

the land, to become a part of the Constitution.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time assigned to the Senator from Idaho has expired.

Under the previous order, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] is recognized for up to 20 minutes.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Laura Philips, who is an American Institute of Physics Fellow, be allowed floor privileges during morning business on this day.

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

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair.

#### THE DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY GAP

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to sound an alarm for my colleagues and my country about a clear and present danger to America's ability to defend itself against foreign enemies in the future.

But first, a look back: throughout history, the time between major changes in the weaponry of war was measured in centuries. Then came the industrial revolution, and ever since the weapons of war have evolved with exponential speed. Now we are in the technology revolution and the pace is so furious that we would fight the gulf war today differently than we did just 4 years ago, simply because weapons—and related tactics—have changed so much.

Nations that first perfect new weapons of war are best-equipped to win wars. Those left behind the curve of change must scramble mightily to catch up—to close the gap—or else their vulnerability will be exploited.

At the beginning of this century there was the dreadnought gap. In 1906, Britain's First Sea Lord, John Fisher, commissioned the H.M.S. *Dreadnought*. It was a technological marvel in its time; bigger, faster, more powerful than any other warship of its kind on the planet.

The Germans, recognizing their vulnerability, built their own dreadnoughts. The English, fearing a dreadnought gap because of Germany's industrial prowess, sped up production and built a total of 15 over the next 6 years. Winston Churchill objected at first, believing there was no dreadnought gap. Indeed, such a gap never materialized. However, Britain's bigger navy provided a key margin for victory in World War I and Churchill, writing in 1928, acknowledged that he "was absolutely wrong in relation to the deep tides of destiny." He learned a lesson that served him and his nation well when the time came to fight the Germans again.

In the middle of this century was the atomic bomb gap. At the end of World War II we were the only nation to have

the atomic bomb. Russia scrambled to catch up, and that led to the so-called missile gap of the late 1950's and early 1960's. Just as Germany and England rushed to build dreadnoughts after 1906, the United States and Russia rushed to build intercontinental ballistic missiles after 1957.

As we approach the end of the century, there is a new gap—a defense technology gap—and it is the gap between the technological capabilities of our military forces and those of any other nation on Earth. The clear and present danger I foresee is the narrowing of that gap in the next 10 to 20 years by virtue of decisions being made under the dome of this great Capitol building today.

The technology gap allowed us to defeat Saddam Hussein handily and deters other despots from acting rashly against us today. Given the threats we are likely to face tomorrow, I believe we must maintain and increase that gap, not let it shrink.

But the closing of the gap began last week when the House of Representatives voted to cut the heart out of crucial new programs designed to advance American technology. Five hundred million dollars were taken out of the Defense Department's technology reinvestment project [TRP] and \$100 million were removed from the related civilian Advanced Technology Program [ATP]. The money is being shifted to pay for military operations in Somalia, Haiti, Iraq, and Bosnia. Additional cuts in the Advanced Research Projects Agency [ARPA], which runs the TRP and other technology programs, are being considered for the 1996 budget.

And just yesterday, a committee of the U.S. Senate cut more than \$300 million from TRP and ATP and millions more from other technology programs in the current 1995 budget.

Some in Congress are cutting military technology to pay for military readiness. What they are really doing is shrinking a real technology margin of victory to close an illusory readiness gap—a gap readiness experts say does not exist.

Closing the defense technology gap is a tragic error we must avert. Disinvestment in military technology is the historical equivalent of Great Britain scuttling its dreadnoughts before World War I or America choosing not to build missiles after Sputnik. Cutting military technology programs is, quite frankly, one of the most thoughtless and harmful courses I have seen Congress contemplate in my 6 years in the Senate.

#### THE NATURE OF THE FUTURE THREAT

Defense spending must meet not only current needs; it must take into account the national security threats of our future. That future is less predictable than it was during the cold war, when we knew who, where, and how capable our enemy was at all times.

The end of the cold war has given us all hope that democracy and free markets will spread around the globe. And

there have been tremendous success stories to celebrate. But the absence of a single superpower rivalry has also unleashed a stream of aggression and hostility and countless thousands have died in this post-cold-war world at the altar of nationalism, ethnicity, race, religion, and plain, old anarchic terrorism.

Over the short term—5 to 10 years—the United States faces potential threats in the Persian Gulf and the Korean Peninsula. Known and unknowable challengers loom more ominously on a 10-, 15-, and 20-year time horizon. The danger of a revived, nationalistic Russia is clearly a possibility.

