

have a picture of Russ Feingold in my mind) and the Arizonan has made campaign finance reform such an important matter that he was willing to risk offending a president of his own party. I'm attracted to people of principle.

Similarly, I've been denouncing the substitute lately put forward by Sen. Chuck Hagel (R-Neb.) because my colleagues who know about these things say it is a sham—even a step backward. I don't like shams.

The problem is (boy, this is humiliating!) I don't know what I want.

Do I want to keep rich people from using their money to support political issues? Political parties? Political candidates? No, that doesn't seem right.

Didn't the Supreme Court say money is speech, thereby bringing political contributions under the protection of the First Amendment? That pronouncement, unlike much that flows out of the court, makes sense to me. If you have a First Amendment right to use your time and shoe leather to harvest votes for your candidate, why shouldn't Mr. Plutocrat use his money in support of his candidate? If it's constitutional for you to campaign for gun control, why shouldn't it be constitutional for Charlton Heston and the people who send him money to campaign against it?

If money is speech—and it certainly has been speaking loudly of late—how reasonable is it to put arbitrary limits on the amount of permissible speech? Is that any different from saying I can make only X number of speeches or stage only Y number of rallies for my favorite politician or cause?

But if limits on money-speech strike me as illogical, the idea that there should be no limits is positively alarming. Politicians—and policies—shouldn't be bought and sold, as is happening far too much these days.

The present debate accepts the distinction between "hard" and "soft" contributions—hard meaning money given in support of candidates and soft referring to money contributed to political parties or on behalf of issues.

McCain-Feingold would put limits on hard money contributions and, as I read it, pretty much ban soft money contributions to political parties. Hagel would be happy with no limits on contributions to parties but has said he might, in the interest of expediency, accept a cap of, say, \$60,000 per contribution.

Hagel's view is that the soft money given to parties is not the problem, since we at least know where the money is coming from. More worrisome, he says, are the "issues" contributions that can be made through non-public channels and thus protect the identity of the donors.

Why has money—hard or soft—come to be such a big issue? Because it takes a lot of money to buy the TV ads without which major campaigns cannot be mounted. Politicians jump through all sorts of unseemly hoops for money because they're dead without it.

So why aren't we debating free television ads for political campaigns? Take away the politician's need for obscene sums of money and maybe you reduce the likelihood of his being bought. We'd be arguing about how much free TV to make available or the thresholds for qualifying for it, but at least that is a debate I could understand.

All I can make of the present one is that I'm for campaign finance reform, and I'm against people who are against campaign finance reform. I just don't know what it is.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now

be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, are we now in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Senate's Finest Hour

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, in my brief tenure in the Senate, I have never witnessed the Senate perform better or meet the expectations of the American people so unequivocally. The Senate is particularly indebted to the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. McCONNELL, and the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. DODD, for presiding over this debate and dealing with difficult moments. They have led the Senate to what is, in my experience, its finest hour.

I will confess, when this debate began on McCain-Feingold, I had real reservations as to whether, indeed, an attempt at narrow reform could genuinely result in comprehensive campaign finance reform. This legislation has exceeded my expectations. The public may have expected simply an elimination of soft money, but many of us who have lived in this process know that the rise of soft money contributions was only one element in a much broader problem.

This legislation is genuine comprehensive campaign finance reform. We have dealt with the need to control or eliminate soft money, but also reduce the cost of campaigns themselves, allowed a more realistic participation through hard money contributions, and dealt with the rising specter of eliminating the class of middle-class candidates in this country by opening this only to become the province of the very wealthy.

The burden may soon go from this Congress to the Supreme Court. I only hope that the Supreme Court meets its responsibility to protect the first amendment, assuring that in our enthusiasm to deal with campaign finance abuses we have not trespassed upon other fundamental rights of the American people. I understand that is their responsibility. I know they will meet it.

I hope they also balance that this Congress felt motivated to deal with the problem of public confidence, assuring the integrity of the process; that, indeed, the Court is mindful that we have attempted to meet that responsibility.

I have never felt better about being a Member of this institution. I am proud of my colleagues. I believe we can feel good about this product. It is not partisan in nature. It does not deal with one part of this problem. It is broad. It is deep reform. It has been a good moment for the Senate.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, 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. BYRD. 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. BYRD. Mr. President, what is the business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in a period of morning business with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak out of order without a limitation on time. I do not expect to speak at great length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate will debate, beginning next week, legislation that will be remembered by Americans for decades to come.

The budget resolution that the Senate will debate will set the Nation on a course that will change, that will affect, and that will impact upon people's lives for a generation or more.

How long is a generation? One might think in terms, in speaking of a generation, of 25, 30 years. We are at a unique moment—hear me—we are at a unique moment in the history of this Nation when we must decide what is the most appropriate way to allocate a projected surplus when we know that just over the horizon we are facing the staggering costs of the retirement of the baby boom generation.

What do we mean in terms of the calendar when we speak of the baby boom generation? I started out in politics in 1946. The baby boom generation began then and there, for the most part, in 1946. That was a good starting point. Ten years from now, when 53 million Americans are expecting Social Security—hear me—10 years from now, when 53 million Americans will be expecting Social Security to be there for them in their retirement, they will remember—they will remember—whether we voted for a budget resolution that failed to address the long-term financing crisis that faces the Social Security program. They will remember, and so will we.

Ten years from now, when 43 million Americans—hear me, again—10 years from now, when 43 million Americans are expecting to rely on the Medicare program for their health care, they will remember whether we voted for a budget resolution that failed to address the long-term problem—they will remember whether we failed to address the long-term problem—the financing crisis that faces the Medicare program. Forty-three million Americans will remember us, whether we addressed the

financing crisis that faces the Medicare program.

Ten years from now our elderly citizens will remember if we, in our day in time, voted for a resolution that failed to provide a fair prescription drug benefit.

Ten years from now our children—our children—will remember if we voted for a budget resolution that resulted in a nation with a failed infrastructure—broken roads, dilapidated bridges, polluted water, water that is not safe to drink. They will remember if we voted for a budget resolution that forced them to go to crumbling schools. What will we say, when they say: Where were you?

