

and enforcement and \$850 million, on top of the \$4 billion already spent, to improve tax collection procedures. Americans want the Federal Tax Code to be made simple, fair, and uniform. But they really do not want billions more to be spent on IRS bureaucrats.

The President's budget fails to institute real work requirements for welfare recipients. It also guarantees that illegal immigrants will be able to receive food stamps. By refusing to sign the welfare reform legislation that Congress has sent to him twice, the President guarantees that welfare dependency will continue in the country and that the American people will continue to foot the bill. The working American will continue to foot the bill.

I believe that is why Republicans were elected in 1994—to end politics as usual. For decades, politicians came to Washington and put Band-Aids on a bad situation until the next election.

That is not what we are here for. We were sent here to offer real long-term solutions—not for the next election but for the generation.

That is why we are trying hard to do what we said we would do and balance the budget. It is why we sent a balanced budget to the President. But he has vetoed that balanced budget. The balanced budget is not about numbers. It is about people just as the Senator from Georgia was just saying.

I think of parents with children in high school afraid their children will not be able to attend college because they cannot afford the interest rates for college loans. I think of the newly married couple that wants to buy their piece of the American dream—a new home—but they are not going to be able to afford the interest rates on the mortgage. I think about working people in their forties and fifties who are trying desperately to set aside that little bit of extra money they are earning for their retirement security. And yet in the budget that the President has submitted it does not even allow homemakers to set aside \$2,000 a year for IRA's like those who work outside the home are able to do. They are not even thinking about one-income earner couples that are sacrificing so that one spouse—the homemaker—will stay home and raise children. And I think of senior citizens who are depending on Medicare but are afraid that it may not be there when they really need it.

These are real people with real concerns and real fears. Unfortunately, instead of hope, President Clinton hyped the status quo. Instead of inspiring Americans to have confidence in their future, instead he incites fear.

It is wrong to ask that American people live within their means but not ask the Federal Government to do the same. Is it wrong to demand that Washington stop wasting taxpayer dollars? Is it wrong to demand an end to politics as usual?

That is what we are demanding—a return to principle instead of politics; a commitment to the next generation instead of the next election.

We are 4 years away from a new millennium. The year 2000 should be a new beginning. Where will we be in the year 2000? As we look forward to the year 2000, where will we be starting with what we need to do today?

As that ball drops in Times Square, and people all over our Nation are celebrating a new beginning, will we be firmly on the path to a balanced budget, and a growing economy? Or will the deficit still be eating away at the working people's livelihood in this country? Will we have reformed the welfare system, or will it continue to undermine the work ethic destroying families and ruin the very lives of people who are receiving welfare? Will we have reduced the excessive tax burden on the American family leaving them with more of their money in their pockets or will we continue to have taxes that takes people's extra money so they cannot put it away for saving for their retirement? Will we have reformed Medicare so that our future generations will know that it will be there for them so that it will be stronger? Or will we have continued on the path that we are on now? And will Medicare be 2 years away from going out of business so that seniors in this country really will have to fear whether it is going to be there for them?

In short, Mr. President, will we have continued business as usual for these 4 years that we have been elected to make change, or will we have kept the promise that we made to the American people?

I hope that in the year 2000 we will have said this year there is no more politics as usual, no more excuses, that we kept our promises in 1996 so that in the year 2000 when we are celebrating a new beginning we will indeed have a strong and thriving economy, and that we will have American families with the hope that their children will be able to have a better life than they have had just as so many generations in the past have been able to hope.

Mr. President, the time to prepare for a new beginning in a new millennium is right now, and we are missing that opportunity with a budget by the President that does not speak to tax fairness and equity for the working families of this country. We are trying to make a difference.

The President has vetoed welfare reform. He has vetoed a balanced budget. He has vetoed middle-class tax cuts. All of the things that he promised and all of the things that we promised—and we are trying to deliver—have been vetoed by the President.

The time is now for us to put partisanship aside and do what all of us said we would do for the American people—balance the budget. That is our commitment. And, Mr. President, we have a chance to keep our promise. And that is what we are trying to do.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized to speak for up to 20 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for as much time as I need.