Russia is still armed to the teeth, and the latest intelligence tells us it is moving ahead with major modernization programs in its most advanced weapons systems—submarines and aircraft. It is resource rich with a highly educated population. In the hands of a dictatorial government, it could resume a threatening world role once again. That is America's worst nightmare and, as unlikely as it seems to us today, consider how many unlikely changes have occurred in world history in just the last 5 years.

China is taking Russia seriously with a major modernization program for its military forces—a program that could make China a superpower in the next century. In response to the buildup in China, India is quickly developing its military. And Japan, in the next century, may well be forced to do the same. Other nations in the Asian rim have growing economies, are technologically advanced, and thus are capable of emerging as a threat to the stability of that region and to our interests there.

Add terrorist groups, the proliferation of ballistic missile technology, radical fundamentalist movements, despotic regimes, and the potential proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons to the list, and it is easy to see that the future is fraught with perils for our Nation.

#### THE TECHNOLOGY DETERRENT

Given those dangers, and given the fact that the United States is the biggest target in sight, how can we best protect ourselves?

Thanks to the lessons of the gulf war, we know a big part of the answer lies in our advanced military technology, which can deter or, if necessary, defeat any challenger, whether it be a superpower, a rogue nation, or a terrorist group.

But we cannot rest on our gulf war laurels, content that today's weapons are enough to protect us for decades to come. Our next adversary, for example, may have access to detailed satellite photographs, making a tactic like General Schwarzkopf's "Hail Mary" movement of troops around Iraqi forces much more difficult. Or the enemy may possess missiles more capable than the Scud. The next gulf war will be far different than the last.

Those Members of Congress bent on cutting technology programs are repeating the error of so many former great powers: with their emphasis on readiness to the detriment of technological research and development, they are preparing to fight the last war all over again, not preparing for the enemies and wars of the future.

Our best defense is to stay as far ahead of any possible challenger as possible. The vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Adm. William Owens, says we need a high technology umbrella to protect us from the enemies of our future just as the nuclear umbrella protected us in the recent past. The nuclear umbrella deters other nuclear powers, like Russia, from attacking us. But because we are unlikely to use nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear nation, it is the high technology weapons in our arsenal that can keep them at bay, or defeat them if they strike.

#### THE BATTLEFIELD OF THE FUTURE

And if they strike, we can defeat them with our technologically advanced forces because we are changing the fundamental concept of the battlefield. The struggle for information is supplanting the fight for geographical position as the key goal on the battlefield, and that is where we can enjoy a huge advantage. Army Chief of Staff Sullivan says that the new battlefield will be a digitalized battlefield, one that can lift the fog of war for commanders and infantry alike.

Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Shalikashvili and Admiral Owens are contemplating the development of an electronic integrated system-of-systems to give us dominant battlefield awareness where real-time intelligence will lead to virtually instantaneous response. No more lengthy Scud hunts. No more service computers that cannot talk to each other.

The digitalized battlefield will also allow for decentralization of command, giving officers on the scene much greater ability to make the right decisions in response to the rapidly changing events of battle.

And that is just one of a hundred different technology avenues we must pursue. We are on the verge of a revolution in defense technology that will dwarf the impact of the dreadnought, the airplane, the tank, and the missile—a revolution that will not occur to our advantage if we fail to invest in military technology today. For innovation cannot occur on demand. It is a long-term process—yet a rapidly changing process as well. That means even a 1- or 2-year interruption in research and development funding will have terrible consequences down the road. A year is a lifetime in the field of high technology.

#### ARPA AND DUAL USE

Our current technological superiority has not evolved accidentally or overnight. The Department of Defense's secretive Advanced Research Projects Agency [ARPA], one of the least

known, yet most important offices in the Pentagon, has been successfully promoting new technology for the military for the 37 years since President Eisenhower set it up.

In retrospect, it was a truly visionary Presidential accomplishment, and it is probably no accident that Eisenhower, like Churchill, approached this issue of military technology as a man who knew what it was like to order other men into battle. He knew this investment in technology would one day save lives—and it has.

What has ARPA done? Most of its efforts are classified, and it has purposely never recorded its history. But, by carefully investing in the private sector like a high-technology Johnny Appleseed, ARPA has helped bring about supercomputing, desktop computers, the internet—formerly ARPAnet—stealth technology, composites, a global positioning system, laser technology, high resolution imaging, advanced acoustics, smart weapons, and even the ubiquitous computer mouse, which has burrowed its way into millions of American homes and offices.

