

and of itself is a recipe for disaster given the nature of the warfare. And anybody who understands the enmity that exists between the parties, and the conflict over who owns what land, knows that the American troops being out longer than a year is likely to just promote and produce a situation in which the parties wait out the situation, and then would return to the status quo, which is obviously not something that any of us looks forward to.

There are a couple of other concerns that I have. One is the question of neutrality. It is one thing to send troops into a situation when those troops are viewed—and that nation sending the troops is viewed—as a truly neutral partner in the process. In this case, we have decidedly sided with one faction in this conflict—the Bosnian Moslems. While we have not seen the final details of the peace agreement, the United States has indicated that one of our objectives in this deployment will be to arm the Moslems, will be to bring them to “a level of parity” with the other factions. That may be comforting news to the Bosnian Moslems. I doubt that is very comforting to the other parties in the conflict, and certainly not the Serbs.

So what our goal should be is a disarming of all parties involved, to reduce the level of tension and reduce the level of potential conflict rather than build up the capacity of one of the parties but, in doing so, even if that were an agreed upon military strategy, I think that is a terrible political strategy because we will not be viewed as a neutral party. The United States, which is already by the very nature of it—I ask unanimous consent for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. COATS. The United States which is already viewed by a number of countries as not necessarily a neutral entity, and which has become a target, unfortunately, over the years for terrorists and extremists and others that want to disrupt either the peace talks or simply make a point, I think would clearly be identified as a party which was not neutral in this conflict and clearly would be a potential target for terrorism.

I had the experience nearly a decade ago of traveling to Beirut visiting the marines that were encamped between warring factions, and witnessed the aftereffects of the tragic bombing of the marine barracks that cost the loss of several hundred lives. Those that perpetrated this incident wanted to make a point, and by making that point they felt that they could influence the course of that conflict. And they did. I think the very same something—maybe not the very same but something similar—happened in Somalia.

So we at great risk put our troops between the warring factions.

My final point is that I think we need to be very, very careful about what a

peace agreement says and means that might come out of Dayton. Dayton could very well produce a “peace”—I put that word in quotation marks. Again, I am referring to the Krauthammer piece—a “peace” that is unstable and divisive, and largely unenforceable. It may be a peace imposed rather than a peace sought and agreed to by the warring factions; imposed by outside forces. If that is the case, we are likely to have a situation where, as Krauthammer says, this lowest common denominator peace plan commands three grudging, resentful signatures from unreconciled parties. That is a disaster for American troops on the ground. And particularly, if the President has not sought the support of the American people, the support of their elected representatives, and defined for the American people just why it is necessary to utilize American troops on the ground. We need to make sure.

I ask for one additional minute, and I promise to quit even if I am not finished.

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

We should make sure that we have an ironclad commitment from the three parties involved that they not only are seeking a true peace but they are willing to self-enforce a true peace; that they will do so with a build-down of forces instead of a buildup of forces; that they will do so with wide zones of separation between them; that the peace will be essentially self-enforcing; and that they will be committed to bringing about that cessation of hostility and conflict between them.

If that is the case, one has to ask themselves the question, why are 60,000 troops needed to enforce that? If that is not the case, I think we have a very serious question.

My time has expired, and I promised to quit, and even though I have more to say, I will say it later. I thank the Chair and the patience of my colleague from Nebraska.

Mr. KERREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GREGG). The Senator from Nebraska.

PEACE IN BOSNIA

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, with additional time, I would love to discuss this situation with the Senator from Indiana. It is a very difficult situation. I was in the Krajina Valley a couple days after the Croatian Army had driven back the Croatian Serbs and several hundred thousand estimated, a couple hundred thousand civilians left that valley, and a day later 120 millimeter rockets came into a market in Sarajevo and killed another 40 civilians. And not long after that a President Clinton-led NATO engaged in airstrikes, and it was not long before you could fly into Sarajevo.

We see the makings of peace in the region. It is an unprecedented event with the United States leading in a dip-

lomatic effort, Ambassador Holbrooke going around the clock with unimaginable stamina to try to negotiate a settlement.

