

resources of liberated areas to be made available to support the resistance to Saddam Hussein.

Military: Serious military support is also needed from the United States, but not the large land invasion that is thrown up regularly as a straw man. What is needed most of all is weapons and logistics support. Anti-tank weapons, in particular, could have a powerful equalizing effect, just as anti-air weapons did in Afghanistan. It is difficult to understand how U.S. officials can claim that we have tried supporting the opposition, when we have never tried to arm them.

We should also be prepared to provide air cover for liberated areas within the southern and northern no-fly zones. This is of critical importance, not only to provide a base from which the resistance to Saddam can operate, but also to provide a secure zone to which units of his own army that wish to change sides can go. Saddam is now so unpopular with his own regular army and even with many parts of his Republican Guards that if a secure and honorable path can be opened for his army to leave, major units are likely to do so or to desert without a fight. This presents a very different scenario than the imagined "major land invasion" with U.S. troops marching on Baghdad against a fiercely resisting Iraqi army.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, it seems clear that the United States is going to have to live with this agreement. While we can work to clarify certain important details—particularly those that bear on the continued ability of UNSCOM to do its remarkable work. But no new agreement with Saddam Hussein is going to fundamentally alter the threat that Saddam poses to his people, his neighbors and the world, whether from weapons of mass destruction or conventional weapons or from terrorism. Despite the eagerness of some for a quick test of the new agreement, we can't really know whether this new inspection regime is working for a long time (although we might learn sooner that it is not working). Despite the eagerness of some for quick military action if the inspectors are obstructed now, we should not be in a hurry to take military action as pointless as what we were just now planning to do.

What we should be doing now is preparing for the time when we face another crisis with Saddam Hussein or another opportunity to act to help the Iraqi people liberate themselves. That is something that we should start doing now. It seems to be something the Administration will not do unless Congress forces them to. For that purpose, I would urge the Congress to:

Urge the United States government to recognize, and assist in all practicable ways, a provisional government of free Iraq representing all the people of Iraq and committed to reconciliation within Iraq and to living at peace with its neighbors.

Appropriate \$100 for the purpose of assisting the provisional government. The administration should work to recover these funds from blocked Iraqi assets now held by the U.S. treasury.

Press for the United States to seek an indictment of Saddam Hussein for war crimes and crimes against humanity in an appropriate international tribunal.

Saddam is in a position of great weakness today. But the weakness will only become apparent if he is pushed. If we exaggerate his strength and thus encourage the defeatist mentality that seems to affect Administration strategy today, we will help him buy time for a later confrontation when he will be much stronger and the costs in blood and lives will be much higher. As the veteran said in Columbus:

"Are we going to do it half-assed? And then men at that time to (sic) come back and ask my grandson and some of these other grandsons to put their lives on the line, if we're going to do it half-assed, the way we did before."

Mr. KYL. Now, this document that the 28 advisers—let me indicate who some of these people are, people like former Secretary of Defense Frank Carlucci; and Caspar Weinberger; and Judge William Clark, former National Security Adviser; Doug Feith, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense; Fred C. Ikle, former Undersecretary of Defense; Bill Kristol; Robert Kagan; Bernard Lewis; Don Rumsfeld, former Secretary of Defense; and Paul Wolfowitz, as I said; and Richard Perle. They are all, I think, eminently qualified to offer this kind of advice.

I urge the President to consider the suggestions that are made here, which revolve around preliminarily the principle that military action alone will not force Saddam to comply, that he is the problem, that is, no coup d'etat is likely to succeed in this country and therefore the way to get him out is to create a series of conditions which will enable the Iraqi people themselves to provide the insurrection that will eventually depose him. This might include the following:

Recognizing a provincial government; restoring safe-haven both in the northern and southern portions of Iraq so that the people there can actually declare themselves free of his influence and control; lifting the sanctions in those areas so that the people can benefit from the economic end, of course, that would result; release frozen Iraqi assets to the Iraqis in exile; facilitating broadcasts from U.S. transmitters to the people of Iraq; removing vestiges of Saddam's "legitimacy" by considering, for example, whether the United Nations should indict him as a war criminal; an air campaign could be a part of this, launched against the Republican Guard divisions which prop him up; and tightening down on the embargo.

Right now we know the sanctions are of primary concern to him. And if we tighten down on the embargo so that the black market oil sales cannot continue to provide him with significant oil revenues, it will squeeze him further.

All of these things could eventually create conditions under which the Iraqi people could retake the Government of Iraq from Saddam Hussein.

So, Mr. President, my concluding point is this: The administration now has some time to develop a strategy which had not been developed prior to the time that it was asking for Congress to support a bombing campaign. If that program is developed, with the help of the Congress—and it makes sense as a broad strategy to deal with Saddam Hussein—the President will have all of the authority and the backing that he needs and deserves in taking action against Saddam Hussein, I

would say, when, not if, that is called for, as a result of probable Iraqi violation of some part of the international inspection regime.

It is a serious business, Mr. President, for us to decide to move beyond a policy of containment to a policy of rollback. It is one which ought to be debated by this body and by the administration. But the time for it has come because, as we have seen, neither the American people nor the Congress were willing to support a half-measures kind of action against Saddam Hussein. We felt something more was required to really deal with the problem.

As we learned in Vietnam, and as we have learned elsewhere, halfway measures—calibrated bombing attacks, and the like—do not seem to solve the problem. When you go to war, I think the maxim from the gulf war, from the Vietnam war, and the new thinking of military strategists in this country is: When you go to war, you'd better mean it; you have to be able to succeed at what you are doing.

That probably requires the imposition of overwhelming force and it requires a broad strategy that will get you where you are going. That is why the administration needs to develop this policy, with the assistance of the Congress, and be able to implement it if and when the time for action comes.

Mr. President, I ask, how much of that remaining time do I have, because I have one more thing I would like to say?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 16 and a half minutes.

Mr. KYL. Fine. Mr. President, I know I can conclude these remarks in the time allotted.

Mr. President, I want to change the subject in this remaining 2 or 3 minutes to discuss the issue of balancing the budget for American families.

BALANCING THE BUDGET FOR AMERICAN FAMILIES

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, Milton Friedman once said he would rather have a \$1 trillion budget that is way out of balance than a \$2 trillion budget that is in balance. I think his point is even more poignant now than when he made it several years ago.

If we manage to balance the unified budget this year—and most recent revenue trends suggest we will—we will do so by taxing and spending at a level of about \$1.75 trillion. That is a level of spending that is 25 percent higher than when President Clinton took office just 5 years ago.

Despite the claim President Clinton made in his State of the Union Address that we have the smallest Government in 35 years, the fact is that the Government has never been bigger—never. And it will continue to grow by leaps and bounds if Congress approves the myriad of new spending proposals that President Clinton is proposing in his latest budget.

It seems to me that although we may have succeeded in balancing the budget, we still have two very different visions of where we should be headed in this country. Is it a balanced budget that is the paramount goal, even if it comes with substantially higher taxes and more spending? Or is the real goal of a balanced budget to be more responsible with people's hard-earned tax dollars—to limit Government's size and give the people more choices and more control over their lives? Before we try to answer those questions, let us give them a little context.

As I mentioned, the Federal Government has grown 25 percent larger in just the last 5 years. It spends the equivalent of \$6,700 for every man, woman, and child in the country every year. And that is the equivalent of nearly \$27,000 for the average family of four. But all of that spending comes at a tremendous cost to hard-working taxpayers.

The Tax Foundation estimates that the median income family in America saw its combined Federal, State, and local tax bill climb to 38.2 percent of income last year—up from 37.3 percent the year before. That is more than the average family spends on food, clothing, and shelter combined. Put another way, in too many families one parent is working to put food on the table while the other is working almost full time just to pay the bill for the Government bureaucracy.

Perhaps a different measure of how heavy a tax burden the Federal Government is imposing would help shed some light here. Consider that Federal revenues this year will claim about 19.9 percent of the Nation's income, its gross domestic product. Next year, the tax take will climb to 20.9 percent, according to the administration's projections. That would be higher than any year since 1945. It would be only the third year in our Nation's entire history that revenues have exceeded 20 percent of the national income.

As if taxes were not high enough, President Clinton is proposing to raise them again. He is proposing a tax increase of \$98 billion, which would more than offset the modest amount of tax relief that we approved just 7 months ago. It is worth noting that the new taxes the President proposes are not needed to balance the budget. We have more than enough revenue to do that given the economy's performance in the last year. The tax increases are intended to finance dozens of new spending programs—\$125 billion worth of new spending over the next 5 years.

