

1998. The largest growth occurred in payroll taxes, and state and local taxes. Adjusting for inflation, the total of all taxes paid by the two-earner family in 1998 was 4.9 times greater than in 1955.

These year-to-year comparisons provide a useful gauge, but ultimately, the goal should be to set tax rates as low as possible after the federal government has met its obligations. The substantial surpluses that are projected alone suggest that we can and should provide additional tax relief.

Another observation: According to Census Bureau data, the labor-force participation of married women, as a proportion of all married women, has nearly tripled from 23 percent in 1951 to 62 percent in 1997. Some of that increase, no doubt, can be attributed to women pursuing their career goals, and that is a good thing. We want our mothers, wives, and daughters to pursue their dreams and fulfill themselves in the workplace. But I suspect that a good part of the increase can also be attributed to the need for many families to earn extra income to pay their bills, including their tax bill.

More people in the labor force means that tax rates do not have to rise substantially to produce more revenue for the government. But when more families have to have two wage earners because they cannot make ends meet, no one is left home with the kids. That is not such a good thing. Providing tax relief will give more families the choice and opportunity to have one parent stay home to raise the children.

As for defense, the increase allowed in the Committee budget is certainly not enough to repair the harm done by the Clinton Administration's underfunding in previous years, but it builds upon the start we made last year.

Since the fall of the Berlin Wall 10 years ago, the strength of our nation's military forces has shrunk from 2.1 million to slightly under 1.4 million active-duty troops. Spending on the military has declined 29 percent since 1989, while spending on almost all other areas of government has gone up. Defense spending has shrunk at the same time that our military has increasingly been called upon to carry out global peacekeeping, domestic disaster relief, the war on drugs, and other less traditional missions.

While many of these objectives are important, they are often pursued without regard to the wear and tear they inflict on our troops and equipment. If we continue to simultaneously increase demand on our forces and cut their budget, we will leave our country vulnerable to potential aggressors. Indeed, according to a review conducted last year by the Pentagon, the U.S. could not today muster a force equal to that which won the 1991 Persian Gulf War so rapidly and decisively.

Last year, Congress reversed this trend by approving an \$18 billion increase in defense spending to: improve the pay and benefits necessary to at-

tract and keep qualified people in uniform; purchase badly needed new equipment, spare parts, and maintenance; improve training; and defend the United States from the growing threat of ballistic missile attack. Yet even this increase merely kept defense spending on pace with inflation.

So the Budget Committee's recommendation to put more money toward defense in this next budget represents a step in the right direction and a good effort to set priorities.

The Committee identified other high priorities, as well, and recommended allocating significant increases toward them. For example, the Committee budget would fund education at a level that is \$13 billion higher than last year—\$600 million more than the President requested. It would increase spending on veterans health by \$1.1 billion, and provide a like increase for the National Institutes of Health for medical research. It would reserve \$40 billion over five years for a new Medicare prescription drug benefit. These are things the American people are telling us are most important to them and they want funded. We do that, in this budget.

Of course, providing these increases in high priority areas will mean that spending on other, less important activities will have to be restrained. But unless we want to return to the days when Congress raided Social Security to pay for other programs, or to the days of big budget deficits, prioritizing spending is key. We have come too far to abandon the discipline that has finally restored some order to the budget process.

I will conclude by talking just briefly about one other aspect of this resolution. To ensure that we ultimately do what we say is intended here, the budget includes some important enforcement provisions. It would establish a 60-vote point order—that is, it would effectively require a supermajority vote to run an on-budget deficit and thus make it harder to raid Social Security in the future. It would similarly require a supermajority vote to declare spending as an emergency that is exempt from spending limits. It would establish a firewall to ensure that we abide by spending limits for defense and non-defense activities. And finally, it would make it much harder to shift appropriations into future years in order to avoid current-year spending limits.

I commend the Chairman and members of the Budget Committee for their work on this resolution, and particularly acknowledge the work of Senators GRAMM, NICKLES, GREGG, and GRAMS, who helped hold the line on spending and ensure that many of the budget gimmicks employed by Congress and the President in recent years were not employed again. As a result of their efforts, I think we have a much better budget.