I listened to the House debate last night on this subject, and I must say I hope our own words do not make it more difficult to get an agreement and we do not find ourselves right back in the soup. I think it is a long shot to get a peace agreement. No question it is going to be difficult to get, but I think in any evaluation of what has gone on in Bosnia in the last 60 days you almost have to begin and end with praise for President Clinton's ability to lead NATO and to lead to where we are today, which is a significant reduction of violence in that part of the world.

DEFICIT REDUCTION ACT

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, as to the Deficit Reduction Act, I would like to make a few comments.

First, we need to sort of check our own rhetoric and ask ourselves why. A lot of people come down and say we have unprecedented debt mounting on top of record debt. We do not have record debt. Our percentage of debt to GDP is going down. A lot of people say we have to do what we did in the cold war. During World War II, we accumulated almost 130 GDP of debt and won the war as a consequence, did the Marshall plan after that, rebuilt our own country as a consequence of a willingness to go into debt, no matter how we used that debt. I will get to that later.

I am very much concerned that a growing portion of our outlays is going not to investments but going to current consumption. I think it is a significant problem. It is not a problem, by the way, caused by the poor. I voted against this proposal for a number of reasons. I do not think it is fair. I do not believe it asks people like myself with higher income to participate in deficit reduction, which I think is terribly important. I receive very little in the way of Government services. People with lower incomes do receive more in Government service. I am asking them to shoulder a disproportionate share of eliminating this deficit.

Second, not only does it rend the social safety net, but it does not start us on the road to evaluating what kind of safety net do we need. I think most of us in this body now believe that we have to have economic growth, that our tax policies, which I do not think encourage savings and investment, need to be written so that we get the kind of investment and economic growth the country needs; that we have regulatory policies that are mindful of the risks that people take when they invest money.

Most of us understand that we have to have an economy that is growing, but if you are going to have a vibrant market economy where people are making business and bottom line decisions, you also have to have some kind of safety net out there. We ought to be

thinking about how do we take the next step of how do we get it universal rather than moving away as I see this proposal doing.

We ought to ask ourselves, as Senator SIMPSON and I did, how do we reform the Federal retirement program so that there is more flexibility, individuals get a higher rate of return, they have something they own and they can acquire wealth during the course of a working life that might not generate much opportunity for savings.

We need to be asking ourselves how do we construct the safety net that enables us to have a vibrant market economy instead. As I see it, we rend the social safety net and then we really do not acknowledge that there is an importance and value to having it there in place.

Again, perhaps as a result of our own orientation, the higher your income gets, there is a tendency to presume that everybody is living like you are and a presumption that, gee, everything is OK. Everything is not OK. You talk to people 50 years of age out there, men or women who tell you what it is like to get a pink slip in a downsizing operation after working 30 years on the job. They have a tough time getting health insurance. They have a tough time adjusting to not just the downsizing but the reduction in income that they face.

If you want to have a vibrant economy, not only do we need to change our tax and our regulatory structure, we also need to change the safety net, and this proposal moves us in the wrong direction.

Third, I talked at length about how it really does not solve the problem of growing entitlements at all. It postpones them. It says, well, we can deal with Social Security later. We can deal with Medicare later. Really, the long-term problems, we deal with them later.

Mr. President, time is not on our side. Every year you wait you really deepen the cut or increase the possibility that working people are going to have to pay more taxes as a consequence of our unwillingness to face the problem.

The next thing I did yesterday was go through a few things that I as a Democrat would be willing to support that would enable us, I think, to produce the savings needed to have more fairness in the proposal, to begin to consider what kind of safety net should we construct and would have us moving in the direction of controlling entitlements.

On my list is I think we should drop the tax cut. I will describe a little bit later a rather remarkable letter from the Congressional Budget Office Director, June O'Neill. We should drop the \$245 billion tax cut, commit ourselves to set a course so that at the end of 1996 we can enact fundamental tax reform that does encourage savings and investment; we understand that the current income tax system needs to be

adjusted; that working families are having trouble saving money.