When God walked through the Garden of Eden—in the cool of the day, when the shadows were falling, when the rays from the Sun were dying out in the west—Adam was hiding. God said, “Adam, Adam, where art thou?”

Ten years from today, the people of America will look at today's legislators, on both sides of the aisle—they will look at the mighty men and women who were given the awesome honor and the profound duty to serve this country in this hour—and they will say to us: Where were you? Where were you? You were there at a time when you could have acted to preserve this system, this Social Security system, Medicare, our infrastructure, our Nation's schools, its forests, its parks. You were there. You had the chance. You had the duty. Where were you?

This is a critical debate. I have been through lots of them. This is as critical a debate, you mind me—hear me, listen to me—this is as critical a debate as you will ever participate in or witness or hear or see in your lifetime, this debate that is coming up on the resolution next week. And yet as we approach this critical debate, we are being asked to do so without a detailed President's budget, without a markup in the Senate Budget Committee, and based on highly, highly questionable 10-year surplus projections—projections. Guesswork—that is what it is, these projections.

When Alexander was being impounded by the Chaldeans upon his return from India not to enter the city of Babylon, Alexander said: “He is the best prophet who can guess right.”

That is what we have here. He is the best prophet who can guess right. And who knows? Who knows? When one looks at these 10-year projections that tell us there will be these huge surpluses, \$5.6 trillion—that is the projection for 10 years—it isn't worth the paper it is written on. What is the weather tomorrow? What is the weather this coming weekend? What is the weather the middle of next week? They can't tell us. With all of our marvelous techniques, they can't tell us. What will the stock market do on Monday? They can't tell us. They didn't know in advance that it was going to drop 436 points in one day.

Yet we are told that we have massive surpluses down the road and, on that

basis, on the basis of those projections, we are going to have a \$1.6 trillion tax cut. And it is growing. All in all, it is already well over \$2 trillion, and still growing. Some are saying we ought to have a bigger one based on these projections.

We are operating without a detailed President's budget, without a markup in the Senate committee, and based on these highly questionable 10-year surplus projections. We do not have a detailed proposal from the President of the United States on how to address the Social Security crisis. We do not have a detailed explanation from the President on how to fix the Medicare program. We do not know the details of his proposed budget cuts that are supposed to help pay for his proposed \$2 trillion tax cut. We don't have it.

Yet we are not only being impounded but we are virtually being forced to take up this budget resolution next week with a beartrap restriction on time that militates against the Senate's working its will. We are being forced into this situation, and we can't even see through a glass darkly, as the Apostle Paul said. We are flying blind. You know the old saying: It is your money.

I hear a lot of talk about bipartisanship. I think that is what the people want—bipartisanship. Let us hope we can give it to them. But they want something else, too. They want us to do our work, and they want us to do our work well. That is what they are paying us to do. That is why they gave every Senator here the votes that placed upon our shoulders the toga of senatorial honor. With that honor goes the duty.

They want us to do our work. They want us to do it well. They want us to represent their views and their interests well. Doing that—representing their views and their interests well—should be a bipartisan concern, a concern of every Member of this body regardless of party.

It is our sworn duty, especially now, now when we are debating a budget that will set the course of this Nation for the next decade. And the ramifications of this budget will go far beyond the next decade. We owe our people our very best judgment.

How can we exercise that judgment, if we don't know the details of the President's budget? How can any of us go back to our people at home and claim that we knew what we were doing on this critical matter—a budget that will largely set our course for the next 10 years and beyond—when we only had just a little, teeny-weeny glimpse of the picture on which to base our judgments and to base our votes? Conscience should pain us very deeply if we dare make that claim.

The Members of this Senate do not at this time—not one Senator in this body—know the details of the President's budget. Yet we are beginning to consider the budget in 2 days—Saturday, Sunday, Monday. Members have

no committee report from the Budget Committee—none. Having no committee report, Members therefore have no majority views. Members have no minority views. We don't have any committee report. We are denied a committee markup of a resolution.

On that point, let me say, I have been told—I want to make this clear—I have been told by one of my colleagues in the Senate—it may be a Republican, it may be a Democrat; I am on good speaking terms with both sides—I was told that one of our Republican colleagues told this colleague, whom I am now quoting, that the reason the Budget Committee did not vote on a budget resolution was that ROBERT BYRD in some way had precluded it or prevented it.

Do you see what is going on here? There is an effort apparently to demonize ROBERT BYRD, along with some other Senators. But I am the demon, understand, according to that rumor, and that is all it is. Apparently, the reason we don't have a measure that has been reported out of the Budget Committee, called a markup, is that ROBERT BYRD somehow prevented it.

I am waiting on any member of that Budget Committee to come to the floor and say that to me, right here and before other Senators. That is the kind of old wives' tale, the kind of rumor, that has no basis whatsoever. Yet it is being used to create fiction here in the minds of the Republicans that the reason we don't have that markup is because of Senator BYRD. It is what he did in the committee. He prevented it. He prevented it. Senator BYRD prevented it.

There isn't a scintilla of truth in that. I have seen that happen before. I have been a victim of demonizing before in the Senate.

I am the one who asked the question at the last meeting, “Is this the last meeting of the committee? If it is, why don't we have a markup?”

Well, Members have no committee report, Members have no majority views, and Members have no minority views because we have no committee report. We are flying as blind as if we were flying in a blizzard with our eyes sewn shut. It should be of no comfort at all to the American people, who are watching through those electronic eyes above the Presiding Officer's chair, that the blindness is completely bipartisan.

Now that is truly bipartisan. The blindness is completely bipartisan. No Member of this Senate, regardless of party, has a complete picture of what is contained in this 10-year budget. Further exacerbating our common difficulties here is that there is no clear mandate for the President's budget.

