

abortions, a procedure in which a fetus is delivered into the birth canal before its skull is collapsed and delivery is completed. This legislation contains a provision which would make an exception for partial-birth abortions that are necessary to save the life of the mother in cases in which no other medical procedure would suffice.

After careful thought about this issue, I have concluded that I simply cannot justify the use of this specific procedure to terminate pregnancies in which the mother's life is not at stake. For this reason, I voted to support the ban on partial-birth abortions, and I hope that the President will reconsider his decision to veto this measure and sign it into law.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to express deep regret at the passage of H.R. 1122, the so-called partial birth abortion bill. I find it appalling that the U.S. Senate will enact legislation that is not just an attack on choice, but more importantly an assault on a woman's reproductive health.

I had hoped that the Daschle amendment, which I cosponsored, would address the alleged concerns about unnecessary abortions being performed after viability. This amendment was a reasonable approach and would have met the State objective of preventing late-term abortions on healthy fetuses when there was no serious threat to the life or health of the mother. However, it has become obvious what the real agenda is; to chip away at the guarantees and protections afforded to all women by the Supreme Court. Those on the other side have now solicited the American Medical Association [AMA] in their efforts to undermine Roe versus Wade and to jeopardize the health of women.

The AMA has simply cut a deal which unfortunately does not include women's reproductive health. They have acted in such a way to protect their interests and not the interest of their patients. Their announcement does not in any way change the intent of this legislation nor does it do anything to address the concerns about women's health. It is simply a political, calculated decision.

During the 104th Congress, there were 53 floor votes attacking reproductive health. Today's vote is simply a continuation of this attack. In the 104th Congress we witnessed attacks on title X, international family planning, and access to save and legal abortion coverage for Federal employees and military personnel. This is not about preventing late-term abortions, this is about preventing a women's and physician's right to determine their own health care needs. They will not stop here. This attack will continue until all abortions, regardless of viability or the life and health of the mother are illegal. Today, we have taken a huge step backward.

Since joining the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, I have

heard from numerous groups representing physicians and from numerous doctors from Washington State. I have been told repeatedly that Congress must act to prevent the further eroding of the patient-doctor relationship currently taking place in the managed care delivery system. I have heard numerous stories about physicians who are unable to prescribe the appropriate treatment for their patients because insurance companies have determined this treatment too costly or not necessary. I have always agreed that doctors should be making health care decisions, not insurance companies. I now am baffled as to why the AMA would want the U.S. Congress to dictate what treatment options physicians can use to save the life and health of their female patients. Today's action invites the U.S. Congress into the operating room and appears to have the blessing of the AMA.

I am grateful that there is one last line of defense; the President's veto. I am hopeful that the President will act swiftly to veto this offensive and threatening legislation and that we will do the right thing and sustain this veto.

Mr. ENZI addressed the Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. ENZI. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. ENZI pertaining to the introduction of S. 765 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

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

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, the concurrent budget resolution, and I might indicate that we conferred with the ranking minority member and he concurs in this consent request.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 27) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the presence

and use of small electronic calculators be permitted during consideration of the fiscal year 1998 concurrent resolution on the budget and any conference report thereon.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for full floor privileges be granted to the following members of the Budget Committee staff: Austin Smythe and Ann Miller.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. That is for the duration of the discussion on the resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that the staff of the Senate Committee on the Budget including congressional fellows and detailees from the executive branch named on the list I now send to the desk be permitted to remain on the Senate floor during consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27 and any conference report thereon.

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

The list is as follows.

SENATE BUDGET COMMITTEE—MAJORITY STAFF TITLE LIST

Scott Burnison, Budget Analyst.
Amy Call, Communications Assistant.
Jim Capretta, Sr. Policy Analyst.
Lisa Cieplak, Sr. Analyst for Education and Social Services.
Kay Davies, Legislative Counsel.
Kathleen Dorn, Administrative Director.
Beth Smerko Felder, Chief Counsel.
Alice Grant, Analyst for International Affairs.
Jim Hearn, Sr. Analyst for Government Finance and Management.
G. William Hoagland, Majority Staff Director.
Carole McGuire, Assistant Staff Director, Director of Appropriations Activities.
Anne Miller, Director of Budget Review.
Mieko Nakabayashi, Staff Assistant.
Cheri Reidy, Sr. Analyst for Budget Review.
Ricardo Rel, Sr. Analyst for Agriculture and Natural Resources & Community Development.

Karen Ricoy, Legal Assistant.
Brian Riley, Sr. Analyst for Transportation and Science.

Michael Ruffner, Sr. Analyst for Income Security and Veterans.

Andrea Shank, Staff Assistant.
Amy Smith, Chief Economist.

Austin Smythe, Assistant Staff Director, Director of Budget Process and Energy.

Bob Stevenson, Communications Director.
Marc Sumerlin, Fellow.

Winslow Wheeler, Analyst for Defense.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I note the presence of Senator LAUTENBERG in the Chamber and I wonder if he might join with me in at least discussing with the Senate how we might try together to be as helpful to fellow Senators yet move this resolution along as expeditiously as possible.

From my standpoint, I do not believe my opening remarks and the opening remarks of any Members that I am aware of who want to speak in favor of the resolution should take any longer than 1 hour. I am not holding anyone to that but just sort of indicating to

the Senate that is the way I kind of see the time elapsing, to be exchanged side by side, one on the Democrat side and one on ours. But I think we need about 1 hour in that regard. Does the Senator have any idea in reference to that side?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I thank the chairman of the Budget Committee for the way in which cooperation has taken place. Both of us and our staffs have worked cooperatively together to get this done, and we now arrive at the point before giving our formal statements where we are about to begin the debate that counts the most, going beyond the discussions we have had within the committee.

I have had several requests for people who would like to make opening statements. I think I probably need 20 to 25 minutes on my own. I do not know how long the distinguished chairman of the committee is going to take for his statement, but I would think that an hour might be on the short side of things.

So, Mr. President, I hope that we could give enough of our colleagues a chance to air their views. It is my fervent hope we will be able to conclude our business before the full 50 hours are used. I also hope that we can get this budget agreement passed. We have a historic opportunity to work together on something that I think the American people want to see, a bipartisan effort to reduce our annual deficit to zero. I think we accomplished that, and I hope the amendments will be those we can discuss honestly, having votes where required and move on with the business of the country.

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me try this. I know that in our conference the leader, Senator TRENT LOTT, suggested we will be voting tonight and that we will be in here late and that is because we expect amendments. There may have to be a window of a couple of hours from 6 to 8 because of some event on that side of the aisle and likewise tomorrow night some window but we do intend to stay in late. I would be willing to accommodate Senators in any way possible, but we need Senators to begin to bring amendments down as soon as possible.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Absolutely.

