here are, for example, a proposal to provide some assistance to repair some of the crumbling schools in this country, not so that the Federal Government will be involved in rebuilding local schools—that is the job of local school districts, State and local governments —but an incentive in a way that says we can at least pay some of the interest on the bonds that provide the right incentive to invest in our schools because so many of them are now 30, 50, 70 years old and more, and some of them are in desperate condition and need help.

On that amendment, for example, under this agreement there will be, I believe, 1 hour of debate. A significant amendment of significant importance, but the Senate will only devote 1 hour to that subject because to devote more would somehow abridge the interests of those who want to contain the debate on education here in the Senate.

I use that as an example. There are others. I say to the Senator from Georgia, I did not, since the first day of this discussion, feel the problem was a filibuster. I felt and still do feel very strongly the problem is that the majority leader said this is our bill, this is our agenda, it is what we feel is important, and we will bring it to the floor, but you must comply with what we expect of you. Don't you be offering amendments we don't want. Don't you be demanding time for your amendment to talk for 3 hours on school construction, for example—and that was what was happening to us over all of these weeks and what resulted in a number of cloture votes.

So I see it differently than does the Senator from Georgia. But as I indicated, he will have his day on his amendment, and I have indicated previously I have great respect for him, but this ought not be habit-forming. This is not the way the Senate works with respect to the current rules of the Senate. It is not the way your side of the aisle dealt with issues when you were in the minority, and I don't think you would expect us to deal with these issues in that manner on a routine basis.

As I said, I did not object to the unanimous consent request after this had been worked out by the majority leader and the minority leader. Education is critically important. In my judgment, there aren't many more important issues than education here in the U.S. Senate. This ought to be job one for the Senate to deal with the critical education issues. We have now a list of them, albeit limited in time and scope with respect to the amendments, but when we get to this issue we will have, I think, a good and thoughtful and constructive debate.

I stand today to say do not make it habit-forming to say it is our agenda and we will demand every other Senator in this place who is not part of the majority conform to our description of how we want to debate these amendments, because that is not the way the Senate should work.

I yield the floor.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, AND 2003

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. CONRAD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be laid aside so I may offer 4 amendments on behalf of Democratic Senators and that these amendments be sequenced between the Republican amendments when we vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Chair. The first amendment is on behalf of Senator DODD of Connecticut. It is an amendment to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund for child care improvements.

AMENDMENT NO. 2173

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund for child care improvements)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD], for Mr. DODD, proposes an amendment numbered 2173.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam 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 appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR CHILD CARE IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, revenue and spending aggregates and other appropriate budgetary levels and limits may be adjusted and allocations may be revised for legislation to improve the affordability, availability, and quality of child care and to support families' choices in caring for their children, provided that, to the extent that this concurrent resolution on the budget does not include the costs of that legislation, the enactment of that legislation will not increase (by virtue of either contemporaneous or previously-passed deficit reduction) the deficit in this resolution for—

(1) fiscal year 1999;

(2) the period of fiscal years 1999 through 2003; or

(3) the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2009.

(b) REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—

(1) ADJUSTMENTS FOR LEGISLATION.—Upon the consideration of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate appropriately-revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this section. These revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(2) ADJUSTMENTS FOR AMENDMENTS.—If the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate submits an adjustment under this section for legislation in furtherance of the purpose described in subsection (a), upon the offering of an amendment to that legislation that would necessitate such submission, the Chairman shall submit to the Senate appropriately-revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this section. These revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) REPORTING REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—The appropriate committees shall report appropriately-revised allocations pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this section.

(d) APPLICATION OF SECTION 202 OF H. CON. RES. 67.—Section 202 of H. Con. Res. 67 (104th Congress) shall not apply for purposes of this section.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, the second amendment is on behalf of myself, Senator LAUTENBERG, Senator BINGAMAN and Senator REED. This is to ensure that the tobacco reserve fund in the resolution protects public health.

