

Senators that they are not going to receive funding levels close to the highway funds or the mass transit funds that their States expect. That is what is shown in this chart. I apologize for the small print on this chart, but we have after all 50 States and it is difficult to get every State on the single chart.

This chart shows what will happen to a State's anticipated funding under the various highway bills that have been introduced, such as STARS 2000, STEP 21, NEXTEA and ISTEAs. Senators have signed onto those bills anticipating certain funding levels. If the Warner-Baucus amendment does not pass, each State will receive a reduction in funding.

I look at the Presiding Officer. New Hampshire—as an example, New Hampshire signed up for the ISTEAs reauthorization bill. If New Hampshire thinks it is going to get \$142 million a year, that is wrong. If my amendment does not pass, New Hampshire is going to receive \$30 million less. If my amendment passes, New Hampshire will get the \$142 million.

That same example holds for every single State.

So it is very clear that Senators are not going to get the money they think they are going to get if this amendment does not pass.

I want to also add that there are other reasons to increase transportation spending.

Our Department of Transportation says that we need about \$50 billion dollars annually to maintain our highway system. The \$26 billion provided for under this amendment is a little more than half of that. That is all.

Think of the competition in the world. The Japanese spend four times what we do as a percentage of GDP than the United States. The European Union, spends twice as much.

We are hurting ourselves in not keeping our transportation system up to snuff.

In addition, if the budget resolution becomes the law, areas that are experiencing growth or areas with an aging infrastructure will not get the money they need. And programs that mean a lot to Members, such as the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality program, or enhancements and bike trails, will not have the money they need.

Our proposal is very simple: That we pass this amendment, which will increase the deficit in the last year from a \$1 billion surplus to about a \$2 billion deficit. That is all. Over all 5 years, \$12 billion. It does not go to the core of the agreement. It does not touch Medicare or Medicaid and does not touch taxes. It does not touch any of the provisions that Senators have been arguing about over the past few months as to what should or should not be in the bipartisan agreement. It doesn't touch those at all. It just says let's spend the interest, plus what comes into the trust fund as revenue each year. That way we can prevent further deterioration of our highways and bridges.

If this amendment should pass,—the Senator from Virginia and I will work with the managers of the Budget Committee and with the administration to try to find some way to accommodate this \$12 billion increase in conference.

I want a balanced budget. I think every Senator wants a balanced budget. Fifty-seven Senators have written the Budget Committee asking for more money in transportation. In fact, what they asked for was a full \$26 billion every year for 5 years. We are only asking for a ramp up to the \$26 billion level over the 5 years. This is very modest and nowhere close to the request made by 57 Senators who have asked for a full \$26 billion to be included in transportation for every year.

This is a very small change in the agreement which the budget and administration negotiators put together. It can very easily be accommodated in conference.

I might add, to those Senators from the Northeast who are concerned about mass transit, this amendment also—the \$12 billion increase in outlays I mentioned—includes increases in mass transit.

So, Mr. President, it is really very simple. I grant that it is technically an increase in the deficit by \$12 billion. I am also saying that we as Senators should not be caught in a box. We should not be rigid. We should not be knee-jerked. We are elected to be thoughtful. We are elected to do what is right. We are elected to be creative.

What do the American people think is right? First, balance the budget; second, do it in a way which is fair to our country and our country's needs.

It is clear that we can balance the budget, including the framework agreed to by the budget negotiators, the administration, and the leadership, and still meet our States' infrastructure needs.

It is a very modest amendment. Again, it just says spend what comes in, plus interest, to the trust fund. In fact, even under our amendment we end up with a \$17 billion balance in the trust fund. So under our amendment, we are not spending anywhere near the amounts the trust fund could sustain. But the Senator from Virginia and I are trying to be modest.

So, I again urge Senators, just go the extra mile. Vote for this. We will all work together to balance the budget in a way which also does not hurt the core provisions of the agreement but addresses the very serious transportation needs of this country.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, first, I commend my distinguished colleague. We worked together as a team on this. He has spent a good deal of his career in the U.S. Senate fighting to improve America's infrastructure and transportation.