Let us not do it piecemeal. Let us do it bigger. This tax cut proposal should be dropped because it enlarges the deficit in the short term. Again, I will discuss that later. I would be willing to vote to reduce the Consumer Price Index by half a point. The adjustment would save hundreds of billions of dollars. I would even go further than half a point, but half a point seems to be about where we are. I am just alerting my Republican colleagues there are ways for us to come up with additional savings that are needed to balance the budget but to do it in a fair way and the way that has us holding onto a safety net that we need in the market economy.

I would be prepared to vote to phase in an increase in the eligibility ages both for Social Security and Medicare. It would not affect current beneficiaries at all. In fact, it does not have to affect beneficiaries over the age of 50. But to phase that in gives everybody under 50 time to plan and produces tremendous future savings.

I would be prepared to vote for an affluence test on all Federal entitlement programs, including farm program payments, if it is fair. It generates tremendous savings in the short term. It seems to me easy for us to sell, and I consider it to be an attractive way again to preserve that safety net and keep fairness in this proposal.

Mr. President, I would like to just sort of insert one other objection that I have that I failed to note earlier in my discussion.

There is a so-called Freedom to Farm Act proposal that is tucked away in this reconciliation bill. You can imagine what the American people are going to say when they find out that somebody out there with a half section of land that they are not farming now—let us say they use it for pasture and they have a hobby farm going on out there. Maybe they raise horses, for all I know. Under this proposal, they are going to be encouraged to enroll. They are going to get paid whether they farm or not. They are going to get income whether they are producing any agriculture product or not. It converts a market based system to a welfare system I do not think the American taxpayers are going to like and I know American farmers are not going to like as well.

Mr. President, there is a document I would urge colleagues to read. I will put in the first two pages. I ask unanimous consent that the first two pages be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, November 16, 1995.

Hon. PETE V. DOMENICI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has reviewed the conference

report on H.R. 2491, the Balanced Budget Act of 1995, and has projected the deficits that would result if the bill is enacted. These projections use the economic and technical assumptions underlying the budget resolution for fiscal year 1996 (H. Con. Res. 67), assume the level of discretionary spending indicated in the budget resolution, and include changes in outlays and revenues estimated to result from the economic impact of balancing the budget by fiscal year 2002 as estimated by CBO in its April 1995 report, *An Analysis of the President's Budgetary Proposals for Fiscal Year 1996*. On that basis, CBO projects that enactment of the reconciliation legislation recommended by the conferees would produce a small budget surplus in 2002. The estimated federal spending, revenues and deficits that would occur if the proposal is enacted are shown in Table 1. The resulting differences from CBO's April 1995 baseline are summarized in Table 2, which includes the adjustments to the baseline assumed by the budget resolution. The estimated savings from changes in direct spending and revenues that would result from enactment of each title of the bill are summarized in Table 3 and described in more detail in an attachment.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL,
Director.

Attachment.

TABLE 1.—CONFERENCE OUTLAYS, REVENUES, AND DEFICITS

[By fiscal year, in billions of dollars]							
	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Outlays: Discretionary ..	534	524	518	516	520	516	515
Mandatory: ..							
Medicare ¹ ..	196	210	217	226	248	267	289
Medicaid ..	97	104	109	113	118	122	127
Other	506	529	555	586	618	642	676
Subtotal	799	843	881	925	984	1,031	1,093
Net Interest ...	257	262	261	262	260	254	249
Total outlays ..	1,590	1,629	1,660	1,703	1,764	1,801	1,857
Revenues	1,412	1,440	1,514	1,585	1,665	1,756	1,861
Deficit	178	189	146	118	100	46	-4

¹ Medicare benefit payments only. Excludes medicare premiums.

Notes.—The fiscal dividend expected to result from balancing the budget is reflected in these figures. Numbers may not add to totals because of rounding.

Source.—Congressional Budget Office.

Mr. KERREY. As you can see, Mr. President, it is from June O'Neill, Director of the Congressional Budget Office. The CBO has been cited a lot as we go through this continuing resolution debate. This is written to Chairman PETE DOMENICI, November 16, 1995, with copies sent to the ranking member, Senator EXON of Nebraska, along with the chairman and ranking member of the House Budget Committee, JOHN KASICH and Congressman SABO.

