

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.

At that point, the President, the leaders of the Republican Party in both the House and the Senate, with the assent of much of the Democratic leadership, reached an agreement, not only on the ultimate goal but on the means by which to reach that goal, and it is some of the details of that agreement which, after further negotiation, are a part of the budget resolution that is before us this afternoon.

The Senator from New Jersey has outlined many of the elements of this budget resolution which he believes meet the agenda of his party and of the President of the United States. Ours on this side may be fewer, but we think they may be more profound. We have reached the goal we have sought without wavering and without compromise: of a resolution that would, in real terms, promise a balance to the Federal budget with lower interest rates, with a fiscal dividend that that would bring with it. And we are now right at the edge of meeting that goal.

We have succeeded in crafting a budget resolution and getting agreement to a budget resolution which will provide real genuine tax relief for the American people, for American families with children, for farmers and small businessmen, and estate tax relief, for investors and for job creators in the realm of capital gains, and we have also succeeded, at least modestly, in getting agreement to the beginnings of certain reforms in the entitlement programs, which are almost exclusively responsible for spending increases each and every year for decades that outpaced both inflation and the growth of our economy.

Government will not grow as a result of this resolution at anything like the rapidity it would have grown without it. The distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, the Senator from New Mexico, has, in this illustration, shown what happens with respect to the budget deficit, even including the tax relief that is an integral part of this resolution today.

So we will have more modest spending than would otherwise have been the case. We will have tax relief for the American people. We will have a balanced budget due to the diligence of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico and the broad support he has from his own party, due to the eloquence and hard work of the majority leader, the Senator from Mississippi, and the wonderful relationship he and the Senator from New Mexico created for one another, due to the hard work of many members of the Democratic Party and of the President and his advisers, and perhaps not least in all of the credit that should be given here in the parenting of this budget resolution would go to those outsiders led by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAU] who last year created a bipartisan budget resolution, with all of the elements that this one has—some to a more dramatic extent

than this one has—and came within four votes of carrying that resolution on the floor of this U.S. Senate, even though they were opposed by the leadership in both parties and by the President of the United States. Many of the elements of their proposal are included today, but they blazed the trail for a degree of bipartisan cooperation that had not previously existed.

So for my part at least, Mr. President, I am delighted to give credit where credit is due and to say that credit is extremely widely spread. I trust that after listening to the debate today and tomorrow—I hope not longer than that—that the resolution that is before us will not have been significantly changed by amendment, that it will be passed by a very substantial bipartisan majority, a majority of both parties, and that it will then be properly carried out and properly enforced by all of those who have supported it, for which the Congress and the President will deserve credit and thanks from the people of the United States, both for their responsibility and for having created the opportunities for greater economic growth and greater prosperity for the people of the United States.

Mr. LAUTENBERG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I yield so much time as the Senator from Maryland wants to use to make a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. President, in 1993, just 4 years ago, in order to reduce the deficit, the Congress, by a narrow margin, enacted a budget resolution which curtailed programs and increased taxes. The increase in taxes primarily impacted those at the upper end of the income scale.

This combination of spending restraint and revenue increases represents a logical way of dealing with the deficit issue. When you are trying to reduce and then eliminate the deficit, the logical way to do it is to restrain spending and to seek additional revenues. That combination, presumably, will result in lowering your deficits.

This approach has worked in a most impressive way. A flourishing economy has brought unemployment below 5 percent for the first time in 24 years. This chart shows the unemployment rate going back to 1971. As you can see, with one exception, the unemployment rate now is the lowest it has been in this period. Back here, in 1973, is when it just dipped below 5 percent. It has now gone below 5 percent again.

While unemployment is at a 24-year low, inflation is at a 31-year low, as is shown by this next chart, which shows the inflation rate from 1966 to 1996.

I do not know what better proof one can offer of a strong economy than the

low unemployment rate and the low inflation rate we are now experiencing.

As a consequence of this flourishing economy, the deficit has declined on a steady basis since fiscal year 1992. In fiscal year 1992, the deficit was at \$290 billion. And it has come down in each succeeding year, to \$255 billion in 1993, \$203 billion in 1994, \$164 billion in 1995, and to \$107 billion in the last fiscal year, the year that ended this past September 30. It is now expected to be below \$70 billion for the current fiscal year. In other words, we will have gone from a \$290 billion deficit in 1992 on a straight downward trend, and we are expecting a deficit under \$70 billion for the fiscal year in which we now find ourselves.

As a percent of the gross domestic product, the deficit has declined in a most impressive way, from 4.9 percent in 1992 to 1.4 percent for the fiscal year that ended this past September 30. As you can see from this next chart, it declined from 4.9 percent in 1992 to 4.1 percent in 1993 to 3.1 percent in 1994 to 2.3 percent in 1995 to 1.4 percent in the fiscal year ending September 30, and it is now anticipated that the deficit as a percent of gross domestic product will be less than 1 percent for the current fiscal year, the lowest percentage since 1974.

So you have the best unemployment rate in 24 years, the lowest inflation in 31 years, the lowest deficit as a percent of GDP in 23 years.

By way of comparison, the Maastricht Agreement of the European Community, which established what are regarded as tough requirements for the member nations, has as its goal the bringing of deficits down to under 3 percent of GDP—3 percent. We, at the end of this year, will be down to less than 1 percent.

In fact, just comparing the United States with the other major industrial countries, we see from this chart that our deficit as a share of GDP is 1.4 percent. Japan is at 3.1 percent, Germany at 3.5 percent, Canada at 4.2 percent, France at 5 percent, the United Kingdom at 5.1 percent, and Italy at 7.2 percent.

Now, by any measure, this is a most impressive economic performance, and certainly a very impressive deficit reduction performance.

Given this performance, one would think that the wise policy would be to stay the course and finish the job. I mean, this is a spectacular course that I have outlined here that we have been following. So one would assume that the wise policy would be to stay the course and finish the job. Instead, the budget resolution before us combines spending restraint with tax cuts—I repeat, spending restraint with tax cuts.

Obviously, spending restraint, as in 1993, works in the direction of deficit reduction. As I said at the outset, that is logical. You are trying to bring the deficit down. Spending restraint works in the direction of deficit reduction. But tax cuts work against deficit reduction. And the tax cuts contained in

this budget agreement will grow over time in a way that may well jeopardize the goal of reaching and staying—and staying—in budget balance.

The capital gains, inheritance, and IRA tax cuts, all of which are provided for in the tax portion of this budget agreement, carry with them the potential for substantial increases in future years.

In fact, this budget agreement recognizes such a trend line by providing for \$85 billion net tax cuts in the first 5 years, 1998 to 2002, and almost double that, a net tax cut of \$165 billion, in the next 5 years, 2003 to 2007. No agreements were made as to the following decade. But obviously, if we are concerned about the future strength and viability of the economy, it is important to look to the out years, to have some sense of where these trend lines may be taking us.

The budget agreement itself, in the tables accompanying the text of the agreement, projects that in the 10th year of the agreement—in other words, at the end of the period when we are to have a total of \$250 billion in tax cuts—the tax cuts would be \$42 billion. Now this represents a rising trend line with respect to the tax cuts. In fact, the projections are that the tax cuts will increase by \$5 billion in each of the last 2 years of the 10-year agreement on which this resolution is based, that is from 2005 to 2006, and from 2006 to 2007.

If you are at \$42 billion in the 10th year, then one can anticipate two scenarios for the following decade, from 2008 to 2017. If in fact the cost of the taxes stayed at \$42 billion a year for each of those years, in other words, plateaued—a most unlikely assumption given the trend line—you would then project \$420 billion in tax cuts over the next 10 years. If, however, the cuts continued to increase according to the trend line established through the first 10 years, in other words, increasing by \$5 billion a year through 2017, you would have tax cuts of \$700 billion in the following decade.

So we have a situation here where it is almost certain that the tax cuts that are part of this agreement will carry with them a rising trend that will, in effect, undercut the deficit reduction effort. And I ask, is it not imprudent, indeed irresponsible to commit to such tax cuts before we have actually achieved budget balance and before we have a more accurate and realistic view of whether it can be sustained?

We are talking about responsibility here. Yet we are undertaking in this resolution to commit to tax cuts before we have actually achieved budget balance and furthermore before we have a realistic and accurate view of whether budget balance can then be sustained.

I believe that the tax-reduction side of the budget agreement carries with it the potential for undermining the deficit-reduction effort. Furthermore, the combination of program curtailment on the one hand and tax reduction on the other represents an inequitable al-

location of the burdens of deficit reduction.

The impact of a reduction in programs will be felt by ordinary working people primarily. The tax reductions, by contrast, will primarily benefit those at the top end of the income and wealth scale.

Consider that 75 percent of the benefits of the capital gains tax can be expected to go to those making over \$100,000 a year, the top 5 percent of the population. The inheritance tax cut would benefit an even smaller percentage of the population. Yet this resolution that is before us imposes additional burdens on working people through program reductions.

In fact, the projections are that domestic discretionary programs will be 10 percent below—10 percent below—the current service level, namely, the level adjusted for inflation, in the year 2002. At the same time that we have a 10-percent cut in programs, substantial tax reductions will be given to those at the apex of the income and wealth pyramid. This is not fair or equitable.

A budget agreement should undertake equitable deficit reduction, namely, apportioning the burdens in a way that it is reasonably spread across the entire society, as was done in 1993, when ordinary working people made their contribution through program reductions and those at the top end of the income scale made their contribution through tax increases.

But in this instance, we have working people bearing a burden through program reduction, but we can anticipate tax reductions which markedly benefit those at the upper end of the income and wealth scale, and impose no burden on these individuals.

Thus, this budget fails the equity test. A budget agreement should also lead to lasting, long-term deficit reduction. As I have indicated, I am most apprehensive about this agreement because I foresee that we will not be able, even if we were to reach balance in 2002—and there is some serious doubt about that under this agreement—to sustain that balance in the subsequent decades. Thus, this agreement also fails the long-term deficit reduction test.

In short, this budget agreement does not have either of the two essential attributes of a budget: equitable deficit reduction and lasting, long-term deficit reduction. Because of that, I do not support it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask Senator ALLARD, do you want to offer an amendment?

Mr. ALLARD. I do have an amendment at the desk, but I understand that Senator DODD is going to offer an amendment before me.

Mr. DOMENICI. I say to the Senator, that means we are going to have Sen-

ator WELLSTONE give his general speech because we are going with general speeches ahead of amendments.

Is that all right with the Senator?

Mr. ALLARD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank all of my colleagues for their courtesy.

Let me first of all start out by saying I associate myself with the remarks of Senator SARBANES, the Senator from Maryland. Senator SARBANES talked about equitable deficit reduction. I emphasize the equitable part of that formulation.

Mr. President, those on both sides labored very hard. People make the decisions they think are the right decisions. I do not rise to point an accusatory finger at any of my colleagues. As I look at this agreement, I do not see that equitable deficit reduction.

To give but one example, I see very little of the shared sacrifice, and I think to be shared sacrifice we would have to extend part of the deficit reduction burden onto large and wealthy corporations and zero in on what has been called corporate welfare. That means some of our large multinational corporations—oil and gas, mining, pharmaceutical, health care conglomerates, and others—who now reap benefits of huge loopholes in our Tax Code, who are fed, if you will, at the trough of unjustified tax giveaways, would, in fact, be required to pay their fair share toward deficit reduction. They are the heavy hitters, the well connected. They are the players. That is not a part of this budget agreement. I do not think what we have here is equitable deficit reduction.

I know a number of my colleagues, as they look at some of these loopholes and deductions or as they make the case for across-the-board, what I call kind of a scatter-gun approach to cuts in capital gains or estate tax, make the argument this will bolster the economy by boosting savings and investments.

I cite a report by the Republican staff of the House Budget Committee from just a few short years ago:

Whether aimed at increasing efficiency or growth, many so-called “growth enhancements” backfire. This is due to two factors. First, few incentives are very powerful, and simply do not result in large increases in output. Second, they typically lose revenues, increasing government borrowing as a consequence, and thus reducing the accumulation of private capital as a result.

My friends say to me, “But we are balancing the budget.” I smile and say, “We will see.” My guess is, as I look at those who are in control of the committees and especially are going to be dealing with the tax legislation, it looks to me like we go toward indexing capital gains. It looks to me that we will have across-the-board cuts in capital gains in estate not targeted to family business, not targeted to middle

income, with the lion's share of benefits going to the very top of the American population.

Mr. President, studies have shown consistently that households with incomes of over \$100,000 a year receive approximately 75 percent of the capital gains income. If the goal is to provide relief to middle-income taxpayers, that is one thing, but what is happening here is the vast majority of the benefits go to those at the very top.

At the same time, as we look at capital gains or estate tax, if you talk about family farmers or small businesses, fine. But I think that under the cover of the problems of small family farmers and small business people we are seeing in this budget agreement massive tax breaks to those who least need it.

This estate tax goes to some of our families. Some of the families that will benefit are Cargo Co., a family-owned company, or Mars Candy or Continental Grain. I suggest to you that the multinational corporations hardly need more by way of more tax breaks.

Mr. President, I think many Democrats are going to vote for this budget agreement but with far less enthusiasm than their public posture suggests. They are hoping when the reconciliation bill fills in the blanks on the budget and it comes to the floor this summer, we will not explode the deficits, and in addition, the critical investments in health care and education and children and all the rest that we believe in will, in fact, be there.