AMENDMENT NO. 2174

(Purpose: To ensure that the tobacco reserve fund in the resolution protects public health)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD], for himself, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Mr. REED, proposes an amendment numbered 2174.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam 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:

On page 28, strike line 2 through line 17 and insert the following:

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, revenue and spending aggregates may be adjusted and allocations may be adjusted for legislation that reserves the Federal share of receipts from tobacco legislation for—

(1) (A) public health efforts to reduce the use of tobacco products by children, including youth tobacco control education and prevention programs, counter-advertising, research, and smoking cessation;

(B) transition assistance programs for tobacco farmers;

(C) increased funding for the Food and Drug Administration to protect children from the hazards of tobacco products; or

(D) increased funding for health research; and

(2) savings for the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund.

(b) FEVISED AGGREGATES AND ALLOCATIONS.—Upon the consideration of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate appropriately-revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this section. These revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional

Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) APPLICATION OF SECTION 202 OF H. CON. RES. 67.—For the purposes of enforcement of Section 202 of H. Con. Res. 67 (104th Congress) with respect to this resolution, the increase in the Federal share of receipts resulting from tobacco legislation and used to fund subsection (a)(2) shall not be taken into account.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, the third amendment is on behalf of Senator CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN.

AMENDMENT NO. 2175

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding elementary and secondary school modernization and construction; improving the educational environment for the 14 million children who attend severely dilapidated schools, the millions of children in overcrowded classrooms, and the 19 million children who are denied access to modern computers because their schools lack basic electrical wiring; relieving overcrowding in our Nation's classrooms; and generally helping States and school districts bring their school buildings into the 21st century)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD], for Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, proposes an amendment numbered 2175.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam 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 title III, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING SCHOOL MODERNIZATION AND CONSTRUCTION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the General Accounting Office has performed a comprehensive survey of the Nation's public elementary and secondary school facilities and has found severe levels of disrepair in all areas of the United States;

(2) the General Accounting Office has concluded that more than 14,000,000 children attend schools in need of extensive repair or replacement, 7,000,000 children attend schools with life safety code violations, and 12,000,000 children attend schools with leaky roofs;

(3) the General Accounting Office has found the problem of crumbling schools transcends demographic and geographic boundaries. At 38 percent of urban schools, 30 percent of rural schools, and 29 percent of suburban schools, at least one building is in need of extensive repair or should be completely replaced;

(4) the condition of school facilities has a direct effect on the safety of students and teachers and on the ability of students to learn. Academic research has provided a direct correlation between the condition of school facilities and student achievement. At Georgetown University, researchers have found the test scores of students assigned to schools in poor condition can be expected to fall 10.9 percentage points below the test scores of students in buildings in excellent condition. Similar studies have demonstrated up to a 20 percent improvement in test scores when students were moved from a poor facility to a new facility;

(5) the General Accounting Office has found most schools are not prepared to incorporate modern technology in the classroom. Forty-six percent of schools lack adequate electrical wiring to support the full-scale use of technology. More than a third of schools lack the requisite electrical power. Fifty-six percent of schools have insufficient phone lines for modems;

(6) the Department of Education has reported that elementary and secondary school enrollment, already at a record high level, will continue to grow over the next 10 years, and that in order to accommodate this growth, the United States will need to build an additional 6,000 schools;

(7) the General Accounting Office has determined the cost of bringing schools up to good, overall condition to be $112,000,000,000, not including the cost of modernizing schools to accommodate technology, or the cost of building additional facilities needed to meet record enrollent levels;

(8) schools run by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) for Native American children are also in dire need of repair and renovation. The General Accounting Office has reported that the cost of total inventory repairs needed for BIA facilities is $754,000,000. The December 1997 report by the Comptroller General of the United States states that, ''Compared with other schools nationally, BIA schools are generally in poorer physical condition, have more unsatisfactory environmental factors, more often lack key facilities requirements for education reform, and are less able to support computer and communications technology;''

(9) State and local financing mechanisms have proven inadequate to meet the challenges facing today's aging school facilities. Large numbers of local educational agencies have difficulties securing financing for school facility improvement;

(10) the Federal Government has provided resources for school construction in the past. For example, between 1933 and 1939, the Federal Government assisted in 70 percent of all new school construction; and

(11) the Federal Government can support elementary and secondary school facilities without interfering in issues of local control, and should help communities leverage additional funds for the improvement of elementary and secondary school facilities.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this budget resolution assume the enactment of legislation to allow States and school districts to issue $21.8 billion worth of zero-interest school modernization bonds to rebuild and modernize our Nation's schools, and to provide Federal income tax credits to the purchasers of those bonds in lieu of interest payments.

