

is that this happens. Let us get away from all of the abstract arguments.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. President, that all too often lobbyists come in to see a Senator, and shortly thereafter the money flows in. All too often, lobby money flows into campaigns, and shortly thereafter lobbyists and groups and organizations represented by lobbyists appear. That is egregious. That does not give people confidence in this process. That does not make the Congress very accountable to the many. That is what this amendment is all about.

Mr. President, I simply say to my colleagues that if you are serious about reform, then this amendment is a test case of that commitment to reform. I do not know how any of us can go back to any of the cafes or restaurants in our own States and justify to people how we voted for the continuation of this practice. We ought to end it. It is a good Government reform. It is part of congressional accountability, and I urge my colleagues—urge my colleagues—to support this amendment. They have in the past. Many of my colleagues found this to be a compelling problem and issue in the past. It is just as compelling today.

I yield the remainder of my time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FORD. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I support campaign finance reform legislation and I have cosponsored it repeatedly over the years only to have it filibustered or vetoed by the other party.

For me, taken outside the context of campaign finance reform, this amendment is problematic. It would prohibit a Senator from receiving support from lobbyists but it would not prevent a challenger from receiving contributions from those very same lobbyists. Yet that challenger could be an incumbent—a Governor, a State legislator, a mayor—and not be subject to the same restrictions. In my most recent campaign, I was challenged by the speaker of the house in the New Jersey State Legislature. I can tell you that he had the ability, based on his contact with various groups and issues, to raise a lot of money from lobbyists and special interest groups. So, without a comprehensive campaign finance program in place, the prohibition in this amendment singles out incumbent Senators—not all incumbents—unfairly.

Further, comprehensive campaign finance reform set a limit on the total amount of money one could spend on a campaign. So even if a challenger could receive funds from lobbyists while an incumbent could not, the limit on total spending would not necessarily create

an uneven playing field. In an environment of unlimited spending, however, denying one candidate resources which are available to another is not equitable.

I support the goal of the Wellstone amendment—to break the link between contributors and any real, or perceived, influence on public policy. We can best achieve that goal in the context of overall reform of our campaign finance system.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. On behalf of the distinguished majority leader, I move to table the Wellstone amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McCAIN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] is absent on official business.

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

The result was announced—yeas 74, nays 17, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 3 Leg.]

YEAS—74

Abraham	Dorgan	Mack
Akaka	Exon	McConnell
Ashcroft	Faircloth	Mikulski
Bennett	Frist	Murkowski
Bingaman	Glenn	Murray
Bond	Gorton	Nickles
Breaux	Graham	Nunn
Brown	Grams	Packwood
Bryan	Grassley	Pressler
Bumpers	Gregg	Pryor
Burns	Hatch	Reid
Byrd	Hatfield	Roth
Chafee	Helms	Santorum
Coats	Hutchison	Sarbanes
Cochran	Inhofe	Shelby
Cohen	Inouye	Simpson
Conrad	Jeffords	Smith
Coverdell	Johnston	Snowe
Craig	Kassebaum	Specter
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Stevens
Daschle	Kyl	Thomas
DeWine	Lautenberg	Thompson
Dodd	Lieberman	Thurmond
Dole	Lott	Warner
Domenici	Lugar	

NAYS—17

Baucus	Feingold	Kennedy
Boxer	Feinstein	Kerry
Bradley	Ford	Kohl
Campbell	Harkin	

Levin	Moynihan	Simon
Moseley-Braun	Peil	Wellstone

NOT VOTING—9

Biden	Hollings	McCain
Gramm	Kerrey	Robb
Heflin	Leahy	Rockefeller

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 5) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

THE GIFT BAN AMENDMENT TO THE CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, during the last session of Congress, I was a cosponsor of the gift ban bill and was among a handful of Republicans who voted for cloture on the conference report. Nevertheless, I voted to table the gift ban amendment to the Congressional Accountability Act.

Congress has been severely criticized for passing legislation that applies one set of rules to itself and a separate set of rules to the rest of the Nation. The Congressional Accountability Act changes that practice, once and for all. The House already has agreed to similar legislation and is expected to endorse the Senate version. Passage of the gift ban bill would delay final approval of this important measure.

Furthermore, passage of a ban on gifts from lobbyists prior to consideration and passage of strict lobbying disclosure requirements is, in my view, shortsighted. The majority leader clearly stated his intention to address the entire issue of how lobbyists interact with Members of Congress and their staffs. Banning gifts from lobbyists should be addressed in that context. To ban gifts from lobbyists under our present inadequate system of registering lobbyists could act as a disincentive to proper registration.

Mr. GLENN. 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. EXON. 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. EXON. Can we have order in the Senate, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senate come to order?

Please proceed.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending Ford amendment be temporarily set aside for the purpose of the Senator from Nebraska offering an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOMENICI. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Is this an amendment, Mr. President, that would mandate that the next budget resolution that is presented to the U.S. Senate must show a balance?

Mr. EXON. In answer to my friend from New Mexico, the chairman of the Budget Committee, the amendment that I am sending to the desk outlines a series of procedures that I think are absolutely necessary to make sure that the balanced budget amendment, which I support, can be fully operative in a reasonable period of time.

Mr. DOMENICI. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A unanimous-consent question is pending. Is there objection?

Mr. DOMENICI. I have no objection.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 6

(Purpose: To apply the balanced budget amendment to Congress)

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON] proposes an amendment numbered 6.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. —CONGRESSIONAL ENFORCEMENT OF A BALANCED BUDGET.

(a) PURPOSE.—The Congress declares it essential that the Congress—

(1) adopt in the first session of the 104th Congress a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution requiring a balanced Federal budget;

(2) set forth with specificity in the first session of the 104th Congress the policies that achieving such a balanced Federal budget would require; and

(3) enforce through the congressional budget process the requirement to achieve a balanced Federal budget.

(b) POINT OF ORDER AGAINST BUDGET RESOLUTIONS THAT FAIL TO SET FORTH A GLIDE PATH TO A BALANCED BUDGET.—Section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

“(j) CONGRESSIONAL ENFORCEMENT OF A BALANCED BUDGET.—It shall not be in order to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget (or amendment, motion, or conference report thereon) that—

“(A) fails to set forth appropriate levels for all items described in subsection (a)(1) through (7) for all fiscal years through 2002;

“(B) sets forth a level of outlays for fiscal year 2002 or any subsequent fiscal year that exceeds the level of revenues for that fiscal year; or

“(C) relies on the assumption of either—

“(i) reductions in direct spending, or

“(ii) increases in revenues, without including specific reconciliation instructions under section 310 to carry out those assumptions.”.

(c) REQUIREMENT FOR 60 VOTES TO WAIVE OR APPEAL IN THE SENATE.—Section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting “301(j),” after “301(i),” in both places that it appears.

(d) SUSPENSION IN THE EVENT OF WAR OR CONGRESSIONALLY DECLARED LOW GROWTH.—

Section 258(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by inserting “301(j),” after “sections”.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senate please come to order and will Senators remove conversations from the floor.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, we are here today considering the worthwhile and laudable goal of applying to the Congress the laws by which all other Americans live. I wholeheartedly support this endeavor and, I might add, it is long overdue.

But, in all of the discussions, many may have lost sight of the fact that the single most significant law that we are going to apply to the American people this year is an amendment to the Constitution to require a balanced Federal budget.

I rise today to offer an amendment that would apply to the Congress itself a constitutional amendment to balance the Federal budget. Simply put, my amendment would create a point of order against considering any budget resolution that fails to comply with the requirements set out in the balanced budget amendment. In other words, under my amendment, it would be out of order to consider any resolution that failed to show a balance in the fiscal year 2002. That is what the balanced budget amendment requires. No more and no less.

My amendment will force the Congress to live up to the policy statement it will set forth in the balanced budget amendment, which I am confident will be adopted sometime this year.

Mr. President, I want to put my colleagues on notice, if anyone is for a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution—truly for it—he or she should be for my amendment, too. My amendment merely forces Congress to abide by the balanced budget amendment in its budget resolutions. There are no gray areas in this amendment.

Specifically, my amendment creates a point of order against consideration of a budget resolution that would not: First, reach a balance in 2002; second, provide at least the usual budget resolution detail; and third, include reconciliation instructions to the affected committees for all entitlement and tax changes assumed.

My amendment requires 60 votes to waive the point of order. This is real enforcement. My amendment applies the same standards before 2002 that a balanced budget amendment would apply to after the year 2002.

My amendment is also sensible. It provides that the new point of order, just like other points of order under the Budget Act, will be suspended if the Congress declares war or adopts a resolution certifying low economic growth, using the existing procedures under the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings measure.

Now, some might say to me: “Just wait until the balanced budget amendment comes up in a couple of weeks.”

Mr. President, with due respect, that is just not good enough. That is not good enough for the people of the United States of America. That is not good enough for this Senator who has come to the floor of the Senate year after year seeking passage of a balanced budget amendment, only to come away empty handed.

To uphold our responsibility to the American people on the eve of the near certain passage of a constitutional amendment, we must have the guarantee before—and I emphasize, Mr. President, before—we vote on the balanced budget amendment itself that we are going to guarantee the specifics of how to reach a balanced budget.

Without that, our action would be only a concept and not a plan. Without that, our action would be a politically palatable sham. Without that assurance, we would merely be voting for an idea of a balanced budget, conveniently leaving in the never, never, Alice-in-Wonderland future the enforcement mechanisms that are essential to getting us there. Without that guarantee, we are adults promising a bridge to fantasyland without pillars or even preliminary plans.

Some may say we can only do so much deficit reduction at any one time. To them I say that my amendment does not force Congress to put all of its deficit reduction in 1 year. Under my amendment, Congress may even choose to delay action on deficit reduction into the year 2001 or 2002. But my amendment forces Congress to choose. It must lay out some plan to get us to a balance.

Let me add, we cannot afford to delay. Yesterday, the Congressional Budget Office issued a brief preliminary report on the state of the deficit. I had been advised of this previously, and it has come to pass.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of that report be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. EXON. Let me just note a few highlights that are quite evident from that report.

The Congressional Budget Office tells us that unless we take action right now, the deficit will rise to \$322 billion in the year 2002. In order to balance the budget between now and then, the Congressional Budget Office tells us that we will need to achieve some \$1.2 trillion in deficit reduction, and if we add into the plan tax cuts in the Republican-controlled Contract With America and, to a lesser extent, the tax cuts suggested by the President of the United States, that figure will easily exceed \$1.5 trillion in cuts that we are going to have to make between now and then.

Let us get on with it. To achieve this herculean task, we must begin to act now. Maybe we are already too late. To quote the CBO report:

If the budget is to be balanced by the year 2002, it is vitally important that Congress and the President begin immediately to put into effect policy that will achieve that goal.

That, Mr. President, is what my amendment is all about. My amendment will force Congress to start dealing with this challenge now, not in the year 2002. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle may choose to vote against requiring compliance with a balanced budget, but make no mistake they will have to vote, they will have to go on record, and if Senators vote against my amendment today we will know that they are in favor of the idea of a balanced budget but they are not for the reality of a balanced budget amendment.

Mr. President, I believe that this is a critical time. We are at a juncture where we have the responsibility to show the American people that there is more to our commitment to balance the Federal budget than simply words and phrases, and passing the amendment.

I suggest that it is time we showed some courage, as difficult as that is going to be, some responsibility and some constructive definitive action.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ECONOMIC AND BUDGET OUTLOOK: FISCAL YEARS 1996-2000—A PRELIMINARY REPORT, JANUARY 5, 1995

In late January, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) will publish "The Economic and Budget Outlook: Fiscal Years 1996-2000." That volume will provide a detailed analysis of the economic and budget situation facing the nation. Because the 104th Congress plans to consider economic and budget policies during January, however, CBO is releasing this summary of the forecast, estimates, and projections that will be discussed in the forthcoming report.

In brief, there have been no fundamental changes in the economic and budget outlook since CBO's last baseline revisions were released in August 1994. The economy may be a bit more robust in 1995 than was anticipated in August, but a likely slowdown in growth in 1996 leaves the current economic projection for 1999 little different from that which was expected in August.

Since CBO's August projections, the short-run outlook for the deficit has deteriorated modestly, but the longer-run picture is essentially unchanged. Higher-than-anticipated interest payments and lower revenues—only partially offset by reduced medical care costs—have pushed up the deficit projections for fiscal years 1995 through 1999 by an average of almost \$25 billion a year. CBO now projects that the deficit will be \$176 billion in 1995, rising to \$207 billion in 1996. CBO's less detailed longer-term projections (for 2001 through 2005) indicate, however, that the deficits after 2002 will be somewhat lower than those that CBO projected in August.

The currently projected deficit for 2002—the first year that a proposed constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget could go into effect—is \$322 billion. CBO has devised an illustrative path to a balanced budget in 2002 that is composed of deficit reduction totaling \$1.2 trillion over the 1996-2002, an amount that would require major changes in current policies.

The Economic Outlook

CBO expects that the strong business investment and personal consumption of durable goods that spurred the economy to a 4.0 percent real rate of growth in 1994 will continue into the first part of 1995 (see Table 1). The 3.1 percent rate of growth forecast for 1995 is lower than the rate in 1994 but is slightly higher than that anticipated last August. Because CBO estimates that the economy is already operating close to potential, such growth is expected to result in somewhat higher inflation and interest rates. In turn, those higher interest rates are likely to slow growth by the end of the year—cutting it to 1.8 percent in 1996 but dampening inflationary pressures. In CBO's longer-term projections, annual average growth is close to the estimated 2.4 percent rate of growth for potential gross domestic product (GDP), inflation averages 3.4 percent, and interest rates are lower than in 1995 and 1996.

The Budget Outlook

CBO projects that the deficit will decline from the \$203 billion registered in 1994 to \$176 billion in 1995, or 2.5 percent of GDP (see Table 2). The deficit's decline in 1995 is not as great as anticipated last August when CBO projected a deficit of \$162 billion for that year (see Table 3). Very little of the reestimate for 1995 or other years is the result of legislation adopted since the last baseline. Instead, higher interest rates have increased projected federal interest costs, and lower wage and salary income has led to slightly lower revenue estimates. Changes in projections that cannot be attributed to legislation or to changes in the economic forecast are called technical reestimates. One such reestimate is a reduction in projected revenues to reflect slightly lower-than-expected tax collections in 1994. In addition, the costs of Medicare and Medicaid have been reestimated downward since August to reflect lower-than-expected spending for Medicaid in 1994 and the slowdown that is occurring in the growth of health care cost.

Deficits are expected to rise after 1995—to \$421 billion in 2005, or 3.6 percent of GDP (for projections of revenues, outlays, and deficits for 1995 through 2005, see Table 4). Those projections assume that current policies governing taxes and mandatory spending remain unchanged. They also assume that discretionary spending is consistent with the statutory limits on appropriations (both for general purpose spending and for spending from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund) that are in effect through 1998, and that discretionary spending grows at the rate of inflation after that. See Table 5 for a comparison of that baseline with one constructed using identical assumptions, except that after 1998 discretionary spending is frozen at the dollar level of the 1998 cap. Table 6 shows the projected outlays for the major components of mandatory spending, which are the same in both baselines.

Illustrative Path to a Balanced Budget

A constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget will be considered during the early days of the 104th Congress. If the Congress adopts such an amendment this year and it is ratified by three-quarters of the state legislatures in the next few years, the requirement could apply to the budget for fiscal year 2002. If the budget is to be balanced by 2002, it is vitally important that the Congress and the President begin immediately to put into effect policies that will achieve that goal. According to CBO's latest projections of a baseline that assumes inflation adjustments for discretionary spending after 1998, some combination of spending cuts and tax increases totaling \$322 billion in 2002 would be needed to eliminate the deficit in that year. The amounts of deficit reduction called for in the years preceding 2002 depend both on the exact policies adopted and on when the process is started.

For illustrative purposes, CBO has devised one possible path leading to a balanced budget in 2002 (see Table 7). Starting from the baseline that assumes an inflation adjustment for discretionary spending after 1998 (see Table 4), that path first shows the savings that would be achieved if discretionary spending were instead frozen at the dollar level of the 1998 cap through 2002. Such a freeze, along with the resulting debt-service effects, would produce \$89 billion of the required savings of \$322 billion in 2002. Under this freeze policy, the buying power of total discretionary appropriations in 2002 would be approximately 20 percent lower than in 1995.

