

147 AP 04-14-93 06:26 EST 45 Lines. Copyright 1993. All rights reserved.
PM-MN--Livable States,0300<
New Hampshire Back in No. 1 Spot<
amps<

LAWRENCE, Kan. (AP) The Most Livable State Award is back in the possession of New Hampshire.

Utah dropped to No. 2 on the most livable list. Kansas, Minnesota and Wisconsin filled out the top five states. Louisiana, which moved up one spot last year from its last-place finish in 1991, was No. 50 again this year.

New Hampshire, the winner when the award was originated in 1991, took the title back from last year's winner, Utah, in the analysis of 43 factors by the Morgan Quitno Corp.

"New Hampshire has seen its share of rough times, but year in and year out, much of the rest of the nation would love to have New Hampshire's problems," said Scott Morgan, president of Morgan Quitno, which publishes books on the annual state rankings.

"Our numbers do not just rank economics. They rank overall quality of life, and New Hampshire has what it takes."

The rankings are based on 18 positive factors and 25 negative factors.

PRESS RETURN TO CONTINUE OR ENTER A REQUEST.

Among the positive factors are personal income, high school graduation rate, job growth, normal temperature, percentage of sunny days, average earnings of manufacturing workers and education expenditures.

Among the negative factors are crime rate, poverty rate, unemployment, percentage of homes receiving food stamps, pupil-teacher ratio, infant mortality rate, suicide rate, AIDS rate, population per square mile and welfare spending.

The ranking of the states: 1. New Hampshire; 2. Utah; 3. Kansas; 4. Minnesota; 5. Wisconsin; 6. Iowa; 7. Nebraska; 8. Colorado; 9. Hawaii; 10. South Dakota; 11. Vermont; 12. Virginia; 13. Maine; 14. Montana; 15. Idaho; 16. North Dakota; 17. Connecticut; 18. Alaska; 19. Wyoming; 20. Massachusetts; 21. New Jersey; 22. Oregon; 23. Nevada; 24. Missouri; 25. Indiana; 26. Washington; 27. Maryland; 28. Arizona; 29. Ohio; 30. Oklahoma; 31. Illinois; 32. Texas; 33. Pennsylvania; 34. Delaware; 35. Arkansas; 36. California; 37. Rhode Island; 38. Michigan; 39. Georgia; 40. New Mexico; 41. Tennessee; 42. North Carolina; 43. South Carolina; 44. Kentucky; 45. Florida; 46. West Virginia; 47. Alabama; 48. Mississippi; 49. New York, and 50. Louisiana.

PRESS RETURN TO CONTINUE OR ENTER A REQUEST.

SENATOR BOB DOLE
MANCHESTER CHAMBER OF
COMMERCE
APRIL 15, 1993

THANK YOU. IT'S A PLEASURE
TO BE IN MANCHESTER AGAIN.

AND THE FIRST THING I WANT
TO DO TODAY IS TO SAY
"CONGRATULATIONS." AS YOU

**PROBABLY KNOW, ACCORDING
TO A STUDY WHICH WAS
RELEASED ON TUESDAY, NEW
HAMPSHIRE IS THE "MOST
LIVABLE STATE" IN THE UNION.
UTAH RANKED SECOND, AND
KANSAS CAME IN THIRD.**

**I HAVE CONCLUDED THAT THE
ONLY REASON KANSAS WAS
RANKED THIRD IS BECAUSE NEW**

**HAMPSHIRE AND UTAH HAVE
REPUBLICAN GOVERNORS, AND
KANSAS HAS A DEMOCRAT
GOVERNOR.**

**AND I DO THINK IT'S MORE
THAN A COINCIDENCE THAT THE
TOP THREE STATES IN
LIVABILITY ARE ALL
REPRESENTED BY TWO
REPUBLICAN SENATORS.**

**AND SPEAKING OF THAT, I
WANT TO ALSO CONGRATULATE
YOU FOR SENDING TWO
OUTSTANDING SENATORS TO
WASHINGTON.**

**BOB SMITH HAS QUICKLY
DEVELOPED A REPUTATION FOR
TELLING IT LIKE IT IS, AND FOR
TACKLING SOME TOUGH ISSUES
THAT OTHERS DON'T WANT TO**