I urge support for this spending plan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for up to 20 minutes.

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, might I ask what the subject matter is?

Mr. KERREY. Nuclear weapons, the Senator's favorite subject.

Mr. KYL. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, might I ask the indulgence of the Senator from Nebraska to read some brief remarks for the leader regarding the remainder of the day?

Mr. KERREY. I am pleased to yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there 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.

FAIRNESS IN ASBESTOS COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I have been asked whether I intend to call up for consideration on the Senate floor legislation that has been introduced in the Senate with respect to asbestos. After conferring with the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and the chairman of the subcommittee with jurisdiction of this issue, it is clear that a markup has not yet been scheduled, and that extensive work would be needed before the bill is ready for Senate floor action. I have also conferred with the sponsor of the bill who informs me that since the bill was introduced, the consensus regarding this legislation, S. 758, between industry, the plaintiffs, and other concerned parties, and among industry itself, appears to have deteriorated substantially. This bill is not ready for Senate floor action. The Senate will soon be occupied with budget, appropriations, tax and other legislation. For these reasons, and in all candor, the necessary floor time will not be available to act on the Senate asbestos bill this year.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I appreciate the majority leader's comments and candor on this issue.

Last year I introduced S. 758, the Fairness in Asbestos Compensation Act in response to two Supreme Court rulings urging Congress to act on national legislation that would fairly and efficiently compensate victims of asbestos. As U.S. Supreme Court Justice David Souter wrote for the court in *Ortiz* versus *Fibreboard*: "The elephantine mass of asbestos cases . . . defies customary judicial administration and calls for national legislation . . . to date Congress has not responded."

It was my hope that this bill could serve to bring all parties together to

solve this issue. It is now clear, however, that this bill will not move in its current form. As I mentioned to the majority leader, the consensus regarding S. 758 between industry, the plaintiffs, and other concerned parties, and among industry itself, appears to have deteriorated substantially since S. 758 was introduced.

It is also clear that there is virtually no time in the Senate to consider this bill this year. The Senate has a target adjournment date of October 6 this year. Before adjourning, the Senate will work to repeal the Social Security earnings limit, repeal the marriage tax penalty, pass agriculture sanctions reform to open markets for American farmers and ranchers, timely pass the budget and 13 separate appropriations bills, reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, give final approval to legislation to combat the methamphetamine crisis, and adopt legislation to protect Social Security. These issues will take up my time this year. And these issues are just a partial list of the ambitious agenda for the year.

In light of this situation, and the fact that the House appears to be taking a different approach entirely, I appreciate the majority leader's candid assessment of the legislative prospects for this bill. Because it serves no purpose to represent that S. 758 will pass or be acted upon this year or in the future, I appreciate the remarks of the majority leader.

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL TYLER H. FLETCHER

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, today I rise to pay tribute to an extraordinary citizen and public servant who has dedicated his life to the noble endeavor of law enforcement and the edification of those committed to this distinguished profession. Tyler H. Fletcher of Hattiesburg, Mississippi, exemplifies the qualities of honor, courage, dedication, and service that reflect the outstanding character of this former colonel in the United States Army Military Police. With the retirement of Colonel Fletcher on Friday, April 7, 2000, I express my highest gratitude to him for over 50 years of service and leadership to the United States of America.

As an officer in the United States Army Military Police, Colonel Fletcher was recognized with the Police Medal of Honor from the Republic of South Vietnam, three Legion of Merit awards, the Bronze Star, an Army Commendation, and four Meritorious Unit Citations. After retirement from the Military Police in 1971, Colonel Fletcher continued his exemplary service as associate professor and chairman of the department of criminal justice at the University of Southern Mississippi, garnering the distinction of Who's Who in American Law Enforcement in 1978 and the Excellence in Teaching Award in 1980.

