

Pennsylvania Breast Cancer Coalition. Ms. Knight is a 54 year old African American woman, and a 7-year breast cancer survivor. Ms. Knight told the Subcommittee that her first mammogram was performed at the age of 36 because of the presence of fibrocystic tissue and a family history of breast cancer. Her sister lost her life to the disease at the age of 43 and her mother is a 5 year breast cancer survivor.

Ms. Knight stated that she was most disturbed by the findings of the NIH Consensus Development Conference statement and felt that their statement would lure entirely too many women of all races, and in their 40s, into a false sense of security about the odds that breast cancer will not likely happen to them during this decade of their lives.

Citing recent statistics from 4 hospitals in Lancaster County, Ms. Knight stated that one hospital, during the 95-96 fiscal year, 105 women underwent breast cancer surgery and nearly 36% of them were under the age of 50. At a second hospital, 21 women underwent breast cancer surgery and 8 of the 21 women were under the age of 50. She also told the Subcommittee that as a volunteer with the American Cancer Society's Reach to Recovery program, she has yet to visit one recovering breast cancer patient that is African American. She believes that this is because not enough African American women are having early detection procedures. The breast cancer mortality rate for African American women increased by 2.6% at a time when the mortality rate in white women declined by 5.5%.

Ms. Knight concluded that every woman, of every race, in every community should have access to mammography at age 40 if that is what she determines to be necessary for her, dictated by family history, her physician and her personal health factors.

Our last witness of the day was Representative Katie True, who represents the 37th legislative district in Pennsylvania. Ms. True told the Subcommittee that one of the weapons that she has chosen to fight breast cancer is House Bill 134. This bill which has already passed the House, would provide for a state income tax checkoff for breast cancer research. The donation is deducted from the tax refund and does not constitute a change against the income tax revenue's to the State.

Representative True also stated that the second weapon used to battle breast cancer is education. She stated that self breast exams combined with mammograms can save many lives. Women still hesitate to look after themselves first, usually putting others needs before their own.

Representative True concluded that the recommendation of the NIH Consensus Development Conference on Breast Cancer Screening is irresponsible, and she questioned the motives behind such a recommendation—plain and simple—their message is wrong and deadly.

MARCH 4, 1997—WASHINGTON, DC

On March 4, 1997, Secretary of Health and Human Services Donna Shalala appeared before the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education to discuss the fiscal year 1998 budget.

At that hearing, I took the opportunity to discuss the NIH Consensus Development Conference recommendations with the Secretary and asked her to take immediate steps towards encouraging women ages 40-49 to undergo mammogram screening. I told the Secretary that the panel finding that mammograms were not warranted for women in the age bracket 40 to 49 has caused quite a stir. And that my own view is that the evidence is substantial, if not overwhelming, that mammograms are very helpful for women of this

age group, they do save lives, and that there ought to be a prompt conclusion by HHS to that effect. When there is a public determination that mammograms are not warranted for women 40-49, many women are reading that to mean that a mammogram is not necessary. I also told the Secretary that I felt that there is not a sufficient sense of urgency in the approach that the Department is taking with regard to this issue in allowing another 60 days to pass before a final judgment is made on this issue. I further stated that when it's a matter of dollars and cents, and there is no clear scientific evidence to the contrary, I think the word ought to come from the Secretary of Health and Human Services that, notwithstanding the cost, we're going to make sure that mammograms are made available to women ages 40-49.

Mr. ROTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friend, Senator DOMENICI, for allowing me to go next. I will limit my remarks to 5 minutes.

(The remarks of Mr. ROTH pertaining to the introduction of S. 436 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair.

I was pleased to accommodate the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee.

(The remarks of Mr. DOMENICI pertaining to the introduction of S. 437 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent I be yielded 10 minutes from the time that is allocated to the Democratic side here, under the auspices of Senator BINGAMAN.

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

THE BUDGET

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, one of the subjects that dominates the landscape these days, of course, is the budget. How we are going to function as a society, what are the priorities, how will we finance these priorities and at the same time reach an objective that all of us care about, and of course that is getting a balanced budget by the year 2002. Of course, that is getting a balanced budget by the year 2002.

The President has presented a budget to achieve that objective. There are disputes about how we reach that objective, where do we cut further, what is the revenue stream. I, therefore, Madam President, use this opportunity to comment on what I see as the lack of a budget proposal from the Republican side, from the majority side.

The President has put down a budget. We have talked about it in the Budget Committee. I am the ranking Demo-

crat on the Budget Committee. We have had numerous hearings as we explored various avenues, various parts of the equation with proponents and some opponents trying to dissuade us from proceeding with the President's budget.