AMENDMENT NO. 2176

(Purpose: To increase Function 500 discretionary budget authority and outlays to accommodate an initiative promoting after-school education and safety)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD], for Mrs. BOXER, proposes an amendment numbered 2176.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam 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:

On page 16, line 9, increase the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 16, line 10, increase the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 16, line 13, increase the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 16, line 14, increase the amount by $40,000,000.

On page 16, line 17, increase the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 16, line 18, increase the amount by $49,000,000.

On page 16, line 21, increase the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 16, line 22, increase the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 16, line 25, increase the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 17, line 1, increase the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 25, line 8, decrease the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 25, line 9, decrease the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 25, line 12, decrease the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 25, line 13, decrease the amount by $40,000,000.

On page 25, line 16, decrease the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 25, line 17, decrease the amount by $49,000,000.

On page 25, line 20, decrease the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 25, line 21, decrease the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 25, line 24, decrease the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 25, line 25, decrease the amount by $50,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 2174

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I will say a word on the amendment offered on behalf of myself, Senator LAUTENBERG, and others. The purpose of that amendment is to make possible comprehensive tobacco legislation on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

As the occupant of the chair knows, in the Budget Committee a resolution came out that provides that the funding from any possible resolution of the tobacco issue can only go for Medicare. While Medicare is clearly a key priority, there are other priorities as well. Among those are the question of preventing kids from taking up a habit. The experts have all told us that we need to use some of the funds for the purpose of tobacco prevention programs, smoking cessation programs, counter-tobacco advertising programs, to increase health research, to provide some easing of the transition for tobacco farmers, and also to fund the expanded role of FDA and the question of regulating these products.

The experts have told us, unanimously, that there is simply no way to have comprehensive tobacco control legislation without those priorities being included. In fact, every single bill that has been introduced that is comprehensive in nature on the floor of the Senate, by Republicans and Democrats, provides for taking some of that money for those purposes. Unfortunately, under the budget resolution, every single comprehensive bill—those introduced on the Republican side and those introduced on the Democratic side—is out of order. Not a single one

of the bills would be in order under the budget resolution as it came out of the committee.

So the amendment offered by myself, Senator LAUTENBERG, Senator BINGAMAN, and Senator REED is to correct that deficiency, to allow the Senate to work its will on comprehensive tobacco legislation, so that we have a chance when we finally get to a discussion of the tobacco bills, that the budget resolution is not an impediment to passing national tobacco policy.

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

Mr. CONRAD. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, the provision in the budget prohibits the use of any of the funds from the tobacco settlement for the range of programs, such as the program for smoking cessation, for education, to try to prevent teens from beginning smoking; is it the case that this budget provision prevents the use of any of the tobacco settlement money for any of those programs?

Mr. CONRAD. Yes, exactly. It seems startling, but that is what the budget resolution provides. The resolution says that not one dime of any tobacco settlement money can go for tobacco smoking cessation, smoking prevention, or any of the other programs that all of the experts have said are required. We could not have any of this money go for the National Institutes of Health and Research. We could not use any of the money for the expanded FDA role in regulating tobacco products. None of the money could be used for counter-tobacco advertising programs. Every single expert that has come to us has said those are essential to a comprehensive plan to actually reduce teen smoking. So the budget resolution is clearly deficient in that regard.

Mr. DORGAN. Will the Senator yield further for a question?

Mr. CONRAD. Yes.

Mr. DORGAN. I understand that those who put this prohibition in the budget agreement said, ''But there are areas in the budget and other areas that expend money for these programs, so these programs are not being shorted.''

Can the Senator describe whether in fact the money is available in other programs sufficient to address these issues?

Mr. CONRAD. Well, that is the convention of those who debated this issue in the Budget Committee. They said, ''Well, we have provided the funding elsewhere in the budget . . .''—not out of the tobacco revenues, which is a curious thing if you think about it. Since these are clearly tobacco-related expenses, you would think you would fund them out of the tobacco revenue. They said, ''Don't worry, we funded it somewhere else.''