What is most obvious about this list is the multitude of ways in which military technology has been adapted for civilian use. In fact, technology developed for the military has revolutionized the lives of all Americans—the way we work, the vehicles we drive, the homes we live in. Technology that was designed to protect our way of life has evolved to transform our way of life. That is what the term "dual use" is all about—the use of technology for military and civilian purposes.

But times are changing—tables are about to be turned. President Eisenhower founded ARPA, but also warned that a military industrial base could swallow our economy. The opposite is now occurring. The defense technology base that was spawned by defense investment is now being swallowed by our civilian technology base.

For example, the computer was invented to help the military design a better way to mount an artillery attack, and it was improved when we needed to target our missiles. The military funded the development of computers and became the biggest market for computers. But today the Department of Defense has but a fraction of the computer market.

For the first time in human history advances in technology are occurring far more rapidly in the civilian sector than in the military. In a sense, we have gone from beating swords into plowshares to creating the plowshares first. Part of the reason is the widespread dissemination of technology among the population. The demand for new and better appliances, cars, and entertainment systems is enormous compared to the demand for better jets, tanks, and ships. The existence of that demand opens the door for cooperation between government and in-

dustry when a technology is of interest to the military and civilian markets.

Government dollars can be leveraged by private investment to produce more than could otherwise be accomplished under the auspices of the defense spending alone. In other words, potential civilian applications for military technology creates a multiplier effect on every Federal dollar we invest. Economies of scale then drive down the cost of the product and the contributing technology. The bottom line is this: Dual use literally gives us more bang for our buck. It is a genuine win-win situation—a win for our economy and for the defense of our country.

Perhaps most important: if our Government fails to use some of its defense spending to promote private sector technological development, the momentum of change in the design of the tools of war stalls and shifts elsewhere, and we risk losing new advances to the defense establishments of other nations, nations whose interests might be inimical to our own.

For the question is never, "Will we be able to invent new weapons of war?" The question is, "Who will invent the new weapons of war?" If we cut back on technological investment, such as is happening in Congress today, we will not always be able to answer that question with the words, "Made in the U.S.A."

This state of affairs can be summarized in three points:

First, the Defense Department must be involved in the exploding civilian technology world to meet its military technology needs.

Second, the United States, for military and economic reasons, must have the goal of maintaining the American advantage in civilian technology markets.

Third, collaboration between the civilian and military technology sectors can work because the applications for civilian and military use are easily transferable.

#### THE TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS AT ISSUE: TRP

The technology reinvestment project [TRP] has been the first victim of the technology disarmament now underway in the House and the Senate. Developed by ARPA during the Bush administration, TRP investments are cost shared at least 50-50 with industry, competitively selected, industry-led and aimed at meeting civilian and military needs.

A brief review of current TRP investments gives us a clear idea of how important they are to our national security:

Head mounted displays: Infantrymen cannot walk around with desktop computers. With lightweight, head-mounted displays they can retain full mobility but have a full computer display of the battlefield and realtime intelligence and targeting data before their eyes. If you saw the movie "Aliens," you know what I am talking about. But this is an alien concept only if we cut

off funding and allow another nation to pick up the ball we drop.

Uncooled infrared sensors: Desert Storm was launched as a night attack using infrared sensors as the basis for high-speed-attack operations. Our military needs to own the night and a new generation of cheaper, much more portable uncooled infrared sensors are an enabling technology being developed by a TRP team that will give us even greater control of the nighttime battlefield than ever before.

Item: Advanced information flow: Military command and control must process an exploding amount of intelligence data immediately to the battlefield for response. But limited communications capacity now clogs our ability to transmit, process, and act on that data. A TRP team is developing digital communications command and control equipment to burst massive new amounts of data through the interpretation and response pipeline at 10 gigabits per second, a 400-percent improvement over today's best equipment. That could mean the difference between life and death, victory and defeat on the battlefield.

Item: Single chip motion detectors: By reducing motion detection to a single chip accelerometer which can withstand accelerations up to 30,000 times the force of gravity, weapons guidance and navigation systems can be made significantly lighter and more sensitive. This will lead us, for example, to newer, more advanced versions of the cruise missiles and smart weapons that were so important to us in the Gulf war.

Item: Autonomous all-weather aircraft landing: The efficiency of military aircraft is still limited by night and weather conditions. Operations at secondary fields are curtailed in these conditions if a full ground control system is absent, or if these facilities are disrupted or damaged. Basing aircraft at a small number of primary bases is not a good alternative because our command of the air becomes more vulnerable. A TRP team is working on placing all-weather air traffic and landing control systems into every cockpit, making aircraft independent of ground control availability and weather conditions.

