



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 143

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1997

No. 17

Senate

The Senate met at 2:15 p.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, You have told us that the things we can see are temporary, but the things which are unseen are eternal. We confess that what is seen captivates our attention. It is easy to get lost in the labyrinth of life's enigmas. The media constantly remind us of violence and vandalism, crimes and conflicts, and the spin we put on sin. Sometimes, the things which are seen blur our vision of the unseen, but indefatigable movement of Your Spirit in people and circumstances. You call us to experience the things which are unseen: Your eternal presence, the power of love, the healing of forgiveness, and Your guidance of leaders who open their minds to You.

In the on-going drama of secular life with all its sinister and alarming possibilities, also help us to see what You are doing to change people and enable them to change government and our society. We are not asking for a simplistic, "God is in His heaven and all is right with the world" nostrum. Rather, we need an "All is not right with the world but lo I am with you always," cure for our deepest needs.

Now it dawns on us with full force; only Your invisible power can transform our intractable problems. We yield ourselves to be agents of Your visible impact on our Nation at this strategic time of history. In the name of our Lord and Savior. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, today the Senate will immediately resume con-

sideration of Senate Joint Resolution 1, the constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget. By unanimous consent, there will be 60 minutes remaining for debate on Senator WELLSTONE's amendment No. 3. Senators can expect a rollcall vote on or in relation to that Wellstone amendment at approximately 3:15 today, if all debate time is used.

Following that vote, it is my hope we will be able to begin consideration of the nomination of BILL RICHARDSON to be the U.N. Ambassador. The Foreign Relations Committee will be reporting out that nomination this afternoon, and we will attempt to reach an agreement limiting debate to approximately 20 minutes equally divided but we will, of course, wait until the committee has officially reported it and then bring it up as shortly thereafter as possible.

Following that vote, we will continue debate on the balanced budget amendment, and it is my understanding that Senator REID will be prepared to offer his amendment relative to Social Security. The amendment will be debated today and tomorrow, and we hope to set a vote on or in relation to the Reid amendment for tomorrow, late in the afternoon, probably around 5:30 or so. But we have to get a final agreement on the exact time. All Senators will be notified as the votes are scheduled.

I thank my colleagues for their cooperation as we approach the Presidents Day recess.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of Senate Joint

Resolution 1, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require a balanced budget.

The Senate resumed consideration of the joint resolution.

Pending:

Wellstone amendment No. 3, to state the policy of the United States that, in achieving a balanced budget, Federal outlays should not be reduced in a manner that disproportionately affects outlays for education, nutrition, and health programs for poor children.

AMENDMENT NO. 3

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 60 minutes for debate, to be equally divided in the usual form, prior to a vote on or in relation to the Wellstone amendment No. 3.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, yesterday I had a chance to speak for some time about this amendment and then Senator HATCH and I had a very honest exchange of views. Let me one more time just make clear to colleagues what this amendment says. This amendment says that if we are going to make a commitment by way of a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, then we go on record that the Federal outlays, as we do this, should not be reduced in a manner that disproportionately affects outlays for education, nutrition, and health programs for poor children.

Yesterday my colleague, Senator HATCH, said I was asking for an exemption. There is no request for an exemption. This is just simply a request for fairness, and it just simply says let us not lock ourselves into a very harsh set of priorities.

I also pointed out yesterday that in the last Congress, 93 percent of the cuts in entitlement programs were entitlement programs that affected poor

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S1203

people in America, too many of them poor children. I also cited the Committee on Economic Development, representing really some of the largest corporations in America, saying that what we did last time, last Congress, was really disproportionate and really not based on a standard of fairness, because we cut a lot of programs that were important to the nutrition and health care and educational status of children.

I also quoted from the Concord Coalition, which has been a driving force for our balancing the budget, taking the same position. I also quoted from an editorial yesterday in the Washington Post.

I think the most important thing that I did yesterday, though, Mr. President—and I would like to start this way today, and then develop these points, and then listen very respectfully to my colleague from Utah, and then respond to some of what he has to say—was to try to translate this debate into human terms. Yesterday, my colleague from Utah said, and I appreciated it, “You know, I don’t agree with Senator WELLSTONE but he is very sincere in his conviction.” And I appreciated that. That’s a tribute from another Senator.

But this is really not about me. This is an amendment that I think is substantive, I think it is important, and I wish there would be 100 votes for it. Because the fact of the matter is, all too often—and that was the record last Congress and I think it has been the record of too many Congresses—when we come down to the nitty-gritty, to the point where the rubber meets the road, we do deficit reduction based on the path of least political resistance. And usually, all too often, it is not the special interests or heavy hitters or well connected or big givers who are the ones that we target. And poor children have been, with the exception of some Senators, the Chair is one of them—you have shown a tremendous commitment to what we can do at a neighborhood level, at a community level, as has the Senator from Missouri, by way of commitment to children.

But all too often, poor children in America are faceless and voiceless in the U.S. Senate, and I just think that it is not at all inconsistent for Senators—even if they are for this amendment, to vote for the constitutional amendment to balance the budget—to at least vote for this proposition. As a matter of fact, we are going to make it clear we are going to do it on a standard of fairness, and we are not going to disproportionately make cuts in programs that so vitally affect the nutritional and the educational and the health care status of children.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield just for a second?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I will be pleased to yield on the time of the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized on his own time.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator indicated he would like 100 people to vote for his amendment. I will make a suggestion to the Senator, and that is, amend your amendment to put it in a sense-of-the-Senate resolution form, and I will work to get you 100 votes. But we are talking about amending the Constitution with language that really clutters up the Constitution with language that should not be in the balanced budget amendment.

If the Senator will do that, I will work to get him 100 votes in the Senate, because nobody wants to treat children or children’s programs disproportionately, but it is not constitutional language, and it should not be in the Constitution. I have to be opposed to it, and I hope most of our fellow Senators will be opposed to it. Nobody is opposed to children.