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

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, this is, it seems to me, a time to talk about change in this country. I think the central question is what kind of change will make this a better place in which to live?

We have had a lot of struggles in our history in this country about what the role of government is. Is there a role for government? What kind of government, and how much government do we want? We have struggled over the decades with that question.

I go back to the early 1900's which relates to the struggle we had over the question of food inspection. I have told my colleagues this before. Some know it because of the readings they have done. But even then we began the struggle over all of these issues.

On the issue of food inspection, Upton Sinclair wrote a book at the turn of the century. He did an investigative book on his discoveries in the meat, packing plants, I believe in Chicago, where he discovered that in the meat packing plants they had rats running around the plants. And they were trying to, of course, control the problem of rats in the meat packing plants. That is a pretty big problem. So they would put out bread laced with arsenic and lay it around the meat plants. And the rats would eat the bread, and die. And they would throw the rats and the bread and the meat down the same chute, and out comes mystery meat on the other side sold as sausage in some location somewhere in America to an unsuspecting consumer. Rats, arsenic, poison bread, meat and sausage.

Upton Sinclair wrote about that—about the outrage of that, about the threat to this country's health as a result of that. And guess what happened? The debate in this country turned quickly to the question of how to stop that. How do we prevent that? How do we assure ourselves that our food supply is safe?

We created in this country a level of government that says we are going to inspect food so that when you eat food you are not going to eat mystery meat laced with bread and arsenic that was used to poison rats. Even then we had people who said it is none of government's business; let the private sector decide. Well, arsenic and rats in meat are the public's business.

Oh, we have gone several stages from that. And in the mid-1960's half of America's senior citizens had no health care. They reached an age where they were not working. They reached retirement age, and did not have any money; nothing really to speak of. And they had no health care coverage.

I remember driving one fellow to the hospital some 55 miles away when I

was a teenager—an old fellow that lived by himself, had no one, had nothing, had no insurance, and was very sick. And my father, who could not take him, asked me to take him to the hospital. I drove him there. They said, “Do you have money, or insurance?” Of course not. They took him in anyway.

But back then half of American seniors had no health coverage at all. In the mid-1960's we had a discussion about that in this country, and we decided that we would develop a Medicare Program.

A lot of people—90 percent of the majority party now—in Congress voted against it and said we do not want Medicare the first time we voted on it. Some are still bragging they voted against it.

Do you know something? Ninety-nine percent of American senior citizens are now covered by health care. I am proud of that.

Do we have some problems with Medicare? Yes, we do. Should we fix it? You had better believe it.

But should we decide to retreat on the things we have done to make this a better country—food inspection and health care and dozens of other areas? I do not think so. I do not think it really does much good to suggest that somehow all of government is unhealthy or unholy and does nothing to protect people. Government is our teachers. Government is our police force. Government is our fire department. Government is the food inspectors, the air traffic controllers. A lot of folks do a lot of good work.

Now, we are reducing the size of government, and we should. There are fewer people working for the Federal Government today than have been at any time since John F. Kennedy. Why? Reinventing Government, headed by AL GORE, the Vice President, developed by Bill Clinton. Reinventing government is reducing the size of government. Do not believe me? There are 200,000 less people working for the Federal Government now than there were 4, 5 years ago. We have program after program after program that has been abolished or disbanded because it did not work. Other programs are reduced. Some programs that are important are expanded.

That is what we ought to do. We ought to use good judgment to see what works and what does not. Let us get rid of what does not work. We ought to ask two questions about everything we do in Congress: Do we need it? Can we afford it? And if the answer is yes, let us go and do it as a country.

I am a little confused, I guess, about some of the things that I have heard in some discussion today, and I have certainly heard a lot of it previously, about what an awful place this is, America has gone to hell in a handbasket. Gee, this country is just in terrible shape. And then we have folks out running for President who want to build a fence between the United States and Mexico and keep the Mexi-

cans out. And we have folks from every other country of the world who want to come to this country. We have a serious immigration problem.

Why would that be? Is it because this place is such an awful place to live? No, it is because this place is still a remarkable country, a country filled with people with enormous strength and vitality and interest to make this a better place.

