

commitments under the OSCE Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security. Common Article 3 of the Geneva Convention states that in "armed conflicts not of an international character, persons taking no part in hostilities . . . shall be treated humanely." Article 36 of the OSCE Code of Conduct states that "if recourse to force cannot be avoided in performing internal security missions, each participating State will ensure that its use must be commensurate with the needs of enforcement. The armed forces will take due care to avoid injury to civilians or their property." Russia's campaign in Chechnya violates these commitments.

In this letter, I am urging President Putin that the Russian Government allow into Chechnya and Ingushetia an international monitoring mission.

This international monitoring mission should have unfettered access and a broad mandate to monitor and report on the humanitarian situation. The Russian Government should immediately allow all civilians safe passage from Chechnya, assist those persons who have been displaced from Chechnya as a result of this conflict, and allow representatives of international humanitarian agencies full and unimpeded access to those persons in order to provide humanitarian relief.

President Putin has made a commitment that an international monitoring presence would be allowed. This has not happened.

Finally, I am urging the Russian Government to initiate investigations into alleged human rights abuses and to hold accountable those responsible.

As a Senator, I send this letter to President Putin today. I think it is very important that he devote every effort to achieve a peaceful resolution.

Neither the use of force in 1994 to 1996, which left over 80,000 civilians dead, nor the current use of force in Chechnya will enhance the prospects for any durable settlement to this conflict.

I am sending this letter today. I am going to send a copy to the Senator from Colorado and other colleagues as well. I hope other Senators will speak out.

There is a delegation of several high-ranking officials, parliamentarians with the Chechnya Government, who are here, and they have been trying to meet with our State Department. So far, they have not been able to arrange any meeting at all.

I am not asking the State Department to recognize the official government, but our State Department has met with dissidents from China and dissidents from Russia over the years. I think these parliamentarians, these courageous individuals from Chechnya, deserve at least an audience with the State Department—whether it be with the Secretary of State, whether it be with Strobe Talbott, or whether it be with Secretary Koh who has done such a fabulous job on human rights issues.

I just want to say to the State Department today—I am going to continue with calls—I just think it is wrong to not at least meet with these

individuals. We have a massacre of innocent people going on there.

As the son of a Jewish immigrant—born in the Ukraine, who lived in Russia, and fled persecution in Russia—I understand our Government's role in the world to speak out for human rights. Our silence, the silence of the administration and our Government, is deafening. I think Democrats and Republicans need to call on President Putin to live up to his commitment to allow an international monitoring force to protect innocent civilians and to get humanitarian assistance to people. This is a moderate, modest request.

CAPITOL HILL POLICE SECURITY

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, in the few minutes I have remaining today, I will talk in specifics about the security situation here at the Capitol, and what is going on and what is not going on by way of living up to our commitment to Capitol Hill police officers, and also to the public.

As I said, we have made the commitment, and we should honor the commitment. You need two officers at a post for their security, much less the security of the public.

Two examples. Please remember, for those who are listening, the officer who works alone at any number of these posts is responsible for the following: Watching the x ray monitor for weapons or contraband, personally screening persons with a handheld metal detector—I say to the Senator from Colorado, we come in every day, and we see them doing this—controlling pedestrian traffic at entrances, and watching both entry and exit doors for people who try to bypass security.

That is what one officer at one post is supposed to do.

Example: Ford House Office Building, Annex 2, Third Street door entrance, 441, Third Street, Southwest. By the way, the Third Street entrance is a multiple-door entrance.

Monday, February 7, 2000, one officer was assigned to this entrance from 0700 to 1500 hours. From 1200 to 1300 hours, 512 people entered through the Third Street entrance—one officer.

The Ford Building sits directly across from the Federal Center Southwest metro station, for those who are trying to identify it.

From 0800 to 0900 hours, 215 people entered through the entrance—one officer. This is Monday, February 7.

By the way, during the highest volume of pedestrian traffic, an officer who was passing by just simply stopped and offered assistance. But that is not the way it is supposed to be.

Hart Senate Office Building, 120 Constitution Avenue, Northeast; C Street door entrance to the Hart Building. This is a multiple-door entrance that is open to staff—Government workers—from 0700 to 0900 hours. This entrance is actually directly next to Senator NICKLES' office.

Tuesday, February 3, one officer was assigned to this entrance from 0700 to 1500 hours. As I say, that was Tuesday, February 3.