I respect this President. I have an admiration for this President. I like what he said in his inaugural speech. I like the fact that he referred to the Scripture, to the Good Samaritan. I like the fact that when I sat down with him at dinner in the White House last week, at his invitation—he was kind enough to

invite me, my colleague TED, the chairman and ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, and our wives to dinner at the White House. I like the fact that he said grace. He asked God's blessing upon the food. In many circles in this town and across this land, the word "God," except in a profane use, is taboo. Don't mention God. On TV, I noticed the other day a Member of the other body swore in a witness and said, "Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?" I said to my wife, "Why did that Member not also say 'so help you God'?"

So you can use God's name all you want to in profanity. That is the "in" thing, but don't use it otherwise. But this President used God's name. He had us all bow our heads. He didn't call on me and he didn't call on Senator STEVENS. He, himself, thanked God for the food.

So what I am saying is, I have a great respect for this President, but this President has no clear mandate for this budget. Look at the Senate. It is 50/50; half the people on one side, half on the other. So there is no clear mandate for this President's budget. The election was a virtual dead heat. Who would know that better than the distinguished Senator from Florida, Mr. NELSON, who is on this floor. The election was a virtual dead heat. The Senate is split 50/50. We have no clear direction from the people on what they think of this budget plan. They don't know about it.

I say to Senators, as they said in the days of the revolution, "Keep your powder dry. Don't fire until you see the whites of their eyes." I think we ought to wait to see what is in this budget before we buy into it. Let's wait and see before we have this concurrent resolution on the budget before this Senate.

We have no clear direction from the people on what they think of this budget plan because they don't know what is in it. All they know is what they heard in a campaign that maybe started up in the snows of winter in New Hampshire. Maybe that is where this idea came from, the \$1.6 trillion, or whatever it is. Maybe it is where some of the other things came from. But we have no clear direction from the people today on what they think of this budget plan because they have not seen it, and neither have any of our colleagues on the right or on the left, on the Republican side, on the Democratic side. We are all like the blind leading the blind, in which case we all fall into the ditch.

Such a situation underscores every Senator's responsibility to understand the details before he casts his vote in the name of the people he or she represents.

(Ms. STABENOW assumed the chair.)

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, what I am saying is nonpartisan. I am saying on behalf of my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle, who are in

the majority, in a 50/50 Senate: You have a right to know the details of the President's budget. And I say that to my colleagues on the Democratic side: You have a right to know. And I say to the people out yonder in the hills, in the mountains, on the Plains, on the stormy deep: You have a right to know what is in that budget. And we won't know because, apparently, the die is cast and the concurrent resolution on the budget will be called up next week under the restrictions of the Budget Act.

So here we have it. It is the product of hearings and the product of the chairman's work—the chairman and his staff. And I have a very high respect for the chairman. He has been kind enough, upon occasion, to come to my office and talk with me about matters. There is a bond between us. It will not be broken, but what we are going to be voting on next week, the concurrent budget resolution—will be the handiwork, for the most part, at this moment, of the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee.

The House has passed a concurrent resolution on the budget. I have not seen it. It may very well be that the leader will call that up. That will be the basic measure on which we begin to work our will.

There are reconciliation instructions in that measure. If there were reconciliation instructions in the Senate measure that had come out of the Budget Committee, I would like, under the circumstances, to move to strike those instructions. There may not be any reconciliation instructions in the Senate Budget chairman's proposal which may be offered as a substitute for the House resolution. Then perhaps there will be an alternative by the ranking member of the Senate Budget Committee.

Who knows how this will work itself out? But let us say just for the moment that when the product leaves the Senate, it leaves without reconciliation instructions. It still has to go to conference, and there Senate conferees will be faced with the reconciliation instructions of the House. They will be in conference.

I know my colleague from Florida wants to speak or wants me to yield. Let me say before I yield, Senators simply do not know. It is a stacked deck. We do not know what the cards are in that deck. We do not know on what we will be voting. I say wait and see what is in that President's budget before you make up your mind to support, for example, a massive tax cut of \$1.6 trillion or \$2 trillion, which is what it will amount to certainly by the time the other matters are taken into consideration. Wait until you see. Do not jump, do not leap, do not start across that railroad crossing. The red lights are flashing. Do not start across it. Do not launch out into that unknown. Do not sign up. Do not sign up here. Let us wait and see what is in the President's budget. I think you are in for some surprises.

A short time ago, we received an outline of the President's budget. I have it right here—this so-called blueprint: "A Blueprint for New Beginnings." Now that is just a little peek, a little peek; let's see what this does; a little peek, just a little peek. We get to see just a little peek of what will be in the President's budget. Yet, we are expected to sign on at this juncture and say: Sign me up; I am for that; I will be for that; I am for a \$1.6 trillion tax cut, or whatever it may be. Sign me up.

How are you going to pay for it? Out of what domestic programs is the cost going to come? You cannot count on those. It is really a laughing matter, to count on those projected surpluses out there.

What are some of the programs that are going to help pay for that tax cut? I am going to sign up for tax cuts; put me down; put my name down; I am going to sign up for that.

What are you prepared to give for that tax cut? Look at your children out there in those crowded classrooms. Look at the broken windows in the schools. Look at the broken plumbing in the schools. Look at our housing developments where the people live. Look at our parks and our forests. What about Medicare? What are we going to do about Medicare? What are we going to do about Social Security? What about our highways? What about our airports? What about safety in the air? What about safety in drinking the water in this country that comes out of the faucet? Are you willing to suffer huge cuts in those programs? What about energy? We are facing an energy crisis in this country. What are you willing to give there? And I can go on and on and on.

Why do we want to get on board something blindfolded—blindfolded? So I say wait and see, wait and see. We should have the budget before us. We are the people's elected representatives. We have no king in this country. People decided that over 200 years ago. The people's representatives—you, the Presiding Officer, you, the Senator, my friends on the Republican side—they are as entitled to know what is in this budget as we, the Democrats, are. Their duties are as deep, their responsibilities are as demanding as are ours.