I think that would be a reasonable way of resolving this. Put it in a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, so it is not incorporated in the Constitution, as a sense-of-the-Congress resolution in the Congress. It just is not the way we should amend the Constitution of the United States.

As chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I cannot let that happen, but if the Senator will change and do that, I would be happy to go to a vote, and I would work my side of the floor to get 100 people to vote to say we do not want children’s programs to be treated disproportionately.

I hope the Senator will consider this kind offer. It is a sincere offer. I share his viewpoint with regard to children. I think virtually everybody in here does. The fact of the matter is, though, that all items have to be on the budget if we are going to have any kind of a balanced budget amendment work. I know the Senator is not going to vote for a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution no matter what we put into it. Even if we accepted his amendment as part of the balanced budget amendment, he would not vote for it.

That way, you are sending a message. That way, you would have your colleagues voting with you. Otherwise, I think people who love and revere the Constitution have to say this is not the way you amend the Constitution; we should not put this language into a constitutional amendment because it is not constitutional.

Frankly, I suggest to my distinguished colleague, I would like to help him do that if he wants to do that. If he doesn’t, then I have to oppose this amendment, and I hope most Senators will oppose the amendment, because this type of language should not go into the Constitution, because although it is meaningful language, it is not constitutional language, and it will not guarantee the children’s programs are going to be treated any differently than anything else under a balanced budget amendment.

I retain the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Utah. Actually, the language of this amendment is constitutional. It is designed that way. If there is going to be a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, I say to my good friend from Utah—and he has taken the leadership on this, he absolutely believes in it—if that is the direction we go in, then it is quite appropriate for me to have an amendment to this amendment to make sure that we do not lock ourselves into some very harsh and distorted priorities.

I tried the route of a sense of the Senate last Congress, and actually I lost a couple of times on a sense of the Senate that we would not take any action to create more hunger, malnutrition, and poverty among children. Finally, it was adopted on a voice vote. I wish there had been a recorded vote. Then I think we went ahead and, in fact, passed some legislation or provisions of some legislation that is going to create that.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator will yield.

Mr. WELLSTONE. If I could just finish. I think this time around, given the track record of the last Congress and given the fact that the citizens that I am trying to represent today—poor children—do not seem to have much of a presence here, quite frankly, I do not think a sense-of-the-Senate amendment does the job.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator will yield.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I will be pleased to yield on the Senator’s time.

Mr. HATCH. On my time. I have to say that you did get a voice vote last time, not a recorded vote. I am offering you a recorded vote. I happen to believe sense-of-the-Senate resolutions mean a lot. But I certainly could not accept this language as part of a balanced budget constitutional amendment. If for no other reason, what does the term “disproportionate” mean? Which programs have to be preferred above others?

There are a thousand programs we are talking about here. I know, because I worked with most all of them when I was ranking member and chairman of the Labor and Human Resources Committee, on which the Senator from Minnesota now sits.

I will get you the votes. I will work my side to try to get 100 of these people to vote for it. I happen to believe when Senators in this body vote for a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, it means something, especially if you get 100 percent. I cannot guarantee it, but I would work to get 100 percent. It would be adopted, because I think virtually everybody here would like to have children’s programs treated fairly.

The distinguished Senator makes a tremendous point. We treat seniors very well. They get about 20 times the help from the Federal Government that individual children get, and we are not

doing what we should do for children in our country. There are a lot of children in poverty who are in serious straits who do not have the health care that they need.

On the other hand, the question is, how do we best solve that problem? I do not think you single it out, because once you do that in this amendment, there must be a thousand other things that do not want to be treated disproportionately.

Frankly, it just makes the amendment a nullity. I would be happy to work for a significant up-or-down vote for the Senator, no motion to table, up-or-down vote if he would make it a sense-of-the-Senate resolution that does not go into this constitutional amendment.

I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair and, again, I thank my colleague. I appreciate his kind words. I know he is very sincere in the offer. Again, what happened last time was we went ahead and adopted an amendment saying we would not take any action to create more malnutrition, hunger, or poverty among children, and then we went ahead and did budget cuts that, in fact, disproportionately affected poor people in America, many of them children.

Mr. President, I really do view this amendment as a litmus test. I think I do want to draw a line in the sand here. If Senators put children first, and Senators believe we ought to invest in the health and skills and intellect and character of our children, and Senators understand—and they do—that what happens before kindergarten is so important, then I do not know why in the world we cannot make a commitment that when it comes to programs like Head Start and WIC and health care programs that affect poor children in America, that we at least make a commitment that we not disproportionately cut those programs.

As to which programs, listen, with a lot of what is in this amendment, we are going to be writing implementing language, that is all going to be made specific. So I just do not think that critique really does any damage to this amendment. I would like to speak, again, about what is at stake.

Yesterday, I read from some examples, just some stories of some families as we kind of reach out and talk to people around the country, not just Minnesota. Marlene is a lot like many women. She went from her parent's home to her husband's. With the exception of a waitressing job in high school, she never had worked outside the home, and had no job skills. After 9 years of marriage, Marlene's husband left her with two children and pregnant with a third.

At 27, she found herself alone with no job skills or means of support. With the help of a neighbor, she enrolled in her local WIC Program. "I knew about nu-

trition, child care and how to take care of myself. I just didn't have the money to. I knew that I needed to have a healthy baby. I just did not know how to get it."

WIC provided Marlene with vouchers to purchase the basics for a healthy baby—milk, cheese, eggs, et cetera.

To this day, I believe that the food from WIC saved me and my baby. Emotionally, I was so distraught and inept, I didn't know if I was coming or going. Thankfully for WIC, for that part of my life, I could just go on auto pilot. I knew that I was taking care of my baby. I could go on with taking care of the rest of the issues I was facing.