CBO also built into the illustrative path a possible course of savings from further policy changes. The amounts of those savings are not based on the adoption of any particular set of policies, but they do assume that policy changes are phased in between 1996 and 1999 in a pattern that is similar to the changes in mandatory spending enacted in the last two reconciliation acts. After 1999, the assumed savings increase at the baseline rate of growth for entitlement and other mandatory spending, excluding Social Security. Such a pattern of savings implies that the cuts implemented in earlier years are permanent and that no additional policy changes are made. If those savings were achieved entirely out of entitlement and other mandatory programs (excluding Social Security), they would represent about a 20 percent reduction from current-policy levels for those programs. Over the entire 1996-2002 period, the savings in CBO's illustrative path that result directly from policy changes total more than \$1 trillion (in relation to a baseline that includes an inflation adjustment for discretionary spending after 1998). When the resulting savings in debt-service payments are included, the total exceeds \$1.2 trillion.

Conclusion

CBO's most recent economic and budget projections underscore the challenge that will face policymakers who may have to enact the spending cuts or tax increases needed to balance the budget by 2002. Although, the long-term budget outlook is no worse now than it was last August, the new projections reinforce the fact that the deficit can be eliminated only through major changes in current policies.

TABLE 1.—CBO MEDIUM-TERM ECONOMIC PROJECTIONS
(By calendar year)

	Esti- mated 1994	Forecast		Projected			
		1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Nominal GDP (billions of dollars)	6,735	7,127	7,456	7,847	8,256	8,680	9,128
Real GDP (billions of 1987 dollars)	5,338	5,505	5,602	5,736	5,870	6,004	6,141
Real GDP (percentage change)	4.0	3.1	1.8	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.3
Implicit GDP deflator (percentage change)	2.1	2.6	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.8
CPI-U (percentage change)	2.6	3.1	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4
Unemployment rate (percent)	6.1	5.5	5.7	5.8	5.9	6.0	6.0
Three-month Treasury bill rate (percent)	4.2	6.2	5.7	5.3	5.1	5.1	5.1
Ten-year Treasury note rate (percent)	7.1	7.7	7.0	6.7	6.7	6.7	6.7

Source.—Congressional Budget Office.

Note.—CPI-U is the consumer price index for all urban consumers.

TABLE 2.—CBO DEFICIT PROJECTIONS
(By fiscal year)

	1994 actual	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
In billions of dollars							
Baseline total deficit:							
With discretionary inflation after 1998	203	176	207	224	222	253	284
Without discretionary inflation after 1998	203	176	207	224	222	234	243
Standardized-employment deficit: ^a							
With discretionary inflation after 1998	187	200	216	223	221	247	273
Without discretionary inflation after 1998	187	200	216	223	221	228	233
On-budget deficit (excluding Social Security and Postal Service):							
With discretionary inflation after 1998	259	244	280	303	308	343	381
Without discretionary inflation after 1998	259	244	280	303	308	323	340
Memorandum: Deposit insurance	-7	-16	-9	-5	-5	-3	-3
Cyclical deficit	23	-8	(b)	5	6	10	13
Off-budget surplus:							
Social Security	57	69	73	78	84	90	96
Postal Service	-1	(b)	(b)	1	1	(b)	1
Total, off-budget surplus	56	68	73	79	85	90	97
As a percentage of GDP							
Baseline total deficit:							
With discretionary inflation after 1998	3.1	2.5	2.8	2.9	2.7	3.0	3.1
Without discretionary inflation after 1998	3.1	2.5	2.8	2.9	2.7	2.7	2.7
Standardized-employment deficit: ^a							
With discretionary inflation after 1998	2.8	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.7	2.9	3.0
Without discretionary inflation after 1998	2.8	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.7	2.6	2.6

Source.—Congressional Budget Office.

Note.—Caps on discretionary spending are set by law through 1998. The first projection assumes that discretionary spending then grows at the rate of inflation after 1998. The second projection assumes that discretionary spending remains frozen in dollar terms at the level of the 1998 caps.

^a Excludes cyclical deficit and deposit insurance.^b Less than \$500 million.^c Expressed as a percentage of potential GDP.TABLE 3.—CHANGES IN CBO DEFICIT PROJECTIONS SINCE AUGUST
(By fiscal year, in billions of dollars)

	1994 actual	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
August 1994 Estimate ^a	202	162	176	193	197	231
Legislative Changes:						
Revenues	0	-1	1	1	3	3
Outlays	1	3	1	(b)	(b)	(b)
Deficit	1	2	2	2	3	3
Economic Changes: Revenues	(b)	2	9	8	3	(b)
Outlays:						
Net interest	(b)	8	16	17	15	15
Other outlays	(b)	(b)	(b)	1	2	2
Subtotal	(b)	8	16	19	17	17
Deficit	(b)	10	25	27	20	17
Technical Changes:						
Revenues	8	6	5	6	9	11
Outlays:						
Deposit insurance	-2	1	3	(b)	(b)	1
Medicaid and Medicare	(b)	-7	-6	-8	-11	-15
Other major benefit programs	(b)	1	1	1	2	2
Net interest	1	(b)	-1	(b)	(b)	1
Other outlays	-6	(b)	3	2	2	3
Subtotal	-7	-5	(b)	-4	-7	-9
Deficit	1	1	5	2	2	2
Total Changes	2	13	31	31	26	22
Current Estimate ^a	203	176	207	224	222	253

Source.—Congressional Budget Office.

Note.—Reductions in revenues are shown with a positive sign because they increase the deficit.

^a Assumes that discretionary spending grows at the rate of inflation after the statutory caps expire in 1998.^b Less than \$500 million.TABLE 4.—CBO BASELINE PROJECTIONS OF REVENUES AND OUTLAYS, WITH DISCRETIONARY INFLATION AFTER 1988
(By fiscal year)

	1994 actual	Projection					Extrapolation					
		1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
In billions of dollars												
Revenues:												
Individual income	543	594	628	656	693	731	772	816	861	910	963	1,018
Corporate income	140	149	151	155	161	167	173	182	192	202	212	223

TABLE 4.—CBO BASELINE PROJECTIONS OF REVENUES AND OUTLAYS, WITH DISCRETIONARY INFLATION AFTER 1988—Continued

[By fiscal year]

	1994 actual	Projection						Extrapolation				
		1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Social insurance	461	494	517	539	565	590	618	650	682	716	752	790
Other	113	119	122	125	127	130	134	138	144	149	155	161
Total	1,257	1,355	1,418	1,475	1,546	1,618	1,697	1,787	1,880	1,978	2,082	2,191
On-budget	922	998	1,043	1,084	1,135	1,187	1,245	1,311	1,381	1,454	1,533	1,614
Off-budget ^a	335	357	375	392	411	431	452	475	499	523	549	577
Outlays:												
Discretionary: ^b												
Defense	282	270	270	278	285	295	304	315	325	336	348	360
International	20	21	22	22	22	23	24	24	25	26	27	28
Domestic	242	253	262	274	284	295	306	316	327	338	350	362
Unspecified reductions	0	0	-5	-26	-44	-47	-49	-50	-52	-54	-56	-57
Subtotal, discretionary	545	544	549	548	547	566	585	605	626	647	669	692
Mandatory:												
Social Security	317	334	352	371	390	411	433	456	481	507	534	563
Medicare	160	176	196	217	238	262	286	314	344	379	417	460
Medicaid	82	90	100	111	123	136	149	164	179	196	214	234
Civil Service and Military Retirement	63	66	68	71	75	80	83	87	91	96	100	105
Other	167	179	183	192	199	208	220	224	231	239	247	256
Subtotal, mandatory	789	845	899	962	1,026	1,097	1,173	1,245	1,328	1,417	1,513	1,617
Deposit insurance	-7	-16	-9	-5	-5	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-4
Net interest	203	235	260	270	279	294	310	325	344	365	387	412
Offsetting receipts	-69	-77	-73	-76	-79	-82	-84	-88	-93	-97	-102	-106
Total	1,461	1,531	1,625	1,699	1,769	1,872	1,981	2,084	2,202	2,329	2,465	2,611
On-budget	1,181	1,242	1,323	1,386	1,443	1,530	1,626	1,712	1,814	1,925	2,043	2,172
Off-budget ^a	279	289	302	313	326	341	355	372	387	404	422	440
Deficit	203	176	207	224	222	253	284	297	322	351	383	421
On-budget deficit	259	244	280	303	308	343	381	401	433	470	510	558
Off-budget surplus ^a	56	68	73	79	85	90	97	104	111	119	128	137
Memorandum:												
Social Security surplus	57	69	73	78	84	90	96	104	111	119	128	137
Hospital Insurance surplus	3	3	-2	-7	-12	-19	-25	-32	-39	-48	-59	-71
Remaining deficit	264	248	278	295	294	324	354	369	394	422	452	487
Debt Held by the Public	3,432	3,617	3,838	4,077	4,317	4,589	4,891	5,207	5,547	5,917	6,318	6,757
As a percentage of GDP												
Revenues:												
Individual income	8.2	8.4	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.6	8.6	8.6	8.7	8.7	8.8
Corporate income	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9
Social insurance	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.8	6.8	6.8	6.8
Other	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4
Total	19.0	19.3	19.2	19.0	19.0	18.9	18.8	18.8	18.8	18.8	18.8	18.8
On-budget	13.9	14.2	14.2	14.0	13.9	13.9	13.8	13.8	13.8	13.9	13.9	13.9
Off-budget ^a	5.1	5.1	5.1	5.1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Outlays:												
Discretionary: ^b												
Defense	4.3	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.1	3.1
International	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2
Domestic	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.1
Unspecified reductions	0	0	-0.1	-0.3	-0.5	-0.5	-0.5	-0.5	-0.5	-0.5	-0.5	-0.5
Subtotal, discretionary	8.2	7.7	7.4	7.1	6.7	6.6	6.5	6.4	6.3	6.2	6.1	6.0
Mandatory:												
Social Security	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Medicare	2.4	2.5	2.7	2.8	2.9	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.5	3.6	3.8	4.0
Medicaid	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.7	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.9	2.0
Civil Service and Military Retirement	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9
Other	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.2	2.2
Subtotal, mandatory	11.9	12.0	12.2	12.4	12.6	12.8	13.0	13.1	13.3	13.5	13.7	13.9
Deposit insurance	-0.1	-0.2	-0.1	-0.1	-0.1	(c)	(c)	(c)	(c)	(c)	(c)	(c)
Net interest	3.1	3.3	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.5
Offsetting receipts	-1.0	-1.1	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-0.9	-0.9	-0.9	-0.9	-0.9	-0.9
Total	22.0	21.8	22.1	21.9	21.7	21.8	22.0	22.0	22.1	22.2	22.3	22.5
On-budget	17.8	17.6	18.0	17.9	17.7	17.9	18.0	18.1	18.2	18.3	18.5	18.7
Off-budget ^a	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.8
Deficit	3.1	2.5	2.8	2.9	2.7	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.5	3.6
On-budget deficit	3.9	3.5	3.8	3.9	3.8	4.0	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.5	4.6	4.8
Off-budget surplus ^a	0.8	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.2
Memorandum:												
Social Security surplus	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.2
Hospital Insurance surplus	0.1	(c)	(c)	-0.1	-0.1	-0.2	-0.3	-0.3	-0.4	-0.5	-0.5	-0.6
Remaining deficit	4.0	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.0	4.1	4.2
Debt Held by the Public	51.8	51.4	52.1	52.6	53.0	53.5	54.3	54.9	55.6	56.4	57.2	58.1

Source.—Congressional Budget Office.

^a Social Security and the Postal Service.

^b Discretionary spending caps are set in the aggregate through 1998. The projections for individual categories (defense, international, and domestic) show amounts that would be spent if 1995 funding levels were increased at the rate of inflation. Unspecified reductions show the cuts that would then be needed to satisfy the caps. Projections for 1999 through 2005 represent 1998 spending adjusted for inflation.

^c Less than 0.05 percent of GDP.

TABLE 5.—ALTERNATIVE BASELINES FOR DISCRETIONARY SPENDING AND THE DEFICIT

[By fiscal year, in billions of dollars]

	1994 actual	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Baseline With Discretionary Inflation After 1998												
Revenues	1,257	1,355	1,418	1,475	1,546	1,618	1,697	1,787	1,880	1,978	2,082	2,191
Outlays:												
Discretionary	545	544	549	548	547	566	585	605	626	647	669	692
Net interest	203	235	260	270	279	294	310	325	344	365	387	412
All other ^a	712	752	816	881	942	1,012	1,086	1,154	1,232	1,317	1,408	1,508

TABLE 5.—ALTERNATIVE BASELINES FOR DISCRETIONARY SPENDING AND THE DEFICIT—Continued

[By fiscal year, in billions of dollars]

	1994 actual	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Total	1,461	1,531	1,625	1,699	1,769	1,872	1,981	2,084	2,202	2,329	2,465	2,611
Deficit	203	176	207	224	222	253	284	297	322	351	383	421
Effects of Freezing Discretionary Spending After 1998												
Revenues	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Outlays:												
Discretionary	0	0	0	0	0	-19	-38	-58	-78	-100	-122	-144
Net interest	0	0	0	0	0	-1	-2	-6	-10	-17	-24	-34
All other ^a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	0	0	-19	-40	-63	-89	-116	-146	-179
Deficit	0	0	0	0	0	-19	-40	-63	-89	-116	-146	-179
Baseline Without Discretionary Inflation After 1998												
Revenues	1,257	1,355	1,418	1,475	1,546	1,618	1,697	1,787	1,880	1,978	2,082	2,191
Outlays:												
Discretionary	545	544	549	548	547	547	547	547	547	547	547	547
Net interest	203	235	260	270	279	293	308	319	334	348	363	378
All other ^a	712	752	816	881	942	1,012	1,086	1,154	1,232	1,317	1,408	1,508
Total	1,461	1,531	1,625	1,699	1,769	1,852	1,941	2,021	2,113	2,213	2,318	2,433
Deficit	203	176	207	224	222	234	243	234	234	235	237	242

Source.—Congressional Budget Office.

^a Mandatory spending, deposit insurance, and offsetting receipts.

TABLE 6.—CBO BASELINE PROJECTIONS FOR ENTITLEMENTS AND OTHER MANDATORY SPENDING

[By fiscal year, in billions of dollars]

	1994 actual	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Means-tested Programs							
Medicaid	82	90	100	111	123	136	149
Food Stamps ^a	25	26	27	29	30	32	32
Supplemental Security Income	24	24	24	29	32	35	40
Family Support	17	18	18	19	19	20	20
Veterans' Pensions	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Child Nutrition	7	8	8	9	9	10	10
Earned Income Tax Credit	11	17	20	23	24	25	26
Student Loans ^b	3	4	3	3	3	3	3
Other	3	3	4	4	5	5	5
Total, means-tested programs	177	194	208	229	248	268	290
Non-means-tested programs							
Social Security	317	334	352	371	390	411	433
Medicare	160	176	196	217	238	262	286
Subtotal	476	510	548	587	628	673	720
Other retirement and disability:							
Federal civilian ^c	40	42	43	46	48	50	53
Military	27	28	29	31	32	35	37
Other	5	5	5	5	5	5	6
Subtotal	72	75	77	81	85	90	96
Unemployment compensation	26	22	23	24	26	27	28
Other programs:							
Veterans benefits ^d	18	17	17	18	19	20	21
Farm price supports	10	10	9	9	8	8	8
Social services	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Credit reform liquidating accounts	-7	1	(^e)	-2	-3	-6	-6
Other	11	11	11	10	10	11	9
Subtotal	37	45	43	41	39	39	39
Total, non-means-tested programs	612	651	691	733	778	829	882
Total outlays							
Total outlays	789	845	899	962	1,026	1,097	1,173

Source.—Congressional Budget Office.

Note.—Spending for benefit programs shown above generally excludes administrative costs, which are discretionary. Spending for Medicare also excludes premiums, which are considered offsetting receipts.

^a Includes nutrition assistance to Puerto Rico.

^b Formerly known as guaranteed student loans.

^c Includes Civil Service, Foreign Service, Coast Guard, other retirement programs, and annuitants' health benefits.

^d Includes veterans compensation, readjustment benefits, life insurance, and housing programs.

^e Less than \$500 million.

TABLE 7.—ILLUSTRATIVE DEFICIT REDUCTION PATH

[By fiscal year, in billions of dollars]

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	1996– 2002
CBO January baseline deficit with discretionary inflation after 1998 ^a	176	207	224	222	253	284	297	322	NA
Freeze discretionary outlays after 1998:									
Discretionary reduction	0	0	0	0	-19	-38	-58	-78	-193
Debt service	0	0	0	0	-1	-2	-6	-10	-19
Total deficit reduction	0	0	0	0	-19	-40	-63	-89	-212
CBO January baseline deficit without discretionary inflation after 1998	176	207	224	222	234	243	234	234	NA
Additional Deficit Reduction:									
Policy change ^c	0	-32	-65	-97	-145	-156	-168	-180	-843
Debt service	0	-1	-4	-10	-18	-28	-40	-54	-156
Total deficit reduction	0	-33	-69	-106	-163	-184	-208	-234	-998
Resulting Deficit	176	174	155	116	71	59	26	(^d)	NA
Total change from baseline deficit with inflation after 1998:									
Policy changes	0	-32	-65	-97	-164	-194	-225	-259	-1,035

TABLE 7.—ILLUSTRATIVE DEFICIT REDUCTION PATH—Continued
[By fiscal year, in billions of dollars]

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	1996–2002
Debt service	0	-1	-4	-10	-19	-31	-46	-64	-175
Total deficit reduction	0	-33	-69	-106	-182	-225	-271	-323	-1,210

Source.—Congressional Budget Office.
Note.—NA=Not applicable.