So I am making a bipartisan, or nonpartisan, speech this afternoon, and I am saying: Let us have the President's budget. No one can tell me that, this late in the game, the executive branch cannot share with us the budget details. Why won't they share the budget details with us? They can do it. Why don't our friends on the Republican side tell the people in the Republican administration: Share with us; we have as much a responsibility as the Democrats have to know where we are going; share with us; what is in this budget?

Even if I had to wait on the document itself, why shouldn't the administration at this point in time be willing, and why should not Members on both sides feel the need for, the desire for,

the necessity for the details that are in that budget? They are available somewhere. Surely they are not going to fall from the skies on the first day after recess. They are around. Why can't we have them before we vote?

I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida, Mr. NELSON. He is on the floor. He has been sitting here and listening, and he is now standing. I am prepared to yield the floor or I can yield to him, whichever he desires.

I ask unanimous consent, Madam President, that I be allowed to yield to the Senator for a statement if he wishes or for questions.

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

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam President, I thought it might be instructive in the course of this debate if the distinguished Senator from West Virginia might explain the gravity of the situation contained within the budget resolution having to do with reconciliation instructions; how several months from now it would bring back to this body a tax bill that would be able to be debated only under very confined circumstances, throwing out the history, the tradition, and the rules of the Senate which have caused it to be recognized as the greatest deliberative body in the world.

Would the Senator please explain for purposes of this debate the threat to the institution that is known as the greatest deliberative body in the world?

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I thank the very distinguished Senator, William Ewart Gladstone, who was Prime Minister of England four times referred to the U.S. Senate as "that remarkable body, the most remarkable of all the inventions of modern politics."

Why did he do that? Because this Senate is so unique there is nothing else in the world like it. There has never been anything in the world like it. It is the forum of the States, and as a result of the Great Compromise of 1787, July 16, the States are equal in the Senate. The States are equal. Every State is equal to every other state when it comes to voting.

Here, if anywhere, the people's representatives may debate freely and may amend at length.

From 1806 until 1917, there was no limitation on debate in this body. Since 1917, of course, debate can be limited in this body by the invocation of the cloture rule. Other than that, the only way, as the Supreme Court has said, we can have debate limited in this Senate is if we limit it ourselves; if we agree by unanimous consent agreement that we will limit debate, then it will be limited.

Now comes the Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974. From that day to this we have had, by virtue of that act, a Congressional Budget Office, we have had congressional Budget Committees in the two Houses, and we

have agreed by that act to bind our hands and to restrict ourselves in regard to debate and to amendments on concurrent budget resolutions, reconciliation bills, and conference reports thereon.

The purpose of that act was to set up a framework of fiscal discipline which would allow us to oversee the whole budget, its revenues, its expenditures, and certain other elements of the fiscal equation, and exercise discipline and reduce the deficits.

Prior to that time, we passed 13 appropriations bills. Each little subcommittee, being a little legislature of its own, adopted its appropriation bill without knowledge of what the other dozen subcommittees were including in the appropriation bills they were reporting out. We had no control over the global fiscal situation, but the Budget Reform Act enabled us to unify the actions of all of these subcommittees and to have better control of the overall fiscal picture and to exercise fiscal discipline.

It came with a price, as I say. It came with very severe restrictions on debate time and on amendments.

Now, to answer the distinguished Senator's specific question, in the concurrent resolution on the budget we will lay out the blueprint for the year, and the impact will be for many years into the beyond. In that blueprint, there will likely be reconciliation instructions. The Concurrent Resolution on the budget, which will be coming up next week, has a time limitation of 50 hours: 2 hours on amendments in the first degree; 1 hour each on debatable motions, or appeals or amendments in the second degree.

But this measure will say to the Finance Committee in the Senate, or the Ways and Means Committee in the House, to report a bill providing up to x amount of money for tax cut purposes. It may say up to \$1.6 trillion. It will instruct that Finance Committee here or the Ways and Means Committee in the House to bring back a reconciliation measure with x amount for tax cuts.

The Finance Committee eventually will bring back its tax bill. That is where the vote will come on cutting the taxes—not here. This concurrent resolution on the budget will never become law. It will never even get to the President's desk. He will never sign it. That Finance Committee will report back a tax bill. That is the reconciliation bill about which the Senator is asking. On that measure, there will be 20 hours of debate—20 hours, half to the majority and half to the minority. That means we on our side of the aisle will have 10 hours, my Republican friends on the other side of the aisle will have 10 hours.

Under the act, the majority party can yield all of its time back if it wishes at any point. Let's say just for the purpose of having an understanding, the majority party could yield all of its time back, yield its 10 hours back; that

would leave 10 hours on our side—the minority.

Suppose then, the minority wishes to offer an amendment, which under the act is 2 hours. Guess what? The majority, let's say, has already yielded all its time back on the resolution. Guess what? The majority gets half the time on the amendment that we, the minority, offer on our side. So, in effect, the majority could, in a certain scenario, end up with 5 of the minority's remaining 10 hours.

Let's go a bit further. The majority could move to cut remaining time on the measure to 2 hours or to 1 hour or to 30 minutes or to zero minutes. It is not a debatable motion, and it carries by a majority vote.

If we were to follow the thesis that might makes right, a party could make us go to a vote without any time left for debate. It is a beartrap. It is a gag rule. Who is being gagged? The people, our constituents, because their elected representatives are being gagged.

Enough said, in response to the question.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BYRD. Yes, I yield.

I ask unanimous consent, Madam President, I retain the floor and I may yield to the Senator.

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

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I thank the Senator for yielding.

He started telling us the story about one of the great Prime Ministers of England, Gladstone—four times Prime Minister—who made reference to the Senate as a great deliberative body. The scenario the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has just outlined is a description that could occur on this floor, in the greatest deliberative body in the world, that would foreclose debate, would stop amendments, would ram down the throats of Senators a piece of legislation that would have far-reaching economic and fiscal consequences for this Nation, without the opportunity for debate and amendment.