It has been 10 years since Marlene received help from WIC. Now she works full time and supports her children. She says,

WIC was crucial for me. WIC was like a bridge to help me go from being dependent on someone to learning how to take care of myself and my kids. It's like they took care of me so I could take care of the rest of my life. I cringe to think of how things would have been without it.

Mr. President, Danielle is 8 years old. She looks closer to 6. Though a spirited and cheerful little girl, Danielle struggles in life. She was born at a low birth weight and has endured its effects. She will for a long time.

As with many children born at a low birth weight, she has a limited immunity system and she catches a lot of colds and flus. She misses a lot of school. Like many children born at low birth weight, it takes Danielle a bit longer to figure things out in school. Says her teacher, "I see her little brain trying to figure things out. She works hard and struggles. She's always a few steps behind us." While pregnant with Danielle, her mother had no prenatal care or guidance.

Every 2 minutes a baby is born to a woman, a mother who had no prenatal care in our country. Her diet of chips, fast food, soda, and candy did not change during the 8½ months of pregnancy. Danielle's mother did not participate in the Women, Infants, and Children Program.

At 5, Danielle's sister Alfrieda is healthy and active. While pregnant with Alfrieda, her mother participated in WIC. She had a healthy diet, check-ups, and guidance. When she gave birth, she then gave birth to a fit and strong baby. She named her after the WIC nurse who mentored her.

Says their mother:

I see how Danielle is not all there * * * how she's slow and kind of sick. They tell me it is 'cause of how it was when I was pregnant. I think they are right 'cause I really see a difference with my baby, Alfrieda. You would not know that Danielle is older.

In one family, in the case of two sisters, we see the impact and influence that WIC has. Danielle will always be a little behind, a little slow, and a little weak. Alfrieda will always be a bit smarter than her older sister, a bit ahead of her older sister, and a bit stronger than her older sister. One small family and one big difference.

Mr. President, I said this yesterday, the medical evidence is irrefutable and

irreducible that the most important educational program for our country is to make sure that every woman expecting a child has a diet rich in vitamins, minerals, and protein; otherwise, that child at birth may not have the same chance as all of our children and grandchildren have. And that is wrong. The goodness of our country is for every child to have that chance.

Mr. President, we do not even fully fund the Women, Infants, and Children Program right now, a program for women during pregnancy, a program for infants, and a program for small children who, by definition, do not have enough income to be able to purchase the food to have an adequate diet.

We know the WIC Program has made an enormous difference. It saves us dollars. It enables children to have a head start. It enables children to go on and do well in school. We know all of that. The only thing this amendment says is, let us make a commitment if we are going to balance this budget that in this constitutional amendment to balance the budget we make a commitment we will not, as we move forward, disproportionately cut programs that affect the nutritional status of children. That is what this amendment is all about.

It is not a sense-of-the-Senate amendment. I do want to draw a line on this. I believe I should be able to get a strong vote for this. I do not think it should be tabled. This is all about, as we go forward with deficit reduction, who is going to decide and who is going to benefit, and who is going to be asked to sacrifice.

Are we going to decide, as we did last Congress, that we are going to disproportionately cut programs that affect the quality of life for children, poor children in America? Who will decide to cut the nutrition programs and whose children will be hurt? They will not be our children, but they are all of God's children. I think we all agree on that.

So I am really hopeful that I will get support for this amendment. This is about values. We talk about values. This is about values. This is about Minnesota values.

If you asked people, are they in favor of a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, they say yes. I have been in disagreement. I wish we would separate the capital investment part of the budget from on operating budget. I worry about it on political economic grounds. But forgetting that, most people say yes. But if you ask people, are you in favor of balancing the budget by making cuts in educational programs or nutritional programs or health care programs that affect children, they say no. So I am hoping that this will not be tabled and that Senators will vote for it.

Arel is only 14 years old but has the responsibility of someone much older. He has two sisters. Even though they are at the right age and eligible for

Head Start, they do not participate because the program near their home is full. I forget—I do not have the numbers right before me—but something like only 17 percent of the eligible 3-year-olds are participating and only 40 percent of the eligible 4-year-olds are participating. Really, we should work Head Start back, Mr. President, to age 1 and 2 as well.

By the way, it should be decentralized. This is a parent-participation program. It should happen at the local level. It should happen at the neighborhood level. It can be done through nonprofits and it can be done through non-governmental organizations. But when we know something works, when we know these kinds of programs give children a head start, why can't we make a commitment that we will not disproportionately cut these programs? Because if we do not make that commitment, I really fear that is what is going to happen.

While we know how no Head Start will affect Arel's sisters, do we know how it is going to affect Arel? Their mother leaves for work as a bus driver at 4 a.m. She is working. This means Arel is responsible for the morning ritual with his sisters. After he gets them fed and dressed, Arel puts one sister on the handlebars of his bike and rides 5 miles to drop her off at affordable day care. He returns home and gets his second sister to drop her off. Since he cannot drop them off early, he is late for school every day.

Because of tardiness, he failed his first-period class twice. Though a talented athlete and a popular kid, Arel does not stay after school for any activities. He would probably make the football team. He is interested in track. He would love to be in a dance troupe. Instead, Arel gets on his bike, rain or shine, to pick up his sisters one at a time. I will not reveal to you what no Head Start means for his sisters. We know that. Unfortunately, so does their brother, a boy who has no childhood.

Finally, Mr. President, Marcus is a shy and quiet first-grader who finds himself in the principal's office for the third time in a week. I gave this example yesterday. According to his teacher, Marcus is either overagitated, annoying other students in class, or listless and disinterested in the class at hand. Marcus does not usually know what is happening in class and he does not know yet his colors, numbers, or alphabet.