^a Assumes compliance with discretionary spending limits of Balanced and Emergency Deficit Control Act through 1998. Discretionary spending is assumed to increase at the rate of inflation after 1998.

^b Assumes compliance with discretionary spending limits of Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act through 1998. Discretionary spending is frozen at the 1998 level after 1998.

^c This represents only one of an infinite number of possible paths that would lead to a balanced budget. The exact path depends on when the deficit reduction begins and the specific policies adopted by the Congress and the President. This path is not based on any specific policy assumptions, but does assume policies are fully phased in by 1999.

^d Less than \$500 million.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, first let me say to my friend, Senator EXON, who will become the ranking member of the Budget Committee, I truly welcome you sitting with me in the Budget Committee. You will be right next to me, and I am hopeful that what you are saying here today in the Chamber means—and I believe it does—that as we try to put together a major deficit reduction package in the next 8 to 9 weeks, you will be here and that you will be at my side as we try to do that.

I want to say to the Senate and the public, the Senate Budget Committee intends to make a very significant downpayment on a balanced budget. I do not believe in the very first budget resolution that we propose that we can be expected to get to a balanced budget.

First of all, we have not adopted the constitutional amendment. That means the President of the United States is not bound by it, because until we have that, which would then become the law of the land, the President does not have to give us a balanced budget format. We are on our own.

I wish to submit to the Senate, if we come up with a budget deficit package, I say to Senator NICKLES, that is anywhere from a \$400 to \$450 billion reduction over the game plan that is in existence right now, that will be a historic budget. It will start to make Government smaller. It will start to change the underlying law of the land so that instead of going up, the budget deficit will be down and down permanently—perhaps, perhaps, I say to my friend, the occupant of the chair, down as close as \$100 billion 5 years from now, where today it is expected to be over \$300 billion.

Now, I submit all of that can be done if the Senate wants to do it. And while I commend my friend from Nebraska, who is dedicated and devoted to a constitutional amendment and balance, while I submit that we are also, I do not believe we ought to be legislating how we implement a constitutional amendment here on the floor of the Senate with a 15-minute introduction of a major bill and 15 minutes to discuss it. This sounds more like what the Congress of the United States will be engaged in once the States send us this

constitutional amendment and say it is the law of the land. Then obviously that amendment says implement that by statute law. This sounds more like an advanced implementation done here in the Chamber of the Senate with no hearings and no discussion.

I do not say that in any way to denigrate the seriousness that Senator EXON, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, places on this issue. It is important. It is important that we not send mixed signals to the public. If we send them a constitutional amendment, we ought to make a very large downpayment, major downpayment, on that deficit in this very first budget resolution.

Indeed, the Congressional Budget Office is warning us today and confirming what some of us on this side have been saying that the last package of so-called deficit reduction efforts did not get the deficit down. It did for a very short period of time. But the underlying basic laws of the land were not changed enough, so that it is going back up again. Our pledge is that in our first resolution we will change that trend by forcing substantive law to be changed, and we will put everything on the table, fellow Senators.

We do not need this proposal. We are going to put everything there except Social Security. And we are entitled to a reasonable period of time—3 months—to see if we can do that. We do not need to change the Budget Act or change the rules, implement a constitutional amendment on the floor of the Senate.

Having said that, I understand this matter is debatable, but I would like to make a point of order, unless somebody wants to speak, in which event I will withhold that, but it clearly violates the Budget Act and requires 60 votes from what I understand. I see my friend, Senator NICKLES, standing.

Mr. NICKLES. Will the Senator withhold before he makes the point of order—

Mr. DOMENICI. I would be pleased to withhold.

Mr. NICKLES. So I can address the Senate for a few minutes?

Mr. NICKLES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I wish to compliment Senator DOMENICI for his statement and also I compliment our colleague from Nebraska for his bill. I was hoping in a way it would be

a sense-of-the-Senate resolution. But I just tell my colleague from Nebraska, who is now the ranking member of the Budget Committee, I think the Budget Act should be amended. I will work with him to amend it. I do not think it should be amended on the floor of the Senate today.

We do not have to pass—I just make mention to my colleagues—we do not have to pass every amendment that might be around in our first week in session. I know there are ideas on campaign reform. There are ideas on lobbying reform. I hope the majority would like to pass a bill to make Congress abide by the laws like everyone else in the country. The House has already passed it and the Senate has not. I really would like the Senate to pass it. I introduced it in 1991. We did not win that time. I remember at that time the majority leader was Senator Mitchell. He spoke out very vigorously and he convinced a lot of people and we lost. I would really like to pass it. I would like to pass it clean.

I am interested in amending the Budget Act. I think our budget procedures do not work very well and one of the things I would like to change is our baseline so we do not have inflated baselines. That is something, now, that has gained some popularity. Maybe that can be in part of our Budget Act Resolution.

There are some other things we can do in the Budget Act, I think, that also would make sense. When the Senator from Nebraska says that any budget resolution should move us on a path towards a balanced budget, I may well support that. Maybe a direct path. We can negotiate that. But I think the Budget Act probably needs some amendments and I will be happy to work with my colleague from Nebraska to make that happen.

I know there are some other amendments that need to be made to the Budget Act in addition to this that is before us today. This particular amendment does not have anything to do with making Congress abide by the laws like everybody else. There are 11 statutes from which Congress has exempted itself, going all the way back to 1935, and we are trying to remedy that.

I know colleagues have amendments: We want to ban lobbying; we want to ban gifts; we want to ban this, and try to correct everything that can possibly be wrong in our first week in session.

We are going to be in session next week. We are going to be in session the following week. The majority leader has already said we can take up several of these issues soon.

The Senator from New Mexico said we are going to take up a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. We are going to take up implementing legislation. We are going to take up a budget resolution. That happens by statute. It has to happen, I believe, by April 15. We have to pass a joint resolution implementing the budget resolution. So this is going to happen. It does not have to happen today.

So the intent of my colleague from Nebraska, I think, is well made. But I hope we will defer it, or postpone it, and let us look at rewriting the Budget Act. Let us not do it on this bill. Let us pass this bill as it is. I would like to pass it today. Let us send it to the President and get his signature on it. I think it would be a positive accomplishment for this Congress and for this President.

I yield the floor and I thank my colleague from New Mexico for yielding to me.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Exon amendment to balance the budget. I am a longtime proponent of balancing the Federal budget and I believe the most effective manner to do this is through an honest budgeting process. This amendment will require truth in budgeting. I wish to add, however, that my support for a balanced budget is contingent on the exemption of the Social Security trust fund from its enforcement. An overwhelming majority of Americans support a balanced budget amendment but not at the expense of our Nation's senior citizens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I failed to mention one other argument I would like to lay before the Congress. I say to my good friend, as soon as the constitutional amendment is adopted by the sovereign States and remitted as it must under the Constitution, and it becomes the sovereign law of the land, there is a very different dynamic that takes place that we do not have today. That is, we will not be the only part of this Government that has to produce a budget resolution that is in balance because, by that time, the President of the United States will have to submit one. The Congress of the United States and the President will be bound by the same generic sovereign law of the land, and I believe we are going to move ahead with a very substantial, large downpayment, probably far in excess of what the President will submit, as our first efforts in the committee.

Having said that, Mr. President, I make a point of order that the pending amendment violates the Budget Act of the United States.

Mr. EXON. addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904(c) of the Congressional Budget Act, I move to waive section 306 of the act for the purpose of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is debatable. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask that it be in order to ask for the yeas and nays at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is in order.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I thank very much my great friend and colleague, the chairman of the Budget Committee, and my friend from Oklahoma, who is also an important member of the Budget Committee, for the kind statements. We have worked together on many, many things in the past. I assure my chairman of the Budget Committee that I will be there with him, I think as he knows. That does not mean we are always going to agree on every detail. But I think over the years, we have demonstrated the fact that while we might disagree on some of the details, I am not certain that our goals have been very significantly different.

Back to the devil in the details—if we pass a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, then the devil will be in the details. What I am trying to do is to get a jump start on that. The chairman of the Budget Committee has indicated that we should not bring this up on this particular bill. This is such a far-reaching bill that we cannot have a 15-minute debate, without any hearings, and then come to a conclusion.

I am prepared to debate this for whatever length of time is necessary. I do not think we can only debate this for 15 minutes. There are no time agreements that this Senator is aware of at the present time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent Senator KOHL of Wisconsin be added as original cosponsor to the amendment that I have offered.

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

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, the chairman of the Budget Committee seems to be saying, in one form or another, that we will comply with the balanced budget amendment at some later date. That is just what I am concerned about. Why wait? We all know, as evidenced by what happened in the House of Representatives earlier this week, that a balanced budget amendment of some form is going to come over here; 80 percent of the people of the United States,

in several polls that I have seen, indicate that they support a balanced budget amendment. Therefore, I think it is very clear that we are going to have a balanced budget amendment before us and I intend to vote for it.

We only lost by, if I remember, two or three votes on obtaining the required two-thirds in the last session of the Senate. So it is a foregone conclusion that this is going to come to pass. I am very much concerned, though, when I hear my chairman of the Budget Committee talking about a downpayment, a significant downpayment on the budget. I have just cited the CBO report that indicates over 5 years, the budget deficit is going to be \$130 billion to \$150 billion more than previously anticipated. I cited in my opening statement the fact that the Congressional Budget Office has said that at a minimum, we are going to have to cut \$1.2 trillion from the budget by the year 2002. We are probably going to have some kind of a politically popular middle-class tax cut, which will easily swell that to \$1.5 trillion. So I simply say this is not a time to wait.

The \$500 billion downpayment that is referenced by the chairman of the Budget Committee took a lot of hard work. But it lacks, as far as I know, any real specifics at this time. That is what I am concerned about. We are going to rush to the passage of a constitutional amendment to balance the budget without anyone having any idea of the roadmap and the detail we are going to have to use to get there. As I said in my opening statement, it is like building a bridge to fantasy land without specifying any pillars, and without even specifying any hastily sketched plan as to what the bridge is going to look like.

It seems to me that, as the senior Democrat on the Budget Committee, the Budget Committee of Republicans and Democrats, we have a responsibility, if indeed we are for a balanced budget amendment, which I think most of the Members of this body are, that in doing so we have the responsibility—that is what the Budget Committee is all about—to study and to bring back the details of how we are going to reach that goal, at least in some specific a fashion, as much as possible. What we have to do, it seems to me, is to show the way, to be specific. I do not think we can wait.

If I had some assurance that the amendment that I have offered would be considered in an up or down majority vote sometime in the immediate future, then I might not be pressing this today. However, I have a strong belief that the more we delay in doing what the Exon amendment says we have to do, the more we are going to be suspect in the eyes of the American people. I am afraid that many of the American people would think passing a constitutional amendment to balance the budget will just take care of everything. I say to the Chair and I say to my colleagues, the easiest thing in the world

to do is to pass a constitutional amendment to balance the budget which everybody would say amen to; 80 percent of the people in the United States and probably 60 to 80 percent of the Members of the Congress would say that is a great idea without fully understanding the difficult role that all are going to have to play in getting from here to there by the year 2002.

One thing that comes to mind, Mr. President, very clearly is the indication of the chairman of the Budget Committee and I compliment Senator DOMENICI for the hard work he did in coming up at least with some figures in the \$400 billion to \$500 billion range. But that is over a 5-year period. If we would accept that and if the balanced budget amendment is ratified by the States, which I presume it would be, and if we go along with what is recommended by the chairman of the Budget Committee, then at best we would be less than halfway and maybe only a third of the way to the \$1.2 to \$1.5 trillion realistic amount of cuts that we are going to have to make to get there.

I simply say, Mr. President, by opposing this amendment, I think we are sending far more mixed signals to the people of the United States as to where the Congress is going and where it is not going and probably how serious we are about passing a politically popular constitutional amendment to balance the budget.

On the subject of hearings, that has been brought up, let me note specifically for the record that this body passed a very famed Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. We saw that come to the floor of the U.S. Senate without 1 minute of hearing. I simply say that a constitutional amendment to balance the Federal budget has been discussed. Hearings were held on it for a long, long time. It is not a particularly complicated piece of legislation in and of itself. It just creates a constitutional amendment that has to be passed by both bodies and sent to the States where 75 percent of the States would have to ratify that before it becomes law. I simply say that if we passed Gramm-Rudman-Hollings way back in 1985 without hearings, which in some ways was a very complicated piece of legislation, then we do not have to have more hearings on this subject because we know we are going to pass it anyway. Certainly, I must say that I believe the chairman of the Budget Committee is very sincere in his belief. But this is one of those cases that I indicated earlier which it just so happens that good friends who I think are working in the same direction do not agree on how fast we should move.

The chairman of the Budget Committee wants to wait for ratification of the constitutional amendment seemingly before we do anything more dynamic than the \$400 to \$500 billion grab bag of reductions that have been suggested. I know the chairman has worked very hard on those. I do not

mean to say that his task was not sincere. I do say, though, that if all we are going to do is to come up with \$500 billion in possible savings, then if we are going to wait around for the States to ratify, the months and years are going to go by and then the next Congress of the United States and maybe the one after that or the one after that will be facing a 2-year period between the year 2000 and the year 2002 when they are going to have to cut \$1 trillion or somewhere in that area over and beyond, assuming we enact all of the cuts of the roughly \$500 billion that has been named in one fashion or another by the chairman of the Budget Committee.

I think more than anything else, Mr. President, that demonstrates the need that, if we are sincere about this, we have to do much more than the timely work that has been done by the chairman of the Budget Committee with the reference to the \$400 to \$500 billion that has been identified loosely in one fashion or another. I am afraid that we cannot wait. We must not wait or we are going to send the signal to the American people that after their States ratify a constitutional amendment, then we will get on with our business of balancing the budget.

If we are sincere, then I think we should start making recommendations now, making cuts now that we know we are going to have to do anyway. I simply say that putting off the hard choices until after a constitutional provision is ratified by the States would be a step in the wrong direction.

Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma says that there is nothing in my amendment dealing with applying the laws of Congress. What greater law is there in applying laws of Congress to the laws that we have imposed on the people than offering them a constitutional amendment but then saying but we are not going to get into the details of this until you make your determination? I happen to believe that the Budget Committee, the House of Representatives Budget Committee, the Senate Budget Committee, respective bodies have an obligation to spell out in as much detail as we possibly can what it is going to take, what the sacrifices are that are going to have to be made to reach the balanced budget by the year 2002. That is why I said in my opening statement that unless we do something more than what has been done now, I am afraid that we are bringing forth a sham on the American people. Certainly I do not believe that the American people want any more shams. I guess that was one of the conclusions that this one Democratic Senator from a Republican State took from the last election.

I, therefore, say delaying the decisions that have to be made is not only unwise and unsound fiscal policy of which we have been on for far too many years, but it is also not satisfactory. It is not carrying out our responsibility to tell the people of the United

States of America to tell the legislatures of the 50 sovereign States of the United States and to tell all interested parties how we might be able to get there in the year 2002.

I simply say that you do not have to be a mathematical genius to recognize the fact that we are going to twiddle our thumbs and not do more than has been thus far recommended—and again I salute him for the recommendations he has made. But if we are going to sit and twiddle our thumbs for 5 years and say we are going to cut about \$500 billion in this fashion, then when and if the States ratify the measure, that Congress, both the Members of the House and the U.S. Senate, are going to be in dire circumstances indeed. And we will be faced with the proposition of either extending the year 2002 to some other date 7 or 8 years into the future beyond that, or they are going to have to make more draconian cuts than they can make in the budget that is still running to a large extent out of hand, and/or they would have to pass such massive tax increases to meet the year 2002 that it would be universally unpopular with 80 or 90 percent of the people of the United States of America. If that is not enough, such a tax increase would certainly send the United States of America into a deep, deep depression, not unlike what some of us remember happened back in the 1930's.

Therefore, I renew my plea, Mr. President, and say that there is nothing revolutionary about the Exon amendment. The Exon amendment is straightforward. I think the amendment, if people sit and study it on both sides of the aisle, could simply be summed up that if you are for a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, then you have to be for the Exon amendment or you are not being fully square with the American people.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. BOXER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. May I inquire if we are going to have a recess at the hour of 1 p.m.?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no such order.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 7 minutes as in morning business.