Mr. DOMENICI. I am going to suggest if a Senator has amendments ready to go, even if we have not finished our opening remarks, other than the Senator's and mine, we ought to welcome them to the floor and proceed.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. In response to the need to get business done here, our leader asked at the caucus that people get their amendments up early this afternoon, at least let us know what amendments are coming so we can deal with them, and move on with the business. Meanwhile, I have alerted my colleagues on the Democratic side to the fact that we will be accepting opening statements this afternoon and those who want to make them are welcome to do so, I think under the structure of our understanding.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, first I thank my friend, Senator LAUTENBERG, for those remarks. Fellow Senators from either side of the aisle, if you have amendments, it would really be helping the Senate with its work if you would let us know about your amendments. We have about five or six already that we are aware of, and we will start sharing those with the Senator from New Jersey so that he will know about them. If the Senator will do the same with us, it will be very helpful.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. We have reason to believe there are about a half a dozen presently listed. We will confirm that.

Mr. DOMENICI. All right.

Mr. President, I want to thank and compliment a few people before I proceed to my substantive remarks. First and foremost, I thank Senator TRENT LOTT, the majority leader of the Senate. He has exhibited a rare determination and real dedication and commitment to trying to get a bipartisan budget resolution through so that the Congress could do the work of the people this year and do as much of it together as we possibly could.

I thank the Democratic leadership, at least the Democratic leadership in the Senate, for their work in behalf of this resolution. Senator DASCHLE has been extremely helpful. On the Democrat side, Senator LAUTENBERG, Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG of New Jersey, has been extremely helpful. He has worked hard. And together we intend to get this budget resolution out of here as close as possible to the form approved by the committee yesterday afternoon, by as overwhelming a vote as we could expect, 17 to 4, and I believe this morning the vote finished up at 17 to 5. So there were 17 Senators from both sides of the aisle and 5 against.

I thank President Clinton and his negotiators, the President personally for his insistence we stay with it and for his early determinations made to this Senator and to Senator LOTT that he wanted to proceed to try to do this.

Obviously, there are many other people who were very important. I am not going to name them all here now but in due course we will try to do that.

Let me say to those listening today that 2 weeks ago we announced in the rotunda that Republicans and Democrats had reached an important agreement on a bipartisan budget plan. That announcement represented a crucial step in both sides coming together to produce a budget in the best interests of the American people.

Yesterday, the Senate Budget Committee took the next step and approved this bipartisan plan, and I sincerely hope this body will follow suit and pass this agreement within the next day or two at the most.

Because the real winners in this budget are the American working families, this budget will lead to reduced Federal spending, the largest tax cut since 1981, and ultimately to lower in-

terest rates that will mean more and better paying jobs.

Moreover, this agreement responds to the American people who clearly sent a message in the last election, tough elections for many Members with many issues, but I believe there was one unmistakable resonance through that campaign across America. I think the people said work together when the interests of the American people are at stake, work together when the issues are American. Do not fight all the time. So we have done just that. A year will find this Congress on opposite sides in the best tradition of debate, disagreeing with each other. Ultimately, parts of the implementation of this budget will find us disagreeing, but the truth is we have taken, yesterday afternoon, the first real step in saying to the American people we accept your request, in many cases your desire and your begging us to work together, and we have done just that. And in doing so we have produced a compromise that I believe will improve the lives of families today while providing a better future for tomorrow.

It will mean, when it is all finished, the first balanced budget in 30 years. It will mean \$135 billion in gross tax relief over 5 years. Included in this will be a capital gains tax differential, obviously a child tax credit, and other things that both sides have talked about. Clearly, it will include some of the President's tax requests with reference to education, higher education and some of the ideas he has enacted.

Now, a budget resolution does not tell anybody precisely what these are. The committees that have to write the law will do that. But what we do give them is a flow of taxes over the years saying how much they can cut each year, and at the end of 5 years they will have a gross revenue number of \$135 billion in new tax cuts. We have also agreed, the leadership has, that over 10 years just in the normal sequence of things that body of new taxes will amount to \$250 billion in permanent reductions over a 10-year period.

I believe those two are pretty good propositions that many Americans would support, but we do not want to stop there. We have made adjustments to the trust fund for senior citizens under Medicare such that it will be solvent for about 10 years. That provides Americans, American leadership with ample opportunity to permanently reform the Medicare system. It also without question provides more options for the Medicare plan which can be adopted as part of this agreement by the Finance Committee and its counterpart in the House. Ten years of solvency for Medicare while providing more choice is, indeed, accomplishing something significant.

Entitlement reforms over the next 10 years including those that will be found in Medicare amount to about \$630 billion over the next 10 years. Some of these might be challenged by Members and we are willing to debate

them. But it is obvious that the entitlement package we are used to in our country will grow far less because of this budget resolution than if we had left everything alone. Funding for White House and Republican domestic priorities and Democratic priorities including education, transportation, housing, environment, crime control, and science programs have been provided for.

All of those will be in the ascendancy, and all of those will be deemed priorities so that the Appropriations Committee will have the full support of the leadership in funding these items at a higher level, including, if I did not mention, the basic environmental protection funding for the United States.

(Mr. KEMPTHORNE assumed the chair.)

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, passing this Balanced Budget Act of 1997 will force the Federal Government to finally live within its means. It makes permanent change that will reduce Government spending by some \$320 billion in the next 5 years and more than \$1 trillion over the next decade.

The agreement will also give families relief by cutting gross taxes, as I have indicated before, by \$135 billion in the first 5 years and gross taxes by as much as \$350 billion over 10 years.

Seniors can be assured that Medicare will remain solvent, ensuring this solvency for 10 years by enacting reforms that slow the growth of spending while providing seniors with more choices, which is what we need in the Medicare system. But nobody should assume that this budget resolution, and I would be prepared as one who knows a bit about budget resolutions, neither this nor any budget resolution will be the vehicle to provide permanent, long-term major reform of the Medicare system which is going to be needed within the next 5 to 6 to 7 years to meet what everybody understands is a very, very large population increase, where the demographics begin to change dramatically because of the baby boomers. We do not have a plan. This budget is not a plan to make Medicare solvent for that kind of change. Anybody who thought it should be has a mistaken understanding of what you can do in a budget resolution. But we did a lot, because it is done on a bipartisan basis and with the President.

This overall plan will shrink Government, making most of the programs leaner and more efficient. Medicaid, Federal retirement, housing, veterans, student loans programs are just some of those that will be targeted for reform and savings, while overall spending will be reduced, as I have indicated, over 10 years by an excess of \$1 trillion. We have added money to protect priorities, and so those priorities that I have mentioned find themselves this time in this budget resolution, and the agreement that attends it finds modest but necessary increases for education, transportation, anticrime, environment, and science.

