of the Small Business Committee at 224–5175.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on rules and Administration will meet to organize on Thursday, January 12, 1995, at 9:30 a.m., in SR–301. At this meeting the committee will adopt its rules of procedure and consider pending administrative business.

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Christine Ciccone of the Rules Committee staff on 224–8921.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet on January 9, 1995, at 3:30 p.m. on legislation on telecommunications reform.

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

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO AMEND THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, pursuant to rule 5, paragraph 1 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give written notice of my intention to amend the Standing Rules of the Senate; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . RECORDED VOTES ON APPROPRIATIONS BILLS IN THE SENATE.

Rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end the following:

''9. An appropriations bill or appropriations bill conference report shall be voted on by the Senate by a roll call vote.''.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

ALASKA WETLANDS CONSERVATION CREDIT PROCEDURES ACT

• Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, on January 4 I introduced S. 49, the Alaska Wetlands Conservation Credit Procedures Act. The bill was not printed at that point in the RECORD so I now ask that it be printed.

The bill follows:

S. 49

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Alaska Wetlands Conservation Credit Procedures Act of 1994''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) according to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, approximately 170,200,000 acres of wetlands existed in Alaska in the 1780's and approximately 170,000,000 acres of wetlands exist now, representing a loss rate of less than one-tenth of 1 percent through human and natural processes;

(2) according to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife more than 221 million acres of wetlands existed at the time of Colonial America in the area that is now the contiguous United States and 117 million of those acres, roughly 53 percent, have been filled, drained, or otherwise removed from wetland status;

(3) Alaska contains more wetlands than any other State, and more wetlands than all other States combined;

(4) eighty-eight percent of Alaska's wetlands are publicly owned, whereas only 26 percent of the wetlands in the contiguous 48 States are in public ownership;

(5) approximately 98 percent of all Alaskan communities, including 200 of 209 remote villages in Alaska, are located in or adjacent to wetlands;

(6) approximately 62 percent of all federally designated wilderness lands, 70 percent of all Federal park lands, and 90 percent of all Federal refuge lands are located in Alaska, thus providing protection to approximately 60 million acres of wetlands;

(7) more than 60 million acres of wetland are conserved in some form by land designations that restrict utilization or degradation of wetlands;

(8) 104 million acres of land were granted to the State of Alaska at statehood for purposes of economic development;

(9) approximately 43 million acres of land were granted to Native Alaskans through regional and village corporations and native allotments for their use and between 45 percent and 100 percent of each Native corporations' land is categorized as wetlands;

(10) development of basic community infrastructure in Alaska, where approximately 75 percent of the nonmountainous areas are wetlands, is often delayed sometimes prevented by the wetlands regulatory program for minimal identifiable environmental benefit;

(11) the 1899 Rivers and Harbors Act formerly regulated disposition of dredge spoils in navigable waters, which did not include wetlands, to keep navigable waters free of impairments;

(12) the 1972 Clean Water Act formed the basis for a broad expansion of Federal jurisdiction over wetlands by modifying the definition of ''navigable waters' to include all ''waters in the United States'';

(13) in 1975, a U.S. District Court ordered the Corps to publish revised regulations concerning the scope of the section 404 program, regulations that expanded the scope of the program to include the discharge of dredged and fill material into wetlands;

(14) the wetlands regulatory program was expanded yet again by regulatory action to include isolated wetlands, those that are not adjacent to navigable waters, and such an expansion formed the basis for burdensome intrusions on the property rights of Alaskans, Alaskan Native Corporations, the State of Alaska, and property owners in Alaska;

(15) expansion of the wetlands regulatory program in this manner is beyond what the Congress intended when it passed the Clean Water Act and the expansion has placed increasing and unnecessary economic and administrative burdens on private property owners, small businesses, city governments, State governments, farmers, ranchers, and other for negligible environmental benefit associated with wetland permits;

(16) for Alaska, a State with substantial conserved wetlands and less than 1 percent private, noncorporate land ownership, the burdens of the current wetlands regulatory program unnecessarily inhibit reasonable community growth and environmentally benign, sensitive resource development;

(17) Alaska villages, municipalities, boroughs, city governments, and Native organizations are experiencing increasing frustration with the constraints of the wetlands regulatory program because it interferes with the location of community centers, airports, sanitation systems, roads, schools, industrial areas, and other critical community infrastructure;

(18) policies that purport to achieve ''no net loss'' of wetlands reflect a Federal response to the 53 percent loss of the wetlands base in the South 48, a calculation that excludes Alaska wetlands;

(19) total wetlands loss in Alaska is less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the total wetlands acreage in Alaska;

(20) individual landowners in Alaska have experienced devaluations of up to 97 percent of their property value due to wetlands regulations and the tax base of many communities has diminished by those regulations.

