

been doing a magnificent job of for the past 4 years, why do we want to muck it up and start cutting taxes, which is absolutely guaranteed to start the deficit back up again?

We tried that in 1981, cutting taxes massively, increasing defense spending massively, and winding up today with a \$5.2 trillion debt. This is the slowest learning crowd I have ever seen. It is worse than trying to housebreak a dog I had one time. We just could not do it.

So what are we doing talking about these massive tax cuts and balancing the budget at the same time? It has never worked, and it never will. Where did all this talk get started? If you are going to cut taxes, cut taxes for people who honestly need the money.

If you cut capital gains, with 75 percent of the benefit going to people who make over \$100,000, where is it going to go? Probably into the stock market. The mutual funds are putting \$15 billion a month into the market right now. Who here believes that the stock market can absorb those kinds of investments? Everything that goes up has to come down at some point or another. But I am talking about the Republican proposal.

And now the President is going to announce tonight apparently a proposed capital gains tax cut for people who have homes worth \$500,000. If you bought a home 20 years ago for \$100,000 and you sell it today for \$500,000, under the proposal of the President you would not pay a nickel tax.

I remember many years ago when we passed an exemption for homeowners to exclude \$150,000 of the price tag. You could do that one time in your life, a \$150,000 exclusion. If you had a \$500,000 home that you had paid \$100,000 for, you not only get your \$100,000 cost back, you can add \$150,000 to that and you have \$250,000 capital gains on which you would pay a 28 percent tax. The President's proposal is that if you have a \$500,000 home and you sell it for \$500,000 there is no tax, no matter what you paid for it. You may have paid \$25,000 for it and it may be worth \$500,000 today because somebody wants to build a McDonald's where you are living, no tax. Now, Mr. President, would you like to know how many people in this country have a home that is valued in excess of \$500,000? The answer is 1 percent. The President's proposal of a \$500,000 exclusion will take care of 99 percent of all the homeowners in America. I do not know what the cost of it is supposed to be.

These things are all laudable. I never lost a vote voting for a tax cut. When you tell people you are for tax cuts, everybody applauds. If there is anything people want to hear, it is that they are overtaxed, they are overregulated, they are overeverything. I understand their frustration.

But let me ask you this: When you have an economy that grew at 4.7 percent in the fourth quarter of 1996—that is a staggering growth rate—with an inflation rate of 2.2 percent, about as

low as you can ever get it, Treasury bills at 5 percent as of yesterday, the unemployment rate as low as it ever gets, in short, you have an economy that is performing absolutely magnificently, and the deficit has gone from \$290 billion in 1992 to \$107 billion, a 63-percent reduction in 1996, what are we going to do? We are going to start pandering again. Why can we not focus on that deficit? The people of this country have a nonnegotiable demand that we balance the budget.

Do you know why a lot of people are going to vote for the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States? Do you think it is because they think it is sound economic or social policy? I do not like to denigrate other people. It is arrogant to do that. But I can tell you one reason is because they have seen the polls. I know what the polls show. One of the reasons the polls show so many people want a constitutional amendment to balance the budget is two things. No. 1, they think a constitutional amendment to balance the budget and a balanced budget are the same thing. A constitutional amendment does not guarantee you anything. Yes, it does, too: It guarantees you chaos. It is the biggest political scam ever perpetrated and foisted off on an unsuspecting public that can bring nothing but utter chaos to this Nation down the road.

Do you know something? People did not elect 100 Senators to come up here and vote however the polls show every time. They elected people to come up here and to think, to read the Constitution, understand the sacredness of the Constitution, understanding that every single little problem that comes up ought not to be solved by tinkering with that sacred document. I have never voted for a constitutional amendment. I thought in 1984 when I voted against that great constitutional amendment of prayer in school that I was serving my last term in the Senate. Do you know something? I went home and I went from one end of the State to the other explaining to the people of my State what that meant, how the school boards could pick the prayers the children would say and tell them how many times a day they would say them. What kind of nonsense is that, giving up the greatest religious freedoms we have to the local school board? Do you know what? I had the fundamentalists and the mainliners and everybody clapping and cheering because they did not want that either. But at least I did not hesitate to talk to them about it and tell them where it would lead us.