Contrasted with other budget resolutions, wherein these kinds of ideas would be nothing more than telling the Appropriations Committee what we hope would happen, we have entered into a very major bipartisan leadership agreement, which I will hold up here, and eventually it will be made a part of the RECORD, entitled the "Bipartisan Agreement on the Budget," dated May 15, between the President and the leadership of Congress. It contains the summary tables, the description of agreements by major category, both in the discretionary programs and the mandatory and budget process reforms that have been agreed to that will have to work their way through the various bills, Mr. President, as they find themselves reported by the various committees.

There are also two letters pertaining to the taxes which were executed by the Republican leaders of the House and Senate directed to the committee chairmen and the President indicating the situation regarding the tax cuts. Once again, I know those listening would like for those of us who write a budget to tell them exactly what the capital gains tax will be. We don't know that. We know it will be significantly reduced. Exactly when the \$500 child care credit will be totally implemented we cannot tell you, but it will be, because, with all of the tax proposals, it may be that some have to wait a little bit and others will start more quickly, but that will be done. Some education tax relief for middle-income Americans who are sending children to college as part of the President's request is included in the letter of agreement as to what our committees will work on as they carry out and implement this budget.

It should be pointed out that this is the first time we have ever had such an agreement, and that means that those of us in the bipartisan leadership and those who worked on this committee, my Democratic counterpart and I, have a very serious responsibility to see we try to carry out on the floor of the Senate not only the budget resolution, but the terms of the agreement as it applies to the budget resolution. We will try that, yet we will have the Senate working its will in its normal manner for the next couple of days.

I am sure there will be many very, very difficult votes. I myself believe the budget is about as good as we are going to get it. It is now agreed to by Democrats and Republicans and the President. I believe before we finish, it will receive an overwhelming vote of support, and we will just have to wait and see whether that prediction is true or not.

We have also agreed in two areas to deal with some problems in society that needed some attention, and let me address the two in a general way.

First of all, it is obvious that even with Medicaid, which should cover many of our children, poor children, there are a lot of American children

who have no health insurance. We have agreed to put money into two programs, and in the basic agreement that we have with the President, it is spelled out that over the next 5 years, \$16 billion will be spent in an effort to cover all children in America who are not covered. There is a lot of leeway on the part of the committees to write that, but it is obvious that there will be added moneys for Medicaid so that they can pick up many of the children who are not covered. There are additional resources in there for a program that will go back to the States, a partnership arrangement, where the States will receive our money and match it and try to cover other children in their own way as they manage the programs in the best possible way.

That is one area that we agreed needed coverage, and I am pleased to say my own polling of Republicans, not a whip check or anything, indicates there are many of them who want to do that. The question remains, how do we do it best and what will it ultimately cost? But we have provided the \$16 billion that goes to the committee of jurisdiction to do the very best job they can.

We also found in the U.S. Senate not too many days ago on an appropriations bill presented by Senator STEVENS that the Senate voted by a huge margin to continue coverage for a group of legal—legal—residents of the United States who happened to come here as immigrants in a legal manner and remain here legally but are not American citizens. They come under an American program of generosity, which permits family reunification. Many of them come here as grandparents and parents. The program has broken down because the sponsors who are supposed to take care of them have not taken care of them, and the law intended to do that has not been enforced for years. As a result, there are more than a few thousand disabled senior Americans who are here as legal immigrants who are getting an SSI check every month. This budget resolution says we are providing sufficient funds so that those people will not drop off the rolls automatically on a date certain as contemplated under last year's law but will continue coverage so long as they live.

We have also said if there are Americans of the same condition that are here under the same circumstance that I described, if they reach the time when they are both senior and disabled, they would be entitled to SSI. But that ends the pool. In the future, any newcomers under these rules will have to rely upon their sponsors, and we wrote strong laws last year to make the sponsors more responsible.

Those are the two major areas of additional expenditures that we have put in place and agreed with the President on.

I will just make a few comparisons by dollars and show those who are paying any attention what we are talking about.

While some accounts are protected, as I indicated, the emphasis in this plan is clear: For every new \$1 added to the budget, it is reduced by \$15. For every new \$1 in spending, there is roughly \$3.50 in tax cuts.

This displays in a very vivid manner what happens to the deficit. Without the agreement is the red line; with the agreement is the green line. We think that is as simple as we can show it. The deficit will be going up from 90 and not coming back down significantly, according to the best estimates. And under these estimates, the green line represents how we will get to balance and, in fact, have a slight surplus by 2002, a pretty important and very-easy-to-understand chart.

This simple chart is nondefense discretionary spending. In our national budget, we have essentially three kinds of expenditures. One batch is called discretionary, which simply means we appropriate it every year. I am not one who thinks that is the greatest idea. I am hoping we can change that and appropriate for 2 years at a time. Part of that is defense, which is appropriated every year. It is a discretionary account annually done, and then all the domestic programs that are appropriated every year are called the non-defense discretionary program.

The sum total of those amount to about \$540 billion plus, about 37 percent of the budget. Some people think it is the whole budget, but it is about 37 percent.

This shows under the greenline, spending without this agreement, for the discretionary domestic part of this budget, and under the red line, it shows what will happen. There were some a few weeks ago who were saying this budget agreement was one that was just throwing money at the discretionary programs instead of trying to get some frugality and some better performance.

This redline indicates that the entire discretionary piece of our Government for the domestic programs will go up, Mr. President, one-half of 1 percent a year. In the prior decade, it went up 6 percent on average. For some, that is bad news. For others, that is good news. The fact that the President of the United States has agreed to that and that we have and said even while it is adjusting at such a low rate of growth, we want to have some priorities like roads, like in education, to me seems to be the kind of thing the public would like us to do.

Share of the total outlays of our budget has changed dramatically, and I will just show that quickly and summarize my remarks very quickly.

When John Kennedy was President of the United States, the budget of the United States was broken up into two parts and went something like this. The interest on the debt was small, Mr. President, so let's leave that aside. It was about 67 percent discretionary spending for defense and domestic programs, those annual ones we do every

year, and the rest of the budget, which would be about 33 percent, were what we call mandatory or entitlement programs. That means a program that spent out on its own, unless Congress changes the law—a Social Security check, a Medicare benefit payment to a hospital.

All the other programs, pensions, and the like, and I guess I would summarize them this way, any program that the U.S. Government has that if they failed to pay it to a citizen or an institution that is entitled to it, they can prevail in getting their money from the Treasury of the United States direct through a court of law.