Item: Turboalternator: Army gas-guzzling battle vehicles require a vast and vulnerable logistics chain and limit battlefield operations. The next war may not be fought next to Saudi oil refineries. A TRP team is developing a turboalternator so main engines can be switched off but all equipment and sensors can continue to operate during silent watch modes. This multiplies fuel efficiency and also makes detection through infrared emissions and engine noise much more difficult.

Item: Composite bridging: Military operations continue to be controlled by terrain: every stream or ravine that must be crossed creates a potential strong point for enemy defenders and disrupts the mobility that gives U.S.

forces much of their edge. Every time our engineer forces have to bring up cumbersome, heavy bridging equipment for a crossing, enemy defenders can rally and our mobility is disrupted. A TRP team is developing superlight, superstrong composites for portable bridges to multiply the mobility of our battlefield forces.

Item: Precision laser manufacturing: Precision laser machining technology, by making aircraft parts microscopically precise, can make aircraft engines much more efficient. A TRP team, working with higher power density, more focused laser beams, and variable pulse formats, aims to double the life of military aircraft engines and sharply improve fuel efficiency and therefore range. Other beneficiaries include shipbuilders, airframe makers, engine makers, and a wide range of manufacturing technologies.

These are some of the new technologies we need for future battlefield dominance. And with a little imagination, we can envision even more revolutionary developments. Imagine a tiny helicopterlike device equipped with video cameras, flown by the dozens behind enemy lines, stealthily hovering throughout enemy territory, identifying the specific location of artillery, sniper nests, tanks, and serve as a guide for smart bombs launched from far away.

Imagine a sublaunched, fast-moving robot that can find and neutralize enemy mines at sea, safeguarding and speeding up the movement of our Navy.

Imagine lightweight, full body armor to make soldiers virtually invulnerable to small arms fire, dramatically improving our ability to control urban environments.

Such is the stuff of science fiction today, but like Leonardo Da Vinci and H.G. Wells, we need to realize that what is today's fiction can be tomorrow's fact. In fact, some Defense Department programs are looking into aspects of the exotic technologies I just described.

We must admit to ourselves we are no longer in the age of the backyard tinkerer when it comes to high technology weapons of war. No more Wright Brothers working out of a garage. The new weapons will come only after substantial investment by the Government and private industry, working together to safeguard the economy and security of our Nation's future.

That is why the drastic cuts in or cancellation of TRP, ATP, and other technology programs is akin to marching onto a field of battle and stripping our soldiers of their weapons. The survival of the soldiers of our future—soldiers to be drawn from the ranks of our children and grandchildren—depends on the development of technologies to help them control the battlefields of our future.

Failure to develop those technologies can only provide comfort to future enemies.

#### CONCLUSION

The movement to slash defense technology is being led by the "techno-nothings." When it comes to the complex interaction between Government and the private sector in technological research and development, the techno-nothings do not understand the lessons of history and they do not see the perils and opportunities in our future.

They cannot see or touch a weapon of the future and so they cannot justify spending money to develop it. They say they do not like Government picking winners and losers, but they do not understand that we need to have Government and business work together, sharing costs and talent, to bring about the defense and civilian technologies our citizens will want and need in the future.

It is a good thing that our predecessors in this Capitol building did not have to see a jet fighter before investing in its development, and did not decide to wait until the private sector invented it on its own.

They did not have to see or even understand the atomic bomb before spending millions on its creation, and did not decide to wait until scientists built one on their own.

They did not have to see and touch cruise missiles, Patriot missiles, stealth fighters, radar, lasers, and the whole panoply of weapons we now possess before allocating resources to their research and development.

We owe our survival to their foresight. Will we lose our liberty to myopia?

There is, I admit, not much of a constituency fighting for these programs, because we are dealing with the future, not the present. That makes investment in military technology a hard sell; not to the private sector, which wants the partnership, but to those political forces that cannot see much beyond the next election.

We need to go about the business of creating technological change the way some of our ancestors created the great pyramids, cathedrals, and other monumental architectural triumphs of the past: They started those works knowing they would not survive to see them finished, but pressed on with the knowledge that generations yet to come would appreciate what they did.

We must press on with such knowledge ourselves, lest we be, as Churchill said, "absolutely wrong in relation to the deep tides of destiny." Those tides are now tides of technological change and it is our destiny—our duty—to recognize there can be no turning back.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Democratic leader is recognized under the previous order.

Mr. DASCHLE. I thank the President.