Let me say to the Senator that there is not any assurance that there would be one thin dime anywhere else in the budget for that purpose because, as you know, the Budget Committee does not make those determinations. What has been set up by the Budget Committee is mounds of money that would be a jump ball. The appropriators would decide. You serve on the appropriation committee and you understand that the Budget Committee gives you an overall spending limit and you decide what the priorities are. If you decided that existing priorities were more important, there might not be any money for smoking cessation, smoking prevention, counter-tobacco advertising, and all the rest. So that is the problem with the budget resolution. They have an assumption in there. The assumption is that the appropriators will provide something over $100 million a year for these purposes, but every single major bill that is out here provides $2 billion a year for these purposes—smoking prevention, smoking cessation, counter-tobacco advertising, expanded health research, FDA authority—and so there is no way that this comes anywhere close to meeting the need.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I have one additional question. The Senator indicated that the Budget Committee does not determine the level of expenditures—the actual expenditures. That is the Appropriations Committee's job. I agree with that. But it is true that the Budget Committee, with this provision, will determine what you cannot expend money for. They, apparently, by this provision, determined that any money coming from the tobacco settlement cannot and will not be used for these specific areas—smoking cessation, curbing teen smoking, a National Institutes of Health investment, and so on.

So is it not the case that, while they don't determine what the money is going to be spent for, they are with this provision trying to determine what you cannot spend the money for? I guess it would require at least a 60-vote provision on the floor to overturn what they are trying to prevent. Can the Senator tell me why on earth the Budget Committee—because the Senator serves on that committee—can bring a bill to the floor that says we are going to have a tobacco settlement, but, by the way, you can't use any money from the settlement to deal with teen smoking, or addiction, or smoking cessation? What on earth could have persuaded them to provide a provision like this in the budget bill?

Mr. CONRAD. I tell you, I have no idea. I will respond in this way. I find it the most curious thing that has happened all year—why you would provide a special reserve fund so that if there is tobacco legislation that passes, you can have the revenue flow to the Federal Treasury; but then you say, when we go to spend the money, none of it can be used for smoking cessation, smoking prevention, counter-tobacco advertising, expanded health research, funding the FDA so that they can attend to their added responsibilities under any of the bills that have been offered, by either Republicans or Democrats.

The curious thing is that every single bill that has been offered out here, whether it is the bill of Senator HATCH, who is chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the bill of Senator MCCAIN, who is chairman of the Commerce Committee, or Senator JEFFORDS' bill, all those bills would be out of order. So you have three Republican chairmen who have offered bills out here, and their bills would be out of order under what has been provided for under the budget resolution.

Mr. BROWNBACK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Madam President, in listening to the debate brought forward through questions on the floor, I would like to put some factual statements into the RECORD. First, the budget resolution puts Social Security and Medicare first. I think people recall that the President was saying we should use any surplus to save Social Security, that this is an important program and we need to invest and protect Social Security and, therefore, we should take any surpluses and put it into Social Security.

We agree, but we also believe that we should go one step further and say that any extra funds and resources here should be used to preserve and protect Medicare as well. Medicare is an enormously important program to the American public. I don't know how many people remember last year when we debated how to save, preserve, and protect Medicare. What is being talked about in the budget agreement is using the resources to save Medicare. Now, you can go a couple of ways here. You can say, OK, I am going to use these resources to save Medicare, this enormous program that provides health care for over 35 million Americans that have had a very difficult financial time, or you can say we are going to start a whole bunch of other programs to do this—which, by the way, we are taking care of in other parts of the agreement. The Budget Committee decided to save and use these resources to preserve and protect Medicare. Let's take care of first things first, and Medicare is one of those programs. Instead of promising to spend billions of dollars on new programs, we propose to dedicate any tobacco receipts, if there are any, to Medicare solvency. Let's protect what we have first. I think that is an important point that needs to be brought into this debate.

