4	1,371.7	128.7
1984	851.8	7.6	-185.4	-193.0	1,564.7	153.9
1985	946.4	40.5	-212.3	-252.8	1,817.5	178.9
1986	990.3	81.9	-221.2	-303.1	2,120.6	190.3
1987	1,003.9	75.7	-149.8	-225.5	2,346.1	195.3
1988	1,064.1	100.0	-155.2	-255.2	2,601.3	214.1
Bush						
1989	1,143.2	114.2	-152.5	-266.7	2,868.3	240.9
1990	1,252.7	117.4	-221.2	-338.6	3,206.6	264.7
1991	1,323.8	122.5	-269.4	-391.9	3,598.5	285.5
1992	1,380.9	113.2	-290.4	-403.6	4,002.1	292.3
Clinton						
1993	1,408.2	94.3	-255.0	-349.3	4,351.4	292.5
1994	1,460.6	89.2	-203.1	-292.3	4,643.7	296.3
1995	1,514.6	113.4	-163.9	-277.3	4,921.0	332.4
1996	1,560.3	153.6	-107.3	-260.9	5,181.9	344.0
1997	1,601.3	165.5	-22.3	-187.8	5,369.7	355.8
1998	1,670.3	164.8	-5.5	-170.3	5,540.0	365.1

Historical Tables, Budget of the US Government FY 1998; Beginning in 1962 CBO's 1998 Economic and Budget Outlook.

TRUST FUNDS LOOTED TO BALANCE BUDGET

[By fiscal year, in billions of dollars]

	1997	1998	2002
Social Security	631	732	1,236
Medicare			
HI	117	113	109
SMI	34	34	51
Military Retirement	126	133	163
Civilian Retirement	431	460	584
Unemployment	62	72	98
Highway	22	23	56
Airport	7	10	30
Railroad Retirement	19	20	23
Other	53	55	68
Total	1,502	1,652	2,418

Mr. HOLLINGS. With this chart, we can see the borrowed trust funds and the unified deficit including the trust funds. But then we see the actual deficit without the trust funds, the real deficit, with a column for each President: Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, Bush and Clinton. This table shows the national debt under each President, as well as the annual increases in spending on interest costs on that debt.

If we look at 1968-1969, we find that listed actual trust funds totalled \$300 million. Since the unified deficit with trust funds was \$3.2 billion, the actual deficit without Social Security trust funds was \$2.9 billion. So trust funds were not used to balance the budget. This is a fallacious argument.

In fact, let me clear that up. In those days the distinguished Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee was Congressman Wilbur Mills of Arkansas. He was the authority on the federal budget and our nation's fiscal state. If you ever wanted to find out about a tax or revenue, if you ever wanted to talk about fiscal policy or otherwise, you went to see Wilbur. He was a brilliant individual. In 1972, he entered the Presidential race. Of course, before he got into that Presidential race—I cannot remember the exact year he announced—he came out and said we had so much money in Social Security that we should give recipients a cost-of-liv-

ing-increase of 10 percent. And President Nixon said, "Well, if Wilbur Mills will give you 10 percent, I will give you 15 percent," and we started spending away the Social Security moneys. We never did have a difficulty with Social Security until those shenanigans commenced.

By 1980, we determined that Social Security would be running into the red and we created the Greenspan Commission, under the distinguished head of the Federal Reserve, Alan Greenspan. The Greenspan Commission came out with a report adopted in 1983, which said that not only are we going to balance Social Security's budget, we are going to have an inordinately high tax, a graduated tax, to make sure that we build up a surplus to take care of the baby boomers. That was the intent of building up the surplus. They knew they were going to have extra money. It wasn't a mystery because it was an inordinately high tax. They built up this surplus intentionally. And Section 21 of the Greenspan Commission report states that in order to maintain the surplus for the baby boomers through the year 2056, we must take Social Security out of the unified budget.