THE BALANCED BUDGET  
AMENDMENT

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, let me begin this morning by going back to the debate yesterday and making a couple of remarks with regard to those who spent the better part of an entire month on the floor debating this issue.

The manager on the Republican side, the distinguished Senator from Utah, was a gentleman. He did an outstanding job and gave everyone the opportunity to be heard, and to discuss the issue, in a way that I think fits the Senate. It was, as the distinguished Senator from West Virginia said yesterday, a very good debate, a rigorous debate, a bruising debate in many cases but, certainly, one that afforded everyone the opportunity to be heard, to present their case, to make their positions well known. That was due in no small measure to the manner in which the distinguished Senator from Utah managed the legislation the entire time that it was pending on the floor.

Let me also commend the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois for his tenacious approach to the debate, and also for conducting himself in a very admirable way. I know that often, as take our positions, we sometimes allow our own personal views to mask what in other ways would be a very legitimate discussion of issues. Certainly, the Senator from Illinois, as he conducted himself throughout this debate, did not allow whatever personal views he may hold with regard to the positions taken by other Senators to distract him from conducting himself in a way that I thought was extraordinary.

Certainly, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG], and his leadership on this issue was also extraordinarily commendable.

I hope that as we take on these issues, as difficult and as fractious as they become sometimes, we can maintain civility, and that we can find ways with which to disagree without being disagreeable. I know there are a lot of strongly held views and a lot of temptation sometimes to get personal, to be negative. But I think that the course of this debate was one of our better moments. It was an opportunity for us to debate the issues in a meaningful way, without getting personal, being negative, and without distracting from what is our real purpose in being here.

Mr. President, the vote we took yesterday may not be the last on the constitutional amendment. The majority leader has indicated, as is his right, he is going to raise the issue again at some later date. Regardless of when that time may come, I think the real question now is: Can we as Democrats and Republicans work together? Can we find a way with which to put aside our differences on an amendment itself and commit ourselves to doing what we say we must do? We need to recognize that the clock is ticking, and to recognize that without some determination to take responsibility, to set forth a

glidepath, we will be right back where we were a month ago, with no real progress, with no real substantive demonstration of our determination to resolve this matter 1 year from now, 2 years from now, or 3 years from now.

So, Mr. President, I think it is very important that we recognize that the clock is ticking. We have 43 days, by law—43 days by law—to produce a budget resolution. We did that last year. We hope very much that we can do it again this year. It is tough. And for those who say we do not need a constitutional amendment to do the job, I think it is all the more important that we demonstrate that we can; that we are up to the task; that we can meet our responsibilities to make it happen correctly, to make it happen in the way that was foreseen when we passed the laws setting up this budget process.

So within the next 43 days, we hope that a majority will come forth, and that we can work together to produce what we have called for on many occasions, a glidepath to a date certain, a time within which we will reduce the deficit to zero, a time within which we can be assured that indeed we are going to take the reins of responsibility and produce a balanced budget.

When that happens, we can look back with some pride at the way in which this whole effort was undertaken. I hope also that we will abide by the law passed some time ago that stipulates that we do so without the Social Security trust funds. That is the law. We are required already to keep Social Security off-budget. So that ought to be our task. That ought to be the responsibility that we all grasp now as Republicans and Democrats. Pro-balanced-budget amendment supporters and those who oppose it must recognize that we have a timeframe within which we must produce, a timeframe that is a little more than a month long, which requires us, by law, to set out a budget resolution that provides the glidepath that we all say we want.

Let us make it a time certain. I am not wedded to a specific date today. But I would agree to a time certain, a time within which we can, with some confidence, look to a decline of the deficit to the point where we can say with authority that we have taken Social Security out of the calculation, as the law requires; we have reduced the deficit annually, building on the 3-year record we have set out now, and we have done it within the timeframe that the law requires.

I think the American people would look at this Congress in a very different way. I think they would look at us with a great deal of admiration if we said we are going to do what we all say we want to do. Certainly, this is the time to prove it. This is an opportunity for us to demonstrate real responsibility. It is an opportunity for us to demonstrate real bipartisanship. It is an opportunity for us to set politics aside and say this is our task, and there can be no more important responsibility.

We are going to do it and do it in a way that we all can feel proud.

So I sincerely hope, Mr. President, that everyone will accept that task, and that everyone will take this responsibility seriously. I think the majority is going to live up to their commitment. I am sure they will produce a resolution. I hope they will produce that resolution in the time the law requires.