Colonel Fletcher's extraordinary accomplishments in the professional

arena are matched only by his dedication to the service of his fellow Americans. He has greatly contributed to the field of law enforcement by authoring numerous books and articles on the subjects of correctional administration, juvenile justice, and community policing. He is a pioneer in his research into areas of police education, crimes against the elderly, and victims of crime in Mississippi. He is a leader in his field as an active contributor to the National Society of Police and Criminal Psychology, the Mississippi Association of chiefs of Police, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, the Disabled Americans Veterans, and the Mississippi Corrections Officers Association.

Mr. President, the distinguished career of Colonel Tyler H. Fletcher associates him with the best of the best in the United States, surpassing the accolades of personal accomplishments and awards only with the gift of inspiration to future leaders and former colleagues. Colonel Fletcher is a great American, and his service to his country, his profession, and his fellow man serves as the benchmark by which we all should hope to achieve.

JOSEPH ILETO POST OFFICE

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am very pleased that yesterday the Senate unanimously passed a bill I introduced to name a United States Post Office after Joseph Santos Iletto. He was the U.S. Postal Service employee of Filipino descent who was brutally gunned down last August by the same man who opened fire on the North Valley Jewish Community Center. This bill designates the new post office located at 14071 Peyton Drive in Chino Hills, California as the "Joseph Iletto Post Office."

Joseph Iletto's death on the job exemplifies the ultimate sacrifice of public service. He served our nation with honor and will be remembered by his family, friends, and community as a kind-hearted man who touched many lives. Despite the tragedy of his death, we can take comfort in knowing that Joseph's life will continue to touch others.

By passing this bill, Congress recognizes the urgent need to address and condemn hate crimes and racism. Dedication of the newly constructed post office in Joseph's hometown is the very least we can do to honor a man who gave his life to his country. The companion legislation, sponsored by Congressman GARY MILLER, has already passed. It is my hope that the bill will be signed into law expeditiously.

THE FLAG DESECRATION ACT

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, in less than a month's time, we will celebrate the first Memorial Day of the second millennium, our first opportunity in this new century to honor and salute

the men and women who, through the decades, have sacrificed so gallantly to keep us free. It will be our first opportunity to thank them publicly for the sacrifice they made, the pain they suffered, and the trauma they endured to ensure that the flame of freedom would never be extinguished.

Each and every one of those patriots, Mr. President, those who died, those who returned, and those we are blessed to still have with us, shouldered squarely the highest responsibility of citizenship; remained dedicated to the survival of our Nation; were willing to pay the highest price to preserve peace and freedom. And they risked it all under the one symbol that summed up their strength and sharpened their courage—our bright banner of red, white, and blue.

We are a Nation of images and symbols, but that's not a 21st century phenomenon. It has always been so. Throughout our history, we have been captivated by scenes that seem to capture all the emotion of a particular event—George Washington's winter encampment at Valley Forge, Robert E. Lee's last ride to Appomattox along a path lined by ranks of Union troops standing at attention, JFK's funeral cortege making its way to Arlington across the Memorial Bridge.

But the most poignant image of all—the one that will live forever in the hearts and minds of all Americans—is the image of a handful of Marines braced against a whipping Pacific wind, raising the American flag over Iwo Jima.

That symbol of freedom that flies over the dome of the building in which we now stand, that adorns the flagpoles of our schools and communities, that graces the windows and doorways of our homes, that is draped in silent tribute over the coffins of our dead—that symbol deserves our protection.

It should not, under any—any—circumstances be desecrated. And that is why I support an amendment to the U.S. Constitution to ensure that this is so.

The Constitutional Amendment proposed by this resolution is surprisingly simple—astoundingly simple when compared to anything that emanates from Washington these days. It does not dictate a particular course of action to the states. It does not threaten the separation of powers. It does not set a complex set of rules and regulations that require a team of lawyers to interpret. It does not change the integrity of the Constitution. And it does not cost the taxpayers one cent. The entire amendment is contained in a single sentence: "The Congress and the States shall have power to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States."

To those who maintain that this amendment would be a violation of First, I quote perhaps the greatest proponent of First Amendment freedoms, Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black, who stated, "It passes my belief that