**TOUCH. HE DID AN
OUTSTANDING JOB LAST YEAR
ON THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON
POW'S AND MIA'S, AND HE WILL
SERVE WITH DISTINCTION ON
THE SENATE ETHICS
COMMITTEE--WHICH IS A VERY
TOUGH ASSIGNMENT.**

**AND IT SHOULD COME AS NO
SURPRISE THAT JUDD GREGG**

**HAS HIT THE GROUND RUNNING.
AND JUST FOUR MONTHS INTO
HIS TERM, HE IS ALREADY
MAKING A BIG DIFFERENCE AS A
KEY MEMBER OF THE BUDGET
COMMITTEE.**

**NO DOUBT ABOUT IT. JUDD
AND BOB MAKE A GREAT TEAM
FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE.**

I'VE BEEN IN KANSAS AND

**QUITE A FEW OTHER STATES IN
THE PAST WEEK, LISTENING AND
TALKING TO FARMERS, SMALL
BUSINESSMEN AND WOMEN,
TRUCK DRIVERS, DOCTORS,
HOMEMAKERS, AND ANYONE
ELSE WHO HAD SOMETHING ON
THEIR MIND.**

**AND IN A FEW MINUTES, I
HOPE TO HEAR WHAT'S ON**

**YOUR MIND, WHEN I TAKE YOUR
QUESTIONS. BUT FIRST, I WANT
TO TALK BRIEFLY ABOUT A FEW
ISSUES WHICH SEEM TO BE
DOMINATING THE HEADLINES.**

**AND THE FIRST ISSUE IS THE
CURRENT DISAGREEMENT
BETWEEN PRESIDENT CLINTON
AND THE SENATE REPUBLICANS.**

**LET ME BE CLEAR IN SAYING
THAT LIKE ALL AMERICANS, I
WANT PRESIDENT CLINTON TO
DO WELL. BUT WHEN KANSANS
SENT ME TO THE SENATE, THEY
ALSO EXPECTED ME TO STAND
UP FOR MY BELIEFS, AND TO
STAND UP FOR THEM. AND
SOMETIMES THAT MEANS
STANDING UP TO THE**

**PRESIDENT. AND I KNOW YOU
EXPECT THE SAME THING OUT
OF BOB SMITH AND JUDD
GREGG.**

**SOME IN THE MEDIA SEEM TO
BE SUGGESTING THAT THE
CONGRESS SHOULD JUST GO
ALONG WITH ANYTHING THE
PRESIDENT PROPOSES. WELL, I
AGREE WITH WHAT TEDDY**

**ROOSEVELT SAID AFTER THE
ELECTION OF WOODROW
WILSON. ROOSEVELT SAID "OUR
LOYALTY IS DUE ENTIRELY TO
THE UNITED STATES...IT IS OUR
DUTY TO SUPPORT THE
PRESIDENT WHEN HE SERVES
THE UNITED STATES WELL. AND
IT IS OUR DUTY TO OPPOSE HIM
WHEN HE SERVES IT BADLY."**

**AND I AM ABSOLUTELY
CONVINCED THAT MANY OF THE
PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC
PROPOSALS ARE BAD POLICY.**

**DURING THE CAMPAIGN,
PRESIDENT CLINTON TALKED
ABOUT MAKING THE DEFICIT
PUBLIC ENEMY #1. AND IF HE
HAD DONE SO IN THE RIGHT
WAY, HE WOULD HAVE FOUND**

NO GREATER ALLY THAN BOB
DOLE.

BECAUSE WHETHER WE'RE
DEMOCRATS, REPUBLICANS, OR
WHETHER WE VOTED FOR ROSS
PEROT...I THINK WE CAN ALL
AGREE THAT WE'VE GOT TO
FIND SOME WAY TO ADDRESS
THE DEFICIT.

AND WHILE IT'S ONE THING

TO TALK TOUGH ABOUT THE
DEFICIT, IT'S ANOTHER THING
TO MAKE THE TOUGH
DECISIONS AND THE TOUGH
CUTS. AND PRESIDENT
CLINTON'S ECONOMIC PLAN
STEERS CLEAR OF THE TOUGH
DECISIONS AND THE TOUGH
CUTS.