Mr. DOMENICI. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President. The Senator is not going to speak on this issue?

Mrs. BOXER. Very briefly, in passing, just a sentence to make an observation. But I have a bill I have introduced and I would like to take about 7 minutes to speak about it, if I might.

Mr. DOMENICI. Might I say to my friend from California, the majority leader is suggesting that we are almost finished with this amendment and that perhaps you can have that time after we have disposed of this amendment.

Mrs. BOXER. I inquire, what time does he feel we will be voting on this amendment.

Mr. DOLE. Does the Senator from Arkansas wish to speak on the amendment?

Mr. PRYOR. The Senator from Arkansas would like to speak for a few moments in making an observation about this amendment. I ask, through the Chair, the distinguished majority leader, do we plan on a vote on the Exon amendment this afternoon?

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, if I may—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. I would say that from the majority leader's standpoint, I would like to vote on the Exon amendment very quickly. We are supposed to be meeting from 12 to 2 with the Governors. Half of that time has already elapsed and I have yet to show up at the meeting. From a personal standpoint—if we can vote on the Exon amendment, I would be happy to yield whatever time the Senator from California may need or however long the Senator from Arkansas may wish to speak following that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has the floor.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you. I compliment Senator EXON and associate myself with his remarks. We have to balance the budget.

Mr. President, I request 60 seconds, if I might, at this time to speak on another topic.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mrs. BOXER pertaining to the introduction of legislation are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, as I understand it, the Senator from Arkansas would like to speak on the amendment, and the Senator from Pennsylvania would like to speak for 3 minutes.

I ask unanimous consent that we vote on the motion to waive at 1:05.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. EXON. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. EXON. Reserving the right to object. I would say to the majority leader that I do not intend a filibustering action on this, but when the chairman of the Budget Committee said something earlier about only having 15 minutes to debate that, that came as a big surprise to me. I do not know, nor did I hear, what the majority leader said a few moments ago about some kind of a vote between 1 or 2 o'clock sometime. I am here ready to debate and do business.

I believe there are some other individuals that would very much like the opportunity to possibly come over and say a few words on this. I had not anticipated that we would vote that

early. However, I recognize the parliamentary rights of the other side to make a motion to table at any particular time. May I ask of the majority leader, why do we want to vote on this at 1:05 when I have some other things I would like to say on this myself? The Senator from California has indicated some interest in it, as has the Senator from Arkansas. What is the rush to vote by 1:05?

Mr. DOLE. There is no rush, but I can move to table right now and we can vote at 12:55. We can always do that. We do not have to wait until 1:05. I am trying to accommodate the Senators on each side, including this Senator, but we will vote at 4 o'clock then. Would that be all right?

Mr. EXON. Yes, 4 o'clock is all right.

Mr. DOLE. I do not want to vote at 4 o'clock. But we are going to do a lot of work here today. We are not going to have one or two votes today, because we are trying to finish this bill by Monday evening. I do not see any way that is going to happen. I do not have any quarrel with the Senator from Nebraska taking all the time he wishes, up to some reasonable point. At that point, we would move to table. But because he has not had much time for debate—

Mr. EXON. May I say, Mr. President, to the majority leader that certainly I would think that I could agree now to a vote not later than 4 o'clock, with the time between now and then equally divided. We might be able to speed it up, depending on how many want to talk.

Mr. DOLE. I would rather not make that request now. I know some Members have other plans this afternoon—not this Member, but other Members on both sides of the aisle—who would like to not only complete this amendment but a couple of others and maybe get an agreement. As I understand it, there will be a meeting at 1 o'clock on the other side to see if we can reach some agreement so those who had amendments could stay and debate them. Those who did not have amendments could keep their commitments, in some cases far away from here. We are trying to accommodate all Senators. So I would not want to wait until 4 o'clock. Why do we not just say we will revisit it in 30 or 45 minutes?

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I understand the difficult task the majority leader has, and I think usually I have cooperated, and I want to cooperate now. He has indicated probably we will not finish this bill today and we may be stacking some votes and vote next week.

Mr. DOLE. Next week means next Monday. Probably votes will occur after 3 o'clock. In any event, I know the distinguished minority leader, Senator DASCHLE, will be meeting at 1 o'clock to see how many amendments will be remaining on that side. We are perfectly prepared to reach agreement so that those who have amendments can stay and debate them but not vote.

But we would like to vote on this one today.

Mr. EXON. I would prefer, frankly, if I could, to stay here and debate this however late and possibly stack the vote on the Exon amendment along with any other votes that the majority leader wishes to stack next week, or whatever is his pleasure.

Mr. DOLE. My pleasure would be not to do that.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I do not want to deny the Senator time. And I hope he did not interpret my saying 15 minutes—I had inquired of his staff how long the Senator intended to speak and they said 15 minutes and I, quite inappropriately, assumed that was the extent of the debate. I clearly do not intend to hold anybody to 15 minutes. That is what I understood.

Mr. EXON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PRYOR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COCHRAN). The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I had not planned to speak this afternoon. I certainly do not want to obstruct the flow of legislative business here.

First, I would like to compliment my colleague and friend from Nebraska on his proposal this afternoon. I also want to say that I cannot support it at this time.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, Mr. President, the fact that in one section of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, which the Senate this afternoon, in just a few minutes of debate, is going to be asked vote on, states that it is "essential that Congress, one, adopt a balanced budget amendment." That is one thing that the Exon amendment proposes to do.

So we, after a very few moments and a very small skirmish on a very large constitutional issue, Mr. President, are going to be required in a few moments, with many absences—I assume some of our colleagues have gone back to their States, to vote on whether or not we think "the Congress should adopt a balanced budget amendment." Maybe we think that the Congress should; maybe we think the Congress should not. But this is a very, very far-reaching proposal.

Mr. President, my colleague and friend from Nebraska stated in the opening moments of his very eloquent presentation the fact that the American public, by overwhelming numbers, says, yes, we need a balanced budget and we need a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. I think there was a CBS poll or one of the polling operations that reported today or yesterday that a great majority of those polled say we need a constitutional amendment to balance the budget.

Mr. President, I know there is a great euphoria around the Capitol these

days, but I do not think that euphoria is of such magnitude and intensity and velocity at this moment that the American people might not give us say a few months, a few months, perhaps even in the summer, early fall or October, certainly before we leave, to let us decide whether or not we want to propose to the 50 States that an amendment to the Federal Constitution be adopted to require a balanced budget.

The Exon proposal, in my opinion, is a very, very responsible proposal because it will require, Mr. President, the policies to be specified that would be required to enforce a balanced budget amendment or, to say it in another way—I assume I am speaking with some degree of correctness—it would imply that there would have to be implementing legislation that would have to go along with a balanced budget amendment. I think that is a responsible course of action.

I think, Mr. President, for us to this afternoon, on Friday, with a short debate, to even take a position on whether we want to, require 60 votes to waive a point of order—that is a new order of consideration provided by the Exon amendment—is questionable. We even go back to a procedure under the old Gramm-Rudman-Hollings concept that provides that the point of order will be suspended if Congress declares war or adopts a resolution certifying low economic growth. This is another question.

But the Senator from Nebraska has put his finger on one of the most important things, and that is, do the people want us to vote for a balanced budget amendment before we know the facts?

Now, do we know the facts, Mr. President? No, we do not know the facts. When we know the facts, then it will be the proper time and the proper opportunity for us to vote yes or no on whether we prefer a balanced budget amendment to the Federal Constitution.

I hope that there will be some way to accommodate the Senator from Nebraska. I wish we could debate this even until next week, because I do not see the necessity to rush an amendment like this through, one of such important consequences, for which I do applaud my colleague and friend from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. I thank my friend and colleague from Arkansas. I will be very brief, I say to my friend from Pennsylvania.

I thank the Senator for his very kind remarks and observations. I, too, would like to put off the vote on this until next week, as I indicated in my conversations with the majority leader.

There is not anything very revolutionary about this proposal. I would simply explain to the Senator from Arkansas that if we did not pass a constitutional amendment to balance the

budget, that even if we passed the Exon amendment it would have no real effect. The Exon amendment would only have effect if and when we do pass a constitutional amendment.

The reason I think it is appropriate to address this now is that we are talking about applying the same rules to the Congress as we do to the people. I think it follows, then, that if we are going to rush pell-mell, as I suggested we are going to do—we are not going to wait several months, I suggest, as the Senator from Arkansas said he would like to see. I think that the first 100 days, maybe the first 10 days, at least the first 10 weeks of this session are going to be very climactic ones and I am very fearful that things are going to be rolled through over here very rapidly.

What this Exon amendment does is simply send out the signal that when and if we do pass a constitutional amendment, then we have the responsibility to direct the Budget Committee to come back with some details, rather than passing the amendment and worrying about the details afterwards.

I thank my friend from Arkansas for his observations.

Mr. President, let me say I just want to correct myself. It does have an effect whether we pass the balanced budget amendment or not. It really says that if we proceed, we proceed in an orderly fashion, which is what the amendment is all about.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, there is no disagreement on the floor today about the desirability of having a balanced budget so that the Federal Government would live within its means as every other governmental entity, like the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has a constitutional requirement to have a balanced budget. Every city and county in my State and every governmental unit across the country has to live within its means within a balanced budget. Only the Federal Government has the prerogative to print money, script, and borrow and not live within its means. This is an affront to every family, and the comment has often been made on this floor.

In the 14 years-plus that I have been in this body, we have debated and talked about this subject, I think, more than any other and there is I think agreement that we need a balanced budget.

Yesterday, in the Judiciary Committee, we had a very constructive hearing analyzing many legal considerations on enacting a constitutional amendment for a balanced budget. I think we will soon do that. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska on its face does something a little different. That is, it "enforces through the congressional budget process the requirement to achieve a balanced Federal budget."

The distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee has raised an understandable objection to this point in tying the hands of the Budget Committee this afternoon with very little debate and only a few Senators on the floor, tying the hands of the Budget Committee on what it will do. I would suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that the preferable course would be for the Senator from Nebraska in his position as the senior Democrat on the Budget Committee to offer the specific amendments to achieve a balanced budget. One of the difficulties in the Senate and the House has been that we have done a lot of talking about the desirability of a balanced budget, but no one has come forward and introduced on the floor the specifics of a balanced budget.

So I would say to the Senator from Nebraska, as the ranking member, the senior Democrat on the Budget Committee, let him come forward with the specifics. He wants a balanced budget. We all do. He thinks he can propose a balanced budget this year. Let him do so. Let him take it to the committee or let him take it to the floor and then we will vote on it.

I expect to be a chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee this session on Labor, Health, Human Services and Education, a committee I have served on in the 14 years-plus I have been in the Senate, and was ranking member last year. I have already called the Secretaries of each of those departments and have said to them, what are you going to be asking for by way of appropriations next year? What is it that may be eliminated? What is it that we may be able to cut on the budget in terms of specifics? I think there is no doubt that the mandate of last November's election was that the American people want smaller Government, want reduced spending, and would like to see tax cuts.

I believe that we should have tax cuts but I am not prepared to vote for a tax cut sight unseen. I am not prepared to engage in the bidding on a middle-class tax cut until we see that we have savings. I do not think we should have tax cuts if it will add to the deficit. I do think, parenthetically, we should have promptly a capital gains tax cut. That is the one tax cut which we could enact promptly which would not lead to a revenue loss. There were 56 Members of this body in the last session of Congress prepared to have a capital gains tax cut. We could not get it through against a filibuster. That is one tax cut we could have.

As to others, we ought not to be in that bidding war until we see what spending cuts we will have. Now, as the prospective chairman of the Subcommittee of Labor, Health, Human Services and Education with a discretionary budget of approximately \$70 billion, I am looking for places to cut. But I am not prepared to make cuts

with a meat ax but instead with a scalpel. I am not prepared to talk about the generalizations.

I think that the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, Senator DOMENICI, the chairman of the Budget Committee, is exactly right when he says, as the chairman with the responsibility to direct those deliberations, that he does not want to see an enforcement mechanism which will compel the Budget Committee to take action before the Budget Committee has a chance to go through the items line by line, which is what the Senator from Arkansas, Senator PRYOR, is in effect saying. What I am saying, is take a look at the specifics of the budget on Labor, Health, Human Services and Education, three committees that have discretionary budgets up to \$70 billion.

The other two provisions in the amendment by the Senator from Nebraska I think are not worthy of adoption. The first one is to adopt in the first session of the 104th Congress, a joint resolution proposing, an amendment to the Constitution requiring, a balanced Federal budget. We are already considering that. It will not do any good to talk any more about that until the Judiciary Committee reports out an amendment and we act on it on the Senate floor.

The second line to set forth with specificity in the first session of the 104th Congress is what the policies of achieving such a balanced Federal budget would require. Mr. President, I think we are well aware at this stage of the life of the Congress of what the policies are. I would say that although this matter is worthy of debate it has been on the floor for a little more than an hour. I do not see any avalanche of Senators coming to the floor to debate the resolution.

What we ought to be doing at this point is talking about the specifics. Talking about the specifics in my subcommittee and talking about the specifics in the Budget Committee. I would invite the Senator from Nebraska to propose the details as to how he would balance the budget. I can assure that this Senator will look closely at that role and would work with him in trying to balance a budget with real money. Not a confederate proposition of "let's talk about it," but let Members be specific about how we will do it. I join him in that effort.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I certainly thank my colleague and friend from Pennsylvania for his remarks, as much as I disagree with them. Certainly, the Senator from Pennsylvania knows, as I believe the chairman of the Budget Committee knows, and as he has indicated in remarks on this debate this afternoon, that the ranking Democrat on the Budget Committee will and is prepared to play a role in developing a list of possibilities that we could come up with.

This does not fall solely on one Senator, just as it does not fall on any one Senator as to what is done in the Health and Labor Committee, the Judiciary Committee, or anything else.

I would simply say that I will be working with the Republican majority the control of all of the committees and all of the subcommittees to jointly work out something. This is not a sole exercise on any Member's part.

The Exon amendment that is currently before us simply tries to define the difficult task that we have in front of us. It simply says that whether we pass the balanced budget amendment or not, and I think we will, we still have a serious, serious, deficit problem on our hands. I think the Budget Committee should play a key role in this.

And in answer to the suggestions of the Senator from Pennsylvania, I will be working very closely with the other members of the Budget Committee, whether or not the Exon amendment is adopted, in the name of fiscal responsibility, where I have been working now, for a long, long time.

The Senator from Pennsylvania has remarked on the valuable hearings that the Judiciary Committee has been holding regarding the enforcement of the balanced budget amendment. As he probably noted, and this is also a concern of this Senator, one of the important considerations under that amendment is whether and how the courts—the courts, I emphasize—might enforce the balanced budget amendment. That is one of the reasons that I offered the amendment that I have. I do not think that the courts should be making these decisions. They should be made here in the U.S. Senate and in the House of Representatives.

My amendment, contrary to what I am afraid my friend from Pennsylvania thought, helps clear some of that up by mandating that the real congressional enforcement by specifics would be outlined, therefore, keeping, hopefully, endorsement in Congress and out of the courts, where I think none of us thinks it belongs.

I think we need to talk specifics. I think we need to talk specifics not as individual Senators but in the Budget Committee, and in the other committees of the Congress that have some jurisdiction. We need to start planning now where we are going to go between now and the year 2002. I object very strenuously to some of the talk that has been carried forth here. With regard to that we do not have to rush into this. We do need to rush in, I suggest, to some kind of a blueprint that would give us some kind of a guide, some kind of an understanding by the people at large on where we are going to go, ask how we are going to get there.

Let us make no mistake about it, we have to work together. But let us also make no mistake about it that, as the last election clearly indicates, while the Republicans are in the majority here, I have said time and time again

during this debate, and will be saying it in the future, that I will work as a dedicated Member of the loyal opposition, not being an obstructionist but pointing out fiscal responsibility and where I think we should be going, not taking the easy road and simply saying, "Let's just go ahead and pass this constitutional amendment to the budget. Then if the States, in their wisdom, 75 percent of them, ratify this, we will get down to the basics."

I think that is not the way to go, and I am very fearful that that is the course that we are about to travel. I understand that the minority leader will be on the floor shortly to talk on this subject. I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. 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. PRYOR. 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. PRYOR. Mr. President, I would like to fill in a little time, if my colleagues do not object—but when the minority leader comes to the floor, I will cease my remarks.

I would like to make just two or three more points, Mr. President. I think that what the Senator from Nebraska is doing, the concept that he is laying out is absolutely sound. I think it is responsible, and I think that it is something we have to do prior to the vote on a balanced budget amendment. There may be a lot of different thought in this Chamber as to what the outcome of this debate might or might not be.