Now, that is what Greenspan recommended. And this Senator worked as a member of the Budget Committee to get that done. Finally, in 1990, we reported it out from the Budget Committee by a vote of 20-1 that we do just that, take Social Security off budget. And 98 Senators voted for that on the floor of the Senate. And President George Bush, on November 5, 1990, signed section 13-301 into the law. Section 13-301 of the budget law says that the Congress and the President you shall not submit a budget using Social Security trust funds.

Of course, that was violated and it is being violated now in this particular budget. Right here, it is violated. There is no question it is being violated because that is what all the news-

papers are reporting on—they are talking about page 10, not page 367.

Here is what has been occurring. Let's go right to Social Security. Last year we owed the trust funds \$631 billion; by the end of September 1998, the Congressional Budget Office estimates we will owe \$732 billion; and under the President's budget plan, by the year 2002 we will owe \$1,236 trillion. Everybody is saying, wait a minute, we have to do something because in 10 years Social Security is going to be broke. Come on, it is broke now. If we look to the end of this year, we will owe Social Security \$732 billion. Now, who in the year 2002 is going to recommend a tax increase of \$1,236 trillion to redeem the Social Security IOUs? He will not be able to stand on the floor and get one vote. They will run him out. That will not happen.

That is why this particular Senator has been insistent from the very beginning that we look at all the trust funds and the condition of the Government—Medicare, military retirement, civilian retirement, unemployment, highway, airports—to evaluate the federal deficit and debt.

For example, at the end of this fiscal year we will owe highway trust funds \$23 billion. Now, why are the highways crumbling and the bridges falling? Because the vehicle-automobile, gasoline taxes are not being used on the roads and the bridges. They are being used for food stamps, for foreign aid, or for any and every other purpose except for highways. Why don't we have updated radar at all the major airports in the U.S. for passengers' safety? After all, who pays airline tax? But the airline tax is not going to the airports. It is going for any and every other purpose but the airports. We owe them \$10 billion. And I don't want to get the military retirees or the Civil Service retirees upset, but as of the end of September we will owe \$133 billion to make payments to them. We will owe \$460

billion, almost half a trillion dollars, to civilian retirees.

This charade, this fraud, has got to stop. It is outrageous that the President comes to the American people and says in one breath, "Tonight I propose that we reserve 100 percent of the surplus—that is every penny of any surplus—until we have taken all the measures necessary to strengthen the Social Security system for the 21st century." And then, after giving that message last week, today he comes and loots the Social Security trust fund to the tune of \$113 billion in order to report a \$9.5 billion surplus. Of course, all the editorial writers and news columnists are writing that we will enjoy balanced budgets as far as the eye can see. We will have surpluses as far as the eye can see, they say, when the actual deficit under the President's budget is \$194.5 billion. Look on page 367 of his report and you will see nothing but deficits for as far as the eye can see—namely, the debt increasing; namely, a billion dollars a day being paid now with the lowest of interest rates that we have had in our history. That amount is going to soar when interest rates rise because spending for interest goes up, up and away under the President's budget proposal. We really are in a downward spiral of financial responsibility here in the National Government.

Now, I delight in the President's budget with respect to child care. I delight in the provisions in there for 100,000 more Border Patrol agents; 100,000 more cops; higher pay for teachers; and smaller classroom size. But we are going to have to pass a tobacco tax settlement or some other measure to get extra moneys for these particular programs. This Senator is willing to vote to pay for those programs. I am trying to put Government on a pay-as-you-go basis.

I know about fiscal responsibility. I achieved the first AAA credit rating for the State of South Carolina, the first Southern State to receive this bond rating. In 1959 I worked like the dickens to get it done. I voted for that federal balanced budget in 1968-69. The entire budget, with the costs of the war in Vietnam and the Great Society, was only \$178 billion. Today, we suffer from a \$1.7 trillion budget. But we balanced it then.