Though many of his class attends a Head Start program and learns the initial steps toward understanding school and learning, Marcus does not. He represents 1 of the 1.2 million children that, though eligible, could not participate in Head Start when he was younger. The program near his home was full. Not only were they full, but there was a year waiting list when Marcus's grandmother tried to sign him up. Though there was room at another program, it was too far for his grandmother to take him.

Marcus stayed alone sometimes at home while his grandmother worked. Marcus is conspicuously behind his classmates. While his classmates scurry around the teacher to be read to, he had not yet held a book or ever been read to. While his classmates—I am going to repeat this—while his classmates scurry around the teacher to be read to, he has not yet held a book or ever been read to.

Marcus does not know how to write his name, nor can he recite the alphabet. In a phrase, Marcus is not part of the culture of the school. Marcus' teacher is concerned and anxious about him. He is far behind his classmates, and she has little, if any, time to help him catch up. As each week progresses, he falls further behind and more frustrated.

Already Marcus hates school and learning, counting the days until summer vacation. He knows he is different. He knows he does not understand. But he also knows there is not much he can do about it.

Said his teacher: "I just don't know what can be done for him. I know that he needs a lot of one-on-one attention and love, but I just don't have the time or the resources. Every day, I feel him slipping and, frankly, it breaks my heart. He is a good boy and a smart boy. I feel as if he is being punished for what we did not do for him. I am worried that he will always hate school and suffer until he can leave. He tries so hard, sometimes," says his teacher, "I want to cry."

Mr. President, I do not want Senators to make this amendment out to be what it is not. There is an amendment on the floor. It is a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. This amendment says, as a part of that constitutional amendment to balance the budget—if that is what we are going to do—we make a commitment that we are not going to disproportionately cut programs that affect the educational and nutrition and health care status of children. It is that simple.

This is about values. This is about fairness. I think we should make that commitment. I think we should make that commitment.

Mr. President, we can no longer give speeches about children and no longer have photo opportunities with children unless we are willing—unless we are willing—to invest in the health and skills and intellect and character of our children. Mr. President, that includes poor children, and that means we are part of local communities, but we are part of a national community. The U.S. Senate ought to go on record that these are our priorities. These poor children are a part of our priorities. That is appropriate, and it is the right thing to do.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has 8 minutes, 25 seconds.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague from Minnesota. I believe he is devoted to children. But he is not alone. There are 99 others in this body who are devoted to children. Frankly, children's programs can compete very successfully with other programs, just like Social Security can. To do a risky gimmick of putting this type of language into the Constitution, like those who want to take Social Security out of the Constitution, the purview of the balanced budget, I think would be highly risky and very, very dangerous.

I was talking with the junior Senator from Wyoming, Senator ENZI. He indicated to me, he said, you know, if you use the language "not disproportionate," which is what this language is, it can force proportionate reductions in all parts of the budget in order to comply with this amendment, because this would be an amendment to this amendment to the Constitution. The worst budgeting for kids could come from across-the-board budget cuts. That is how the courts could easily interpret the amendment. Mr. President, for the information of every Senator, I have offered to give the Senator an up-or-down vote on a true sense-of-the-Senate resolution saying the same thing which he did not get last year and which I will get him today, and I have offered to try to get him 100 percent of the Senators to vote for this so we would be on record as not wanting to have children's programs reduced disproportionately.

However, to put this into the Constitution is the wrong thing to do. This is not language that you would normally see in the Constitution. The Wellstone amendment is not an appropriate amendment for inclusion in the Constitution. I want to point out to my colleagues that the Wellstone amendment would place in the text of the Constitution itself a statement of "policy." I put policy in quotes because I think there is a lot of room to disagree with the Senator. It would put a statement of policy of the United States with regard to the budget priorities into the Constitution, the first time in history to do that. Mr. President, I do not believe that it is appropriate to put what is essentially a sense-of-the-Senate resolution in the actual text of the Constitution. That is why I am suggesting that our colleagues vote against this amendment because that is not what should be done. I believe that such a policy statement would either be surplusage or produce confusion and difficulties if it became part of the Constitution.

Now, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota sincerely said we are not locking ourselves into a harsh set of priorities if we take this amendment. I think you are. Let me paraphrase that better. He said if we take the amendment as it is we are locking ourselves into a harsh set of priorities. I think it makes it more harsh if you put his

amendment in because, first of all, nobody knows what the word disproportionate means vis-a-vis constitutional language or interpretation; and, second, you are referring one item in the budget for one group of people in the Constitution over everybody else and there are a lot of people in this country who would like to not be treated in a disproportionate way. So we are not locking ourselves into a harsh set of priorities by having this balanced budget amendment passed. We are simply saying everything in the unified budget must be on the table. These programs for children are totally capable of competing with all other programs in the budget, as they should be. The fact is we have to have everything on the table because we are going to hit some very, very difficult times in the future and it will be difficult to know what to do to balance this budget.

As we begin today's debate on Senate Joint Resolution 1, I do welcome the discussion of this amendment, because after all what this debate and the balanced budget amendment are all about is the legacy we intend to pass on to our children and our children's children. Unfortunately, as it stands today, the legacy is not one of health and prosperity, as has been the American tradition for the past two centuries; rather, the legacy we are imposing on our children is one of fiscal servitude. The debt, Mr. President, is a real threat to our children's future and to their well-being.

As I emphasized before, with our national debt standing at \$5.3 trillion and going to \$5.4 trillion, every child born today is born into this world trapped into a \$20,000 debt. This new baby owes \$20,000—\$20,000. Think about that for a minute. In essence, what we are doing is handing every child who comes into the world an unsolicited and undeserved \$20,000 liability. Unfortunately for our children, they are given nothing to show for that liability.

