It is sad to have to conclude on this note, but this is clearly a failed budget. Once it passes, as it will, we will be starting over again on what we went through last year—meeting after meeting, crisis after crisis, and not a workable budget that can be supported by the President, by the minority in both the House and the Senate, and certainly not by the American people. When, oh, when, will they learn?

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I wonder, since nobody else is seeking recognition, if I might ask the Senate if they would mind my yielding up to 5 minutes to Senator ABRAHAM for comments on Senator DOLE, to be taken off my time.

Mr. EXON. We have no objection.

Mr. DOMENICI. I so request and so yield.

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

The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

## TRIBUTE TO SENATOR BOB DOLE

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise at this time to speak in concert with so many others who have spoken today about the career of Senator BOB DOLE who today moved on to a new role and new responsibilities and left behind a legacy that is virtually unsurpassed in the history of the Senate. Obviously, the accomplishments that BOB DOLE achieved, both as a leader in the Senate as well, in his earlier career, as a Member of the House of Representatives, have been chronicled pretty thoroughly both by the media as well as by Senator DOLE himself today. It is a legislative record that any of us would be, I think, immensely proud to have at the end of our careers here in this institution.

So, what I thought I might do instead was to just spend a minute or two talking about the personal side of BOB DOLE, the side that many of us here in the Senate know but which is maybe not as well known to the American people.

I have certainly come to know BOB DOLE as a friend. He is somebody who, from the very day that I arrived in the Senate, had a door that was open to me, and I know it was open to others in the freshman class that makes up this 104th Congress. He is a man who did not view himself as a senior Member and we as, somehow, junior Members not to be on the same playing field, but somebody who viewed us all as Members of this institution, as equals, who treated us that way, as he treats everybody.

He is a man of great compassion, a person who, through his own life's experiences, I think, probably cares about and sympathizes and understands the problems that his fellow citizens have more than virtually anybody else in national leadership. He is a person who, I think, personifies the words trust and honesty and integrity more than anybody I have ever worked with in the political process or in the private sector. I have never known anybody who has served with BOB DOLE who has not said that his word was good, that his word was always one that you could count on. That is clearly a reason why he is held in such high esteem on both sides of the political aisle.

These qualities, his capacity to be a good friend, his compassion for his fellow citizens, the honesty, the trust and the integrity that he brought to his service here in the Congress of the United States, make him a giant, in my opinion, a giant who will be remembered far beyond the balcony which today was named after him. But he will be remembered along with the names of Webster and Clay, Johnson, Mansfield, and others who have served and who are remembered as the important ingredients in the formation of our democracy and its continuation.

I would just say this. Although my tenure in the Senate has lasted only a year and a half, I am extraordinarily proud that I had the chance for that year and a half to serve with BOB DOLE. I happen to be one of those who believes that his career in public service is not coming to an end today but that in just a few months he will be back in a different role, working together with us. But I am proud that I had the chance to serve as a fellow Member of the U.S. Senate with him.

Some people come to this Chamber and perhaps never are given the opportunity to work closely with one of the giants of our Nation's history and of the Senate's history. I feel very lucky and fortunate to have had that chance, even if it was only for a year and a half.

I wish him and his family great good fortune as they move on to a new challenge in this political campaign, and the best of luck and best wishes for the future.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

## CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, just for purposes of some kind of accounting, how much time has Senator EXON used and how much have I used, with all of that which I asked that I yield and asked be credited to me even though the speeches were on Senator DOLE?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has used 28 minutes; the Senator from Nebraska has used 17 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask Senator EXON if he has any other Senators coming down this afternoon.

Mr. EXON. I advise my friend, I am expecting Senator KENNEDY momentarily. I have no certainty beyond Senator KENNEDY, but I am certain Senator KENNEDY will be here very shortly, and I will yield to him such time as he needs when he comes. Other than that, I know of no Senator on this side who will be speaking tonight, but we have had surprises before, as you know.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I will just ask again if there are any Republican Senators desiring to speak on this budget resolution or ask any questions regarding it. While there will be some time tomorrow—I am not at all sure how much time there will be—to speak on the resolution. I think we are going to be here—

Mr. EXON. I might advise my colleague that Senator KENNEDY will be using approximately 30 minutes when he arrives, and I have just been advised Senator SIMON, a member of the Budget Committee, wishes 15 minutes. So that is about 45 minutes that I know of for Senators at this juncture.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I repeat for Senators on this side, if they would like to speak this evening—I know it is somewhat of an imposition since we have already announced there are no votes for the remainder of the day—there will be some time this evening and there will be some time tomorrow. Clearly, there will be some Members who would like to be heard.

Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I did not get to hear all the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, but I believe I know generally what his criticism is, and I would like to address my views and my beliefs with reference to this budget.

First, Medicare, the trust fund for the senior citizens' hospital protection—and I do not say this with any joy in my voice—is going broke. I do not know how else to say it. This is not partisanship that determines that the trust fund is going bankrupt. It is not Republicans predicting it, it is not Democrats predicting it, in the sense of elected Members of Congress.

The trustees who are in charge of telling the American people the truth about the trust fund and making recommendations have, once again, reported—I do not say this to frighten anyone; it is just true—we are now spending more money out of the trust fund for senior citizens than is coming into the trust fund. In fact, we started doing that last year by a small amount. It is growing this year, that is, the amount that is spent in excess of what is coming in, and the next year after that it is more, and the trustees say in 5 years—in 5 years, not 30, not 20; 5 years—there will not be any money in the trust fund to pay the hospital bills for senior citizens.

No one has violated the trust fund. Congress has not taken money out of the Medicare fund. All of the money in

those payroll deductions is going into that trust fund. The problem is that the hospital costs and home health care costs which are in that trust fund are growing more rapidly than the money that comes in.

Can you believe that when we try to fix it and save money that somebody says we are doing this because we want to cut taxes? I do not know how else to present it. When the trust fund is going bankrupt and you say, ''Let's save money for the trust fund'', and then you save the money for the trust fund and the trust fund gets more solvent, and over on the side you are cutting taxes, how in the world can it be said that saving the trust fund is being done so you can cut taxes?

What if you did not cut any taxes? Would the trust fund be any more solvent? What if you said, no tax breaks for families with children—which we want to do—does that make the trust fund solvent? Not at all. It has none, zero, impact on the trust fund. If the trust fund continues to spend more than it takes in, it continues bit by bit to go bankrupt.

Everyone knows that, and yet time after time, as we move along and say, ''Let's fix the trust fund and let's fix the insurance program for seniors,'' as soon as you say you are doing that, somebody says, ''You're doing it to cut taxes.''

The President is cutting taxes. In fact, he made another announcement recently of another tax cut. Are we running around saying that he is doing that because he is reforming Medicare to try to save it, albeit he is not doing very much? He is doing it more than a few billion dollars' worth of savings, of reforms. Can it be said then that the President is doing that so he can cut taxes? Of course not. They are not even related.

That is bad enough, but then we hear it is not changed no matter what we do to this budget. It is the same song and dance: ''You're cutting taxes for the rich.''

I want to repeat one more time, and I defy anyone who reads budgets to say this is not true, taxes are reduced in the next 6 years by the sum total of $122 billion. That means, as best you can calculate, taxes were going to be *X* billions of dollars over the next 6 years. We have said, ''Let's assume they will be $122 billion less.'' What more can we do than to say in a budget resolution that $122 billion shall be used for, what? For up to $500 child credit for 46 million American families. That is what the $122 billion is for.

Is that for the rich of America, or is that because we are worried about families in America? Is that Republicans cutting taxes for the rich of America, or is it to say that it is very tough to raise two or three children with the tax deductions you get because they have not kept pace with the demands and the needs and the moneys required to raise children?

If they want to say, ''Republicans are trying to give families with children a $500 credit for each child,'' we will stand up and say, ''We are guilty.'' Right? We will say, ''We are guilty as charged.'' But then to then turn around and say, ''That's not the case, you're helping rich Americans''?