So our purpose in coming to the floor this morning is to say that the balanced budget amendment debate, for now, is behind us. It is over. Let us get on with the real work of doing the job, doing what we say we are going to do. Let us get on with making sure that we do not miss this opportunity. Let us get on with trying to do what we all have professed is the most important thing we can do, and that is set out the glidepath to a balanced Federal budget at a time certain. That time certain is in the next 43 days.

Mr. President, I know of several of my colleagues that have come to the floor also to express themselves on this issue. I will yield whatever time he may require to the Senator from Nevada.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, last year, I offered a balanced budget amendment which excluded Social Security from the budget. When this body again considered a balanced budget amendment 4 or 5 weeks ago I offered an amendment that excluded Social Security. After it was defeated, I worked with others to ensure the Social Security trust funds would not be looted to reduce the deficit. Of course, we know the result of the vote yesterday. But, Mr. President, I feel no jubilation. I do not feel a sense of victory as a result of having my amendment being one of the principal—if not the principal—reason the balanced budget amendment failed.

But, in fact, the day after the vote, I feel a sense of hope, perhaps even anticipation, that the debate that has taken place in this body over the past several weeks has established at least two things in my mind. No. 1 is that the accumulating debt this country has is serious. No. 2, the American people recognize the seriousness of that debt, but they do not want to balance the budget using Social Security trust fund moneys.

We have heard several times on this floor that 80 percent of the American people support a balanced budget amendment. That is true. If you ask that same group of people, "Do you support a balanced budget amendment using Social Security to achieve a balanced budget?" only about 32 percent of those people say yes. In fact, most of the polls show a number slightly lower than that.

Mr. President, what was the debate on this floor about as relating to Social Security? Well, we established quite clearly that Social Security has not contributed one penny to the huge

deficits that this country is accumulating—not a penny. We further established, without any refutation, that Social Security is not a welfare program. Social Security, quite to the contrary, is a self-financing program where a person's employer pays 6.2 percent of their wages into a fund—we call it a trust fund—and the individual, the employee, pays 6.2 percent of their wages into a fund. That is to be accumulated during their working life, so that when they retire, they will have a retirement income. The average around the country is \$640 a month. That is not a lot, but certainly, for an individual, it is a difference between despair and the ability to live a decent life.

Mr. President, the issue now before us is to continue on a path of deficit reduction until we get to balance. I want to show this body the fact that while we have not done a wonderful job, we have done a pretty good job, and we have to do a lot better, recognizing that this will be the third year in a row that we have had a decline in the deficit, the first time in 50 years.

We also recognize, Mr. President, that we have also had the lowest unemployment and the lowest inflation in 50 years, the highest economic growth since LBJ. And we have 120,000 fewer Federal employees than we had 2 years and 2 months ago. We can do a lot better. But what if we had not adopted the Democratic deficit-reduction plan? What would we have had we not done that?

Well, Mr. President, this chart shows clearly what would have happened. As a result of the deficit-reduction plan that worked, we have had a declining deficit. It has not declined nearly enough, but a declining deficit. It levels off and this is, as seen on these lines at the bottom of this chart, what happened as a result of the hard choices we made.

Mr. President, I do not think it is wrong to mention to the American public that we did not receive a single Republican vote to bring this deficit down.

In fact, had we not adopted the tough program that we did, the deficit would have been huge. This is what would have happened had the Republicans prevailed, had the Republicans' deficit-reduction plan been adopted. It would not have been a deficit-reduction plan, it would have been a deficit increase. This red line shows what would have happened. And beginning next year, the budget we are adopting now, you can see where it would have skyrocketed.

So, Mr. President, we have not completely dropped the ball. We have done some good things and the economy now is in good shape. The question is: Can we learn from our experiences? Can we learn from the debate that has taken place on the Senate floor these past few weeks? I hope so.

I know, speaking from my perspective, I think the debate has been constructive. I join in what the minority leader, the Democratic leader, has said.

I think the majority has allowed us to have a full debate on this issue. I commend and I applaud the senior Senator from Kansas, the majority leader of the Senate. I think he has really done a good job of moving this legislation through this body. I believe it has been a good debate. It is one that I hope we can learn from as we look to the future.

I look forward to seeing what budget is going to come from the leadership of Senator DOMENICI and Senator EXON. These are two experienced legislators. I have not had the opportunity—I know that the senior Senator from New Mexico has had a death in his family and I know he has a lot on his mind. But I know that his experience, together with Senator EXON, to whom I have spoken, is going to bring out a budget, that will take into consideration what has been debated on this floor; namely, that we need to bring the deficit down and we cannot and we should not use Social Security to bring the deficit down.