It is a remarkable document, Mr. President, and shows the folly of the tax cut. But it also shows that we really are postponing most of the difficult choices. No American should believe that because if we enact this reconciliation bill—let us say by some miracle the President changes his mind, which I do not believe he is going to do; I believe he is going to veto it. Let us say we enact this thing. All it does is commit it for a single year. Next year we come back and vote again.

The year after that we have to vote again. I say to Americans, examine the

document. For gosh sakes, the deficit this year is \$164 billion. It has been going down every year for the last 4 years. Next year the deficit goes to \$178 billion, and the year after that it goes to \$189 billion. I mean, this proposal increases the deficit next year and increases the deficit the year after that. This does not reduce deficits; it increases deficits.

And to exclude Social Security—there is another letter coming from June O'Neill that says that because you include Social Security income, you are actually reducing the size of the deficit by some \$60 to \$100 billion, depending on the year that you take. So we get an increase in the deficit, Mr. President, and we are postponing most of the difficult cuts.

In the year 2002 this Congress is going to be expected to cut \$70 billion in a single year. Unlikely, Mr. President. If you look at the backdating of the difficult decisions, I think the American people begin to understand why this so-called revolution is a lot less than meets the eye, a lot less, and why they should insist, if they want to balance the budget and they want to do it in a fair way and in a fashion that enables us to have some kind of a reasonable safety net and vibrant market economy—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. KERREY. That we need a different reconciliation bill than the one that was passed by this body by 52 votes yesterday.

Again, I would urge colleagues to look as well at the growth of entitlement programs. These are not programs for the poor. These are middle-class entitlements and most difficult of all. Almost half of the growth of all spending in here is Social Security, which is not even on the table in this discussion.

So, look at the growth and then ask yourself, if you had \$435 billion this year for defense and nondefense appropriations—which is what you have in the year 2002—construct the budget, build a budget with \$435 billion, go home and tell your citizens, OK, we are going to use \$263 billion for defense, and that gives me \$174 billion for all other spending, you cannot do it, Mr. President. You are not going to be just closing down odds and ends; you are going to be shutting down NASA and shutting down the courts and significant functions of Government.

You cannot get there from here, Mr. President, unless we come as Democrats and Republicans and say we are willing to do something, drop the tax cut, adjust the CPI, phase in changes in the eligibility age, consider an affluence test, do something with part B premiums. Those kinds of changes, Mr.

President, would not only enable us to balance the budget in 7 years, but do it in a fair fashion, do it in a way that enables us to build a new safety net and a vibrant market economy, and I think restore the confidence of the American people, who rightly have concluded, by the way, even if this is enacted, that we are not going to be balancing our budget.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Before my friend from Nebraska leaves the floor, I want to state to him, through the Chair, and to my friend who is the chairman of the Budget Committee, that the two Senators from Nebraska are people who have credentials to speak about balanced budgets. The ranking member, Senator EXON from Nebraska, of the Budget Committee, former chairman of the Budget Committee, has worked for years on balancing the budget. My friend from Nebraska, the junior Senator from Nebraska, chaired the entitlement commission and has spoken out, to his detriment politically, on many occasions of what he sees as the wrongs of what we are doing with entitlements.

So, the reason I mention that while he is here on the floor, the chairman of the entitlement commission, a Governor from the State of Nebraska, people who have credentials to talk about balancing the budget and who have actually done significant things to get us toward that direction, when you have the two Senators from Nebraska speaking out against the reconciliation bill that passed, I think the American public should be aware that it is not a good piece of legislation.

Mr. President, before my friend leaves, I would also like to ask him a question as a former Governor of the State of Nebraska. Would the Senator, based upon his experience and expertise, indicate in his words why he thinks it is wrong to have the executive bound by numbers given to him by the legislative branch?

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, the Senator asks a question that I think is very relevant. I voted against the continuing resolution for precisely that reason. This Congress should not bind the President to use numbers that are developed by the Congress, just like I do not think we should be bound to accept carte blanche the numbers that are used by OMB. Indeed, when I came into office in 1983, there was a great political controversy that occurred as a result of nobody trusted the numbers. We actually created a statute, an independent agency, to produce the numbers that both sides trust. And a lot of the politics now has been taken out of it.