As we contemplate this prospect happening as a result of our passing this budget resolution next week, will the Senator further contemplate and reflect upon the history of the Founding Fathers in crafting this Constitution in the protection of the minority and how those rights of the minority might be trampled next week?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I want to yield the floor soon. There are other Senators here, including the Senator from Florida, who want to speak. I do not want to maintain the floor.

Let me answer the Senator like this. One of the reasons for the Senate's being is for the protection of the minority. The minority can be right. With respect to the upcoming Budget

Resolution, the minority is being gagged by the events that are bringing us up to the point of action on the concurrent resolution on the budget. And a part of that gagging, if I may use the word this way—a part of that gagging is that we are being forced to act on the President's budget without seeing the President's budget. That is a kind of gagging, as I see it. Senators are not going to be able to speak on what is truly in the President's budget.

It is a fast-track operation that takes away the rights of the minority. In this instance, it is also going to take away the rights of the majority Senators. They won't see the budget either.

Let me leave it at that for the moment. I hope I will have another opportunity one day to speak on this. But let me close by saying this. The Senator from Florida, the Senator from New York, Mrs. CLINTON, the Senator from Delaware here—these Senators, and the Senators on the other side of the aisle, come here wanting to work for the people, wanting to be a part of a productive process, and wanting to fulfill their commitments to the people who send them here. That is what they want to do.

They must understand, however, that they cannot do that and achieve the full potential if the minority—and in this instance it is also the majority, meaning both sides, Republican and Democrats—are forced to debate a matter which is a revolving target. We can't see it: It is here—no. It is here—no. It is there. It is here. It is there. We can't see it. It is a budget we shall have to read in the dark.

A Senator cannot fulfill his high ideals. He comes here with the highest, most noble purpose. "I do not want to be a part of the bickering. I want to be a part of making things happen. I want to serve my people. It is time to get on with the business of the people. I don't want to be a part of this bitter partisanship."

But how can you do what you want to do if you have this resolution crammed down your gullet because of a time constriction here that is going to be enforced and because you don't know what is in that budget? Believe me, if you did know what is in that budget, it might change your mind on many things in that budget, one of which could be a \$1.6 trillion tax cut.

It may not change your mind. Senators shouldn't have to vote in the dark. Senators shouldn't have to wear blinders in making this decision. This decision isn't just for you, or for me, or for my children today. It is not just for my grandchildren today, not just for my great-granddaughter, Caroline. It is beyond all these, because we will be laying down a baseline here. We are going to be laying down a baseline. We are going to be making decisions here without knowing what we are really voting on really, and that decision is going to affect our children and their children.

We know it is going out there 10 years, but that is not the whole picture. It is a fateful decision that we are embarking upon, and we are being forced to make these judgments sight unseen in many instances—a pig in a poke.

That is not right. That is wrong. That is not just. That is an injustice to our people.

Madam President, I am going to yield the floor. I thank the Senators who are here on this nice afternoon. We have finished our voting for the day but these Senators are still working.

I yield the floor.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam President, I want to add to the comments of the very distinguished Senator who has taught us freshmen Senators so much in the few short days that we have been here.

If I may dare to expound upon the lesson that he has already taught us today by just underscoring the fact of this wonderful experiment we sometimes call a democracy is really a republic. The rights of the minority were one of the most cherished rights to be protected under the Constitution. That is why a body such as this was developed, crafted, and created by those political geniuses who, at a moment in history, happened to come together and create this government.

For the protection of the rights of the minority, they clearly intended that whenever a piece of legislation would come in front of this body—which would be so important that it would have an economic consequence over years and years—that it ought to have the right of debate for more than 10 hours.

You heard the Senator describe how this tax bill may come back to this body and only have 10 hours of debate. And through the process of amendment it could have even less than 10 hours of debate.

No one ever contemplated that a \$1.6 trillion tax bill—which all the economists are starting to tell us is really a \$2.5 trillion tax cut, and maybe even more—would ever be discussed, debated and amended in less than 10 hours.

That is a travesty; and, that is what the American people need to understand is about to happen, if we don't clean up this budget resolution next week.

I echo the sentiments already expressed by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia that we should have, as a priority—and I can tell you my people in Florida have clearly indicated to me in no uncertain terms that their No. 1 priority is to pay down the national debt, out of this surplus, if it continues to exist, and if the projections are right. One projection is \$5.6 trillion. But recently that was lowered

to \$4.5 trillion. With the economy seemingly going in a downward trend, who knows what that projection of the surplus is going to be?

It is incumbent upon us, as we all have agreed, that we enact a substantial tax cut. It is incumbent upon us to make reasoned judgments, with fiscal restraint, on how we can pay down the national debt; enact a tax cut; and, provide for certain other priorities in this nation that my people have also told me that they want very much:

A prescription drug benefit that will modernize Medicare;

A substantial investment in education, so we can bring down class size; so we can pay teachers more; and, so we can have safer schools and have those schools be accountable.

My people have also instructed me about their concern for the environment. They want investment there. They clearly are concerned about health care; and, they want investment there. They are concerned about providing for the common defense. They want an additional investment there—to pay our young men and women in the armed services adequate wages to keep the quality we need in the defense of this country, instead of losing it to the private sector.

I have mentioned a few things. All of those are high priorities for the people of this nation, and I know they are high priorities for the people of Florida.

They sent me up here to exercise judgment about how to pay down the national debt, and how within the resources we have, to enact a substantial tax cut, take care of those other needs, and to be fiscally disciplined in the process of exercising that judgment—so we don't run ourselves into the economic ditch like we did in the 1980s, when we were deficit financing.

I will conclude. I have been through this before because I was one of the people who voted for the 1981 tax cut. It was an excessively large tax cut. It was well intended, but it was overdone. It was overdone so much so that we had to undo it—not once, but three times—in the decade of the 1980s, while I was in the House of Representatives.

As a result of that, and a lack of fiscal restraint by the Congress, the annual deficit spending—that is spending more than you have coming in in tax revenue—in the late 1970s went from approximately \$22 billion to close to \$300 billion by the end of the decade—that's spending \$300 billion more in that one year than we had in tax revenue. You see what the result was in the economy in the 1980s. You see how painful it was to have to turn that around.

