

Over Palace." There were so many complaints about the loss of parking, the program was soon abandoned. Bill wasn't alone, however, because many mayors had the same unpleasant experience with urban renewal projects.

His year and a half as president of the Alabama League of Municipalities was a period he really cherished. He had sincere affection for mayors and councilmen from all over the State and they loved him in return. When he became my chief of staff, he renewed his closeness with the Alabama League of Municipalities and would come to Washington with Municipal groups for conferences with the National League of Cities. He was always in attendance at the State conventions of the Alabama League of Municipalities.

Bill and I went through many campaigns together. He was my campaign manager in my election for chief justice and my three elections for U.S. Senate. No one could ever hope to have a greater friend. In the words of the 66th Psalm, "We went through fire and through water." He was like a brother to me. His service as my chief of staff was superb. He was my eyes and ears in Alabama. I will indeed miss his outstanding judgment and motivation.

Bill spent approximately 35 years in public service, either as a public official or as my chief of staff.

He loved his friends and was always loyal to them. We know that loyal people themselves inspire loyalty among others, and Bill leaves behind many who were loyal to him. A great many of them were present at his funeral on February 23, 1995 at the First United Methodist Church in Tusculum. Those who attended, as well as many others who could not, were a testament to the kind of man that he was and to the kind of persons which he surrounded himself and depended on.

At the visitation the night before the funeral thousands of people came to the funeral home to express their affection to his family and pay their respects to him. People were lined up for blocks to get into the funeral home. Members of my staff who were there told me they waited in line for 2 hours in order to speak to his family. In the line were people from every walk of life, including farmers, garbage truck drivers, street cleaners, policemen, bankers, and government officials.

He was a fine family man. He loved to attend family reunions. He would tell me well in advance of a family reunion, "Now mark that period down because I will be gone." He would gather at family reunions with members of his family who had grown up in Farley, AL and reflect upon their younger days, imparting to the younger members of the family a spirit of unity and a desire to be of help to everyone.

He was completely devoted to his wonderful wife Betsy and their children, and he always put them first and foremost in his thoughts. Betsy's understanding always helped Bill in so many ways. She seemed to always

know the right thing to say and do at the right time. She knew how to bring out the best in him. I firmly believe that his wonderful trait of loyalty was reinforced by her own loyalty to him. As his grandchildren grow and learn more about their "Big Daddy," they will be very proud of him.

At his funeral, as we said goodbye to Bill Gardiner, many of us were wondering silently how we would get along without him. We will really never find anyone to take his place. But we must persevere and be guided by his spirit of being always faithful. After all, that funeral was just as much a celebration of the life of a wonderful friend and family man who was an inspiration to all who knew him. We are all better because Bill Gardiner came our way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, the Senate made a mistake today in rejecting the balanced budget amendment. But make no mistake, that issue will be before the Senate before very long again. In failing by a single vote, the Senate rejected the overwhelming demand of the American people, as expressed in last November's election, that we need to exercise restraint in a constitutional context to live within our means. Today, on the motion for reconsideration entered by the majority leader, the procedural posture is now established so that the Senate can take up the issue again at any time.

It is my prediction that the American people will respond to today's vote by a forceful declaration to the 34 Senators who voted against the balanced budget amendment that the American people want the balanced budget amendment passed. The procedure of the Senate is such that, if any one of those 34 Senators changes his or her mind, the amendment may be brought again to the floor of the Senate on short notice, giving Senators an opportunity to be present so all may express themselves, and the amendment could be passed.

So my request, my plea to the American people, is to let your representatives, your U.S. Senators, the Senators who represent you in the U.S. Senate, know what your feelings are. A number of the Senators had been expected to vote in favor of the balanced budget amendment based upon prior votes or upon prior statements. I do not challenge in any way, shape, or form the good faith of any Senator who voted, in any respect, in any way. But there were six Senators who had previously voted in favor of the amendment and today voted against it. Those six Senators previously expressed themselves forcefully in favor of the principles of the balanced budget amendment, suggesting at least some indication of a favorable disposition. It is my thought that if their constituents express themselves, that there may well be a change of heart. Beyond that, there are 20 other U.S. Senators who might be persuaded to have a shift of position,

based upon the will of the American people.

