As you know, I share your deep concern over these incidents and believe that a thorough Congressional review of these, and related federal law enforcement issues, is warranted. However, hearings on these matters would not be properly within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology and Government Information. Indeed, when your staff raised this issue with Committee staff more than one week ago, my position on this matter was promptly conveyed. Due to the important nature of these issues and their ramifications for federal law enforcement, hearings should be held at the Full Committee. I intend that hearings will be held in the near future following Senate consideration of comprehensive anti-terrorism legislation. Indeed, I believe the House Judiciary Committee has announced hearings as well. It might prove beneficial to hold our hearings after the House completes its hearing.

The hearing you propose is an important one, but I believe that it is unrelated, in any true sense, to the broader issue of the prevention of domestic terrorism. Accordingly, to hold the hearing as you propose at this time will serve only to confuse these important issues. Indeed, by linking the Waco incident to the terrorism issue through hearings at this time, the Committee could inappropriately, albeit unintentionally, convey the wrong message regarding the culpability of those responsible for the atrocity in Oklahoma City. We must not do this.

I appreciate your concern over this matter. I look forward to working with you on this and all other matters before the Judiciary Committee.

Sincerely,

ORRIN G. HATCH,
Chairman.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, May 9, 1995.

Hon. ORRIN G. HATCH,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC

DEAR ORRIN: I have your letter of May 8.

I disagree with you on three counts:

1. Hearings on Waco and Ruby Ridge, Idaho, should be held promptly (actually they are long overdue) rather than waiting to some unspecified time in the ''near future'' or ''after the House completes its hearings.''

2. My Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology and Government Information has clear cut jurisdiction both as our authority relates to terrorism and government information.

3. I categorically reject your assertions that the Subcommittee's scheduled hearing will ''serve only to confuse these important issues'' and ''convey the wrong message regarding the culpability of those responsible for that atrocity in Oklahoma City.'' There can be no conceivable misunderstanding that there is no possible justification for the bombing in Oklahoma City regardless of what happened in Waco or Idaho. The public interest requires full disclosure of those incidents through hearings to promote public confidence in government.

Since I have had and am continuing to have media inquiries on these hearings, for your information I am releasing this exchange of correspondence.

Sincerely,

ARLEN SPECTER.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we extend the recess period—my understanding is the Senate was to stand in recess at 12:30—I ask it be extended to allow me to speak for 5 minutes.

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

MEDICARE AND THE BUDGET

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the Senate Budget Committee is meeting today, and they are involved in, I think, a gripping, wrenching debate about how they will try to find a route toward a balanced budget. It is an effort that I think needs to involve all of us because I do not know of anybody in this Chamber who has stood on the floor and said they do not agree that a balanced budget is necessary and desirable for this country.

There were some presentations on the floor of the Senate earlier this morning talking about the issue of Medicare, and I wanted to stand and respond to a couple of those comments, because part of this issue of balancing the Federal budget involves the question of Medicare.

We are in a circumstance described, interestingly enough, by E.J. Dionne today in the Washington Post. I would like to read a paragraph or two from his column:

When the House Republicans passed their big tax cut earlier this year, they were not at all interested in what President Clinton or the Democrats had to say about it. They wanted credit for doing what they said they would do in the Contract With America. And they got it.

But now the time has come to pay both for the tax cut and for even a bigger promise, a balanced budget by year 2002. Suddenly, the Republicans are whining that the President has refused to take the lead in cutting Medicare and Medicaid, which is what the GOP needs to do to make any sense of its budget promises.

Mr. Dionne says:

Let's see: When it comes to passing around the goodies, the House Republicans are prepared to take full responsibility. When it comes to paying for the goodies, they want a Democratic President to take full responsibility. And they act shocked, shocked when he refuses to play along.

You can't blame the Republicans for trying. It's a clever, if transparent, strategy.

The point is, there has been a lot of protest on the floor of the Senate and the House in the last few days about concerns many of us have about the Medicare Program and the tax cut that was passed recently by the House of Representatives.

It seems to me that at least some in Congress dived off the high board and showed wonderful form as they did their double twists and have now discovered there is no water in the pool.

A tax cut first, for the middle class they said. Of course, the chart shows something different. Who benefits from the tax cut bill? If you earn over $200,000 as a family, you get $11,200 a year in tax cuts. If you are a family earning less than $30,000 a year, you get $120 a year in tax cuts. This is not a middle class I have seen anywhere in America. The fact is that it is a tax cut for the wealthy. That was passed, and now they say we should cut Medicare to pay for it.

Well, we are going to have to reduce the rate of growth in Medicare. No one disputes that. But before we engage in a discussion about what you do about Medicare and Medicaid, many of us believe that the first thing you ought to do is get rid of this tax cut for the rich. It is time to deep-six this kind of a proposal, then let us talk about Medicare. Otherwise, what you have is a direct circumstance that cannot be avoided.

The comparison is obvious: $340 billion in tax cuts, for $300 to $400 billion in Medicare and Medicaid health care cuts. Let us back away from the tax cut. As soon as the majority party does that—and I hope they will—then I think this Congress ought to begin, in a joint effort on Medicare and Medicaid and virtually every other area of the Federal budget, to sift through these things to find out where we achieve the means by which we balance the Federal budget.

But you know, some of us have been through all of this before. Talk is cheap. Talking about balancing the budget is very, very easy. Everyone talks about it.

Last week, I proposed a series of budget cuts, real budget cuts in a whole range of areas that totaled some $800 billion, and I am going to propose more. That package does not include Medicare and Medicaid, and I know we have to reduce the rate of growth on both of those. But I also feel very strongly that as we approach this problem, we should not allow the other party to pass a very big tax cut first and then say to others later, ''Now help us pay for that by taking it out of the hide of your constituents.''

Let us join together and work together, but let us do it in a way that gets rid of the tax cut that was ill-advised, bad public policy, not middle class, but essentially a tax cut that benefits the wealthy. Get rid of it, disavow it and then move on together in every single area of the Federal budget and do what is right for the country.

That is what the American people expect and deserve, and I think that is what will benefit this country's future in a real and meaningful way.

Let me thank the President for allowing me to extend the time. With that, I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 p.m., plus the unanimous consent for additional time, having arrived, the Senate will stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.