Second, I think we need to know some more basic things about a balanced budget amendment. I think we need to know how we are going to achieve a balanced budget, and if some Senators say, "Oh, we have 7 or 8 years to figure that out; we'll just vote the balanced budget amendment in and we will feel good; we will write a press release; we will go back home and we will boast that we have voted for a balanced budget amendment," that does not take a lot of creativity, nor a lot of courage.

I think what we have to ask ourselves is this: How are we going to achieve a balanced budget if we adopt the balanced budget amendment? What will be the implementing legislation that will be called for? What is going to be the issue with regard to rescission? What is going to be the answer with regard to impoundment? Are we going to basically exclude or include Social Security? Are we going to exclude or include veterans benefits?

These are the types of issues, Mr. President, that I think we need to know before we stake out the course of this afternoon, saying it is a congressional decision, that it is essential for

Congress to adopt a balanced budget amendment.

The Senator from Pennsylvania stated there is no disagreement among anyone, I think, in this Chamber of whether we need a balanced budget. That is different from a balanced budget amendment, I say respectfully, and I certainly agree with my colleague and friend from Pennsylvania. But we have a lot of things going on here. We have the Contract With America. Some of it has already started to roll. Things are happening very quickly.

We are going to have a markup on Monday, I believe, in the Governmental Affairs Committee, on an issue that may or may not change the relationship between the Federal and State governments. That is a voluminous piece of legislation. It is a piece of legislation that I will probably vote for. But, Mr. President, I do not think we are taking enough time to really look and analyze some of these far-reaching pieces of legislation before we cast our vote.

But a constitutional amendment to the Federal Constitution to require a balanced budget I think should be voted on when we have the facts, when we know how we are going to achieve and how we will implement that balanced budget that all of us may ultimately support.

Mr. President, those are the comments that I have. I see other Senators may be coming to the floor desiring to speak. So with that I will yield the floor, and I will 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. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, do I have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator does have the floor.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair. I ask unanimous consent that I may, as the Senator who has the floor, propound a question to the Senator from Nebraska without losing my right to the floor.

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

Mr. BYRD. My question is this, may I say to the distinguished Senator: Would the Senator be willing to revise his proposal in a way that would delete the language that is set forth in paragraph (1) and in (a), preceding (1), which reads as follows:

PURPOSE.—The Congress declares it essential that the Congress—

(1) adopt in the first session of the 104th Congress a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution requiring a balanced Federal budget.

Mr. President, before he responds, there are some other aspects of this

proposal that the distinguished Senator has made here that I like. I think he is not willing to go into this thing with his eyes shut. He is not willing just to go along with having a constitutional amendment on a balanced budget, although I believe I heard him say he was going to vote for one. I hope he will, in his characteristic fashion, think that through. I have always thought of him as a man who really thinks matters through, and the fact that he has offered this as a proposal today indicates to me that he is thinking that through and that he sees some problems with it.

I like most of what the Senator has, but I do not like and could never support (a) and (1):

The Congress declares it essential that the Congress adopt in the first session of the 104th Congress a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution requiring a balanced Federal budget.

I am not for that. I will not be for it tomorrow, and I am going to do everything I can to oppose that for reasons that I will explain later.

Now, would the Senator consider revising his proposal so as to leave out that language to which I object strenuously?

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, in response to my friend and colleague from West Virginia, I hear his sound and wise advice very clearly. You are not the only Senator that has raised that question, but you are the first one.

I will certainly say I have a right to revise the amendment. I have it under consideration to revise it at this time.

As I take it, if I would revise the amendment and any amendment anyone ever writes, we could say afterwards, "Had I had it to do over again, I would have struck this way."

If I could anticipate the support of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, I take it that he would simply say that we would strike lines 7, 8, and 9, and strike "(2)" in line 10 and make that "(1)"; likewise, on line 3, on the second page, strike "1" and make it "2," that the Senator would feel, with those changes, he would be in a position to support the amendment?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is getting very close. He is getting very close. I do not want to say right here that I would support that as the Senator has outlined the precise changes, but he is moving in the direction, and I would like to see what he puts in as (a). I would like to see what goes in in lieu of what is being taken out.

Mr. EXON. May I ask the Senator from Arkansas, who has also spoken to me privately about this general subject, if he agrees with the discussion that just took place between the Senator from West Virginia and this Senator.

I would certainly say that I am one of those who for a long time has supported a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, and I intend to support one when it is finally presented in some form, if that form does not

raise too many barriers. If I am presented with a constitutional amendment that says but you cannot touch this and you cannot touch that, I may be in a position of having to say that that kind of a constitutional amendment is unworkable and under those circumstances I could not support it. But I want to make it clear that this Senator supports a constitutional amendment to balance the budget but not just any one.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, do I still have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Before the distinguished Senator from Nebraska inquires of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas with reference to this matter, may I also ask the Senator how he would feel about this proposed language, if the Senator from Arkansas will also indulge me.

I would ask the Senator from Nebraska, does he see anything inherently objectionable in the following changes that I would propose:

(a) Purpose. The Congress declares that prior to any vote to adopt in the first session of the 104th Congress a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution requiring a balanced Federal budget, it is essential—

This is paragraph (2).—

That it set forth with specificity in the first session—

And I am picking up the Senator's language thereon.

This would not declare that it is essential that the Congress adopt a constitutional amendment on a balanced budget. I do not think that is essential. So I am opposed to that. But if we are going to have that, then the Senator would then be saying with his proposal:

The Congress declares that—

(1) Prior to any vote to adopt in the first session of the 104th Congress a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution requiring a balanced budget;

(2) It is essential that it set forth with specificity in the first session of the 104th Congress the policies that achieving such a balanced Federal budget would require; and

(3) Enforce through the congressional budget process the requirement to achieve a balanced Federal budget.

I do not have any comments on the rest of it at this point. I will have to look carefully at the remainder of the Senator's proposal. But I think he is working on what seems to me to be a very worthwhile proposal.

I have asked the question.

Mr. EXON. I am glad to respond to my friend from West Virginia. I will take all that I have under consideration.

The Senator makes some good points. There are some others who may not be totally enthusiastic about this.

But I do not, again, think that there is any set language or set rules. I just want to make it clear that this Senator has long supported a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. After the Senator from Arkansas,

who I believe sought recognition and was going to ask me a question, remarks, I am looking forward to thoughts and suggestions by my friend from Illinois, with whom I have worked for many, many years and was one of the pull horses when we lost by two or three votes last year. I am very much interested in what his views are on all of this.

Did the Senator seek to ask me a question or was the Senator seeking the floor in his own right?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I still have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has the floor.

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska for the purpose of his asking those questions.

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

Mr. BYRD. Without my losing the right to the floor.

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

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas had thought that the Senator from Nebraska was posing a question, and I was rising to answer that question. I would like to answer, if I may, by saying I think the Senator is certainly moving in the right direction.

Right now, on Friday afternoon, before we have really geared up the Senate, before we really place our feet and our positions in concrete on whether we support or reject the idea of a constitutional amendment, it is in the spirit of good legislative wisdom and in keeping with the legislative philosophy of the Senator from Nebraska, I am sure, that this change be made, and if that change is made, I will enthusiastically—enthusiastically—support the requirements of specificity that the Senator from Nebraska is addressing in his amendment.

Mr. EXON. I thank my friend from Arkansas. I will take that under advisement.

Mr. PRYOR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. EXON. I thank my friend from West Virginia for yielding.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SIMON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SIMON. If I may have the attention of my colleague from Nebraska and also the attention of my friend from West Virginia, I have no objection to dropping point one because this is coming down the road.

I would have objection to the language offered by Senator BYRD. Senator BYRD and I differ on this, and Senator BYRD is obviously trying to put some language in here where we will end up fighting over how we balance the budget rather than first establishing the principle. I think it is important that we first establish the principle.

So if my colleague from Nebraska were to accept the Byrd amendment, with all due respect to the Cicero of the Senate, I would have to object, I would have to oppose the Exon amendment.

Mr. EXON. Will the Senator yield for just a brief statement?

Mr. SIMON. I will be pleased to yield.

Mr. EXON. I was very interested in hearing the Senator—Cicero, or the Senator from Illinois—because I had anticipated exactly what my colleague just said. He probably would not object to what I suggested originally. But when Senator BYRD carried it one step further, I saw him rise.

Mr. SIMON. That is correct.

Mr. EXON. It is nice, though, that we do have this kind of consideration.

Mr. President, to try to bring this matter to a head, I send a revised amendment to the desk which is the revised amendment that I first suggested. It strikes lines 7, 8, and 9 of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois still has the floor.

Mr. EXON. I am sorry.

Mr. SIMON. If I could just ask one other question on the amendment, because I basically like the thrust of the Senator's amendment. Suppose that a year from now or 2 years from now or 3 years from now, we come in with a health program for the Nation with an increase in cigarette taxes or some other revenue. This amendment would not cause us to have 60 votes to pass such a package, would it?

Mr. EXON. It is neutral on that. I think the Senator knows full well what happened in the House of Representatives the other day. But as of now, it would be considered as it has traditionally been considered, a majority vote.

However, I would simply say that if something like that were offered under the budget rules, a point of order could be raised if we do not pay for it.

Mr. SIMON. Yes, that is correct. And I agree with that completely. Whatever we do in the way of spending we have to have the revenue for it. I just want to make sure that we are not locking out some other possibility.

Mr. EXON. We are not.

Mr. SIMON. I thank my colleague from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I understand the leader hopes to speak on this amendment very shortly. I understand that Senator BRADLEY wishes to speak on the amendment shortly and is on his way over.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished leader, Senator DASCHLE, be added as original co-sponsor of the amendment.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 6, AS MODIFIED

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I send a modification to the desk as earlier outlined. It simply strikes lines 7, 8, and 9. On line 10 it strikes the number 2 and

inserts the number 1. And on line 3, on the second page, it strikes the number 3 and inserts the number 2.

I send that modified amendment to the desk and ask the amendment be so modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to modify his amendment. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 6) as modified is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. .—CONGRESSIONAL ENFORCEMENT OF A BALANCED BUDGET

(a) PURPOSE.—The Congress declares it essential that the Congress—

(1) set forth with specificity in the first session of the 104th Congress the policies that achieving such a balanced Federal budget would require; and

(2) enforce through the congressional budget process the requirement to achieve a balanced Federal budget.

(b) POINT OF ORDER AGAINST BUDGET RESOLUTIONS THAT FAIL TO SET FORTH A GLIDE PATH TO A BALANCED BUDGET.—Section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

“(j) CONGRESSIONAL ENFORCEMENT OF A BALANCED BUDGET.—It shall not be in order to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget (or amendment, motion, or conference report thereon) that—

“(A) fails to set forth appropriate levels for all items described in subsection (a)(1) through (7) for all fiscal years through 2002;

“(B) sets forth a level of outlays for fiscal year 2002 or any subsequent fiscal year that exceeds the level of revenues for that fiscal year; or

“(C) relies on the assumption of either—

“(i) reductions in direct spending, or

“(ii) increases in revenues, without including specific reconciliation instructions under section 310 to carry out those assumptions.”.

(c) REQUIREMENT FOR 60 VOTES TO WAIVE OR APPEAL IN THE SENATE.—Section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting “301(j),” after “301(i),” in both places that it appears.

(d) SUSPENSION IN THE EVENT OF WAR OR CONGRESSIONALLY-DECLARED LOW GROWTH.—Section 258(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by inserting “301(j),” after “sections”.

Mr. EXON. 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. DASCHLE. 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. DASCHLE. Mr. President, as a longtime supporter of a balanced budget amendment, I am pleased to join my very distinguished colleague from Nebraska in offering this amendment.

This amendment says we should translate words into action that we have to take immediate steps to balance the Federal budget. Passing a constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget 7 years from now,

while highly appropriate, does nothing today.

From all appearances, a balanced budget amendment will pass Congress this year. There appears to be widespread support on both sides of the aisle on that point.

But we simply cannot afford to wait until 2001 to start complying with the balanced budget amendment. By doing so, we will be adding a far greater burden to our national debt, which already is above \$4 trillion.

If we pledge our commitment to continued deficit reduction today, we will still need more than \$1 trillion of cuts over the next 7 years to balance the budget by the year 2002.

If we delay even 1 year, the national debt will increase by over \$150 billion as a result of that delay, and the interest on the debt will be approximately \$50 billion greater. Each year that we delay adds another enormous sum to our already-astronomical national debt, and increase the percentage of our budget that must be dedicated to servicing that debt.

In the last Congress, we passed a deficit reduction package that will reduce the budget deficit by nearly \$500 billion. Given the magnitude of our existing debt, it would be irresponsible and profoundly illogical not to continue striving toward a balanced budget this year, not next year or the year after.

To illustrate the point that Senator EXON and I are trying to make, consider the simple situation of a person who has run up huge amounts of debt at the bank. Does the bank say to that person, "You have 7 years to pay off your debt and, by the way, feel free to incur more debt in the meantime?"

Certainly not. The bank would insist that, at a minimum, the debtor not incur further debt.

That is precisely what we are talking about here, and that is why every Member of this body who supports the balanced budget amendment should support this amendment today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am not sure that everybody is aware of what we are considering as the underlying bill in this body. But remember, during the campaign there was a hue and cry from the grassroots, expressed very clearly in that election, that people wanted to end the situation where we had two sets of laws in America, one for Capitol Hill and one for the rest of the Nation.

In other words, Congress did not have certain employment safety laws apply to us that applied to the private sector. The small business people of America are very up in arms about the fact that they have to abide by very egregious legislation, and we who make the laws have exempted ourselves from that. That bill passed the House of Representatives 2 days ago unanimously. Senator DOLE placed the Congressional Accountability Act, which I and Sen-

ator LIEBERMAN are main sponsors of, as a first bill on the agenda because he wanted to respond to the people at the grassroots who expressed in that election the resentment of a dual system of law in America.

So that is why that bill is before us. We had debate on that bill yesterday. Senator GLENN, the Democratic manager, spoke very eloquently of the reasons that legislation ought to pass. Senator LIEBERMAN did, several other Democrats and several Republicans did.

There does not seem to be much disagreement about what the people said in that election and that S. 2 ought to pass the Senate like it has already passed the House. Yet, we are not getting from there to here very quickly because we are dealing with a lot of amendments that are unrelated to the bill that the people so clearly expressed in the election that we ought to pass and do it very quickly.

By the way, one of the things that the new majority wants to do is show the people of this country that it is not business as usual anymore in Washington on Capitol Hill passing legislation that they clearly stated they wanted passed and that is on the agenda of the victor of that election, and we ought to get to it and get the job done. The other body stated that they understood that very well with their action 2 days ago. Hopefully, we will get that done in this body very quickly. But we have dealt with lobbying reform. We have dealt with campaign finance reform. We are going to deal with the issue of private use of frequent flyer mileage. We are now dealing with a very important issue of balancing the budget.

There is not one of these issues that is being presented by our friends on the other side of the aisle that are not very legitimate issues to be discussed here. But every one of these issues will be discussed pursuant to the promise of our distinguished leader, Senator DOLE, who said that within just a few weeks we will have lobbying reform and campaign finance reform before this body. It is already on the majority agenda in both the House and Senate that we are going to take up a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget. In just 6 weeks we will be working on the budget resolution that fits right into what my friend, the Senator from Nebraska, is trying to accomplish this time on this very important underlying piece of legislation.

So I wish that we could get some sort of understanding that we could deal with what the people want us to deal with. The purpose of S. 2 is responding to the mandate of the people in the last election that we should end the dual system of law within this country, one set of law for Congress, and another set of law for the rest of the Nation. But all of this other discussion that is going on is preventing us from getting at what we promised the people in the last election.

I do not have a fight with the Senator from Nebraska. He has very worthwhile goals on budget issues. In fact, if you remember in the last Congress, the only successful effort to change President Clinton's budget was the EXON-GRASSLEY amendment that was adopted that cut \$26 billion from the President's budget when it passed the Senate and \$13 billion from the compromise version that came out of the conference committee.

So I have worked very closely with Senator EXON in trying to bring a sound fiscal policy to our Federal Government. I will continue to work with him for a sound fiscal policy. Why do it on legislation that is so easily understood by the American people that they very clearly want? And we are almost set to give it to them. The President is prepared to sign it. And I just think we ought to get on with the show and final passage of this legislation and forget about all of this extraneous stuff that is not unimportant. It is a very important issue to be discussing. But there is a time and place for everything, and the time and place is set for all these other issues within just the next few weeks. We are taking up what ought to be No. 1 on everybody's mind. We have it up. We ought to pass it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BRADLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, the debate of the Senate on a Friday always has a certain unique quality to it. I rise today simply to say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that I do not know how this issue will be resolved. I assume it will be resolved today. But I applaud him for raising the issue and the amendment that he has offered.

This is really a precursor to a debate we will have here in the next week on the balanced budget amendment. It is really a truth-in-advertising amendment. It makes explicit what anyone who supports a balanced budget amendment should know—which is if you vote for it you have to deliver on it. And it makes explicit what delivering on it, voting for the balanced budget amendment, will cost.