I think the Senator raises what I consider to be a fundamental defect in the continuing resolution that was passed and the President vetoed. This body should not bind the President to

use congressional numbers, just as this body should not write into statute that we are always going to use OMB numbers.

Mr. NUNN. If my friend from Nevada would yield on that point, while the Senator from Nebraska is here.

Mr. REID. Certainly.

Mr. NUNN. I would like to make a few remarks on this very subject. I think the 7-year number for balancing the budget in 7 years is a reasonable goal. I would hope that the President would agree with that goal as we proceed to try to find a way to end this Government shutdown and pass a continuing resolution.

Mr. REID. I would say to my friend, though, is it not a fact that the President has basically agreed to that anyway?

Mr. NUNN. It is my understanding that is what is being talked about now. But the Congressional Budget Office [CBO], I happen to believe they have more conservative numbers and should be agreed to as the basis for the overall approach to get a balanced budget, because we have seen time and time again that we end up erring on the side of optimism, and we do not end up achieving the savings that were projected.

But, having said that, I think no President of the United States is going to accept the CBO numbers for a 7-year period and have that dictated to by Congress in law. It is one thing to agree to 1 year as an estimate; it is another thing to have the congressional branch tell the executive branch that it has to abide by those numbers. Congress passes those numbers, can use the CBO numbers, but Congress then has to send the bill to the President. The President has a right to veto it under the Constitution.

This business of shutting down Government if the President will not agree for a 7-year period to the congressional numbers is a way of trying to avoid the constitutional procedures that were set up by our Founding Fathers which have worked pretty darn well. Shutting down Government to prevent the President from using his veto is something that I think is a sad mistake and is going to hurt more and more people as time goes on.

I say that as one who watched Republican Presidents make virtually the same point. I do not believe President Reagan or President Bush would have accepted a dictate by a Democratic Congress that they use CBO numbers during their periods in office. I have talked to the former Directors of OMB under the previous Presidents, and they have confirmed that opinion.

I do not believe President DOLE or President GRAMM or President SPECTER or President LUGAR would allow the Congress to say, "You are going to use CBO numbers"—a Democratic Congress particularly, reversing the present scenario—"We are going to require you to use these numbers." Billions and billions of dollars are at stake, and also a separation of powers is at stake.

So while I favor using the CBO numbers, I do not favor putting into law and holding the President hostage in terms of a shutdown of Government if he does not agree to that, because if I were President of the United States I would not agree to it.

It does not have much to do with the question of the budget. It has a lot to do with the question of separation of powers. We are going to be visiting, as the Senator from Nebraska said, these issues every year, whatever the results of this compromise that I hope will emerge in negotiating a final reconciliation bill.

We will have to have a compromise. These are going to be estimates. We are going to make mistakes. The Medicare-Medicaid savings—I applaud the Republicans for taking on these entitlements; I think it is long overdue. I think those of us on the Democratic side need to muster up some courage to begin to take on the entitlements also. But I believe we are going to have to go back and have a lot of corrections made to the changes that are being made because all of these are estimates.

We do not know how much is going to be saved. That is one of the reasons I feel that going forward with a front-end tax cut is a mistake now because we are going to have to have some money to patch up the mistakes as we go along and we find out people are really being hurt in an unjustified way.

So I hope out of all of this, we will reach some compromise very soon that will have the President basically agree to the 7-year target and goal but not have Congress impose by law the CBO numbers. There are lots of ways to be able to do that, and I hope we will find a way before too many more hours go by.

I thank the Senator for yielding. I did want to comment on that one point.

Mr. REID. I appreciate my friend's statement. In addition to the two Senators from Nebraska, the Senator from Georgia has a record of many, many years of being frugal and always trying to do something about a balanced budget and entitlements. He and the senior Senator from New Mexico have worked together on this for many years, and when we hear of the Senator from Georgia speaking out about the problems with the present reconciliation bill, it says volumes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 7½ minutes. The Senator's request is to speak for a total of how long?