It turns out from President Kennedy's time to ours, it has flipped on its head, and 67 percent of the budget is now on automatic pilot, running on its own, mandatory programs which we can only control if we change the underlying law by a vote of the Congress and the signature of the President. The balance of 33 percent makes up all of the expenditures for defense and domestic programs.

So it seems to most of us that we know where the area of growth is and the areas that cry out for reform if we are going to bring this Government's fiscal policy under control and not have to look at taxes skyrocketing 15 years from now and the bill that our children must pay getting bigger and bigger and the credit card that we kind of take from them without representation. If ever there was taxation without representation, it is the deficit you impose on kids where they do not get to vote. It clearly means they are going to have to pay taxes in order to pay these bills that they were not even around to vote on.

So I believe when you look at what we have done and add three other things, we will enforce this program. The discretionary caps, the discretionary programs that I have described for domestic spending, we will have a cap on them for each year at a dollar number agreed to in the resolution. That dollar number is the one that moves this one-half percent growth we spoke of. That will be a cap that says, at the end of a year if you spend more than that, by operation of law, every program in the Government will get cut by the percentage needed to bring it back to that cap.

It has been the only effective tool we have had. It has worked twice because we have only breached it twice. That is set to expire. We need to reput that in the law for another 5 years. That is provided for here.

We also preserve budget points of order against those caps. I will not go into that, but that is a second remedy to make sure we are doing what we promised and what we say here.

In addition, the deficit comes down each year starting in 1998, albeit not as much as we would like in the early years because, remember, we are cutting taxes in those early years and the entitlement program savings grow in

the outyears. But essentially it will not go back up and down in spurts; it will be at a level and gradual road and path downward.

We used conservative economics in this budget. There is some confusion about that. But if one wants to check them, we use the economic assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office as to growth, unemployment, and those basic ingredients, those basic pieces of the economy that we measure.

This budget is conservative. So when somebody says you have not provided for a recession, I ask, have you ever seen a budget presented by a President or Congress that anticipates specifically a recession and says in 2 years we have a recession and therefore things are changed? Obviously, nobody does that. But when you use the conservative numbers that the Congressional Budget Office says should be used, they say built within it over time is the conservatism that would permit you to be much safer in case of a recession, that your numbers will not be very much out of kilter, because of the conservatism of the economic assumptions.

Now, later on, if a Senator wants to talk about the revenues that we assume will come into this budget, I will be pleased to do that. We were confronted midstream with a change in the revenue expectations, but I would be pleased to discuss that with anybody who chooses during the next 2 days.

Suffice it to say that we hope—we found out the revenues were going to be up, and the Congressional Budget Office, heretofore very conservative in that regard, had decided that their estimates were too low. We spent only about \$30 billion of their \$225 billion, and that was done for very specific purposes, and the rest stayed in there as deficit reduction.

So I believe for the future of our country and in particular for the future of our children, the time is now to pass this budget rather intact and get on with implementing it.

Mr. President and fellow Senators, this budget has the best chance of reaching the reality that is predicted within the four corners of this resolution of any we have produced, because this is not one party's budget resolution, and that party being in Congress, and another party's President being in the White House with a different idea. Since we have something that is agreed to by both, it would seem to me that its implementation has a much better chance of being achieved rather than just fought over and reach stalemates because we cannot agree.

That is why last year as I finished doing our Republican budget, I said, I hope I do not have to do one that is just Republican again unless we happen to have a Republican President, because it would seem to me you have to take into consideration the President and his wishes to some extent. And I

believe we have done that. And he has taken ours into account to some extent. And that is the final product.

So, fellow Senators, that is my best explanation. I will answer anybody's questions and go into as much detail on any parts of it that anyone wants. But for now, again, if you can give us ideas about amendments you intend to offer, it will be greatly appreciated.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LAUTENBERG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, first, I start by issuing the plea also that Senator DOMENICI, the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, started with; that is, to our fellow Senators, get your amendments down here. Do not cause a jam up at the end when you may not be able to get the floor. You may not be able to have a full explanation of that which you are interested in.

We want to move the process. This is no longer a time for delay and bickering among ourselves. We are obliged to move it because it is the right thing for America.

First, let me say that I am pleased to join my colleague, the chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI, in urging support for this budget resolution.

For the past several weeks, Senator DOMENICI and I, along with representatives of the administration and the House Budget Committee, have been working long hours and arduously to reach a budget agreement. It has been a long, difficult and occasionally a painful process. But in the end I am pleased to say that we succeeded in our mission.

Today, for the first time in many, many years, we will be considering a budget resolution that is truly bipartisan. This resolution, Mr. President, is historic. It will lead to the first balanced budget since 1969. It calls for the largest investment in education and training since the Johnson administration. It combines tough fiscal discipline with a strong commitment to Medicare, the environment, transportation, and other national priorities.

Beyond its substance, Mr. President, I am hopeful that this agreement represents a turning point in contemporary American politics. For many years, Congress has been dominated by partisanship and immobilized by gridlock. This constant infighting has undermined our standing around the country. It has made it more difficult to solve our Nation's problems. And we all hope that a sense of comity that now seems to be here during these budget discussions will prevail here in Washington. This agreement marks a major step in that direction.

The agreement shows Democrats and Republicans are ready to put aside partisan differences, rise above petty bick-

ering, and make the hard decisions that our people across the country want us to do. That is what we are delivering.

Mr. President, this agreement comes before us at a time when our economy is remarkably strong. Over the past 2½ years the stock market has skyrocketed by more than 80 percent; unemployment is at its lowest point in 24 years; inflation is at the slowest pace in 31 years; new investment has soared at a 9 percent annual rate over the last 4 years, a welcome change from the performance over the preceding 8 years; and real wages have started to rise again after years of stagnation.

The tremendous strength of our economy is a tribute to President Clinton and the Democratic Party. When President Clinton came into office, the budget deficit was \$290 billion and it was expected to explode to more than \$500 billion by 2002. Since then, just the contrary has happened. The deficit has been cut by 63 percent, falling 4 years in a row to \$107 billion in 1996. This year, the deficit is estimated to be falling to \$67 billion.

This, Mr. President, is remarkable progress. We want to continue that progress, and this budget agreement will get it done.

People tend to think of budgeting as a zero sum game in which one person's win is another's loss. But this budget agreement is a win-win-win all around. It is a win for our economy. It is a win for ordinary Americans who are working hard to raise their families and keep their heads above water. It is a win for the future of our country.

Mr. President, both parties should be pleased with this bipartisan achievement. But I want to take a few minutes to explain why I think Democrats deserve to be especially proud.

Throughout this process, we Democrats have insisted on an agreement that imposes real fiscal discipline that builds on President Clinton's tremendous success in reducing the deficit, and that balances the budget in a real, credible way. And the American people have won.

