

that has hard time enacting laws. Under those circumstances, laws would change less often, less frequently disrupting peoples' lives, less often intruding into them. If you agree with Thoreau that the best government is that which governs least, then the most societally efficient government is the one with the most checks and balances.

The Republican majority may thus have served legislative efficiency at the expense of societal efficiency. Good or bad, the Senate has changed.

As Daschle warned on May 21, "What goes around comes around." Democrats will remember the lessons the Republicans have taught them of how to use the power of the majority.

So say "bye, bye" to this slice of American pie. This'll be the day that it dies. This'll be the way that it dies.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed in morning business, and that each Senator have 5 minutes to speak in morning business.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield the floor.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

THE PERPETRATORS OF HATE CRIMES

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I will speak in morning business in relation to the rash of hate crimes that we have experienced in this country lately.

Mr. President, the perpetrators of the rash of hate crimes and church burnings in this country are no more than cowardly domestic terrorists. They work under cover of darkness and anonymity to intimidate some and encourage others precisely because they have neither the will nor the courage to be associated with the evil they seek to unleash on the land. It has been suggested that the objective of their actions is to start a race war. However, there is every indication that the arsonists are confused about the country in which their crimes are taking place.

Most Americans, Mr. President, are appalled and outraged. Our Nation as a whole, without regard to color or religion, is shamed by this horror. The outpouring of support and comfort for the victims of the terrorism has been consistent and has been multiracial. The religious community has closed

ranks with the targets of the arson in rejection and repudiation of the evil these crimes represent. From the President of the United States to the neighbors in areas which have witnessed these crimes, the leadership taken by individual citizens to affirm a climate of respect and community gives truth to the fact that our Nation will not fall prey to the forces of fear.

Mr. President, I recently talked with the victim of a cross burning in my own State of Illinois, who lives in Glen Carbon, IL. I spoke with Mr. Ellis who had been victimized by a cross being burned on the front lawn of his home. And the comment that I was most struck with is that he said how nice his neighbors had been. This is an integrated community. His neighbors, black and white alike, have come to the aid of this family that has suffered this heinous crime.

Mr. President, America will not go back. As we enter the 21st century, America is anxious to put the ugly legacy of racial divisions behind us. Unlike a century ago, the masses of people who make up our national community cannot be seduced by the messages of hate and conflict which consumed us in the past. Those messages lost their power with the moral victory of the civil rights movement, and our country has matured in ways which cannot be undone by racist terrorism. We are not intimidated, but embarrassed, and challenged by these criminals and their destruction.

Make no mistake but that they are criminals. The act of arson is a crime, when directed at a church it is a crime of unspeakable dimension. But that is precisely why we are called upon, each of us, to speak and act in ways which will demonstrate our collective intolerance of such hate crimes. Our community, as a whole, must dedicate itself to the rebuilding of the churches. We must engage our Government and law enforcement apparatus to investigate and uncover the perpetrators of this terrorism. No stone should be left unturned in our search for the truth. Federal, State, and local law enforcement must approach these hate crimes with the same vigor and sophistication as would be given the most heinous foreign threat.

My late mother would often say, "The Lord works in mysterious ways, His wonders to perform." And she was right. The resurrection of the burnt places of worship may well provide the kind of redemption which can only come of suffering. We will move our Nation forward to the elimination of racism if we dedicate ourselves to restore the symbols of love and unity, and in so doing put to rest forever the forces of division based on race which these acts of terror seek to unleash.

Mr. President, this is one of those historic moments for America, when the path of our future will be chosen. In our collective repudiation of domestic terrorism, in our aggressive prosecution of its perpetrators, in our vigi-

lance against hate and in the vitality of our response to it, we will build the New Jerusalem of a stronger, more moral, and more inclusive country.

With that, Mr. President, I will send later to the desk a resolution which I hope will be cleared quickly for action by this body and which I hope and pray will receive the unanimous consent of my colleagues. Thank you very much, Mr. President. I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, the Senator from California is a very valuable member of the Budget Committee. We had saved some time for her. I request we move back to the budget resolution, and I yield up to 8 minutes to the Senator from California, or whatever time she needs.

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, thank you. I want to thank my leader on the Budget Committee, Senator EXON, who will be sorely missed when he retires. This is a man who has stood for a real balance in our Government, a balanced budget, and a balance in our priorities. I hope as America listens to him, and some of us who do not believe this budget is the right budget, I hope Americans will understand the fight over balancing the budget.

Mr. EXON. Will the Senator yield?

Mrs. BOXER. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. EXON. I appreciate your kind remarks, and I yield 5 hours to the Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, thank you so much.

As I was saying about the Senator from Nebraska, he has stood for real balance in the budget, both in terms of dollars in and dollars out, so that we do not add to a debt, but also a balance of needs. What is very interesting to me, in particular, Senator EXON, as the former chairman of the Budget Committee, and now as its ranking member, has always been one who has stood for the strongest possible defense that America must have. When I hear him stand up and talk about some of the excesses in that area, it means a lot to me.

What is interesting to me, when we had an opportunity to vote on budgets, we had three budgets. We had the Republican budget before the Senate today, coming back from the conference; we had the Democratic budget, which, basically, was President Clinton's budget; and we had the bipartisan

budget, which was put together by Republicans and Democrats in this U.S. Senate.

I had the privilege of voting for two budgets, the Democrat budget and the bipartisan budget. I did not vote for the Republican budget. Although many people's eyes glaze over when you talk about the budget, it is really a very simple document when you think about it. It is a statement of our priorities, and a statement, really, of what we think we ought to be doing as a nation, just as we and our families will determine every year what our priorities are, where we will spend our dollars. We do that here.