As I look at the record of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle over the last couple of years, I have seen a defeat of efforts to go after corporate welfare. I have seen outrageous tax giveaways. I have seen a relentless attack on those in society least able to protect themselves, and I have seen very little standard of fairness when it comes to deficit reduction. I have seen deficit reduction based upon the path of least political resistance. Cut the benefits for those who are weakest—for children, for legal immigrants, for low- and moderate-income people, but when it comes to the subsidies for large oil companies or big insurance companies or some of the multinational corporations, big grain companies, no; they need more by way of benefits.

I agree with my colleague from Maryland, I fear, and I think there is every reason to believe this based upon the pronouncements I have heard so far, that when we get to the tax part of this package we will see backloaded cuts, indexing, and cuts in capital gains and estate taxes that will explode the deficit as we move into the next millennium, at the very time, I might add, Mr. President, that many of us baby boomers come of age and we will have precious little by way of investment.

Mr. President, I have several amendments that I will propose. I will start out joining with my colleague from

Connecticut, Senator DODD. But I just want to highlight a few things I want to focus on.

First let me talk a little bit about child nutrition. The School Breakfast Program, currently 6.5 million children participate. That is barely half of the children that are eligible. In the reform bill passed last year, all in the name of deficit reduction, we eliminated, wiped out grants for schools to start up the School Breakfast Program.

Anybody who understands anything about education, anybody who understands anything about children, anybody who spends any time in schools will certainly acknowledge the fact that children who come to school hungry and cannot participate in school breakfast because we cut the funding for this program, are not going to be able to do as well in school as children who do not come to school hungry.

Where is the standard of fairness?

Mr. President, we also have a Summer Food Service Program, not real well known. As a matter of fact, only 2 million out of 14 million children participate because we do not adequately fund it. But do you want to know something, Mr. President? These children that really are so dependent upon school lunch and school breakfast, where it is available, during the summer they are malnourished and do not have an adequate diet. We are able to fund only 2 million out of 14 million children. Mr. President, in my amendment I will call for increasing the funding for this program.

Finally, I want to talk a little bit about school construction. My friend Jonathan Kozol wrote a book called "Savage Inequalities." He traveled all across the country and reported on what he observed.

Mr. President, let me just make the point, I will not give specific examples, but let me say to my colleagues, we have too many children who go to rotting schools. What kind of message are we conveying to children in this country when they go to schools that are dilapidated, with rotting infrastructure, toilets that do not work, cold in the winter, too hot in the summer, crumbling buildings, decrepit? What kind of message are we conveying to these children? Are they not all God's children? Is there not some need for investment in infrastructure?

The General Accounting Office reported in 1994, that over all, it would be about a \$112 billion investment, and we want a \$5 billion investment by way of a start as we move into the next century?

Mr. President, have I not heard before speeches given, the talk about the importance of building a bridge to the next century? If we are not going to invest in rotting schools, if we are not going to invest in the infrastructure of the schools our children attend in this country, if we are not willing to invest a little bit more in child nutrition programs, if we are not willing to invest in

some of what Senator DODD's amendment, an amendment I want to join in and I know others will join, Head Start and Early Start, if we will not invest in children in these very critical early years of their lives, how can this budget agreement be a blueprint or a bridge for moving into the next century?

My amendments will just simply say, take it out of corporate welfare and invest it in Head Start, child nutrition programs, and invest in the infrastructure of schools in America for our children.

I have another amendment that will focus on some of the tax cuts that will say scale down the capital gains tax cut, scale down the estate tax cut, target it to middle-income people, target it to small business people, and target it to family farmers. Frankly, these large multinational corporations do not need it, nor do the top 1 or 2 percent of the population. Instead, invest in children. Invest in children.

Mr. President, my final point, because I know we want to go on with the amendments, my final point, we have in the last several months been reading in Time magazine, in Newsweek magazine, there was a White House conference on the importance of early childhood development and the argument that is made is that the neuroscience evidence tells us if we do not do well for these children from the very beginning of their lives, if we do not do well with a mother expecting a child, in the very early years up to age 3, many of these children will never come to school ready to learn, and many of these children will never be prepared for life.

One out of every four children in America under the age of 3 are poor. And one out of every two children of color in America under the age of 3 are poor.

Mr. President, it is a scandal. It is unconscionable that we do not yet even fully fund the programs that we know work—Head Start, to give children a head start, nutrition programs so they do not come to school hungry, investment in infrastructure so the schools are inviting places as opposed to being decrepit and so demoralizing for children.

Mr. President, my amendments will say invest in these areas and take it out of the subsidies of these large multinational corporations or scale back these tax giveaways that go mainly to the top 1, 2, or 3 percent of the population.

To my colleagues, all of us have to make our own decisions, but for my own part, I think this is a budget without a soul. Quite frankly, I say to Democrats in particular, I think there comes a point in time where there are certain values and there are certain principles we hold dear. I think there comes a point in time when we cannot keep giving the speeches about the importance of children, the importance of education, the importance of equality of opportunity, the importance of each

and every child having the same opportunity to reach his and her full potential. We cannot keep giving those speeches if we do not match the legislative lives that we live with the words that we speak.

I will join with Senator DODD in his amendment, and I will have other amendments on the floor, and I will raise this issue over and over and over again. I will raise this question over and over and over again.

I do not believe this is a budget that calls for equitable deficit reduction. I do not believe this is a budget that is a bridge to the next century. I do not believe this is a budget that gives children in our country, every child—they are all God's children—the same opportunity to reach their full potential.

I do not think this is a budget that invests in our future, because this budget, as opposed to being a new deal for too many children in America, is a raw deal for too many children in America, and that makes this budget unfair and that makes this budget wrong and that makes this budget not the best that we can do for children in America. Therefore, I will oppose this budget agreement.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, as previously agreed, Senator DODD was to be recognized for 10 minutes to offer an amendment.

Mr. DODD. If I could, I have discussed this with my colleague from Colorado, and we will defer at this moment and let my colleague from Colorado go first and I will follow.

AMENDMENT NO. 293

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate about the Federal debt and that the President should submit a budget proposal with a plan for repayment of the Federal debt)

Mr. ALLARD. I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SNOWE). The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD] proposes an amendment numbered 293.

At the end of the budget resolution add the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON REPAYMENT OF THE FEDERAL DEBT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) Congress and the President have a basic moral and ethical responsibility to future generations to repay the Federal debt, including money borrowed from the Social Security Trust Fund;

(2) the Congress and the President should enact a law that creates a regimen for paying off the Federal debt within 30 years; and

(3) if spending growth were held to a level one percentage point lower than projected growth in revenues, then the Federal debt could be repaid within 30 years.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that—

(1) the President's annual budget submission to Congress should include a plan for repayment of the Federal debt beyond the year 2002, including the money borrowed from the Social Security Trust Fund; and

(2) the plan should specifically explain how the President would cap spending growth at a level one percentage point lower than projected growth in revenues.

Mr. ALLARD. Madam President, I would like to begin by commending the chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI, in fact, the entire Budget Committee, Senator LAUTENBERG, the ranking member of the committee, for their hard work and diligence in crafting the budget resolution.

While I am pleased that we have a budget resolution before the Senate, I believe that this document is not without faults and that improvements can be made.

The people of Colorado elected me on the premise that I would utilize all the tools at my disposal to balance the budget. This is a promise that I made to my constituents and a commitment that I do not take lightly.

In this light, I am pleased that the current budget debate is focused on not "if" we are going to balance the budget, but "how" are we going to balance the budget. I believe that this is in and of itself a moral victory for those of us who preach fiscal responsibility. Yet, we must now begin the process of balancing the budget by 2002. The framework provided within the budget resolution is an excellent starting point on which we can improve.

The sense-of-the-Senate amendment talks about what we are going to be doing today. The economy is strong. People have jobs. And the stock market is surging. History tells us, however, that this is not always the case. Unfortunately, the budget resolution assumes economic growth over the next 5 years that is unmatched in this country's history. I am a veterinarian. I am not an economist. But I do know that the document before us today must be able to account for a future that is not necessarily as rosy.

On the sense-of-the-Senate resolution, we are talking about the years that are following after 2002. Let us say that we have eliminated the deficit. Then what is the next step in the Congress? We need to begin to address the problem of the debt.

This amendment is a resolution that was adopted on the House side. It says that in order to continue to move forward on the fiscal soundness of this country, we need to begin to pay down the debt, and we do that by spending less than what we bring in in revenues. The amount that I suggested in the sense-of-the-Senate resolution is to spend 1 percent less than what comes in in revenues.

For example, if we have 5 percent in revenue that comes in in any one of the years, then we would spend out 4 percent. One percent would be moved toward paying down the debt. If the Congress, both the House and the Senate, will commit themselves to this type of plan to pay down the debt, we can balance the budget and pay down the debt by the year 2023.

The debate so far in both the House and the Senate has been concerning deficits that have been accumulating, and now we must move toward paying those down. I am comfortable that the

direction of deficit spending is moving down. But once we eliminate deficit spending, then I think we have to begin to look at paying down the debt.

The debt is reflected in this budget by the interest that we are paying on the debt, which is running somewhere around \$245 billion a year, about 15 percent of our total budget. That is almost as much as what we pay for defense.

So we put ourselves at considerable liability as we move through the years after 2002 because we do not know what the interest rates are going to be. We do not know whether they are going to be 2 percent, or 6 percent, and heaven forbid if they ever get into the double-digit inflation rates and interest rates that we had in the late 1970's.

The purpose of this amendment is to begin to pay down that total debt so we don't have that unknown liability that this country will be facing year after year. The sense-of-the-Senate resolution is to point out to the Senate that there is a potential problem.

So I am asking that this amendment be adopted so that we can begin considering a plan that says that we will begin paying down the debt by spending 1 percent per year less than comes in in revenues, which would eliminate our debt around the year 2023, which would indeed put this country on a very sound fiscal and financial basis.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Madam President, we are prepared to accept the amendment and yield time back off the amendment, if the Senator from Colorado agrees with that.

Mr. ALLARD. I yield the remainder of my time.

Is there any reason to ask for the yeas and nays? Is the floor manager ready for the yeas and nays?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, it was my understanding that this amendment was going to be offered and dealt with on a voice vote. As far as I know, there is no further debate required. If that is the case, then I suggest that we move in that direction.

Mr. ALLARD. Madam President, if the Senator from New Jersey will yield, I agree to a voice vote and ask for a voice vote.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. To my colleague, the manager at the moment, we will accept this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment (No. 293) was agreed to.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Under a previous agreement, Madam President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, unfortunately, it is our obligation to yield time to our people.

So, is the Senator from Connecticut ready?

Mr. DODD. Yes, Madam President.

If my colleague will yield, I would like to take a few minutes to discuss the budget proposal generally, and then I will be offering an amendment on behalf of myself and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] and others. We have not reached any agreement on time, but I am sensitive to the needs of the committee to move along. I don't intend to take a long time on the amendment.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. With that understanding, Madam President, I would certainly be willing to yield as much time as the Senator from Connecticut requires.

Mr. DODD. I thank my colleague from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I would like to spend a few minutes on the overall budget agreement. I know several of my colleagues have talked about it earlier today.

I had the privilege of serving on the Budget Committee for a number of years with the distinguished chairman of the committee, Senator DOMENICI, and my colleague from New Jersey, Senator LAUTENBERG, and my colleague from South Carolina, whom I see on the floor, Senator HOLLINGS, and others.

It was involuntary servitude, I would say. Serving on the Budget Committee was not a position that I sought at all. I was asked to go on the committee and I served there for a number of years. I enjoyed my service. But it can be a thankless task in many ways to be on the Budget Committee.

So, I begin these brief remarks by commending the chairman of the committee and the ranking Democrat, Senator LAUTENBERG, for their tremendous effort. It is not easy to put these agreements together, this year in particular. Over the last several months, we have seen a major effort here to come up with a budget agreement that would bring the Federal budget into balance over the next 5 years. I commend them for their efforts.

I must say that despite reservations that we all have, I don't know of a single Member of this body who wouldn't have written a different agreement had they been king or queen for a day.

So I begin by complimenting my colleagues and endorsing their work with reservations. I will offer an amendment to do a bit better for Head Start, Healthy Start and child care issues.

I support this agreement. Obviously, I am going to watch what happens in

the amendment process and reserve final judgment. I respect, as well, my colleagues on both sides who will have strong feelings about this agreement. But, as it stands today, I think the authors have done a pretty good job with this budget agreement.

In 1981, I voted against that budget agreement. In my view, that deal went way too far. As has been pointed out already, this agreement is vastly different from the 1981 agreement that created such huge deficits from which we still are recovering. In many ways, today's agreement is an effort to really try to solve the problem that began back almost 16 years ago with that vote and the problems which were created by that legislation.

David Stockman, who many may have forgotten, was the Director of the Office of Management and Budget at that time. He has since written a wonderful book about that agreement, "The Triumph of Politics," which I strongly urge my colleagues to read if they want to know the history of what happened in 1981 when this earlier agreement was reached causing the deficit to reach the magnitude that we have seen in the last number of years.

So this agreement I think needs to be seen in a broader context. It is the culmination of a 4-year effort by the President and supporters in this body and the other to try to come up with a budget that would protect American families, that would allow us to reduce that deficit and reduce interest rates, which are like a tremendous tax people pay when they buy homes or automobiles. Obviously, as we have seen over the last several years, the declining deficit has contributed significantly to the growth and expansion in this country.

When the President came to office 4 years ago we had an annual deficit of some \$290 billion. That annual deficit has been reduced to \$67 billion, a major achievement over the last 4 years that has brought significant prosperity to this country. We have seen 12 million new jobs created, the lowest average inflation since John F. Kennedy was President; median family income rise over \$1,600, and the list goes on and on of effects of the improved economy in this country.