Thus, it is our responsibility in the government of the United States to wisely spend the surplus. And I can tell you, this one Member of the Senate wants to be able to exercise his judgment for the people who sent me here to be as fiscally disciplined and fiscally restrained as I can—so we don't go back into that economic ditch.

I am grateful, beyond measure, to the Senator from West Virginia for the history lessons he has provided for us, for the perspective he has provided for us, for the knowledge he has provided about what can happen to the economy of this Nation. It is my intention, with every ounce of energy I have, to continue to speak out on the issue of fiscal discipline.

There is a very crucial vote that is coming up next week on how we dispose of this budget resolution, and how we dispose of the reconciliation instructions, which will ultimately determine how we handle the tax bill when it comes back to the Senate for debate.

Again, let me say, in closing, what a tremendous privilege it is for me to be a part of this deliberative body. I want to be a good Senator. I want to be a Senator who reaches across the aisle to forge bipartisan consensus. And that opportunity is either going to be there or not, in great measure, next week. I hope it is going to be a bipartisan consensus.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor.

Mrs. CLINTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CARNAHAN). The Senator from New York.

Mrs. CLINTON. Madam President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business with Senators permitted to speak for 10 minutes each.

The Senator is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mrs. CLINTON. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from New York speak out of order and that she may speak for up to 20 minutes.

Mrs. CLINTON. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KYL. Madam President, reserving the right to object, and I will not object if the Senator chooses to speak for 20 minutes, but I would like to get in the queue, if I might. Since the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has been speaking now or has had the floor at least for over an hour, I would like, after the Senator from New York has concluded—for however long she takes—to have the right to speak or be yielded time for up to 1 hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New York.

Mrs. CLINTON. Madam President, I come to the floor today to speak out and join the distinguished Senator from West Virginia and the distinguished Senator from Florida to express our concerns about the upcoming budget debate.

First, I thank Senator BYRD for his extraordinary commitment to this institution, which is really unprecedented in history and is such a blessing

for not only the institution and those who have been privileged to serve with him but for our country. And I heed his words seriously because he has taken the long view about what is in the best interests of a deliberative body, of this Senate, of a nation, that should rely upon the careful, thoughtful analysis of the issues that come before us and the people we represent.

I am personally grateful to him for the time he has taken as my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Florida, referred to, to help mentor us freshmen Senators, to give us the guidance we need to be able to do the best possible job for the people who sent us here. And it is such an honor to stand on the floor of this Senate, a place I have long revered, on behalf of New Yorkers.

But I come today with somewhat of a heavy heart because I believe in the principles and values this Senate represents. I want to see them fulfilled. I want to be a part of perpetuating them into our future.

I find myself, as a new Member, struck by how difficult it will be to discharge my responsibilities in the upcoming week without having seen the budget, without having the opportunity to debate its priorities, and even more than its priorities, the values which it seeks to implement. I do not know that the people I represent, or the people any of us represent, will get the benefit of our best judgment, that the decisions we make will be grounded in our careful, thoughtful analysis.

There will certainly be differences among us. That is what makes this a great deliberative body and makes our country so great. We come with different experiences. We come with different viewpoints. I come as the daughter of a small businessman who did not believe in mortgages, did not have a house until he could pay for it with cash, did not believe in credit, and who believed it was his responsibility to always make sure our family's books were balanced.

I come with the belief that we had to go to extraordinary efforts to make sure our economy enjoyed these last 8 years of prosperity and progress and that we could not have done so had we not reversed the decade of deficits and debt that really did undermine America's capacity at home and abroad.

So when we talk about the important debate in which we will engage next week, I think it is the most important debate in which I may engage in my entire term as Senator. It is certainly one of the most important debates for our country, and everyone who is following it, to understand what is at stake.

This debate will set our priorities as a nation for the foreseeable future and could determine whether or not we have surpluses, whether or not we will be prepared for the impending retirement of the baby boomers that starts in just 11 years. It is a debate that will certainly be about numbers, deficit

projections, surplus projections, and spending.

But I think underlying it is a debate about who we are as a people. It is not only about our prosperity, not only about our Federal budget—it is certainly about that—it is about who we are as Americans.

I come to this body determined to represent the people of my State and our country, as all of us do. But will we be able to do that? We are going to be deciding, in the votes we cast—starting with procedural votes—whether or not our seniors will have prescription drug benefits. We are going to be deciding whether or not our children will have the teachers they need and the schools they deserve to have. We are going to be deciding whether we have the sewer systems and the clean drinking water that every American deserves and should be able to count on. We are going to be deciding whether or not we do have the resources to maintain America's strength around the world, whether we will combat terrorism, whether we will stand firm with our allies. We are going to be determining whether we make the investments in research and development that will make us a stronger, richer, smarter nation in the decades ahead.

I am deeply concerned that we enter this debate without the benefit of the administration's budget.

I am privileged to serve on the Budget Committee under the extraordinary leadership of the Senator from North Dakota and my colleagues, the Senators from West Virginia and Florida. We sat through fascinating hearings. We listened as our defense priorities were discussed, as our education priorities were discussed, as our health care priorities were discussed. We listened to experts from all across the spectrum of economic opinion and analysis. I found it an extraordinarily enlightening experience. But we are not going to get a chance to debate with our colleagues what it is we as a committee should be deciding to recommend to this body with respect to the budget we will be debating. So we are flying blind. We are looking through a glass darkly. We are in the dark.

Will this budget have the investments we need to protect child care and child abuse programs? The early information is it will not; that we will be turning our backs on working parents, cutting tens of millions of dollars from child care. Will we protect our most vulnerable children, those who are abused? The information we have, without a budget but kind of leaking out of the administration, suggests that we are going to be asked to cut child abuse prevention programs.

