

by a President who believes that one can have a war not only without casualties on our side but with few, if any, casualties on the other side. You should not begin a war for reasons that do not justify the use of force, and only the gravest national security reasons do so. And, if you get in one, you should not go into it halfheartedly or without a desire actually to win.

Mr. President, what are the potential outcomes? If we are overwhelmingly successful, we may get sometime in the next week, or the next month, or the next year, exactly the privileges that we sought in the first place—the right to send our soldiers into a now devastated countryside in order to require people to live together who do not wish to live together, and perhaps to enforce an autonomy, which I have already said both sides oppose, or, alternatively, maybe we can get the Russians or someone else to help us reach a negotiated solution in which the Kosovars will be worse off than they were before, and in which the barbarism of Mr. Milosevic will at least have been partially rewarded. Or we may end up sending our own troops into that devilishly difficult part of the Balkans, whether from the south, or the west and the north—and we do not yet know—with an escalation of what will still be a halfhearted war with secondary goals, goals that will not include the removal of the present government in Belgrade and the establishment of a real peace. Or, I suppose it is possible—just remotely possible—that the President and NATO may decide that we want a full-scale war against Serbia until that regime is, in fact, destroyed.

None of these is an appetizing outcome, by any stretch of the imagination. We are left with these alternatives only, I think, because this administration did not seriously consider what it was doing before it began doing it, or seriously consider both the cost and expense in men, material, money, and prestige of the United States for such a dubious goal.

I wish that I had a firm, accurate, and a favorable outcome to look forward to. I wish I could come up with the appropriate means to reach such a goal. However, it seems to me that if we have learned anything in the last several years from other parts of the world, and in the last several weeks from this part of the world, it is that the armed services of the United States should only be used for a vitally important interest of the United States. If they are then to be used, they should be used with a clear and worthy goal, and with a degree of ruthlessness that assures we attain that goal. At this point we have done nothing but worsen our relationships with the Russians and with the neighbors of Kosovo itself at great expense to ourselves and at a horrendous expense to the victims in Kosovo who have been killed, driven from their homes, or driven out of their homeland entirely, without any

significant prospect of returning at any time soon.

We do need a serious national debate on the subject and we need a President of the United States who far more clearly articulates our goals and how we are to attain those goals. We have not had that kind of presentation. For that reason, support for the United States efforts is extremely shallow and is almost certain to disappear once the casualty lists begin to be published in this country.

It is time for candor. It is time for clarity. It is time for a clear statement of our goals. In fact, we are well past time for both of those and we have not received them. I think we are faced with an extremely serious challenge with no clear way to that proper and appropriate goal.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:32 p.m., recessed until 2:20 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. ROBERTS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Parliamentary inquiry. What is before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no business before the Senate at the moment.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

MOTION TO APPOINT CONFEREES

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate with respect to the budget resolution.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Thank you, Mr. President. I understand Senator REID has some motions to instruct. I do not think they will be in order unless we yield back the time that has just been announced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I say to Senator LAUTENBERG that the situation now is that the motion I made to appoint conferees is pending. There is 1 hour on it. I am prepared to yield back time on that if the Senator from New Jersey is, and then he can proceed to his first motion.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. We are OK with that.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield back the half hour we have.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. And I yield back the time we have on our side.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator from

New Jersey, and the Senate would probably like to know, what he has by way of motions on his side. How many does he think he is going to have this afternoon?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Since the chairman of the committee asked how many I think, I am free to give an answer. I think there are four, but my guess is that we have to wait to see if there are going to be any more or not.

Mr. DOMENICI. Parliamentary inquiry. Is it not correct, now that the time has been yielded back on the motion to appoint conferees, each motion to instruct carries 30 minutes equally divided and that is all the time available at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. Unless and until that is yielded back, another motion is not in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. Are second-degree amendments to those motions in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; second-degree amendments are in order, and they have 20 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Equally divided?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I think we will have one that has to do with praising our men in the military which we will attach to this at some point. Substantively, unless Senator LAUTENBERG proposes something that prompts a second-degree amendment of some type or prompts us to make an amendment, we do not have any contemplated at this time.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. It is hard for me to imagine there is anything here—

Mr. DOMENICI. We can accept them; right?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. We will have to kind of slug our way through and see how it goes. I appreciate the introduction that the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee presented. We are going to offer our motions on instructing conferees.

Mr. President, are we now in a position to go ahead and offer those?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Just to recount, there is a half hour equally divided on the motions themselves?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I send to the desk a motion to instruct the conferees on H. Con. Res. 68, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the motion be dispensed with.

Mr. DOMENICI. I reserve the right to object. Is it very lengthy?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator reserves the right to object.

Mr. DOMENICI. I object, and let's read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG] moves to instruct conferees on H. Con. Res. 68, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2000, to include in the conference report provisions that would reserve all Social Security surpluses only for Social Security, and not for other programs (including other retirement programs) or tax cuts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Thank you, Mr. President.

The motion is very simple. It instructs the conferees who are going to be reviewing the budget resolution to include in the conference report provisions that will reserve all Social Security surpluses for Social Security and for Social Security only—not other programs, including other retirement programs, as has been suggested, and not for tax cuts.

For years, Democrats have been arguing that our top fiscal priority should be to save Social Security first, and we feel very strongly about that. It is, after all, our party's creation that kicked off Social Security, and we have spent decades since then protecting the program from attack.

In our view, Social Security represents a sacred trust between the Government and the people. It is a trust that should not and must not be violated.

Nearly 44 million Americans now benefit from Social Security, and many of them depend heavily on the program for their survival. For 66 percent of the elderly, Social Security provides half their income. Without Social Security, the poverty rate among the elderly would be 48 percent; roughly 15 million more Americans would be living in poverty than do now. For single, divorced, or widowed elderly women, the poverty rate without Social Security would be 60 percent—60 percent for elderly women.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, under current projections, Social Security is adequately financed only until 2034. At that time, just when millions of baby boomers will be retired and struggling to get by, Social Security may be unable to pay the full benefits to which these Americans are entitled.

We need to act promptly to address this problem. President Clinton has proposed policies which would extend Social Security significantly to the year 2059. Unfortunately, the majority has rejected those policies, and in their place nothing has been proposed. Thus, the budget resolution approved by the Senate included nothing to extend Social Security's solvency by even a single day.

Having said that, while the Senate resolution did nothing to actually help Social Security, it at least seemed to do no harm. The resolution was based on the premise that, at a minimum,

Congress should not spend Social Security surpluses on anything else. That would not extend solvency at all, but at least it would not make matters worse.

Unfortunately, we now understand that the Republican leadership has backed off from even this modest commitment. Instead, they reportedly—and we have not really seen the details—have agreed to include in the final version of the budget resolution a provision that could pose a direct and serious threat to Social Security.

Although we have not seen any final language, this provision apparently calls for using Social Security not just for Social Security but for other programs as well. Apparently, the provision would allow Social Security taxes to be diverted to other things that have some connection to retirement security. That could be a catchword. It could mean a new privatized Medicare system. Perhaps it could include civil service or military retirement programs. More likely, I am afraid it could also mean tax cuts for the wealthy that are claimed to somehow affect retirement.

I was stunned when I heard about this provision, and I think it is remarkable that the Republican leadership would even consider using Social Security surpluses for anything other than Social Security. After all, how many times during the debate on the budget did we hear about the Republicans' commitment to preserving Social Security surpluses? That was supposed to be a centerpiece of their whole resolution. But now it appears that when the Republican leadership met behind closed doors, their commitment was overwhelmed with other concerns.

This reversal is especially stunning in light of Republican criticisms about double counting, and now the GOP seems to want to use Social Security surpluses for all sorts of other programs. That sounds like double counting to me, Mr. President. After all, you cannot use a dollar twice. If you use it as a Social Security dollar for Medicaid or tax cuts, that is one less dollar available to pay Social Security benefits.

So we ought to stand up for a simple proposition; that is, to use Social Security surpluses for Social Security. That is the message of this motion to instruct. It is an effort to reverse yesterday's decision and to get the entire Senate on record in support of saving Social Security surpluses for Social Security, and exclusively for Social Security.

I know my friends on the other side of the aisle will establish some type of elaborate lockbox that will protect Social Security. But given the agreement that developed yesterday, it makes one wonder: What will Social Security surpluses be locked up for? Will they be locked up for tax cuts? For other retirement programs? For some new type of program that is given the label "Social Security"? Or will they be locked

up to pay guaranteed Social Security benefits, as they are supposed to be?

I think Social Security taxes should be used for Social Security benefits, not for other types of spending or tax cuts that somehow or other can be called retirement security. So I strongly urge the Republican leadership to reverse the decision that was reached last night. Social Security surpluses should be used for Social Security—and I drum the point home—and only Social Security, not other programs, not tax cuts. If we are serious about that principle, let's really make a commitment to it. Let's not endorse open-ended language like retirement security that could encourage future abuses.

I hope and urge that my colleagues will support this motion to instruct to reverse a commitment to language that permits an open-ended use of that money under the umbrella of "retirement security."

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. How much time do we have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has now 14 minutes 55 seconds. The Senator from New Jersey has 7 minutes 47 seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, let me just make a couple points for everyone. First, I think everybody here understands that when you go to conference, you go to conference with the House. You do not go to conference with yourself. If that were the case, we would rule supreme and there would be no need to go to conference, and whatever the House thought about any of these measures would be totally irrelevant. I think everybody understands that isn't the case. We have to go to conference with them.

Secondly, I would like to make two points about what we do in our budget and what the President did so everybody will understand.