On the other hand, we have not seen anything yet from the Republican side, the majority side, I point out, Madam President. They have produced one piece of budget legislation this year, but it is not a balanced budget. It is the notion that we ought to be giving a big tax break, primarily devoted to the wealthy in our country. The Republican tax break will blow a huge hole in the deficit, even as we struggle to get down to a zero budget deficit by the year 2002.

In the first 5 years, the Republican plan would cost \$200 billion. In the next 5 years, these costs would increase 60 percent to \$325 billion for a total of \$526 billion over the 10-year period. This chart will help explain exactly where it is we are going.

It causes a ballooning of the deficit. We see it from 1997, which is on the chart projected at \$120 billion and expected to be less by the time we reach the end of the fiscal year, September 30. It continues to expand. In the year 2002, when we are striving to have a zero budget deficit, we are at \$239 billion, unless some way is found to pay for these tax breaks. They are not free. If we adopt the Republican tax scheme, we would have to make deeper cuts someplace. I guess that would have to come from Medicare, Medicaid, education, transportation, crimefighting, and environmental protection.

These tax breaks are also backloaded. Their costs explode, as we can see by the expansion of the deficit, after the year 2002. And, believe it or not, these tax breaks are bigger than those that were originally in the Contract With America, larger than the tax breaks that were proposed last year.

This chart is from the Joint Committee on Taxation. It is now at \$200 billion, expanded to \$525 billion. These are the tax cuts as planned, to \$525 billion. That would be a terrible consequence. That is in the year 2007.

Finally, the Republican tax breaks are overwhelmingly tilted toward the very wealthy. According to one analysis, on average, the Republican tax scheme would give a tax break each year of \$21,000 for those who make \$645,000 a year, the top 1 percent of the income earners in our country. But if you are in the middle 20 percent of our wage earners and you make \$27,000 a year, you would get \$186 worth of tax relief, 50 cents a day—50 cents a day—for the average hard-working family.

It borders on insulting to suggest that someone who makes \$645,000 is entitled to a tax break of \$21,000—I hardly think that those people need any help—and if you make \$27,000, which is the per capita income of the middle 20

percent, \$186 for the year. It is hard to comprehend how that is going to help our society or help hard-working families make ends meet, plan for their child's education, plan for a roof over their heads, plan for health care, plan for helping their parents, the elderly, achieve the tranquility and the peace that they need in their older age. Madam President, this is not a good way to do business.

We have been down this road before. The Reagan administration gave us a tax break for the wealthy, and what was the result? The deficit exploded. It is time to get down to serious budgeting. It is time to balance the budget.

I urge the Republican leadership, the good friends that I have on the Republican side of the aisle who are concerned about balancing a budget, to produce a budget that does the job. If the Republican leadership is committed to their tax scheme, they ought to put up a budget that reflects it. Show us how they would pay for it. But we can't continuously engage in this dialog without, at some point, having to put up a budget that reflects how they intend to get us to where they say they would like to be: Tax breaks for the wealthy, purportedly investments in our society to produce jobs, et cetera, while someone making \$27,000 a year is going to get a \$186 tax reduction.

It is not fair, it is not just, it is not acceptable. The American people won't accept it, even though we could be bowled over by a majority vote. It is an outrageous scheme for doing things, the constant refusal to produce any kind of a response to a Democratic budget. We in the Democratic Party are not in charge. The Republicans are in charge, and if they are in charge, they ought to take the responsibilities of leadership. Produce a budget, show us exactly what you mean. Enough of this nonsense where they talk about a tax cut and no one willing to say where it is going to come from. If we have a \$200 billion extra cost for our society, where are we going to get the money?

People are worried about their future; they are anxious about their jobs. Yes, there has been good growth in our economy, but the anxiety factor has continued to expand because people do not believe that they have the security they need for the years ahead.

So, Madam President, I hope that we will be able to soon get on with our business, have the budget produced by the Republican majority, and tell us how they are going to pay for it.

Let us have an honest debate about it. Let the American people know what is going on here and not hide behind a smokescreen that says, well, we want to give this huge tax cut but we are not going to tell you how we are going to pay for it.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I thank the Chair.

Madam President, I come here to echo the words that I caught of my predecessor in speaking, and that is Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG from New Jersey, who is the ranking Democrat on the Budget Committee.

I, too, am frustrated. I mean, there are lots of things to be frustrated about this year. The pace has been slow. There are things we should have been doing. There are distractions hither and yon.

One thing we should be doing is the budget. The budget is the statement of priorities of the Congress, representing to the American people what needs to be done in this Nation. The budget, although it comes in a very thick book and has a very sterile appearance, in fact is a powerful and humane document about what our priorities are. It is the ultimate statement of what you believe in.

I do not want to see a Government furlough, and I do not want to see a shutdown. I know the Presiding Officer does not want to see that. The American people certainly do not. In fact, it had a rather devastating consequence, far beyond what I thought would be the case, in States not only close to Washington, DC, but around the country.