Mr. President, look at the budget. Read the budget, and that is what it says. It says precisely what I have just done, and I ask for Senators who will come to the floor and say you are reducing the expenditures and the outlays under Medicare so you can cut taxes, I ask one question: What if you do not cut any taxes, does the Medicare fund get any better? Does it last 10 years instead of going bankrupt in 5? Of course not. You have to reduce expenditures within the trust fund or increase taxes that go into the trust fund to give it more longevity and a longer life.

Having said that, does the President of the United States not propose to save Medicare? If he does, must he not think it is going bankrupt? I believe he uses the same principles we use. But I want to stay on this subject for just a couple more minutes.

The President has a very, very strange way of saving Medicare, and let me explain it. Frankly, the President of the United States plays games with Medicare and the taxpayers of America when it comes to Medicare for the future. Now let me tell you how.

The President says, ''Yes, my trustees,'' four of whom are part of his Cabinet or appointed by him to run Social Security and Medicare, ''have told us this trust fund is going to be bankrupt in 5 years.''

So the President says, ''Let's fix it.'' Now, how does he fix it? If this is not a sham, then I have never seen one. If this is not smoke and mirrors, then I have not been around when smoke and mirrors were perpetrated as part of a budget. He says, ''Let's just take $55 billion of the current expenditures under that trust fund of the current obligations, just take them out.'' What does he take out?

He says, ''Let's take out the fastest growing item in Medicare, take it out of the trust fund, and not pay for it out of the trust fund anymore. Magic. What is the fastest one? Home health care. Home health care has been part of the trust fund for a long, long time. So seniors expect their home health care bills and their hospital bills to be paid for out of that trust fund. Sort of like magic. What is the word? Abracadabra. I am making it $55 billion more solvent because it does not have to pay those obligations anymore. I just take them out of there and let somebody else pay for them.

Who is the somebody else? The President says the taxpayer will pay for it. They do not even know it. They are about to be given a big gift by the President. The gift is, you taxpayers pay $55 billion for the home health part of Medicare, which I just relieved the Medicare trust fund of, so that I can say it is getting solvent.

What is happening to America? It may be getting solvent, but America is getting whacked for $55 billion in taxes that a couple sitting around at their table one morning, wondering about how much taxes they are paying and will it ever stop, they just got a new present. The present is another tax burden, because the President wants to claim he is fixing Medicare by letting that couple, who are paying income taxes on their hard earned money, let them pay.

Is that the right way to fix Medicare? I ask in all honesty, if you brought before the U.S. Senate a proposal, free-standing, just put one up here one of these days, and resolve that henceforth $55 billion over the next 6 years of Medicare expenditures will be paid for by the general tax coffers of America, and then vote. I surmise there may be 10 Senators that vote for it, but we have never voted to put general tax money in Medicare part A or in Social Security, because we understand those are trust funds that should be paid for by the revenues dedicated to those entrusted funds, not by the general taxpayer. But this is being done in this bill, and at the same time the President and my good friend from Nebraska can run away and say it is the Republicans who are restraining and cutting back on Medicare, not the President.

What do we do? We say how much money is necessary to make it solvent in the next decade, and keep it solvent for 10 years. We are told how. We have said, ''Let's reform the system, give seniors options to have their coverage in different ways,'' but always they can keep what they have, the same system they have, and let us ratchet back on how providers are paid and hospitals are paid and save enough money to make it solvent. We have not increased 1 cent of cost to the senior citizens, yet we are making it solvent for 10 years.

Frankly, when we say we are doing that and Democrats and the President say you do not have to do that, we have done it another way. I just told you the other way. This is a very short-term fix. Medicare will be growing at an annual rate of 6.2 percent—not cut. The per capita expenditure for seniors will not go down. It will go from about $5,200 to $7,000, an $1,800 increase over that 6-year period. All of that in the name of doing what is right, for which we are accused of harming seniors, of doing this so we can cut taxes, when it will be insolvent whether you cut taxes or whether you do not cut taxes.

Let me move for a minute quickly to how we treat two big other items in the budget. The President of the United States produced another very interesting phenomenon in his budget, 1997, which will be appropriated before October of this year, an election year. The President of the United States says for all of the discretionary accounts, the non-Social Security, the non-Medicare, the nondefense domestic accounts, the President says, ''I think I want to balance the budget, but I think for 1997 I

better increase spending.'' So he increases it $15 billion. The discretionary accounts are increased $15 billion. But, Mr. President, only for 1997. After all, we have to balance this budget.