Senator LAUTENBERG talks about the Republican budget and the lockbox that we contemplate and speculates that he does not know what it might be used for. Let me tell everybody so they will understand. For starters, in the first 10 years the Republican budget, and that which will be locked in to be spent as we determine in conference, is \$300 billion—you got it, \$300 billion—more than the President proposes to set aside for safekeeping for the Social Security trust account.

Why is that the case? Because we say, put 100 percent of the accumulated surplus that belongs in the trust fund in the trust fund. For all the rhetoric about who is saving what, we put \$300 billion more in there than the President, because the President concocted a 15-year payout for this trust fund. We have never even had a budget that contemplates 15 years. In fact, the President, when he goes beyond 5, he does

not even have the programs enumerated in his budget, but he is telling us all, wait 15 years, and we will put enough money in that trust fund that is supposed to be there for some security. We said, put it in now as it accrues year by year—not 62 percent of it; 100 percent.

In addition, for those who are wondering what we are doing about Social Security and what the President does about it, let me remind you, we do not spend one nickel of Social Security, of their money, for any new program. The President of the United States, in his budget, decided that it was not important to save Social Security by keeping their money. He had contemplated spending out of the Social Security trust fund \$158 billion. Let me repeat, we now have a motion by the other side of the aisle, our good Democratic friends, challenging what we are doing, when the President of the United States spent \$158 billion, in the first 5 years, out of the Social Security trust fund without any apologies—just said, “Spend it.” We say, “Don’t spend it. Keep it in the trust fund, and put it in a statutorily created lockbox that will be tied to debt limits so it can never be spent.”

Having said that, it is really ironic that the other side of the aisle claims the President is doing so much for Social Security, and they would like to join on his coattails, so much for Medicare, and they would like to join on his coattails, and the facts are what I have just told you. The facts are what I have just told you.

Fellow Senators, you do not have to be worried about whether that Social Security trust fund is going to be used for tax cuts, because we cannot direct that any of that money be used for tax cuts. In fact, go read the resolution. It says tax cuts are to come from a mandated reconciliation pot of money that is called on-budget surplus.

Mr. President, forget all the jargon. It means that tax cuts, if any, come out of surpluses that have nothing to do with the Social Security trust fund, by definition. So tax cuts are going to accrue over a decade, and they will come out of surpluses, not the surplus that is accumulated in the Social Security trust fund.

Having said that, once again, the amendment is calculated to play politics, and I see no reason why we should not accept the instruction. So if the distinguished Senator would like us to accept it, we can get on with our business and we can accept it right now. If he would like a vote on it, we will tell all our people to vote 100 percent for it because, remember, we have to go to conference with the House, and we will do our very best, but we will be glad to accept it.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LAUTENBERG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

I am very happy that the chairman of the Budget Committee is going to agree to Senator LAUTENBERG’s language, because there is some confusion here, if you read the press reports today. That wouldn’t be the first time there would be some confusion. But what it says here is that “[t]he final budget resolution will also contain language allowing the entire \$1.8 trillion Social Security surplus over the next 10 years to be used for retirement security. . . .” It could include Medicare, it says.

Here is the nub of the argument that we had in the Budget Committee, of which I am proud to be a member. The Democrats on the committee wanted to see 15 percent of the surplus dedicated to Medicare and 62 percent for Social Security. We had a very good debate, I thought, in the committee about that. And my colleague from New Mexico made the point very clearly that Social Security would be put in a lockbox and would be used only for that. And we really did not get anywhere on the Medicare debate because we did not set aside anything from the surplus. Yes, there is money in there for Medicare at the current level, but there is nothing additional out of the surplus. We wanted to see 62 percent of the surplus for Social Security, 15 percent for Medicare.

Now we read that that 62 percent would be used for Medicare, in other words, stealing that money from Social Security. I am very glad that my colleague from New Mexico is going to accept this language. It will clarify it. I assume that this report is incorrect and that this language will not appear.

I also hope that this newspaper is wrong when it reports that the Dodd-Jeffords language on child care was stripped from the resolution. This was a 59-vote majority in this body, quite bipartisan, to do something about child care.

So I am very pleased that we are going to have agreement on this. I hope when we look at the budget language—and, hopefully, I will be there looking at it with my colleagues—that we will not see such language in the resolution.

I thank you very much and yield back my time to Senator LAUTENBERG.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from California. She is a valuable member of the Budget Committee and works hard in making sure that the commitments we develop are to be met.

I remind my good friend from New Mexico that we are pleased to have his support, that the vagary that develops as a result of this new language “retirement security” is kind of a red flag. It tells us that there is something else. Knowing the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee as I do, when he

says he is going to do this, I know that he is going to do it. I know when he goes to conference again that he is going to make sure that this is held. I am comforted by that notion, as are millions of Americans who are one day to get Social Security as part of their retirement program.

This is kind of a happy day. I hope that all of the Republicans will support this, as will the Senator from New Mexico, chairman of the Budget Committee. I do not see how they can resist.

With that, Mr. President, I ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico whether he is ready to yield back time?

Mr. DOMENICI. Shall we accept the amendment, or does the Senator want to have a vote?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I would like a roll call.

Mr. DOMENICI. I am just wondering if we can’t stack a few votes.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. That wouldn’t be a problem. The question is in terms of whether we have our other amendments.

Mr. DOMENICI. If we don’t, we will put in a quorum call. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has 9 minutes 49 seconds, and the Senator from New Jersey has 4 minutes 15 seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. I will yield down to 4½, and then we can both yield back the remainder.

Let me say, first of all, I heard that the Senator from California had recently been to my State. Incidentally, I was quite surprised. I walked into the airport in New Mexico, our international airport. I ran into the Senator and asked her if she was coming all the way to New Mexico to try to defeat the budget that we prepared. She told me, “No. I am here for other purposes.” I was kind of glad of that, and I surely didn’t want New Mexicans to listen to her about the budget when I worked so hard to try to get them to listen to me. She did not quite do that, because I looked around to see how much she got and it was pretty Democratic, what she did, with a big D.

Anyhow, let me suggest, Senator, that you should be careful when you use these percentages. You say that what we want, speaking for you, we wanted 62 percent that the President wanted to set aside, and then we wanted 15 percent for Medicare. The budget is a big document, big numbers, but I just added those two up, and that is 77 percent.

Mrs. BOXER. That is right, of the surplus.

Mr. DOMENICI. Frankly, we have 100 percent in the first 10 years. So the 15 percent that would have gone to Medicare under the proposal in the committee, added to the percent that the President saved of the Social Security trust fund, is the astronomical percentage of 77 percent of the Social Security trust fund. Guess what we did in our

budget resolution. One hundred. Let's do that one. What is the difference there? Twenty-three percent additional accumulated surplus in the first 10 years is in the lockbox as we prescribed in our budget. Having said that, I relinquish the remainder of my time, if the Senator will relinquish his.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I strongly support the Lautenberg motion, which would instruct the budget conferees to reserve all Social Security surpluses for Social Security, and for no other purpose. This is what Senate Republicans promised to do in the budget debate just last month. Now, just three weeks later, we are hearing disturbing reports that they are poised to renege on their pledge. The Republican conferees are contemplating a new raid on Social Security. In a move which would reflect a new level of cynicism, the Republican leadership is cutting a trap door in their so-called "Social Security lock-box." Those dollars were raised by payroll taxes expressly dedicated to financing Social Security benefits. However, the Republicans now want to allow that money to be used for any type of "retirement security" plan. I hope such reports are wrong. But I fear they might be accurate.

This would open the door to risky schemes that use the Social Security surplus to finance private retirement accounts at the expense of Social Security's guaranteed benefits. Such a privatization plan could actually make Social Security's financial picture far worse than it is today, necessitating deep benefit cuts. A genuine "lock-box" would prevent any such diversion of funds, but not the Republican version. A genuine "lock-box" would guarantee that all those dollars would be in the Trust Fund when needed to pay benefits to future recipients. The "lock-box" in this budget apparently does not.

It is bad enough that the budget passed by Senate Republicans three weeks ago did not provide even one additional dollar to pay Social Security benefits to future retirees, that it did not extend the life of the Social Security Trust Fund by one more day. To our Republican colleagues, I say: "If you are unwilling to strengthen Social Security, at least do not weaken it. Do not divert dollars which belong to the Social Security Trust Fund for other purposes. Every dollar in that Trust Fund is needed to pay future Social Security benefits."

The Republican "retirement security" scheme could be nothing more than tax cuts to subsidize private accounts disproportionately benefiting their wealthy friends. Placing Social Security on a firm financial footing should be our highest budget priority, not further enriching the already wealthy. Two-thirds of our senior citizens depend upon Social Security retirement benefits for more than 50 percent of their annual income. Without it, half the Nation's elderly would fall below the poverty line.

It appears that the Republicans may be planning to take these Social Security dollars and to use them instead to finance more tax cuts in the guise of "retirement security." If this occurs, there will be no debt reduction. There will be no strengthening of the Social Security Trust Fund to meet the demands of the baby boomers' retirement. Every one of those payroll tax dollars belongs to Social Security, and should be used solely to strengthen the Trust Fund. If our Republican colleagues have no ulterior motive, the wording of the Budget Resolution should state that principle unambiguously. When instead we see language as vague and open-ended as "retirement security," suspicions are understandably raised. If this gaping trap door is not eliminated, the American people will know that the Republican "lock-box" is nothing more than a cynical magician's trick. The millions of senior citizens who depend on Social Security will know that the Republican majority has abandoned them once more.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I am happy to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask for the yeas and nays on the Lautenberg motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask that we not proceed to the vote but, rather, that we have a quorum call now and see if the distinguished Senator can muster up another amendment on his side, and we will just wait for awhile and see.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, before the quorum call is begun, I agree with the Senator's mission here; that is, perhaps we can stack several votes together, but we will work on that during the quorum call.