There is another reason I worry, and that is what we do know about the Republican budget, which to this point basically is tax cuts. It is not just a question of tax cuts, but the fact that the tax cuts are not paid for. There is no statement or sense or hint of where the money will come from.

So, first, there is not a budget, and second, to the extent there is a budget, it only relates to tax cuts. The Republican tax cuts add up to \$526 billion over a 10-year period. They backloaded it so that, to the public, the more reasonable approach to a tax cut would be the first part, and then at the end the tax cut really bulges and the beneficiaries of that really benefit.

What is interesting is that we have been through this exercise. The American people, and I thought the Republicans themselves, had rejected the idea that we could do the kinds of tax cuts that we were talking about and that we are now talking about, and that is tax cuts that favor the rich, tax cuts that do not favor working American families, the American middle class. Yet here they are back again.

That is frustrating to me. I do not understand that. I am not being partisan in saying this. I am genuinely perplexed by it. I am more than perplexed, I am annoyed by that. But, first of all, I am perplexed.

Why this statement of \$526 billion? Incidentally, \$526 billion—in the last 4 years of the 10 years, 325 billion of those dollars flow into the back pockets of those who benefit. So, therefore, those who benefit and those who do not is obviously very important. And I will get to that in a moment.

There is a child tax credit the Republicans have put forward and a child tax credit the Democrats have put forward.

That is something I feel very, very positively about, both in terms of Republicans and Democrats—with one exception.

There was a policy that I helped advance, along with at that time Gov. Bill Clinton, on something called the National Commission on Children and Families, which I chaired for 4 years. We put forward the idea of the \$1,000 child tax credit. It is put forward really by both parties to the extent of \$500, but there is a difference.

The Democrats adjust theirs, change theirs, with inflation. It is very expensive to bring up a child in this country. People do not think of it that way. You know, they do not quantify so much per child. But it costs about \$7,000 a year on average to bring up an individual child in this country. If you have four, then it costs \$28,000 a year. That is averaging in from the time that you are buying Pampers to the time you are paying college tuition. Obviously, it is an average, but it is a very expensive average. So it is a very good proposition, the idea of a tax credit, but it ought to be indexed to inflation. The Democratic tax cut is. The Republican tax cut is not.

So, if my colleagues would just listen for a moment about what the experts found out about the Republican tax cut proposals and who gains and who does not, more than 75 percent of the Republican tax cuts would go to the top 20 percent of taxpayers. Well, that does not ring right. And it should not ring right.

I mean, this is a country which is constantly—we have all watched, hopefully, the public broadcasting thing on Thomas Jefferson who wrote the Declaration of Independence. In that he talked about life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. There was a sense of equality. People were created to be equal, to have equal opportunity.

Well, that does not mean that all people work as hard as others. But does it mean that if you are in the middle class and you are a working family, much less a two-parent working family, and you are working very, very hard and you are working at a job that pays a lot less money, then should you be treated substantially differently than somebody who works hard but makes a whole lot of money or somebody who does not work hard and who makes a whole lot of money through unearned income? The fact of the matter is that only 8.6 percent of the benefit of the \$526 billion in Republican tax cuts would go to the bottom 60 percent of the American people. Let us call it 9 percent. Nine percent of the benefit of \$526 billion would go to 60 percent of the American people who happen to be at the bottom of the economic scale, that is, to the extent that you are within the 60 percent. It ranges, obviously.

This means that middle-income Americans with an average income of \$26,900, which is high cotton in West Virginia, would get a \$186 tax cut from

the Republican tax package. That is just the fact. But the top 1 percent of Americans, myself included, I suppose, and people whose incomes average \$645,000, would get \$21,000—actually \$21,306 in tax cuts.

That is not the American way. That is not why we are what we are as a country. I understand that some people do better than others in life. And I understand that some people are propelled, through good fortune or through exceptional brain power, to be in a position to make more money. Often that is a circumstance of birth and often that is a circumstance of education, often that is simply a circumstance of life. And sometimes it is simply a matter that you really did it and you deserve it.

But you cannot take something called the working middle class, people who work in steel mills, who work in factories, who work in grocery stores but who work all the time and work every day and pay taxes, and for whom every \$10 or \$100 is important, and say to them, "You don't count." You do not do that in a budget. We do not do that, at least in a Democratic budget.

So, Madam President, I appreciate your courtesy in listening to these short pronouncements on my part. But I think the budget process should begin. I think we should take the crazy idea of trying to cut \$526 billion of taxes, much less figure out how to pay for it, take it and sort of lay it outside the door and let it rest there for time immemorial. In the meantime, let us do a budget.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor and 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. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

LITHUANIA

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I rise to speak this morning on an issue of great importance to American foreign policy and to the future of Europe.

