

the Department of Commerce as well as the resources of the Small Business Administration have helped New Mexico to participate in the global economy. We have a long way to go in our great State, but supporting exports, supporting technology development make sense for New Mexico and make sense for America.

In conclusion, Mr. President, we need to heed Adam Smith's word. We need to make sure that Government addresses those tasks that the private sector cannot or will not address. We need to maintain our investment in civilian research and development efforts, and we must continue to build the export platform that has been under construction for some time. To fail to do this would limit our leverage in building a more prosperous future and securing continued American leadership.

I would like to remind my Republican colleagues that their opposition to these export programs is an entirely new development. Letters of support for the Foreign Commercial Service, for expansion of International Trade Administration domestic service centers, and for prevention of reduced staffs for sites have been sent to the Secretary of Commerce by Senators BROWN, CAMPBELL, COVERDELL, D'AMATO, DOMENICI, HATCH, HATFIELD, and numerous others. I realize that we are all facing a confluence of tough choices in our budget deficit reduction efforts, what to cut and what not to cut—but I would argue that our colleagues' earlier intentions were correct, that supporting our small and mid-sized businesses into the international arena was the correct strategy to jump start growth, spur jobs, and create a more healthy economy.

Claims that these programs significantly impact our budget deficit are not supported by the facts. We spend less than a billion a year for all export programs in a \$1.2 trillion annual budget, but reducing this amount would harm our business sector, reduce growth, stifle incomes and keep us blocked out of important growing economies. We would effectively be handing over to other nations important, high-paying jobs that would otherwise go to American workers.

That, Mr. President, is not what we have been elected by the citizens of this great Nation to do.

Mr. President, let me just urge that in finalizing a budget resolution between this Congress and the President, we need to keep our eye on the ball of those programs that will promote job creation and promote more economic growth in the future. This budget, as it comes before us today, does not do that. Mr. President, I hope that can be corrected before final action is taken by this Congress.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MACK). The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I yield myself as much time as I may consume of my remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 20 minutes remaining of the Senator's time.

THE 1996 BUDGET: TRUTH AND PRIORITIES

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, today we will consider the conference report on the budget. It is interesting that we saw, today, a big chart on the floor of the Senate, again, entitled Where is Bill? I indicated the other day that if I were someone inclined to do that sort of thing, I would bring a chart that says Where is the Bill?

This budget conference report comes to the floor of the Senate, I believe, nearly 75 days after the law required that it be brought to the floor. But, frankly, I think that is less important than the question of what is brought to the floor. I do not think there is much difference here on the floor of the Senate with respect to our desire to balance the budget. No one who is thinking very clearly in this Senate or in this Congress or in the country could believe that we can spend money we do not have very long and remain a strong nation.

The question is not whether. The question is how do we put our fiscal house in order and balance the budget?

In 1993, I voted for an initiative recommended by President Clinton to cut \$500 billion from the projected deficits. The \$500 billion cut in deficits included some very controversial things. It included some tax increases that were not popular, some specific spending cuts that were not popular. And I understand why a number of people did not want to vote for it. In fact, it passed the Senate by one vote. It passed the House of Representatives by one vote.

In the Senate, in fact, we did not even have one Member of the minority vote for that resolution—not one. I understand that as well. They felt strongly that it was a resolution that did not have the correct priorities, so they did not want to support it. Many of us voted for it, even though it was very controversial, in order to reduce the deficit. We felt it was necessary to do so. Now we have folks saying, well, the Democrats do not care about the deficit, and they do not want to do anything. The fact is that we had to produce all the votes in 1993 on the \$500 billion deficit reduction package. We did not get help from one Republican.

But what is past is past. The question is what do we do now for the future? The majority party brings a budget resolution to the floor of the Senate today. First of all, let me give them credit. I think this is the right issue. We need to reduce the deficit. In fact, some were critical of the President this morning, and I share that criticism. I have indicated to the President that the initial budget he sent to this Con-

gress had deficits that were too large, and I assume that is why he sent us a supplemental budget recently. I share that criticism. I think we have to do this in a manner that is right and real for the American people.

A while ago, I asked one of my colleagues on the floor of the Senate to look at page three of the budget resolution. The budget resolution, which is on every Senate desk, which we are going to vote on today, says on page three, line four, Deficits. It says, "For the purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows * * *". And then it indicates that in the year 2002 the deficit is \$108 billion.