Without this progress, obviously, we would never have what we have today, and that is the first credible chance in a generation to actually eliminate the deficit completely. I believe that we must take advantage of this chance, and that is why I will support this resolution, provided that it is not amended beyond recognition. It is a good framework for a budget that achieves real balance while protecting our Nation's most important priorities. It is, of course, as I said only a framework. We will have to see what the details will be before ultimate passage.

Obviously, there will be two sets of debates, the one that we will go through on the outlay side, and then, of course, on the tax-cut proposals, the

specifics of which we will not see until the fall, and that will be another debate. I myself am going to be interested, as my colleagues will be, to see the details of the tax plan that is passed by the Finance Committee.

Any final tax bill should be designed, I think all of us would agree, so that its cost in the out years is limited. And I listened very carefully to the remarks of my colleague from Maryland, Senator SARBANES. I know my colleague from South Carolina will address this issue in part. Their concerns should not go unheeded because there is a legitimate concern about what happens at the end of this process. And if we end up where we were at the end of the 1981 process, with an explosion in the deficit, obviously, we may look back on this agreement and wish we had done otherwise.

But nonetheless, I think it strikes a good balance here with tax cuts in the education field. I for one might reserve any tax cuts until we actually got down to zero. I think there is a lot of legitimacy in that argument. But I accept the notion that that is not going to happen, that we are going to have some tax cuts here, and some, like the postsecondary education tax cuts, can actually be helpful to many families.

I would note as well that in addition to these tax cuts, there are large increases in discretionary spending on education. For instance, the Pell grant is increased to a historic high of \$3,000 a year. Many of us have fought for this program, which we think is tremendously important, for years. There also is real progress in the area of children's health insurance. Obviously, we will have a chance with the Kennedy-Hatch proposal tomorrow to do even more in that regard. But nonetheless, I would be less than honest if I did not commend the budgeters for doing a lot in moving in the right direction.

Madam President, I think the budget agreement is pretty good and one that I think is going to help the country. This has not been an easy process. There have been weeks and weeks of discussion. I respect that. I also respect the fact that each and every one of us here as individual Members of this body have the right certainly and obligation where we disagree to offer some changes to this agreement.

And so for those reasons I will be offering an amendment that will increase funding for Head Start, Healthy Start, and child care. These are three issues that I have spent a good part of my entire career in this body working on. In fact, the Presiding Officer and I, in years past, worked on a number of issues together, as I have with a number of my colleagues here. I never would have passed the original child care development block grant legislation if it had not been for my colleague from Utah, Senator HATCH, who joined in bringing that bill together.

On the issue of Head Start, there have been a lot of people here who supported the efforts over the years to do

more. I noted in this budget, there is a determination to serve 1 million children by 2002 in Head Start. That is certainly progress; it is an increase of 200,000 over where we are today. But I think we can do better over 5 years. We should ensure that all eligible children are served. We know it works so well and makes such a difference in children's lives. Particularly now with welfare reform, we are going to have so many more families that are going to need to have child care or Head Start. It is clear we are coming up short in this area. Serving 1 million children in Head Start is a laudable goal—but it is far short of what is needed. With this amendment over 1.4 million children eligible and in need would receive Head Start services.

In addition, this amendment would triple the size of the Early Head Start Program, which serves that critical zero to 3 group. We see so many of these families now that have these new infants, with Early Head Start, we can make a real difference in these children and their families to provide them a safe, quality environment where these infants will be while the parents go to work.

Welfare reform is all about getting people off welfare and into jobs. However, we know, and the Governors tell us, there will be tremendous need in the child care area. If we are going to move these families off welfare and public assistance into a working environment, there must be someone to care for these children.

I do not know of anyone who disagrees with that. No one wants to see children wander neighborhoods or in makeshift baby-sitting operations. In every State, there are horror stories of what has happened when parents have left children unattended and uncared for. We have had dreadful stories in my State in the last year alone; some five deaths have occurred in these settings that are far from high quality. I am not suggesting you are going to solve every one of those problems, but at a most basic level, none of us here could come to work each day if we had a child that we did not have someone to care for. We would miss votes, we would miss committee hearings, if it were a question of placing our child in a unsafe environment. And there is not one of our constituents who would disagree with that. We would be indicted publicly for irresponsibility.

This is a fine agreement, but we can do better in this area. This amendment would provide Head Start to 400,000 more children, it doubles the size of the child care development block grant and addresses infant mortality. When we are talking about \$85 billion in tax cuts—and I do not disagree with that—do not tell me we cannot find over 5 years less than \$15 billion to deal with Early Head Start, Head Start, Healthy Start, and child care so that these kids and families can really have the kind of support they need in their lives.

That is the intent of this amendment that I am offering on behalf of myself,

Senator JEFFORDS, Senator MURRAY, Senator BINGAMAN, Senator WELLSTONE, and Senator LANDRIEU to this resolution. We think it is a modest request to make. It is not as if we do not respect the work of the Budget Committee. I also feel we can do a bit better here.

I support the hard work of those who put this agreement together, but let us not suggest somehow that this is totally inviolate. Some suggestions we might offer here would make this a better bill in our view. I think quality child care is one of those issue. I know very few of my colleagues who disagree with that. I know of no one who disagrees with Head Start, the work its done, and the Early Head Start Program. A few more dollars here, shaving off a bit on one end to provide a bit more on the other is really not too much to ask to make this agreement that much more worthwhile.

AMENDMENT NO. 296

(Purpose: To improve funding of critical programs to assist infants, toddlers and young children by increasing the discretionary spending caps by \$15.752 billion in outlays over five years and offsetting this effort by closing corporate tax loopholes)

Mr. DODD. So with that, Madam President, I will send this amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], for himself, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Ms. LANDRIEU, proposes an amendment numbered 296.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 3, line 4, increase the amount by 2,006,000,000.
On page 3, line 5, increase the amount by 2,820,000,000.
On page 3, line 6, increase the amount by 3,991,000,000.
On page 3, line 7, increase the amount by 5,766,000,000.
On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by 2,006,000,000.
On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by 2,820,000,000.
On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by 3,991,000,000.
On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by 5,766,000,000.
On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by 2,533,000,000.
On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by 3,481,000,000.
On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by 4,993,000,000.
On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by 7,305,000,000.
On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by 2,006,000,000.
On page 4, line 14, increase the amount by 2,820,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by 3,991,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by 5,766,000,000.
On page 21, line 25, increase the amount by 1,013,000,000.

On page 22, line 1, increase the amount by 643,000,000.

On page 22, line 8, increase the amount by 1,951,000,000.

On page 22, line 9, increase the amount by 1,335,000,000.

On page 22, line 16, increase the amount by 3,453,000,000.

On page 22, line 17, increase the amount by 2,458,000,000.

On page 22, line 24, increase the amount by 5,755,000,000.

On page 22, line 25, increase the amount by 4,224,000,000.

On page 23, line 15, increase the amount by 20,000,000.

On page 23, line 16, increase the amount by 13,000,000.

On page 23, line 22, increase the amount by 30,000,000.

On page 23, line 23, increase the amount by 23,000,000.

On page 24, line 5, increase the amount by 40,000,000.

On page 24, line 6, increase the amount by 33,000,000.

On page 24, line 12, increase the amount by 50,000,000.

On page 24, line 13, increase the amount by 43,000,000.

On page 26, line 14, increase the amount by 1,500,000,000.

On page 26, line 15, increase the amount by 1,350,000,000.

On page 26, line 22, increase the amount by 1,500,000,000.

On page 26, line 23, increase the amount by 1,463,000,000.

On page 27, line 5, increase the amount by 1,500,000,000.

On page 27, line 6, increase the amount by 1,500,000,000.

On page 27, line 13, increase the amount by 1,500,000,000.

On page 27, line 14, increase the amount by 1,500,000,000.

On page 41, line 7, increase the amount by 5,766,000,000.

On page 41, line 8, increase the amount by 15,752,000,000.

On page 43, line 21, increase the amount by 2,533,000,000.

On page 43, line 22, increase the amount by 2,006,000,000.

On page 43, line 24, increase the amount by 3,481,000,000.

On page 43, line 25, increase the amount by 2,820,000,000.

On page 44, line 2, increase the amount by 4,993,000,000.

On page 44, line 3, increase the amount by 3,991,000,000.

On page 44, line 5, increase the amount by 7,305,000,000.

On page 44, line 6, increase the amount by 5,766,000,000.

At the appropriate place insert the following:

It is the sense of the Senate that funding should be increased for vital programs serving the youngest children. Head Start should be funded at a level necessary to serve all eligible children. Funding for the Child Care Development Block Grant should be doubled to support the working poor and new resources should be dedicated to addressing issues of quality and supply in areas such as infant care and care during non-traditional work hours. The Healthy Start should be expanded to improve maternal and infant health. These initiatives should be funded through by changes in the tax code such as the elimination of the runaway plant deduction, the billionaire's loophole, the exclusion of income from Foreign Sales Corporations and other changes as necessary.

Mr. DODD. Let me, if I can, briefly describe what the amendment does. I see my colleagues here who have come to the floor. I note the chairman standing. Is he looking for a time agreement? When a chairman stands, it usually means he is looking for a time agreement. Is my colleague from New Mexico looking for a time agreement?

Mr. DOMENICI. I wanted to just—excuse me. I yield on my time.

Mr. DODD. I will yield to my colleague.

Mr. DOMENICI. I just wanted to sort of suggest to those in the Chamber who I see—I see Senator DODD has an amendment, and I assume that is what the Senator from Minnesota is going to speak to.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, my colleague from New Mexico is correct. I join with him on his amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. I understand Senator HOLLINGS has an amendment, and I do not know how long the Senator intends to speak to it, but I plan sequentially to call on the distinguished Senator from Colorado, Mr. ALLARD, who has an amendment.

I was wondering if we might just at least be considering for our fellow Senators that we might finish the debate on those amendments by somewhere around 6:15. It is 5:30 now. And then we try to stack these three so people after that could have a little time for dinner while we continue debating here. We would eventually ask those votes be 10-minute votes. I am just wondering, does that make any sense?

Mr. DODD. If my colleague will yield, I don't know how many Members want to speak on this, and there may not be that many. So rather than trying to spend the time negotiating an agreement, why not let it roll a little while on the bill; we just got underway, and see how it comes out. We may not need a time agreement. There is probably going to be just on this amendment 45 minutes, just the three of us on the floor who I know are sponsors of the amendment, and I presume Senator JEFFORDS is coming over, and there may be a couple of others. So we will try to move quickly. It is not my desire—I understand what the chairman wants to do, and we will try to move as fast as we can.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Senator SMITH is in the Chamber in my stead and whatever parliamentary privileges I have under the bill, I designate to him until I return.

Mr. LAUTENBERG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I do not want to cut off the debate, but I wonder, because I deferred to my colleague from Connecticut to present his comments on the amendment, whether there is—can we ask the people who want to

speak, I ask the Senator, whether the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Washington would be able to conclude their remarks in 5 minutes. Would that be asking too much?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, if I could respond to my colleague from New Jersey, I think it would be difficult to do so. I think it is a very important amendment. I did not go into the specifics of what this amendment was about earlier because I thought we would have a chance to speak to it. I think it speaks to a fundamental question of priorities. I could not cover this in 5 minutes. I certainly will do whatever I can to stay within a reasonable limit but 5 minutes would not be a sufficient time. I do not know about Senator MURRAY.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. The Senator from Washington has requested 5 minutes. And we will take the rest of the time as needed. I yield the floor.

Mr. DODD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator.

Madam President, the amendment I have sent to the desk that is under consideration basically says I think we can do a little bit more here. That is basically what it comes down to. As I said earlier, it is not to be offered to undo the budget agreement that has been struck by the committee along with the President. I respect and support that agreement.

I think we can do a bit more when it comes to investing in our most important resource. Statements are made over and over on the floor of this Chamber, about America's children. I do not know anyone who would list a higher priority than doing what we can to serve the most innocent in our society, who have the most in front of them. There is no lack of people expressing an interest in the subject matter today.

I recall going back some 15 to 16 years ago when Senator SPECTER of Pennsylvania and I formed the first children's caucus of the Senate. We had a difficult time, but we tried to convince people over the years that this was a worthwhile endeavor in which to engage on child care, on the issue of Head Start, and family and medical leave. No one would believe it today, but back then we had to fight hard just to form a caucus. Fortunately, we were successful in that effort as well as in the effort to pass critical legislation on issues affecting families and their children.

Today, few argue against these initiatives. Most people agree in our society, as we look to the 21st century, that we want to give our children the best start they can possibly have. We cannot guarantee them success. No one can be guaranteed that in our society. But we want to guarantee them an opportunity.

What we are talking about with Healthy Start, Early Head Start, Head Start, and quality child care is trying

to give children a good start, the best start we can so they will at least have the opportunity for success.

In that regard, the amendment I am offering increases funding for three children's programs that strike at the very heart of the most basic needs of children in our Nation: Head Start, Healthy Start, and child care. These three programs truly are sound investments and, I think, time tested. These are not new ideas. They have been around now, in the case of Head Start, a generation. We have had the benefit of analyzing the programs and know they work.

In the case of child care, it has been over a decade, and Healthy Start, almost as long. We know from recent scientific findings that creative, positive environments for children in their earliest years is an investment that yields tremendous returns in the long term.

We are now engaged in the process of laying out this Nation's priorities for the next 5 years. In addition to numbers, we are laying out where are our priorities, where do we believe the most important things that need to be addressed over the next half decade are. We managed to find \$85 billion in tax cuts intended to spur investment. While I do not necessarily disagree with that, I think it can be tremendously helpful and important. But I believe we can certainly find an additional \$14.6 billion over the next 5 years to improve the investment of children, and that is what I am talking about.