From 0900 to 1000 hours, 432 people entered through this entrance, not to mention the 332 staffers—Government workers—from 0800 to 0900 hours—one officer. Just think about the number of people who are streaming in with one officer. Again, I don't know exactly who is right in terms of how this problem gets solved. I think some of our police officers believe there are overtime funds for this purpose. It may be that upper management is arguing that those funds are not available. Others say we have to have more funds to hire more people. One way or the other, either there is money there for the overtime funds to properly staff these posts or additional money is necessary in appropriation.

I just gave two concrete examples on the House and the Senate side this month of February. I don't think any Senator or anyone in any decision-making position who is responsible for the security situation here—starting with these police officers, for them, much less for the public, much less for us—can justify this. It cannot be defended.

I will say it one more time. I think it is OK for me to say it. If I say it the wrong way, it is not OK for me to say it. We lost two fine officers. Agent Gibson, Officer Chestnut, we lost them. I do believe we all said to one another that we were going to do everything humanly possible to get the very best security for our officers. No one can ever guarantee a 100-percent safe situation. What we do know is that we can do everything that is humanly possible to try to meet that goal.

I just gave two examples this month that show we have fallen way short of meeting that goal. We are not doing right by the Capitol Hill police officers. We are not doing right by the public. We have to take action.

I will give other examples over the days and weeks to come. Of course, my hope is this problem will be dealt with.

I thank Senator DURBIN for allowing me this time. Not seeing any other Senators on the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WELLSTONE. 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. WELLSTONE. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes as in morning business.

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

THE BUDGET

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I didn't want to take any time during

the Democrats' timeframe because I am so appreciative of Senator DURBIN's remarks. I have another perspective, which is just my own intellectually honest and, by the way, personally heartfelt analysis of the budget.

I was struck when Senator DURBIN was talking about: If not now, when? The words of Rabbi Hill, his third century admonition, were heard by many. Rabbi Hill, speaking to Jews, said: If we don't speak for ourselves, who will? And if we speak only for ourselves, who are we? And if not now, when?

I think Senator DURBIN was talking about this booming economy and the fact that with a booming economy and the business cycle up, we can make our very good country even better. I agree. Let me spell out my dissent from the President's budget. I did it yesterday, but today I want to do it in a somewhat different way.

I do worry about the cynicism of people in the country toward politics and toward government. I think we all do, regardless of party. I think one of the ways we get ourselves into trouble is when there is such a disconnect or a gap between what we say and what we do. We are going to do versus the actual budgets and what, in fact, we really are calling for by way of investment.

As I hear the President talk about his budget and where we are heading as a country, I hear the President talk about the goal of ending child poverty; of making sure we have health care coverage for our children; of making sure every child comes to kindergarten ready to learn; making sure that when children are no longer children but young people, like our pages, they will eventually be able to afford college, if they choose to make that higher education decision; that there will be economic security for senior citizens.

Then I look at the budget and this emphasis on Social Security, Medicare, yes, and basically paying down more of the debt. Frankly, when all is said and done—if somebody can prove me wrong, I am pleased to be proven wrong—the actual nonmilitary discretionary spending over the next 10 years is, in real dollar terms, cut. There is no additional investment at all.

Now, the way in which we try to do this in this budget is through the tax system, because politically it seems as if Democrats are scared to death to talk about investment in people any longer for fear they will be accused of being a big spender. Therefore, we do it through the Tax Code, through deductions and tax credits.

Let me give credit where credit is due, and let me tell you where I think there is this huge gap between what we say we are going to do and what we are really going to do. The earned-income tax credit is one of the best things we have done for poor people in this country, many of whom are children. Refundable tax credits makes a whole lot more sense. When we did the HOPE scholarship for higher education, we didn't make it refundable, so a lot of

young people or not so young people who were attending community colleges, who had incomes under \$28,000, \$29,000 a year, got no help anyway. They had no tax liability from which to get a credit. Refundable tax credits help low- and moderate-income working Americans more.