I have been watching people break their arms patting themselves on the back this morning, saying that this is a balanced budget. I come from a town of 300 people where people talk pretty straight about these things. If you look at this and read page three, they would say, wait, if you say this is a balanced budget, why in the year you claim there is a budget in balance do you have a \$108 billion deficit? This is not a balanced budget.

The only way they can claim it is to say: We will reduce this \$108 billion to zero by taking the trust funds in the Social Security account for that year, and we will show this as a zero debt. Well, let us say a business has lost \$100 million. If a business did what this budget does, if you told business people to take the money from their employees' pension accounts and bring it into their books and claim they have lost no money, the folks that did that will be fast on their way to jail. This is not an honest way to budget. This budget is not in balance. That is point No. 1.

We need to balance the budget. We need to do it without misusing the Social Security trust funds. Those Social Security trust funds coming from taxes taken from the paychecks of workers, contributions made by businesses, which go, by law, into a trust fund. They are not to build star wars, or to offset other kinds of spending in the Federal budget, but only for the purposes of funding Social Security. This budget is out of balance.

The only way they can put it in balance—even though on page three it says it is a \$108 billion deficit in the year 2002, the only way they can put it in balance, and the way they come to the floor and claim it is in balance is to misuse the Social Security trust funds. That is not an honest thing to do; it is not the right thing to do.

Second, with respect to priorities. Previous speakers today said the fact is that we need to cut spending. I do not disagree with that. I sent to the Budget Committee recommendations on over \$800 billion of deficit cuts, most of it spending cuts.

But this budget comes to the floor with more money for defense. This budget comes to the floor with a special accommodation made so we can continue to build star wars, SDI, or

ballistic missiles defense, BMD. I happen to think that is a priority that is out of whack. There is no disagreement about cutting spending. But at this time and place, we say in a budget we are going to make it harder for kids to go to college, but it is time now to build star wars when the Soviet Union is gone, is that a priority that makes sense, or is that going to strengthen or weaken our country? I would switch that around and take the billions for star wars and pump it back into allowing kids to go to school, allowing kids to get a higher education. That is what strengthens our country. In my judgment, that is the right priority.

The budget that is brought to the floor of the Senate today says that we need a tax cut. I understand why that is popular. If one were to take a poll and say to people, "Would you like a tax cut?" the answer would be, "Heck, yes, I would like a tax cut."

But the job before us is not first to cut our revenue. The job before us is first to get our fiscal house in order and reduce the Federal budget deficit. When that is done, then I think we ought to talk about trying to relieve the tax burden on middle-income families in this country, but only when we have solved the deficit problem. The fact is that this budget resolution brings with it to the floor of the Senate a \$108 billion deficit in the year 2002 and brings with it a \$250 billion or so tax cut, most of which will go to the upper income families in this country.

Now, I do not have the specifics of a Senate tax cut, but we know that this budget is closer to the House tax cut, and we do have the specifics of that, as measured by the Congressional Budget Office. It shows that the bulk of the tax cut is going to go to upper income families. So we are saying that we are going to leave a \$108 billion deficit in the year 2002, and we are going to embark on the effort to provide lower taxes for upper income folks. I do not share that priority.

I understand why calling it a family middle-income tax cut is popular. I understand why promising a tax cut is popular. My children would love it if I promised them dessert before dinner. The tax cut is enormously popular. But the fact is that we have a responsibility to cut the budget deficit and balance the budget. That ought to be the honest responsibility that is brought to the floor of the Senate.

I fully understand that the easiest possible political course for anyone is merely to be critical, and that is not enough for our country. We have, in this country, it seems to me, far too much criticism and far too little examples of rolling up one's sleeves and doing what is necessary to fix what is wrong in our country.

We also have too many people who are part of the blame America first crowd who get up, as I said the other day, get up crabby and are determined to share that mood with the rest of America.

This is a remarkable, very special country, with very special strengths and attributes. We have done a lot of things, a lot of wonderful things, which I support.

We had someone speaking on the floor today about regulations. Boy, I, more than most, understand what a pain regulations can be, and some of them go way too far. We have folks who work in the permanent bureaucracy who say, "Well, we will impose this regulation despite the fact that it may make no common sense at all." And it makes people angry with Government. I understand that.

Let me give another side of the same issue so we do not decide immediately to get rid of all regulations. Twenty years ago we used twice as much energy in America as we do today, yet we have less pollution in America today. We have cleaner air now than we did 20 years ago, and we use twice as much energy.