Every one of the 28 years represented by these unbalanced budgets, every one of those 28 years these unbalanced budgets in this pile, in all but one of the last 36 years what we have done is finance our own exorbitant spending habits by mortgaging our children's future. In my view, this is taxation without representation in its purest form. What is worse, unlike you or me who may take out a loan to buy a house or a car and begin to pay that loan off, not only do we not pay down any of our children's debt, we continue to refinance and finance again our children's mortgages, adding more and more debt to pay for our own protracted fiscal irresponsibility.

Let me illustrate this point, Mr. President. According to the Congressional Budget Office, by the time a child born today is 5 years old, the national debt would have risen to \$6.8 trillion and his or her share of that debt will have increased from \$20,000 to \$24,000. By age 10, that debt will stand at \$8.5 trillion, with that child should-

dering approximately \$29,000 of that burden. Just think about it. That is nearly a 50-percent increase of his or her debt burden in just 10 years. At that rate, by the time a child graduated from college, he or she would owe in the neighborhood of \$50,000 as their share of the Nation's debt. Now that, in my view, is no way to send a young man or young woman into the world to make a living. As sincere as my good friend from Minnesota is, the fact is even if we accepted this amendment he would not vote for the balanced budget amendment, which is the only hope of helping these young children in the future, the only hope of stopping us from spending their future away and saddling them with an irresponsible debt burden.

Now our former colleague, Senator Simon, who led the fight for a balanced budget amendment on the Democrat side for many years, shared with us the words of another of our former colleagues, Senator Cohen, now Secretary of Defense, when he testified before the Judiciary Committee a few weeks ago. Senator Cohen was at one time opposed to a balanced budget amendment. And I remember those days because I have been responsible for bringing every balanced budget amendment to the floor of the U.S. Senate from the first one right on up until today. After serving in Congress for 18 years, Senator Cohen had this to say, and he was against it initially, but after 18 years, this is what he said:

Today the ethic of self-sacrifice has been perversely inverted. Parents and grandparents borrow from their heirs so they might enjoy the comforts and pleasures of the moment. The practice of handing our children trillions of dollars of debt with little more than a good luck wish can only be considered an unconscionable and criminal act.

Secretary Cohen is exactly right.

As I have repeatedly said, the mortgaging of our children's future is nothing short of fiscal child abuse and it must end.

As a result of our failure to exhibit fiscal restraints in setting budget priorities our children are faced with not only the looming burden of our enormous debt but also with massive annual interest payments required just to maintain the standard. This year we will pay \$360 billion in gross interest to service our existing debt. That means we will spend nearly \$1 billion every day of this year just on interest on the debt. Now to put this in perspective, if we take just the net interest, meaning we ignore interest paid by the Government to the various trust funds and subtract interest income received by the Government, our annual interest payment would amount to \$935 for every man, woman, and child in America. Just look at this. Interest on the national debt, we could pay \$340 to every man, woman, and child in Utah every day. Think about it. That is in my own State, and the interest on the debt is the fastest growing item in the Federal budget.

According to the CBO, interest on the debt will continue to rise substantially over the next 5 years, to \$412 billion by the year 2002. My gosh, that is more than the total Federal budget was 20 years ago. That represents half of all projected individual income tax receipts for that year and nearly two times all corporate income taxes. By 2007, the interest on the debt is projected to reach a whopping \$493 billion. That is just the interest we owe. That is not the debt. That \$493 billion is just \$50 billion shy of our entire discretionary budget for the current fiscal year.

Mr. President, it is outrageous to me that we would consider subjecting our children to a future where 50 percent of their hard-earned tax dollars would go to service the debt incurred by us, their parents. Just think what we could do for our children and our children's children if this money were available to be put to more productive use.

We have talked a lot about the WIC Program, Women, Infants, and Children Program. I know a lot about that. As a newly elected conservative, one of my counties said they did not want WIC funds because they did not want Federal Government strings. I thought WIC funds were pretty important because they helped lactating mothers to be able to bring the best nutritional needs to their children, and even though this was a county that really supported me I stood up and said I think the WIC Program is a good program. Today, that county and the mothers that are poor benefit from that WIC Program. It is a highly effective program and works to improve the health of the mothers and the newborn children, and also serves to reduce our Nation's overall health care costs. I have long supported the WIC Program, as has just about every Senator. We are constantly struggling to come up with the money to fully fund participation in the WIC Program. With the \$360 billion we spend on interest on the debt this year not only could we fully fund participation in the WIC Program, we could afford to pay recipients nearly 100 times what they received last year.

I could go through every program affecting children in our country today and we can talk about not allowing them to be disproportionately reduced. The best way to not allow children's programs to go down the drain is to pass the balanced budget amendment and put some fiscal responsibility into the Constitution, so we have to live within our means and we do not barter away our children's future, we do not mortgage it away, so we have the money to be able to help children. These gimmicks that some on the other side want to put into the Constitution are dangerous. In the end, they will wind up hurting children and not balancing the budget. The best thing we can do for our country is to get that budget balanced and keep it balanced and start paring down the national debt, as well. If we do not start

doing that, we are going to pay the price and it will be a heavy, heavy price.

Mr. President, I am very concerned about this because if we are going to have a balanced budget amendment everybody in the world knows and everybody in Congress knows this is it. This is the last chance. This has been developed over 20 years. It is a balanced budget amendment that has been developed by Democrats and Republicans. I do not believe any single person can say they wrote it. It is an attempt by all of us to get together and do what is right. It is supported by an overwhelming majority in this body. Sixty-eight people have guaranteed to their constituents they will vote for it. We need 67. We should have one more than 67 if everybody lives up to their word. Frankly, if we pass this balanced budget amendment, it has a very excellent chance of going through the House.