This amendment would provide for full funding of Head Start by the year 2002. The President's budget and the budget agreement take a positive step in this direction by committing, as I said, to serve 1 million children over the next 5 years. That is up from 800,000 currently to 1 million in 2002, 200,000 additional slots. I think we can do better. This amendment would ensure that all eligible children who need Head Start will get it. By increasing funding to \$11.2 billion in the year 2002, Head Start could reach over 1.4 million children. That is 400,000 more who would be reached than under the budget agreement.

As my colleague from New Mexico, Senator BINGAMAN, related the other day, in Albuquerque, NM, they have a staggering number of children waiting to get into Head Start and were unable to because the resources were not there. I am sure that story can be repeated in every State in the country, where parents are trying to get their children into the programs.

Going from 800,000, where we are today, to 1 million, 1.4 million over the next 5 years ought not be an impossibility for us to achieve in this country.

This amendment would also triple funding for Early Head Start programs to \$560 million by the year 2002. This program, which my colleagues certainly recall, provides high-quality child development for infants and toddlers ages zero to 3. Again, I am

preaching to the choir here, I presume, because of the tremendous amount of new information on this 36-month period that occurs in a child's life, to see to it that they get the quality care and development they need.

This amendment that I have offered on behalf of myself and Senator JEFFORDS, along with others, would also make an investment in quality child care. It would double the size of the child care development block grant to \$2 billion annually and provide an additional \$500 million each year to help increase quality and meet supply shortages in critically underserved types of care, including infant care and nontraditional hours.

I heard my colleague from Minnesota speak on the need for child care during nontraditional hours. Most people think of people working from 8 to 5. However, there are a vast number of people in our country who do not work traditional hours because of time shifts and so forth. We have very few child care slots for the nontraditional hours. We need to be doing everything we can as people are struggling to hold their families together economically to provide for that quality child care.

Again, I say to my colleagues, when Senator HATCH and I initially offered the Child Care Development Block Grant Program 10 years ago, we made the point over and over again how important it is to working people that their children are in quality child care. The block grant provides vital assistance to working families as they struggle to meet these needs. But it is not enough; it is sorely underfunded. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that in the wake of welfare reform, there will be a \$1.4 billion shortage in assistance for child care. This amendment provides an additional \$1 billion for supply and another \$500 million to address issues of quality and supply in key areas such as infants and the nontraditional hours. Again, as we move people from welfare to work, it is going to be critically important that we have these quality slots out there for people. So that is the second part of this amendment.

The additional \$140 million is for the Healthy Start Program. Let me just remind my colleagues, I think all of us, I hope, have had an opportunity to visit Healthy Start programs. These programs offer to at-risk mothers prenatal care and other services that have been tremendously successful in seeing to it that new infants and their mothers get the proper care. Again, the studies show how critically important this can be for children's cognitive and emotional development.

Overall, this effort dedicates an additional, as I said, \$14 billion to meeting the most basic needs of our youngest children. Healthy Start, Head Start, and quality child care are all about the earliest days. Obviously, the quality child care can spill over to school years, to after school programs, but nonetheless, the bulk of it goes to the

earliest days of these infants' lives to see to it they have the best possible beginning. I realize \$14 billion is not an insignificant amount, but over 5 years, that is less than \$3 billion a year to fully fund Head Start, to double quality child care, and to provide more resources for Healthy Start. If we can find the \$85 billion over 5 years, isn't it possible to find \$3 billion less than that a year to make a difference in the lives of children from zero to 5 years?

So tonight, as we begin this process, this very first amendment that will be voted on in this budget debate, to say we have done a good job here and we can do a bit more. In my view, this agreement must serve the children who we talk about endlessly, who we debate and discuss at every meeting. Here is to reset our priorities for children with just a few more dollars. We know it is going to be hard. We realize there are other problems we are faced with, but when it comes to our children, this Congress, this Senate will stand up and say we can find the resources to see to it that these children get the proper kind of beginning that they deserve.

But don't look in the faces of innocent children and tell them we can't do a bit more. I know we are going to do a lot for people in the upper income levels, I understand that. If we can do that, we can do this and still balance this budget by asking for a little less in some areas for children, even though they don't vote, don't have political action committees, and don't participate in this process. With all the speeches that are given over and over again, this is the time to let rhetoric become a reality.

Madam President, at the proper time, obviously, I will ask for a rollcall vote on this amendment and urge my colleagues to join Senator JEFFORDS and me in this bipartisan proposal. Senator JEFFORDS is the chairman of the Labor and Human Resources Committee and has worked on a number of these issues over the years. He has joined with me, as Senator COATS did, on family and medical leave and Senator HATCH on the child care legislation.

With that, I yield the floor and invite my colleagues' comments.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Madam President, I yield myself 5 minutes. I would like to respond to the Senator from Connecticut.

I think there are many on my side of the aisle who care a great deal about issues with respect to children. I am one of those who has kind of bucked the tide in my party and signed up as a cosponsor, with enthusiasm, to the Hatch-Kennedy bill, which raises the tax on tobacco to provide expanded Medicaid to children. I also have great sympathy for many of the points Senator DODD is making. I believe we should fully fund Head Start. I am told it takes \$10 billion to do that, not \$14 billion—

Mr. DODD. Eleven billion dollars.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I am interested in that, but I am not interested in breaking this budget agreement, if it means that we are breaking our promises to the American people. Republicans and Democrats alike—neither side, frankly—are thrilled with every provision of this budget, but the truth is, a lot of promises are being kept with this budget.

Ultimately, it comes into balance, but in addition to that, we are protecting essential programs, we are cutting taxes, and we are balancing budgets. I think that is what America expects. I think that is what they want, and overriding all of our individual little concerns, I think they want us to keep our word on balancing the budget. In defense of this Congress, I think it is important to point out that since 1990, funding for Head Start has tripled. It ought to do better, but it ought not to do so at the expense of the promises we have made to cut the tax burden on the American people.

In addition, children's programming is a priority in this budget. We have funded Head Start at the President's requested level of an additional \$2.7 billion over 5 years. We provided \$1 billion for this program last year and an additional \$4.5 billion for child care through the welfare reform bill. So it is not like we are insensitive to this. In fact, many of us would like to do more. It is just the vehicle being chosen, and this vehicle, the Dodd amendment, will, frankly, in the end violate this bipartisan agreement, and that we cannot do, because to get a majority, we need to keep this promise to ourselves, to our constituents, and keep faith with the leadership and with the White House.

Thank you, Madam President.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, let me respond to the Senator from Oregon. I appreciate his remarks, but I want to point out that this amendment says that the offset comes from corporate welfare, as I understand it. Some we are looking at. The Joint Tax Committee and others have carefully studied hundreds of billions of dollars of tax loopholes that usually go to some of the largest corporations and some of the wealthiest individuals in the country.

We are saying, can you not take a little bit from that, and instead, wouldn't you invest this in Head Start? And wouldn't you invest this in affordable child care? And wouldn't you invest this in Early Start? And wouldn't this make much more of a difference in children's lives? And wouldn't this better represent the standard of fairness of the people in the country?

So, Madam President, this is not about breaking any deficit reduction plan. This is about whether or not this budget agreement reflects the priorities of people in this country.

With all due respect to my colleagues, I think that if the choice for people in this country is between eliminating some of these egregious loopholes and deductions and instead investing more in children, and especially investing in this critical area of early childhood development, I say absolutely we ought to be doing that.

Madam President, I would like to talk just a little bit about these programs and a little bit about the sort of overall context of this amendment.

First of all, I have heard it so stated—and I say to my colleague from Oregon I will be willing to be critical of my own colleagues. I actually say this in a scrupulously, if you will, non-partisan way. We talk about how we are expanding Head Start and, therefore, we are going to serve an additional 1 million children. But are we doing enough to reach the 2 million children who are not now participating?

My colleague from Connecticut points out that in addition there is going to be some early Head Start funding, frankly, above and beyond the 1 million children who still are not receiving any assistance; that is, Head Start 3 to 5.

If I was to include early Head Start, which is very consistent with very compelling scientific evidence that these are the really critical years, you know, right after birth, 1, 2, up to age 3, we are not coming even close to providing many children in this country with a head start. I far prefer to do that than to continue with a variety of different loopholes and deductions and breaks for some of the largest corporations in this country and wealthiest individuals who do not need it.

I mean, I would be more than willing to lay out this proposition for people in the country over and over again and say, you know, whose side are you on? Cargo Continental Grain Co. or vulnerable children who are just looking for a break by way of Head Start to get them prepared for school or good child care or, as I was talking about earlier, though not in this amendment, adequate nutrition? That is what this is all about. That is what this amendment is all about.

So the issue is not whether or not Senators are going to vote against this amendment because they are opposed to a budget agreement. I think my colleague from Connecticut and I may have different views on the overall budget agreement. I do not know yet. I guess he reserves final judgment. But you can be for the budget agreement and vote for this amendment because this amendment still keeps us within this path of a balanced budget. It just says: Couldn't we do a little bit better for children?

I am aware of the fact that colleagues feel some time constraint, and I promise not to take more than a couple more minutes, but this is, I think, such an important amendment. I am proud to join in with the Senator from

Connecticut and Senator JEFFORDS from Vermont and Senator MURRAY from Washington.

Another way of looking at this for just a moment, with all due respect—and this is my hard-hitting point; I might have said it before on the floor of the Senate but it just feels right to say it at 10 to 6 on Tuesday evening—a real heroine to me—she is no longer alive—was a woman named Fannie Lou Hamer. She was a share cropper from Mississippi, an African-American woman. She once said, "I'm sick and tired of being sick and tired." She was a great civil rights leader.

I just get a little sick and tired of everybody who says they are for children and investment in children and we are now going to build a bridge going to the next century and we are all for these children—except when it comes to investment.

On the one hand, we say it is so important that children who come from really difficult circumstances get a head start. I mean, that is what we try to do. We do what the name of the program suggests, give these children a head start. And we talk about how unfair it is that so many children do not have this head start. And then we seem to be so comfortable with the fact that we still are not providing enough funding for 1 million children who are not going to receive it, ages 3 to 5, and God knows how many more children under the age of 3.

Can't we do better? Can't we do better? Can't we have just a little bit less by way of tax breaks, loopholes, deductions, whatever you want to call it, for large multinational corporations? I mean, Lord, we are just talking about \$15 billion out of studies that have talked about hundreds of billions of dollars. Can't we just provide them with a little less so we can provide a little more for these children?

Second point. It will just be the last one, which is the child care piece. I believe my colleague from Connecticut, in this overall over 5 years, \$15 billion, is saying we can do better. I think many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle agrees with this.

You look at the child care picture, and whether or not you want to talk about family-based child care or center-based child care or figure out ways you can have child care available for parent or parents at place of work, however you do it, however you do it, Madam President, it is just amazing, it is stunning how little we have done and how much we have to do.

David Packard, who was Deputy Secretary of Defense under President Reagan, and his wife Lucile Packard have a foundation. They issued a report this past summer, and they talk about child care. They make the point, look, it is not just nutrition, it is not just health care, but in addition, if these children do not get the kind of nurturing and intellectual stimulation that affects the way the brain is wired, that affects whether or not they are going to have a chance.

So many families—if we want to talk about working families, this is not just a poor people's issue. So many working families, so many of our children of parents in their thirties with two small children themselves, you look at their salaries, they cannot afford really good child care.

What Senator DODD is trying to do is at least expand some funding for good developmental child care. This is critical. This is the critical time.

If the medical evidence is so compelling, if it is so irreducible, if it is irrefutable, and if we know we have to do this for children, why cannot we in this budget agreement take a little bit away from or have a little less by way of tax breaks, loopholes, deductions, you name it, for large multinational corporations and wealthy people at the top of the economic ladder in our country and instead do a little better by way of investment in children, so each and every child can finish this way, each and every child?

I think we should be able to get good, strong bipartisan support. Each and every child in America, regardless of color of skin, regardless of income, regardless of religion, regardless of rural or urban, regardless of whether they be in Oregon or Connecticut or Maine or New Jersey or Minnesota, each and every child, regardless of religion, should have the same chance to reach her full potential, have a full chance to reach his full potential.

That is the essence of the American dream. That is the goodness of our country. That is what we believe in. This amendment takes us just a little bit—but, boy, it really matters to many children in many families—takes us a little bit further in that wonderful direction.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DODD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. How much time does my colleague from Washington need?

Mrs. MURRAY. Five minutes.

Mr. DODD. I yield the Senator from Washington 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, thank you.

We are at a historic time in our Nation's history where we have before this body a balanced budget agreement that purports to balance this budget by the year 2002. I think many of my colleagues feel, as I do, that we have worked long and hard to reduce the deficit and we are finally getting there and we feel good about it.

But what we also know is that this economy is doing very well. We know that unemployment is down. We know that those people on Wall Street are doing well. We know that our college graduates are getting jobs that were not available to them 5 or 10 years ago. And there is a lot of hope and opportunity out there.

Madam President, it seems to me that this is the right time to take a

look and say, Who are we missing in this budget? And when we know that one out of four children in this country live in poverty, despite the fact that our economy is doing well and that things are looking really good, we ought to take this opportunity now, as we put this balanced budget agreement together, to make sure that this country focuses its resources on a place where it can really make a difference.

I come to you today as a mother, as a preschool teacher before I was in the Senate, and as a U.S. Senator to tell you that I can think of no place that we can invest money better than in the young children of this country.

I want to thank Senator DODD for his work on this issue over many years and for all the time and energy he has put in to make sure that that group of people who do not have a voice do have a voice on the Senate floor.

His amendment before us today, that I am delighted to be a cosponsor of, addresses the current needs of today's young children in a way that this budget does not and should.