Why do we have cleaner air in America today? Because of regulations. We said to the captains of some industries, we are sorry, but you cannot keep dumping this pollution into our air. It may cost a little more to retrofit your smokestacks, and so on, but that cost is worth it because America must have an environment in which it is healthy to live.

So we have cleaner air today than 20 years ago. That is not by accident. That is because some people had the strength to stand on the floor of the Senate and the House of Representatives to say there are rules. One rule is you cannot dump chemicals into the streams, cannot send pollution up into the air.

We want a clean place for our children to live. We have cleaner streams and cleaner water and cleaner lakes in America today than we did 20 years ago. Why is that? We have less acid rain. Why? Because we decided 20 years ago that we would require the right things. We will say that if you do certain things you have to do them right.

Not only is production good, creating jobs is important. That is the golden goose, there is no question. But the private sector, in creating jobs and advancing the standards in this country, also must respect the environment. We have said that. Those in many cases are regulations that I would not want our country to back away from.

So, we must do things, it seems to me, in a whole range of areas, whether it is regulation, or the budget. We must do things that we think represent the economic interests in our country, to advance the standard of living in our country, and advance the interests of all Americans. That includes the economic interest and it includes the interests that we have to live in a country that is not polluted and not despoiled. All of those things come to bear in one document. That document is the budget.

None of us will be around 100 years from now. None of us. Not one in this

room will be around 100 years from now to answer for any of this. But anyone, 100 years from now, who is interested in who we were and what we felt was dear to us and important to the future of our country, can simply search our records or the history of the Senate and take a look at a budget document. They can say, at least with respect to public resources, here is what that group of men and women thought were the priorities for their future. Here is how they decided to spend their money.

This budget document says we are going to spend our money on star wars, because star wars must be deployed. And we are going to decide that we do not have as much money to send children to college, so we make it harder for families to send their kids to colleges. That is what the budget says—a priority I do not share.

We could flip that and we could say, well, the Soviet Union is gone, we will not build star wars—it is a gold-plated weapon system we do not need—and we will invest for the future. We will make sure that our Nation's children can become the best they can be, have the best education that their talents will allow them to have.

Well, that would represent the priority, I think, that is important for this country. We can do that all in the context, still, of making decisions that have the right priorities that still lead to a balanced budget.

In the aggregate, we only have so much money to spend. The question is not whether—it is how we balance the budget. That is the fight about priorities.

I always get a kick when we come to these debates in the Senate, we have people, especially people who have been speaking currently in recent months, that say, "Well, we want to balance the budget, the other side does not care. Therefore, we are responsible and the other side is not."

I do not share that view of this body. I think we have terrific people all around this body on both sides of the political aisle. I think all Members should share a responsibility and a determination to try to do what we can to bring this budget in balance.

There is not any question that we have different priorities about what we think is important. The political process is the process by which we make those choices. This is a great process.

John F. Kennedy used to kid, he said, "Every mother kind of hopes that her child might grow up to be President, as long as they do not have to get involved in politics." But of course, politics is a system by which we make choices in America. It is a great system.

In some cases, I am on a side that loses, in some cases I am on a side that wins; but my responsibility is always to fight for the things I think are important for the future of this country.

My kids, and everybody's kids—they are all that we have in this country, today and tomorrow and in the future.

The question is, what makes this a better future for America? When I look at what our ancestors left us, it is pretty striking and pretty remarkable. And the courage and the strength and the determination with which they approached life and with which they made decisions were really quite remarkable.

We have been a nation of builders and doers. This country has not gotten to where it has gotten in the world stage by deciding to sit back and do nothing. We have been out rolling up our sleeves and doing and creating. We have led the world in dozens of areas, even in pollution control and civil rights.

If we have a problem, we face it. A lot of countries just push it aside because it is too painful. Part of the genius of this country is to face these issues and fight about them, and to make public decisions in a consensus in our political system about the issues.

That is what this budget debate is. Nobody ought to be concerned about the fact that we are fighting about priorities. That is what this is about. That is the political system. It is the genius and the wonder of the political system.

I hope in the end stage of this process, that good will and determination expressed by people on all sides of the political aisle, and including the President of the United States, will result in compromises that really do balance the budget, No. 1, to put our fiscal house in order; and, No. 2, do it in a way that advances the interests of all the people in this country, so that this country can have a brighter and better future.