But with all due respect, we have made hardly any additional investment. Sometimes, if you are going to do it through the tax system, if you are going to talk about long-term care, I say to the Senator from Colorado—I know this is a huge issue in his State—families are thinking long and hard. I have been through it. Sheila and I and our children, we went through it with my parents. They are no longer alive. They both had Parkinson's disease. I know what it is like. You don't want your parent or parents to be in a nursing home. The United States of America is still the only country in the world where you have to go to the poorhouse when you are in a nursing home before you are going to get public help. You have to basically lose everything. You want your parents, or a loved one with a disability, to be able to live at home in as near normal circumstances as possible and with dignity.

We say there will be economic security. We are now concerned about long-term care and that people should be able to live at home. Do you know what. In this budget proposal—maybe I am wrong—when you finally get down to it, you are probably talking about a couple thousand dollars a year that a family can get on a tax credit.

For my mother and father, and other mothers and fathers and grandparents, if we want to make a commitment to people being able to live at home with dignity, it is going to cost them more than \$3,000 a year to have some people come in and help them do that.

We are so much for the children, and we have all this irrefutable medical evidence about the development of the brain. Last night, I was lucky enough to have dinner with Rob Reiner. He is so committed to this, and I thank him for his work. We know we have to get it right—prekindergarten. The Federal Government should be a player. It should be centralized, and we should get funds to the neighborhoods and community level and have really good developmental child care.

We have a pittance in this budget. Yes, we add more money for Head Start. I guess we should since, right now, we have been covering, under the age of 3, only 2 percent of the kids who are eligible. That is hardly much of a commitment to give children from poor income backgrounds. We have additional money, but in terms of the need, we only cover 20 percent of low-income families in America. This is a huge issue for middle-income and working families. We are talking about good child care, not unsafe child care. It is a pittance. It is a pittance.

So my point is—and the Presiding Officer is Republican, so don't take this

the wrong way; we like each other—I think and I hope we like each other. I think what the President has proposed is better than what the Republicans propose for sure. The Republican view, when it comes to these issues, is that there is not much the Government can or should do but give people a tax break, most of it going to the people on top. That doesn't meet the needs of working families in this country anyway. If you don't own a large corporation and you are not wealthy, there is a role for Government by way of getting some resources down to the community level that can make a real difference to families. But where I dissent from this budget is where the polls say emphasize this, so we talk about it. The polls say it is a hot issue, so we talk about it.

But the truth of the matter is that when people hear us, they actually think what we are proposing is going to make a huge difference, so that children won't be in poverty. We have more children in severe poverty today—one-half the poverty income—than we have ever had. We still have about 13 million poor children.

People think a budget is going to help us end child poverty and make a commitment to prekindergarten and good child care, so that every child who comes to kindergarten is ready to learn, or the budget will help the elderly with health care. There is a little bit, but most families will find out there isn't going to be nearly enough—not if we truly want to live up to the goodness of America.

Every child should have the same opportunity to do well. People who have worked hard and built this country and are on their backs at the end of their lives ought to have decent coverage. They ought not to have to worry about going to a nursing home and losing everything.

Higher education should be affordable. People should not fall between the cracks in health care. I was at a dramatic hearing yesterday on suicide. Dr. Jameson from Johns Hopkins and many other people testified. People need coverage because of a struggle with mental illness. I argue that it is politically unsafe, and because there is substance abuse and addiction, they should not be discriminated against and denied coverage. We could save so many lives with the dollars if we did better.

People who work hard but don't have any coverage at all ought to have coverage for themselves and their loved ones. That is not in this budget. We hardly make a dent. So I take the words of my colleagues, the Democrats with whom I work, who say the economy is booming and we can do better, and I say I agree: So why are we not doing much better?

I think we have been taught to think small. I think that, unfortunately, part of what has been going on over x number of years is that we Democrats have decided we should think small. The

conventional wisdom is that that is the way to win—think small; come up with programs that people think are popular, and then appropriate, get some money, and do it through the Tax Code so nobody can say you are spending money. But you are, either way. But you don't even come close to meeting the needs of the people to whom I say you are going to respond. I think it invites cynicism. No wonder people say Government programs don't work. They hear all this fanfare in press conferences, and, frankly, the investment isn't there. The people aren't helped very much.

I say to the Democrats—and I get to do it because I am a Senator and I get to speak to the floor to whoever wants to listen—I think everybody says the reason you have a 50-percent hole in the electorate, with 50 percent of the people voting in a Presidential election, much less a congressional election, much less a local election, is because of money, politics, and disillusionment. That is true. But the other part is that we aren't necessarily standing for politics that really speaks to people's lives, where ordinary citizens can say: Yes, the party, the Democratic Party, the party of the people, is behind us. We know it. Here is what they say they stand for, and they are willing to make the investments to make sure that, for parents and grandparents, our children and grandchildren can do better. I think that is the void in American politics.