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. KENNEDY. 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. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I understand that it is in order to send a motion to instruct conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. Under the time agreement, the motions to instruct have 30 minutes equally divided.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I send a motion to instruct on behalf of myself and Senator DASCHLE and others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] moves to instruct conferees on H. Con. Res. 68, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000, to include in the conference report provisions that would:

(1) allow targeted tax relief for low- and middle-income working families; and

(2) reserve a sufficient portion of projected non-Social Security surpluses to extend significantly the solvency of the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and modernize and strengthen the program, before—

(A) using budget surpluses to pay for tax breaks that would give most of their benefits to the wealthiest Americans, or

(B) enacting new spending above the levels in the Senate-passed version of the budget resolution, unless it is offset in accordance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. President, I want to take a moment to review the motion to instruct very quickly for the benefit of the Members so they have a keen awareness and understanding of exactly what this motion is to the conferees. This motion is to instruct the conferees to include in the conference report the provisions that would allow the targeted tax relief for low- and middle-income working families which has been presented here during the course of the debate on the budget; and, two, to preserve a sufficient portion of the projected non-Social Security surplus to extend significantly the solvency of the Medicare hospital insurance trust fund and modernize and strengthen the program. We are effectively asking that there be the allocation of resources to extend the solvency of the Medicare program.

I think the percentage that we had identified earlier during the course of the debate on the budget was 15 percent. What we have indicated here is that it would be important to extend the solvency of the trust fund before using any of the budget surplus to pay for the tax breaks which would give most of the benefits to the wealthiest Americans by enacting new spending above the levels in the Senate-passed version of the budget resolution.

Effectively what this instruction is, Mr. President, is very easy to understand. It says given the size and the significance of the budget surplus that we want to have the sufficient allocations of resources for the protection of Medicare. In an earlier instruction on this particular measure, we included an instruction to have sufficient funding set aside for the solvency of the Medicare trust fund before we provide any tax cuts or tax breaks for the American people. That is basically and fundamentally the issue.

We in this body make choices and make decisions. This is certainly one of the most important ones that we will make, not only for just this year, but for future years. We are saying, given the kinds of resources that we have available, that we are going to do two things with regard to this instruction; that is, to set aside sufficient resources for the solvency of the Medicare program, and be serious about taking the steps to ensure that there will be the changes in the Medicare program that are responding to the particular needs of the Medicare program.

Certainly there are a number of ideas about how we can strengthen the Medicare program. I think one of the most important is the addition of a prescription drug proposal. The President of the United States, in his speech to the American people on the State of the Union, indicated that one of his high priorities with the restructuring of the Medicare system would be for a program to meet the prescription drug needs of the elderly people in this country.

We want to make sure that we are going to have sufficiency in terms of the savings of the projected surpluses, and that then we will have an opportunity in the remainder of this Congress for the Congress to work its will on the floor of the Senate. I hope that one of the first areas of priority would be in the area of prescription drugs.

As has been pointed out on many different occasions, when the Medicare issue was debated in 1964 it lost narrowly here in the Senate in the spring of that year. It became a primary issue in the 1964 election. There was an extraordinary resonance across the country about the importance of Medicare. There were 18 Members of the Senate that voted one way in 1964 and another way in 1965. They had heard the voices of the elderly people in this country in support of the Medicare program. When we adopted the Medicare program we did not include prescription drugs for one very basic and fundamental reason, and that is because about 95 percent of the private programs at that time did not include prescription drugs. Now they do. The need is out there.

We will have an opportunity to do it, and it will be greatly strengthened with this kind of an instruction to the conferees. If we are able to set aside the kind of surplus that was included in the President's recommendations and included in this instruction, then we will know that we will have a sound Medicare system. The Medicare program will have greater solvency, and we will be able to deal with alterations and changes in the Medicare system. And, hopefully, we will be able to address the prescription drug issue.

This issue is so basic and so fundamental that it is really the question of a priority. Do we think having broad kinds of tax cuts for the American people is preferable to ensuring the financial security and solvency of the Medicare system? That is the issue that is incorporated in this particular instruction. It is as basic and fundamental as that. Do you believe that with the scarce but sufficient resources that are in the various surpluses that we are going to say let's put a priority on Social Security and Medicare? This instruction says we are going to give the priority to Medicare. And many of us who are supporting this also give high priority when we are going to have that financial security to make sure there is going to be a prescription drug provision.

I see my friend and colleague. I would be glad to yield for a question.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for yielding for a couple of questions.

First, I thank him for his motion to instruct conferees. As a member of the Budget Committee, I can tell you that the Democrats on that committee fought very, very hard to get the committee to set aside enough funds from the overall surplus that we have to meet the needs of Medicare. And many of us brought out points that the Senator from Massachusetts has brought out before. I just want to ask him a couple of questions.

Does the Senator not agree that Medicare is really the twin pillar of Social Security for our people? In other words, you save Social Security, but if you do not save Medicare, then our seniors will have to spend their Social Security income to pay for their health care. Doesn't the Senator feel that this is the twin pillar of the senior citizens' safety net?

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator has made an excellent point and one which I agree with completely. If you look at a profile of who the Social Security recipient is, it is a person that is living alone, \$12,000 in income, a woman 76 years of age who has at least one chronic disease and is paying some 19 percent of her income in out-of-pocket health care costs. That is 19 percent out of \$12,000—paying that percent of her income out of pocket for health care. If the Senator understands the amount that is being paid out of pocket by even those today that are getting Medicare, it is just about what it was at the time of the enactment of Medicare.

So for those that say, well, we really do not have to have this instruction, we are going to be able to consider the Commission's recommendations, that will effectively require \$688 billion over the next additional 12 years to get the kind of economic stability that would be included in our particular instruction. And that is only going to be able to be achieved with higher copays, or higher premiums, or higher deductibles. It is going to come out of the pocket or the pocketbook of that senior citizen. I don't understand how we can do that.

Mrs. BOXER. I have one more question that goes to the heart of the Senator's point. What the Republicans are saying is we can reform our way. We don't think we need additional resources. They proposed tax breaks for the wealthiest people in America instead of saving Medicare. What you do is very clearly say, yes, we will support targeted tax relief for low- and middle-class families, but we want to save Medicare before we give back funds to the wealthiest among us, those at the very, very top tier.

The question I wanted to pose to my friend is this: As I look at Medicare and the numbers we have in the Budget Committee, I want to ask my friend if he agrees with these numbers. We are told that the Medicare program pro-

vides health care to 39 million Americans today, but by 2032 the number of Medicare beneficiaries will double to 78 million as the baby boomers retire. So the question for the Senator is basically this: We are looking at a program that is very important, and we are looking at some good news. We are living longer. This is good. We all work toward that. We want to live longer. We want to have a good quality of life. But can we just say we can reform our way out of this problem, or do we have to commit some of the surplus to Medicare?

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is correct in terms of the size of the Medicare population and correct in terms of allocating these additional resources for Medicare. Let's understand that the amount that we are talking about effectively is money that is being paid in by working families. Those are resources that are being paid in by those working families. All we are saying is that we believe those working families' interests should be protected with the previous instruction on Social Security and this instruction on Medicare before we provide tax breaks for individuals who are not participants in paying into the system like the workers have been in terms of the Medicare system and Social Security.

I withhold the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAPO). The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I apologize to Senator KENNEDY for not being here. I assume it is fair to say that I probably heard his argument as we put the budget through. It is similar to the one he made before. That doesn't mean I shouldn't have been here. But I just couldn't. When the time is up, let me ask if we could get a unanimous consent on stacked votes.

Mr. President, I would like to talk just for a moment about the Republican budget as it pertains to a blueprint for our country's future. When I have used up about 6 minutes of my 15, will the Chair advise me? I appreciate that.

First of all, let me say to those who are listening that we have a situation that is pretty unique in our country, and it is a situation that we ought to look at very carefully to see what the public policy ought to be and what would be best for America's future.

The American taxpayer has received a bonanza in new taxes. As a matter of fact, there is now going to be over the next decade a huge surplus. "surplus" means the taxes collected exceed the expenditures. That is a surplus. We were used to living in a deficit. "Deficit" means the expenditures, the program costs, are more than the taxes that come in.

For a variety of reasons, not the least of which is a sustained recovery; low interest rates, partially attributable to good, sound, budget policies; high productivity, because we have added new machines and equipment to

the production of service organizations and what they sell to the American people, we have more money coming in than we are going to spend. Over the decade, it is going to be a very large amount of money.

Where we depart from the Democrats who have been arguing on the floor—not all Democrats—the principal position on our side is that we think we don't need some of that big surplus paid in by the taxpayer, which means they are paying more than we need to run the Government year by year; we think a portion of that should go back to the taxpayer by way of tax changes that will help our taxpayers and will help the economy continue to grow and produce jobs and be a strong economy.

We say there are three very important things to take care of, one of which is to give back some taxes to the American people, who are paying in more than they expected in terms of our Government. There are some who say we shouldn't do that or the budget resolution ought to state exactly how we are going to change those tax laws.

Frankly, in the Congress we do things a little differently. There is a committee that will determine our tax reductions and our tax changes. All we can do is say we are making some money available for doing that. What we do is take all of the Social Security surplus—not 62 percent of it as does the President, but 100 percent of it—and we say that accumulation, that surplus, is set aside and cannot be used for tax cuts. Under our budget resolution, it is to be used for Social Security reform to pay for any additional costs. We think that is very exciting, and we think that is better than what the President has in mind. It is 100 percent of that surplus.