How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 3 minutes and 38 seconds remaining.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

JORDANELLE STATE PARK

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Jordanelle State Park, located in Wasatch County, UT, will soon become Utah's newest and most modern recreational facility. Funded through the Bureau of Reclamation as part of the Central Utah Project [CUP], this project represents the cumulative efforts of nearly 50 interfacing agencies, scores of special interest groups, and an extensive public input process. The Jordanelle State Park will not only contribute to Utah's critically needed water reserves, but it will also provide excellent recreational opportunities for residents and visitors.

The Jordanelle recreation development deserves recognition for achiev-

ing its project-specific objectives by maximizing each participant's resources. With a multimillion dollar project such as the Jordanelle, a burden rests on the shoulders of responsible agencies to make certain that appropriated funds are conscientiously expended. Those associated with the Jordanelle project have set and achieved this goal.

The effort to provide recreational use of Jordanelle Reservoir has served as a model of intergovernmental cooperation among the Federal, State, and local agencies that have institutional control over the project. This same level of cooperation and trust was generated with the public during numerous informational meetings. An uncommon dedication to common goals existed, most notably among the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, the Utah Division of Parks and Recreation, and interested parties from throughout the State of Utah. This mutual dedication grew out of an important understanding of one another's expectations and values. All of these factors have brought about a refreshing and healthy partnership that has produced wonderful results.

A significant achievement is being reached in the mountains east of Salt Lake City today with the dedication of the Jordanelle State Park. The water resources of Utah will be significantly supplemented with the completion of Jordanelle Reservoir, and millions of recreationists across this country will have the opportunity to utilize and enjoy Jordanelle State Park for years to come.

In my view, this two-fer is an excellent tribute to the resourcefulness and stewardship of Utahns. I congratulate everyone on a remarkable achievement.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN E. BURGER

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, America lost one of its great constitutional thinkers and jurists with the death of former Chief Justice Warren Earl Burger on Sunday, June 25. He served as Chief Justice for 17 years, longer than any other in this century. While he pointed the Court toward a more centrist course during his tenure, he nevertheless presided at a time when the Supreme Court was still seen as being at the forefront of social change in this country.

As my colleagues know, I have an abiding interest in judicial administration, and I always looked to Justice Burger as a true leader in improving the administration of justice. My term as chief justice of the Alabama Supreme Court coincided with his as the U.S. Chief Justice. He was a tremendous help with our efforts to pass the judicial article and with the court reform movement in our State. He was keenly interested in judicial education not only for legal professionals, but for people from all walks of life, believing

that knowledge of the system could help individuals improve their lives.

Chief Justice Burger advocated the unified court system for States and founded the National Center for State Courts. He helped organize State and Federal judicial councils to ease the friction that tended to result between State and Federal courts at the time.

He developed the Federal Judicial Center, an educational and research arm for the Federal court system. He persuaded Senior Judge Alfred Murrah—for whom the Federal building in Oklahoma City was named—to serve as head of the Judicial Center. Judge Murrah's leadership resulted in enormous strides for the center. Justice Burger was also a strong supporter of the National College of the Judiciary.

We might say that Justice Burger's passion was more the overall administration of the law as opposed to the hard substance of the law. He believed that the process of the law was important to preserving its substance. He strove to make the courts run better. He pushed Congress to create more judgeships and to raise judges' salaries. To help eliminate congestion and reduce case backlog, he promoted the streamlining of court procedures. He has been called the guiding force in helping State courts improve their judicial administration.

Born in St. Paul, MN, Warren Burger spent his early life on a farm. He worked his way through the University of Minnesota and the St. Paul College of Law, now the Mitchell College of Law. After obtaining a law degree in 1931, he practiced law in Minnesota for over 20 years.

In 1953, President Eisenhower appointed him as an assistant U.S. Attorney General for the Justice Department's Civil Division. Three years later, he was placed on the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. In 1969, President Nixon elevated him to the High Court to succeed retiring Chief Justice Earl Warren. The Senate overwhelmingly approved Chief Justice Burger on June 9, 1969, after a judiciary committee hearing that reportedly lasted but an hour and 40 minutes, something that is hard to imagine happening today.

As Chief Justice, Warren Burger was tough on criminal defendants, but he was neither a hard-line conservative nor an activist willing to reverse rulings of the Warren Court. After he retired in 1986, he spoke regularly at judicial conventions. He wrote a recent book, "It Is So Ordered: A Constitution Unfolds," in which he narrated in detail 14 major Supreme Court cases.

From 1987 until 1991, the former Chief Justice headed the commission on the bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution, a job he pursued with great passion, energy, and intensity. While he believed the Constitution to be a living document, allowing for the evolution of national governmental institutions, he also believed in following the letter of