I can tell you from personal experience that Head Start makes a difference, and it makes a dramatic difference for those kids who are not in Head Start today. I taught preschool. I know that when you have a child in your classroom and when they are 3, 4 years old and they learn cognitive skills and they learn, in their beginning time, to get along with other children and they learn child development in a healthy way with a good teacher and with good equipment and with good adults around them, they will enter our schools ready to learn. It makes an incredible difference.

But it makes an incredible difference in those families as well because that mother or father has to bring that child to your classroom every day, and as a result they begin to learn how to deal better with their own young children. The result is a rippling tide. You have the child in your classroom, you have the siblings of that child, and you have the parents of that child really focusing on family. This is about creating good, strong families in this country. There is nothing we can do better than to devote our resources to Head Start for the families across this country and for the children in this country.

The child care development block grants have been spoken eloquently to. We know, as welfare reform goes into effect, that as women and men on welfare go into the work force, who is going to be left behind at home is their children. If we do not do everything we can to provide child care at those odd hours when a mother is working the night shift at the grocery store, that we are going to have infants and children who are not well cared for.

The results of that are going to be dramatic on those young children as they are not paid good attention to. But it will have an even more dramatic impact on those welfare moms when

they are at work, because I can assure you that just like every other parent today, if I know that my child is being taken care of, whether they are at school or whether they are in child care, I do a better job when I am at work.

We need to make sure that the child care is available out there so that every working adult can be the best and most competent they can be at work and so that those children grow up feeling secure. I am tired of having young children say to me today that they do not think adults care about them in this country. If we leave them home alone without child care, it sends that message strongly. Those children end up on our streets, they end up in gangs, and they end up disillusioned as American citizens. We have to invest time and money and energy into child care through the child care development block grant so that we can raise a healthy generation of adults.

Finally, on the Healthy Start, we know when we take care of children and their health when they are young, that it will pay dividends in the future. One out of four children live in poverty. One out of four children are not getting the health care they need, not being taken care of. Guess where they will be when they grow up?

Madam President, it is essential that as adults on the floor of the Senate, we take the time and the energy and the resources to send our country in the right direction when we have the time and energy to do that. And that is now.

I applaud the Senator from Connecticut and the other cosponsors, and I urge this body to do what needs to be done. Those children were not in on the budget agreement. They were not there. They were not available to be there for the handshakes. We have to be on this floor to speak for them and speak loudly. I urge your support of this amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DODD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I am going to shortly yield the floor as well to my colleague from New Mexico, who is also a cosponsor of the amendment.

Let me just address the issue of how does this get paid for. We are not allowed specifically here to target revenue sources, but I have tried to lay out in the amendment where the revenues will come from.

One source is the foreign sales corporation, which most of my colleagues may be familiar with. This was set up back about 1981 or 1982, in fact, part of another budget agreement, done in a conference report. These are basically paper companies with very few employees, if any, in some cases that enabled American companies to exempt export income from U.S. taxation. That is about \$24 billion over 5 years. The cigarette tax is another source here.

I cannot dictate a specific revenue source in this amendment—I am pro-

hibited from specifically directing the Finance Committee. But it would certainly be my intention, as we stated here, to take the \$14 billion over 5 years from those sources. If you took a little bit from the foreign sales corporation—you do not have to take all of it—some from the cigarette tax increase, it would be easy to pay for this amendment to provide for full funding for Head Start, child care, and Healthy Start programs.

My colleague from New Mexico is here, and I yield, Madam President, 5 minutes to my colleague from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on behalf of this amendment by the Senator from Connecticut.

I think, to put this in context, at least as I see it, this budget resolution is a blueprint for taking us into the next century. It sets out our priorities as a nation as we go into the next century, what we think it is important to spend our resources on, and what can we justify to the people who elect us in our States for spending resources on.

I believe very strongly that we can justify to our constituents, to those who vote for us and those who vote against us, we can justify to any of them the additional expenditure for the Head Start Program that the Senator from Connecticut is recommending here.

I look at my home State and the inadequate funding that we have for Head Start there, and it is a great concern. Let me give you a few specifics. In a State like mine, New Mexico, for example, 16 percent of the eligible children under age 5 are enrolled in Head Start. That is in the 1995 fiscal year. The national average is around 20 percent; in my State, it is 16 percent. There are only 1,000 of the 8,000 eligible children that are being served by Head Start in our principal city of Albuquerque, NM, which is about 12 percent of the eligible children in Albuquerque being served. I had the good fortune of visiting a Head Start center and was impressed by the opportunities being offered to those young people, but for them to tell me there are 8,000 eligible students or eligible children who are not able to participate in Albuquerque, I think, is a real concern.

Despite the clear need and several proposals to obtain funding that received higher ratings, my State has no early Head Start programs. The early Head Start programs are for the students that are less than 3, as I understand it, and there are some of those around the country but very few. We will have another amendment later on in the budget debate here about the importance of early childhood education and the tremendous impact of trying to work with children from the age of birth until 3 years old. Early Head Start programs provide, fill a need

there, and we are doing too little. In my State, we have no, absolutely no early Head Start programs.

Increasing Head Start participation to 1 million children by the year 2002, as has been proposed in the resolution, would only increase participation by about 200,000 children, as I understand it. We need to add 1 million children to Head Start, not reach the total of 1 million by the year 2002.

For these reasons, I am glad to cosponsor the amendment of Senator DODD, and glad to speak on behalf of this amendment.

Let me say we need to recognize here on the floor, we have a lot of talk about what we can afford and what we cannot afford. We are the wealthiest nation in the world. We have the largest economy of any nation in the world. We are able to afford what we determine is a priority in our country.

Unfortunately, we have not determined that it is a priority to fully fund Head Start. This amendment would correct that very major defect in this budget resolution. I strongly support it. I urge my colleagues to vote for the amendment.

MODIFICATION OF AMENDMENT NO. 296

Mr. DODD. I send a modification of my amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWBACK). The amendment is so modified.

The modification is as follows:

On page 8 on line 13 after "loophole," insert "increases in the cigarette tax."

Mr. DODD. Briefly, Mr. President, the modification, as I pointed out a moment ago, obviously, under the way the budget agreement is struck here, we cannot dictate to the Finance Committee where revenues—that is up to the committee to decide. I listed various tax cuts that might be modified or increased to pay for the amendment. You have to offset it. I have listed a number at the end of the amendment. I have added the cigarette tax as one that could also be considered, obviously. So that is the modification I sent to the desk. I listed a couple of those already.

As I said earlier, I think this agreement is a pretty good agreement. I began my remarks in offering the amendment by suggesting that I thought the members of the Budget Committee and others have done a good job, certainly, in this process, and the reason we are debating and voting is we have to offer our own ideas to it. My colleagues may reject the idea or accept the idea.

I happen to believe that by doing a bit more, a little under \$3 billion each year over the next 5 years, in Head Start, in child care, in Early Start, in Healthy Start, is in the best interests of our country. By doing so, by adding a bit more to the cigarette tax or lopping off some of the foreign sales corporation, a program that I think, in fact, we voted on, the billionaire tax cut I listed, 96 Senators voted, 1.6 billion it would bring in. Many times we

voted on it. It is there. There are resources that would not in any way get to the issue of middle-income tax cuts that are also included as part of this agreement which I would support.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, there is no issue of greater importance to our country than the education of our citizens. The budget before us calls for modest new investments in education over the next 5 years by increasing resources for education and training programs. In addition, the budget provides tax credits and deductions to middle income families to help pay for post-secondary education as outlined in the budget resolution. I fully support those initiatives. However, I believe we can and must do better.

Several years ago I read a report by the Committee on Economic Development. This is a group of CEO's from some of our Nation's largest companies and they called on us to fundamentally change how we think about education. They said education is a process that begins at birth and that preparation must begin before birth. They called on the Federal Government to make additional investments in early intervention activities such as Head Start. I believe we should heed their words.

The pending amendment makes these investments to ensure the readiness of all children and I want to commend Senator DODD for his leadership.

Last month, at my request, the Labor, Health and Human Services Appropriations Subcommittee held a hearing focusing on the importance of early childhood education. That hearing was on the eve of the White House conference on early learning and the brain which highlighted this most significant issue of the education of our youngest children.

Over the past several months we have been reading a great deal about research on the brain and the implications for the education and development of young children.

The research provides the scientific evidence which validates what many parents and children's advocates have been saying for years—the greatest potential for learning happens during the first years of a child's life. Therefore, we need to make sure that all children have rich learning experiences during that critical time.

The first National Education Goal states that by the year 2000, all children will start school ready to learn. I strongly support all of the goals, but believe that the first goal is essential for achieving the rest of our national goals. Without a strong foundation in the early years, children, particularly children from low-income families, start school behind their peers school and often find it very difficult to catch up.

Early intervention also makes good economic sense. Studies tell us that each dollar invested in high quality early childhood education programs such as Head Start saves \$7 in future costs by increasing the likelihood that

children will be literate and employed rather than dependent on welfare or engaged in criminal activities. However, less than half of the 2.1 million children eligible for Head Start participate. With the additional resources provided by the Dodd amendment, Head Start will be fully funded in 2002. That's a goal that is long overdue.

The most perplexing problem for working families is the availability and affordability of high-quality child care. In Iowa, 67 percent of children under the age of 6 have all parents in the labor force. The cost of child care overwhelms the modest budgets of most working families since the care for one young child can cost as much as \$4,000 per year. Availability of subsidies for working families are vital to helping many of these families stay off of welfare and the pending amendment provides an additional \$7.5 billion over the next 5 years for this purpose.

Finally the amendment increases funding for the Healthy Start Program. This initiative provides grants to areas with high rates of infant mortality to decrease the incidence of infant deaths. The additional will help sustain the gains made in those places and help disseminate information on successful interventions for other areas.

Mr. President, we must not lose sight of the importance of investments in the education of young children. After all, high quality educational activities during a child's first years often alleviates the need for more expensive interventions later in life. I hope that we will be able to work together to create the infrastructure which truly redefines how we view education—as a process that begins at birth, with preparations beginning before birth.

This amendment significantly increases investments for these vital early intervention initiatives and pays for these investments by closing several tax loopholes.

I urge my colleagues to support the Dodd amendment and yield the floor.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator HARKIN be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Would the Senator from Connecticut call for the yeas and nays?

Mr. DODD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. DODD. Reserving the request, I withhold, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I ask all time be yielded back from our side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield back time?

All time is yielded back.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. The DODD amendment is not germane. Pursuant to section 305 of the Budget Act, I raise a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. DODD. This is not in line, I do not believe, on this particular amendment. There are no budget increases in the first year. I changed the amendment, and my colleagues may not have been aware of it, to comply.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. It is my understanding from the Parliamentarian that—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion. There is 1 hour equally divided.

Mr. DOMENICI. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. This will take 60 votes to waive the nongermaneness, will it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The Senator from New Mexico is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. Unless you need further time, we do not need time. We can have the vote.

Mr. DODD. My point was, I say to my colleague from New Mexico, to try to avoid a point of order is the reason we modified the amendment. I am happy to make this a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, and I think that would then get us away from the point-of-order issue, and I would so modify my amendment to make it a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, in which case we can avoid.

Mr. DOMENICI. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. I do not believe he can amend, can he?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would take unanimous consent to modify.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent if I can modify it to make it a sense of the Senate.

Mr. DOMENICI. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: What is the status in the regular order at this moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to waive the Budget Act. The Senator from New Mexico has 20 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Have the yeas and nays been sought on the motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. They have not.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the sponsor of the bill would like to—and the manager of the bill on this side with the consent of Senator LAUTENBERG on the minority side—propose to the Senate a solution to this problem which would expedite the matter.

We would like to proceed—and I ask unanimous consent that we do this—that we vitiate the motion and we vitiate the germaneness statement; that the Senator be permitted to modify his amendment; that we will not make a germaneness point of order; and that we will proceed after about 5 minutes—and I will say who gets the 5 minutes—to move to a motion to table the amendment; and the yeas and nays will be ordered on that, and the first vote will then be on the motion to table this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DODD. Reserving the right to object, I apologize to my colleague from New Mexico. What was the last part?

Mr. DOMENICI. That when we rid ourselves of the germaneness and the motion to waive it, we will be back on the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut. And I will then move to table it, and the Senator from Connecticut will ask for the yeas and nays, which we will grant, obviously, and we will vote on a tabling motion to the Senator's amendment without a germaneness defense being asserted.

Mr. DODD. There will no other points of order raised. I will just offer the amendment as proposed with the modification.

Mr. DOMENICI. I think we are just permitting the Senator from Connecticut to make it as it is and not raising the germaneness issue.

Mr. DODD. I accept that. I would prefer we didn't have a tabling motion. But I respect my colleague.

Mr. DOMENICI. I suggest that we ought to have 3 or 4 minutes.

Mr. DODD. Let me have a quorum call so that I can make sure we have the modification correctly.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, perhaps as the amendment is being reworked, maybe I can comment very briefly.

This is one of those very difficult circumstances that I am sure the majority leader and I are going to find ourselves in throughout this debate. I am very enthusiastic about the subject matter, about the issue, about the amendment. I would in any other set of circumstances be a cosponsor of it. I applaud the Senator for raising the issue.

But because it falls outside the parameter of the agreement of this budget I am going to oppose this amendment under these circumstances.

Again, I regret that I have to do that. But that is the agreement that we have enjoined, and I am going to try to adhere to that agreement throughout this debate.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Democratic leader for making that statement at this time. I intend to do the same thing as we go forward.