We also are being told that we are going to be asked in this budget to cut training programs for the pediatricians who take care of the sickest of our children in our children's hospitals. These are very difficult issues in any circumstance, but not to have the chance to be able to analyze what is

being proposed is troubling to me. Will this budget ensure our children will grow up in a safe environment with clean water and clean air, with access to quality, affordable health care? Will it adequately protect our food supply? Every day we see a new article in the paper about what is happening with our food supply in Europe, in the United States, around the world. Will we be able to protect ourselves so we have the kind of reliable food supply that Americans deserve?

What are we doing in this time of surplus to ensure a safety net for all Americans, young and old? The prescription drug benefit that we hear about from the administration would leave over 25 million of our seniors without prescription drugs. I don't want to choose between some of our seniors and others in New York, those who may be just a penny over the limit that they, therefore, won't get the prescription drugs they need. I want to make sure that everyone on Medicare—and that is what most Americans want—has access to those prescription drugs.

To pay for the tax cut, the administration includes the Medicare surpluses. Those are resources that should be ensuring the solvency of Medicare for all Americans, totally in a reserve that is set off, never to be used for any other obligations. I believe other obligations that we have should be paid for in the context of a balanced budget and not put Medicare at risk.

The administration has correctly committed to doubling the number of people served through community health centers. I support that. It is a worthy goal. But then on the other hand, I understand they are doing it by completely eliminating the community access program that ensures that community health providers work together to create an infrastructure for care so no patient falls through the cracks. New York is filled with wonderful religiously based hospitals, privately based hospitals that are part of this infrastructure of care that would be left out completely. We also have the finest teaching hospitals in the world. There are no resources that will continue to make sure that they are the finest in the world. New York trains 50 percent of all the doctors in America. What are the plans for making sure that continues and that our teaching hospitals are given the resources they need?

We are also hearing that the administration's budget will provide more security guards for our Nation's schools. That, too, is a worthy goal. In fact, I was heartbroken to hear today of yet another school shooting in another school in another part of our country. That is an issue we must address. If security guards would help, I will support that. But I am troubled and my heart goes out to the families who are suffering these terrible tragedies in school shootings.

I will do whatever I can on all fronts to try to deal with that problem. But I

understand from the President's budget that they are shifting funds from the very successful COPS Program that has really helped us drive down the crime rate in order to pay for the security guards at the schools. We are robbing Peter to pay Paul. Why would we take resources away from the COPS Program, where so many brave men and women put on the uniform and walk those streets, that has become so effective in driving crime out of neighborhoods? Why would we take money away from our police officers and put it in our security guards at schools, if we need to do both? I argue strenuously we do.

Are we being confronted with such a Hobson's choice because of a genuine shortage of resources or are we making these choices and cutting needed investments simply to allow for an enormously expensive tax cut that leaves millions of Americans out, leaves millions of America's working families again behind where they need to be in order to make the decisions that are best for their families because we are favoring others?

The kinds of priorities I speak of today, for which I have fought for so many years, going back to the days when we tried to bring fiscal responsibility to our budget, when we tried to lower the crime rate, when we tried to improve health care and education and protect the environment, are bipartisan priorities. These are genuinely American priorities. Child care, child abuse prevention, police on our streets, we don't stop and ask: Are you for it or against that based on party? We say: Isn't this something we should do together in America?

Madam President, I hope we will come together once again, Republicans and Democrats, Americans, to fashion a budget that pays down the debt, which is still the best tax cut we can give the vast majority of Americans. That is what puts money in your pocket when you have to have a mortgage, when you do have a credit card, when you do have a car payment. Let's keep those interest rates down.

We have learned from the last 8 years that the best way to do that is to be fiscally responsible and pay down our debt.

We need to provide sensible tax relief. Everybody in this Chamber is for that—sensible, affordable, fiscally responsible tax relief that says to every American, we are going to make it possible for everybody to share in these surpluses. We are not going to favor one group over another. That is the kind of tax relief I would be proud to be part of and for which I will speak out.

Finally, we need a budget that invests in our Nation's most pressing needs, not just what we see right before us. The fact that we should continue to lower class size in the early grades, that we should continue to modernize our schools, those are needs I see every day. I go in and out of schools. I talk with teachers and parents and stu-

dents. I know how much better our education system can be if we have both increased accountability and increased investments. I know we have needs that are staring us right in the face that we may be turning our back on if we are not careful.

I also want to be looking to the horizon, looking around the corner. It is not just enough to take care of today. We have to be thinking about next year and the next 10 years and the next 25 and 50 years, if we are to fulfill our obligations as stewards for our people. That means we cannot turn our backs on the demands of Social Security and Medicare.

As a member of the so-called baby boomer generation, I do not want to be part of a generation that is not responsible. The World War II generation is often rightly called the greatest generation. I am proud of the service of my father. I am proud of the service of all who came before. But they also understood the investment that needed to be made. It was in those years after that war when we started investing in our Nation's schools, started building the Interstate Highway System, started making the investment that we, frankly, have been living on for the last 50 years in this country. How on Earth can we keep faith with those who came before us, let alone our children and grandchildren and great grandchildren, if we don't have the same level of responsibility?

I think we have a rendezvous with responsibility, and it is now. If we turn our backs on that responsibility, we are going to have a great price to pay. Maybe the bill won't become due until 5 years, 10 years, maybe 15 or 25 years. But like my colleagues who have spoken, I want to be able to say to the young children I meet that we tried to be responsible, we tried to do the right thing that will make us a stronger, richer, smarter nation.

The American people—and I certainly know that people in New York who sent me—send us here to Washington to work together across party lines, to make the tough choices necessary to move our country forward. That is exactly what I want to do. It is not necessarily going to mean that Democrats will support all Republican proposals, or vice versa. But what it does mean is that we will reason together and work together to do what is right for our Nation. I hope when that process begins next week we will have a chance to really sit down and look at the President's budget, have a good, honest, open debate, as we just had these last few weeks about another very important matter before this body, and that we will honestly say what the priorities are we are setting, the values we stand for, the vision we have for America.

