



NEWS from U.S. Senator Bob Dole

(R.—Kans.)

New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510 (202) 225-6521

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
THURSDAY, MAY 1, 1975

CONTACT: JANET ANDERSON

DOLE TO VOTE "NO" ON BUDGET RESOLUTION

WASHINGTON, D.C.--Senator Bob Dole today announced his intention to vote against the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget. Following his his statement:

"Mr. President, when I offered my amendment yesterday to reduce the overall level of Federal expenditures by 0.9 of one percent, I hoped Congress would take the leadership role on the issue of fiscal responsibility. At this point, the Administration and the Budget Committee are generally in agreement on the overall amount of the Federal deficit. For the apparent gap of \$7.6 billion between the Administration's \$59.6 billion deficit projection and the Budget Committee's \$67.2 billion deficit estimate is accounted for by different economic assumptions and cost estimates.

"I believe we should have demonstrated to the American people that we were spending their money only for meritorious, prudent programs. We could have done this by reducing expenditures by the \$3.2 billion I proposed -- thus, eliminating the "fat" which undoubtedly exists in almost every government program.

"Depending on which figures you use, a vote for the Budget Committee Resolution will yield a budget deficit of \$59.6 billion or \$67.2 billion. Thus, I cannot support the Resolution.

"My vote is not a vote against the new Congressional budget process. I commend the Budget Committee. For without its efforts, a budget deficit of \$80, \$90 or \$100 billion could have resulted. Indeed by the time we look back on Fiscal Year 1976, a deficit of such magnitude may yet emerge. But we must keep in mind that we are engaged in the new Congressional budget process, not simply the new Congressional Budget Committee process.

"Mr. President, I recognize the unavailability of a large Federal deficit in 1976. For that reason, I did not support attempts to substantially reduce budget outlays. At a time when over 8 million Americans are unemployed and the rate of unemployment is still climbing, government -- which is largely responsible for the recession -- must respond in a meaningful way. And that costs money -- lots of it. My proposal for a modest reduction in expenditures was grounded on the belief that there is certainly enough "fat" in various spending programs to reduce expenditures by less than one percent. It was not designed to gut needed anti-recession programs.

"On more practical terms, I fear that when we go to Conference with the House -- which is proposing a \$73.2 billion deficit -- the \$67.2 billion deficit projected by the Senate Budget Committee will be increased by \$2 or \$3 billion. Thus, within a couple of weeks, we will be asked to endorse a resolution calling for a deficit in the range of \$70 billion.

"Mr. President, I shall, therefore, vote against the resolution. I do so because I am confident that there can and should be reductions in almost every government program. I believe that at a time of personal financial belt-tightening, the hard-pressed American taxpayer has the right to be assured that his government is behaving in a fiscally responsible manner. In my opinion, the budget proposed by the Committee and the Administration does not meet this test."