PRESIDENT CLINTON TAKES

**THE EASY WAY OUT. TIME AND
AGAIN, INSTEAD OF TELLING THE
BUREAUCRACY THAT IT WILL
HAVE TO DO MORE WITH LESS,
HE IS TELLING THE AMERICAN
PEOPLE THEY WILL HAVE TO
GET BY WITH LESS MONEY.**

**I KNOW THAT TODAY IS APRIL
15. AND I SUSPECT THAT SOME
OF YOU MIGHT BE VISITING THE**

**POST OFFICE TONIGHT....AND I
CAN GUARANTEE YOU THAT
UNDER THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN,
WHATEVER YOU'RE PAYING IN
TAXES THIS YEAR, YOU'RE
GOING TO BE PAYING MORE
NEXT YEAR. AND, AS NEW
HAMPSHIRE'S FARMERS NOW,
THE LETTERS B.T.U. REALLY
STAND FOR "BIG TIME**

UNEMPLOYMENT.

AND, UNFORTUNATELY,
UNDER THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN, I
CAN'T GUARANTEE YOU,
HOWEVER, THAT GOVERNMENT
NON-MILITARY SPENDING WILL
BE CUT...NOR CAN I GUARANTEE
YOU THAT YOUR INCREASED TAX
DOLLARS WILL GO TO REDUCE
THE DEFICIT.

**IN FACT, AS RESPECTED
WASHINGTON JOURNALIST
DAVID BRODER WROTE THIS
WEEK, "CLINTON'S BEST
ESTIMATE IS THAT, IF
CONGRESS ACCEPTS ALL HIS
PROPOSALS AND THE ECONOMY
GROWS FOR FOUR STRAIGHT
YEARS, AS HE HOPES, THE NEXT
FOUR ANNUAL DEFICITS WILL BE**

**\$264 BILLION, \$247 BILLION, \$212
BILLION, AND \$214 BILLION.
ADD THEM UP AND YOU GET
\$937 BILLION OF NEW PUBLIC
DEBT PASSED ON TO OUR
CHILDREN AND
GRANDCHILDREN."**

**AT IT'S HEART, THE
DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN
PRESIDENT CLINTON AND THE**

**REPUBLICAN SENATORS IS NOT
AN EXAMPLE OF POLITICS AS
USUAL....RATHER IT'S AN
EXAMPLE OF TWO
FUNDAMENTALLY DIFFERENT
PHILOSOPHIES.**

**ONE PHILOSOPHY WANTS TO
INCREASE SPENDING. THE
OTHER WANTS TO REDUCE
SPENDING.**

**ONE PHILOSOPHY IS HAPPY
JUST TACKLING THE COST OF
NEW PROGRAMS ON TO THE
DEFICIT. THE OTHER BELIEVES
THAT ANY NEW PROGRAMS
MUST BE PAID FOR NOW BY
CUTTING OTHER PROGRAMS.**

**ONE PHILOSOPHY THINKS
THAT THE BEST JOBS ARE
THOSE PROVIDED BY THE**

**GOVERNMENT. THE OTHER
BELIEVES THAT THE BEST JOBS
ARE THOSE PROVIDED BY
PRIVATE ENTERPRISE.**

**THAT'S THE DEBATE THAT
WILL CONTINUE WHEN
CONGRESS RETURNS TO
SESSION NEXT WEEK.**

**AND THERE'S NO DOUBT THAT
THE DEMOCRATS HAVE THE**

**UPPER HAND IN WASHINGTON.
THEY CONTROL THE WHITE
HOUSE. THEY CONTROL THE
SENATE. AND THEY CONTROL
THE HOUSE. BUT I BELIEVE THE
REPUBLICANS ARE GOING TO
WIN A FEW VICTORIES.
BECAUSE OUR PHILOSOPHY IS
RIGHT...AND BECAUSE THE
MORE THE AMERICAN PEOPLE**

**LEARN ABOUT THE PRESIDENT'S
PLAN, THE MORE THEY ARE IN
OUR CORNER.**

HEALTH CARE

**JUST AS I TOLD THE
PRESIDENT I WANTED TO WORK
WITH HIM FOR MEANINGFUL
DEFICIT REDUCTION, I TOLD HE
AND MRS. CLINTON THAT**