Then read the Broder article on Sunday where Senator BOND is making the case that after you get the $15 billion increase, and then you still say you are going to balance by the year 2002, you let the discretionary spending just fall off the log, $72 billion in cuts in the last year in discretionary accounts, but not in the year of the budget, not in the year of the election. Then you get Cabinet Members telling the public of the United States that the President is not serious about that. After all, he is not going to cut veterans that much, even though if you look at where that leads you, veterans get scalped.

But they are saying, ''We will take it 1 year at a time.'' How, 1 year at a time, when the dollar numbers keep going down, how are you going to fit them all in with an increase? Something will get cut. They would like to let the American people think it is only Republicans that have to make these cuts.

What do we propose? We propose a freeze, fellow Americans. In a year we are really trying to get a budget, if we cannot live with a freeze in domestic spending, we will never get the budget balanced. So we are not cutting this year. The conference report that comes back has a freeze in budget authority. Program authority for all domestic bills freeze at exactly the level we are now spending for all of these programs. I believe that is a fair approach in a difficult year. I hope we produce these appropriations bills at a freeze level, one after another. I hope there will be no strings attached and no riders, and we will see whether the President wants to close down Government based upon a freeze, especially if he has to say we want $15 billion more to keep it open. We will not mind that battle this time. We will not mind that battle this time.

Which do you really want? Are you serious about a balanced budget? We will give you a freeze. No harm, no gain. Or do you want to spend $15 billion more? Those are the basic elements. I have given the tax proposals. I have given Medicare. Medicaid will grow at 6.2 percent a year on average, not be cut, but more power is going home to our Governors and to our legislators to see if we cannot streamline and make the programs more efficient.

From my standpoint, I do not think it matters what we change in this budget and how it is different from last year or the year before. We will hear the same broken-down medley, ''hurting senior citizens, helping the rich with tax cuts, hurting the poor with Medicare cuts,'' when, as a matter of fact, what we are really trying to do is help seniors, keep the fund from going bankrupt, and do little or no harm to them. We have the exact same dollar amount of savings for the insurance program for senior citizens as the President. He found he needed $44 billion. We got the same amount.

When you are all finished, clearly, there is a lot of politics surrounding all of this. I wish it was not the case. Sooner or later we have to fix Medicare, fix Medicaid. We have to save money on both programs. We have to reduce taxes on working families in the United States significantly, sooner or later. We think this is the right year to do it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, under the leadership of a Congress committed to fundamental reform of the Federal Government, we have once again delivered a balanced budget to the American people. I have no doubt that this budget is a blueprint that will protect the future of every American child.

Last year, Mr. President, the debate on the budget was mainly focused on whether we should have a balanced budget by 2002. Today, all sides, including President Clinton, have agreed that we should and can balance our budget by 2002, while we provide tax relief to middle-class American families. The remaining question is how.

In my view, our budget priorities should reflect traditional American values: a smaller government, less spending and more savings, and helping those who want to help themselves. Mr. President, I must say that this budget resolution moves us confidently in that direction. The budget resolution will balance our budget in 6 years, yielding a $5 billion surplus in 2002. It will also create more jobs, provide more affordable education, make Medicare more secure, and offer real welfare and Medicaid reform.

Mr. President, I am particularly pleased that this resolution has kept our promise to the American people to provide meaningful tax relief for middle-class Americans. The resolution explicitly recommends that this should include a tax credit of $500 per child. I am proud that this provision, which I have made a priority since my election to Congress, remains at the heart of our efforts to balance the budget while reducing the tax burden on working families.

The tax burden has become increasingly unbearable for middle-class Americans. This year, the average American worked from January 1 until May 7 to pay his or her tax bill. Only after paying the Government more than one-third of their earnings can the taxpayers then spend to meet their own needs. If we do not impose discipline in our budget, children born today would have to pay as high as 84 percent of their lifetime earnings for our Government spending and national debt. This is simply outrageous. We must provide tax relief for middle-class families to reduce their financial burden, and encourage saving and investment.

It is my belief, Mr. President, that the $500-per-child tax credit is essential. Cutting taxes creates more real spending power for Americans. It would allow more than 201,000 families in my home State of Minnesota with 437,000 children to save or spend more of their own money—money that should not have been taken from them in the first place. The $500 per-child tax credit would return $297 million to the taxpayers of Minnesota, $45 million to the taxpayers of South Dakota, $39 million to the taxpayers of North Dakota, $329 million to the taxpayers of Wisconsin, and $180 million to the taxpayers of Iowa.

Mr. President, we not only need to eliminate wasteful and unnecessary spending, but we also must reform and control our entitlement programs. Without responsible reforms, entitlement spending will consume all Federal spending in 2015, leaving nothing for education, environment, defense, and other domestic discretionary programs.

I am therefore pleased, Mr. President, that this budget resolution has included my amendment on long-term trends in budget estimates. In the past, budget estimates were projected for only 5 years. My amendment requires both CBO and OMB to provide a 30-year projection of the budget impact on entitlements. This is good policy and will help Congress and the American taxpayer understand the long-term commitments were are imposing on future generations. My amendment also requires the President to include long-term economic projections in his budget. Entitlement programs can then be reviewed and analyzed for their economic impact today and for generations to come.

Mr. President, although I personally would prefer more cuts in Federal spending and more tax relief for working American families, this budget resolution is a well-balanced one. While it reduces Federal spending by $580 billion over 6 years, it has kept vital programs such as law enforcement and crime prevention, education, veterans' benefits, R&D, and environmental protection as national priorities. In my view, this budget resolution is a credible, workable and no-gimmicks plan for getting our fiscal house in order.

If we want to rebuild the financial integrity of this Nation, avert the Nation from fiscal disaster, and leave our children a viable government, we must pass this balanced budget to control government spending and reduce the burden for our children.

Mr. President, I believe strongly that it is the responsibility and duty of this Congress to ensure our children and grandchildren a strong economy, a good education, a clean environment, and a debt-free future. Let us fulfill that responsibility and pass the balanced budget resolution conference report.

Mr. DOMENICI. Senator EXON, can we accommodate a couple speakers on Senator DOLE statements?

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I would like 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I would like 2 minutes.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I wish to speak on the health insurance reform legislation. So I am happy to wait my turn.

Mr. DOMENICI. We have an arrangement that the Senator from Massachusetts will go next. It is your turn.

Mr. EXON. With the understanding, I might say, that the Senator from Massachusetts has been very patient. I scheduled him at 4:30, the best I could.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is fine.

Mr. EXON. We understand that you will have 7 minutes for other matters, and then we will yield to the Senator from Massachusetts, is that correct?

Mr. DOMENICI. That is exactly what I hope and agree to.

Mr. EXON. We agree with that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes; following that, the Senator from Kentucky will be recognized for 2 minutes; then the Senator from Massachusetts will be recognized for such time as the Senator from Nebraska may yield him.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from South Dakota.

## TRIBUTE TO BOB DOLE

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to our friend, BOB DOLE. It has been my pleasure over the years to hold over 30 joint meetings with him in my State, in my time as a Congressman and as a Senator and when he was running for South Dakota's early primary. There were at least 30 meetings. I learned a great deal from BOB'S service, and I learned that his tireless energy was always an inspiration to me. In fact, he would always shake hands with everybody at the end of those meetings, regardless of how long it took. But he offered a great deal of substance when somebody asked him a complicated question. He would give the full Senate answer, so to speak. I believe that he will go down as one of the great Members of this Chamber, in terms of legislative accomplishments and contributions.

I was one of the first Senators to commit to him for majority leader or minority leader—whichever was the case, because at the time we did not know for sure. I was one of the first Senators to endorse him for President. I think his career in the Senate represents the best of Senate life. I guess everybody knows about his wit and his determination. I could never believe or comprehend how he had so much energy. He literally went 7 days a week. He would be as energetic on Sunday night when he was coming back to Washington.