Democrats have insisted that we make education a top national priority. We have demanded that middle-class families get tax relief to help pay for college, and that all Americans get assistance in affording further education and job training. And the American people have won.

Democrats have insisted that Medicare be protected. We have demanded that the solvency of the Medicare trust fund be extended, that senior citizens not be asked to bear unfair burdens, that the quality of their health care not be put at risk, and that new preventative benefits be added. And the American people have won.

Democrats have insisted on targeting tax relief to the middle class. We have demanded that when Congress cuts taxes, much of the relief must go to struggling families who need help the most. And the American people have won.

Democrats have insisted that uninsured children be provided with health insurance. We have demanded that millions of kids get the health care they need and deserve. And the American people have won.

Democrats have insisted on fairness for people who come into this country legally, who have obeyed the law, and paid their taxes and who then suffer from a disability. We have demanded the elimination of extreme laws that punish people because they get hit by a bus or lose their eyesight. And the American people have won.

Democrats have insisted on maintaining our commitment to environmental protection. We have demanded more funding to clean up hazardous waste sites while resisting schemes to gut the Environmental Protection Agency. And the American people have won.

Democrats have also insisted on investing in transportation. We have demanded that transportation be made a priority and that funding be increased substantially over the levels originally proposed earlier this year. And the American people have won.

Mr. President, my point is not that Democrats are the sole winners here. That of course is not true. This is a fair and balanced agreement. The Republicans have won on many of their most cherished priorities. Some of those wins have been bitter pills for me and for many Democrats, but I say to my friends on this side of the aisle, the fact is that we do not control either Houses of the Congress. And we have to respect the will of the American people. So there is no way to solve our Nation's problems without compromise. It is the only way, and painful though it may be for some, it is the right thing to do.

Mr. President, let me turn to some of the specifics in the budget agreement, some of which have been mentioned by the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, but I think are worthy of repetition.

First, and perhaps most fundamentally, this agreement will balance the budget by the year 2002. Beginning next year, when the agreement first goes into effect, the deficit will decline every year until we reach balance. Balancing the budget will require real fiscal discipline. This agreement calls for \$320 billion in savings over the next 5 years. More than half of those savings will come from entitlement programs and other mandatory spending. More than \$75 billion will come out of the military budget. While important domestic priorities will be spared the meat cleaver, nondefense discretionary spending, which encompasses many of the programs that the people across the country are interested in, will be reduced in real terms by \$61 billion, or about 4 percent. As I said, some pain comes.

Will all of these savings really balance the budget? Mr. President, any

budget projection must rely on economic assumptions. But the assumptions in this budget are on the conservative side. They are based on economic projections of the Congressional Budget Office which have proven to be far from reality for the past 4 years. They have missed the targets. They have overestimated some poor results.

Consider that just a few months ago, CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, estimated this year's budget deficit would be \$124 billion. That was only in January. In March, CBO, 2 months later, revised its estimate down to \$115 billion from \$124 billion. Now, in May, there are reports that the deficit could be as low as \$67 billion.

Think about that, Mr. President. We are talking about the current fiscal year which ends in less than 5 months, and in just that same length of time, the projected deficit has shrunk by 45 percent from \$124 billion to \$67 billion.

At this rate, some have suggested the best way to balance the budget would be for Congress to sit down, keep quiet, and go home. Who knows, they may be right. If they are, this agreement will produce significant budget surpluses, a result unimaginable not long ago.

My point, though, is simply that in using CBO's economic assumptions, we are using projections that have consistently proven to be too pessimistic. This budget does not rest on unrealistic rosy scenarios, as have past budget agreements, so it is very likely that we will actually reach balance or a surplus before the next 5 years is out if we can get this agreement enacted into law.

Mr. President, this budget resolution establishes without question that both political parties are now firmly committed to fiscal discipline. For years, Republicans have run for office by accusing the Democrats of being tax-and-spend liberals, unconcerned about fiscal responsibility. This agreement puts these charges to rest once and for all. It is now clear that Democrats and Republicans are both committed to a balanced budget. We disagree only about the means to that end and how the burden of the deficit reduction will be distributed.

Fortunately, this budget agreement is more than an accounting exercise. It will set our country on a firm course into the 21st century by empowering our people, by investing in them and ensuring they are ready to compete in the years and decades ahead.

As I noted earlier, this agreement includes the largest investment in education and training since the administration of Lyndon Baines Johnson. The agreement moves us toward a day when every 8-year-old child can read, every 12-year-old child can log in on the Internet, and every 18-year-old can go to college. Those are the goals that President Clinton committed to when he addressed us earlier this year, and they are the right goals for America.

Mr. President, I grew up the son of working-class immigrants, but was able, because of my service in World

War II, to attend Columbia University, thanks to the GI bill. I want all Americans to have the same opportunities I had, because education is the key to prosperity and security and because, like I, not only will they learn important subjects, but maybe their horizons will be less limiting. My horizons were developed because I saw my parents standing behind the counter making sandwiches, washing dishes, working from 6 o'clock in the morning until 11 o'clock at night, typically, 7 days a week, just to grind out a living to take care of my sister and me. They could not give us much more than the comfort of interested parents, and goals to which they wanted us to aspire. That is the way it ought to be, Mr. President.

The opportunity came along for me to have an education that never would have come my way. It changed my perspective totally, and enabled me, without being too immodest, to start a company that started an industry—the computing industry—that is today larger than the hardware industry. That is on the service side, software—everybody now is familiar with software—outsourcing services. The company has 29,000 employees. I am a member of something called the "Information Processing Hall of Fame," all of that because I got a boost from my Government, from my fellow citizens, for something that I did.

All Americans, no matter how rich or poor, should have access to that American dream. My parents never thought that I would have the opportunity to serve in the U.S. Senate, to be given the honor of serving the American people, but, again, it happened because a start was given to me at just the right time in my life.

Toward that end, Mr. President, toward access to the American dream, this agreement includes the largest Pell grant increases in two decades. Four million students will receive a grant of up to \$3,000 for higher education. These grants, we hope, will open the doors of opportunity and help lead our country in the next century. Our entire Nation will reap the reward.

The agreement also will provide significant tax relief to those who want to attend college. It endorses the objectives of President Clinton's HOPE scholarship proposal, which would provide a \$1,500 annual tax credit for higher education. This extra money would encourage millions of young people to go to college.

The agreement also endorses the objectives of the President's proposal to give a \$10,000 tax deduction to help cover education and job training costs for young people in the family. This proposal is critical to ensure that Americans are able to train and retrain themselves throughout their lives, not just upper level managers, but each and every American.