Madam President, I have an amendment to offer, but before I do that I will yield to the Senator from Wyoming for a statement that he has. He has been on the floor waiting for a longer period of time than I.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, my original intent was to give some comments on amendment No. 2166. Before I

do that, since the topic is opened up on the tobacco settlement, I feel compelled to make a few statements based on what has been said on the floor.

I am on the Labor Committee and that has been a part of the tobacco settlement debate. I can tell you how far we have gotten on that committee. We have had a filibuster so far on the very issues the Senators from North Dakota have been saying they want to get into the budget. So the progress on this thing has been so disappointing to me. Last week, when I was flying back from Wyoming—I go back almost every weekend, and it's quite a trip to get from there back to Washington—I started working on my laptop computer and listing the reasons why a tobacco settlement might not happen this year. There were three single-spaced pages on why it won't happen this year. I changed it to why it won't happen this year.

What we are suggesting here is that we ought to go ahead and spend the money anyway. I can't tell how the negotiations have gone that you have been in, but I certainly never have liked to be in negotiations with anybody where I had already spent the money I might get out of the program. That is why we are taking some precaution with that. That is why we are saying let's put it in Medicare. That is the biggest program that we have to save that deals with health—particularly the health of people in the United States. It is something we have to be concerned about. We put that first. There can be changes made later. But after that, there is some agreement from these three pages, single spaced, and reasons why 100 Senators here may not be able to come to any agreement on why there ought to be a tobacco settlement, let alone how that tobacco settlement ought to take place.

Having said that, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes on amendment 2166, the Sessions-Enzi amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SNOWE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2166

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I rise today in support of amendment 2166 introduced by me and my colleague and good friend from Alabama, Senator SESSIONS. Our amendment is entitled the ''Antidiscrimination of At-Home Parents Amendment.''

I am proud to lend my support of this amendment that would give at-home parents, who forego a second income so that one parent can raise their children, the recognition by the federal government that they truly deserve.

There has been a lot of talk about beefing up the quality and availability of child care across our nation. I, too, have played a role in this debate and feel it's one to be taken seriously. Parents who choose to enroll their kids in day care face a difficult decision—one based on trust, reliability, the quality of care and, of course, the high costs. Moreover, that decision touches one of our nation's most important resources—our children.

Unfortunately, this debate has unfairly excluded married couples who face an even bigger decision—at-home care. There are more families that fit this mold than I think many of us are aware. In fact, only 37 percent of mothers with children under the age of 6 are employed on a full-time basis. The remaining percentage includes a constituency with little representation. That must change.

It is true that conditions can be difficult for two income families. I don't refute that. It is very hard for single, working moms to raise children. To be fair, however, we must not imply that families who choose to keep one parent home with their children are not making sacrifices. For years now, the debate on family policy has been centered on single working parents and day care. For years the sub-text of federal family policy has been that everyone should work and that the burden of accommodation should be on those parents who choose to stay at home to raise their children. However, if the debate revolves around the quality of care our children receive, we must modify existing federal policy and end this senseless discrimination.

It would seem at times as if all forces conspire against single income families. America's tax burden has grown so large that in many instances, a second parent has to work just to pay their families tax burden. A 1993 survey found that more than 50 percent of working women would ''stay at home if money weren't an issue.'' Most families in which both parents work would much prefer to have one parent stay at home with the children if expenses would allow.

The financial penalty inherent in having one parent stay at home to raise the children is large indeed. The few families who pursue such an arrangement don't do it because they can easily afford it. They do it because they believe that it is best for their kids. It should not be the work of this body to second guess their judgement of their values. Most importantly, these parents should not be discriminated against by its own federal government simply because they sacrifice greater financial gain for their children.

As you can see, there are a growing number of parents who give up one income so that the mother or father can stay at home and be with their children. Not long ago, this decision to utilize at-home care was commonplace. However, our nation's workplace has changed significantly as more parents move into the workforce—making parent's decision to sacrifice one income for their child all the more difficult. This is truly saddening, because the people who can best care for our nation's children are the parents.

I have listened during the last few months to members implying that parents who choose to forego a second income to stay home with their children do so at no financial sacrifice. It has even been implied that such parents lead a life of luxury and self-indulgence while working mothers make the real sacrifice for their children. This notion is as offensive as it is unfounded.