There is a Medicare program which is very important to seniors. We have done three things in this budget regarding Medicare. One, the President cut \$20 billion more out of Medicare during the next decade, and we said cut nothing, don't cut any more by way of expenditures out of the Medicare trust fund—\$19 billion over 10 years. In addition, our budget plan increases Medicare spending by \$200 billion over 10 years, an average of \$20 billion a year. Then, starting in the sixth year of this budget, there is an additional \$100 billion that does not go to tax cuts, does not go to the Social Security fund, that could be used by Medicare if Medicare needed it. In fact, we believe this is a very, very, ambitious program to make sure Medicare is taken care of.

I remind everyone that a strong, powerful economy is one of the best tools to keep Medicare strong. Just a few weeks ago, the trustees in charge said, because things have been going so well, we have increased the life of the Medicare fund from the year 2008 to 2015. We have added between 7 and 8 years by keeping the economy going with a lot of employment and people paying into the Medicare system.

We believe this budget is good policy for America. We think it is just as im-

portant to talk on the floor of the Senate about who pays all these taxes as what programs we ought to spend the money on. We don't want to just discuss how we can spend the money; we want to discuss the taxpayers.

We are saying it is time to fix the Tax Code and make it more fair for married couples, put some other reductions in and return some of those tax dollars to the American people, because we are worried about taxpayers; they deserve our concern.

At the same time, we have adequately provided for Medicare and adequately provided for an assured Social Security; that when the changes are made, and only then, will this trust fund money be used for Social Security.

We are involved in an air war over in Kosovo, Yugoslavia, and we are going to need more money for that war. Everybody understands we are going to do that when we are asked. We will have it. It will change how much can go for taxes and how much can be held in reserve. It will change some of that, but actually that is a very high priority.

I say to Senators and my fellow Americans that in our regular budget we provided for some very significant increases in defense and some significant increases in education. If you add that up, it is a pretty good package. We will go to conference with the House. I don't know what we can get out of them, but we will get a good budget. It will be very much like the one we produced.

Having said that, I reserve the remainder of my time and hope the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts might yield back some of his time at some point.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts has 4 minutes 16 seconds.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I will use that remaining time so we can move along, then ask for the yeas and nays in accordance with the leadership proposal, and vote.

Mr. President, according to the trustees' report on the Medicare trust fund, this particular measure will add some 7 years to the Medicare trust fund. Now it will be—instead of 2008, in the most recent figures it is 2015. With 15 percent, as we talk about, a substantial increase, it will provide the stability and solvency of the trust fund to the year 2027. That is what this amendment does.

If we do not take this action, then, if we look over a 25-year period, it is going to mean benefit cuts of 11 percent in 25 years, 25 percent in 50 years, and 31 percent in 75 years, to make up for the shortfall.

It seems to me, given the special circumstances, we ought to protect Social Security and protect Medicare. We still have resources, even after that, for individual accounts, as the President suggested—close to \$500 billion for indi-

vidual accounts, for savings and for investment for individuals—and we also have resources that will be available for a tax cut.

But let us say, with regard to Medicare, we are going to provide these additional resources and we are going to commit them to our Medicare system and then in this Congress we are going to get about the possibility of making the alterations or changes in our Medicare system, primarily in the area of enhancing prescription drugs, and also other changes that will strengthen the Medicare system even further. This is a sound, prudent investment.

Finally, the greatest percentage of the surplus was paid in by working families. Working families often become dependent primarily on Social Security and Medicare as they age. Some of them get some pensions from companies they have worked for. But if you look over what is happening, even in terms of the pensions, they are gradually being cut back. They are gradually being reduced every single year. Medicare and Social Security are the rocks on which our elderly and seniors really depend. We have an opportunity to go on record on that measure here today with this amendment, and I hope the Senate will accept it.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I rise to support this motion to instruct the conferees to set aside some of the on-budget surplus for Medicare.

The Budget Resolution approved by this body in March made the correct decision with regard to Social Security by devoting the off-budget, or Social Security, surplus to paying down the publicly held debt. That was the right thing to do, especially if we are not going to come to closure on a true Social Security reform plan that brings down future liabilities.

While the direction on Social security was the correct course, failure to hold some of the on-budget surplus to deal with Medicare takes us down the wrong fiscal path. Medicare's financial problems are not only more acute than Social Security's but also much more difficult to solve. The fact of the matter is that even under the reform plan considered in the Medicare Commission, solvency would not be significantly extended.

Given these facts, it seems to me that the smarter fiscal policy over the long-term would be to leave some of the on-budget surplus to address Medicare. Using it all for a tax cut significantly reduces our flexibility to prepare for the retirement of the Baby Boom generation and the demands on Social Security, Medicare, and our overall budget that will result from the doubling of beneficiaries eligible for these programs.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support this motion to instruct if they are serious about acting in a fiscally responsible way to shore up Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts has 1 minute 20 seconds.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I propound the following unanimous consent request, and it has been cleared on both sides. It has nothing to do with the amendment that is pending.

I ask unanimous consent the pending motion and any motions or amendments regarding the appointment of conferees to the budget resolution be stacked to occur in the order in which they were offered at the conclusion or yielding back of time on the motions. I further ask that there be 2 minutes before each vote for the explanation and the votes in the sequence after the first vote be limited to 10 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Were the yeas and nays included, Mr. President? Reserving the right to object—I do not intend to—will the Senator ask it be in order to ask for the yeas and nays at this time for all of those amendments?

Mr. DOMENICI. No, Senator; we want to wait until the time has expired.

You want to get the yeas and nays now?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes, please.

Mr. DOMENICI. We can still amend. You could not, but we could.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. 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.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I understand the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has 1 minute.

Mr. KENNEDY. I will be glad to yield it back.

Mr. DOMENICI. If he yields his back, I am going to yield mine back.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield mine back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

AMENDMENT NO. 252 TO THE KENNEDY MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, at the end of the Kennedy motion add the following: Include in the conference report, No. 1, amendment No. 176, offered by Senators ROTH and BREAUX, regarding Medicare reform; and section 209 of the Senate-passed resolution to the budget offered by Senators SNOWE and WYDEN, regarding the use of on-budget surpluses for prescription drug benefits.

I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] proposes an amendment numbered 252 to

the Kennedy motion to instruct the conferees.

The amendment follows:

At the end add the following in the conference report:

(1) Amendment No. 176, offered in the Senate by Senators ROTH and BREAUX, regarding Medicare reform; and

(2) Section 209 of the Senate-passed resolution, offered in the Budget Committee by Senators SNOWE and WYDEN, regarding the use of on-budget surpluses for a prescription drug benefit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 20 minutes equally divided on the amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, let me explain to Senator KENNEDY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. We will make a copy of that amendment and distribute it.

What we are going to do with this amendment is simply add to the end of the Kennedy amendment two provisions that were voted on by the Senate during the debate, just as most of his instruction was already voted on. These two sections are essentially as follows: No. 1, the Roth, Breaux, and others amendment regarding a bipartisan proposal on Medicare; and, No. 2, an amendment offered by the Budget Committee in behalf of the distinguished Senator from Maine, Ms. SNOWE, which essentially said that any additional on-budget surplus, non-Social Security money, that existed beyond the tax cut—which is, as I understand, about \$102 billion starting 5 years from now—could be available for prescription drugs.

Essentially, what we will then do is we will get a request for the yeas and nays on our amendment. I understand, pursuant to the unanimous consent, when it gets called up in order, we will get an additional 2 minutes, 1 minute per side, to explain it.

So, essentially I am just asking we add to the end of yours, two proposals that have already been adopted by the Senate: One, the Roth-Breaux et al. on the bipartisan Medicare proposal; and, second, the Budget Committee portion, which was Senator SNOWE's amendment, which said any excess surplus beyond the tax cut and Social Security could be used for prescription drugs.

So we will vote on ours first and see what happens to yours.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator to Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the Senator obviously is entitled to conform with the Senate rules. But we are as well. So we will continue to go along on this merry chase until we have an opportunity to vote on this measure. We are glad to spend whatever time debating Medicare that the chairman of the committee wants.

You can load this up as the rules permit, but the rules also permit us finally to get a rollcall, and we are going to take full advantage of the rules to make sure we do. I will just let the membership understand that now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished Senator from New Jersey could tell us, were there any other instructions?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. We have potentially two more. The Senator from Connecticut is going to be offering a motion to instruct, and there may be a question about another, which we will find out about in just a few minutes.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, how does this proceed?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask Senator KENNEDY if he will yield back time on my amendment. I yield back mine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Massachusetts willing to yield back time?

Mr. KENNEDY. Are you talking about the second-degree amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; it is the first-degree amendment to your motion.

Mr. KENNEDY. No, not at this time, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. KENNEDY. 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.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, with reference to the issue that is before us, I ask unanimous consent that with respect to votes in order to the motion to appoint conferees, the Domenici amendment No. 252, which I have just described, be considered a separate motion to instruct and the vote occur on, or in relation to, the Domenici motion, to be followed, pursuant to the consent agreement, by a vote in relation to the Kennedy motion.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Having said that, with reference to mine, I yield back any time I have.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield back the time.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. DODD. May I inquire of the chairman, I can offer a motion?

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes, indeed.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I send a motion to the desk and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] moves to instruct conferees on H. Con. Res. 68, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2000, to include in the conference report the Dodd-Jeffords amendment No. 160, as modified, which passed the Senate on March 25 by 57-40.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, first, how much time is allowed on this?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty minutes equally divided, 15 minutes per side. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. DODD. I thank the President.