I think it is a shame that this budget doesn't do a better job of filling that void. Frankly, I don't think we Democrats are doing the job we should do.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGEL). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1999—RESUMED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 1287, which the clerk will report by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1287) to provide for the storage of spent nuclear fuel pending completion of the nuclear waste repository, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Lott (for Murkowski) amendment No. 2808, in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I understand the majority manager needs

some more time. Pursuant to the provisions of rule XXII, I now yield the hour allotted to me postcloture to the majority manager, Senator MURKOWSKI.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAUCUS. 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. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask to speak as in morning business.

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

A COMMONSENSE BUDGET

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I want to take a few moments to focus on the budget debate in which this Congress is engaged. It is very important at the beginning to set priorities and parameters as we put a budget together that makes sense for our country rather than treating in isolation each individual spending or tax matter that comes before this body. It is very important that we step back and look at the bigger picture.

When a family or a corporation puts together a budget, they have to make all of their needs and desires fit into an overall budget plan. In the same way we should start out by making sure that all of our individual proposals fit into an overall budget plan.

I say this because some Members of the House are going to be moving specific tax bills in advance, without looking at the overall budget. The problem, obviously, is if we take very tempting separate items, such as a tax bill, say, a marriage penalty, or maybe it is an education tax bill, perhaps a retirement savings tax bill—it is very tempting to pass these in isolation and we are picking and choosing between different tax cuts before we even have agreed on how much money we have available.

Let's not put the cart before the horse. It's the same kind of helter-skelter approach that got us deeply into debt in the first place. Let's set our budget priorities first.

As we do so, we should keep two points in mind. First, we should be, if I may use the word, conservative. Let's keep the cork in the champagne and not put too much stock in ten-year projections that show a huge surplus.

I don't care how good your crystal ball is. Things change, and small changes add up to a lot over 10 years.

I would like to make a point about an article in yesterday's Washington Post that underlines this problem. It is a story by Eric Pianin and John Berry. Their basic point is the fragility of the long-term budget projections—whether

they are the President's projections, the CBO's, or others.

Let me quote, "Clinton's projections highlight just how tenuous those surpluses could be."

There is another example of this. This chart shows how difficult it is to predict the future and how quickly and how dramatically budget projections change. On the left, the red bar illustrates that 2 years ago, January 1998, the Congressional Budget Office projected the country would face about a \$900 billion deficit over the next 10 years.

Just a couple of weeks ago, the CBO reached a different conclusion. Their conclusion was that we are going to have the benefit of a roughly \$2 trillion budget surplus over the next 10 years. That is a swing of practically \$3 trillion in just two years! Clearly, 2 years from now this \$2 trillion projected surplus is going to look a lot different, as it will 3 years from now and 4 years from now. Therefore, let us not listen to the siren song of these huge projected surpluses based upon current economic estimates. I know the budget estimators do the best they can. But I sure wouldn't want to bet the farm that these new numbers will hold up for a decade.

The current economy is doing well. We want it to continue doing well, but there is no guarantee it will. Let's be careful. Let's be cautious. These projections of huge surpluses could fade. It could change very quickly.

The point came home to me in a conversation I had with the CEO of a major telecommunications company.

I said: Sir, does your company make 5-year plans?

He said: Well, yes, we do.

I said: How closely do you follow them? How well do you implement them?

He said: Well, we really don't. We try, but things change so quickly, we have to change and adjust.

Granted, telecommunications is a fast-changing industry. But we are a fast-changing country in many respects. Changes happen very quickly. Changes happen, particularly as our world gets more and more interconnected and more technologically advanced. With more and more technology and more factors involved in determining the course of our economy, it is more and more difficult to predict the future. It is a problem we face.

With all the inherent uncertainty about the future, let's be a little cautious when it comes to the Federal budget. And let's also adhere to the Hippocratic Oath, that is, "first, let's do no harm."

I believe the prudent course is to adopt what I'd call a "no regrets" budget.

Policies that we believe make sense and address important needs irrespective of upticks or downticks in the economy.

To my mind, this means we should, first and foremost, reduce the debt.