Parents who decide to forego a second income so that one parent might be at home during their children's formative years incur quite an expense, as several members of my own staff can attest. I have two fathers on my staff that have made this difficult decision. One of those parents on my staff spends four hours each work-day commuting to and from work—only because raising a family on a single, moderate income simply cannot be done here in Washington, DC. I am confident that parents all over the nation are in similar straits.

If the Senate is serious about issues facing our nation's children, then it must not exclude parents who choose at-home care for the benefit of their kids. If those parents are left out, then the message this body sends about the quality of care for American's children is short-sighted at best. This amendment is geared to provide that recognition and I encourage all members of the Senate to carefully read it, cosponsor it, and vote in favor of its passage.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the remainder of my time but reserve the time remaining for the amendment.

Mr. BROWNBACK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 2177

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding economic growth, Social Security, and Government efficiency)

Mr. BROWNBACK. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK) proposes an amendment numbered 2177.

Mr. BROWNBACK. 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 title III, add the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ECONOMIC GROWTH, SOCIAL SECURITY, AND GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY.

It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals underlying this resolution assume that—

(1) the elimination of a discretionary spending program may be used for either tax cuts or to reform the Social Security system.

(2) the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and other appropriate budget rules and laws should be amended to implement the policy stated in paragraph (1).

Mr. BROWNBACK. Madam President, this amendment to the budget resolution being considered before us today

would make it a priority for this Congress to cut taxes and to begin shoring up our teetering Social Security system.

Madam President, before I begin I wish to commend Chairman DOMENICI and other Members for their excellent work on the budget committee. While I would prefer a budget that cut government spending more as well as cut taxes more; I appreciate the enormity of the task before the chairman and would like to compliment him for his leadership in this area. As well, I look forward to working with the chairman to both ensure a more fiscally responsible government as well as lower taxes for all Americans.

Madam President, I would like to begin by making a few remarks on the size and scope of our federal government and the importance of keeping our promise with the American people by living up to the spending parameters outlined in the bipartisan budget deal reached last year between the Congress and the administration and with the American people; and also to speak on the importance of honestly addressing the need to begin reforming our Social Security system.

It is absolutely paramount and fundamental and something we must give our attention to.

Although many of us agree that the Federal government is too large, and too intrusive most of us seldom seem to be able to make the necessary cuts to the federal government that will actually curtail its size and curb its consumptive desires. In fact, the Administration which once declared that ''the era of big government is over,'' has now proposed an expansion of government programs that will have the effect of busting the bipartisan budget deal that was so difficult to get to in the first place. This is not only inconsistent but bad policy.

In contrast, I believe that it is imperative that we live within the constraints agreed to last year during negotiations with the administration. We had a deal. We had a deal with the administration that set the limits on the size and scope of the federal government. And, we had a deal with the American people.

Now is not the time to walk away from the principles that we outlined in our bipartisan agreement just a few months ago simply because the budget—thanks mostly to the entrepreneurial spirit of main street America—is now near balance.

The fact of the matter is that our books aren't really balanced at all because we are continuing to allow the federal government to raid the social security trust fund in order to finance its day to day operations. If a company in the private sector tried to do that they would be shut down—and rightfully so.

If the President is serious about saving social security then he would not continue raiding the Social Security trust fund to prop up his government programs and he would not be proposing $140 billion in new spending (which is coincidentally just a little more than expected surplus receipts to the OASDI trust fund this year), rather he would be cutting government spending and paying down the debt in anticipation of unfunded future social security obligations. But he is doing just the opposite.

Because this administration doesn't want to lead, the Congress must. And my amendment takes the lead by prioritizing Social Security solvency and tax cuts over more government spending and budget games.

Let's stop the nonsense.

Americans don't want more glib talk about big government programs solving all of their problems. They don't want more empty promises. They want a less intrusive government, they want lower taxes and they deserve retirement security.

In order to help in our efforts to cut the size of the government I am offering an amendment expressing the sense of the Senate that we should destroy the firewall between spending reductions and tax cuts; by allowing for government spending reductions to be used for either tax cuts or Social Security solvency.