So I do not have any hesitancy today in coming to the floor and saying I am very apprehensive about all the tax cut proposals. Why are we going to cut \$138 billion from Medicare and turn right around and give it away in tax cuts to the wealthiest people in America? That is not my idea of responsible legislation. That is not my idea of a responsible economy. If you want a balanced

budget, now is the time to show it, and do not tell me you will hide behind this constitutional amendment and go home and say, "I did my part. I cut taxes and then I voted for a constitutional amendment to balance the budget."

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

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

CONCERNING THE NEED FOR ACCURATE GUIDELINES FOR BREAST CANCER SCREENING

The Senate continued with the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be added as a cosponsor and urge my colleagues to vote for the resolution.

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

Mr. BOND. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] is necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY] is absent because of attending a funeral.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWNBACK). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 5 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Abraham	Dorgan	Kohl
Akaka	Durbin	Kyl
Allard	Enzi	Landrieu
Ashcroft	Faircloth	Lautenberg
Baucus	Feingold	Leahy
Bennett	Feinstein	Levin
Biden	Ford	Lieberman
Bingaman	Frist	Lott
Bond	Glenn	Lugar
Boxer	Gorton	Mack
Breaux	Graham	McCain
Brownback	Gramm	McConnell
Bryan	Grams	Mikulski
Bumpers	Grassley	Moseley-Braun
Burns	Gregg	Moynihan
Byrd	Hagel	Murkowski
Campbell	Harkin	Nickles
Chafee	Hatch	Reed
Cleland	Helms	Reid
Coats	Hollings	Robb
Cochran	Hutchinson	Roberts
Collins	Hutchison	Rockefeller
Conrad	Inhofe	Roth
Coverdell	Inouye	Santorum
Craig	Jeffords	Sarbanes
D'Amato	Johnson	Sessions
Daschle	Kempthorne	Shelby
DeWine	Kennedy	Smith, Bob
Dodd	Kerry	Smith, Gordon
Domenici	Kerry	H.

Snowe
Specter
Stevens

Thomas
Thompson
Torrice

Warner
Wellstone
Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Murray

Thurmond

The resolution (S. Res. 47) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, read as follows:

S. RES. 47

Whereas the National Cancer Institute is the lead Federal agency for research on the causes, prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of cancer;

Whereas health professionals and consumers throughout the United States regard the guidelines of the National Cancer Institute as reliable scientific and medical advice;

Whereas it has been proven that intervention through routine screening for breast cancer through mammography can save the lives of women at a time when medical science is unable to prevent this disease;

Whereas the National Cancer Institute issued a guideline in 1989 recommending that women in their forties seek mammograms, but rescinded this guideline in 1993;

Whereas in 1993, it was difficult to have the same degree of scientific confidence about the benefit of mammography for women between the ages of 40 and 49 as existed for women between the ages of 50 and 69 due to inherent limitations in the studies that were conducted as of that date;

Whereas at that time, the American Cancer Society and 21 other national medical organizations and health and consumer groups were at variance with the decision of the National Cancer Institute to rescind the guidelines of the Institute for mammography for women between the ages of 40 and 49;

Whereas the statement of scientific fact on breast cancer screening issued by the National Cancer Institute on December 3, 1993, caused widespread confusion and concern among women and physicians, eroded confidence in mammography, and reinforced barriers and negative attitudes that keep women of all ages from being screened;

Whereas in 1995, investigators found a 24 percent lower death rate among women who received mammograms in their forties when the world's population-based trials were combined;

Whereas in 1996, Swedish researchers in 2 studies found a 44 and 36 percent lower death rate among women who received mammograms in their forties;

Whereas a number of studies have shown that breast tumors in women under the age of 50 may grow far more rapidly than in older women, suggesting, that annual mammograms are of value to women in this age group;

Whereas on January 23, 1997, a panel convened by the National Institutes of Health reviewed these and other compelling studies but decided not to recommend that the National Cancer Institute reissue its earlier guidelines;