Let me begin these brief remarks by once again commending my dear friend from New Mexico, the chairman of the committee. We use the word "friend" around here to describe each other with great frequency. On numerous occasions, we actually mean it, and this is one of those instances. He is one of my best friends in the Senate. So it is with a degree of reluctance I rise to offer this motion because this is in regard to an amendment that was passed by a pretty good vote, Mr. President, 57-40, during the consideration of the budget resolution.

Occasionally, there are matters that are bipartisan on these budget resolutions. I argue strongly this is one of them. Child care is an issue that does not have an ideological parent, does not have a partisan parent, if you will. This is an issue of which I believe people all across the country appreciate the importance.

The average cost of child care is \$4,000 to \$10,000 per child. Even families that have decent incomes and have two or three children can appreciate the cost of child care. One can imagine then, when talking about working families who are struggling to keep food on the table, how important this kind of a proposal is for them.

The amendment that was adopted expands an existing program—it does not create a new program. It was almost a decade ago that my friend from Utah, Senator ORRIN HATCH, and I offered the child care block grant, which was adopted. President Bush, to his credit, supported and accepted the block grant proposal.

For almost 10 years now we have had this child care block grant. And it's only drawback is that it doesn't have enough funding to reach all eligible children—only one in ten can currently receive assistance. So Senator JEFFORDS and I offered, along with 55 other Members of this body—12 members of the majority and 45 members of the minority—a proposal that would increase the child care development block grant by \$5 billion over 5 years, about \$1 billion a year. It amounts to little more than \$12 billion over 10 years. We pay for that by reducing the \$780 billion proposed tax cut by the same amount.

We also said in this amendment that it is our preference, if there is a tax cut proposal, that we also do a child care tax cut for all working parents as well as for stay-at-home parents.

Why do we need to add money to the block grant? When we passed the welfare reform package a few years ago to move people from welfare to work, all across the country States took what little money they had for child care and provided it to the welfare recipient as they came off welfare and went to work.

But tragically, what has happened in Idaho, Connecticut, and many other places is, the family that was not on welfare, that was on the margin and working, now loses child care assistance. It is a great irony in a way.

So what Senator JEFFORDS, Senator CHAFEE, Senator COLLINS, Senator SNOWE, Senator ABRAHAM, Senator FRIST, Senator HATCH, Senator DEWINE, Senator ROBERTS, Senator CAMPBELL, Senator SPECTER, Senator WARNER and I, and others, are asking here in this budget resolution is that we ought to try to do something about this.

The people who need this are working people with young children. They need the kind of help this block grant can provide. Some people have mistakenly said, "Well, I don't like this program because it says that a parent couldn't choose a church-based child-care program." That is not true. This money can go to church-based programs, neighborhoods, families. It is not restricted as to the kind of child care setting that a family can choose to use.

This is a good bipartisan proposal. It is with a great degree of reluctance that I offer this motion to instruct. But the reason I have to do it—and, again, I have such great affection for my colleague from New Mexico; and he can straighten me out on this if he cares to; in fact, I wish he would—but I am reading now from this report—the "Daily Report for Executives". "U.S. Budget, Domenici and Kasich agree on final budget." This is dated April 13, Tuesday, today. It says, my friend:

Domenici and Kasich also said they had stricken from the final budget plan a Senate-passed amendment sponsored by [yours truly] Sens. CHRISTOPHER DODD [of Connecticut] and JAMES JEFFORDS [of Vermont] that would have reduced the size of the tax cut by \$10 billion [over 10 years] and made that money available to a child care program.

"What they're going to do is they're going to have some language in there that's going to say that out of the \$780 billion tax [cut] some consideration ought to be given to families that have child care needs," Kasich said of the language in the final budget that will replace the Dodd-Jeffords amendment.

"And we'll drop all add-ons like Dodd-Jeffords," Domenici added.

Kasich [then] said they had no intention of creating a new child care entitlement—

This is not new. It is a 10-year program. I am just adding resources to it; no question about that—

but suggested that the final budget will recommend that the child care-related tax [cut] relief be looked at by the tax-writing committees "because there are needs out there."

I appreciate the last phrase, "because there are needs."

The problem, of course, with just tax writing is that if you pay taxes, you

may get the benefit of it. But if you are down at that \$20,000-a-year level—this is not a great mystery to anybody—the idea you are going to get a tax break at that income level that can meet the cost of child care is just a fantasy.

So we want to increase the block grant by \$12 billion over 10 years nationwide to help these families. I think this body, regardless of which side of the aisle we sit on, ought to be able to find room in our hearts and our budget for this, if we care about these working families.

We understand the pressures, the tremendous pressures, on these families. I was at a child-care center at the Justice Department yesterday here in Washington. It is a magnificent child-care center. As you can well imagine, they have done a good job down there. But that good care costs.

I spoke to a woman who is a lawyer with the Justice Department and has children at the center. Her husband is a public interest lawyer. They have three children in that child-care center, twins and a young child. It cost them \$26,000 a year—\$26,000 a year. And they are happy just to have a place. The waiting list is a mile long, which is another problem we face here and why I offer this motion.

All over the country we see this scenario replicated—in the State of California the waiting list is some 200,000 children. In Texas and Florida, there are similar lists.

So, Mr. President, again, I would love to hear the members of the Budget Committee say, "Listen, you know, we didn't like this amendment terribly, but we did have a strong bipartisan vote"—that is a pretty strong vote, almost 60-40 here on this amendment; it was sponsored in a bipartisan fashion; it was passed in a bipartisan fashion—"while we weren't enthusiastic about this initially, this is one we are going to take." If that is the case, then I do not want to have our colleagues have to vote twice on something here. I do not like doing that. But when I read here that I am dropped, I am history, I am being kind of written off, then you do not leave me much choice but to defend myself.

I am forced to defend it for the families out there who got excited about the fact that in this budget resolution we had made a place, for the first time in years, to provide some assistance.

So I plead with my colleagues here to not oppose this, in fact even accept this instruction, if you will, and let's see if we can't convince some of those recalcitrant voices who do not want to embrace the idea that this Congress could do something about working families and their children.

With that, Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. How much time does Senator DODD have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator DODD has 4 minutes 49 seconds remaining.

Mr. DOMENICI. I say to Senator DODD, let me just put in perspective what we are going through here this afternoon.

I am a mild-mannered guy.

Mr. DODD. Yes, you are.

Mr. DOMENICI. That does not mean I do not get excited about things. Look, everything we are talking about here on the floor we just voted on. You either won or you lost. You happen to have won. Senator KENNEDY has a proposal. That already was voted on. He lost. Let's see, what else do we have? Oh, Senator LAUTENBERG has an instruction. We already voted on that.

It is interesting. I would just put in perspective for the Senators and for those listening, normally—I have been here for a while; I have wrapped up a lot of budget resolutions—we appoint the conferees. That is what we are doing here, this little administrative job of appointing conferees. We normally do it at the same time we pass those resolutions. So if we finish at 10 o'clock at night, by 10:15 this is gone, they have been appointed. Nobody moves to instruct the conferees, because they just voted on it; they already got their instructions through their votes.

We made a mistake. We made a mistake. We should never have seen the press last night. We were not obligated to tell the press we had a meeting. We like to keep them informed. But now, because of everything they said about what we discussed, Senators are saying, "Well, maybe they are not going to do in that conference what the Senate said we should do, so we are coming to the floor and repropounding the whole thing," bringing the issues all back up, even if they lost on them or even, in Senator DODD's case, where he won on them, and we are going to have to vote again.

Actually, everybody should understand, an instruction to the conferees, through the process we are doing this afternoon, is nice. It is a wonderful thing. You should be very pleased if you win. But the House isn't bound by it. That is just the simple truth of it. The conference is not between Senators asking for a second vote which will make their will the law; they are asking that we do something with the House to make them go with us. I am not promising that I can do that. If you win here on the floor, I am not promising that I can do that. As a matter of fact, some Senators think I can, that if we are to vote again on Dodd-Jeffords, I should just go over there and I will win that.

Well, it isn't quite that easy. I do a little better here on the floor sometimes with all these Senators from both sides than I do sometimes in those conferences. I am not going to offer a second-degree. We all understand the issue. If you want to vote, we will have a vote.

I guess I could tell you for myself, I understood very clearly who voted. There were some Republicans who voted with you. I didn't happen to be one. But I am not going to be able to carry any more water with any more assurance or any more power in the water that I carry because we vote again this afternoon than to go to that conference and wrap it up and say, Senator DODD and Senator JEFFORDS won—not that they won this instruction. That would be there. So if you want to save some time, you might just urge me to do it better than the news reports, and I tell you I am going to try. I tell you that if we can't do that, I am going to find some way in the tax instructions to see if we can't do something significant in the area of child care through the Tax Code. But if you would like a vote, that may be an easier way.

I say, though, there is a reason that we do not need to vote in additional money for this program. I will tell you what it is. I do not know the ultimate number, but I understand that almost all the States have a very large surplus in the TANF program, the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program. That is the successor to the welfare program, Mr. President. When we sent them the money, we sent them a block of money predicated upon a significant caseload and estimates about how much it would be reduced.

It turns out that almost every State has a very large surplus there. What they plan to do with it, not every State but a very large number of them, is to use it for this program. As a matter of fact, I understand the regulations have been approved just yesterday which will authorize the States to use their TANF, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, excesses for the block grant program, which we would still be funding for child care. So essentially I think we are going to have an expanded child care program. I do not think we need to do this, but I do not go to conference based on that. That is just an explanation to the Senate as to why a number of Senators did not think we needed to vote for that when it first appeared and won.