When we have amendments that change the basic content of the budget agreement, as this one does, which would provide for changes in the tax provisions, to have tax increases in the code, and move that over into funding programs at a level above what was included in the budget agreement, we think that would be outside the agreement. And, while there are a number of Senators led by the Democratic leader who see an attractiveness in it, I think this is the right thing to do.

We were trying to be cooperative by not going through the waiver of a point of order. But we will have the vote on the motion to table.

It would be my intent to take the same position when amendments are offered of this nature from our side of the aisle.

I think it is important that the two leaders on both sides make it clear that we are going to try to stick with this agreement as we go forward in the next 2 days.

I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

MODIFICATION NO. 2 OF AMENDMENT NO. 296

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I send the modification to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

The modification No. 2 is as follows:

On page 8, line 5 after "that" add "the assumptions underlying the budget resolution assume that,".

Mr. DODD. I think this modification of the amendment conforms with the conversation that I had with the Parliamentarian.

Mr. DOMENICI. Has the modification been accepted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification has been accepted.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, a brief moment: That is to say, with great reluctance I am going to oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut. He has a long and distinguished record on matters affecting children and their well-being.

I have also been a supporter of those programs that protect America's children to try to help them develop into functioning citizens.

But we do have an agreement that was hammered out, if I can use the expression, in great pain with a great pain in many cases over many weeks of hard work.

I just make the point that I commend the Senator for his interest, his continuing interest in the well-being of our children in the country, and that I again acknowledge regretfully that in my position here I am going to be opposing the amendment.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be added as a co-sponsor.

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

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask that I be permitted to speak for 2 minutes after which we will vote, unless the Senator wants a minute.

Mr. DODD. I will take 30 seconds.

I respect immensely both my leaders, the chairman and the ranking member of the Budget Committee, and their positions on all of this. I understand their positions. I understand as well that, as Senators, we all have a chance to modify this resolution, hopefully without doing damage to the underlying agreement.

This resolution is a 5-year commitment to our country. I thought it should also be a stronger 5-year commitment to our children.

It seems to me that in the midst of everything else going on here, shifting around a little bit to accommodate those needs is very little to ask for America's kids.

I understand again the leadership position on it. I respect it. I offered the amendment. I am one who supports this agreement, by the way. I am not out here to undo it. I simply want to make it better with this amendment.

I regret that the leadership will oppose this amendment. But I respect that position, and urge my colleagues to support the amendment when the tabling motion is made.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, because there will be a lot of people supporting my motion to table, I do not want them to feel the least bit embarrassed about doing that because, as a matter of fact, this agreement that is before us contains every single nickel that the President of the United States asked for in terms of Head Start—\$2.7 billion. That is what he asked for. It is a priority item. It must be funded. And you can't do better than that.

We have a good record in the U.S. Congress in terms of child care. Mr. President, \$1 billion was added last year, and \$4.1 billion in the welfare bill.

So those who support my motion are, indeed, doing that with the full cognizance that the U.S. Congress and the President have done right by these programs over the last 2 years, and intend to do even better by them without the Dodd amendment when it is tabled tonight, because we are going to leave that \$2.7 billion in. It is in the agreement right now.

With that, Mr. President, I move to table the Dodd amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion

of the Senator from New Mexico to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 72 Leg.]

YEAS—61

Abraham	Faircloth	McCain
Allard	Ford	McConnell
Ashcroft	Frist	Murkowski
Baucus	Gorton	Nickles
Bennett	Gramm	Robb
Bond	Grams	Roberts
Breaux	Grassley	Rockefeller
Brownback	Gregg	Roth
Burns	Hagel	Santorum
Campbell	Hatch	Sessions
Chafee	Helms	Shelby
Cleland	Hutchinson	Smith (NH)
Coats	Hutchison	Smith (OR)
Cochran	Inhofe	Snowe
Collins	Johnson	Stevens
Coverdell	Kempthorne	Thomas
Craig	Kyl	Thompson
Daschle	Lautenberg	Thurmond
DeWine	Lott	Warner
Domenici	Lugar	
Enzi	Mack	

NAYS—39

Akaka	Feinstein	Levin
Biden	Glenn	Lieberman
Bingaman	Graham	Mikulski
Boxer	Harkin	Moseley-Braun
Bryan	Hollings	Moynihhan
Bumpers	Inouye	Murray
Byrd	Jeffords	Reed
Conrad	Kennedy	Reid
D'Amato	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kerry	Specter
Dorgan	Kohl	Torricelli
Durbin	Landrieu	Wellstone
Feingold	Leahy	Wyden

The motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 296) was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I would like to propound ask a unanimous-consent agreement now which would say we would not have any more recorded votes until 7:45, but we would have two at 7:45.

So I ask unanimous consent the next two amendments in order to Senate Concurrent Resolution 27 be an amendment to be offered by Senator ALLARD and an amendment to be offered by Senator HOLLINGS, that no amendments be in order to either amendment, and at 7:45 this evening, the Senate proceed to vote on or in relation to the Allard amendment, to be followed by 2 minutes for debate, to be followed by a vote on or in relation to the Hollings amendment.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. We have no objection.

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

Mr. LOTT. I further ask all time between now and 7:45 p.m. be equally divided between the two amendments in the usual form, with Senator ALLARD's amendment being offered first.

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

Mr. LOTT. For the information of all Senators, it would be the intention, I believe, of the managers of this legislation, to proceed, then, to continue to work on some other amendments that would be voted on in the morning. But, for now, these would be the two votes stacked at 7:45, and they would be the last recorded votes tonight.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition? The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I request order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will please be in order in the Chamber.

AMENDMENT NO. 292

(Purpose: To require that any shortfall in revenues projected by the resolution be offset by reductions in discretionary spending)

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Could we please have order in the Chamber? The Senator is proposing an important amendment and deserves to be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD] for himself and Mr. INHOFE, proposes an amendment numbered 292.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. . OFFSET OF REVENUE SHORTFALLS BY DISCRETIONARY SPENDING REDUCTIONS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1999, 2000, 2001, or 2002 that provides a revenue total for any of those fiscal years below the levels provided in this resolution unless the discretionary budget authority and outlay totals in that resolution are reduced to offset the amount by which revenues are below the levels provided in this resolution.

(b) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(c) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the concurrent resolution, bill, or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(d) DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, new entitlement authority, and revenues for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time on the amendment is limited to approximately 25 minutes.

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I again thank the chairman of the Budget Committee and the ranking member of the Budget Committee for their hard work in putting together this agreement. I still have one overriding concern. I think there are a number of Members in the Senate that share my concern about what happens if the revenues we are projecting do not hold up over the years.

Mr. President, I share the concern that as we move through our economic cycles, the projected revenues in this budget agreement may not hold up. So I think it is a very legitimate question for us to ask ourselves, what happens if the revenues do not hold up to this agreement? Potentially, we could find ourselves back at the negotiating table, working hard to reestablish those priorities set up in the original agreement because the revenues were falling short.

Mr. President, I ask you bring the Senate to order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. Can we please have order in the Chamber?

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I think it is important that we move toward our goal, that we continue to eliminate the deficit by 2002. The amendment that I am offering considers that if the revenues do not come in as projected, then there will be an automatic adjustment that would occur through the procedure set forth to hold down spending and keep the deficit from increasing.

We all recognize that the economy goes through cycles. As a member of the House Budget Committee several years ago, I felt the figures coming out of the Congressional Budget Office, built on the first 2 or 3 years prior to that, were good numbers. But I have a feeling that we are reaching the top of our economic cycle and that at some point in time we will be forced to address the problem of not meeting our projected revenues.

This amendment tries to address that problem. Today, the economy is strong. People have jobs and the stock market is surging. History tells us, however, that this is not always the case. Unfortunately, the budget resolution assumes economic growth over the next 5 years that is unmatched in this country's history.

The Congressional Budget Office has provided Congress with a series of revised revenue forecasts, all pointing to future economic growth. In fact, balancing the budget is \$629 billion easier now than last year at this time. If these revenues do not materialize, then all of our hard work will be lost to increasing deficits. I do not want this hard work to be lost. That is why I have introduced my amendment today.

The concept behind my amendment is simple: Provide a means to reduce spending within this budget agreement if real revenues fall short of those pro-

jected. This amendment will decrease discretionary spending in proportion to the revenue shortfall. This would help ensure that the budget remains on the glidepath to balance by the year 2002.

I am well aware of the historic nature of this agreement and would like to back the resolution with my undivided support, but I cannot mortgage the future of my children and grandchildren on Congressional Budget Office revenue forecasts. We should make sure that the document before us today has a mechanism to secure deficit forecasts. I do not believe that this change alters the intent of the agreement, but rather enhances its ability to react to changes in the economy, changes we may never see. But we cannot be shortsighted in this matter. If we are going to craft legislation to blueprint the next 5 years, let us be smart enough to realize that we cannot see into the future. Let us be smart enough to include language that allows this agreement to react to future changes.

I believe we can and should do more. We should do more in the form of tax relief for the American family, more in the form of tax relief for the family farmer, more in the form of reducing waste and duplication within the Federal Government. But I also believe that we can do more in future budget debates.

My amendment is not to serve as a protest, but rather a constructive improvement to a realistic budget compromise. I served on the Budget Committee in the other body and realize how difficult it was even to get to the point where we are today. But this cannot preclude us from holding true to our commitments. This amendment locks in nothing but our commitment to balance the budget.

My greatest fear is that reduced future revenues will unravel this agreement, just as we have seen with similar resolutions in the past. This amendment allows for future economic changes and would only strengthen the budget resolution.

The people of Colorado sent me to Washington to balance the budget and, in the process, make sure that any budget agreement keeps the Federal budget on a glidepath to balance. I ask that my colleagues hold true to balancing the budget and support this amendment.

I yield my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

Is the manager opposed to the amendment?

Mr. DOMENICI. The manager is opposed to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then the manager controls time in opposition.

Mr. DOMENICI. Then I yield to Senator LAUTENBERG as much time as he wishes.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank the manager. I think, just to ask a parliamentary question, when there is time for an amendment, that time is automatically divided between the two sides re-

gardless of which side is being spoken for?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. When an amendment is proposed, half of the time is controlled by the proponent of the amendment, the other half is controlled by the majority manager if he is in opposition, and if he is not in opposition, then the minority manager will control that time.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, now that that is resolved, this amendment would force a cut in discretionary programs, if I read the amendment correctly, if projected revenues fall. That means that we would be putting national security at risk as well, because we would be taking it from defense as well as from discretionary accounts. That hardly seems the way, in my view, that the country ought to be doing business.

There may be circumstances that we cannot possibly imagine at this juncture, and apart from the basic rule of saying, look, this falls outside the understanding that, again, was negotiated at length, this means that if the economy falters, critical programs, in addition to defense, would be cut. It might be a time when, if things suddenly start turning tough, you might want to make other decisions. This would tie our hands and not enable us to consider these things as expected, and there are many other conditions that might be considered.

Would the Senator from Colorado suggest, if revenues fall short, that taxes ought to be increased? I hardly think so. I will not bother the Senator for a response to that; I will answer for him, taking that liberty. I just want to make the point that an agreement has, again, been negotiated, considering all prospects—revenues, expenditures, firewalls, protection of defense, development of discretionary accounts—again, through long, arduous discussions. While I think there are probably a number of people who would like to change the agreement, the fact is this represents a consensus point of view, and we are going to oppose the Senator's amendment and hope that the manager will agree with us that the amendment is going to be opposed. I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, yes, I do oppose the amendment, and let me tell the Senate why. First of all, I think everybody should understand that revenues are not the only thing we estimate in the budget. We estimate the economic growth, we estimate the inflation, we estimate the unemployment, and, frankly, all of them are estimates. We also estimate the amount of revenues that are coming in.

Might I suggest, it is very interesting, during this recovery, which is not an enormously high recovery in terms of gross domestic product growth, it

has been an enormous yielder of revenues. Revenues have been coming in for 4 successive years at much higher than the Congressional Budget Office ever assumed, and, frankly, we have been saying the OMB is too generous, it has even been coming in higher than they have assumed.

On the other hand, the economic growth, the gross domestic product, has come in higher than estimated by either OMB or CBO. Now, the best you can do in a budget resolution is get the information regarding those factors that you do not have control over, how much revenue is coming in, how fast are we going to grow, what is the inflation rate going to be, how much unemployment are you going to expect and the other myriad of indicators of economic significance to the country.

Why we would just take one, revenues, and say if revenues do not meet the expectation, that we would then set about to do what? To cut the appropriated accounts.

Let me remind everyone, the appropriated accounts are now about 33 percent of the budget, and guess what they are, Mr. President? Half of them are defense—about half, almost split in the middle—and half are all the rest of the domestic programs. But how about this? What about the 67 percent of the budget that are the entitlements and mandatory programs and all the other things?

It would seem to me if you are going to have some kind of automatic adjustment—we tried this before and it has never worked—but if you are going to have one, then you ought to do it to everything. Why would you pick out defense, and it essentially is going to get half the cut if such is necessary? I do not think that is fair. Right off the bat, I would oppose this amendment on that alone.

There are others who say, "If you only do defense, we will support you, Senator from Colorado, and leave out the domestic." But the point of it is, you are not going to be absolutely accurate when it comes to estimating. You are not going to be absolutely accurate. You do the very best you can, and then you make the alterations year by year if such are required.

I have even reached the point where I think you ought to make the alterations every 2 years. That is what I think about estimating. Having to go through budgets and appropriations, I think it ought to be every 2 years rather than one.

I do commend the distinguished Senator from my neighboring State of Colorado. He is a new Senator, and he knows a lot about putting budgets together. He knows a lot about putting reserve funds in place so that you come out right, because he has told me about them in his State of Colorado, a good conservative State that knows how to budget.