There are several other education initiatives that are guaranteed by this agreement. For example, it guarantees funding for a child literacy initiative

such as the President's America Reads proposal. This program would provide individualized after-school and summer help for more than 3 million children in kindergarten through the third grade. More than a million tutors would be involved.

The budget agreement also will fund a technological literacy initiative. The President has proposed to connect every American classroom to the Internet and to ensure that all teachers are trained to work with this latest in technology. His proposal would help schools integrate the technology into their programs so that no American child is burdened with computer illiteracy.

The budget agreement also calls for significant expansion of Head Start. This widely praised program has had tremendous success in preparing very young children for their education and for their futures. This agreement will help move us toward President Clinton's goal of increasing Head Start enrollments to 1 million children by the year 2002.

Mr. President, the combination of increased Pell grants, the tuition tax credit, the education training deduction, the children literacy initiative, the technological literacy program, Head Start, and many other educational initiatives, make this agreement a truly historic commitment to education, and it is reason enough for Democrats and Republicans alike to support this agreement.

I want to move on to some other important features of the budget resolution. It will ensure that up to 5 million uninsured children are provided with health coverage. The resolution includes \$16 billion toward that end, and it will be up to the committees of responsibility to decide whether to use Medicaid expansion or a grant program to States or another approach, but the commitment and the resources are there to get the job done. In the end, that will mean that more children of working families will have health insurance.

This budget agreement also will strengthen and modernize our Medicare Program. The agreement first would extend the solvency of the Medicare trust fund for at least 10 years. Senator DOMENICI made mention of the fact that during that time we will have to look to the longer term problems often associated with Medicare while carrying on the wonderful, very positive benefits that have resulted. It makes positive structural reforms which will bring Medicare more into line with the private sector while preparing it for the baby-boom generation.

The agreement extends the trust fund solvency in part by reforming payment systems for hospitals and doctors. In addition, it gives the seniors more choices. It increases the number of health plan options such as preferred provider organizations and provider-sponsored organizations. It also gives beneficiaries comparative information

about their options such as now provided Federal employees of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program.

Additionally, the agreement provides funding for several very significant new preventive benefits. These include expanded mammography coverage, coverage for colorectal screening, coverage for diabetes self-examination, and vaccinations. Beyond investing in education and protecting and improving Medicare, this agreement will provide significant tax relief to millions of American families.

In addition to the education tax cuts that I mentioned earlier, the agreement includes a \$500-per-child tax credit. This will be of real assistance to many Americans who are working hard and struggling to make ends meet. The agreement also will allow the Finance Committee to cut capital gains and estate taxes, as well as expand IRA's and make other changes to the Tax Code. These changes will benefit many small businesses and farmers, goals which Republicans and Democrats strongly agree upon.

However, there is real concern, Mr. President, among many Democrats that these tax breaks will go disproportionately to the wealthy and will explode the deficit in the long term. Frankly, I share those concerns. In a time of scarce resources, it seems wrong to be handing out huge tax breaks to people who do not need them.

The bottom line is we would not have a budget agreement if Democrats were not willing to accept some of these tax breaks. This was the main win that the Republicans demanded. Though it is a bitter pill for some, in my view, it is a pill we have to swallow for the benefits of a balanced budget, education investment, health coverage for 5 million children, restoration of disability benefits for desperate legal immigrants, and other positive parts of this agreement.

I do want to assure my colleagues, however, that the agreement includes significant constraints in the tax area that will help prevent a redo of the kind of economics that created the deficit problem in the first place.

First, there are firm limits on the size of the tax cuts—the agreement states that the net tax cuts shall be \$85 billion in the first 5 years, and no more than \$250 billion through 2007. Second, Leader LOTT and Speaker GINGRICH have given their firm commitment—in writing—that tax cuts, and I quote “shall not cause costs to explode in the outyears.”

For those who are not satisfied with that commitment, I would point out that President Clinton has made it clear that he will not tolerate a tax bill that imposes huge costs in the future. And while he has agreed to a significant capital gains and estate tax cut, he has not signed away his right to veto extreme legislation that violates our basic understanding.

I also want to assure my colleagues that the size of the tax cuts in this

agreement are very small compared to the enormous breaks that were approved in the early 1980's. The tax cut of 1981 cost \$2.8 trillion over 10 years, in today's dollars. By contrast, this agreement would allow tax cuts of \$250 billion—less than 10 percent of those that were proposed 17 years ago.

Mr. President, Republicans may have won in their insistence on tax breaks for wealthier Americans, but they did abandon radical plans to completely gut domestic priorities, and undermine the basic functions of Government. Over the next 5 years, this agreement calls for \$355 billion more in domestic discretionary spending than NEWT GINGRICH demanded in the infamous Contract With America. And it includes \$189 billion more than in last year's Republican budget resolution.

Mr. President, lest anyone has the impression that Government is going to be growing over the next 5 years because of these increases in some of the discretionary funds, it won't be. Non-defense discretionary spending will be cut from baseline by 4 percent overall, and by 10 percent in real terms in 2002. And when you consider that priority programs will be spared, the real cuts in other programs will be significant.

Still, in nominal terms, available resources for basic Government functions will increase overall, if only modestly. And we will trim Government with a scalpel, not a meat axe cleaver. Under the circumstances, that's a major victory.

Let me now move on to another part of the budget agreement, which deals with Medicaid.

Mr. President, this agreement preserves the Medicaid Program in two major respects. First, it preserves the guarantee of health coverage for our Nation's most vulnerable citizens. Second, it rejects the administration's proposal to establish a per capita cap on Medicaid payments. I want to publicly thank my fellow negotiators for both of these decisions.

I think it would have been a poor way to administer the Medicaid Program. We shouldn't be adopting a scheme that jeopardizes the quality of health care for millions of children, seniors, and other vulnerable Americans.

At one point, I was in a distinct minority in the negotiating room in my opposition to the per capita cap, and I am very pleased that the proposal was rejected in the end. In my view, at a time when the growth in Medicaid spending has dropped dramatically, we should not be adopting risky schemes that could jeopardize the quality of health care for millions of children, seniors, and other vulnerable Americans.

Mr. President, the agreement does include a cut in payments for hospitals that serve a disproportionate share of Medicaid and uninsured patients. I have real concerns about this. Clearly, some States have abused the program, and we should be able to find savings

by reforming the program. But we must be very careful not to hurt children's hospitals and others who are very reliant on this funding. I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Finance Committee to ensure that this does not happen.

Mr. President, let me turn now to another important element of this agreement, the provisions that will roll back some of the more extreme provisions in last year's welfare reform bill.

First, this agreement will restore Medicaid and disability benefits for many disabled legal immigrants. These are people who have come to this country legally, who have worked and paid their taxes, and who suffer from a serious disability.