More taxes, more spending, and more Government. That is just the opposite of where I believe we ought to be headed. For me, there is no great achievement in balancing the budget if it means that hard-working families continue to be overtaxed. There is no great achievement in a balanced budget if the Government continues to grow, seemingly without limits, taking choice and freedom away from the people in the process.

Mr. President, this is the point that I think Milton Friedman was making. A balanced budget is not the only goal, or even the highest goal. A balanced budget is merely the means of right-sizing the Government so that it is more respectful of hard-working taxpayers' earnings and their desire to do right by their own families. That is where our paramount concern should be—with families.

To those who are suggesting we abandon plans for another tax relief bill this year, I say this: Let us not lose sight of our true objective. Families are overtaxed. The Government is still too big. We were sent here to help hard-working families, not to keep them saddled with high taxes or to add to that burden with more spending and more taxes. We will do the right thing by limiting the size of Government so that families have more freedom and more income left in their pockets.

Mr. President, thank you. And I thank the Senator from West Virginia for being patient.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. May I assure the distinguished Senator that this Senator is always patient, never in too big a hurry. I thank the Senator.

TRIBUTE TO ABRAHAM RIBICOFF

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as I grow older I am obliged to bid farewell to some friend almost every day, and thus does the circle gradually and all too rapidly diminish. That great New England poet James Russell Lowell said it well:

As life runs on,
The road grows strange
With faces new,
And near the end
The milestones into headstones change,
'Neath everyone a friend

Mr. President, it is with sadness that I take the Floor today to pay tribute to the memory of a departed former colleague, Abraham Alexander Ribicoff, with whom I served from January 3, 1963, to January 3, 1981. Senator Ribicoff was a man of many talents. And he was a man who had been honored by the people of his State and country many times and in many ways. After graduating from the University of Chicago Law School in 1933, he was admitted to the bar the same year. He became a hearing examiner, under the Connecticut Fair Employment Practices Act in 1937, and he became a member of the Connecticut legislature in 1938, a judge of the Hartford Police Court in 1941, Chairman of the Assembly of Municipal Court Judges for the State of Connecticut in 1941, and he was elected to the 81st and 82nd Congresses, a service which extended from January 3, 1949 to January 3, 1953. He was Governor of Connecticut during the years 1955–1961, and he was sworn in as Secretary of the Department of

Health, Education, and Welfare in the cabinet of the late President John Kennedy.

Abraham Ribicoff was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1962, reelected in 1968 and again in 1974, and served until January 3, 1981, not being a candidate for reelection in 1980. During this period of Senator Ribicoff's service in the Senate, I served in the Senate leadership as Secretary to the Democratic Conference, Democratic Whip, and Senate Majority Leader, during which time Abe Ribicoff was my close friend and valued advisor.

Abraham Ribicoff was a man of high character, great character, sterling integrity, excellent judgment, with an unusual sense of history and with excellent political instincts, and with uncommon ability.

His advice was widely sought by other Senators, and it was always kindly given. He was a popular Senator, and could easily have won reelection to a fourth Senate term. His career of public service spanned 42 years.

Abe Ribicoff had a very rare sense of timing and political judgement. He was among the first to endorse Senator John F. Kennedy for President. He nominated John F. Kennedy for Vice President in 1956, and was his convention Floor Manager for the, now legendary, successful presidential nomination in 1960.

Abe Ribicoff had the air and dignity of a Senator in a classic sense. He always dressed impeccably, he possessed faultless manners, and he was a gentleman in every sense of the word. Yet, he spoke forcefully, and he was unafraid of advocating politically difficult positions—unafraid. He was among the first to break with the strong-armed tactics of certain Israeli lobby groups, and he willingly paid a political price for his courage. In 1978, he conducted the first major Senate investigation, and produced the first Senate report on the difficult problem of global warming. His report on the subject could well have been written today, some 20 years later, when global warming has now become fashionable as an issue. He was also an expert on international trade.

I have spoken of his service during the time I was Majority Leader. He was then the Chairman of the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee, as well as second ranking Democrat under Senator Russell Long on the Finance Committee. I relied heavily on Abe Ribicoff's advice on a broad range of issues, from the creation of the cabinet level Department of Education to the fashioning of major energy legislation during the energy crisis of the late 1970's.

Abe Ribicoff was a persuasive speaker, and always gave as well as he got in Senate debates, during the days when the Senate really did debate issues. Yet, his strength was as much in his ability to sense the appropriate compromise, and he knew how to build consensus, and to craft sound solutions to