Frankly, it is very difficult to be that accurate with our National Government's budget the size it is, since we have so many programs that, if you change the economic growth just a lit-

tle bit, then the unemployment compensation goes up a whole bunch and we have a lot of indicators, a lot of things that are related to this estimating that we cannot be certain of, other than look back after we have done it.

Incidentally, we have even done that. We have even said that, if that is the case, let's look back and correct it retroactively. I am not for that either. I am for being conservative in the estimating, and we have been as conservative as you can be in this budget. We have used the economic assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office in terms of growth, in terms of all the other important indicators, and I believe that that is among the lowest and most conservative set of estimates out there. I think blue chips' is higher than that. I think OMB is higher than that. Most of the major companies who do it have higher ones than we do. I think we are protecting the integrity of this budget as best we can by using that approach.

Once again, I commend my friend and colleague and neighbor for being genuinely concerned and targeting some of the issues that we might look at more carefully and try to handle in a better way.

Let me suggest that the only other amendment after my good friend from Colorado completes his argument is Senator HOLLINGS' amendment. I kind of made a mistake. I thought we were going to have a full half hour, starting at 7:30, for Senator HOLLINGS, but it looks like we are going to vote at a quarter of. So I hope if somebody can get hold of him and get him here earlier—I will not use much time in opposition to his amendment, so he will have all the time once he gets here until the vote. I yield the floor.

Mr. ALLARD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). The Senator from Colorado.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seven minutes.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I again compliment the chairman and ranking member. I know they have worked hard with the best figures they had. I come from a State, the State of Colorado, that has a balanced budget amendment. I have been involved in the legislative body in the State of Colorado when we went through good years and bad years. During those good years, you look back and you build your budget based on what you think is going to happen at some future point in time.

The fact is, we do go through economic cycles, and despite the best of intentions and how valid our figures are today, those cycles are unpredictable. I think at one point in time we will have an economic downturn. This Congress needs to be prepared to address those unforeseen circumstances.

The point of my amendment addresses when those unforeseen circumstances do happen, when revenues coming in do not meet what was fore-

cast and we have a spending level up here and maybe the revenues are coming in lower than expected, we just bring down the spending level and say that we need to adjust our figures in the baseline so that our budget reflects the change in economic conditions in this country. I think it is a common-sense type of amendment, and I ask the Members of the Senate to vote yes on this amendment. I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Is the Senator finished?

Mr. ALLARD. I yield the floor, and if the Senator from New Mexico is willing to yield back his time, I will yield back my time.

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator from Colorado should not yield his time because we might get back to his amendment for a little bit. We are waiting for Senator HOLLINGS, and if the Senator doesn't mind, Senator DURBIN would like to speak in opposition for a couple minutes.

Mr. ALLARD. That will be fine.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding.

Not being a high priest on the Budget Committee, I am not bound by sacred oath to the agreement, but I stand in opposition to this amendment. I believe that the Senator from Colorado has raised an important issue.

We can see the fact that the economy has moved forward very nicely over the last 4½ to 5 years. Those on the Democratic side take particular pleasure in saying that, but regardless of the reason, we are happy the economy has moved forward. As the Senator from New Mexico has mentioned, it has generated more jobs, more revenue and, in fact, more economic growth than even some of the experts suggested.

If I follow the suggestion of the Senator from Colorado, he is saying that if at some future date the economy has a downturn, revenues to the Federal Government decrease, he would want us to cut spending programs to match those cuts in revenue. I stand in opposition to that for one very obvious reason.

Since the late 1940s, we have noticed a very positive occurrence in the economy of America. As we have gone into recessions, we have not seen those deep spikes that we had in years gone by. The recessions have been milder, there has been less unemployment, less dislocation by businesses and families. It is no accident. It is known as automatic stabilizers, things in our Government and in our economy that step in in times of recession to try to bring us back into a time of economic expansion.

For instance, if we have a recession and a business lays off workers, there are Government programs available to help that working family get back on its feet. We have training programs, we have education programs, we have safety net programs, whether it is food

stamps or unemployment compensation, to make sure that family doesn't fall even deeper, but rather to keep them in a position and poised ready for retraining and reemployment, and it has worked.

With these automatic stabilizers and this Government spending, we have managed to moderate recessions. The Senator from Colorado has suggested we remove the stabilizers. If you have a recession, if you have a downturn, if your Government revenues have been reduced, then cut spending. Well, what about the family that needs a helping hand? "I am sorry, there is not enough Federal money to go around."

We are more determined to balance the budget than recover from a recession under the Senator's amendment, and I think that is a mistake. We do not want to see a downturn in the economy become a recession. We certainly do not want to see a recession become a depression. The Senator's amendment would make economic circumstances even worse for the families out of work, worse for the businesses that have had to close, worse for the family farmers who have had to give it up.

I would think that the Senator would want to go in the opposite direction. We would want to get the American economy moving forward again, help those families back to work, help that business back on its feet, help those farmers, if we can, and the ranchers as well. But the Senator's amendment would have exactly the opposite effect. As a recession hits, revenues go down, the Senator would say spend less and bring the economy back to its feet. I think that is the wrong, wrong medicine.

As important as a balanced budget is, it is more important for America to have an expanding economy, to recover from a recession, and to have the wherewithal to do it. So I respect the Senator for his suggestion, but I respectfully disagree with his point of view.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ALLARD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has 3½ minutes.

Mr. ALLARD. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I would like to respond to the comments made on the floor about our economy and what happens if we go through an economic downturn.

First of all, I think the biggest burden that the farmers and small businesspeople and the average American family has to deal with in today's world is this huge Federal debt that we are facing. When you look at the amount of interest that we are paying on that debt and the potential liability to the budget, I believe—and this is a fundamental difference being discussed here on the floor of the Senate—but I

happen to believe that the most important thing we can do to help our economy, to help the farmers of this country, to help the small businesses and help the homeowner, to help the family businessperson, is to get that burden off their shoulders.

If you are born today, you are born with a \$20,000 debt which each individual in America burdens. How did we get to this point? We got to this point because of the very arguments we just heard on how we need to continue to spend more and more believing that it is going to help our economy. But inevitably we are going to have to pay the price.

If we do not make the decisions today, the tough decisions today, we are going to have to make them tomorrow. If we do not make those tough decisions, then our children and grandchildren are going to have to pay the price. And I think that is unforgivable. I think it is morally wrong to pass those tough decisions off to the next generation.

I happen to feel that this is an important amendment because it is holding the Congress accountable, both the House and the Senate. I am saying that if revenues do not measure up, we reduce spending. We have some flexibility in there to protect the most needed programs. I think it is a commonsense amendment. I think it holds true to the agreement generally and the fact that we will hold our priorities together that were agreed upon between the President and the Congress. I think it is a good amendment, and I ask for an aye vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired on the amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. Has all time expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time has expired.

Mr. DOMENICI. For both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Both sides.

Mr. DOMENICI. This vote will not occur at this time.

Parliamentary inquiry. May I move to table it at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may make that motion now, and the vote will occur at 7:45.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to table the Allard amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the amendment is set aside, and the Senator from South Carolina is to be recognized to offer an amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, Senator HOLLINGS is the one we have the consent for. He is not here, but he is coming.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill 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.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I understood from the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee I have 30 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I say to the Senator, we vote at a quarter of. You have the time from now to a quarter of.

Mr. HOLLINGS. You said vote at 8 o'clock when I left the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. The leader asked for 7:45.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I ask unanimous consent that I have 30 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I will not object.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished chairman.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 295

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk and ask the clerk to report it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] proposes an amendment numbered 295.

At the appropriate place, insert the following: "Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, all function levels, allocations, aggregates and reconciliation instructions in this resolution shall be adjusted to reflect elimination of tax cuts of \$85 billion from baseline levels and elimination of Presidential initiatives of \$31.2 billion and interest savings of \$13.8 billion for a total saving of \$130 billion over five years."

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, this amendment does away with the sweetheart deal that will continue to increase the deficit instead of decreasing the deficit that current budget laws allow. We have had 5 years of decreasing deficits. This amendment continues the decrease of the deficits and actually puts us on a steady path of a balanced budget with no deficit whatsoever by the year 2007.

I measure my comments and words because we have been engaged in an outrageous charade for 15 years now. I speak advisedly having been on the Budget Committee since its institution and as a former chairman of the Budget Committee. That is one of the reasons I wanted to try to cooperate with the distinguished chairman because he has a tremendous burden of moving this bill along. It was not my intent to hold the legislation up, but to bring into sharp focus the situation we have created for the American people.

I supported and worked on a balanced budget in 1968 with the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. We did not have a Budget Committee. We called over to the White House to ask President Lyndon Johnson if we could cut another \$5 billion so that we could make sure that we had a balanced budget. And he said, "cut it."

Mind you me, Mr. President. We had the war in Vietnam: guns. We had the Great Society: butter. Guns and butter. President Lyndon Baines Johnson was

awfully sensitive about paying the bill. Wherein, we have no idea in this particular budget resolution of paying the bill. It is a sweetheart resolution, much like we had back in 1985.

In 1985, the Republicans, to their credit, brought former Senator Pete Wilson to the floor in great pain. Senator Wilson had had an appendectomy, and they brought him in at 1 o'clock in the morning on a stretcher, and they voted to freeze spending, Social Security, and the other particular matters at the time.

We went over early the next morning to see President Reagan. At that particular time, President Reagan said, "Now, gentlemen, before we start"—we were all gathered around the Cabinet table—he said, "I want to tell you, I had a little visit from the Speaker last evening, Speaker O'Neill." And we went outside there, you see right underneath that tree, and we had a little toddy, and we talked along, and we finally agreed. The Speaker said, "I'll take your defense if you take my Social Security entitlements."

I can see Senator Dole now. He threw down the pencil on the Cabinet table and he said it was a whole waste of time.

We faced the fire. We did the job that was necessary. So did Senator DOMENICI. He remembers it. So there was a swap.

Now, here 12 years later in 1997, we have a swap. President Clinton says, "I'll take your tax cuts if you take my spending increases." And then everybody races around and hollers "balanced budget." But folks, there is no balance in this budget.

Like Patrick Henry might have said, "But as for me, give me either a balanced budget or give me a freeze."

Let me show you exactly what is going on here. What we have here are the actual budget realities. And underneath budget realities you can see, Mr. President, the budgets for every President, from Truman right on through President Clinton.

You see the United States budget, the borrowed trust funds in this particular column, what they call the "unified deficit," which is the greatest deception of all. For years we have been acting like "unified" meant "net." Necessarily, the Government has income. It also has spending. And the inference is this is a net deficit after you take it all in. Absolutely false.

The real actual deficit is really listed in this column, because this one here borrows the money and loots the trust funds.

We have been looting the Social Security trust fund, as of last year, \$550 billion; by 1997, the end of this fiscal year, September 30, it will be \$629 billion; and under this budget resolution they take another practically \$500 billion, half a trillion bucks to \$1.095 trillion.

They say, "Oh, watch out here in the next century with the baby boomers.

The baby boomers are coming. We used to have five or six workers per recipient or retiree. We're only going to have one worker per retiree."

Do not watch the baby boomers in the next century. Watch the adults on the floor of the U.S. Senate. Watch the adults that are looting the fund. We are causing the deficit. And it is not any charismatic formula that changes now or in the next century. Incidentally, I voted and will continue to support Senator KERREY on doing something about entitlements. I am not messianic that you cannot touch entitlements. I voted already with the Danforth-Kerrey solution last Congress.

But be that as it may, we are using \$1.095 trillion from the Social Security trust fund. We have been looting it. After 5 years, the military retirees fund will owe \$173 billion and the government will say they ought to start contributing more. If there is any military retiree within the sound of my voice, watch out, because they are already doing this with civilian retirement funds. We have a full \$422 billion surplus, and they are saying we have to increase the contribution. Why? If you increase the contribution it goes to the deficit, not civilian retirement.

It is the same with unemployment compensation and the highway trust fund. We are using \$40 billion from the highway trust fund. I have been trying to get funding for a bridge in South Carolina. You can build a bridge in every one of the 50 States with the money we are using to reduce the deficit.

We are going to continue the airport tax to make way for a net tax cut. So we continue this tax for all the air travelers, but this money does not go to airports. It goes to reduce the deficit. It takes unmitigated gall to extend the airport tax, and then put it toward the deficit. In fact, you don't put it all toward the deficit. Some of it is put toward a tax cut for inheritance taxes or capital gains taxes. And everybody traveling in an airplane wonders why the planes are bumping into each other in the sky and the airport radar is broken down and communications go out and everything else—remember that we are solving the deficit in Washington. We are giving them a unified deficit instead of an actual deficit.

So turning to the resolution itself, Mr. President, I want you to show me in this document I hold in my hand—Calendar 55, Senate Concurrent Resolution 27—where it says the budget is balanced. Do not give me this nonsense about the conversation that is in the committee report. That is a farce. Look at the actual law, the actual resolution that we are going to pass. If you can find in here, by way of language that there is a balanced budget by the year 2002, I will jump off the Capitol dome. I made that particular charge 4 years ago with the chairman of the Budget Committee, and I have not had to jump yet. Why?

Just turn to page 2, line 23, under the heading of deficits. "For purposes of

the enforcement of this resolution" it says, deficit for fiscal year 2002—\$108.7 billion. Then turn the page and get the actual deficit. That only counts under the law of section 13301 about Social Security. But you see, you have all of the other trust funds in there. Anytime you want to add up the annual deficit, just subtract the annual increase of the debt from the present year. In other words, you go here to page 5 and you will find that we have a debt of \$6,301,200,000,000 in 1997 but then for the fiscal year 2002 the debt has gone up to \$6,473,500,000,000, a deficit of 172 billion bucks.