Heretofore we have had a firewall between cutting domestic discretionary programs and paying for tax cuts, saying we can't cut this to pay for tax cuts. I am saying let's have a provision such that you can eliminate discretionary spending in certain categories and that money to be used to pay for tax cuts or Social Security solvency.

Currently, according to budget law Congress cannot make cuts in discretionary spending programs in order to finance tax cuts. Rather, Congress has to make cuts in mandatory spending programs like Social Security and Medicare in order to pay for its tax cuts. It is wrong to pit Social Security against tax cuts.

My amendment flips the table on this false tradeoff by pitting Social Security and tax cuts against big Government spending on the other side. Let's use the cuts in big Government spending to support Social Security and tax cuts.

According to the current budget law every time someone wants to cut taxes they are essentially forced to propose cuts in either social security or Medicare. That just isn't right.

Our federal government is too large, and this arcane law is part of the reason. We need to focus our efforts on cutting government spending—not increasing it. And I believe one way to help accelerate the downsizing of our massive federal bureaucracy is by allowing cuts in discretionary spending to be used for tax cuts and Social Security accounts.

My amendment would call for a change in budget law that would allow for tax cuts to be implemented in the amount of program eliminations and for saving Social Security. So, when we eliminate a program during consideration of an appropriations measure that money would be credited to the PAYGO scorecard and reserved for tax cuts and Social Security.

Therefore, should my amendment pass and budget law be changed, we can eliminate programs like the Advanced Technology Program, the National Endowment for the Arts, the Department of Commerce, and a whole host of other government programs while at the same time giving the taxpayers the tax relief they deserve and the retirement security they need—and we can do it without making draconian cuts to mandatory spending programs that ultimately do little to save the programs and much to simply prolong the crisis.

With my amendment we can eliminate wasteful programs and at the same time provide the American taxpayers with a solvent Social Security System along with the tax relief that they deserve.

That is why I am offering this amendment. We can begin to cut taxes and to reform our Social Security system by transforming the debate about Social Security from rhetoric into reality.

We have a unique opportunity to substantively begin to reform our social security system in order to ensure long-run solvency.

We have this opportunity in large part because for the first time in over a generation we will have a balanced budget this fiscal year.

This presents Congress with a chance to begin making changes to the Social Security system that will both protect current benefits for retirees, and those about to retire, as well as to help preserve benefits for future generations.

We must make use of this historic opportunity to cut more government spending and to use those cuts along with the unified budget surplus to help shore up the Social Security trust fund.

My amendment begins the process of reforming our government by making it a priority for this Congress to cut taxes and to begin shoring up our teetering Social Security system.

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.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2178

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding the use of agricultural trade programs to promote the export of United States agricultural commodities and products)

Mr. BURNS. Madam President, I send the desk an amendment to the budget.

It is a sense-of-the-Senate amendment. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] proposes an amendment numbered 2178.

Mr. BURNS. Madam 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 appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF SENATE REGARDING AGRICULTURAL TRADE PROGRAMS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals in this concurrent resolution assume the Secretary of Agriculture will use agricultural trade programs established by law to promote, to the maximum extent practicable, the export of United States agricultural commodities and products.

Mr. BURNS. Madam President, this is a sense-of-the-Senate amendment. Every year, we have authorized and we have appropriated moneys for programs sponsored by the U.S. Department of Agriculture to help market grain abroad; in other words, to beef up our exports and to be able to compete in the international market.

We are going through times now where prices are very, very stressed and depressed, I would say. We need all the help we can get to move the supply that we have into foreign hands after the collapse of the financial markets in the Pacific rim that have been major buyers of our agricultural commodities. Of course, the actions of the IMF and what this country has undertaken to help those countries out of that financial condition will help those of us who depend heavily on agricultural exports.

This is just a sense of the Senate to tell the USDA and the International Trade Representative that we need help. It does no good to put the loaded pistol in the holster if the USDA doesn't pull it in times when we really need it. The time is now. This is just a sense of the Senate to say that we have authorized it, we have funded it, and we hope the USDA will use it.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I ask unanimous consent that Senator KENNEDY's name be added as a cosponsor to the Conrad amendment No. 2174.