Whereas the Director of the National Cancer Institute and other major national organizations, including the American Cancer Society, expressed surprise and disappointment with this decision;

Whereas the majority (approximately 80 percent) of women who are diagnosed with breast cancer have no identifiable risk for this disease;

Whereas breast cancer is the single leading cause of death for women in their forties and fifties, and a leading cause of death for women between the ages of 30 and 60; and

Whereas more women will be diagnosed with breast cancer this year in their forties

(over 33,000 women) than in their fifties: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) adequately designed and conducted studies are needed to further determine the benefits of screening women between the ages of 40 and 49 through mammography and other emerging technologies; and

(2)(A) the Senate strongly urges the Advisory Panel for the National Cancer Institute to consider reissuing the guideline rescinded in 1993 for mammography for women between the ages of 40 and 49 when it convenes in February; or

(B) until there is more definitive data, direct the public to consider guidelines issued by the other organizations.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MIKE DOMBECK, CHIEF OF THE U.S. FOREST SERVICE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I rise today to echo the words of Senator BUMPERS regarding national forest policy and to welcome Mike Dombeck as Chief of the U.S. Forest Service. The Forest Service is one of the oldest and one of the largest stewards of our public lands. This year marks the 100th anniversary of the Organic Act in which Congress laid out the purposes for our national forests. Since the Forest Service was created in 1905, it has grown to manage over 190 million acres of forest lands. These lands span the entire United States, ranging from the small national forests of the East to the multimillion-acre forests of the West. The mission of the Forest Service is to manage all of these forests under the principles of multiple use and sustained yield. As Gifford Pinchot, the first Forest Service Chief, declared in 1905, the role of the Forest Service was to achieve "the greatest good for the greatest number in the long run." This mandate still stands today and should guide us into the next century of national forest management.

As the Green Mountain National Forest in my State begins review of its forest plan, the Pinchot vision is what I would like to see the Forest Service follow. The challenges facing the Green Mountain in many ways reflect the challenges facing the Forest Service as we move into the next century—increased recreational use, pressure to increase timber production, and protection of the forest's wildlife habitat, streams, and wilderness areas. Over the last decade we have witnessed a boom

in recreational use of the Green Mountain, with more than 1.5 million visitors using the forest for skiing, hiking, hunting, snowmobiling, and fishing. All of our national forests together host over 820 million visits a year.

Although visitor use is a valuable indication of the importance of these national forests, we must not forget the equally compelling reason to protect these national treasures. They represent some of our Nation's most unique ecosystems, from the tropical rainforests in the South, the alpine meadows of the Rocky Mountains, the coastal redwoods of the Pacific coast, and the hardwood forests in the East. This network of forests preserves natural resources for scientific, educational, and historical values. New scientific information and advances in technology have allowed us to improve the management of our forests to protect these values. I applaud Chief Dombeck's call for increased use of available technology, enhanced conservation education, and insistence on personal accountability to protect these natural resources.

At the same time, the resources available to the Forest Service to move our national forests into the next century must keep pace with the demands. The Forest Service is developing joint business ventures and cooperative agreements with both public and private partners to address this situation. It has looked to its neighbors to share in the responsibility and caretaking of the forests. It has reached out to private enterprises to operate facilities and develop viable business ventures to provide quality recreational opportunities while ensuring ecosystem protection.

In Vermont, the Green Mountain National Forest has worked with numerous volunteer organizations to maintain and develop campgrounds and trails in the forest. The Green Mountain also has been participating in a cooperative effort with the University of Vermont to develop a database of resource information to analyze different management scenarios in the forest. I appreciate Chief Dombeck's recognition of the value of these multipartner projects in reaching out to the communities who live near our national forests.

Although some people feel that these increasing pressures and sometimes conflicting demands on our national forests is reason to completely overhaul the laws that govern our forests, I believe that these laws are sound. When the National Forest Management Act [NFMA] was drafted in the mid-1970's there was a crisis facing the management of our forest, the competing interests of timber production and forest conservation were colliding. That environment created what I believe is a law that offers the flexibility, public participation, and accountability necessary to guide our national forests into the next century.