I really do not think that there has been adequate public focus on what the cost of a balanced budget amendment will be for average people in this country, for regions of the country which get a disproportionate share of the Federal dollar or elements of the economy that have heavy subsidies.

I think that the public needs to see what will be cut if we have to meet a balanced budget by the year 2002. And I am all for that.

In the last Congress I was on this floor offering spending cut after spending cut on virtually every appropriations bill. I am pleased that within the Democrats I was No. 4 in voting for spending cuts. I am making the point

only because after you vote for a balanced budget amendment, you then have to vote to cut spending.

The balanced budget amendment is just a process. What the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska, as I understand it, does is say that after a balanced budget amendment passes, if it should pass, that any budget resolution has a point of order against it if the budget resolution did not submit a budget that reached a balanced budget by the year 2002, which by the way it is projected will be the year in which the deficit is \$322 billion.

So anyone who supports the balanced budget amendment would have to support this Exon proposal, because that would make explicit how we cut \$322 billion by the year 2002. I applaud the Senator very much for his amendment.

I know that we will yet have a chance to debate the balanced budget amendment. One of the puzzling things for me with regard to understanding the support for the balanced budget amendment—and maybe the Senator from Nebraska is aware of this—is that there are certain States in the Union that get a higher return on their tax dollar than other States. Certain States pay taxes, and get back a lot more in Federal spending than they have sent to Washington in taxes. Unfortunately, my State is not in that group because we have a high income. We pay a high tax, and we send a lot of tax dollars to Washington. We do not get back that many tax dollars relative to what we sent.

Once we get a balanced budget amendment, all those States which get back much more than they kick in—and these States are disproportionately in the West—those are the States that will be disproportionately hit by the need to dramatically cut spending \$322 billion by the year 2002. And in the coming debate, I hope that we will be able to focus on these facts.

I think the Senator's amendment is an enormously positive step in getting us to face up to what actually balancing the budget will mean. It will not be easy. There will be no substitute for cutting spending, and there will be no substitute for Senators coming to the floor of the U.S. Senate and voting to cut spending, not voting for a process in that 7 or 10 years from now if it goes into effect, and if there are no exclusions or if there are loopholes, will lead to a balanced budget. We need to have Senators actually coming over here and voting to cut spending.

So I applaud the Senator from Nebraska for his amendment. I know that perhaps he and I have a different view on the balanced budget amendment, but his amendment makes explicit what steps must be taken if we are to balance the budget and requires the Congress to belly up to the wire and say in 7 years we are going to balance the budget, and here is how we are going to do it—not that in 7 years we will create some budget glidepath down to a balanced budget in 10 years or 15 years from now, but in 2002.

So I am anxiously awaiting such a congressional resolution, because I think once that congressional resolution is out there and you see how much is going to have to be cut in virtually every subsidy, virtually every Federal program, virtually every entitlement there for the last 14 years in the Federal Government, there will be a moment of truth for the Congress and a moment of truth for those who have voted for the balanced budget amendment.

I salute the Senator for his amendment.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague from the State of New Jersey very much for his excellent remarks. I think he has indeed hit it right on the head. This is a truth-in-advertising amendment, in addition to a truth-in-budgeting amendment. And the Senator made an excellent, right-on point as to what this is all about. I hope, therefore, we will have the votes to pass this. We first have to get the 60 votes to waive.

I also thank my friend and colleague from Iowa. Senator GRASSLEY and myself have worked together on many things over the years, and we will be working on things in the future. I simply say to my friend from Iowa that I was very pleased with the fact that he mentioned once again what few know—that the only reductions made in the budget last year were the Exon-Grassley amendments that he and I fashioned and worked through the Congress.

What I am doing in this particular case, as the Senator has clearly indicated, is to apply to Congress what we apply to others—And if Congress wants to have a balanced budget amendment, which I hope they do, then they should live up to it. You had indicated in your remarks that while you thought the Exon amendment was probably a good one, this is the wrong place to put it. Well, I suggest that this is the right place to put it. What we are talking about here today is to make Congress live up to the laws that it applies to the people of the United States. If we are going to have a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, then that has to apply to the Congress. So I think it is very appropriate that this measure be passed on the bill, the underlying bill before us, which I indicated in my opening remarks I strongly support.

Now, it is not the intention of this Senator to delay at all the institution of the measure that is going to receive overwhelming support.

Mr. DORGAN. If the Senator will yield—

Mr. EXON. I am prepared to come to a vote in a relatively short period of time. I do not want to be accused of holding up anything.

I think it is important enough that it should go on this legislation. I do not think there is any piece of legislation we are likely to pass this year that is going to be more important than a con-

stitutional amendment to balance the budget, which 80 percent of the people in the United States of America want. I want to get on with that. I do not happen to buy the reason or excuse, depending on your point of view, as to why it should not be an amendment to the measure before us.

Mr. DORGAN. I wonder if the Senator will yield for a question.

Mr. EXON. Yes, I am happy to yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. DORGAN. I have listened to some of the debate on this issue, and I have heard some say, Gee, I do not necessarily oppose what you are trying to do, but maybe this is not the place or time to do it. That is always an interesting discussion. I understand that one can make a stronger or weaker case against doing something like this on one bill or another. But the fact is that the ultimate—it seems to me that the ultimate rule and the ultimate circumstance, which is that we ought to live the way everybody else does in this country, would be to have a budget process that says when you come here with a budget, let us, if we are going to pass a constitutional amendment—and I think we will—to balance the budget, and let us require the budget document itself to get us to that point.

In other words, if you bring a road map to the floor of the Senate that is purported to be the budget but never gets to the destination, of what value is the map? And the Senator from Nebraska, who I think has been one of the most consistent voices on this subject over the years, I think, does a service by raising the question. I assume if the Senator from Nebraska loses the vote here because some people say, Gee, this is a great idea but the wrong place, I assume we will see it again. I hope we see it again.

I fully intend to vote for it, because I do not think this is a question of what place you put this in the process. The question is whether this makes sense in the context of what we are about to embark on this year as a body. The answer clearly is yes. It makes perfect sense, and it makes perfect sense to do now, this minute. I wanted to state that the Senator has done a service, I think, by offering this.

I hope my colleagues will look at the merits of this and say: Gee, this makes a lot of sense. If we are going to put out a budget map here, let us have a destination on the map that gets us to what all the American people want—that is, a balanced budget.

I will frame it in a question. As I have understood the debate, is it the understanding of the Senator from Nebraska that there seems to be a fair amount, at least, of sympathy with this amendment, but some are saying, Gee maybe we cannot vote for it because it is the wrong time? Will the Senator once again explain, is there a better time anywhere he knows of than to pass this at this moment?

(Mr. THOMAS assumed the Chair.)

Mr. EXON. In answer to my friend from North Dakota, I do not know of a better time or a more appropriate time, as I have said. Since we are talking about making laws that we apply to others apply to ourselves, what more important law is there than a constitutional amendment?

I simply say that I thank my friend from North Dakota for his kind remarks. I must say to him that this Senator was somewhat surprised to find opposition to this amendment, because I felt that this amendment would pass overwhelmingly since we had almost two-thirds of the Senate vote for a constitutional amendment to balance the budget last year. Then I heard about the fact that there may be a point of order raised against the amendment, since it was not particularly germane, as the rules of the Senate so indicate, so therefore I moved to waive that. We have to have 60 votes now to even have an up-or-down vote on the Exon amendment. I was quite surprised because I thought the opposition to the Exon amendment would come from the relatively few Members of the U.S. Senate that traditionally have stood against passing a constitutional amendment to balance the budget.

And there are some legitimate reasons that those people have, and very well thought of Members of this Senate. I do not suppose there is a better constitutional lawyer in this body than Senator BYRD of West Virginia. He is fundamentally opposed to a constitutional amendment to balance the Federal budget. He has pointed out in several speeches that I have heard him give that, while it is true that you have this in some of the States, it does not and should not apply in the Congress of the United States.

To answer the Senator's question, I am somewhat mystified at the opposition that has arisen to this, since I thought two-thirds of the people were for a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. I am, therefore, very concerned about the fact, I must tell my friend from North Dakota, that possibly some of our colleagues are for the constitutional amendment to balance the budget but do not want to spell out the hard choices that are going to have to be made.

So I will simply say, in answer to another question that the Senator from North Dakota raised, if the Exon amendment is defeated in any fashion on this particular measure, I assure my friend from North Dakota that it will, in the words of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, come up again and again and again. So there will be chances for people to vote on this again if it fails today.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, if I might ask the Senator from Nebraska to yield one more moment, just for one additional question.

Mr. EXON. Yes.

Mr. DORGAN. The prospect here of voting today and deciding not to sup-

port this, as the Senator has said, will produce this same amendment in the future. I am pleased to hear him say that.

I think all of us probably agree that a balanced budget—that is, a zero balance—is not necessarily nirvana somewhere out there.

I did not used to think we should change the Constitution to do this, as a matter of fact. But year after year after year of a budget that is fundamentally out of balance with respect to operating budget deficits, that cannot continue. That hurts this country. And I decided some years ago, gee, I mean, we do not have much choice.

But we could change the Constitution at 2:15, 3 minutes from now, and it will do nothing, nothing, to balance the budget. We will simply have changed the Constitution to require a balanced budget, and then others will have to find ways to achieve those ends.

I must also say to you that I would not care at all if we had a budget deficit that was \$300 billion this year if that budget deficit, by its expenditure, had cured cancer, as an example. Spend \$300 billion you do not have and cure cancer. Is that a good investment? Your darn right it is a good investment. It would not bother me a bit.

But the billions of dollars, hundreds of billions of dollars, that we are now spending that we do not have are not investments. They are operating budget deficits, year after year, that cannot continue. If this were an investment, it would be one thing. But it is not an investment, it is the operating budget. And it is, in my judgment, impeding this country's economy and opportunity.

So that is why I support what the Senator is doing. I hope, Mr. President, the Senator will prevail today. If not, I hope the Senator will tell us how soon he will be back to give us the opportunity to do this once again.

Mr. EXON. I thank my friend from North Dakota.

Let me say, in probably closing debate, since I am ready to vote on this at the pleasure of the majority leader, the Senator is certainly right. The balanced budget amendment does not in and of itself balance a budget. And that needs to be said time and time again. We will need, sooner or later, an amendment just like mine if we are ever going to balance the budget.

When the Senator was talking about—and I thought he made an excellent point—if we had a \$200 or \$300 billion deficit and we had cured cancer as a result of it, I think we would all vote for it. But the deficit has become a way of life, unfortunately.

Not only is the budget deficit something that we talk about—and I think we should have possibly a better understanding by the American people of this addition to the problem of the annual deficits in the billions of dollars; that is only part of the problem. The real problem is, at the end of each and

every fiscal year, we take whatever the deficit is and we get rid of it. It goes away. Where does it go? On the national debt.

I find many times that many people simply have not taken the time to address the fact that they hear about billions and billions of dollars, between a \$100 billion and a \$350 billion deficit, and that is only for 1 year. All of that, of course, goes on to the national debt at the end of every fiscal year.

So we not only have the annual deficit to worry about, we have the absolutely skyrocketing national debt of the United States that, of course, is the accumulation of all the deficits over the years.

At the present time, that national debt stands at \$4.7 trillion. Interest alone on the national debt that, once again, is the accumulation of the annual fiscal year deficits, is the fastest growing part of the debt—not welfare, not food stamps, not even national defense. The fastest growing part of the drain on your tax dollars is interest on the national debt.

I thought the President explained it pretty well recently in a speech when he said that very shortly, when you pay your income taxes in April 1995, 28 cents—28 cents—of every dollar that is paid in taxes by the American people next April 15 goes directly to pay interest on the national debt which, of course, is the accumulation of the annual deficits. I wonder how many Americans fully understand that.

Not only is that a serious problem, but I say to you that as far as we can see into the future—and even the projections into the future by the year 2002, where we are going to have annual deficits in the \$200 billion to \$350 billion range annually—that national debt that is already at \$4.7 trillion is clearly going to go up at the rate of \$200 to \$300 to \$350 billion a year, if and when we pass the constitutional amendment to balance the budget, and if and when we ever line up how we are going to reach that by the 2002 date.

Another way of saying that is under the best scenario, the most optimistic scenario, we are going to see the national debt go from \$4.7 to \$6 or \$7 trillion while we are twiddling our thumbs here and debating whether or not an amendment to put teeth in the balanced budget amendment is germane on a bill before the U.S. Senate.

It does not make any sense to me. I do not think it will make any sense to the American people when they understand it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, pursuant to the majority leader's request, with the approval, I believe, of the Democratic leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on or in relation to the motion to waive the

Budget Act with respect to the Exon amendment at 2:30 today, with the time between now and 2:30 equally divided between Senator EXON and Senator GRASSLEY.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I do not object. I agree to the unanimous-consent request offered by my colleague from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? If not, without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask that the time be equally divided.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. 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. EXON. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from North Dakota whatever time he desires.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

I have come to the floor to commend the Senator for what I think is an excellent amendment, precisely the kind of amendment we ought to consider and we ought to support today. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska has offered an amendment which says simply and clearly and powerfully, that if we are going to pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, something that I support, that we ought to match our words and our deeds.

That is precisely what the Senator from Nebraska has put before this body. Mr. President, that is what the underlying legislation is all about. Matching words with deeds. Holding Congress accountable. Having Congress follow the laws that it writes. Nothing could be more important with respect to a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution than that we actually start to write a balanced budget. Not just pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, and then do the same old thing and not start to actually balance the budget. The easiest thing in the world is to pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution and then do nothing to start balancing the budget. I cannot think of anything that would be more destructive of public trust than to engage in that kind of cruel public hoax. That is precisely what could happen here.

We all know what is politically easy and what is politically hard. What is politically easy is to stand up and say "I'm for a balanced budget;" what is politically hard is to actually do the work of balancing the budget. That is what is challenging. That is what is difficult. That is what is politically hard to do.

The Senator from Nebraska says "Yes, let's have a balanced budget amendment; but beyond that, let's ac-

tually start to balance the budget." What a novel idea. Mr. President, it is precisely what we ought to do. That is exactly what we ought to do. I cannot think of anything that would give this country more confidence in what we are doing than that.

Now, Mr. President, one of the things I am concerned about as I watch this debate is we talk about balancing the budget, but we rarely talk about why we should balance the budget. It is not just because it makes us feel good. It is not just because you should match what you spend with what you take in. It is because balancing the budget has real economic consequences that are positive for this country. It makes a difference in the lives of people.

Mr. President, we got the evidence today of a package we passed 2 years ago doing something positive in the lives of people. Just today we received news of what has happened with the unemployment rate in this country. It has dropped to 5.4 percent, the lowest level in 4 years, and 3.5 million jobs were created in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. The remaining 3 minutes belongs to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we might extend the time by 10 minutes, to be equally divided.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota.

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

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I yield whatever time is remaining to me to my colleague from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

As I was pointing out, 3.5 million jobs were created in 1994—3.5 million. I believe one of the key reasons is that a number of us had the courage to vote for a budget package 2 years ago that reduced the deficit by over \$500 billion over the next 5 years. Because we did that, because we cut spending, and, yes, raised taxes on the wealthiest 1 percent among us, the result was a reduced deficit. The result of that was renewed economic growth in this country, increased job creation, and a much stronger economy.

That is why we need to move toward a balanced budget, because it will take pressure off of interest rates. It will allow this economy to continue to grow. It will allow this country to get back on track. That is why the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska is so important.

Mr. President, I thank, again, the Senator from Nebraska.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, how much time is remaining on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five and one-half minutes for the Senator from Iowa and 1 minute and 14 seconds for the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield back the remaining time on this side.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I yield back the time remaining on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to waive section 306 of the Budget Act.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND], the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] are necessary absent.

Mr. BREAU. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN], the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMBERS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] would vote "yea."

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 30, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 4 Leg.]

YEAS—30

Akaka	Dodd	Kohl
Baucus	Dorgan	Lautenberg
Bingaman	Exon	Mikulski
Bradley	Feingold	Moseley-Braun
Breaux	Feinstein	Moynihan
Bryan	Graham	Murray
Byrd	Harkin	Pell
Campbell	Inouye	Pryor
Conrad	Johnston	Reid
Daschle	Kerry	Simon

NAYS—53

Abraham	Gorton	Nickles
Ashcroft	Grams	Packwood
Bennett	Grassley	Pressler
Brown	Gregg	Roth
Burns	Hatch	Santorum
Chafee	Hatfield	Sarbanes
Coats	Helms	Shelby
Cochran	Hutchison	Simpson
Cohen	Inhofe	Smith
Coverdell	Jeffords	Snowe
Craig	Kassebaum	Specter
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Stevens
DeWine	Kyl	Thomas
Dole	Lott	Thompson
Domenici	Lugar	Thurmond
Faircloth	Mack	Warner
Frist	McConnell	Wellstone
Glenn	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—17

Biden	Bumpers	Heflin
Bond	Ford	Hollings
Boxer	Gramm	Kennedy

Kerrey	Lieberman	Robb
Leahy	McCain	Rockefeller
Levin	Numm	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 30, the nays are 53. Three-fifths of the Senators duly sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska deals with a matter within the jurisdiction of the Senate Budget Committee. It is being offered to a bill that was not reported by that committee in violation of section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act.

The point of order is sustained. The amendment fails.

Mr. SIMON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator seeking consent to set aside the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 7

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding the Bridgestone/Firestone dispute)

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON], for himself, Mr. GLENN, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, and Mr. FEINGOLD proposes an amendment numbered 7.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:
SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—
(1) Bridgestone/Firestone, a subsidiary of foreign owned Bridgestone Corp., has recently announced its decision to hire permanent replacement workers displacing more than 2,000 American workers;

(2) this action may result in the largest permanent displacement of workers in over a decade;

(3) the practice of hiring permanent replacement workers is devastating, not only to the replaced workers, but also to their families and communities;

(4) the position of management of foreign owned Bridgestone/Firestone appears to be that they cannot compete with their American owned competitor, Goodyear, if they provide wages, benefits, and conditions of employment patterned after those provided by Goodyear;

(5) hiring permanent replacement workers is illegal under the laws of the parent company's own country; and

(6) most of the United States' major trading partners, including Japan, Germany, France, and Canada, recognize that using permanent replacements is bad business and bad public policy.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) Bridgestone/Firestone should reconsider its decision to hire permanent replacement workers and return to the bargaining table and bargain in good faith with the United Rubberworkers of America, the representative of their employees; and

(2) the Clinton Administration, working through the appropriate diplomatic channels and using the appropriate trade negotiations, should impress upon the parent company's home government the concern of the United States over this matter and seek their assistance in getting Bridgestone/Firestone to reconsider their decision.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I offer this amendment on behalf of Senator GLENN, Senator HARKIN, Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN, Senator FEINGOLD, and myself. And I believe I am willing to enter into a time agreement on that. I am checking with Senator DASCHLE on my side on the time agreement and I should know that very shortly.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SIMON. I will be pleased to yield.

Mr. BYRD. Before we will be able to enter into a time agreement, some of us would like to know what the amendment does. We did not let the clerk read it.

Mr. SIMON. I did not let the clerk read it but I will be happy to explain the amendment.

Mr. BYRD. May I hear that before we are asked to enter into an agreement?

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, this is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution regarding a strike situation that we face in this country. Bridgestone/Firestone is a company wholly owned by a Japanese corporation. They bought Firestone, merged the two companies. They have had a strike on since July. And back, I guess about a month ago, Senator GLENN and Senator HARKIN and Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN and several of us met with the Japanese Ambassador and urged that they negotiate, that they sit down and negotiate.

I, frankly, do not know, in terms of the dispute between labor and management, which side is right. What I do know is that they ought to sit down and negotiate. But the Bridgestone/Firestone has announced they are going to fire all the strikers and permanently replace them. That is—I have been doing some checking—we have had only two precedents like that since the 1930's. We have had no striker replacement law, as Western Europe and Canada and the other countries do, but we have had a tradition that you do not do that. And this resolution simply says to the corporation: Sit down and negotiate, rather than just firing several thousand workers.

I would hope that we could adopt this resolution. My friend from Iowa indicates that he has some concerns, otherwise we could adopt it by voice vote. That is basically the situation.

Let me point out one other thing. This is a Japanese—wholly-owned Japanese firm now. In Japan it would be illegal for them to do what they are doing in Illinois, in Iowa, in Oklahoma, Ohio, and Indiana. My hope is that this

sense-of-the-Senate resolution could be adopted and that we can move forward. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the sense-of-the-Senate amendment of my colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois, [Mr. SIMON], and to give some background on this issue. It is something that has troubled us greatly and that I believe is a matter that really boils down to good corporate citizenship.

Mr. President, some 4,000 members of the United Rubber Workers, including 1,250 members of local 713 in Decatur, IL, have been exercising their right to strike against the Bridgestone/Firestone company which is, as Senator SIMON indicated, a foreign-owned corporation. The strike began when, after months of negotiations, the company refused to accept a contract that was similar to the contract the United Rubber Workers had negotiated with Goodyear, which is an American company. Throughout the duration of the strike the United Rubber Workers have maintained a willingness to bargain with Bridgestone/Firestone to attempt to resolve their differences. In fact, earlier this week the URW bargaining committee notified Bridgestone/Firestone that it would be meeting with Federal mediators in an effort to resume bargaining and to end the work stoppage.

Unfortunately, the company has not shown the same willingness to negotiate in good faith. In fact, some 2 days ago the company informed its workers that they will be permanently replaced as a result of this ongoing dispute. A number of Senators and I, whose workers are affected by this strike, have done everything we can, everything possible, to try to help resolve this dispute. In fact, just this afternoon I called on and had a conversation with some of our trade negotiators, to see to it that these kinds of issues of the conduct, the corporate citizenship of foreign companies doing business here in America, was an issue that would be brought up in their trade discussions and negotiations in future times. We will see how that plays out.

But the point is, without giving a long speech about this because I understand there are others who want to speak to this issue, this company is doing to American workers what American companies cannot do, or have not done, to American workers, by and large. Senator SIMON has discovered one tiny precedent of similarity in one instance. But by and large, in this industry, what is going on here is quite extraordinary. While on the one hand we do not want to get in a situation in which investment by foreign companies is discouraged—we want to encourage investment, we want to encourage participation—we certainly want to encourage positive relations with our

companies from whatever part of the world they may come, the fact is that when one is doing business here in the United States it is only appropriate and only a function of good corporate citizenship that one does business in keeping with the values and the tradition and the fair play that American workers, I think, have every right to expect.

We do not have a striker replacement law in this country but we know for a fact it is against the law to fire a worker for exercising the right to strike. It is not against the law to permanently replace that worker. But at the same time, to have permanent replacement resorted to as a measure by corporate leadership in an instance in which it would not happen if it were an American company, or has not happened in certain similarly situated American companies, sours the atmosphere and sets an unfortunate precedent that I hope the leadership of Bridgestone/Firestone would take a good hard look at and reconsider.

Mr. President, with that I encourage my colleagues to support this sense-of-the-Senate resolution and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I rise to support the actions being taken by Senator SIMON. It is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution. Certainly we would not be willing to vote today to do exactly the opposite and to say no, we do not think there should be any more negotiations; no, we think it should be final. Even Japanese law, it was pointed out here, in the home country of Japan—this is a wholly-owned Japanese corporation now—but the law in Japan would prevent them from doing exactly what we are doing here, even though we have yet to put into place any striker replacement legislation in this country.

So surely we do not go the opposite tack and say, "No. We don't think there should be any more negotiation." We do quite the opposite. We say, "Look, it is never too late." And while we cannot take sides in this as U.S. Senators and come down on exactly what the final solution would be, surely it is within our responsibility to our people in our respective States and this country to say, "Look, don't just give up on this thing. At least sit down and talk about it some more." I know it has been a long discussion. They have had long negotiations. But sometimes just when things look the blackest in the negotiation is when real progress can be made.

I hope this is not just a negotiating ploy. I do not think it is. I think Bridgestone/Firestone is serious about this, and that makes it all the more incumbent upon us to take some action here on the Senate floor.

So I had real hope after we met with the Japanese Ambassador that he was going to use his good offices to do everything he possibly could. Perhaps he

did. I certainly will not say that he did not do everything that he could possibly do. But what we are saying is, in the interest of fairness to our workers and in the interest of even the company adhering to what the Japanese law is, sit down again and let us see if we cannot work this thing out before we go through the throes of seeing some 2,000-plus American workers being tossed out permanently. I think that would be too bad.

I want to compliment Senator SIMON for taking the lead on this and am glad to support his sense-of-the-Senate resolution.

Mr. SIMON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SIMON. I thank Senator GLENN.

Mr. President, let me just add one other point. In addition to the labor-management factor here, I think the other factor is United States-Japan relations. This is not the kind of thing that is going to help relations between our two countries.

So I hope that, if we adopt this resolution—and I hope we do—that the corporation would take another look at this. This is not good for United States-Japan relations as well as not good for the future of this corporation, Bridgestone/Firestone. The rubber workers have taken the position they should have the same contract as they do with the Firestone competitor, Goodyear. I do not know whether they are right or wrong. That is not the point. All we say is sit down and negotiate and see if this can be worked out.

Mr. President, if no one else seeks the floor, I question the presence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time prior to a motion to table the Simon amendment be as follows: 5 minutes under the control of myself, 20 minutes under the control of Senator SIMON; and, further, at the conclusion or yielding back of time, the majority leader or his designee be recognized to make a motion to table the Simon amendment.

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

Who yields time?

Mr. SIMON. I say to my colleague from Iowa, if he is going to yield his time, I am willing to yield my time and proceed to a vote.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Except for Senator KASSEBAUM to speak a few moments, as she put it, we will do that.

Mr. SIMON. I always welcome Senator KASSEBAUM's speech.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield such time as she might consume

to the distinguished Senator from Kansas, NANCY KASSEBAUM.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM], is recognized.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I appreciate that. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Illinois as well. As he knows, I have some strong views on this issue that I would like to express. I can certainly appreciate the points of view of the Senators from Illinois, Senators MOSELEY-BRAUN and SIMON. But I have to rise in strong opposition to the resolution that has been offered by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to the resolution offered by the Senator from Illinois. The Senator's resolution expresses the sense of the Senate that Bridgestone/Firestone Tire Co. should not use permanent replacements for workers on strike in a labor dispute in Ohio, Oklahoma, Indiana, and Illinois.

Mr. President, we have been through this argument on the floor, and it is well understood by most everyone here.

The Congressional Accountability Act passed the House of Representatives on a unanimous vote 2 days ago, and now we are here on a late Friday afternoon with a sense-of-the-Senate resolution on an enormously important issue that does not relate in any way to the Congressional Accountability Act.

I know the Senator from Illinois is well-intentioned. But this is neither the time nor the place for Congress to be considering anything other than this very important bill which is before us—the Congressional Accountability Act.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois is completely extraneous from the matter at hand, and for that reason alone I believe the Senate should table his amendment.

Not only is the amendment inappropriate and untimely, but it is also wrong on the substance as well.

Just for a moment, if I may reiterate what we have talked about before in the debate on this issue, Congress should not take sides in a private labor dispute as this amendment clearly does. We should not take sides in a private dispute.

Because we have many new Members in this body, I think it might be helpful to provide a brief background on our Federal labor laws. It has been established Federal labor law for over 50 years that labor has the right to strike, and companies have the right to continue operating during the strike. On rare occasions, this may require hiring permanent replacements.

These competing rights, and the risks they entail, enable the parties to settle the overwhelming number of labor disputes at the bargaining table which is the way I believe strongly they should be resolved.

Without the ability to hire permanent replacements, labor could strike at any time, for any reason, without any risk. It really disrupts completely. I would argue that the balance is a difficult one, but I think a fair balance.

The compelling nature of these arguments led the Senate to defeat legislation—S. 55—during both the 102d and 103d Congress. S. 55 would have prohibited employers from hiring permanent replacements during an economic strike. So the law is clear the employers may hire permanent replacements during economic strikes.

Mr. President, Congress established the private collective bargaining system to facilitate the peaceful resolution of labor disputes. We leave it to the parties to decide for themselves what a fair deal is.

As difficult as it may be—and each of us has had these disputes in our own States and we wish we could do something that could bring it to a resolution, but as sure as we start down that path, we will all regret it and all the parties to those labor disputes will regret it as well.

It is not for this body to decide whether Bridgestone is justified in hiring permanent replacements during the course of their current labor dispute. We are not the arbiters of labor disputes in the U.S. Senate, and we do not judge the fairness of any of the terms of a particular labor agreement.

Mr. President, it is improper for the Senate to single out one company and attempt to influence a private labor dispute. Regardless of the merits on either side, we do not negotiate collective bargaining agreements in the Senate. There is a good reason for this.

We would be establishing a dangerous precedent if we approved this sense-of-the-Senate resolution, because we would be opening ourselves up to debating the merits of very single labor disputes. In fact, we would see a virtual parade of labor and management groups coming to Capitol Hill seeking to gain a bargaining advantage through congressional action. We do not want to start that kind of precedent.

Mr. President, I am also perplexed by the language in the resolution that compares the laws of the United States and Japan. The resolution seems to suggest that there is something wrong with Bridgestone, a Japanese-owned company, following the laws of the United States, because using permanent replacements would be illegal in Japan.

Companies doing business in the United States are supposed to follow our laws. We demand that they follow our laws, whether they are owned by the Japanese or by Americans. So the fact that Japanese law does not allow permanent replacements is totally irrelevant.

The irony, of course, is that often we complain that American companies export jobs overseas. In this case, a Japanese company bought an American

company—Firestone—and invested billions of dollars in an American company to make it financially viable. I think we want to encourage that kind of investment.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, let me say in response to my colleague from Kansas, that we are not passing the law on striker replacement. This is simply a sense of the Senate stating they ought to sit down and work these things out. We do have traditions of not hiring permanent replacements for strikers. And as far as interfering in a labor-management situation, we have passed a lot of resolutions on these, including specific legislation. This is not legislation. We have, on at least three occasions that I know of, passed legislation dictating what is going to happen in railroad strikes, since I have been in the Senate. And since my colleague from Kansas has been here longer, she has probably voted for more than three of these.

This is only a sense-of-the-Senate resolution urging the two parties to sit down and work things out. We do not take sides. We do not say one side is right and one side is wrong. We do say that firing these thousands of workers who are on strike is not the direction we think they should go. I have participated in the striker replacement legislation, and I think everyone here on the floor said we do not think this is the way people should go, even though that ultimate right should be there for employers.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SIMON. I yield, of course, to my colleague from Illinois.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Is it not a fact that the parties are refusing to negotiate or even discuss the contractual issues at this time?

Mr. SIMON. That is correct.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Is it not also a fact that this sense-of-the-Senate resolution, which is not now legislation, simply calls on the company to discuss the issues with its workers?

Mr. SIMON. And to negotiate, that is correct.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Is it not also a fact that the American company with which this company is the competition has already reached closure on the issues that are currently at issue here?

Mr. SIMON. That is correct.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Is it not also a fact that you have taken this opportunity on this bill—and I understand the Senator from Kansas is concerned about this coming in the middle of the Congressional Accountability Act, and I think we are all concerned about that and would like to see this legislation resolved. But at the same time, given the enormity of the concern of the company and the workers, is it not a fact that time is of the essence and this was an opportunity to move on this issue in order to facilitate—or at least encourage—that such discussions take place over the weekend?

Mr. SIMON. Absolutely. In terms of cluttering up this bill, as the Senator

from Kansas indicated, if she will indicate to me that she will be happy to support this legislation if we introduce it independently and not on this bill, I will be happy to withdraw it, and we will bring it up independently.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, if I may respond. I must say that I am very sensitive to the concerns the Senator has with an industry that is facing some real turmoil in his State and other States. I realize it is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, and it applies specifically to one private company. When you mention the railroad strikes, just to draw a distinction, that was a strike that affected the whole country and was of national concern. Even then we were sensitive to intrusion by Congress.

The reason I went over the striker replacement issue is because you address it in the sense-of-the-Senate resolution. In many ways I would say I am sympathetic. But I do not think that we should address it here in the United States Congress. It opens every other private labor-management dispute to our wanting to try to address it from Washington and intruding on what is a private bargaining position. That is my concern. I thank the Senator from Illinois, even though I recognize Senator SIMON's and Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN's interest in the issue.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I am a great believer in sitting down and working things out. Any time anybody in this body wants to put up a resolution for any corporation where there is a strike resolution, encouraging both sides to sit down, I am willing to support it. I think that is a sensible position for the U.S. Senate to take.

Let me add that I am willing to vote soon. I understand Senator HARKIN is on his way over here to speak. I hope we can just give him another minute or two to get over here. I am sure he will speak briefly, because I know some people are anxious to get out of here. I do not want to hold anyone up. If no one else seeks the floor, I will suggest the absence of a quorum for about 3 minutes. If Senator HARKIN is not here, we will move ahead.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SIMON. 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. SIMON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Senator KENNEDY added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I agree with Senator SIMON's interest in encouraging the Bridgestone-Firestone management and labor to return to the bargaining table.

Bridgestone-Firestone is the largest manufacturing employer in Polk County. The recent developments surrounding this 6-month strike are very unfortunate for all concerned. I am a strong supporter of the collective bargaining process, and although companies have the right to replace strikers during an economic strike, it is a tragic decision for the workers and their families. It is not helpful for our economy, and frankly, for that matter, the company.

I am deeply concerned about the workers and their families, and therefore have written a letter to the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service urging them to redouble their efforts and find possible alternatives to bring company and union officials together to bring this dispute to a satisfactory conclusion. Others may want to do the same.

However, as I have voted against all other amendments to the congressional coverage bill, I will vote against this resolution as well. The congressional coverage bill is not the appropriate vehicle.

Mr. SIMON. I am willing to yield back my time and move to a vote.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield back the time on this side.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND], the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. BREAUX. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN], the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. BUMPERS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Sen-

ator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] would each vote "nay."

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

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 23, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 5 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Abraham	Frist	McConnell
Ashcroft	Gorton	Murkowski
Bennett	Graham	Nickles
Breaux	Grams	Packwood
Brown	Grassley	Pressler
Bryan	Gregg	Pryor
Burns	Hatch	Reid
Chafee	Hatfield	Roth
Coats	Helms	Santorum
Cochran	Hutchison	Shelby
Cohen	Inhofe	Simpson
Coverdell	Jeffords	Smith
Craig	Johnston	Snowe
D'Amato	Kassebaum	Stevens
DeWine	Kempthorne	Thomas
Dole	Kyl	Thompson
Domenici	Lott	Thurmond
Faircloth	Lugar	Warner
Feinstein	Mack	

NAYS—23

Akaka	Exon	Moseley-Braun
Baucus	Feingold	Moynihan
Bradley	Glenn	Murray
Byrd	Harkin	Pell
Conrad	Inouye	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kohl	Simon
Dodd	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Dorgan	Mikulski	

NOT VOTING—21

Biden	Gramm	Levin
Bingaman	Heflin	Lieberman
Bond	Hollings	McCain
Boxer	Kennedy	Nunn
Bumpers	Kerrey	Robb
Campbell	Kerry	Rockefeller
Ford	Leahy	Specter

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 7) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HARKIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I was unable to be on the floor prior to the vote to join my colleague from Illinois on this debate on this resolution. But I did want to take a couple minutes now to add my voice in support of the resolution that Senator SIMON offered. I was pleased to be a cosponsor of it.

As Senator SIMON said before the vote, what Bridgestone Corp., a Japanese-owned corporation, is doing with our workers at the Firestone plant in my State of Iowa would be illegal for them to do in their own country. What they want to do with our workers would be illegal in their own country.

Mr. President, I am very close to the Firestone plant in Des Moines, IA. Many of my cousins work there. In the small town of 150 that I come from, almost half the town had worked at Firestone at one time or another. Many of my cousins work there. In fact, I spoke to one just yesterday. He has worked there almost 20 years, has a couple of kids in college, and has given the best

years of his life to Firestone. Now they are told that they can just go take a walk, that they do not have a contract to operate under, and that they have to accede to what I consider to be unconscionable terms that Bridgestone has put up.

I might also point out, Mr. President, and for the benefit of my colleagues here, that the Bridgestone Corp. in Japan also has union employees—Japanese union employees in Japan—and they make tires, just as they do in America. The average annual wage of a Japanese union employee in Japan working for Bridgestone is \$52,500 a year. In the United States, their average wage is \$37,045 a year.

Yet, Bridgestone is telling our people in this country, our workers, that they have to take less money. Is that based on productivity? Hardly. In March of 1994, the workers at the Firestone plant in America reached a new high of 80.5 pounds of rubber tire per man hour and set an all-time record, and they did it with 600 fewer workers. So it is not based on productivity. Bridgestone simply wants to ratchet down the wages of our American workers, even much lower than what they pay their own in Japan.

But most unconscionable, I think, is the kind of work schedule they want to put them on. Understand this: The Bridgestone company has said to the Firestone workers: "We want you to work a 12-hour shift." There would be two 12-hour shifts a day at their plants. But then they would work 3 days on a 12-hour shift, and they would have 2 days off. Then they would work 2 days on a 12-hour shift and have 3 days off. Then they would work 2 days on a 12-hour shift and have 2 days off. Then they would come back around and work 2 days on, 3 days off. You have to have a calculator to calculate when your days off will be.

You might be off one Saturday and not off on another Saturday for 3 weeks. Most of these people have spouses who work and kids in school; they could never plan to be home with their families. And yet the Bridgestone employees in Japan do not work those 12-hour days. They work 8-hour shifts; three 8-hour shifts a day. They know exactly what days they are going to have off.

But Bridgestone is telling our workers: "Forget it; you can't plan any time with your families. You are on this rotating shift of 12 hours a day." And they are going to pay them less money.

So I just want to make these points, Mr. President, because I think we ought to send a signal to Bridgestone Corp. that we just cannot allow our workers in this country to be treated in that manner. We have had a long tradition of collective bargaining in this country. With what is happening now with the replacement of these workers, the right of collective bargaining is a hollow right. The right of collective bargaining takes with it the

right to be able to bargain with whatever power and resources you have. The only power and resource that a worker has in this country is to withhold his or her labor. They have no other bargaining power.

And so if that power then becomes a hollow power; if, in fact, I do exercise my legal right to go on strike and the company says, "Fine, you can do that; then, bang, I will replace you," then, A, there is no real right to strike, and because there is no real right to strike and withhold your labor then, B, there is no real right to collective bargaining any longer in this country.

I said to the replacement workers that were being hired in Des Moines: "You may think you have a good job, but without a contract, you may not have a job next year or next week or even tomorrow." In fact, I have already been contacted by one of those replacement workers who was just fired for the most scant reasons. He said: "I came, I thought I had a good job, and they told me I was fired."

So what is happening to our workers in this country and what Bridgestone is doing to our workers, as Senator SIMON pointed out, is illegal in Japan.

I say to Bridgestone/Firestone that this issue is far from over. The Japanese Prime Minister is coming to this country next week to meet with our President. I intend to take the opportunity, when he is here, to take this floor to speak about this injustice by a Japanese corporation.

Now, I am not blaming the Japanese Prime Minister for this. He may not even know about it. But I want him to know about it. I want him to know what that corporation is doing in this country.

I know the Japanese Prime Minister is interested in good relations between Japan and America. I am, too. I do not want to join those who are bashing Japan. They are a good, strong ally and a good friend of ours. I respect them highly, and I like them. I spent a year and a half of my life living in Japan. But this kind of action by this corporation is unconscionable. I believe that the Government of Japan ought to be looking into what this company is doing with their workers in this country.

So I intend, as I said, Mr. President to take this floor next week when the Prime Minister of Japan is here to once again talk about this company and what it is doing so that he is not mistaken in any way, so that he takes back with him the strong feelings that this Senator and I believe the people I represent have about the gross injustice being perpetrated on the Firestone workers in this country.

Mr. SIMON. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. HARKIN. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. SIMON. I wish to commend him for his statement, and I simply want the officers of that corporation to know this vote today was just the first salvo. This is not the end of the road. The Senator is talking about when the

Japanese Prime Minister is here. I do not know what other opportunities we are going to have. All I know is what has happened is wrong, wrong, wrong. We have to turn it around in some way.

I do not know whether the rubber workers are right in all their requests. I do not know all the things that management has requested. All I know is that the right way to settle this dispute is to sit down and work it out between labor and management, not to hire workers permanently to replace workers of those families the Senator is talking about.

So I commend my colleague, and I look forward to working with him.

Mr. HARKIN. My colleague is absolutely right. In fact, the Department of Labor has had the Federal Mediation Service working on this case for quite some months. They have been working in good faith to try to resolve these differences. They have been very close. There is not that much separating the two parties. I think if Bridgestone/Firestone would in good faith sit down and negotiate, they could reach an amicable settlement of the strike.

Mr. SIMON. The Senator from Iowa is absolutely correct. It is interesting that the former chief executive of the American operation received awards for his labor-management relations and the improvement of productivity that took place. Now, all of a sudden, with the change in executives, things went downhill fast. We have to do what we can to encourage the two sides to get together.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank my colleague. I have a letter to the editor of the Des Moines Register written by a farmer who was commenting on this strike, what Bridgestone was doing.

He said I went out and counted and that he counted his tractors, trucks, wagons, combine, there were over 140 tires. He said that should Bridgestone continue to refuse to negotiate, he would never buy a tire made by them. I would like to ask unanimous consent that a copy of this letter to the editor and several others be included in the record at the conclusion of my statement.

I think that ought to be a signal to Bridgestone/Firestone. There are other tires out there, and I know this Senator and probably a lot of the workers in this country who drive automobiles are going to look askance at Bridgestone/Firestone if they will not sit down and work this thing out and will feel that maybe there are other tires they can buy and maybe there ought to be a boycott against buying tires from Bridgestone/Firestone if they are going to treat our people in this manner.

There being no objection, the letters to the editor were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REGISTER'S READERS SAY—A TIRE COMPANY'S "ASSAULT" ON UNION

The situation at Bridgestone/Firestone has been of great concern to me since the strike began.

It is a continuation of the story family farmers and our laboring friends have experienced since 1980 from those who want cheap raw materials and labor to maximize their profits.

A quick inventory tells me that my tractor, trucks, wagons, combine and cars roll on more than 140 tires. My vow to Bridgestone/Firestone is that if this strike is not settled within 30 days, I will never buy another tire made by them—Joe Weisshaar, *chairman, Iowa Farm Unity Coalition*.

There are many ways to do violence. Twelve workers at Bridgestone/Firestone were fired by the company three days before Christmas as a response to what the company referred to as "acts of violence, threats and aggressive behavior."

I do not condone physical violence and physical threats. Most of us abhor such things as they occur in labor confrontations. However, that is what company officials are counting on in this situation as they commit their own brand of violence by refusing to bargain in good faith for an end to the strike. The company is using its financial might as a club over the workers.

The management of Bridgestone/Firestone wants nothing less than complete capitulation by the members of the United Rubber Workers union. The union is trying to hang on to benefits gained over the years in legitimate negotiating processes.

It behooves the rest of us in the community to understand that what is happening out on Second Avenue in Des Moines and at the other Bridgestone/Firestone locations around the country is an attempt to further erode the rights of workers to maintain some control over their own lives, minds and bodies rather than become the *de facto* property of the company.

Do not be fooled by the actions of the management of Bridgestone/Firestone. It is every bit as violent (and more so) as any act of physical violence on the picket line in its destructive effects on human life.—The Rev. Carlos C. Jayne, *Des Moines Area Urban Mission Council, The United Methodist Church*.

Bridgestone/Firestone's strategy to wear down the striking tire workers is becoming more self-evident: undercut public support by repeatedly making strikers look like the bad guys. Three recent examples are instructive:

(1) In firing 12 union members, a company spokesman cited "violence, threats, and aggressive behavior" as the reason for dismissal.

(2) Firestone's request for an injunction limiting the number of picketers implied that strikers in groups larger than two presented a danger to company employees.

(3) During a peaceful march, when a handful of strike supporters (many from out of state) threw snowballs toward the plant, the company and TV stations described the event as a "riot." This amounted to an absurd exaggeration. But the message to viewers was "These guys are dangerous."

Since the strike began, I have visited the picket line 20 or 30 times and have spoken with maybe 100 striking tire workers. I have yet to meet a single one who condones the isolated acts of violence that have occurred on both sides of the conflict.

In fact, given the financial and emotional hardships they have suffered, the strikers deserve praise for the extent to which they have remained peaceful and nonviolent.

Firestone's focus on violence may sell to the media, but it distracts public attention from the real issue: Management wants more concessions, while the union feels it's already given up enough. Given the workers' solidarity and the fairness of their position, I am convinced this strike will end only when the company agrees to come to the

table and talk.—Ed Fallon, *State representative*.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURNS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak as in morning business.

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

A SIGNIFICANT COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENT

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, as a result of committee assignments announced yesterday, I have the privilege and delight to be a member, for the next 2 years, of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources. I want to take this opportunity to discuss, in general, why I feel that assignment to be so significant and why I feel so privileged to be a member of a committee with the jurisdiction that it possesses. I also want to discuss one specific issue which has been discussed in that committee in the past, which I regard as being of peculiar and special importance.

First, however, I express my delight in being a member of the committee chaired by the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM] who has been, during the course of the last Congress, my seat mate in this part of the body and will continue to be so. I look forward to her leadership and to her wise advice and counsel. Issues which will come before the Labor Committee include many that are of vital concern to all Americans in today's world. These issues include those relating to aging, to disability policies, overwhelmingly to education, to families and children, to employment, and to productivity.

I see two profound tidal changes in American society today that are driving the concerns of millions upon millions of our people. As the United States is in the midst of an inevitable shift of its economic base from an industrial/manufacturing system to an information-based economy, millions of families find their justified expectations shattered and find themselves in a new and very difficult world. This shift gives every promise of being as cataclysmic as the shift from an agrarian-based economy to an industrial-based economy in the latter part of the last century and the beginning of this century.

Understandably, many people are deeply concerned and apprehensive about this change, about the direction in which our country is heading, and

wish that it were not so. It is so, however, and we need to meet that challenge.

The American people understand that the societal contract is changing and that we must change with it. Today, the receipt of a high school diploma, or for that matter a college diploma, lacks the meaning it once had. Some families, some people are stuck on welfare and have few, if any, alternatives which they see as being viable. Today, there is no such thing as guaranteed lifetime employment. Working families find it more and more difficult to get ahead. Sending both parents into the workplace used to be a matter of choice, sometimes as a fulfillment for the second spouse to be employed, sometimes as an option to help a family buy a new home or to take a special trip. Today, for far too many, it is not a choice but a necessity. It makes or breaks a family's budget. And without two paychecks, bills would not be paid and the children might not be fed. Women in the workplace still find themselves stuck in either clerical or middle management positions and their growth stopped dead short by a glass ceiling that has not yet disappeared. Families are still deeply concerned about health care; some cannot change jobs for fear of losing their insurance; others let illness drag on because there is no money to pay in an uninsured situation; and many worry about retirement security. No individual wants to spend his or her golden years being taken care of, being dependent upon their children. But it seems increasingly difficult to save money for retirement.

All of this I believe to be the most significant cause of the consistently found proposition that the majority of the American people feel that the country is moving in the wrong direction, that the programs of this Government do not help, but actually hinder, the ability of our citizens efficiently to manage their lives in a changing economy.

As a result, I am excited and delighted about the challenges and about the prospects of being on a committee that is designed to address precisely these challenges. I believe we need to reorient the programs of the Federal Government to deal with this new reality. Only when this Government understands this changing reality will Americans believe that their Government is once again on the right track. I think the committee and its Members can make a difference.

Beyond my desire to work with my distinguished colleague from Kansas and others on these paramount issues, I am convinced that one of the most important issues facing this country today is the need to educate our children in an environment conducive to learning. In the age of information, nothing—nothing at all—is more important to America's success than a well-educated citizenry.

In that connection, I believe the largest single threat to successful edu-

cation today is the growing spate of violence in our schools.

A year ago this month, I held an education conference in Fife, WA, at which educators and parents from across Washington State spent an entire day discussing what the Federal Government could do to improve our system of education. For the first time in a long career, the No. 1 priority was not more money, it was not more teachers in specific areas, it was not longer school days. The men and women and kids at this conference talked about school violence.

In Washington State, violent crimes by young people have doubled in the past decade in spite of a 3-percent drop in the number of students. Recently, our superintendent of public instruction released a report that calculated a total of 2,237 incidents of firearms or dangerous weapons violations reported by school districts and by private schools. And just today, of course, in the Washington Post, we see of a gun-induced killing at the very door of one of the high schools in the District of Columbia.

Teachers and parents from all around Washington State have shared with me horror stories of violence in their children's schools: First graders threatening their peers with screwdrivers; a fourth grader extorting lunch money at knife point; a sixth grader who brought a fake but real-looking gun to school and threatened fellow students' lives with it.

How can we expect our children to learn calculus and Tolstoy when they are afraid of walking the halls between classes?

On the issue of school violence, the role of the Federal Government has not been a positive one. This Government has not concerned itself sufficiently with the safety of children threatened by these violent students. The Federal Government does not concern themselves with the safety of the faculty and administrators in these schools. It does not seem sufficiently concerned with the disruptive impact of violence in the learning process. In fact, the rules and regulations pursuant to statutes passed by this Congress on the part of the Federal Government has severely limited the ability of local school officials and teachers to deal effectively with violence in our schools. It has, in many respects, tied their hands. It has set up a double standard, depending upon the classification of students in our schools, with respect to the discipline of violent students who bring guns into the schools.

Mr. President, this is profoundly the wrong direction in which to go. I am frustrated because the Federal Government, in fact, is making it far more difficult for communities to create an environment in our schools conducive to learning. As a result, last year, I led a