I was a cosponsor of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings in order to try to cut the deficits, but of course the quickest way to anonymity in public office is to cosponsor a bill with Senator GRAMM or Senator Rudman. I never heard since from it but that is how it works around here. But we did get the majority of Democratic votes, 14 votes up and down against the opposition of the majority leader, the chairman of the Budget Committee and the Democratic whip. They all opposed Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, but we had a majority of Democrats on this side of the aisle vote for Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. I even suggested at one time a value-added tax to

get on top of this sea of red ink, allocated to the deficit and the debt so we wouldn't get into this waste of \$1 billion a day.

I am still working now, not just on the amount of the deficit and debt but for the principle of truth, truth in budgeting. How do you get the national media, the national press, who are co-conspirators in this charade, to report the truth. They are talking about conspiracy around this town with regard to special prosecutors, when in reality the conspiracy is right here, in the so-called unified budget. The budget the White House submitted today results without question in a \$194.5 billion deficit if adopted as it is now submitted. It is time everyone realize this. It is time we practice truth in governing and reporting.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes in morning business.

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

#### THE BUDGET FOR 1999

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I wanted to make a couple of comments following those of the Senator from South Carolina, Senator HOLLINGS. He knows that I certainly agree with him on the issue of the Social Security trust funds and the unified budget. There are some definitional issues about the budget.

I was at the White House this morning, at the invitation of President Clinton, when he made a presentation on the budget that he released today. Frankly, the budget contains a lot of good news. The Senator from South Carolina is correct about the unified budget. But it is also correct to say that this President, beginning in 1993, said that we are going to change courses here and we are going to set this country on a different direction. Between then and now, we have wrestled the Federal budget deficit to the ground.

Is our job over? No. There is more to be done because of the Social Security trust funds and some other issues. But this President deserves substantial credit for deciding that we are going to change courses, change directions, and wrestle this budget deficit to the ground. I must say that, in 1993, when he proposed to do that, it was very controversial because, up until then, we had seen budget after budget with deficits that continued to increase, year after year. It was \$35 bad habits around here, wanting to give tax cuts and

spending increases. And the deficit continued to grow, and the Federal debt continued to escalate.

In 1993, when President Clinton said let's change direction here, he proposed a couple of things that were very controversial. He said, let's really cut some Federal spending, let's really increase some taxes on a selected basis. And it became very controversial because all those folks who had stood up and talked the loudest about controlling the Federal deficit, when it came time to take the vote, where were they? They weren't here. We didn't get one vote from the other side of the aisle—even by accident. We won by one vote in the U.S. Senate and one vote in the U.S. House, and that set this country on a different course.

Five years later, we now see daylight with the Federal deficits, and the deficits in future years are well under control. In fact, in the long-term, even with Social Security funds out of the calculation, we will reach a balanced budget.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. DORGAN. I yield to my friend.

Mr. HOLLINGS. The Senator is right on target with respect to giving the President credit. There is no question, we increased taxes, cut spending, and cut the number of Federal employees. And in increasing the taxes, I will never forget the colleague from Texas, when he stated on the floor—regarding increasing taxes on Social Security—that they were going to be hunting us Democrats down in the streets and shooting us like dogs. I will never forget that. They not only projected a recession and a depression, but that Social Security tax increase, which I don't see anybody putting into a bill or talking about today—but at that particular time, taking on that hard choice, as they talked about, without a single Republican vote, was very, very difficult. But we faced the fire, and to President Clinton's credit, now we have the economy headed in the right direction. My comments on the unified budget and deficit is to make sure we don't go in the other direction.

Mr. DORGAN. The Senator is certainly correct. The last thing we want to do is step back into the hole we were in before. Just the hint of a budget surplus in the future has persuaded a legion of people here to talk about new tax breaks on the one hand or new spending on the other hand. We ought rather to decide to have discipline. Let's accept the good news that we have wrestled the Federal budget deficit to the ground. Let's work to keep it there, instead of getting right back into the same fiscal mess we were in before.

I know some will dispute my recitation of the facts. But there is no dispute that, in 1993, we had a huge vote in the Senate. And we passed that deficit reduction bill by one vote, which sent this country on a different course. That vote indicated that we cared