Now I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DODD. Before my colleague does that, again, I appreciate my colleague from New Mexico, the chairman, has a difficult job. Having served on the Budget Committee for many years with the chairman of the committee, I have a great admiration for his ability and the difficult job he has. I appreciate as well the fact that this is a somewhat unique procedure, although we have used it in the past. It is not uncommon for it to be done. I hope my colleague appreciates, that when I pick up and read that my amendment has been pushed out, before the conference has even met, that it makes it kind of hard on me and hard on those of us who supported that amendment.

So, yes, this is taking advantage of a unique situation here, but maybe, just

maybe if we go into that conference—and I know the chairman does not agree with this amendment, but I know he has historically respected the will of the Senate even when he disagrees with it, which is the mark of a good chairman, in my view, and he goes on and says, look, ladies and gentlemen here, not only this crowd in the Senate, over my objection voted for this once, they did it twice. The bipartisan Senate cares about this and thinks it is an important priority. To that extent, it may have some value.

Mr. President, whatever time I have remaining, I see my colleague from Vermont.

Mr. DOMENICI. I just want to say, whatever time Senator JEFFORDS needs, a few minutes, we will make sure he gets them. I would like to tell you, since you indicated that you and I have worked together on a lot of things, do you know what you could do for me that would be the best thing going? Not to have so many votes on budget resolutions. What is happening, we spend so much time voting on them that Senators are wondering what this whole process is all about. This year probably 50 percent of the votes, maybe 60 are all on the budget resolution and the four or five today. My job is getting more difficult because of that. Pretty soon Senators will be saying maybe it is not worth all this trouble.

How much time do you need?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Five minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Do you have any left?

Mr. DODD. I don't know if I do or not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has 2 minutes 50 seconds remaining.

Mr. DOMENICI. You yield your 2, and I yield him 3.

Mr. DODD. Absolutely.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rushed over here in hopes of getting to the floor on time, and I appreciate very much the opportunity to speak on this very important issue.

I have worked with the Senator from Connecticut for years on child care. Every time we think we have a victory, it somehow disappears. Yet the need for quality child care does not disappear. The need continues to increase. We must take advantage of the information we have learned and recognize that the early years of life are so incredibly important in a child's development. The first 3 to 5 years are critical. At this point, we do little or nothing for this age group and these are the most important years of your life in many respects. Fortunately, few babies get totally ignored during that period. But this is the period in time which the brain develops most rapidly. It is the one which can be most damaged by the lack of adequate child care.

I will be introducing on Thursday and I thought it was going to be the filler for what we did on the budget bill. We were all ready to go, and now we are back to ground zero on this

issue. Well, I am going to introduce the bill on Thursday in hopes that this issue does not go away and that it will continue to be heard before the conference. We must continue to try to do what must be done for the children of this country.

In addition, we have to look at businesses and do something to give them the incentives to have their own child care. We have to make sure that we take care of the most critical thing and to make sure that we deliver quality child care and learn how to maximize the period of time in a child's life which is so critically important.

I want to do everything I can, and I am sure the Senator from Connecticut joins with me in saying we are not going to let this issue go away. We will do whatever it takes to make sure this country is in a position to allow our children to maximize their opportunities in school by having the best child care possible.

This is an incredibly important issue. I know that the Senator from New Mexico is with us in the sense that he understands the essential aspects of maximizing opportunities during the most critical period in a child's life. In the past, the Senator has been supportive of us, and I hope he continues to do so. At this point, I will close and say, I am going to plow forward. I know we will work with the Senator from Connecticut and we are not going to let this issue go away.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, does the Senator yield back his time?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Yes, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, that means we have one proposal left, as I understand it.

I yield the floor.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I send a motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota, Mr. DORGAN, moves to instruct conferees on H. Con. Res. 68, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000, to include in the conference report provisions that would provide additional funding for income assistance for family farmers above the level provided in the Senate-passed resolution.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, we are dealing with the budget and the naming of conferees, and a number of priorities have been discussed here on the floor of the Senate. That is what a budget is, establishing priorities. I offer this motion to instruct, and it is very simple. The Senator from New Mexico said he would like to take this, and if he does, I will not ask for a recorded vote.

In this motion, I move to instruct the conferees on H. Con. Res. 68, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000, to include in the conference report provisions that would provide additional funding for income assistance for family farmers above the level provided in the Senate-passed resolution.

Why am I asking for favorable consideration on this motion? Yesterday, I read on the Senate floor a letter from a North Dakota woman that I want to read today. Her name is Susan Jorgenson. She wrote in her letter, describing the plight of family farmers, something that I think everybody listening to this debate should digest. Susan Jorgenson has lost her husband. He died last August. She said he had diabetes, but she said:

... what I really feel caused his death was trying to make a living as a family farmer.

She said:

I had an auction last week to sell the [farm] machinery so I can pay off some of the debt that [we] incurred after 26 years of farming. I have a 17-year-old son who would not help me prepare for the auction and did not get out of bed the day of the [auction] sale because he was so heartbroken that he could not continue [to farm] this land [that he loved].

She said this of her husband:

He chose to farm rather than to live in Phoenix where he had a job with Motorola [early on] because he wanted to raise his children in a place with clean air, no crime, and good schools. He worked very hard, physically and emotionally, to make this farm work and its failure was . . . no fault of his own.

That is what this farm wife says about her deceased husband.

What is happening on the family farm? Everybody is making money but them. They raise the crop and give it to a railroad; the railroad makes a record profit hauling it. They raise steer and sell them to the slaughter house; the slaughter house makes a profit and the farmer goes belly up. They raise grain and put it into a cereal manufacturing plant, and they then take that wheat or rice and puff it and send it to a grocery store as puffed wheat or rice. The company that added the puff makes a mint and the farmer goes broke. Everything that touches what the farmer raises makes record profits, and the farmers are going broke in record numbers.

We have a serious emergency on family farms. Here is a headline concerning prairie dogs. Some groups have now decided—including in the Government—that we have a big problem, that we have to save prairie dogs. I don't know if these folks have driven around my part of the country much, but we have lots and lots of prairie dogs. We don't need a Federal program to ensure that we are going to have them in our future. Prairie dogs will take care of themselves, thank you.

What we lack are family farmers. Every day in every way, every week, every month, and every single year, we lose more and more family farmers.

Now, we have farmers raising wheat and selling it for Depression-era prices in constant dollars. How would you like to be receiving wages that are Depression-era wages right now in constant dollars?

How about a minimum wage for family farmers? We debate minimum wage here on the floor of the Senate and I always vote for it. I think the folks at the bottom end of the ladder need to be given the chance to raise themselves up a bit.

What about an opportunity to provide a fair price for farmers? Wheat prices and grain prices have collapsed. Cattle prices and pork prices have collapsed. Farmers are having auction sales and 17-year-old boys won't get out of bed because they are so heart-sick about losing their farms.

We are told by people around here: Well, that's just the way the market system works. That is not a system that works at all. The system says to those who gas the tractor in the spring, plow the ground, plant the seed, and harvest the crop that their work has no value but the giant agrifactories that make a fortune with it have value. I am saying that this Congress must do something about that. This Congress must decide that family farmers matter in this country's future.

I have watched the chairman of the Budget Committee fight for things that matter to him. I have watched him fight for the National Labs and so many other things that are so important to him and there is no more tenacious of a fighter in the Senate than the Senator from New Mexico about the things that matter to him. I feel the same way about family farmers. That is what matters to me. I am not saying that [farming] doesn't matter to him or anybody else. I am not making a judgment about that. I am just saying that we have a full-blown emergency in rural America.

I held up a chart yesterday that showed the counties in this country which are losing population, which have lost over 15 percent of their population in the last 15 years. What you have is a huge red swath in the middle of America being depopulated—the middle part of our country.

We need a farm program that works. And when we see auction sale posters from wall to wall in small towns, and small town businesses boarded up—so many auction sales that they have to call retired auctioneers out of retirement to handle the sales—we ought to understand that this counts for something in this country and that we need to develop a public policy that says we are going to try to do something to stop the flow of family farmers who are leaving the land and discovering that their hopes and dreams have come to an end.

Every single month, we add a "New York City" in population to this Earth. Every month, a new "New York City" is added in population to this Earth. Yet, farmers are told that the food they

produce has no value. The market system says it has no value. That is not logical. Over half of the people on this Earth go to bed with an ache in their belly because they don't have enough to eat.

I have mentioned time and again—and I will do it again—that in Sudan people talk about old women climbing trees to gather leaves to eat because there is nothing to eat. Ask yourselves about the people in refugee camps today and what their needs are. It is food. Somehow this system of ours, in a Byzantine way, says that those who produce the food ought not to get full value for it, but those who make it into cereal, those who haul it, those who add value somehow should achieve record profits. There is something wrong with that system.

I hope this Senate will go on record saying that we need to do more and better. My personal feeling is that we need to take the caps off the loan rates. The farm bill—which I didn't vote for because I didn't think it was a good bill—was saying we will take away with the fine print what we promised to give you in the large print. We promised a loan rate, and we promised that that loan rate would produce \$3.25 in wheat, but in the small print it was limited to about \$2.58.

Let's take away that provision that limits the amount of support and help farmers during this period of collapsed prices and see if we can give them the opportunity to have a decent income when prices collapse. If we don't build a bridge across those valleys, nobody will do it. We will be left with a country full of giant agri-factories farming from California to Maine. We will get the food all right, but it will be more expensive, and nobody will be living in rural America. We will have lost something very important—family farmers, small towns, main street businesses, and a very special and unique part of this country's character that comes from that part of America.

So I am offering this motion to instruct conferees to ask that money be added above the Senate level for income support for family farmers.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, first, I greatly appreciate the kind remarks of my good friend, and I say to him that on some of the issues he cares about, such as agriculture and the problems of the family farm, he has as much tenacity as anybody around here. I compliment him for that.

