

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 unabashed 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

they are placed. Surely every military activity, and particularly recruit training, and high tension battlefield environments, are the kinds of environments wherein we need to be particularly attentive to the burdens we are placing on normal American men and women.

It certainly should be clear that integrating men and women in the training, and into the combat forces of the military, introduces an explosive new element into the attempt to create an effective fighting force. The ultimate, bottom-line question should be this: what is the impact of sexual integration on the battlefield? The purpose of an Army is to fight, and to win. If gender integration enhances the prospects of readiness, and effectiveness in combat, then we should all be for it. If it reduces American effectiveness on the battlefield, should we be for gender integration on the general grounds of social equality? I, for one, think the question answers itself, and the answer is no. Perhaps the facts are not all in. There are few, if any models around the world, of other modern, effective Armies which have gender-integrated their forces. So we are breaking new ground in America on gender integrated training, particularly when it comes to combat roles. In plain words, we are conducting an experiment.

I think that the scandals which we are seeing in the training commands must be taken as a danger sign that sexual integration complicates an Army's fighting capabilities, in that it introduces a new element which diverts the focused attention on winning battles that an Army must have.

It seems completely obvious to me that living and training in close quarters puts a strain and a stress on people's behavior. Furthermore, the effect of confined environments where men and women work and live in close quarters certainly involves sexual issues. It is laughable to assume otherwise. Sexual issues involve not just breaking the rules on fraternization and sexual relations, per se, but involve perceptions of favoritism in unit life which can negatively affect the cohesiveness, morale, and discipline that are the critical ingredients of success in military life, and success in combat. Whether one believes in equality among men and women is not the issue here. In the special world of military life where the ultimate mission of fighting and winning is uniquely different from all other environments and roles in civilian life, the issue is the national security of our nation and how best to maintain it with the most effective fighting force.

There is no real reason for social experimentation in mixing the sexes at all levels of military life and functions. Certainly this does not mean women cannot be as successful as men in all or certainly most of the levels of work in the military. But this may only be true with two caveats. First, because women are not as a rule as physically able to meet harsh combat conditions,

they start with a disadvantage. This reality is central to the consideration by the Marine Corps not to include women in infantry units. Second, the relations among the sexes present an irreducible diversion which complicates the effectiveness of combat units. The Marines train women and men separately as recruits, and have found that it works best for them. After initial recruit training, they are trained together, except for the unique function of combat training, since women do not serve in Marine infantry units.

It is not at all clear to me that there is any body of evidence that a force trained on a gender-integrated basis performs better in combat than a force trained on a segregated basis. More to the essential point, there is no credible body of evidence showing that gender-integrated combat forces, such as infantry forces, perform better than all male units. Before we extend our desire to treat women fairly and equally with men, a bedrock working principle of American society, we need to satisfy ourselves that the conditions under which men fight are actually conducive to fielding integrated units. Indeed, it would be folly to assume that the natural attractions, jealousies and diversions that close sexual quarters enhance can be overcome by issuing an edict that professionalism only will be permitted. It is quite clearly the case, as Aberdeen and other scandals indicate to me, that gender-integrated training is having a very bumpy ride, and we should review the kinds of integrated training that will work, and the kinds of gender-integrated training that will not work.

Mr. President, there must be ways to thoroughly examine, review, and evaluate the reasons for the recent spate of scandals regarding sexual relations in training commands. Such a study should be made by an independent blue-ribbon body with unquestioned credentials—with no social agenda, but geared solely to the effect of gender integration at all levels of the military, in support as well as combat roles, in training recruits as well as seasoned soldiers—to evaluate the impacts solely on our national security. In the meantime, until such a review can be done and fully considered by the Congress, I intend to propose an amendment to the fiscal year 1998 Department of Defense authorization bill which would suspend the continuation of gender-integrated recruit training in all the services, as is currently the case with regard to the Marine Corps.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

The Senate continued with the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, as we are going back and forth, I will take a very few moments and then yield to one of my Democratic colleagues, so I yield such time as I may use.

Mr. President, the parentage of this successful budget resolution is ardently sought by many. Only failure is an orphan. In this case—I hope not to drive the metaphor too far—I believe that many properly may claim parentage of the resolution that is before us here.

In the decade and a half during which I have served in the U.S. Senate, this budget resolution marks two firsts. It is the first resolution that genuinely will yield us, when passed and enforced, to a balanced budget, to a situation in which we will no longer be piling debt upon debt on the backs of our children and our grandchildren. It is also, remarkably, the first budget resolution during that period of time that seems likely to pass with significant majorities in favor of it from both political parties.

As I look back on the history that has led to this point, I reflect on the fact that members of the Democratic Party and the President of the United States can claim some credit in moving in this direction for the highly controversial resolution that they proposed and passed without any support from the Republican Party some 4 years ago. Our predictions that that resolution would have dire consequences did not, in fact, turn out to be the case. We may still believe that a different course of action would have had even better results, but, obviously, at this point we cannot prove that. The Senator from New Jersey has already spoken to that proposition.

At the same time, 2 years later, when the Republicans became a majority in both the House and in the Senate, we passed and attempted to enforce a budget resolution more dramatic even than the one that is before us today, with its reform of entitlement programs, its securing of Medicare for many, many years to come, and in the tax relief that it provided for the American people.

Ultimately, the enforcing mechanism for that budget resolution was successfully vetoed by President Clinton, but, nonetheless, it charted a new and different course of action for the American economy and especially for the way in which the Congress and the President determined spending and taxing priorities.

Before the President vetoed the results of that budget resolution, he had, for the first time, committed himself to balancing the budget. I think, again, many Members of this side discounted that commitment, as we believed that it was not carried out by the policies that he recommended pursuant to his commitment to a balanced budget. But nevertheless, the debate then became not whether to balance the budget but how. That debate, a debate separating the two political parties, continued until just a short few weeks ago.