Why did they have to borrow? Because that is what the deficit is. Now you can see from this other chart that the deficit this year is \$180 billion. That is after 5 years of deficits going down. Under this budget resolution, deficits go up in 1998, 1999, and the year 2000. They go way up. They do not go down. Just look at the figures.

So after 5 years, instead of a deficit of \$180 billion, we will have a deficit of \$172 billion. That is, if everything goes right. And then it is still back-end loaded, Mr. President. 72 percent of the spending cuts occur in the last 2 years. It is back-end loaded, as usual, and the back-end loaders will say that those Congresses can do it in the year 2001 and 2002. In any event, the deficit comes out \$172 billion. That is according to the Committee's facts and figures.

What we have to do—and that is why I proposed this amendment—is see if we can just take the entire spending cuts and tax increases and just eliminate them. I want to be realistic. I would like to do away with the so-called spectrum auctions. These are totally out of the question. We got somebody to come in last year—and it was verified by the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission—and say that we can get \$2.9 billion from this spectrum auction. We had a spectrum auction 6 months later and we got \$13.1 million. This is the kind of extreme exaggerated figures we are dealing with.

But aside from that, take all the figures in the work of the two Budget Committees and the agreement they have made. Eliminate the tax cuts and eliminate the spending increases—the Presidential initiatives—and steady as you go. If we can do that—that is what my amendment calls for—then you actually get a balanced budget. Government on a pay-as-you-go basis in fiscal year 2007. An honest budget. Truth in budgeting.

Mr. President, we have had conscience. That is why we came back after the Reagan deal with Tip O'Neill. We came back in here and we passed Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. I got it through over on this side over the objection of the majority leader, the majority whip, and the chairman of the Budget Committee. I got 14 votes up and down, the majority of the Democrats joined with the Republicans, in

1985, for that initiative. We could develop that kind of initiative now, instead of this sweetheart deal.

What good really has occurred as a result of the 1993 vote? Give President Clinton credit. And give this side of the aisle credit, because we could not get a single vote on that side of the aisle. They said they were going to hunt me down in the street and shoot me like a dog. Majority leader Dole said it would cause a recession and the world would end. I wish we had time to read those particular statements made by opponents of the 1993 plan.

Be that as it may, it worked. And that is the first President that has come around here in the past 15 years, since we started that Reaganomics, and has lowered the deficit.

To President Clinton's credit, he lowered the deficit in 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, and we are in the fifth year of lowered deficits, and this particular instrument asks us to go turncoat and start increasing spending so that we can give the rich a tax cut. Inheritance taxes, capital gains taxes, and all of these other things. Somewhere, sometime, Mr. President, we have to tell the American people that we in the Congress have been giving them over 200 billion bucks a year in Government that we are not willing to pay for. We have been buying their votes.

They are talking about campaign finance reform: it starts on the floor of the U.S. Senate here this evening. If you really want campaign finance reform, quit using the subterfuge to the taxpayers of America and offloading the debt to future years and vote to do away. Keep us on a steady course, because that is exactly what we need to do.

We are moving this deficit over. I do not know if you can see this on the chart, come up here to President Kennedy. We had already had all the wars under President Kennedy, except the closing days of the war in Vietnam. We had Korea, the world wars, the Revolutionary War and everything else, and we only ran up a debt that cost us \$9 billion in interest costs. Now, it is projected by CBO to be \$359 billion. So you can see where we have come.

We are spending \$360 billion more—for what? For waste. The crowd that came to town to do away with waste, fraud, and abuse has caused the biggest waste of all. That \$360 billion more we are spending is the biggest spending item; it is like taxes. It is almost \$1 billion a day. We are sitting around here giving each other the good government award saying, "heavens above, balanced budget, balanced budget, balanced budget," when we are increasing taxes, or the same as taxes, interest on the national debt, of \$1 billion a day.

Now Mr. President, let me just emphasize exactly the duplicitous conduct here of the Congress up here in Washington. Bob Reich, the Secretary of Labor, retired the other day and he wrote a book. I saw him on TV. He was proud of two things. He said, "You

know, we passed the Pension Reform Act of 1994, the Pension Reform Act of 1994." He said, "In addition to getting the minimum wage, I am most proud of that Pension Reform Act because corporate America has to fully secure their pensions so the workers of America moving from one place to another are not going to lose their rights and their entitlements."

Now what happens? Mr. President, I refer to the New York Times here just 10 some days ago, May 8, page 26: "Former Star Pitcher Is Sentenced to Prison."

Denny McLain, the former star pitcher for the Detroit Tigers, was sentenced today to eight years in prison and ordered to pay \$2.5 million in restitution for stealing from the pension plan of a company he owned.

The two-time Cy Young Award winner, who was the last man to win 30 games in a season, and his business partner were convicted in December on charges that they had stolen \$3 million from the pension fund of the Peet Packing Co., then used the money for company debts. . . .

We make sure you get a criminal charge and a sentence, and a prison sentence if you steal from the fund, but up here in Washington, the same crowd that passed that, whoopee, there it is. We get the good government award. It is a wonderful thing. You can just steal from these funds; the money is there. I do not see how you could in good conscience come around here with this budget without getting ashes in your mouth. To say balanced budget when you know the instrument itself says we have a deficit of \$108 billion. Look on page 4, you can see down there on line 23, the actual amount of \$108 billion. Then you can see where they list the debt for each year. As it increased, you can find that the actual deficit in the fiscal year 2002 is 172 billion bucks.

So after all of this work, we have come from \$180 billion—Mr. President, I see the distinguished ranking Member looking at the chart. The actual deficit according for this year according to CBO is \$180 billion, not \$70 billion. They are bragging about \$67 billion. They gave us a figure of \$70 billion a couple days ago because we use \$110 billion of the trust funds. We steal that money and give it to ourselves, saying we have the deficit down to \$70 billion and it is actually \$180 billion; and after 5 years under this resolution, by their own figures, it is estimated to be \$172 billion.

So, Mr. President, we have to stop the destruction of the economy of this country. It is a 1 percent drag on economic growth when you run these deficits and pay out all of this money when you don't pay for the Government you have. Here they have 12 million new jobs, low inflation, low interest rates, and the finest growth for 5 years in a row. If we can't stop look, listen, sober up, and begin to put this Government on a pay-as-you-go basis tonight and this week in Washington, DC, in this U.S. Congress, it is never going to happen. And somehow, somewhere, we have to get the free press, the media,

to report the truth, because they continue to report misleading figures. They don't quote the actual deficit. All they have to do is read this bill. Find in here where they say they balance the budget in the year 2002.

On the work sheet, they had the figures down here, Mr. President, of a \$1 billion surplus. But when they put out the actual resolution, that is not the case. They hide that in the descriptive language.

That is the way the system works. It is a cancer. We are spending more money on waste. Interest payments cannot build a school, a highway, and not 1 hour of research. There is no medical treatment. There is nothing for the children of America that we are all concerned about. There is nothing for Head Start, nothing for WIC, nothing for school construction. We could build all the new school buildings all over the country for \$360 billion.

That is how much we have increased our national interest payments with this extravagance and this charade. It is a fraud on the American people. The free press is supposed to keep us honest. They, as co-conspirators, unindicted, joined with us to defraud the American people.

I hope we can vote for this amendment of mine this evening and stop the fraud and get back to truth in budgeting. It is not too traumatic. Everybody is doing fine this year.

Just the other day, the Senate said rather than shut down the Government we could take this year's budget for next year. The mayor of any city in this situation would say, "Let's not fire the policemen and firemen. We will just take this budget for the next year." A Governor of any State would say, "Let's just take this year's budget for next year."

We can save \$50 billion by doing it. But we don't want to do that. We play this game. We exact this fraud on the American people. Somehow, somewhere it has to stop.

I yield the floor, and I thank the distinguished chairman of our Budget Committee and our ranking member.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, we are due to vote, as I understand it, pursuant to the last unanimous-consent agreement at 10 minutes to 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I know that the manager, the chairman of the Budget Committee, wants to say something. I would like to make a quick comment, if I might.

Few have the knowledge of the budget that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has. He understands it thoroughly, and he has been a consistent purveyor of the alarm to be aware and to make sure that we do the right thing.

It would be an ideal situation if we had the trust funds off budget, if we could deal with that in a quick moment like this. But the reality is that

we just can't do it, Mr. President. We have hammered out a budget. I used the term before. "Hammer" suggests the arduous effort that the budget agreement took to get 5 million children covered under health care, to make sure that impoverished seniors aren't further burdened by additional premiums because we have moved the home health care from part A to part B.

There are a whole series of things. There are tax cuts for the middle class. There are tax cuts for education. This bill was put together with a lot of work and a lot of giving by many people, people who do not like every part of this budget. I am one of them, I must tell you, but I am determined that we see that we pass this budget.

I say to the Senator from South Carolina, a dear friend to many of us here, that we ought to take a couple of these issues and work on them.

I agree with him on the trust funds on Social Security. I really do. I think we ought to take the time now—because we will be dealing with a more solvent situation in several of the trust funds—to deal with that. But it is not going to happen, I say here and now.

I will, unfortunately, be forced to vote against what the distinguished Senator from South Carolina is proposing. I intend to do just that, to vote against it.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Could I ask the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina still has 3 minutes left.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President. The distinguished chairman said in an ideal world that trust funds would be off budget. We live in an ideal world with respect to Social Security. Section 13301, in accordance with the Greenspan commission recommendation—President George Herbert Walker Bush signed legislation on November 5, 1990 that put Social Security off budget.

That is why, instead of a surplus in this document, you have a deficit of \$108 billion. We didn't get the rest of the trust funds off budget like we should have. We should get the highways, airport, retirement trust funds, Medicare off budget. But this document uses the money on the deficit. You are allocating it to the deficit. So the ideal world would be truth in budgeting.

I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. DOMENICI. Has the Senator yielded back the remainder of his time?

Mr. HOLLINGS. I do.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I will use just 2 minutes.

Mr. President, there has been a lot of talk about trust funds. But let everybody understand that the amendment has nothing to do with trust funds. The amendment has to do with just two things.

One, it strikes all of the tax cuts provided in this budget agreement, ham-

mered out with the President and the Democratic leaders and the Republican leaders of both Houses. That is No. 1. Strike them all.

Second, it says that the \$31.2 billion over 5 years of new initiatives that we have hammered out with the President—and we cut his initiatives almost in half to get there—but it says those initiatives are gone, too.

So essentially the President got \$31 billion in initiatives on covering the little kids and things like that that most of us want. He would take that out of this agreement, and at the same time, take out all of the tax cuts.

I don't intend to argue the substantive issue, which I think is totally wrong for America today. I just suggest that nothing could more basically attack the agreement than this, for the fundamentals of the agreement are gone if this amendment passes.

I yield any time I may have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded.

Under the previous order, the Hollings amendment is set aside.

AMENDMENT NO. 292

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the motion to table the Allard amendment, No. 292. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 29, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 73 Leg.]

YEAS—70

Akaka	Feingold	Mikulski
Baucus	Feinstein	Moseley-Braun
Bennett	Ford	Moynihan
Biden	Frist	Murray
Bingaman	Glenn	Reed
Bond	Gorton	Reid
Boxer	Graham	Robb
Breaux	Hagel	Roberts
Bryan	Hollings	Rockefeller
Bumpers	Inouye	Roth
Byrd	Jeffords	Sarbanes
Campbell	Johnson	Shelby
Chafee	Kennedy	Smith (OR)
Cleland	Kerrey	Snowe
Cochran	Kerry	Specter
Collins	Kohl	Stevens
Conrad	Landrieu	Thompson
D'Amato	Lautenberg	Thurmond
Daschle	Leahy	Torricelli
DeWine	Levin	Warner
Dodd	Lieberman	Wellstone
Domenici	Lott	Wyden
Dorgan	Lugar	
Durbin	Mack	

NAYS—29

Abraham	Gramm	Kyl
Allard	Grams	McCain
Ashcroft	Grassley	McConnell
Brownback	Gregg	Murkowski
Burns	Hatch	Nickles
Coats	Helms	Santorum
Coverdell	Hutchinson	Sessions
Craig	Hutchison	Smith (NH)
Enzi	Inhofe	Thomas
Faircloth	Kempthorne	

NOT VOTING—1

Harkin

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BENNETT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Regular order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will please come to order.

AMENDMENT NO. 295

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided on the HOLLINGS amendment No. 295.

The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the Chair. Right to the point, here is the concurrent resolution. You will not find in this document anywhere a balanced budget. Everyone is running hither and yon: "Balanced budget, balanced budget." The truth is, if you look on page 5, you have the fiscal year debt to the year 2001 and for the year 2002, the fiscal year debt there going up to \$172 billion. Actual deficit, without the use of the trust funds, without looting all the pension funds, there is \$172 billion.

This increases the debt each year every year for 5 years, whereby the interest costs on the debt is a billion a day. We have spending on autopilot of \$1 billion a day for absolutely nothing. Not for children. Not for highways. Not for research. Not for foreign aid. Not for defense. We have total waste.

We have a cancer and it ought to be removed. My particular amendment says do away with the tax cuts in this instrument; do away with the spending increases, the President's initiatives. We are on course for a balanced budget by the fiscal year 2007. Truth in budgeting is the question put before us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has 1 minute. The Senate will please come to order.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, this amendment takes out all of the tax cuts and all of the President's initiatives. Essentially it totally guts the entire agreement. There would be no tax cuts and there would be no initiatives that we have agreed with the President on. I urge a no vote. I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on the amendment No. 295. A rollcall has not been requested.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced, yeas 8, nays 91, as follows: