

frankly, that the President, if that should be part of this bill, even though he needs this emergency supplemental appropriation, would veto it and say give me a clean bill on what we need in the Defense Department. I know that postpones things for the Defense Department, and I know they would not be happy about it, but the better answer is for us not to accept the Kassebaum amendment and to move ahead and maintain this important balance between labor and management that we need in this Nation.

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 legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAIG. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak as in morning business for no longer than 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator is recognized.

THE DAY-TO-DAY ACTIVITIES OF CONGRESS

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I have before me at this moment the National Journal's Congressional Daily. It is a report of the activities of Congress on a daily basis, referring to what committees are doing both in the House and the Senate and also reporting on the executive branch of Government. It is one of those documents that many of us often refer to as an accurate accounting of the day-to-day activities of the U.S. Congress.

I thought it was appropriate to bring before us at this time. A week ago, we finalized debate and voted on a balanced budget amendment to our Constitution. At that time, we failed to get the necessary 67 votes by 1 vote. Immediately following that, we saw a precipitous drop in the value of the dollar on world currency markets, which actually continued through most of this week, only to be abated by Alan Greenspan coming to Capitol Hill and talking to a House committee on the need for congressional action as it relates to deficit reduction. That seemed to, at least for a time, level out the decline of the dollar.

One of the things that has concerned me—and I see the Senator from Illinois on the floor at this moment, who was one of the major leaders in the balanced budget amendment issue—and has concerned the Senator from Illinois for so long is the inability of Congress to manage the deficit. And even though there have been many tries made over the last several years, it was this inability that brought me, several years ago, to the conclusion that only a con-

stitutional amendment to balance the budget would change this scenario.

I am not going to speak of the intentions of this President, but I will only say that this President, since he came to office, convinced this Congress that with a major tax increase in what was called a deficit reduction package, that he could reduce the deficit, he could control the out-of-control Federal budget.

Yet, this year we saw this President bring to the Hill a budget that is not reflective of a declining deficit. In fact, most assume that this administration has largely given up on their ability to bring the deficit near balance and that it is now moving up again. The reason I thought it was appropriate at this moment to mention that is that, in today's Congressional Daily, it says President Clinton's fiscal 1996 budget would cause the Federal deficit to climb \$82 billion higher by the year 2000 than the administration has estimated, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

The article goes on to talk about preliminary studies or examinations which show that, by 2000, the deficit will still be in the \$276 billion-and-climbing range.

The point I want to make is very simple. Once again, it is clearly reflective that this Congress and this President cannot and have not been able to control the Federal deficit. While this President may have tried, it is obvious that, under their own budget figures, whether it is lack of an adequate estimate or whether simply a failure to make the necessary cuts, he, too, is missing a Federal budget deficit projection in his own budgets by \$82 billion.

That is a phenomenal amount of money under anyone's estimation and certainly it is by ours. If the budget were out of balance by \$82 billion, then I think the Senator from Illinois and I would say, well, that is a major and a good-faith effort. But this is the estimate of a budget that is out of balance by nearly \$300 billion, as it will be \$82 billion higher.

Those are the problems we face that I think so clearly dramatize, day after day, year after year, why we need a constitutional amendment to balance the Federal budget.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I want to join my colleague from Idaho in his efforts in this area. I would give the President a little more credit than he might in terms of what the President did in 1993. There is no question we made some progress on the deficit.

But the budget that has been submitted by the administration is illustrative of the fact that these things kind of ebb and flow. They go up and down like a roller coaster. Right now, I think the mood in Congress, after our lengthy discussion of the constitutional amendment, is we want to do something. And I think we may pass some statutory action to move us in that direction. I have no confidence, however, that statutory action this

time, any more than in the past, is going to get us there. Because while today the mood is "Let's do something about the deficit," tomorrow, who knows what the mood will be? And so we will move away from that.

So I join my colleague in believing that that is the direction in which we have to go and one of these days, I believe it will happen.

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

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator withhold?

Mr. SIMON. I withdraw my request.

(Mr. CRAIG assumed the chair.)

BALANCING THE BUDGET

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, may I suggest to both of my good friends, the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Illinois, why do we not just quit talking about the balanced budget amendment and get on with balancing the budget?

The President has proposed an \$83 billion tax cut. Let us vote it down. The Republicans, in their so-called Contract With America, have urged that we have something like a \$200 billion tax cut. Let us also vote that down. Let us get out here and say that we are against any tax cuts at this time.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. No, I am not ready to yield just yet.

Let us say we are against tax cuts; just vote them both down. This is no time to talk about tax cuts while balancing the budget.

We are all concerned about budget deficits. We are concerned about passing this huge debt on to our children and grandchildren. Let us do something about it. Let us do it now.

We have heard the advertisement on TV, "Do it here. Do it now." Let us vote down both proposals for tax cuts. Why do we not consider a tax increase? Let us increase taxes. Surely, we could sit down and, working together, could come up with a reasonable tax increase that would be calculated and directed toward reducing the deficits.

We have operated on a national credit card now for 14 years. During the 12 years of the Reagan and Bush administrations, we were on a national credit card binge: Enjoy today, pay later. Let our children and grandchildren pay for our profligacy. Live for today.

One can only cry so much over spilt milk, and it does not do any good after awhile. So why do we not just get on with balancing the budget? Let us help this President. Let us help him to balance the budget. First of all, vote his \$83-billion tax cut down.

I have been somewhat critical of the tax cut that the President has advocated. I try to be constructive about it. But I think we also ought to be critical of the more-than-\$200-billion tax cut

that is being advocated by our Republican friends. That is not going to balance the budget.

"Oh," they say, "we will offset our tax cut. We can find \$189 billion to offset it." Let us take a look at what they are going to offset, first, Mr. President. And then, whatever can be offset, whatever can be reasonably offset, let us apply that to the deficit.

Now, the Senator asked me to yield.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from West Virginia for yielding.

The Senator asked a question, and the question was: Why not pass a tax increase? I suggest to the Senator from West Virginia that we passed, under the Clinton budget in 1993, what has been characterized as the largest single tax increase in our Nation's history.

All too often, we go back and say what a great job the administration did and we have these wonderful reductions in the deficit. I suggest to the Senator from West Virginia that a lot of people out there are learning that that kind of talk is not being very honest.

There was an article in Reader's Digest, I believe it was last December, the name of which was "Budget Baloney." In that article, they said, to let you know how they do things in Washington, a guy who has \$5,000 who wants a \$10,000 car, all he does is say, "Well, I really wanted a \$15,000 car, but I settled on a \$10,000 car. So I reduced the deficit by \$5,000."

We played games for so long that I think we have an awareness and an understanding by the public out there that they did not have in years past.

I can recall one of your very good friends that you served with, Senator Carl Curtis of Nebraska, way back in 1972 was trying so hard to convince the American people that we could not continue on this road of increased deficits. Our deficit in 1972 was \$15 billion. I remember this so well, because they tried to get the people of America to understand how significant the debt was, and they stacked up \$1,000 bills until they were the height of the Empire State Building to try to impress upon people how significant the debt was. The debt at that time, in 1972, was \$240 billion.

The first question you asked was, you know, why do we not do something about it if we want to reduce the deficit? That is a very legitimate question.

But I think that we, in the two bodies here in Congress, have demonstrated over the past 40 years that we are incapable of doing it without having some type of discipline there that we are forced to adhere to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Here we go again, saying that we need some kind of discipline to force us to act.

I do not know when we are going to stop breaking the mirror in the Alice in Wonderland story.

The Senator says we passed—we passed in 1993—the greatest tax increase. No, "we" did not pass it. Not a Senator on that side of the aisle voted for that tax increase. Not a Senator. Not a House Member on the Republican side of the aisle voted for that tax increase. Moreover, not one Republican on the Senator's side of the aisle or in the House on the Republican side voted for that same 1993 legislation, which, overall, reduced the budget deficits by somewhere between \$450 billion to \$500 billion. And it really has done better than that. The deficit has decreased 3 consecutive years in a row.

The Senator does not want to vote for a tax increase, but the Senator's party is advocating a tax cut of over \$200 billion.

Now, who can possibly stand with a straight face and say, "Let's cut the deficit," and, at the same time, come in here day after day and talk about the President and how he has failed to cut the deficit, how the President has failed to exemplify leadership, who could do that with a straight face, and then turn around and say, "Let's cut taxes"?

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. Not yet. I will yield in a moment.

The Senator's party is the party that is out here advocating cutting taxes louder than anybody else.

I think it is folly to cut taxes in this climate. It is folly, whether it is my President advocating it, or whether it is the so-called Contract With America. It is silly.

I cannot look my grandchildren in the eye and say "Well, I am for cutting taxes. I would rather have you live with the problems that we leave." I cannot say that to my grandchildren. "I would rather have you live with the problems that we have created in our time. I prefer that you increase taxes in your day and time."

Do not talk to me about cutting taxes. I think that is a bad message.

But we say, "Cut taxes." What utter folly! Now, the Senator's party is advocating cutting taxes. I do not see how they can do that with a straight face and come here on this floor, day after day after day and moan and groan and gnash their teeth over the fact that the balanced budget to the Constitution has been voted down. Now they say that that is the cause of the drop in the dollar. That is the cause of this, that, everything else.

But yet, not a word do they say—not a word—about the \$200-plus billion tax cut that is being advocated by the so-called Contract With America.

Mr. SIMON. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. BYRD. Yes, I will yield in a moment, Mr. President.

Furthermore, I say to my friend from Oklahoma, who says we have played games, we are playing games. Yes, I was here when we played games during the Reagan administration. Read David Stockman's book, and he will tell the Senator from Oklahoma who played

the games down in the Oval Office. He will tell the Senator who played the games in the Reagan administration with hidden asterisks.

I urge all Senators to read David Stockman's book. As a matter of fact, I may bring a portion of it to the floor after a while and read it. It is enlightening. Yes, I was here when the Reagan administration blew into town. And in all of the 39 previous administrations—182 years of administrations under various political parties—the Nation had accumulated a total debt of less than \$1 trillion.

I saw Mr. Reagan get on television with that chart, pointing to that stack of what he called, would represent a stack of \$1,000 bills, "Have a stack four inches thick and you will be a millionaire." He said it would take a stack of \$1,000 bills 63 miles high to be representative of the debt that had been accumulated in all the administrations going back to the year 1789.

He never appeared on television with that chart again, Senator. Know why? Because during his administrations the debt reached to a total of over \$3 trillion, and then, during the Bush administration, it reached \$4 trillion. So, to represent that debt on the chart, with \$1,000 bills stacked into the stratosphere and beyond, would probably require a stack of bills that would reach 252 miles into the sky, or some such.

I saw the debt triple. I saw it quadruple. Further, may I say to the distinguished Senator, I went down to see Mr. Reagan. I urged him not to press for his triple tax cut in 1981. He proposed a 3-year tax cut—the first year 5 percent, the next year 10 percent, and the third year, 10 percent—all in one passage. I urged him to at least leave off the third year until we could evaluate the economy, the deficit, what was happening to the dollar, interest rates, unemployment. At least, leave off the third year and wait 2 years, and then if he felt compelled to go for the third year, then try it. Why go for a 3-year tax cut all at once? He never could tell me why, never. He looked at his little card, the notes on the card, but he never could answer that question.

So now we have the aftermath of the Reagan tax cuts of 1981. I voted for his tax cuts. I have always regretted it. My constituents back home said "Give the man a chance. Give this new President a chance." I gave him a chance. I have regretted it ever since. There is blame enough to go around, Senator.

The Senator from Oklahoma has talked about the last 40 years. Do not go back that far. Just go back to the fiscal year 1981 budget. Start there. Start there and see then what happened.

I yield.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I agree with two-thirds of what my colleague from West Virginia has to say, and he knows I differ on the balanced budget amendment.

I do believe, however, in the immediate choices that we face, one is a tax

cut. I think it makes absolutely no sense. When I was in the House I voted against the Reagan tax cut and I voted against the Democratic tax cut. We were in a bidding war, we are in a bidding war again. I am going to vote against the Republican vote, and I am going to vote against the Democratic tax cut. I do not think they make any sense at all.

In terms of tax increases, I think the political reality is we can only pass them if they are for designated purposes. The American public—if we need it for balancing the budget, it is very interesting—53 percent of the American public says they are for balancing the budget, even if it means they have to sacrifice. I think they are willing to face that.

In 1990, if I may be immodest, I faced reelection. One of the things my opponent, a very distinguished woman who served in the House, Lynn Martin, used against me, is that I said I think we need increases in Federal taxes to balance the budget.

I can remember reading in Roll Call that I was destined to defeat. I ended up getting the biggest plurality of any contested Senator of either political party running for reelection that year. I think people want to be told the truth.

The reality is on tax increases—if we take the 18 Western industrialized countries as a percentage of our income—we pay a lower percentage than any of the other countries. We have the lowest tax on gasoline of any country outside of Saudi Arabia. We have the lowest tax on cigarettes. We do not have a value-added tax that many countries have. But I think the reality is we have to tie any kind of revenue increase with something concrete, like a health program. Or like getting rid of the deficit.

As my colleague who is presiding, Senator CRAIG, knows, I have said all along that I think we have to combine cuts in spending to achieve a balanced budget with increases in revenue. I think that is the reality.

I do believe—and here I differ with my colleague from West Virginia—I do believe the only way we are really going to get a balanced budget is with constitutional restraint. I respect the fact that he and I differ on that question. I thank him for yielding.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator. We do not have to wait. We do not have to wait for a constitutional amendment.

Mr. SIMON. I agree.

Mr. BYRD. Putting that aside entirely, I have many reasons for opposing the constitutional amendment to balance the budget. I am not against amending the Constitution. I have voted for five amendments to the Constitution since I have been in the Senate. Enough of that.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. The framers saw a need for amendments at some point in time, so they provided a way to do that in the Constitution itself. But I am op-

posed to amending the Constitution to write fiscal theory into it, fiscal policy. I am also opposed to destroying our constitutional system of mixed powers and checks and balances by a constitutional amendment to balance the budget.

I respect those who differ with me, but why do we keep on talking about a constitutional amendment? We Senators have as much power as Senators in the year 2002 will have. Why wait?

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I will in a moment. Why wait? Why not do it now? Instead, we continue to hear those who are up here every day pining over the loss of the balanced budget amendment, still bewailing the loss of the constitutional amendment that they say would give us discipline, that would put a little iron in our backbone; that great constitutional amendment, still crying over it, weeping, bemoaning the days of the past when the Senate voted down that monstrosity—killed it.

I hope that Senators will stop whining and weeping and bemoaning that vote. Let us get on with balancing this budget that they want so much to do. Let us get on with doing something for our children and grandchildren, which the Senators say they want so much to do. And, first of all, may I say to my friends on the other side, stop talking about Mr. Clinton until you yourselves are willing to vote for a deficit reduction package that he helped us to work out. You did not demonstrate your willingness to do that.

The Senator from Oklahoma was not here at that time, of course. But Republican Senators did not demonstrate a willingness in 1993 to exercise a little discipline, a little steel in the backbone. They used the excuse, and still use it, that it increased taxes.

I say, let them haul down the banner, haul down their own party banner of a tax cut. It is silly—silly—whether you use the old math or the new math. How in the world can anyone with a straight face get up here day after day and complain about a balanced budget constitutional amendment that was rejected and, at the same time, support a so-called Contract With America that would advocate a \$200-billion-plus tax cut? That is what the Republican leadership is doing, advocating over \$200 billion in tax cuts to the middle class.

If we really mean business about reducing the deficit, that will bring more relief to the middle class and every other class in this country and to our children and to our children's children, let us get on with balancing the budget, and not rule out the raising of taxes. That is a tool that could be used to balance the budget and to decrease the deficit. I am not on the Finance Committee or the Ways and Means Committee, but I certainly am open to suggestions as to how we might enact a tax increase that would be calculated and directed toward reduction of the deficit. There are many people in this country who can afford such a tax. Do

not put the tax option off the table. At least leave it on the table as something to consider.

Yes, I yield.

Mr. INHOFE. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia has asked the question a couple of times that I previously answered, and that question is, What are we doing? I think, I say to the Senator, that if we have demonstrated that we have been incapable of doing it, that we are incapable of facing up to that insatiable appetite for spending money that future generations will have to pay back, year after year after year, then that should be evidence enough the discipline, the word you do not seem to like, is necessary.

Mr. BYRD. Oh, I like the word discipline. I like it. I like the word discipline. I have no problem with the word discipline. Let us discipline ourselves now. Let us not wait until we garble and scar the Constitution waiting on some magic discipline that that might give us. Let us exercise discipline now.

Mr. INHOFE. Let me repeat to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. INHOFE. We have demonstrated we are incapable of doing it—

Mr. BYRD. No, we are not incapable.

Mr. INHOFE. Year after year after year.

Mr. BYRD. No, no.

Mr. INHOFE. Some 48 States—in 1941 in Oklahoma, we were incapable of doing it. We passed a balanced budget amendment and it worked.

I want to address one other thing that you mentioned and—

Mr. BYRD. On that point—Mr. President, I have the floor—on that point about the States, the States do not balance their budgets in the sense that we are talking about balancing the Federal budget. The States have operating budgets. The States have capital budgets, and the Senator knows that. And to use that old canard is to fool the American people. The American people know that the States do not balance their budgets. The States borrow money, the States are in debt, the States are going more and more into debt every year.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield on that?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. INHOFE. They borrow money, but the difference is the States pay the money back.

Mr. BYRD. Oh—

Mr. INHOFE. The cities pay it back. I served in the State legislature.

Mr. BYRD. So did I.

Mr. INHOFE. I served as mayor of a major city, the city of Tulsa, and we have those constraints beyond which we cannot spend. It has worked very effectively. I did not get to the point I wanted to.

Mr. BYRD. On that point, let us stay with that point. I was majority leader when the Governors and the mayors of the country came to Washington with

their hats in their hands and their hands out.

Mr. INHOFE. No, not this mayor. I was a mayor when you were majority leader.

Mr. BYRD. I did not say anything about the Senator. I was saying I was majority leader once. I was majority leader twice, and I saw the Governors of the States and mayors. I talked with them on the telephone. They called me on the telephone. They wanted this help; they wanted this aid; they wanted that aid; they wanted this appropriation increased. Do not talk to me about the great job the mayors and Governors have done throughout this country in balancing their budgets without help from the Federal Government.

Now, that is not to say that mayors and Governors have not taken strong actions to try to curtail expenditures. I do not say that at all. But do not come here trying to tell this Senator that the States balance their budgets. They do not do it, and they get a lot of help from the Federal Government. I know. I have met them right there, back there in my office and right over here in that office when I was leader. Do not tell me that stuff.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BYRD. I know different. Yes, I yield.

Mr. INHOFE. I wanted to address this subject of the tax increase that you seem to be advocating at this time. There is a great misunderstanding about tax increases. When you look at what our problem is today, I offer a very friendly alternative to your philosophy, and that is, our problems are not that we are taxed too little, we are spending too much.

When you talk about a tax reduction that has been offered, you are also talking about spending reductions that are going to be offered at the same time.

I would like to suggest also that perhaps you share the philosophy of the chief financial adviser to the President, Laura Tyson, when she said that there is no relationship between the level of taxation and economic activity, and herein is the problem that we are having in communicating within this body and with the administration.

You are talking about the tax cuts during the eighties, during the Reagan years and the Bush years, keeping in mind just a few of those years did we have even control of one of the Houses, so it took both Houses to do it.

In 1980, the total revenues—

Mr. BYRD. We did not have control of the White House.

Mr. INHOFE. If the Senator will read the Constitution which he has in his pocket there and very available to him—

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. INHOFE. I am sure that he will see that it is the constitutional responsibility of Congress to develop the budget, to pass the budget on to the President.

In 1980, the total revenues that were derived from the income taxes amounted to \$244 billion. In 1990, 10 years later, the total revenues that were derived were \$466 billion. In that interim period, in the 1980's came the largest marginal tax reductions, as the Senator has already mentioned, that we probably have had in any 10-year period in this Nation's history.

The maximum rate then went down from 70 percent to 28 percent. We had some help as far as capital gains taxes are concerned. And yet during that time we actually increased the revenue from those sources.

The fact is that for each 1-percent increase in economic activity we increase revenues by \$24 billion. And if we can increase economic activity, we can increase revenues. What has been suggested by many of the conservative think tanks using the CBO's projections is that we can balance the budget without cutting any programs. We can balance the budget without reducing any programs. The 2-percent-growth concept which we have already talked about, the Senator and I have, on the floor of this body, is one that would actually bring the budget into balance in approximately 8 years and not reduce one Government program; without a tax increase.

Mr. BYRD. I say to the Senator, the Congress has cut the Presidents' deficits. Since 1945, over that period of 50 years, Congress has appropriated something like \$200 billion less than the accumulated budgets that have been requested by the various Presidents who have occupied the White House during those years. Congress has a good record.

Mr. INHOFE. I will grant the Senator that on occasion Presidents have left their philosophy feeling they could not get a budget passed and have gone to Congress such as was the case with President Bush at the famous meeting out at Andrews Air Force Base where he decided to go ahead and agree to a tax increase.

I think now in retrospect, and I think he believes the same thing, that was a mistake.

Before I catch a plane, I have one other area the Senator mentioned I feel compelled to address which is the issue of grandchildren.

The Senator might remember here a few weeks ago—it seems as if we have been addressing this subject now for quite a few weeks—I had occasion to give a talk over here for about an hour and 10 minutes with the picture of two beautiful children behind me, and those two children were my grandchildren.

If we are to look at this in a compassionate way, I think that should be the driving force for our actions today because virtually everyone who has made any kind of a prediction, CBO included, has said that if we do not change from the way we have been doing business for the last 10 years and the last 40 years, if you project that forward, someone who is born today such as my

two grandchildren, who are less than 2 years old, will have to pay 82 percent of their lifetime income in taxes.

Now, the distinguished Senator advocates increases in taxes. I believe, and I believe the people who voted in the election on November 8 believe, that we can do it without increasing taxes but cutting the size of Government.

I used two charts here in the Chamber to show that those individuals who were opposing the balanced budget amendment were also the same ones who historically on the record are the biggest taxers and spenders in Congress, in both Houses. And also I showed on a chart that those individuals who lost the election, the 66 House Members that are not here after the November 8 election, and the eight Senators who either retired or are not here for one reason or another, all of them had a National Taxpayers Union rating of D or F. That is the universally accepted rating for those people who tax and spend. And all of them had voted for the 1993 stimulus bill, which was the largest spending increase, and the 1993 tax increase, which was the largest tax increase.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I saw those lovely pictures of the Senator's grandchildren, and we all love our grandchildren. I have been loving my grandchildren for almost 30 years now. But if we really want to do something for those grandchildren, those two lovely grandchildren whose pictures the Senator so proudly and prominently displayed on the floor, let us get on with the business of reducing the deficits now. We do not have to have any constitutional amendment to balance the budget. We have the tools in our own hands now. If we really want to help those grandchildren, let us get on with balancing the budget. Let us speak out against tax cuts for the middle class, whether they are being advocated by Mr. Clinton or by the so-called Contract With America.

Now is not the time for a tax cut. And let us not remove possible tax increases from the table when it comes to consideration. There must be some heads in this Chamber who have the expertise, who serve on the tax writing committees, who could devise a tax increase that would be calculated to reduce the deficit, which could be directed solely to the reduction of the deficit.

I know it is not easy to vote for a tax increase. I have been in political bodies—I am in my 49th year of serving in various and sundry legislative bodies. It is not easy to vote for tax increases. It is always easy to vote for tax cuts. But I think we have to forget the easy road now and at least consider increasing some taxes. We do have to continue to cut spending. I carry no brief for protecting all spending. There is some

spending we have to do as a Government of a great people. We have to invest in our people's future.

Mr. INHOFE. One last comment before I leave.

Mr. BYRD. Not yet. I will yield to the Senator. I am conscious of the fact that he needs to catch a plane. But let me finish what I was about to say.

There is not only a Federal fiscal deficit but there is also an investment deficit. I was at the 1990 summit with Mr. Bush and with the Republican leadership and with the Democratic leadership in both ends of the Capitol. I said at the summit, we have an investment deficit. We need to build up our infrastructure, both human and physical. Any business or company that does not improve its plant and equipment and keep its employees trained to the new mode of manufacturing or production of things is going to go under. Business has to invest. Our country needs to invest. And spending moneys for infrastructure is wise. We just cannot cut everything.

During the Reagan years, and up to now, we have continued to cut domestic discretionary spending. It has been cut to the bone. I say to the Senator, we will have cut over the next 5 years—in the 1993 deficit reduction package, we cut Government spending. We cut domestic discretionary spending. And we put the level of spending on a 5-year downward glide. We froze it, meaning that we would not take into account inflation from year to year.

Not only that, but the amendment that was offered in the Finance Committee by Mr. EXON and Mr. GRASSLEY further cut \$26 billion below a freeze. That \$26 billion was reduced to a \$13 billion cut in conference with the other body. So we are operating below a freeze in discretionary spending.

That is not to say we cannot cut more. But we cannot take defense off the table and say we will not touch it and still balance the budget and have a tax cut. All of these goodies—if you have a tax cut at the same time—we cannot do it.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. Yes, I yield.

Mr. INHOFE. One more comment. It was not my intention to use so much of the Senator's time.

I can only say, I am going to catch a plane. I am going back to Oklahoma where real people are, where the people spoke loudly and clearly in the November 8 election when they said: We want to downsize the scope of Government; we do not want to have Government involved in our lives to the degree that Government now is involved.

You and I probably will disagree philosophically with the role of Government. But the bottom line is, and I say it one last time, we have demonstrated we cannot do it, that either we cannot or will not do it.

I have not given up. I would like to serve notice to everyone in this Chamber, I believe we will get that one additional vote because the people are now

identifying what is going on in this country and they are going to be heard.

I have the utmost respect for the Senator from West Virginia, but I suggest if you take a trip back to West Virginia, you will hear the same thing there.

Thank you.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on that point, may I say to my friend, he does not need to instruct me about going to West Virginia. When he says he is going to Oklahoma where "real people are," he does not have to travel that far. West Virginia is within an hour and a half's drive. West Virginians are "real people." The people of Oklahoma are real people. The people of West Virginia are real people.

May I say to the Senator, I came here when I was a little wet behind the ears, too. For me to say to another Senator that he ought to go back to his own State and see what the people say—that is a little bit—that is stretching one's credibility a little bit.

Mr. INHOFE. I would say I appreciate the compliment, to the Senator from West Virginia, because this is the first time since I have reached the age of 60 I have been called wet behind the ears.

Mr. BYRD. Of course, a person who is 77, who has been in this body 37 years, can remember when he, this Senator from West Virginia, came here when he, too, was wet behind the ears. But I have never said to a Senator: You ought to go back to your own State and see what the people think. Leave me and my fellow West Virginians to ourselves.

Does anybody else want me to yield? I yield to the—I will either yield the floor or yield to the lady.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I was just going to ask the Senator from West Virginia—I would like to make a statement totally off this subject in morning business talk. But I certainly do not want to interrupt the Senator if he is in the middle of continuing his speech on the amendment. I was really asking for a clarification of his ability to yield me some time, but I do not want to interrupt.

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

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

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

A STRAITJACKET FOR LILLIE RUBIN

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, our regulatory reform debate has ranged from the sublime to the ridiculous and back. Today I would like to weigh in briefly on the side of the ridiculous.

The dressing room of a fine women's clothing store may seem like an odd place for the EEOC to intrude in a way that perfectly illustrates regulatory excess, but that is exactly where we

find ourselves today. The firm in question, Lillie Rubin, is a successful 49-year-old business with 60 affiliates, specializing in clothes for women. But the EEOC is measuring Lillie Rubin for a new outfit, and I think it seems like more of a straitjacket than a woman's dress.

In opposition to its own regulations and its own previous decisions, the EEOC has ruled that a Lillie Rubin store in Phoenix must employ male salespeople, and it is demanding that they be allowed to work in the store's fitting rooms where female customers try on clothes. I know this does not sound like an EEOC case so much as an "I Love Lucy" rerun, but it is true.

However much our society has changed, I still believe that certain standards prevail, and I believe this dress store's customers should not be guinea pigs in a new Government experiment. I am astounded that an agency of the Government would seek to strong-arm a private business into violating basic standards in such an outrageous way. It is beyond my understanding why the EEOC would try to force a business such as Lillie Rubin to sacrifice the privacy of its customers in order to avoid Government censure.

But customer privacy is not all that Lillie Rubin would be sacrificing if it is forced to comply with this EEOC ruling. What the EEOC has concocted is a remedy that could well drive away Lillie Rubin's customers and hurt its business.

This is more than regulatory intrusion. The EEOC decision, if not reversed, will leave the company in an exposed financial position.

As a final blow, EEOC is insisting that Lillie Rubin pay for newspaper advertisements to publicize that it may be vulnerable to EEOC claims by men who have applied in the past or might in the future.

The EEOC's approach to Lillie Rubin has been highhanded and arbitrary in the extreme, and bizarre, I think, as well. According to the company, one EEOC investigator told a company representative that "Some women like it" when there are males in the dressing room when they disrobe.

Mr. President, I ask you, is that what the taxpayers of America want their hard-earned dollars to pay for from our Government employees? Is that what this Congress wants the people to whom we are delegating our authority to implement regulations to do? Of course not. I am sure President Clinton would not want an agency of his executive branch to be putting forward a policy that forces men into women's dressing rooms. Surely he realizes by now that it is impossible for one individual, regardless of how powerful, to even think that this would happen and to come to grips with the regulatory gridlock that has been created here.

I think this argues even more for a regulatory moratorium. If these kinds of things are out there happening in the real world, and if regulators are