How do we make it a better place? Do we make it a better place by calling for changes that say, well, let us decide to retract our commitment to Medicare; let us decide it is not important for a poor kid to have an entitlement to a hot lunch in the middle of the day at school; let us decide that is not important; let us decide that what we really need to do is cut the Star Schools Program which is designed to try to boost our country in math and sciences and education; let us cut Star Schools by 40 percent, and let us increase the star wars program by over 100 percent because we want to build more missiles and put an astrodome over America with missile defense and we want to do it much faster with much more money than the generals and admirals think is appropriate because these folks know better about that, so increase that spending 100 percent and cut Star Schools investments by 40 percent. Does that advance this country's interests? I do not think so.

Maybe build some orphanages, as a welfare solution. Maybe give every poor kid a laptop, take their lunch away but give them a laptop. And the other one is term limits. If you can just have term limits, you would solve all the problems. I tell you, it is hard not to laugh out loud to see people walk in this Chamber who served here 30 years and vote for term limits and say, “Yes, the problem is I have served here too long so stop me before I run again, except the term limit I want to vote for will not apply to me.”

That is what they say. It is hard not to laugh out loud when you see that. They do not believe that. And it is wrong not to deal with the real issues.

Do you know what the real issues are, in my judgment? The real issues I think you can categorize in about three areas. Kids. That is our future. Jobs. There is no social program in this country more important than a good job that pays well. Jobs. How do we get jobs? How do we expand jobs and create jobs and have an economy that provides more opportunity? Kids, jobs, and the other issue is values.

Those are the core issues I think we have to address. We can run around on dozens of other issues. I just heard discussions about the balanced budget amendment. We ought to pass a balanced budget amendment. But anybody who thinks they are going to get a balanced budget through this Chamber that loots the Social Security system by taking the Social Security trust funds to the tune of nearly \$700 billion in 7 years is dreaming.

I am not going to vote for that. I did not come here to vote to loot the Social Security trust funds. We ought to balance the budget honestly. The Social Security trust funds are dedicated only to be used for Social Security, and to use them for other purposes is dishonest budgeting. To those who say, well, we could not get it through the Chamber of the Senate, I say I voted for a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, one that said the Social Security trust funds will have a firewall; you cannot use Social Security trust funds as operating budget revenues because it is dishonest. Guess what. The folks who said they wanted a balanced budget voted against that because they wanted a balanced budget amendment in the Constitution that created a constitutional opportunity for them to misuse \$1.2 trillion in Social Security trust funds over 10 years.

No wonder it did not get through the Senate. It is the goofiest idea I ever heard—tell people we are going to take money out of your paychecks, called Social Security taxes; we are going to put it in a trust fund; and we promise we will get it in a trust fund dedicated only for that use. But now we have decided to put in the Constitution a provision that says we are going to use hundreds of billions of dollars of the trust funds as offsets against other operating revenue. And by the way, what are our priorities for the revenue and expenditures on the rest of the budget? Well, we say, while we balance the budget let's provide a tax cut. Let's provide a very large tax cut for people with very large incomes and let's provide a minuscule tax cut for all the rest. It seems to me maybe people are bound to be a little skeptical about that.

So what do you do about the central issues that I think really relate to people's lives? Kids, what about our kids, jobs and values? When people in my hometown sit down to have supper—we call it in Regent, ND; we sit down for supper—and you talk about your circumstances, what is important? What is important is how are your kids doing. What kind of opportunities are your kids going to have. It is also important, how are we doing? Do we have more income now? We are working harder. Are we making more? How are we doing? What kind of economic opportunity will we have?

And then the issue of values. There is a collapsing kind of value system, coarsening language, difficulty with what our children see on television, more crime, and a whole series of related issues that I think fall under the heading of values. But let me talk just for a moment about kids.

The first issue with kids that matters most to this country, in my judgment, is not all the peripheral antigovernment nonsense. It is, do you have in this country the best education system in the world or do you not? Because if you do not, we will not win. Our country ought to dedicate itself at

every single level of Government, and we ought to dedicate ourselves in every home with every set of parents and in every school that America is going to have the best education system on the face of the Earth. American kids are going to be the best educated kids in the world. That ought to be the central debate.