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

Mr. LAUTENBERG. And I ask unanimous consent that I be added as a cosponsor to the Gregg amendment No. 2168.

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

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, I also ask unanimous consent that I may proceed as in morning business.

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

AMERICAN MISSILE PROTECTION ACT OF 1998

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator ENZI be added as a cosponsor to S. 1873, the American Missile Protection Act of 1998.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, this bill was introduced by Senator INOUYE and me on March 19. After we sent a letter to all Senators inviting cosponsors, we received a very positive response. I am pleased to advise the Senate that with the addition of Senator ENZI, there are now 40 cosponsors of S. 1873.

This bill would make it the policy of the United States to deploy as soon as technologically possible an effective national missile defense system capable of defending the territory of the United States against limited ballistic missile attack, whether accidental, unauthorized or deliberate.

We believe this policy is necessary because of the growing proliferation threat. The proliferation threat includes both weapons of mass destruction and long-range ballistic missile delivery systems.

The fact is that determining how quickly the United States will be facing an ICBM threat from a rogue nation is difficult to estimate. The Director of Central Intelligence recognized this point last year when he said to the Senate, ''Gaps and uncertainties preclude a good projection of exactly when 'rest of the world' countries will deploy ICBMs.''

That ''gaps and uncertainties'' exist is not an indictment of our intelligence agencies. We have many fine and dedicated people in the intelligence community who have devoted their professional careers to obtaining information about and analyzing proliferation. But it is extremely difficult to predict accurately just how quickly technology will move forward and will be made in certain countries.

Predicting the rate of technological advance would be difficult even if rogue states were to accept no outside assistance in their pursuit of mass destruction weapons and missile delivery platforms of ever-increasing range. But adding the knowledge now available in the information age to anyone with a computer and a telephone line to the fact that some nations are actively assisting pursuit of these capabilities makes for a situation in which predictions can be outdated soon after they are made.

Take, for example, the case of the Shahab-3 and Shahab-4, two intermediate-range ballistic missiles Iran is pursuing with substantial help from Russian organizations. Last Friday's Washington Times carried an article entitled ''Pentagon Confirms Details on Iranian Missiles.'' It describes this situation, and I think it is very alarming.

It is no secret that Iran is pursuing these missiles. The Shahab-3, with a range of 1,300 kilometers, will be capable of striking U.S. forces throughout the Middle East and our close allies in the region as well. The Shahab-4, with a range of 2,000 kilometers, will be able to reach into Central Europe.

We all understand that neither of these missiles will have the range to strike the United States unless they are launched from some kind of a mobile platform, like a ship. But the important point is that these missiles are proceeding at a much more rapid pace than anticipated just last year, and the reason these missiles can be ready sooner than we expected is because of Russian expertise provided to Iran.

In February the Director of Central Intelligence testified to the Senate:

. . . since I testified, Iran's success in getting technology and materials from Russian companies, combined with recent indigenous Iranian advances, means that it could have a medium-range missile much sooner than I assessed last year.

Madam President, the very kind of outside assistance that is speeding this Shahab-3 along so rapidly could also contribute in a similar way to the acquisition of long-range ballistic missiles by rogue nations. These kinds of nations are interested in ICBMs because they make the United States vulnerable to coercion or intimidation in time of crisis. It is a vulnerability that disappears when an effective national missile defense is deployed.

That is why we have introduced the American Missile Protection Act of 1998. America should end its ICBM vulnerability as soon as the technology is available.

Madam President, given the uncertainties about just when other nations will possess ICBMs, it only makes sense to be clear now in our commitment to deploy defenses against these systems as soon as the technology is ready. If the choice is to deploy a national missile defense capable against a limited threat 1 year too soon or 1 year too late, let it be 1 year too soon. The lesson of the Shahab-3 is that even the best intentioned estimates can be wrong.

I ask unanimous consent, Madam President, that the article I referred to from the Washington Times be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times, Mar. 27, 1998]

PENTAGON CONFIRMS DETAILS ON IRANIAN MISSILES

(By Bill Gertz)

The Pentagon identified Iran's two medium-range ballistic missiles for the first