Mr. REID. I would like to speak for 10 minutes starting now, since my friends have used part of my time.

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

GROWING USE OF VIOLENCE TO SHOW DISAGREEMENT WITH THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, like most everyone here who serves in the U.S. Senate, I have a home in my home State, Nevada, and a home here. I announce that because my wife, recently one night, presented to me something she received in the mail from our home here in Washington, and I want to refer to it.

In March 1993, I was the first Member of this body to come to the floor and renounce the senseless killing of Dr. David Gunn as he left his job at a health clinic in Pensacola, FL. I came to the floor again in 1994 and offered a sense-of-the-Senate resolution condemning the specific tactic of soliciting signatures on petitions that express support and justify the use of murderous violence against those who oppose the pro-life position.

I am prompted again today to come to the floor and address this issue after finding in our mailbox this despicable piece of literature. This flier is simply abdicating violence. It abdicates clearly an invasion of a person's privacy, who happens to be a physician who I do not know and do not want to know, as well as the man's family.

It is well known that I advocate a pro-life position, and during my years in the House and Senate have voted accordingly. Because of my affiliation with this position, I also feel it is my responsibility to stand up and condemn tactics such as this flier, which are used by fringe elements of the pro-life movement.

This is a piece of trash. The people who put this in my mailbox violated Federal law. They have no right to put this in my mailbox.

"Guilty of crimes against humanity." I am reading from the document—"The National Socialist Party in Germany made gassing gypsies, Poles and other non-Aryans legal."

They go on to insinuate this man, whose name, work, and home address are on this document—with phone numbers for both is a Nazi. They direct me to call this doctor and his spouse, asking them to "end this slaughter, because they say he has no conscience."

They say, "In reality it is murder." This man, whose name I am not going to disclose, "should be tried for crimes against humanity."

They quote various pieces of scripture from the Old Testament. They go on to say, "He so lacks conscience that slave owners would have used him to apprehend runaways."

"He is the equivalent of a slave trader."

"Don't allow your children to play with his."

"We will haunt him." I am skipping around on this document.

"In the meantime, organize to have his lease canceled," and it goes on and on.

Mr. President, this is wrong. This is wrong.

Two months ago, I came to the floor to express my outrage over the bombing of the family car of a Nevada forest ranger. This car was located 3 feet away from his family who was in their living room. I am concerned about the growing use of violence as a means of showing disagreement with the Government and with other individuals. It is this extremist mentality that is at the foot of devastating acts, such as the assassination of Prime Minister Rabin and, I believe, the Oklahoma bombing and, of course, the shooting of Dr. Gunn.

Extremists advocate violence as an alternative to meaningful debate and meaningful discussions. Individuals who carry out such violence or endorse it believe they are above the law.

As I have stated earlier, I am personally pro-life, but *Roe v. Wade* is the current law in our country, and I, as a citizen of this country, respect the law of the land. In fact, I personally disagree with the judgment rendered by a court, however, I believe in following the law.

This does not mean that those who disagree with the Supreme Court's decision cannot work within the legislative process to change the law. The debate over abortion elicits some of the strongest emotions that people feel.

However passionate and vigorous debates can be, they should be healthy and they should be speeches, comment, and discourse that are civil in nature, not statements like "crimes against humanity," "gassing gypsies," "don't play with their children."

Mr. President, when you arrive at a passionate, vigorous debate, I believe this represents what our democracy is all about, which is a participatory and functioning democracy at work. We have a responsibility to decry the violence and the advocacy of violence as a legitimate means to solve our differences. We cannot acquiesce to the violence through our silence, and I am not going to. It is incumbent upon this body, this Congress, this country to make it unmistakably clear that such tactics are shameful and are to be denounced.

Without quick condemnation of such tactics, as this flier in my mailbox, violence will continue.

I shed tears at the assassination of President Kennedy, at the assassination of Prime Minister Rabin, especially when his granddaughter cried pain of love for her grandfather. We cannot stand by and allow this to happen.

I hope we will all speak out against it and that the people who are spewing forth this filth will stop doing it, because it does not help the cause.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. REID. I yield back my time.

Mr. NUNN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.