Now, most of education is run by State and local governments. It is not run by the Federal Government. We play a peripheral role. We play a role of providing financial aid to college students largely, plus we have some title programs—title I which moves some money to school districts to help some of the disadvantaged kids. But education is largely a function of State and local government. We must, it seems to me, as a country, not necessarily with a central plan but as a country in which all of us work together, decide our goal is to have the finest education system on the face of the Earth. That is the way this country will succeed and win in the future.

I have told my colleagues before, and I am going to again because I think it is so illustrative, the first week I came to Congress some years ago I walked into the office of the oldest Member of the House, Claude Pepper, and I will never forget what I saw on the wall behind his chair. Two pictures. One was Orville and Wilbur Wright making the first airplane flight down at Kitty Hawk, and Claude was an old fellow, wonderful old fellow at that point. He had an autographed picture of Orville Wright making the first flight autographed to Congressman Claude Pepper, an autographed picture to him before he died, and then he had a picture of Neil Armstrong walking on the Moon autographed to Congressman Claude Pepper. I thought to myself, here is the person who has an autograph of the first American to leave the ground and fly and the first person to step on the Moon. What is the significance of leaving the ground to fly, and flying to the Moon? Education, massive investments in education, so that this country led the world in technological achievement in dozens of areas from airplanes to television to medicine—you name it. Education; it is the key to this country's future.

Second, with respect to kids, is welfare. I know people talk about welfare in this Chamber with respect to able-bodied people who will not work. Able-bodied people on welfare ought to go to work. We offered a program called Work First, which I am enormously proud of, that says to people, "If you are down and out and disadvantaged we will give you a hand up and a helping hand, but your obligation is to get up and out and get a job."

But understand the reality of welfare. Two-thirds of the welfare payments in this country go to kids under 16 years of age. A young boy named David spoke at a hearing I went to some years ago, a 10-year-old boy from New York who lived in a homeless shel-

ter. He said, "No 10-year-old boy like me ought to have to lay his head down on his desk in the middle of the afternoon at school because it hurts to be hungry." Welfare largely relates to America's children as well. One in four children in America under the age of 3 is living in circumstances of poverty. We must have a welfare system that says to able-bodied people, "We are going to help you get a job because you cannot, as able-bodied persons, remain on welfare indefinitely."

But we must also have a welfare system that understands kids and the needs of kids. It is not their fault they were born in circumstances of poverty. And those who parade around these Chambers and say, "By the way, let us retract the entitlement for a poor kid to be able to get a hot lunch in the middle of the day of school," do no service for children. Let us care about kids, educate them, help them become better educated citizens for the future of this country.

With respect to jobs, we can talk about a hundred other issues but there is no social program that we will discuss in the 104th Congress that is as important to this country and as important for Americans as a good job that pays a good income.

We have seen what causes the anxiety. The chief executive officers of America's corporations increased their compensation 23 percent last year; last year alone, a 23-percent increase for the people at the top. But guess what? For 60 percent of the American families now, when they sit down for supper at night and talk about their lot in life after 20 years, they are working harder and they are making less money. When you adjust their income for inflation they have less purchasing power now than they had 20 years ago.

How can all that have happen? Last year we had the largest trade deficit, merchandise trade deficit in the history of this country; the largest merchandise trade deficit in history. That means jobs are leaving, not coming. It means we are competing with 2 or 3 billion other people in the world, some of whom will make 12 cents, 18 cents, 50 cents, or \$1 an hour, working in unsafe plants that are dumping pollution into the air and water. That is not fair competition and we should not have to deal with it. We must deal with the issue of jobs and do it now. We must bring jobs issues to the floor of the Senate and respond in a real way.

Those who come to the floor talking about helping people do no service, especially to working people at the bottom of the ladder, when they also embrace policies that will pull out the rug from under those people on the earned income tax credit, because that is the kind of policy designed to help working people at the bottom of the economic ladder.