I do believe the principle behind the balanced budget amendment is sound. I do not say so lightly, because changing the Constitution of the United States is a very major act. But it has been demonstrated that not only the Congress of the United States, but the people of the United States, need a discipline to have a framework which requires us to live within our means. Every State has to live within its means—every county, every city, and every individual. If you and I do not live within our means, we wind up in a bankruptcy court. Within the context of the need for economy, constituents now come to us—and I am sure you, Mr. President, have had the same response in your State of Oklahoma as I have in my State of Pennsylvania—people are no longer asking for increases or even cost-of-living adjustments. But in many cases, they are saying, "Do not make the cut too big." In other cases, they are saying, "Do not zero out the program all the way in this year."

I think that mental attitude is very important. I think this amendment would have been a good thing for America, to have that kind of discipline imposed.

Mr. President, in the absence of any other Senator in the Chamber, I ask unanimous consent I may proceed up to 10 minutes for the purpose of introducing legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is so recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. SPECTER pertaining to the introduction of S. 488 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. INHOFE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). The Senator from Oklahoma.

#### THE DEFICIT

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, during the time that I was privileged to sit in the chair, some comments were made that I think should be responded to.

A comment was made that we are doing something constructively about the deficit today. Reference was made that President Clinton's budget was dramatically cutting the deficit.

I was reminded of an article that anyone can find, if they wanted to get last December's Reader's Digest. It was called "Budget Baloney." In this article, they talked about how politicians refer to cutting deficits as if somehow they are going to bring the deficit and the debt under control. They used this example. They said if a guy has \$5,000 but he wants a \$10,000 car, all he does is say, "Well, I really want a \$15,000 car, and I have effectively taken a \$10,000 car and, therefore, cut the deficit by \$5,000."

If we take to the conclusion of 5 years the budget that the President has submitted to us for the fiscal year coming up, it would increase the debt by \$200 billion a year for the next 5 years. That is an increase in the debt at the end of that time by \$1 trillion. I think the American people are aware of this. I think a few years ago they got tired of the smoke and mirrors that we were doing here in Washington and they became aware of what is really happening.

The second thing that was mentioned was the cuts—all of these draconian cuts that would be necessary, if we had been successful in passing the balanced budget amendment. I would suggest to you that there are ways of balancing the budget without having any cuts; that is, just limit the growth. There was a study made using the figures that were supplied by the Federal Government that, if we could put merely a 2-percent growth cap on Government spending, we would be able to bring the deficit down to zero at end of 6 years. This can be done. But Congress in both Houses has had historically an insatiable appetite to spend money that they do not have, and without the discipline that would be imposed upon them by a constitutional amendment for a balanced budget, it has been demonstrated that for 40 years they are incapable of that discipline.

The third thing that was talked about was the awareness of what is going on around the country. I suggest that there is not one Senator who would go home and misrepresent his or her position to his or her constituents. However, it has been quite evident that there are many people in some of the States who really believed that their Senator was in favor of a balanced budget amendment. Now, I think the good news in today's vote is they all know, and they know which Senators voted yes and which Senators voted no.

Last, during the debate, I put together a profile of those individuals who were in support of the so-called "right-to-know amendment" to the balanced budget amendment. That was the amendment that says show us exactly where the cuts are going to be for the next 7 years. I found that all 41 of those cosponsors had either a D or an F rating by the National Taxpayers Union. All 41 had voted for the stimulus bill, which was the largest spending bill increase that we have had in contemporary history.

And so the bottom line is, is it just a coincidence that those 41 who supported that amendment also were the big tax and spenders here in the U.S. Senate? No, I do not think so. In fact, I am having my staff, right now, look at the 34 who voted against it this time. And I suspect that we are going to find the same thing; that is, those 34, each one of whom was responsible for killing the balanced budget amendment today, I suspect, was a big tax and spender. When we find out, we will give this report tomorrow.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GLENN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

#### THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF IWO JIMA

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I rise today to add my voice to that of my colleagues who have made remarks commemorating the 50th anniversary of the heroic Battle of Iwo Jima, which began on February 19, 1945.