Head Start is another program we have heard a lot about. I strongly support the Head Start Program. As chairman and ranking member of the Labor Committee, I was deeply involved in fighting to provide increased authorizations for Head Start, and I am proud of the fact that since I first came to the Senate, the number of children served by federally funded Head Start programs has more than doubled. And yet, given the budget constraints we face, we are still working toward the goal of fully funding the Head Start Program—a result I believe every one of my colleagues favors.

If we could recoup just a small portion of the money we will pay in interest on the debt this year, we could fully fund Head Start in a heartbeat. Not only could we fully fund the entire Head Start Program, including the new Head Start Program for infants and toddlers that was established in 1994, with this year's interest expenditures we could increase Head Start funding for every one of those children by more than 10 times what we currently spend.

There are plenty of other important programs we could improve if we were to free up the resources currently dedicated to servicing the debt. In fact, with the money we will spend in gross interest on the debt just this year, we could cover the costs of all food and nutrition assistance programs, including food stamps, for the last 14 years—\$346.9 billion. This same interest payment would cover the costs of all payments for WIC and other supplemental feeding programs, child nutrition and milk programs, student assistance, and low income home energy assistance for the last 20 years—\$348.2 billion.

Even in the current fiscal year, as this chart shows, with the money we will spend on gross interest payments, we could afford to double projected spending for elementary, secondary, and vocational education, higher education, research and general education aids, training and employment, housing assistance, food and nutrition assistance, social services, unemploy-

ment compensation, all health care services, and pollution control and abatement—and still increase Medicare spending by 50 percent.

Now obviously we cannot simply pay off \$5.3 trillion of debt and recoup our \$360 billion in annual gross interest payments overnight. But, according to CBO, moving toward a balanced budget in 2002 would reduce projected net interest costs by some \$46 billion and improve economic performance enough to produce a total fiscal dividend of \$77 billion over the next 5 years. This represents real savings of nearly twice the amount we spent on all food and nutrition assistance programs last year, and is nearly 10 times all earned income tax credit payments for the past 10 years combined. This is real savings we can bring about to benefit our children now just by balancing the budget.

But, if we continue to deficit spend, as we have in all but 8 of the last 66 years, we will only continue to compound our existing debt, increasing the interest payments necessary to service that debt and further exacerbating the tax burdens our children will face in future years. According to OMB and CBO, such tax burdens may equate to a lifetime net tax rate of about 82 percent for future generations in order to finance the cost of government at all levels. The 82 percent figure for our children stands in stark contrast to the 29 percent net tax rate for the generation of Americans born in the 1920's and the 34.4 percent net tax rate for the generation born in the 1960's.

But the mammoth costs of financing both the Government and our enormous national debt are not the only burdens we are creating for our children by not balancing the budget. We should also recognize the significant economic benefits that our children stand to inherit from recurring balanced budgets, but which we are withholding from future generations by failing to exercise fiscal restraint today.

As CBO reaffirms in its January report, balancing the budget in 2002 and subsequent years will lead to increased real economic growth, reduced interest rates, higher corporate profits, and increased revenues to the Federal Government. As a result, the Joint Economic Committee has estimated that a typical middle class family could easily save \$1,500 each year; \$1,500 every single year, Mr. President. That is like a built-in \$500-per-child tax credit for a family of five—at no cost to the Government—just for passing the balanced budget amendment. I know a lot of families in Utah that could use an extra \$1,500 each year to pay for food or clothing for their children, to pay for college tuition, to pay down credit card debts, or even to take a vacation and spend time with their kids.

Even a college student could save an estimated \$120 each year on a \$10,000 student loan if we were to pass the balanced budget amendment. And it is not the Government that must pay for that

savings. It is simply the real benefit generated by the economy's reaction to long-term balanced budgets.

Mr. President, it is time for us to face reality. The single largest threat to our children's well-being is not that the Republicans and Democrats will be forced to live within their means when funding any given program. The real threat is that we will continue down the path of the last 66 years and mortgage our children's future earnings to pay for what we consider to be spending priorities today. If we do, our children will be left with no choice but to cut the very programs my colleague is talking about in ways that are unthinkable today, or drastically increase taxes on every American family to pay for the continued existence of those important programs. The balanced budget amendment is the only real assurance we have that our children will not be forced to make those choices.

Now Mr. President, it doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out the solution to this problem. In fact, Grant Anderson, a 13-year-old young man in my home State of Utah, took the time to write a letter to me outlining how it can be done. Let me share with my colleagues what he had to say:

Dear Orrin Hatch, I think we have a huge problem with the national budget. I have the easiest way to fix it. Do you want to hear it? Okay. Stop buying things if you don't have the money.

That about says it all, Mr. President. It's just that simple. Yet, without a balanced budget amendment, there appears to be no real end in sight to Congress' abdication of its responsibility to people like Grant Anderson and to future generations.

The fact is that after 4 years of declining deficits we have not reduced our staggering \$5.3 trillion debt one penny. We have only slowed the growth in the national debt. More importantly, as my Republican colleagues and I predicted would happen during the debate on the President's 1993 budget package, CBO now predicts that annual deficits will resume their upward climb beginning this year—from an annual deficit of \$124 billion in 1997, to \$188 billion in 2002, and reaching a near-record \$278 billion in 2007. Even OMB's estimates from the President's newly proposed budget, which predict lower deficit totals than CBO, project that gross Federal debt will top \$6.6 trillion, exceeding 66 percent of our gross domestic product, by 2002.

Now I know that there are those who will say that we can solve this problem without the constraints of a balanced budget amendment—that Congress and the President are committed to balancing the budget and to putting an end to the era of deficit spending. While I can only pray that they are right, our history of deficit reduction efforts in Congress should give the American people reason to be skeptical.