I am going to place at the desk at the time of the vote a letter signed by 66 Members of this body supporting precisely what it is we have before them today in this amendment, together with letters from each of the Governors. All 50 Governors support a higher level of funding for our highways.

Senator BAUCUS and I, as we worked on this amendment, decided not to take the top dollar. As Senator BAUCUS clearly said, \$17 billion remains in the trust fund. We tried to take a reasonable amount of increase.

This chart shows the green line of what this budget resolution does in terms of highways—flat. Our amendment takes this up at a gradual increase to where we reach the \$26 billion, that figure subscribed to by 66 Senators, that figure subscribed to by all 50 Governors.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we temporarily set aside the amendment that is pending and permit Senator PAT ROBERTS to speak for up to 10 minutes on the bill, after which we return to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. INHOFE. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. BAUCUS. Reserving the right to object. I am sorry. I did not hear the request.

Mr. DOMENICI. I had checked with Senator LAUTENBERG. All we did was ask that the Senator set aside his amendment for 10 minutes and return immediately to it after PAT ROBERTS speaks for 10 minutes.

Mr. BAUCUS. How much time is remaining on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-nine minutes on Senator DOMENICI's side and 12 minutes on Senator WARNER's side.

Mr. BAUCUS. Thank you. No objection.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I rise on a point of personal privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. INHOFE. I ask unanimous consent to be allowed 2 minutes to count against either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLARIFICATION OF PRESS REPORT

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I was shocked a little bit this morning to read in the Washington Times a story by Ralph Hallow in which he quotes a statement that was supposedly attributed to me by Mr. Paul Weyrich. I would like to read it.

Hallow writes that:

Mr. Weyrich said that at his regular Tuesday meeting for conservative leaders, Senator James Inhofe, Oklahoma Republican,

accused Mr. LOTT of having "betrayed the national-security interests of the country."

I have to tell you, Mr. President, that I don't think anything like this has ever happened to me. Even though I don't have thin skin—I have been beat up by the liberal media quite often—this is not the case. I never made such a statement.

I even checked the tape of a TV show that I had with the gentleman, Mr. Weyrich recently, and I find nothing but compliments which I made about Mr. LOTT. I did say on a couple of occasions that I disagreed with him on the chemical weapons stand. I disagreed with him on his suggestion in terms of potential punishment for Lt. Flynn. However, I was very complimentary of him.

Just a few minutes ago I received a memo from Paul Weyrich which clarifies the matter. I want to read into the RECORD the first half of that memo, dated this morning.

Once again Ralph Hallow has caused a problem. He called me on my private line and asked my views on Lott and Lt. Flynn, which I was happy to give. He asked me about the rest of the movement, and I told him that at the Wednesday lunch we gave Senator Inhofe a message to take back to the Steering Committee which was supported almost unanimously by the 65 or so in attendance. I then quoted Frank Gaffney as saying that twice in a month Senator Lott had betrayed the security interests of the United States. Instead, he attributes this quote to Senator Inhofe, who refrained from criticizing Lott even though he disagrees with him. Believe me, Hallow did not misunderstand what I told him because he even called me back and said he had interviewed Inhofe and he—Inhofe—refused to be critical of Lott.

Thank you, Mr. President.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

The Senate continued with the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the Chair. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee.

Mr. President, I rise in support of the overall balanced budget plan and rise expressing some reservations in regard to many of the amendments that we are considering, the pending amendments; some 45 of them, as a matter of fact.

If nothing else, I wanted to pay a personal tribute in behalf of the taxpayers of Kansas and thank the chairman of the Budget Committee for his leadership, his perseverance, his patience. He has the patience of Job. I must confess, having come from the lower body, as described by Senator BYRD, and being the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, I am not sure I had the patience of Senator DOMENICI. We now spell "persevere" D-o-m-e-n-i-c-i.

How many hours, I ask of the chairman, if he could respond, how many days, even years, have been involved?

Does he have any estimate in regard to the hours he has spent late, early—he and Chairman KASICH of the House? If he gives me an estimate, what is it? 10,000?

Mr. DOMENICI. On this agreement itself, just this year, I would estimate 1,000 hours.

Mr. ROBERTS. 1,000 hours. I said hours and minutes; even years.