Finally, on the issue of values, I think there is general agreement in this Chamber, between Republicans and Democrats, that there is a col-

lapsing of values in this country that is troublesome. There are, perhaps, many reasons for it. But the restoration of values starts in the home, in the neighborhood, in the community. It starts with all of us. Television is too coarse, language is too coarse during times when children are watching. There is too much violence on television. America has become too violent a country. We are the murder capital of the world. We are the cocaine capital of the world. We have 23,000 murders and 110,000 rapes every year, and we must respond to it. And that is one of the areas, I think, in which Republicans and Democrats have joined in trying to respond in a significant way. But we must understand the collapsing of values in this country is also causing significant concern.

Let me, finally, point out about those who spend a lot of time talking about how awful Government is—and there are plenty of areas of Government that have gone awry, that we must rein in and correct—I applaud those and join them when they want to do that. I would also say it is important for us to talk about what works and what is right. Do you know we now use twice as much energy as we did 20 years ago, but we have less water pollution and less air pollution? We have cleaner air and water than we did 20 years ago, despite the fact we have doubled our energy use. Is that accidental? No, it is not. It is because this Congress decided we are going to start penalizing people who pollute; there is only one Earth to live on, and we want the environment to be clean.

I urge my colleagues to understand, there is a lot of what has been done by people of this country in public policy, ranging from cleaning up our air and water to providing health care for senior citizens, intervening in the lives of young children to provide education and to deal with hunger and nutrition issues, and many other areas that have made this a better country.

As I conclude, let me just say I had a town meeting in which I said to people who, I am sure, listen to all of the talk shows—and everyday in every way we have all these shows that talk about what is wrong with America. They hold up this little thing and say, "Isn't this ugly? See this? Is this not awful?" I understand, it is what entertains.

I said, "Why don't we talk about what works? Let us be positive for a half-hour. Let's talk about only what works in our lives." It was a remarkable transformation, because a lot of people talked about a lot of good things in their lives, a lot of things that are improving, a lot of things that are working. Then from that we discovered what is left, what is left for us to do as a people together to make this a better country.

I hope, in the coming months, the challenges that were discussed by the Members of the majority party today and myself and others are challenges we will decide to embrace quickly and

debate in a thoughtful way. What about the future of our children? What about our kids? What kind of jobs and opportunities will we have in the future? How do we address the issue of collapsing values in our country? Those are the central challenges I think we face in our country today.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, my understanding, I say to my colleagues, is that I have 10 minutes in morning business. I will not exceed that. I will be very brief.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

NATIONAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE HOTLINE

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, for the past 2 weeks I have tried to come to the floor every day, whenever my colleagues would generously allow me a few minutes, to announce the realization of another component of our initiative to prevent violence against women, which the Senator from Utah has been a very, very strong leader in, the national domestic violence hotline. The hotline, which officially opened on February 24, signifies the realization of the key provision of the Violence Against Women Act, passed by the Congress as part of the 1994 crime bill.

The toll free number—I have tried to announce this on the floor over the last several weeks—is 1-800-799-SAFE. This will provide immediate crisis assistance and counseling and local shelter referrals to women across the country, 24 hours a day. There is also a TDD number for the hearing impaired, and that number is 1-800-787-3224.

Today, on the last day of the 2-week period in which I promised to highlight the hotline, I want to take the opportunity to stress how much work still has to be done to fight domestic abuse in our country. On Tuesday of this week, the chief prosecutor in Alexandria, VA, John Kloch, called for tougher strategies against domestic violence in response to a murder of a local schoolteacher, Karen Mitsoff, who was killed early Monday of this week by an ex-boyfriend who had been stalking her.

Miss Mitsoff's former boyfriend, Mr. Senet, reportedly broke into her apartment on March 10 and threatened to kill her and himself. Senet was charged with burglary and then released on a \$2,500 bond in a routine hearing.

This past Monday, 1 week after his arrest, he apparently broke into Miss Mitsoff's apartment and fatally shot her before killing himself. Commonwealth Attorney Kloch was quoted as saying:

This case shows that there are holes in the system. Somehow we failed to stop this. This case clearly illustrates that in many instances, potential threats to women are not addressed with enough urgency.