Mr. President, I am willing to work with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I agree with my colleagues, we should have a balanced budget. But, Mr. President, we can do that. Even though the balanced budget amendment did not pass, we can still do that.

Section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act says that you are not supposed to use Social Security. We should follow this law. Our numbers may not look as good as we would like them in the newspapers, but we could and we should have a balanced budget amendment. So, Mr. President, I repeat, our deficit is too big, but we also should not raid Social Security and try to justify using those moneys. I see my friend from North Dakota. My understanding is that the leader wanted to yield time to the Senator from North Dakota under the leader's time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield time to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, how much time is available?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 13 minutes 36 seconds.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President I thank the minority leader.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, yesterday, of course, we voted on a major proposed constitutional amendment to balance the budget. That was a vote that was difficult for a number of Members of the Senate. Most understood it was a very significant, serious issue, and a great deal of emotion existed on both sides. It was not an easy vote, I expect, for virtually anyone. And I suppose there are some ruptured feelings

and relationships, at least momentarily, about some of these issues.

But I was thinking about it last evening. In the middle of the debate that we had for some weeks over the question of whether we should amend the Constitution, a news item appeared one morning about America's trade deficit. That news item disclosed that in the last year, when figures for December were released and we had a full year's picture of America's trade deficit, that we had the largest merchandise trade deficit in the history of the world. The United States was running the largest trade deficit in the history of humankind. We had gone, in a few years—15 years—from being the largest creditor or the biggest banker as a country to now the largest debtor in the world.

I thought about that in the context of the fractious debate on the issue of balancing the budget by a constitutional amendment. Because, with respect to international trade and the question of how we as a country do, we are a team, all of us. The entire country's future is at stake. Our jobs are at stake, opportunities for our children are at stake. And it is an international competition that we must win. There ought not be anyone in the congressional branch of Government that does not understand that we are on this team together and that we need policies that allow this team to win.

Well, then we come to domestic policies, including provisions that would require a change in the Constitution. And what is a team, or what should be a team, because we are all on the same side, in international competition in who will have the jobs, who will have the expansion, where will be the opportunity and that then breaks down into a debate in our Chamber. And, of course, what happens in the process of trying to make decisions about this, emotions run high and sometimes we have very fractious debates. There are, it seems to me, no winners and no losers in these kinds of debates. Certainly, when you are dealing with a question of whether or how to change the U.S. Constitution one would expect people to feel very strongly about their points of view.

I want to add to the comments by the Senator from South Dakota and Senator REID and others that I have the greatest respect for Senator HATCH and Senator SIMON. I think both of them did an extraordinary job. I have great respect for their point of view.

My own view is that there is a right way and a wrong way to change the Constitution. I feel very strongly that the question of how you count receipts in the Constitution is very important to the future of the Social Security system. Because the future of the Social Security system will not be a future that guarantees benefits to Americans who deserve them and who are entitled to them unless we preserve the funds in the trust funds. And that

would not have been the case under this amendment.

If that had been changed, it would have passed yesterday with 75 votes. So there is no joy in that vote. And the message in that vote is not that the U.S. Senate does not want a balanced budget amendment. If that amendment had been changed, the message would have been 75—probably more, maybe 80 votes—in favor of a constitutional amendment to balance the budget provided there was a guarantee that trust funds of Social Security be protected.

I noted that in the Washington Post this morning they editorialized about this Social Security issue and said it is not an issue, because the fact is Social Security is now one-fourth of all spending for other than interest on the debt and that the deficit cannot be reduced without it.

I do not agree with that. If someone believes we should reduce the Federal deficit by cutting Social Security benefits, they would have a responsibility to cut Social Security taxes because the only purpose for which that tax is collected is to put it in a trust fund to be used for only one program, and that is Social Security.

I think the Washington Post is all wet. I am surprised to see the editorial. Everybody has a right to think as they think. I just disagree with them.

Now, the question of Social Security that we have discussed at some length I hope could still be resolved. If we could resolve that, that constitutional amendment can be brought back and will pass by a very significant margin.

I was probably 14 years old when I got a driver's license to drive my father's pickup truck, and my way of making some money during high school was to haul garbage. I would pick up the 50-gallon drums that had been opened at the top, used oil drums that the widows in my hometown of 300 people used to put their trash in and burn their trash.