**REPUBLICANS WANTED TO
WORK WITH THEM ON HEALTH
CARE REFORM.**

**UNFORTUNATELY,
REPUBLICANS HAVE BEEN
COMPLETELY SHUT OUT FROM
WRITING THE PLAN...AND SO
HAVE DOCTORS, BUSINESSES,
INSURANCE COMPANIES, OR
ANY OTHER GROUPS THAT THE**

**ADMINISTRATION HAVE
LABELLED AS "SPECIAL
INTERESTS."**

**AND THAT'S TOO BAD.
BECAUSE THE HEALTH CARE
CHALLENGE IS BIGGER THAN
ANY ONE GROUP--IT'S BIGGER
THAN THE WHITE HOUSE--AND
THE SOONER WE ALL GET
INVOLVED THE BETTER.**

**THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE
TELLING US THAT THEY WANT
MORE HEALTH CARE, MORE
QUALITY, MORE ACCESS, AND
LOWER COSTS. AND THAT'S A
TOUGH FORMULA TO ACHIEVE.**

**AND LET ME BE CLEAR IN
SAYING THAT WE ARE NOT
CANADA OR SWEDEN. WE NEED
A SYSTEM THAT RESPONDS TO**

**AMERICAN PROBLEMS AND
AMERICAN NEEDS.**

**WE NEED A SYSTEM THAT
PROTECTS THE HIGH QUALITY
OF OUR HEALTH CARE.**

**AMERICA IS RECOGNIZED
AROUND THE WORLD AS THE
HOME OF MEDICAL MIRACLES.**

**WE NEED A SYSTEM THAT
LETS CONSUMERS--AND NOT**

**GOVERNMENT--MAKE THE
CHOICE ABOUT WHERE THEY
GET THEIR CARE AND FROM
WHOM.**

**WE NEED A SYSTEM THAT
PRESERVES JOBS BY NOT
MANDATING AND TAXING SMALL
BUSINESS OUT OF EXISTENCE.**

**THE WHITE HOUSE WILL
PROBABLY RELEASE THEIR**

**HEALTH CARE PLAN IN MAY, BUT
I SUSPECT THAT SINCE SO MANY
PEOPLE HAVE BEEN SHUT OUT
OF THE PROCESS, THE DEBATE
IS LIKELY TO CONTINUE INTO
NEXT YEAR.**

RUSSIA

**LET ME END BY BRIEFLY
DISCUSSING AN ISSUE WHERE**

**PRESIDENT CLINTON AND I ARE
VERY MUCH IN AGREEMENT.**

**AND THAT'S WHETHER OR NOT
AMERICA SHOULD DO ALL WE
CAN TO ASSIST BORIS YELTSIN
AND RUSSIA IN THEIR
TRANSITION TO DEMOCRACY.**

**NOW, IF I TOOK A POLL HERE,
I BET THAT MOST OF YOU
WOULD PROBABLY OPPOSE**

**AIDE TO RUSSIA. AND IT'S
NATURAL TO SAY THAT
AMERICAN MONEY SHOULD BE
SPENT ON AMERICAN
PROBLEMS.**

**BUT I AM COMPLETELY
CONVINCED THAT A PRACTICAL
PROGRAM OF AIDE TO RUSSIA IS
IN OUR BEST INTERESTS AND
WILL PAY OFF MANY TIMES**

**OVER IN BENEFITS FOR
AMERICA.**

**BENEFITS IN NEW
OPPORTUNITIES FOR TRADE.
BENEFITS IN REDUCED MILITARY
SPENDING. BENEFITS IN NOT
HAVING TO WORRY ABOUT
ARMED CONFLICTS ON THE
HORIZON. BENEFITS IN HAVING
RUSSIA SERVE AS AN EXAMPLE**

**TO ALL NATIONS THAT FREE
ENTERPRISE WORKS AND THAT
DEMOCRACY IS THE WAY TO GO.**

**BORIS YELTSIN AND THE
RUSSIAN PEOPLE HAVE TAKEN A
BIG RISK. AND IF THE RISK
FAILS, THEN THE WORLD IS
GOING TO BE A MUCH MORE
DANGEROUS AND MUCH MORE
UNSTABLE PLACE.**

**LET ME CONCLUDE BY
SAYING AGAIN THAT THERE IS
ONE THING THAT PRESIDENT
CLINTON AND BOB DOLE SHARE
IN COMMON...BOTH OF US LOST
THE NEW HAMPSHIRE PRIMARY.**

**DESPITE THAT, IT IS A
PLEASURE TO RETURN TO NEW
HAMPSHIRE, AND I HOPE TO
COME BACK AGAIN SOON.**

David S. Broder

Missing Numbers

There are thousands of numbers in the 1,478-page budget President Clinton presented last week—big and little numbers detailing his plans for taxing and spending and borrowing. But two numbers are missing, numbers which would have helped people understand how big a mess we're in when it comes to paying—or not paying—our bills as a nation.