One would think that the cold war had not ended if you look at this budget. That is what is so terribly confusing to me, because we know we have to be lean in this budget. We know we are not doing as much for education as we would like. We are not doing as much to clean up the environment as we would like, at least most of us. We are certainly not doing enough health research as we would like.

Every dollar that we can find to make these investments is a dollar, I think, that is well spent when we make them. Yet, we have this Republican Senate and House throwing \$12 billion more at the Pentagon than they asked for in budget authority. That, to me, is nonsensical.

We need the strongest military in the world, and we have it, and we will always have it. We do not need to throw dollars that the generals and the admirals do not want. What is the point of it? It is wasting money, money that we need elsewhere, money that could even reduce the deficit further.

To me, it is not a close call as far as how I will vote. The Republican budget left the Senate, and I think the priorities were out of whack. Too many cuts in Medicare, too many cuts in Medicaid, too many cuts in education, too many cuts in the environment, and too much spending on the Pentagon—more than they asked for. It is something I hope that the American people will look at, because it is not pie-in-the-sky and it is not rhetoric. It is not politics. It is budgeting. It is hard dollars that will go to pay for what the American people need to have.

Mr. President, we do have an election coming up in November. Frankly, I think a lot of these issues will be issues in that election. I can think of no greater honor than to serve on the Budget Committee. When I was in the House, I spent 6 years there, and here in the U.S. Senate I am finishing the fourth. To me, it is one of the most important things that I do, because the hopes and dreams of American people, their aspirations, are really contained in that budget.

All you have to do is look at education, and see how the Republicans are slashing it, to understand that will translate into fewer scholarships for our young people to go to college, fewer slots that can be filled in Head

Start so our kids can get off to a good start on a level playing field, fewer ways to clean up Superfund sites. Frankly, in California, we have many that are languishing and are dangerous, with toxins seeping into water supplies, because we do not have enough resources there.

This is the greatest Nation in the world. We can do better.

The Democratic budget, the Clinton budget, the bipartisan budget, I think all of those are quite mainstream in their approach, compared to this budget that is before the Senate today. We do not have to hurt our seniors the way they will be hurt with this. We do not have to hurt our children the way they will be hurt with this.

Now we have a whole new idea. We will go back to star wars. We will build a full star wars. I think we ought to prepare, in case we have to. We should do all the research. I have always taken that position. But to get ready to deploy a star wars system—we will be facing that in the defense bill—it will cost us billions of dollars, billions of dollars, when we do not even know exactly what we need to do, and we are being told the threat is not defined yet. It just does not make sense.

I submit, Mr. President, if you went to a supermarket or shopping center in Tennessee, or I went to one in California, or my friend went to one in Nebraska, and you said to the person who was coming in to do his shopping: Out of these few things, which do you feel most threatened by, crime in the street and that you might get mugged or attacked, or somebody in your family getting breast cancer or prostate cancer, or a ballistic missile coming over and hitting you in your house? I honestly think that people would say we should have the strongest military in the world, but the threats that are facing me are absolutely that someone in my family would get such a dreadful disease or that, yes, someone could be a victim of a crime. Yet, you look at this budget and it has the opposite kind of priorities.

So I thank my friend from Nebraska for his leadership, his very down-to-earth Nebraska leadership. I will sorely miss it next year. I think he stands for mainstream America in his opposition to this budget.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this budget. It got worse when it went into conference. It has more of the NEWT GINGRICH approach to budgeting, and I frankly think we ought to vote "no."

I yield the floor at this time.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I want to briefly thank my dear friend and colleague from California. I said earlier that she is a valuable member of the Budget Committee, and her earlier training over on the House side has served her and us well. She is very consistent and tender, one who becomes involved in the details of the budget process. It has been a great pleasure for me to see this relatively new Senator

come in and take her place as a very influential member of the Budget Committee. I thank her for her kind remarks.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now move off of the budget temporarily and return to a period of morning business with Senators allowed to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

A NEW CHANCE FOR PEACE IN NORTHERN IRELAND

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I welcome the news that negotiations on Northern Ireland are back on course. Fractious though they might be, the talks involving the British and Irish Governments, as well as representatives of Northern Ireland's political parties, offer hope to all of us who long for a permanent peace in Northern Ireland.

The talks, which opened Monday, had hit a significant impasse over the role of our former colleague George Mitchell, who was chosen by the British and Irish Governments to chair the negotiating sessions. Due to the courage shown by all those involved, but particularly Prime Minister Major and Unionist leader David Trimble, the impasse has been resolved and a possible deadlock has been averted. The talks will proceed with Senator Mitchell at the helm.

I regret that there are still some Unionists, however, who object to Senator Mitchell's chairmanship, for the sole purpose, I suspect, of obstructing the peace process. Having served with George Mitchell for many years in the Senate, I can personally attest to his even-handed and judicious approach to the issues. Here in the Senate, he was admired by members of both parties for his ability to build bridges and cut across partisan lines. George Mitchell is quite frankly, one of the most fair-minded individuals with whom I have had the pleasure of working.

Senator Mitchell has already demonstrated great wisdom and balance with regard to the peace process in Northern Ireland. In January, Senator Mitchell issued an excellent report examining the link between the decommissioning of weapons and all-party talks. As head of the international body charged with studying this issue, Senator Mitchell drew upon his background as a judge. He did an excellent