This week, on March 11, Lithuanians and Lithuanian-Americans celebrated the seventh anniversary of the restoration of independence from Russia. Lithuania, for those who are not familiar, is a country of fewer than 4 million people. It is smaller than the State of South Carolina, and it is located between Belarus and the Baltic Sea. Historically, it has been the neighbor, sometimes friendly and sometimes not, of Russia and the Soviet Union. It is a nation that has had to struggle time and again for its freedom. Today, it is struggling to recover from the devastation of a half-century of Soviet occupation.

The history of this little country is very interesting. During the middle

ages, it was one of Europe's most powerful countries. In the 15th century, it was combined with Poland to create a new kingdom. In the late 18th century, when Poland was partitioned, Lithuania was divided between Russia and Prussia. The czars tried to Russify Lithuania during the 19th century, but their attempts to destroy Lithuanian culture gave rise to a Lithuanian nationalist movement supported by the Catholic Church. Ironically, it was this effort by the czars to Russify Lithuania which resulted in my being on the floor of the Senate today, because these efforts by the Russians led my mother's family to pick her up as a small girl and emigrate from Lithuania to the United States. They came here to preserve their Lithuanian culture, their Roman Catholic religion, and, of course, for the economic opportunity that the United States offered.

In February 1918, Lithuania finally declared its independence from Russia. But, of course, World War II took its toll.

In 1940, as a result of the Hitler-Stalin nonaggression pact, known as the Molotov-Ribbentrop agreement, Lithuania was taken over by the Soviet Union. In 1941, Hitler invaded Lithuania. After World War II, Stalin resumed his brutal repression and Sovietization of Lithuania, forbidding democratic institutions and subjugating the church. Countless thousands of Lithuanians gave their lives during the war and were then subjected to the Stalinist regime and deportation to Siberia.

But the Lithuanian national movement would not die, and it rose again as the Soviet Union crumbled. Of the many things which I have been fortunate enough to witness in my lifetime, one of the most memorable was the restoration of Lithuania's independence. On February 24, 1990, while still occupied by the Soviet Union, Lithuania held free elections to the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet. I was there on the day of the election, as part of a delegation sent by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The best efforts of the Soviets to keep us out of the country were not successful. The Lithuanian Reform Movement, called Sajudis, won the elections. Keep in mind, this tiny country was still considered by the Soviets to be part of the Soviet Union.

On March 11, 1990, Lithuania declared the restoration of complete independence from the Soviet Union. In January, 1991, the Soviets struck back. A Soviet coup was attempted in Lithuania, leaving 13 Lithuanian civilians dead.

After the failed August coup in Moscow, the United States recognized the Lithuanian Government on September 2, 1991.

Since the restoration of independence, Lithuania and the other independent Baltic countries, Latvia and Estonia, have held numerous free elections. In Lithuania's case, there have been three—in October 1992, February 1993, and October 1996.

If you look at the relationship between Lithuania and the United States, it is one of mutual cooperation and support. The United States recognized Lithuania as an independent country in 1922 and never recognized the annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union as a result of the Molotov-Ribbentrop agreement.

During the years of the Soviet occupation of Eastern and Central Europe, the Senate and the House continued to pass resolutions and proclamations commemorating Captive Nations Week, and asking Americans across the country to join us in recognizing the fundamental freedom and independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

In 1991, the United States recognized the Lithuanian Government, free of Soviet domination. And the United States continued to play a very important role because, even after Lithuania had restored its independence, there were 70,000 Soviet troops still on Lithuanian soil. President Clinton deserves credit for working very hard, through diplomatic channels, for the removal of those troops. When the troops finally left in August 1993, due to the President's good efforts, once and for all, the Lithuanians were free of occupation troops.

Today, however, we are debating the next chapter, and an important one in the history of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and modern Europe. We are debating the enlargement of NATO, and the question of how much of a say Russia should have in this process. This summer, in Madrid, Spain, the members of the NATO alliance will gather together to consider whether new members will be allowed to join the alliance.

All of us are aware of the important role that NATO played after World War II. NATO was the bulwark of Western democracy against the expansion of communism. The allies who came together in that alliance not only were setting out to protect themselves but to establish commonality in terms of values and culture—a commitment to democracy, a commitment to free markets. The NATO alliance has been successful. The Berlin Wall came down. The cold war came to an end.

Now we are talking about a new NATO alliance, and asking ourselves what this NATO alliance would bring to the world. Certainly more than defense, because I do not think that is the paramount concern to Europe. It would be, in the words of Secretary Albright, an effort to "gain new allies who are eager and increasingly able to contribute to our common agenda for security, from fighting terrorism and weapons proliferation to ensuring stability."

The reason I have come to the floor today is to speak about the situation in Lithuania and the challenge we face on the question of NATO membership. It is said that Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic are likely to be invited to join NATO. I fully support that. My visit to Poland, I can tell you,