The first number is \$937 billion, a staggering sum. That is the amount Clinton proposes adding to the public debt in the first of what he hopes will be two terms as president. It does not count the additional hundreds of billions he plans to borrow from the Social Security trust fund, just as his predecessors did.

Even excluding those internal borrowings, Clinton's best estimate is that, if Congress accepts all his proposals and the economy grows for four straight years, as he hopes, the next four annual deficits will be \$264 billion, \$247 billion, \$212 billion and \$214 billion. Add them up and you get \$937 billion of new public debt passed on to our children and grandchildren.

You may recall candidate Clinton talking about the profligate ways of Presidents Reagan and Bush, who took a national debt that after more than two centuries had reached "only" \$1 trillion and in 12 years' time ran it up to roughly \$4 trillion. Every four years these wastrel "borrow-and-spend" Republicans were in office, the Democrats complained, they added a trillion dollars to the debt.

So here comes this "new Democrat" Clinton, and in his first budget he suggests that—if everything goes right—he will add nearly \$1 trillion to the

distance away, on Page 921 of the appendix, you learn that interest payments on the public debt are budgeted at almost \$295 billion this year.

The government obviously doesn't want you to compare the two numbers, but if you divide the larger number into the smaller, you find that 57 cents of every personal income tax dollar this year will not buy a single military uniform, or finance a single day of Head Start or even help pay for printing the massive budget.

Those 57 cents go to the bondholders, and as long as we go on piling up debt at the rate of another \$1 trillion every presidential term, the inexorable laws of compound interest will guarantee that the interest costs will rise exponentially from year to year. Clinton estimates the interest bill will be \$15 billion higher next year—just about the size of the whole "stimulus package" he's battling to get through Congress.

If it's worth a big fight to get \$16 billion of borrowed money injected into the economy this year, wouldn't you think that it might at least merit one word of comment from the president or someone in his administration that next year an equivalent sum will be subtracted from the available spending or investment pool by our wretched profligacy? But no.

I asked Treasury Secretary Lloyd M. Bentsen on "Meet the Press" last Sunday if another near-trillion dollars of deficit spending was the best the Clinton administration could do in the next four years. His reply was, in effect, that we ought to be applauding because it isn't worse.

Somehow, I don't feel like cheering a budget that is that far out of balance, even before the unknown added costs of the promised national health care plan are factored into the equation. I don't feel like cheering when Vice President Gore tells a White House budget briefing that the deficit will be cut by "more than \$500 billion in the next five years," and the next day, the nonpartisan Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget says that over that five-year period, "the budget achieves \$356 billion in deficit reduction," which is not only \$144 billion less than Gore said, but \$97 billion less than Congress already has mandated.

Two months ago, when Clinton offered his budget outline, I complained about the "trust deficit" he was creating by his misleading presentation. I said then, and I repeat, that Clinton did not cause this debt and deficit problem, but if he is to start solving it, he has to be a lot more candid in talking about his spending and taxing plans than he and his associates have been so far.

The American voters don't shrink from tough decisions when they are given the information they need. But when essential facts are buried, or distorted, leaders are failing their people.

Clinton estimates the interest will be \$15 billion higher next year—just about the size of his whole stimulus package.

staggering mass of debt being passed on to the next generation.

If numbers of that scale give you a headache, let me give you a simpler sum—57 cents—which also doesn't appear in the Clinton budget.

Fifty-seven cents is the portion of every dollar of personal income tax you and I and all our fellow citizens will pay this year that will be siphoned off to pay interest on the runaway public debt.

How do I know? Because on Page 11 of the Clinton budget, individual income tax receipts for fiscal 1993 are estimated at \$515 billion. And at a safe