Since 1978 we have adopted no fewer than five statutory regimes which promised to bring about balanced budgets. Every single one of them has failed. As this chart shows, time after time statutory fixes have been met with increased deficits. In fact, nearly 85 percent of our current national debt has accumulated while Congress has operated within statutory budget frameworks designed to ensure balanced budgets. Now, we are told, things are different. But will they really be all that different without the discipline of a constitutional amendment?

A quick look at the President's budget shows that under his plan, we will continue to have deficits that are higher than last year's budget deficit until the year 2000. Only in the last 2 years of this budget do we see the dramatic cuts necessary to bring us into balance. That's right, Mr. President, a full 75 percent of the deficit reduction planned in President Clinton's recent budget submission comes in the 2 years after President Clinton leaves office. This is reminiscent to me of the 1985 Gramm-Rudman-Hollings law, wherein we committed ourselves to balancing the budget by 1991, only to see the law slowly amended, circumvented, and the requirement for a balanced budget finally eliminated just 1 year prior to the year in which we were to achieve balance under the original law.

While I commend the President for his avowed commitment to balancing the budget and appreciate the dedication expressed by leaders of both political parties to reaching a balanced budget, I seriously doubt whether, without the weight of a constitutional requirement to balance the budget, we will achieve balance by 2002. Even if we did—and I intend to work to that end—there is nothing to prevent future Congresses from yielding to the political pressures that would lead to renewed deficit spending. We need a constitutional amendment if we are truly committed to solving this problem.

Mr. President, passing the balanced budget amendment, free of exemptions and loopholes that can be exploited by those who might not be fully dedicated to balancing the budget, is the most important thing we can do in this Congress to protect our children and the future generations that will follow. I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort by supporting the balanced budget amendment. If that happens, we will protect children like never before. To me that is worth it all. And in the end it will accomplish what the distinguished Senator from Minnesota would like to do. But if we put amendments like this in everybody and their dog will be in here with some sort of a program they want to protect because they think it is the most important program in the world. No. Let us put everything in the budget on budget. Let us have everything subject to the balanced budget amendment and let us have them compete for the available funds as it should be. Then let us make

the right priority choices. And I guarantee my friend from Minnesota that ORRIN HATCH will be there with him trying to help the children of this country so that they don't suffer a disproportionate reduction in their programs. And I do not think they will as long as both he and I are here, and others as well.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, when Senators vote on this they should not confuse two different issues. There is not anybody on the floor of the Senate that I know of who is opposed to balancing the budget. There are Senators who oppose this amendment.

My colleague keeps talking about balancing the budget or passing the constitutional amendment to balance the budget is the best thing that we can do for our children. My amendment speaks to the concerns and circumstances of the lives of poor children. Close to one out of every four children in America is poor. One out of every two children of color is poor. Every 30 seconds a child is born into poverty in our country. Every 2 minutes a child is born to a mother who has had no prenatal care. Every 12 or 13 seconds a child drops out of school, many of them children from poor families. And there is a higher correlation between high school dropout and winding up in prison than there is between cigarette smoking and lung cancer.

Mr. President, all too many of our children are rushing into the arms of the police and not into parents' arms, or teachers' arms.

My colleague used the word "gimmick." This is no gimmick. This is a very serious amendment because for these children they don't have any future. How can you argue that a child who is born severely underweight and damaged and who can't do well in school is going to benefit by deficit reduction and balancing the budget 7 years from now? What about that child right now? How can you argue that the 50 percent of children or the 60 percent of children who could be given a head start but come to school without a head start not ready to learn are going to do well, if we do not make a commitment that we are going to invest in them? Balancing the budget 7 years from now does not help those children right now.

There are 10 million children who have no health care coverage, most of them from working poor families, many of them with ear infections who have lost hearing; too many. Many can't read well because they should have had an eye examination. They can't afford it. Many of them should have dental care, and they come to school with an infected tooth and abscess. They can't learn well. It is difficult for children who are in pain and discomfort to learn well.

If we do not make a commitment that in balancing this budget we will not balance this budget on the backs of those children and we proceed to do what we did in the last Congress, which is disproportionately cut programs that affect poor people and poor children in America, they don't have any future. What good does it do those children if we are going to balance the budget 6 years from now if we are going to savage them right now?

This is all about values. And if my colleague means or is sincere—and he always is. I guess it is just an honest difference that we have—that surely we are not going to make these cuts, that is what we have done in the past because these children don't hire the lobbyists. They don't march on Washington every day, and one more time they are not the big givers. Maybe there is a connection with all that we are reading about money and politics.

Mr. President, I ask all of my colleagues whether you are against this constitutional amendment to balance the budget or whether you are for it to vote for this amendment. It is all about fairness. We ought to go on record. We ought to make it clear that in our effort to balance the budget with a constitutional amendment—or the way I prefer to do it, not a constitutional amendment—that we go on record that we will not do what we have all too often done in the past—unfortunately, the evidence is clear—that we will not disproportionately cut the programs that benefit and affect the health and the nutrition and education of children.

What is the definition? Just pick out the percentage of low-income programs that are part of the entitlement programs. Pick out the low-income programs for children that are part of the discretionary spending. Pick out the percentage, and in our overall cuts, don't cut them any higher. It is simple. It does not take a rocket scientist to figure it out. Let us not weave and dodge on this question.

I hope that I can get a strong vote. It is a difficult debate because the Senator from Utah is one of the Senators whom I like the most and whom I respect the most. It is an honest disagreement.

But I hope Senators will vote for this. It is the right thing to do. This does not say we are not going to balance the budget. This does not say we should not do what the Senator from Utah believes we should do. It just says that if we are going to lock ourselves into a constitutional amendment, or, if we do not do that, we are still going to make the commitment to balance the budget, that we will not balance the budget on the backs of poor children; that we will invest in the skills, health, and character of children in America, including poor children. These are all God's children. I am telling you something, and I could argue this for 24 straight hours, the history

of the way we have done deficit reduction is that they come out on the short end of the stick.