At the end of a week or two, their 50-gallon drums would be full of burnt trash, and somebody would have to haul it to the dump ground in my small town. I borrowed my dad's pickup truck. When I was 14, I had a garbage route. I picked up the drums and hauled the trash to the dump ground for half a dozen widows in my hometown. That is the way I earned a few dollars and got along in high school.

All of those widows in my hometown whom I was doing a little work for—virtually all of them—lived on Social Security. That is about all they had. The difference between them, then, and those who preceded them 30 or 40 years prior to that, was that they reached that stage in life where they were in their seventies or eighties, some in their early nineties, and they had Social Security checks.

It was the difference between being impoverished at age 80 with nothing to live on, or having a little something to give you a decent life and give you an opportunity. That is what Social Security meant to them.

I saw it when I was a kid. That is why the Social Security system is still important to me. I think it is the crown jewel of achievement in the last 60 or 70 years in this country for us to have constructed something that works the way this works, to give an opportunity during one's retirement years to draw on a stream of income that one contributed to during one's working years.

We face challenges with Social Security, but the wrong way to approach those challenges is to say to somebody, "You can take what is built up in the trust fund or what we intend to build up in the trust fund to save for the future, and use it to balance the Federal deficit." It is the wrong thing to do. I know the amendment might be popular, but there is a difference between right and wrong.

It seems to me here, notwithstanding the strong winds, you need to be prepared to stand and fight for what is right. I respect everyone's views. Those who oppose me on this or dozens of other issues will not hear me denigrating the way they do business or the way they think. There is great room for disagreement. I have enormous respect for those who do disagree, but I also hope they will accord similar respect to the kind of debate that we have had.

I think that we have a country in which people look at the congressional branch of Government these days and they say, "You know, I kind of wish they could just make progress and get things done." And they probably know that there are many Members inside the institution who feel the same way. We understand what the problems are.

Let Members find a way to coalesce to solve the problems. There is no reason that on the issue of a balanced budget, we cannot follow on from what we did in 1993. Yes, I voted for the Deficit Reduction Act of 1993. That was enormously controversial. But I am glad I voted for it. It was the right thing, and it is still the right thing to have done, because it reduced the Federal budget deficit. I am glad I did that. I am prepared to do more.

I hope there are many people on both sides of the aisle during the budget and appropriations process who will join hands together in a bipartisan way. We are prepared to march up the hill. We do not need a constitutional amendment to do that. No one needs a constitutional amendment to build the steps to a balanced budget. Those are decisions of taxing and spending that are made individually, day after day, on appropriations bills and on the budget bill.

I guess my point today is to say there were conditions under which I was fully prepared to vote for this, and I described what those conditions were. They were not able to be met, I guess. I was not able to vote for it. That does not mean that we should not march together toward a balanced budget. Of course, we should. And we ought to start immediately. Some of us started

in 1993. And we are pleased we did. Some who decided to vote for that paid a very heavy price for it. But it was a vote well worth taking as far as I was concerned.

Now, the next question for all Members is, what are the subsequent votes by which we can, together, begin to climb those stairs and make progress toward balancing this country's budget, and not just balancing the budget, but starting at some point to pay off the debt.

We need to create investment in this country. We need to create investment and growth opportunity. I started by talking about the trade deficit, because ultimately we are involved in world competition for the future. There will be winners and losers. I do not want this country to be a loser in the international competition. I want this country to win, because winners will be assigned new jobs, expansion opportunities, and hope, and losers will have the British disease of long, slow economic decay because they believe what is important is consumption, not production. That is another discussion for another time.

I fervently hope that all Members can understand we wear the same jersey. We are on the same team. In international competition, we are fighting the same fight for the future of this country. The answer—should we balance this budget and should we start paying off the debt—is clearly yes, notwithstanding what constitutional amendment might or might not be debated or discussed now or at any time in the future. The answer is yes, that is our job. The sooner that we get that job done, the better it is for the American people and for our children.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is entitled, under the previous order, to 15 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, how much time is remaining on Senator DASCHLE's time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute and thirty-two seconds.

#### A HAPPY DAY FOR FLORIDA

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, this is a happy day for my State of Florida. One hundred and fifty years ago today, March 3, 1845, President John Tyler signed legislation which this Senate had passed 2 days earlier making Florida the 27th State to join the Union.

I am pleased to stand on the Senate floor today and express my appreciation to America for having accepted our State as a member of the United States and for the benefits that Florida has gained by that membership.

Florida has a long history that predates its period of statehood. In fact, Florida was the first point in North America to be discovered by Europeans when Ponce de Leon came upon the coast of Florida near what is now St.