Let me explain just how urgent these threats to the safety of women and children are.

Every 12 seconds, a woman is beaten by a husband, boyfriend, or partner in the United States of America—every 12 seconds;

Over 4,000 women are killed every year by their abuser;

Every 6 minutes in our country, a woman is forcibly raped;

Severe repeated violence occurs in 1 out of every 14 marriages, with an average of 35 incidents before it is reported;

Roughly 1 million women are victims of domestic violence each year, and battering may be the most common cause of injury to women, more common than auto accidents, muggings, or rapes by a stranger.

According to the FBI, Mr. President, one out of every two women in America will be beaten at least once in the course of an intimate relationship. Let me repeat that. According to the FBI, one out of every two women in America will be beaten at least once in the course of an intimate relationship.

It is estimated that the new hotline, that we have shown and brought out to the floor of the Senate as often as we could over the last 2 weeks, will receive close to 10,000 calls a day.

The first day I came to the floor to talk about the hotline, I shared a story told to me by my wife, Sheila, while she was speaking in southern Minnesota 2 days before the hotline opened. I would like to tell the story again of a courageous woman in danger whose story illustrates how crucial the existence of a national domestic violence hotline will be in saving the lives of women and children in danger.

This woman had been living in New York with her abusive husband and a 5-month-old child. Her husband had moved to New York following their marriage, and he kept his wife and child very isolated there. The husband was very controlling and made it impossible for his wife to socialize, to make friends, or have a job. He checked on her all the time to make sure that she was at home with her baby.

In addition to beating her routinely and savagely, he took out a life insurance policy on her, so she lived in constant fear of being killed.

This woman told my wife, Sheila, that every time she opened the apartment door, she was sure someone would be on the other side with a shotgun.

Her husband had a one-time, out-of-town business deal. He left in the afternoon and planned on returning the following morning. After he left, she decided that it was her only chance to get away. Panicked and pressed for time, she called a local hotline number but found it was disconnected. She was devastated. She called the Legal Aid Society in New York City and was initially told that they could not help her.

Out of sheer desperation, she persisted with Legal Aid and was finally

given a local agency phone number. Calling the local agency, the woman informed them she wanted to return to Minnesota. They were able to access a computer and put her in touch with a battered woman's shelter in Minnesota in her hometown. She and her baby were on a plane the next morning before her husband got home.

Mr. President, this woman was lucky; she was able to obtain the information she needed. But how much better it would be if that hotline had been up and running to give her the information immediately. Unfortunately, some women might not have the whole day to track down information. I think this shows how crucial a national network, like the hotline, will be for keeping women and children safe, literally saving their lives.

So today, I ask everyone listening to honor the memory of Karen Mitsoff of Alexandria, VA, as well as all the other women who lose their lives every year at the hands of a husband or a boyfriend or a partner.

I also ask you to honor all of the women who have been hurt at the hands of someone with whom they have had an intimate relationship. Chances are you already know one of those women—a coworker, a sister, a mother, a daughter, or a friend.

I commend innovations like the national domestic violence hotline. I want to support more creative solutions to stopping this family violence. I want all of us to do that, Democrats and Republicans alike. But most important, today I want to remember Karen Mitsoff who lost her life on Monday, and remind everyone that these efforts to stop this violence in our homes must be ongoing.

Mr. President, once again, at the end of this 2-week period, I want to one more time talk about the hotline number. The toll free number of the national domestic violence hotline is 1-800-799-SAFE and 1-800-787-3224 for the hearing impaired.

Everyone has the right to be safe in their own home. Share the number today, those of you who are watching, and maybe you will help someone make themselves safe.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). Under the previous order, the Senator from Utah, Senator HATCH, is recognized to speak for up to 20 minutes.

JUDICIAL SELECTION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to address a subject that I have discussed several times in the past few weeks, and that is the issue of judicial selection. As I said in those speeches, differences in judicial philosophy can have real and profound consequences for the safety of Americans in their neighborhoods, homes, and workplaces. Sound judging is every bit as much a part of the Federal anticrime effort as FBI and DEA agents and prosecutors.