This has been the third year on this particular budget plan. This is the culmination of 3 years of hard work that the Senator from New Mexico has put in, all members of the Budget Committee, as well as the staff. This has been a Lonesome Dove Trail ride. I hope we get through the tall grass and balanced budget with all of our body parts intact. If we do, the chairman will get most of the credit.

In the last session of the Congress we had two balanced budgets. We worked very hard and very diligently. They were vetoed by the President. We even came to a Government shutdown. Nobody wants to repeat that. I understand that when you are doing a budget for the U.S. Government, you have many, many strong differences of opinion. After all, for better or worse, the Congress of the United States reflects the diversity we have in this country and the strong difference of opinions. Goodness knows, we have good diversity and strong differences of opinion. The House, the other body, just the other night stayed until 3 a.m., and, finally, by a two-vote margin, succeeded in defeating an amendment that was a deal breaker. It involved highways. As a matter of fact, it involved transportation, the very issue we are discussing on the floor at this very moment other than my comments. Two votes was the difference. Goodness knows, everybody in the House of the Representatives, everybody in the Senate cares about transportation and cares about highways and the infrastructure.

We came within five votes of a deal breaker on the floor of the Senate. I think it was five votes in regard to health care for children. Who can be opposed to additional funds for health care for children? As a matter of fact, the chairman has worked very hard to provide \$16 billion in regard to that goal.

So we had highways, health care, and we had a situation in regard to the construction of our schools, to fix the infrastructure of the Nation's schools—\$5 billion—with a \$100 billion price tag, which set a very unique precedent.

I don't question the intent. I don't question the purpose nor the integrity of any Senator, nor, for that matter, anyone who would like to propose an amendment or a better idea in regard to the budget. But I would suggest that the high road of humility and responsibility is not bothered by heavy traffic in this instance.

Most of the amendments—I have them all here. Here is the stack, 45 of them. Most of the pending amendments right here are either sense of the Sen-

ate or they have been rejected outright as deal breakers.

Sense of the Senate means it is the sense of the Senate. It has no legal standing, has no legislative standing. It is just a Senator saying this would be a good idea in terms of my intent, my purpose, what I think we ought to do. And there are a few that are agreed to that obviously will be very helpful.

But here are the 45. Most of them are simply not going anywhere but raises the point. I took a little counting here. There are 8 Democrats and 11 Republicans—11 Republicans who have decided that they will take the time of the Senate, take the time of the American people, take the time of the chairman of the Budget Committee and staff and go over and repeat their priority concerns in regard to the budget.

There is nothing wrong with that. I understand that. Each Senator is an island in terms of their own ideas and their own purpose and their integrity. I do not really question that but in terms of time, I mean after 3 years of debate, after hours and hours and hours of careful deliberation between the President and the Republican leadership and 45 pending amendments.

I have my own amendments. I have my own amendments. I should have had some sense of the Senate amendments. I feel a bit left out. I thought we had a budget deal. I thought we were going to vote on it. I thought that we were going to conclude. And then during the regular appropriations process, during the regular order, if you will, of the rest of the session, why, perhaps we could address these things that I care very deeply about.

Maybe we ought to have a sense-of-the-Senate resolution introduced by Senator ROBERTS that all wheat in Kansas should be sold at \$6. That is a little facetious, to say the least, but I do have concerns about crop insurance, a child care bill I have introduced, along with a capital gains bill, capital gains and estate tax. I think capital gains should be across the board. I think estate tax should be at least \$1 million. I want a sense-of-the-Senate resolution or amendment declaring that. Or maybe an amendment—I tell you what we ought to have, if the chairman would agree. I think you ought to make a unanimous consent request to consider an amendment that all Senators who offer an amendment on the budget process must be required to serve 6 months on the Budget Committee. Why not? Perhaps in the interest of time, since all of the time that is being spent by the 11 Republicans and the 8 Democrats—oh, I forgot my sense-of-the-Senate resolution on defense. I do not think we have enough money committed to our national defense with the obligations we hear from the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the administration and everything else. So add that one in Roberts' sense of the Senate.

Maybe we ought to have a unanimous consent request, to save time, to get