This amendment I think is the right thing to do. It puts us on record and it makes it clear that we are going to balance this budget based upon the Minnesota standard of fairness.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. President, I yield the rest of my time.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I will not take long.

I know my colleague is sincere. I know he is a very good person and that he feels very deeply about children. And I have a great regard for him. He knows that. Children have the love in this town. One of the most effective lobbyists in this town is Marian Wright Edelman. I know. She and I worked hard to get the child care bill through. That has helped millions of children all over this country.

I do not take a second seat to anybody with regard to taking care of children. In fact, Elaine and I have six. We are expecting our 16th and 17th grandchild within 2 weeks. I want them to have a future. I want them to have the care. I want there to be some money to help them. I want our country to be solvent. I do not want their futures bartered away and mortgaged away. The reason child care programs are being cut every year is because we are spending it all on interest on the national debt.

The only thing that will give children protection in the future is if we pass this balanced budget amendment. We have here 28 years of unbalanced budgets. I do not know about others, but this pile is very significant to me. Every year we have people who are of the more liberal persuasion saying we should spend more, we should just get the will to balance the budget but we should spend more. They are inconsistent.

Let me just tell you something. I think out of the mouths of children comes the greatest truths sometimes. This is a letter I received from Grant Anderson, a young boy. Here is what he said, August 5, 1996:

Dear Orrin Hatch. I think we have a huge problem with the national budget. I have the easiest way to fix it. Do you want to hear it? OK—

With an exclamation mark. And then he writes in big print the letters. He said:

Stop buying things if you don't have money—

And a bigger exclamation mark. And then he said:

Thanks for your time. Grant S. Anderson. P.S. My mom and dad voted for you.

A particularly good letter, I thought. But the fact of the matter is Grant is right on the money. My friend Grant

Anderson really calls it the way it should be. If we are going to stop spending money we do not have, we have got to get rid of all these years of unbalanced budgets. And since we have proven that we are not going to get rid of them without a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, then, by gosh, I suggest we pass the balanced budget amendment so by the year 2002 we have the true budget that will be balanced so kids like Grant Anderson and all the kids my colleague is fighting for and I am fighting for will have a future.

Now, to me out of the mouths of young people sometimes comes the greatest truth.

Dear Orrin Hatch. I think we have a huge problem with the national budget. I have the easiest way to fix it. Do you want to hear it? OK. Stop buying things if you don't have money. Thanks for your time. Grant S. Anderson.

I am grateful to Grant. I am grateful that he took the time to write to me, and there are thousands of others who are writing to us who want us to try to put some fiscal sanity into the system. We have tried five different balance-the-budget methodologies and not one of them has worked. The distinguished Senator said his amendment is not a gimmick, but his amendment reads:

It is the policy of the United States that in achieving a balanced budget amendment—

"It is the policy of the United States." He is writing policy into the Constitution—

Federal outlays must not be reduced in a manner that disproportionately affects outlays for education, nutrition and health programs for poor children.

I agree with him; it is not a gimmick. It is a risky gimmick. If you start putting language into the Constitution that the distinguished Senator thinks can be easily interpreted, he does not know much about the Supreme Court if he takes that attitude. I have to tell you, we are making a great mistake. So I hope our colleagues will realize it is important to keep this amendment intact. It is the only amendment that has a chance of passing. It is a bipartisan amendment, and I hope we will support it here today.

I move to table the Senator's amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEMPTHORNE). Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table the Wellstone amendment No. 3. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 36, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 8 Leg.]

YEAS—64

Abraham	Ashcroft	Bennett
Allard	Baucus	Biden

Bingaman	Graham	McConnell
Bond	Gramm	Murkowski
Brownback	Grams	Nickles
Bryan	Grassley	Reid
Burns	Gregg	Robb
Campbell	Hagel	Roberts
Chafee	Hatch	Roth
Coats	Helms	Santorum
Cochran	Hollings	Sessions
Collins	Hutchinson	Shelby
Coverdell	Hutchison	Smith, Bob
Craig	Inhofe	Smith, Gordon
D'Amato	Jeffords	H.
DeWine	Kemphorne	Snowe
Domenici	Kohl	Stevens
Enzi	Kyl	Thomas
Faircloth	Lott	Thompson
Feingold	Lugar	Thurmond
Frist	Mack	Warner
Gorton	McCain	

NAYS—36

Akaka	Ford	Lieberman
Boxer	Glenn	Mikulski
Breaux	Harkin	Moseley-Braun
Bumpers	Inouye	Moynihan
Byrd	Johnson	Murray
Cleland	Kennedy	Reed
Conrad	Kerrey	Rockefeller
Daschle	Kerry	Sarbanes
Dodd	Landrieu	Specter
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Durbin	Leahy	Wellstone
Feinstein	Levin	Wyden

The motion to table the amendment (No. 3) was agreed to.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

CURRENT MILK CRISIS

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has sent a resolution to the desk which will require a unanimous-consent request at this time.

Mr. SPECTER. I understand that. I want to make a comment or two about it, and then I will make that unanimous-consent request.

Mr. President, this resolution relates to a very urgent problem on milk pricing in the country, but especially in Pennsylvania, where Senator SANTORUM and I have been working with our farmers to try to find something to grant some immediate relief. This is a problem which exists nationwide, and we believe that we have found a way to deal with this issue in the short run as it relates to the price of cheese, which is an ingredient in establishing the price of milk.

Yesterday, Secretary of Agriculture Glickman accompanied me to northeastern Pennsylvania. We have found that the Secretary has the authority unilaterally to change the price of milk if there is a different price for cheese other than that which has been established by the National Cheese Exchange in Wisconsin.

This is a matter of some urgency, Mr. President, which is why I have discussed with the leadership the prospect of offering this resolution at this time.