Mr. President, it is wrong to punish these people for getting hit by a bus, or losing their eyesight. Many of them are desperately poor to begin with. Now they may be confined to bed or a wheelchair, with nowhere to go and nobody to turn to. They can't work. And they need help to survive. Providing basic assistance is the right thing to do.

This agreement also will provide relief to some individuals who would lose food stamps because they are unable to find work. This was another provision of the welfare reform bill that simply went too far. The agreement will permit States to exempt 15 percent of those who would lose benefits because of the law's very strict time limits, and would fund additional work slots for individuals subject to those limits.

In addition, the agreement includes \$3 billion to help people move from welfare to work, something that all of us want to see happen.

Mr. President, let me now turn to an area of special interest to me, transportation.

Mr. President, as most of my colleagues know, I believe strongly in the value of investing in transportation, because I'm convinced that it yields tremendous benefits for our people and our economy. For years, our Nation has underinvested in transportation. And we are paying the price for that—in deteriorating roads, in snarling traffic, and in crumbling bridges and deteriorating rail systems.

Mr. President, when you compare transportation to other functions within the Government, this agreement treats transportation relatively well. I pushed hard in the negotiations for additional resources, and we were able to find over \$8 billion more than the President's request over the next 5 years. That was a major increase from where we began.

Is it enough? No, it's not. But the bottom line is that there just aren't enough resources to balance the budget while doing everything we'd like. Compared with most parts of the Government, transportation does very well in this budget. And I'm hopeful we can identify even more resources as the legislative process moves forward.

Let me turn briefly to another area of particular interest to me, the environment. This budget agreement confirms that the environment is a priority. It commits the congressional leadership to fully fund environmental protection and natural resources. And it specifically protects the President's funding requests for operations of the EPA and the National Park Service's operation of the National Park System and the Everglades. In addition, the agreement reserves funds for cleaning up hazardous waste sites, assuming we can reach an agreement on policy issues concerning Superfund, which I expect will happen. Finally, the agreement provides an additional \$700 million for priority land acquisitions and exchanges.

Mr. President, before I close, let me once again say how much a privilege it has been for me to work with the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI. We have spent many, many hours together over the past several weeks. And the more I have gotten to know him, the more I have come to respect and like him. He is an honorable man who genuinely cares about our country, even if we often disagree. And he is a strong negotiator.

I also want to take this opportunity to publicly thank the other negotiators who have worked so hard to make this agreement a reality. First, Congressmen JOHN KASICH and JOHN SPRATT, men of totally different styles who share a common commitment to hard work and serious policymaking. And Frank Raines, John Hille, and Gene Sperling of the administration, all of whom did a tremendous job in pulling this agreement together. The President has put together a very impressive team.

I also want to acknowledge the many contributions of Democratic Senators on the Budget Committee who have worked with us on this agreement.

Senators HOLLINGS, CONRAD, FEINGOLD and JOHNSON have all been vocal and effective advocates for truth in budgeting, and for a plan that makes real progress in addressing our long-term deficit problems. They have held our feet to the fire, and deserve real credit for that.

Senator SARBANES has taken the lead to ensure that the burdens of deficit reduction are distributed fairly. I know he still has some concerns about the resolution, but I want to thank him for his input as the process has moved forward.

Senators BOXER and MURRAY have been outspoken advocates for our children. They have demanded that we do a better job of covering our uninsured young people, and that we not make dangerous changes in the Medicaid Program that could jeopardize health care for our Nation's most vulnerable citizens. Their efforts will touch the lives of millions of Americans.

Senator WYDEN has been unrelenting in his demand that we modernize Medi-

care, that we provide additional health care choices for senior citizens, and that we protect the long-term solvency of the Medicare trust fund. No Senator has been more devoted to the future of this critical program, or more determined to make it work.

Last but not least, Senator DURBIN has in many ways been the conscience of our efforts in recent weeks. He has demanded that ordinary Americans, especially those with modest incomes, be treated fairly as we reduce the deficit. And he has helped lead the fight to restore critically needed protections for legal immigrants and children.

Mr. President, I know that many of my fellow Democrats have been frustrated with the process that led to this agreement. And I share that frustration. This was not the process that I wanted. But we have done our best under the circumstances to maximize consultation with committee members, and with all Senate Democrats. And I am optimistic that, in the end, most of my colleagues will be pleased with the end product.

Finally, I want to congratulate President Clinton for his leadership in this effort. We are here today on a bipartisan basis only because the President decided to make it happen. He deserves enormous credit for that. And I think his commitment will be appreciated and acknowledged for many years to come.

Mr. President, let me close this way. I don't think there's anyone who is entirely happy with this agreement. But while nobody sees it as perfect, everyone should see it as a good compromise. It's fair and it's balanced. And it will serve America well.

It will balance the budget. It will invest in education and training. It will provide tax relief to the middle class. It will protect Medicare and Medicaid. It will provide health care coverage to millions of children. It will throw a life vest to disabled legal immigrants. It will invest in transportation, and in environmental protection. And it will make life better for millions of ordinary, working Americans.

I close, Mr. President, with saying my thanks and appreciation to my staff who worked so hard on the Budget Committee—Bruce King, Sander Lurie, and Sue Nelson—and all of the members of the staff of the Budget Committee for their effort. We all did what we thought was right for America. I am proud to have been a part of it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, might I inquire of the number of Senators present on the floor—which pleases me to no end. Normally at this hour at this stage of the budget resolution nobody is interested. Senator DODD was here first. Might I inquire what he intends to do, so we kind of know?

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I thank the chairman. My intention was to

offer an amendment at the appropriate time. I thought if I got here early, I would be high on the list, if not first, to offer my amendment. I will defer any comment on the bill itself and reserve time to offer an amendment favorably on the budget agreement that was reached. That is my purpose.

Mr. DOMENICI. Senator SARBANES?

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, it was my intention to offer a statement about the bill.

Mr. DOMENICI. Senator BYRD? I am not trying to limit or anything of this sort.

Mr. BYRD. Yes. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I expect to speak about 20 minutes. It will not be on the budget resolution.

Mr. DOMENICI. We will take the time off the resolution.

Mr. BYRD. Very well, if you will allow me.

Mr. DOMENICI. Indeed.

Senator WELLSTONE?

Mr. WELLSTONE. It is my intention to speak on the bill in general and to try to analyze the overall agreement. I will in all likelihood join with Senator DODD in his amendment later.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I think we have established in the beginning that we would go from side to side in recognition. If it is all right with my colleagues, I would like to give Senator BYRD the 20 minutes that he has asked for and permit him to speak as he wishes at this juncture.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I am going to leave Senator GORTON in my stead here in a minute or so. Whatever rights have been designated to me by the leader I designate to him under the statute. I am not going to try to make any further allotment. But if there are no Republicans forthcoming after Senator BYRD, then I will have no objection to whomever you choose next, and I will ask you to hold the amendments until some of these speeches are finished. Then we can kind of pile some of those up, and that is what people would like to do. I shouldn't use that word. That carries with it some resonance that is not so nice. We will try to stack them like beautiful lumber.

Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. SARBANES. Do they grow lumber in New Mexico?

Mr. DOMENICI. They grow anything you like in New Mexico. It is all sweet, aromatic, and beautiful.

Mr. President, I want to make a few points.

First of all, I am very glad, even though I did not intend to during this budget debate, to go through a litany of what Republicans have stood for and what we have accomplished, nor do I intend at this moment to go through all of the things the President asked

for that he didn't get. I would like to make just a couple of comments.

First of all, I believe that I should be very proud of being a Republican because I don't believe without Republicans pushing for a balanced budget this President would ever have gotten to the point where he would have been for a balanced budget, much less negotiating one with us. I think history will reveal that. It was very hard to get him to come to that point.

I am not now offering this as a critical thing but merely saying that Republicans—since my friend Senator LAUTENBERG chose to have a great litany of Democratic things the Democratic Party has done—I am very pleased to be part of the party that actually pushed this country and its leaders to get a balanced budget.

Second, I would like to say I am unashamed in talking about tax cuts.

Mr. President, there is no question that our philosophy and our idea is that tax dollars don't belong to the Government, that they belong to the people who earned it, and that the Government ought to take from the people only that minimum amount needed leaving the people as free as possible.

I believe that before we are finished, many middle-income families will be receiving some of their money back. We will not be saying that we are refunding taxes to them. They will be keeping some of their money, which we are hopeful as time passes they can keep more and more of as we make Government more and more efficient.

The country with the most individual freedom is the country that is going to achieve the most. And one measurement of that over time is going to be the level of taxation that the Government chooses by virtue of which they take from people rather than leave money with people.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I thank the two managers for yielding time.

SEXUAL CONDUCT, TRAINING, AND AMERICAN NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, two weeks ago, on May 6, 1997, a military jury sentenced an Army staff sergeant to 25 years in prison for raping six female trainees, just one of a series of highly visible scandals regarding sexual relations now plaguing training facilities in the Army. Press reports indicate that hundreds of similar cases of alleged sexual abuse and discrimination have been reported and are being investigated at other military training commands around the country. On May 10, 1997, the senior enlisted soldier in the U.S. Army was charged with similar offenses. The extent of the scandals that have been unearthed at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, as well as other

facilities, indicates to me that the time has arrived for a thorough review of further gender-integrated training in the military. There are those who feel that same-sex training has failed as a training mechanism and is adversely affecting morale, discipline and the integrity of our armed forces. This is a serious situation, involving very serious allegations with possible repercussions on our national security. The situation needs to be examined with a dispassionate attitude, and it greatly complicates our task if well-meaning advocacy groups in our country make the assumption that anyone who calls for a thorough investigation of the viability of gender integrated training and operational roles is per se, a bigot, is against equal treatment and opportunity, and is trying to roll the clock back because of his or her narrow vision.

The Senate Armed Services committee held a hearing on this matter on February 4, 1997, at which the Army leadership testified. Certainly one of the issues we need to understand is the pervasiveness of sexual misconduct in the services. Are these isolated incidents we have been reading about, or are there systemic problems rooted in the integration of the armed forces and the environments in which they must train and operate? There was some testimony before the committee that these incidents are akin to the proverbial few bad apples in the barrel, and that what needs to be done is emphasize right and wrong, professional behavior, and punish unprofessional behavior. But, Mr. President, the numbers involved here tell a different story. The Army established a hot line for women to report sexual harassment, misconduct, or abuse last fall when the first incidents were reported. In a little over two and a half months, that hot line received about 7,000 phone calls. That is an astonishing and disturbing number. It takes little courage to make such a phone call. One wonders how many phone calls, on top of the 7,000, that should have been made were not made for fear of retaliation, or just reticence. Now, the Secretary of the Army testified that by February the number of calls on the hot line had "tapered off" to about 50 a week. This is not indicative to me of just a few bad apples in the barrel. More than one thousand of those calls have generated an investigation of some kind. Furthermore, recent surveys taken by the Defense Manpower Data Center Survey indicated that large numbers of women reported one or more incidents of unwanted sexual attention. In 1988-89, 68 percent of women reported such incidents. In 1995 a similar survey got similar results, with 61 percent of the women in the Army reporting such incidents. So this is not just your random, marginal population. There is a serious, central problem that needs to be looked at.

This is not just about sexual harassment among soldiers of equal rank. It

is about that, but it is about much more, it is about the use of power and authority of sergeants and officers whom we put in authority, over the recruits and junior people whom they are responsible to train and look after. It is about raw abuse of power of a shocking, crude kind. It is about power and sexual misconduct. It leads one to ask a fundamental question: are women actually safe in the U.S. military? As Senator SNOWE said during that hearing: "As we incorporate the sexes together in tighter and tighter situations, at higher and higher stress situations, in more confined situations, common sense tells us that we are going to be dealing with a very difficult problem. Is there a danger that we are trying to minimize the very real differences here between men and women? Might there really be enough significant distinctions between being a man and being a woman that we should be more discriminating, not less, in terms of assignments and utilization?"

The Chief of Staff of the Army, Mr. Joe Reimer, testified at the Armed Services hearing that this is an issue that is not about policy, and instead it is an issue about right and wrong. That is, it is not about whether we should have women in the military, but whether we can expect our sergeants and officers in authority to carry out their job properly, not use their power to engage in misconduct. But, I think that just begs the question. While it is about right and wrong, it is also surely about policy. It is about in what situations, what kinds of training, what kinds of operations, women and men can work effectively in the military, and in what kinds of training and operations situations the sexual diversion is just too difficult a factor. For instance, we have had gender integrated training in the military since 1974, but we have only had such training of recruits in the military for the last three years. It is in the recruit training situation that we are certainly experiencing very serious problems, and surely that needs to be revisited now. I note that there is legislation moving through the other body to prohibit mixed recruit training. That is one natural reaction to the situation, as I now understand it, and that is the approach that I would support.

But I think the better policy question is this: are we putting people into situations that put at risk our goal of an effective trained combat force with high morale, discipline and unit cohesiveness, making that goal more difficult to achieve than it should be? Are we putting temptations in the face of people and saying to them, "overcome those temptations?"

The U.S. military goal is not to change basic human nature. It is to mold that nature for very specific military tasks. We do not need a major sociological analysis to know that sexual tension between men and women is affected by the environment in which