We are going to accept his motion because it says we ought to try to do better in conference than we did here, and everybody understands that we will do that. If the Senate accepts this, we will try to do that. However, in defense of the budget resolution, I will make two big points that are very important.

The budget resolution increased the mandatory spending, the spending for agriculture, \$6 billion over what it would have been but for the change we

have made—\$2 billion in each year, more or less, in this budget resolution.

At first we decided we would do \$4 billion at the behest of some Senators from the middle of the heartland of the agriculture country. They asked for more. We put \$2 billion more in. That has been done. Why do I say that? Because the President of the United States, who has his agriculture Secretary traveling all over the United States in agriculture country talking about the needs of the family farm and the needs of the farmers, did not put one penny of increase for agriculture in their budget. I don't know whether they expected that we would come along because we have Senators who really pushed this and we would put the money in.

But I believe for a President of the United States in the midst of an agriculture disaster, more or less, to leave it up to Senators to have to put more money in for agriculture—but you can count on it. They won't be remiss in going out there and talking to the farmer about what they did. They should put up their hand, like this, and say they did zero. At least we put \$6 billion new money in for which the distinguished Senator has thanked the Budget Committee when we put it in. And so did his colleague from his State. He thanked the committee. You put in \$6 billion. Nobody did at the White House. There was nothing.

So it isn't as if we are not concerned and as if we did nothing. As a matter of fact, we have been spending a very healthy amount of money for agriculture. And we are going through some cyclical problems in agriculture, with parts of the worldwide economy not in very good shape. And they used to buy a lot of our agricultural products. We know that. We are getting better at producing more with less acreage, and there seems to be no limit to that. We get better all the time. In other words, the farmer is producing prolifically in the United States, be it the family farmer or the corporate farm. We are producing large amounts.

Having said that, I don't know ultimately how we resolve this issue, but for now we are going to conference with this proposal saying we ought to do more, if we can. And, frankly, I appreciate the Senator bringing it to all our attention.

It will be accepted now, if he doesn't mind.

I yield any time I have.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, my colleague, Senator CONRAD, wanted to speak for at least 5 minutes. I understand he is on his way. I hope we can wait for just a moment. It appears he could use the remaining 5 minutes of my time.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent that I be vested back with any time that I had remaining. I thought we would finish. That is why I yielded.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Thank you very much. I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me take a minute to say that I understand the point the Senator from New Mexico made. I appreciate the additional \$6 billion that was added over the 5 years. My point is, it is far short of what we need in terms of income support. It is the case that the administration budget did not do nearly what it needed to do. But there comes a time at some point when the urgency of the situation in rural America really requires us to say this isn't about us or them anymore; it is about what we are going to do together to respond to a real problem of significant consequence to this country. We will simply not have family farmers left unless we together, Republicans and Democrats in Congress, recognize that we have a farm bill that says when market prices collapse, it's response is too bad. That can't be the farm bill response.

When market prices collapse, if we want to save family farmers, we have to build a bridge across those valleys. Only the largest corporate farms will survive a collapse in market prices. They are big enough and strong enough to survive. Family farmers can't and won't. So if we care about having people live out on the land, if we care about the special quality family farms and small towns give this country, then we must reconnect and provide some kind of basic safety net for family farmers.

Again, I see all these headlines about prairie dogs. They are going to save the prairie dog. God bless the prairie dog. There sure are plenty of them in my State. We don't need a special effort to save prairie dogs. We need to save family farmers. That is the message, and that is the urgency, in my judgment, for a public policy debate here in Congress and the establishment of the correct priorities in this budget to say to family farmers, "You matter." Some say we need a national missile defense system. Yes, that might be the priority for some. But I happen to think we need a farm program that works for family farmers. In the absence of it, we are going to see wholesale bankruptcies and more and more auction sales, and this country will have lost something that is very important to its character and its economy.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, let me say to the Senators who are not here but are listening to what is going to be going on on the floor, that in about 6 or 7 minutes, I hope not much longer than that, we are going to start voting. There is already a consent agreement to vote on everything. All votes are stacked this afternoon. That means we will have about five or six votes. After the first one, they will be 10 minutes, with both sides having 2 minutes to explain each proposal, and on each instruction 1 minute on the side. So we ought to be starting by 4:15, and perhaps in an hour we will be finished.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). Who yields time?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota, Senator CONRAD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, Senator DORGAN, for offering this motion, and for bringing to the attention of our colleagues in the Senate the disastrous circumstances we face in American agriculture.

I represent North Dakota. I can tell you that in agriculture in our State we are on the brink of a depression. We are the victims of a triple whammy of bad prices, bad weather, and bad policy. Bad prices are the lowest prices for farm commodities in 52 years. The bad policy is the last farm bill that was passed, and some of our trade policy that has left America vulnerable to a very intense effort by our competitors. Mr. President, our chief competitors—the Europeans—are spending 10 times as much to support their farmers as we are spending to support ours. We are, in essence, saying to our farmers, you go out and compete against the French farmer and the German farmer, and, while you are at it, take on the French Government and the German Government as well. That is not a fair fight.

In addition to the bad prices and the bad policy, we are also stuck with bad weather. We have had 5 years of overly wet conditions in North Dakota. The result has been the development of a disease called scab. That is a fungus. It has dramatically reduced production. There are parts of North Dakota that saw their production reduced 40 percent.

So you put all of this together, what do you have? You have an economic calamity, a disaster of its own, with the lowest prices in 52 years and production reduced because of bad weather, and because of an outbreak of disease that is unprecedented in this century, and couple that with the bad policy of a bad farm bill that has been put in place that makes no note of what happens to farm prices but that cuts each and every year the support that is given to American agricultural producers at the exact time our competitors are dramatically increasing what they are doing for their producers.

Mr. President, Members of the Senate, this is an emergency. It is a disaster. It is stunning in its proportion. I just completed a series of meetings across the State of North Dakota. Everywhere I went, producers took me aside and said unless something is done and done quickly, we are faced with a calamity of losing tens of thousands of family farmers across the heartland of America.

I hope very much that our colleagues will support this motion that instructs the conferees to provide additional funding for agricultural policy reform. It is critically needed. It must be done. The consequences could not be more serious. A failure to act will lead to the

unraveling of the farm safety net in this country and will mean we will lose literally tens of thousands of farm families this year. We are not talking about sometime in the distant future. We are talking about right now. We are talking about an economic calamity.

Again, I hope my colleagues will support this motion. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I don't believe I need to respond. I gave my response to the principal sponsor. We have agreed to accept the instruction.

I yield back any time I might have and I yield the floor.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, perhaps we could engage in a parliamentary discussion regarding order. If I am correct, the first vote would be on the Lautenberg Social Security motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. There is 1 minute on each side to discuss the motion.

The second vote will be on the Domenici motion. We will explain that when the time comes. Then we will vote on the Kennedy Medicare tax breaks motion. Then we will vote on the motion of Senator DODD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, for all Senators who might be listening, the first motion to instruct is Senator LAUTENBERG's on Social Security. This is essentially consistent with the budget resolution that we voted for on our side of the aisle. I ask every Senator to vote for it.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

VOTE ON LAUTENBERG MOTION TO INSTRUCT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have 1 minute and the Senator from New Jersey has 1 minute. Have the yeas and nays been requested?

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Senators should be on notice we will start this vote in 2 minutes.

This motion to instruct says to the conferees, adopt the language regard-

ing the Social Security trust fund that is in the budget resolution which passed the Senate with every Republican and one Democrat supporting it. Since it is consistent with the budget resolution, and I still have to go to conference with the House under all circumstances, I recommend on our side, at least, that everybody vote for it.

I yield back any time remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, this motion is pretty simple. It instructs the conferees on the budget resolution to include in the conference report provisions that would reserve all Social Security surpluses for Social Security, and only Social Security—no other programs, including other retirement programs, and not for tax cuts.

I hope when the conference is held that the distinguished chairman of the Senate Budget Committee will be there to say, "Here is a vote that is potentially 100-0 or 95-5. This is serious."

It is not part of a scheme to go into conference and say, "Sorry, we are dropping it." We don't want it dropped. I know that the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee doesn't really want it dropped.

We can differ about the approach, but all of us will make a single statement: If Social Security has a surplus, we want it there for the people who are going to retire when their time comes. It is as simple as that.

I am pleased to have the support of the chairman of the Budget Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) is necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) is necessarily absent due to surgery.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) would vote "Aye."

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

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

[Roll No. 82 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Abraham	Chafee	Fitzgerald
Akaka	Cleland	Frist
Allard	Cochran	Gorton
Ashcroft	Collins	Graham
Baucus	Conrad	Gramm
Bayh	Coverdell	Grams
Bennett	Craig	Grassley
Biden	Crapo	Gregg
Bingaman	Daschle	Hagel
Bond	DeWine	Harkin
Boxer	Dodd	Hatch
Breaux	Domenici	Helms
Brownback	Dorgan	Hollings
Bryan	Durbin	Hutchinson
Bunning	Edwards	Hutchison
Burns	Enzi	Inhofe
Byrd	Feingold	Inouye
Campbell	Feinstein	Jeffords

Johnson	McCain	Sessions
Kennedy	McConnell	Shelby
Kerrey	Mikulski	Smith (NH)
Kerry	Murkowski	Smith (OR)
Kohl	Murray	Snowe
Kyl	Nickles	Specter
Landrieu	Reed	Stevens
Lautenberg	Reid	Thomas
Leahy	Robb	Thompson
Levin	Roberts	Thurmond
Lieberman	Rockefeller	Torricelli
Lincoln	Roth	Voinovich
Lott	Santorum	Wellstone
Lugar	Sarbanes	Wyden
Mack	Schumer	

NOT VOTING—2

Moynihan	Warner
----------	--------

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

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.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, if you would get everyone's attention, I will tell everybody where we are going.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. We have three remaining votes. There is 1 minute in between each one. Then we are finished.

I say while many of the Senators are here, I am sorry that we have to vote over again on the same issues we voted on 2 weeks ago, but essentially most of the motions are revoting on what we already voted on. Had we appointed conferees the very night we did this budget resolution, there would not have been any time to have motions to instruct the conferees. So I am trying to hurry through, but I cannot do any better.

VOTE ON DOMENICI MOTION TO INSTRUCT

What is up now is the Domenici motion to instruct. It reaffirms the Senate position on the Roth-Breaux amendment calling for Medicare reform. That really extends solvency.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, can we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Will those having conversations in the well cease their conversations. We are not going to be able to proceed until the conversations cease or those having them go somewhere else.

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, let me just finish quickly.

The Domenici instruction takes into consideration the Breaux-Thomas bipartisan plan which includes prescription drugs as part of the reform. And this instruction includes that we adopt the Snowe-Wyden provision which allows budget surpluses not currently allocated to the Social Security trust fund, because it is not needed there for taxes, that those surpluses may be used for major Medicare reform.

I hope we will adopt this motion. It will be followed by a Kennedy motion that I will speak to later.

I yield back any time I might have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. My friend and colleague, as we could expect, explained correctly what this motion effectively does. If you vote in favor of the motion, effectively you are saying you are not going to use any of the surpluses of the Federal budget for the Medicare system, No. 1, because that is the recommendation of the Commission. And secondly, before we get overly excited about a reserve fund on the prescription drugs, just read page 90 of the report and you will see that the trust fund is not utilized until there is significant extension of solvency for Social Security. That is defined as 9 or 12 years. That comes to either premium increases or cost benefits of some \$686 billion. So it is never going to go into effect.

I am all for having an existing fund. But this isn't it. It is right here on page 90, the requirements for the fund.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY. And it says it will not go into effect unless there is significant solvency from 9 to 12 years. That is what the trustees say, \$686 billion.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. 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 Domenici motion to instruct the conferees. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) is absent due to surgery.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) would vote "no."

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

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 83 Leg.]

YEAS—57

Abraham	Enzi	Lugar
Allard	Fitzgerald	Mack
Ashcroft	Frist	McCain
Bennett	Gorton	McConnell
Bond	Gramm	Murkowski
Breaux	Grams	Nickles
Brownback	Grassley	Roberts
Bunning	Gregg	Roth
Burns	Hagel	Santorum
Campbell	Hatch	Sessions
Chafee	Helms	Shelby
Cochran	Hutchinson	Smith (NH)
Collins	Hutchison	Smith (OR)
Coverdell	Inhofe	Snowe
Craig	Jeffords	Specter
Crapo	Kerrey	
DeWine	Kyl	
Domenici	Lott	

Stevens	Thompson	Voinovich
Thomas	Thurmond	Warner

NAYS—42

Akaka	Edwards	Levin
Baucus	Feingold	Lieberman
Bayh	Feinstein	Lincoln
Biden	Graham	Mikulski
Bingaman	Harkin	Murray
Boxer	Hollings	Reed
Bryan	Inouye	Reid
Byrd	Johnson	Robb
Cleland	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Conrad	Kerry	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kohl	Schumer
Dodd	Landrieu	Torricelli
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Durbin	Leahy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Moynihan

The motion was agreed to.

VOTE ON KENNEDY MOTION TO INSTRUCT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, there are now 2 minutes evenly divided on the Kennedy motion to instruct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this motion is very simple. It says to devote a portion of the surplus—not all of it, just some of it—to saving Medicare before using it for a tax cut or new spending. This policy is supported by Alan Greenspan and by 100 leading economists because it makes economic sense and because it makes sense for Medicare.

My friend across the aisle has talked at length about how much he and his party care about Medicare, but that budget resolution does not devote one thin dime of new resources to Medicare beyond those required by law. This vote is a test: Tax cuts versus Medicare. That is the issue.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the Senate rejected an amendment on this by a vote of 56-43 just a few days ago. It is the identical issue.

Senator KENNEDY would have us believe that the President's approach to putting 15 percent of the surplus into IOUs in the Medicare trust fund will help Medicare become solvent. He also suggests, Mr. President, that leading economists support the President's IOU; that is, we will pay for it later. They support that. They support it because we are not spending the money. But we already save \$400 billion more than the President and we would apply it to the national debt, which is what the economists thought was good. Our budget is better than this in that regard and it does not put IOUs into a fund, which in this case is a postdated check that somebody will pay for later on—our kids and grandkids.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 17 seconds.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the IOU is a payroll tax. This is the full faith and credit of the United States. That is what we are talking about. It is

very clear what this issue is. Let's make sure we have solvency in the Medicare system before tax cuts.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to table the Kennedy motion, 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.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) is absent due to surgery.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) would vote "no."

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

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 84 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Abraham	Fitzgerald	McCain
Allard	Frist	McConnell
Ashcroft	Gorton	Murkowski
Bennett	Gramm	Nickles
Bond	Grassley	Roberts
Brownback	Gregg	Roth
Bunning	Hagel	Santorum
Burns	Hatch	Sessions
Campbell	Helms	Shelby
Chafee	Hutchinson	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Hutchison	Smith (OR)
Collins	Inhofe	Stevens
Coverdell	Jeffords	Thomas
Craig	Kyl	Thompson
Crapo	Lott	Thurmond
DeWine	Lugar	Voinovich
Domenici	Mack	Warner
Enzi		

NAYS—45

Akaka	Edwards	Levin
Baucus	Feingold	Lieberman
Bayh	Feinstein	Lincoln
Biden	Graham	Mikulski
Bingaman	Harkin	Murray
Boxer	Hollings	Reed
Breaux	Inouye	Reid
Bryan	Johnson	Robb
Byrd	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Cleland	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Conrad	Kerry	Schumer
Daschle	Kohl	Specter
Dodd	Landrieu	Torricelli
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Durbin	Leahy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Moynihan

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to table the motion, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

VOTE ON DODD MOTION TO INSTRUCT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague from Vermont, myself and many others who supported this 2 weeks by a vote of 57-40 I want to express my gratitude to my Republican colleagues for supporting that amendment that day. Unfortunately, the House conferees, or potential conferees, have indicated they intend to drop this amendment which would add over 5 years \$5 billion to the existing

child care and development block grant, despite the fact that this was a bipartisan amendment supported by a bipartisan coalition of Members here in the Senate.

I would not be asking for this vote except I think it is important we send a clear message out of this Chamber that we care about working families who need child care assistance.

With the few seconds remaining, I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues on this side of the aisle to vote in favor of this motion. It will keep the issue alive.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the Senate voted by a vote of 57 to 40 to approve this amendment when we had the budget resolution. We are going to go to conference and try to work it out. I am not asking anyone to vote against it. In terms of the chairman's position, vote however you wish. I don't think there is a total Republican position because 15 Republicans voted for it last time.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) is absent due to surgery.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN), would vote "aye."

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

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 85 Leg.]

YEAS—66

Abraham	Edwards	Levin
Akaka	Feingold	Lieberman
Baucus	Feinstein	Lincoln
Bayh	Fitzgerald	Lugar
Biden	Frist	McCain
Bingaman	Graham	Mikulski
Boxer	Grassley	Murray
Breaux	Harkin	Reed
Bryan	Hatch	Reid
Byrd	Hollings	Robb
Campbell	Hutchinson	Roberts
Chafee	Hutchison	Rockefeller
Cleland	Inouye	Sarbanes
Collins	Jeffords	Schumer
Conrad	Johnson	Smith (OR)
Coverdell	Kennedy	Snowe
Daschle	Kerrey	Specter
DeWine	Kerry	Torricelli
Dodd	Kohl	Voinovich
Domenici	Landrieu	Warner
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Durbin	Leahy	Wyden

NAYS—33

Allard	Craig	Helms
Ashcroft	Crapo	Inhofe
Bennett	Enzi	Kyl
Bond	Gorton	Lott
Brownback	Gramm	Mack
Bunning	Grassley	McConnell
Burns	Gregg	Murkowski
Cochran	Hagel	Nickles

Roth
Santorum
Sessions

Shelby
Smith (NH)
Stevens

Thomas
Thompson
Thurmond

NOT VOTING—1

Moynihan

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the underlying motion to authorize the Chair to appoint conferees.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer (Mr. SMITH of Oregon) appointed Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. GORTON, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. CONRAD, Mrs. BOXER and Mrs. MURRAY conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. VOINOVICH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak up to 10 minutes each.

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

THE CRISIS IN KOSOVO

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I rise today to vehemently oppose sending American ground forces into Kosovo and to demand that if the President contemplates sending in ground troops, that decision be deliberated and authorized by the Congress of the United States.

I am an American of Serbian-Slovenian ancestry. My father's family is from southern Croatia, which is known as Krijna, and my mother's family is from Ljubljana and Stranje in Slovenia.

I want to make it clear—I don't oppose sending ground troops into Kosovo because I am Serbian. I oppose it because it is bad policy. However, my ethnic heritage does give me a special insight into the situation that someone else might not have.

I have always opposed the leadership of Slobodan Milosevic. Like most Americans, I consider him to be a war criminal.

However, Mr. President, I was 1 of 41 Senators who voted against the bombing because I was concerned that this bombing would not achieve our end of bringing Slobodan Milosevic to the negotiating table as contemplated by the Clinton Administration and NATO.

These negotiations were designed to get Milosevic to sign the Rambouillet agreement or something very similar, thereby guaranteeing the basic human