I believe there won't be a more important issue that I will face. I want to make my decisions in a deliberative, thoughtful manner. I want to look for ways I can work with my friends across

the aisle, as well as my colleagues on this side, because I want to be sure that at the end of the day we have done the right thing for the children of America. If we are not going to leave any child behind, then let's make sure we know what we are voting on that will affect every child.

If we can make that determination to work together, I am confident we can come up with a bipartisan, sensible policy that leads to a budget we can support. In the absence of that, it will be very difficult to do so, and I hope that certainly the people of New York and America understand we are trying to stand firmly in favor of a process that may sound arcane and difficult from time to time to understand but which goes back, as Senator BYRD so rightly points out, to people who were very thoughtful about how to design a process that protected the rights of everybody. It is not just about that, as important as that is; it is fundamentally about the choices we will make for the children and families of America.

I know that people of good faith will find a way to come to a resolution about how we proceed next week. I am looking forward to that. But I do have to say that, in the absence of such an agreement, I for one will have to be asking the hard questions the people of New York sent me here to ask about what specifically will be done to affect the hopes and aspirations and needs and interests of the people I represent.

So I will be guided by three principles:

Will this budget pay down the debt to continue us on a path of fiscal responsibility that protects Social Security and Medicare?

Will we be in a position to recognize that the investments we need to make are important investments that are not going to disappear overnight?

And, at the end of the day, will we have made decisions that will protect America's long-term interests at home and abroad?

Madam President, I hope I will be able to answer affirmatively every one of those questions.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, will the distinguished Senator from Arizona yield me just a couple of minutes?

Mr. KYL. Certainly.

Mr. BYRD. Without the time being charged to the Senator from Arizona.

Madam President, I merely want to take this moment to thank both of the Senators on my side of the aisle who have spoken this afternoon—the Senator from Florida, Mr. NELSON, and the distinguished Senator from New York, Mrs. CLINTON—in support of the need for having the President's budget in the Senate before the Senate debates and amends the concurrent resolution on the budget.

They have spoken from their hearts. I have sat and listened to every word, and I am personally grateful for the insights they brought here, their dedica-

tion, their perception of the necessity for our having the President's budget, or at least knowing what is in the budget before the Senate proceeds to it.

Let me also thank them for their desire to work with other Senators on both sides of the aisle, their desire for bipartisanship, their desire to work with our Republican leadership and our Republican Senators. Both of these Senators who have spoken have manifested that very clearly, stated it clearly, and it comes from their heart because they came here to do the work of the people, and they know that the work of the people and of the Nation and our children cries out for bipartisanship, cries out for us working together to meet the needs of this country.

That is what they are here for. That is what they are here to do. I thank them for such a clear enunciation of the need to serve our people and, in so serving, the need to have before us all of the facts and details that we can so we can exercise judgment on both sides of the aisle. I thank them from the bottom of my heart.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Arizona is recognized.

THE BUDGET

Mr. KYL. Madam President, while the distinguished Senator from West Virginia is still here, let me thank him for the remarks he has just made. I, too, listened very carefully to his remarks, as well as to the Senator from Florida and the Senator from New York.

But I must say that I find this rather bemusing—if I am using that term correctly. People around the country might wonder why there is such an emphasis on, or such a concern for, taking up the budget. After all, isn't it time to take up the budget? Indeed, in the normal course of events in the Senate, we would be taking up the budget about right now. So why is there all this expression about concern about taking up the budget? I suggest it has to do with the old phrase, "You follow the money."

While I came here to speak about another subject, I want to speak for a few minutes about this subject because I think people across this country deserve to know what is really behind all of this talk about taking up the budget. You see, the truth is, until we take up the budget and pass a budget, we can't take up tax relief. Until we take up and pass tax relief, the money that is available here in Washington to be spent by the politicians will be spent by the politicians. So you follow the money. If we never take up the budget, then we can't pass the tax relief. If we don't pass the tax relief, the money that the hard-working families of this country have sent to Washington, DC, will be available for this Congress to spend.

People who like to spend other people's money don't want to see tax relief. They can't stand in the way of tax relief, which is too popular. It is going to pass. But they might be able to stop the budget from being considered, based upon some parliamentary procedures. That, Madam President, is what I think this is all about.

Let me take the four points that have been raised by my friends across the aisle in order:

First of all, that we can't possibly take up the budget yet because we don't have the details of the President's budget. I have in my hand a copy of something called "A Vision of Change For America." The Senator from West Virginia will remember this. It is dated February 17, 1993.

This is what the Democratically controlled Senate had before it when it considered the budget resolution in that year. We did not have the Clinton budget. There was no Clinton budget.

Like the first year of President Bush, that was the first year of President Clinton. It takes a new President's team a little while to put together the budget, but that has never stopped the Congress from passing a budget in the ordinary timeframe because that is the first thing we have to do. We are pretty well stymied in all of the other things we have to do in terms of reconciliation, in terms of appropriations, until we have adopted the budget.

What is this "Vision for Change for America" that President Clinton sent up? It was not a budget, as he acknowledges here; it was a blueprint, a vision, as he called it, pretty similar to the document the Senator from West Virginia has been referring to that President Bush sent up to Capitol Hill.

It is a blueprint. It is a vision for what he would like to do. There is a lot of information in it. It is not as detailed as the usual budget, to be sure, but there is plenty of information about the general direction he would like to take.

What happened to this "Vision for Change for America"? Did Republicans say: We cannot possibly take this budget resolution up; we have to wait for a detailed budget by President Clinton? Actually, I think some Republicans did say that, but the Democratic leadership said: Forget it; we are going to take up the budget resolution, and this body passed a budget resolution in a number of days—we are trying to determine whether it was 12 or 13. It was a number of days, close to 2 weeks, before the real Clinton budget was sent up here. The Senate acted upon its budget resolution before it ever had the detailed Clinton budget before it.

I do think it is a bit much to argue that it is unprecedent, that it is improper for the Senate to take up a budget resolution when it has not yet got the exact, complete, detailed budget from the President. We know full well the general direction this President's budget is going to take.

The second point is that there are questionable forecasts. I have heard