I also visited at least 15 States with him during the time he was a Presidential candidate or chairman of the party or when I was a Congressman, and he did the same thing there, too. He was not a golfer or a tennis player. He just worked all the time. I have never seen anything like it. He would fill up the whole weekend with work and visits. To him, it was service. I just would not have that much energy because I need a day off now and then. I pay tribute to him because he is one of the great Members of this Chamber that I have served with, and it has been my pleasure to work side by side with him.

I have a number of other reminiscences, which I will place in the RECORD. During this short time, let me also say that I have felt a great deal of friendship and still feel a great deal of friendship with BOB DOLE. He is a person with whom I could always talk to if I was struggling in some of my campaigns, or whatever. He would always be there to help. Just recently, he invited me along on four stops in several States with him. His energy is as great as it has ever been.

BOB DOLE is a great man. He will be a great President, and I will miss him very much here in the Senate. It feels lonely around here without him already, without his quips, and so forth. I came in a little late at lunch today and he said, ''You are late, PRESSLER. We are going to count you late.'' He was full of quips all the time. I pay tribute to my friend, BOB DOLE, a great U.S. Senator, who will be a great President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we witnessed today the departure from the Senate of one of the giants of American history. On a day like this, obviously, all of your memories come back to you. I remember the first time I met BOB DOLE. It was in this room in the early part of 1969. I was a fuzzy-cheeked staffer back here on what was then these big stuffed couches. BOB DOLE was a freshman Senator. Since desks on the floor of the Senate were assigned on the basis of seniority, he sat near the back. I remember him as being the most popular of the freshman Republicans with the staff. Why? Because he was nice to us. This is a place where, as many know, some Senators are a little full of themselves and frequently are not all that nice to staff. BOB DOLE was not only nice to us, his humor was often practiced on us before he related some of it on the floor.

In short, you could sense from the beginning, from the day BOB DOLE walked in here, that he was something special, that he was not going to be just your average Senator. So like everybody else, I watched his development over the years. I left as a staffer and went back home to do my own thing. My next recollection of BOB DOLE was in 1980, his first campaign for President, which was not conspicuously successful. I remember picking him up one day in Kentucky and taking him to a meeting and watching him tirelessly work the crowd. He had to have a sense that his campaign was failing. But as Woody Allen said, ''Eighty percent of life is showing up.'' BOB DOLE was driven. He always showed up. He continued to push.

The next time I saw him was in 1984, 3 days before the Senate race in Kentucky. All of a sudden, the word had spread around that this challenger in the Senate race in Kentucky might have a shot. BOB and Elizabeth Dole came in, and we wheeled around the State in their plane, and they gave me the boost I needed at the end to get over the finish line.

In short, like everybody else here, I have had a number of reminiscences of this great American. On a day like this, they all come back. It seems like there is a giant sort of gap here in the Senate with his departure. Today was a bittersweet day for all of us. I think it is kind of a mixture of exhilaration for him that he goes out on this new challenge, undeterred by all of the restraints that are obvious here, but at the same time he regretted his departure. I only add: Godspeed, BOB DOLE. I think we will be seeing you in Government once again.

I yield the floor.

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

Mr. EXON. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts whatever time he needs off of our 5 hours.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator from Nebraska. I see the Senator from Kansas on the floor, who was here earlier than I was. She has indicated that she has just a short comment to make. I am glad, if it is agreeable with the Senator from Nebraska, to yield to her to speak briefly.

Mr. EXON. I will yield whatever time she needs from our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

## HEALTH INSURANCE REFORM

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I very much appreciate the Senator from Massachusetts giving me some time at this moment. I would have been happy to wait. But both the Senator from Massachusetts and myself have worked for many months on health insurance reform. I very much appreciated Senator KENNEDY, the ranking member of the Labor and Human Resources Committee—his efforts to help us achieve what the Senate voted on 100 to 0 for some very important health insurance reform measures.

Today, I want to speak for a moment about where we stand on this issue. First, because I heard the chairman of the Budget Committee speak on the budget resolution before us, I want to speak with respect to the admiration I have for Senator DOMENICI and his honesty and vision regarding what is needed in our budget. Both he and Senator EXON from Nebraska, who is the ranking member, have worked many years on budget matters, and I am sure that at some point there must be a certain weariness that sets in as yet one more budget resolution comes before the