I made some impromptu remarks on this subject last week when my colleague from Arkansas delivered his remarks. It was one of the most moving moments on the floor of the U.S. Senate that I have participated in. We had the Senators here who had been marines at one time in their lives, and it was a very moving moment. Each of the other former marines in the Senate have stood on the Senate floor over the last several days to pay tribute to the extraordinary bravery of the men who fought so ferociously in the Battle of Iwo Jima. It was this grueling 36-day battle that gave rise to Admiral Nimitz' famous description that "Among the Americans who served on Iwo, uncommon valor was a common virtue."

This battle also exacted one of the greatest casualty tolls in the history of the Marine Corps. For that uncommon valor, more medals of honor—27 in all—were awarded for that action than for any other action in World War II. Out of those 27, 14 were awarded posthumously.

I was in World War II. I went in a few days after Pearl Harbor and started training. Fifty years ago, I had just returned to the United States from combat in the Pacific in the Marshall Islands, just when the Marine assault on the island of Iwo Jima began. Having participated in combat at that time in the Marshall Islands, we took our losses there, too, but nothing like Iwo, of course. But I understood the strategic importance this battle was to play in our island-hopping campaign in the Pacific. We watched that very closely, because I was in training, along with other members of the squadron I was in, to go back out again for the assault on Japan. Lying between Japan and our bomber bases in the Marianas was Iwo Jima, which would provide a critical base from which fighter escorts could protect our B-29's en route to the Japanese home islands.

Our B-29's had the range to make their way from the Marianas, but without fighter escorts, they went unprotected and too often fell victim to attacks by Japanese fighters.

Iwo Jima also would provide a haven for battle damaged bombers returning from their assaults on Japan. And taking Iwo Jima's three airfields would deprive the Japanese of a base from which they could intercept our bombers.

This was part of the overall strategy, the strategy of saying we needed bases

that bring the Japanese to their senses to bomb, to bomb, to bomb, and hope that we could end that war before we would need to make an invasion. Estimates of that invasion were that if the Japanese fought with the tenacity they had throughout that war, we could lose as many as a million people in that conquest of Japan. So it was in that strategy that Iwo was of critical importance.

The challenge that 75,000 marines of the 3d, 4th, and 5th Marine Divisions faced was an awesome one. Iwo Jima, despite the heavy bombing it had endured in the hours leading up to the Marine assault, remained heavily defended by Japanese in caves and pill boxes and bunkers.

Just picture yourself coming to shore in a bobbing landing craft, coming in with shells landing and people being hit in the landing craft before it got there, and seeing other craft ahead of you that had already been hit. It was a very tough moment. The island provided no natural cover for attackers, and Marines were slowed by Iwo Jima's black sand beaches. It was a sand of large grain, where you would step up on the beach and try and go uphill, and you made two steps forward and went one step backward.

As I mentioned the other night, Mr. President, I did not participate in the Battle of Iwo Jima. But after the war, following assignment to China, my squadron flew through Iwo. We were there for several days and we walked that territory. I stood on those beaches and on the cliffs and was up on Mount Suribachi. I tried to imagine what it must have been like in those days.

Having seen the terrain, it is hard to imagine how anybody could have ever made it up those beaches. They were the only landing areas on the island, but above the beaches, the cliffs were literally honeycombed with caves, back in the rocks, interconnected so the defenders could go from one cave opening to another. From the caves, machine guns would come out and fire, and unless naval supporting gunfire was able to make an unlikely very direct hit on a tiny cave opening, the guns kept coming out and kept mowing people down, and mowing them down, and mowing them down.

As far as that gunfire, I remember one large Japanese gun that had been shooting at ships, and it accidentally had been hit directly by a shell while coming in from the sea. The whole end of that gun barrel was splayed out just like a banana that you would peel down, or like a flower petal spread out in different directions. It was a savage, savage battle. We were there, and my squadron mates and I walked in the caves and walked on the beaches just as the Japanese gunners were able to during that combat. How anybody ever got ashore with that kind of withering fire coming right down their throats, on top of them, is something hard to fathom. It was an experience being