SEC. 3 AMENDMENT TO THE FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) is amended—

(a) in section 101(a) (33 U.S.C. 1251(a)) by—

(1) striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (6);

(2) striking the period at the end of paragraph (7) and inserting in lieu thereof ''; and''; and

(3) adding the following new paragraphs:

''(8) it is the national policy to—(A) achieve a balance between wetlands conservation and adverse economic impacts on local, regional, and private economic interests and (B) to eliminate the regulatory taking of private property by the regulatory program authorized under section 404;

''(9) it is the national policy to encourage localized wetlands planning, without mandating it and by providing funds to encourage it, and such planning shall allow local political subdivisions and local governments to apply differential standards for the issuance of wetlands permits based on factors that include the relative amount of conserved wetlands habitat and the wetlands loss rate in the State in which such political subdivision or local government is located; and

''(10) it is the national policy that compensatory mitigation on wetlands or potential wetlands located outside the boundaries of a State shall not be required, requested, or otherwise utilized to offset impacts to wetlands inside that State.''.

(b) in section 404(b) (33 U.S.C. 1344(b)) by inserting immediately after ''anchorage'' the following: ''; provided however, that the guidelines adopted pursuant to clause (1) for a State with substantial conserved wetlands areas—

''(A) shall not include requirements or standards for mitigation to compensate for wetlands loss and adverse impacts to wetlands;

''(B) may include requirements or standards for minimization of adverse impacts to wetlands; and

''(C) may include standards or requirements for avoidance of impacts only if the permit applicant is not required to establish that upland alternative sites do not exists.''.

(c) in section 404(e) (33 U.S.C. 1344(e)) by inserting at the end the following new paragraph—

''(3) Notwithstanding the requirements of paragraphs (1)and (2), at the request of a State with substantial conserved wetlands areas, the Secretary shall issue general permits for such States and the requirements under which such general permits are issued

shall contain a regulatory standard for discharge of dredged or fill material into navigable waters in such State, including wetlands, that is no greater than the standard under subsection (b).''.

(d) in section 404(f)(1) (33 U.S.C. 1344(f)(1)) by—

(1) striking the comma at the end of subparagraph (F) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon; and

(2) adding the following new subparagraphs—

''(G) associated with airport safety (ground and air) in a State with substantial conserved wetlands areas, and in any case associated with airport safety (gound and air) when the Secretary of Transportation determines that it is advisable for public safety reasons and deems it necessary;

''(H) for construction and maintenance of log transfer facilities associated with log transportation activities;

''(I) for construction of tailings impoundments utilized for treatment facilities (as determined by the development document) for the mining subcategory for which the tailings impoundment is constructed;

''(J) for construction of ice pads and ice roads and for purposes of snow storage and removal,''.

(e) by adding at the end of section 404 (33 U.S.C. 1344) the following new subsections—

''(s) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section the term—

''(1) 'conserved wetlands' means wetlands that are located in the National Park System, National Wildlife Refuge System, National Wilderness System, the Wild and Scenic River System, and other similar Federal conservation systems, combined with wetlands located in comparable types of conservation systems established under State and local authority within State and local land use systems.

''(2) 'economic base lands' means lands conveyed to, selected by, or owned by Alaska Native entities pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, Public Law 92–203, as amended, or the Alaska Native Allotment of 1906 (34 stat. 197), and lands conveyed to, selected by, or owned by the State of Alaska pursuant to the Alaska Statehood Act, Public Law 85–508, as amended.

''(3) 'State with substantial conserved wetlands areas' means any State which—

''(A) contains at least 15 acres of wetlands for each acre of wetlands filled, drained, or otherwise converted within such State (based upon wetlands loss statistics reported in the 1990 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wetlands Trends Report to Congress entitled 'Wetlands Losses In the United States 1780's to 1980's'); or

''(B) the Secretary of the Army determines has sufficient conserved wetlands areas to provide adequate wetlands conservation in such State, based on the policies set forth in this Act.

''(t) ALASKA NATIVE AND STATE OF ALASKA LANDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall issue individual and general permits pursuant to the standards and requirements of subsections (a) and (b) for a State with substantial conserved wetlands areas.

''(2) PERMIT CONSIDERATIONS.—For permits issued pursuant to this section for economic base lands, in addition to the requirements in subsections (a) and (b), the Secretary shall—

''(A) balance the standards and policies of this Act against the obligations of the United States to allow economic base lands to be beneficially used to create and sustain economic activity;

''(B) with respect to Alaska Native lands, give substantial weight to the social and economic needs of Alaska Natives; and

''(C) account for regional differences in the abundance and value of wetlands.

''(3) GENERAL PERMITS.—For permits issued under this section on lands owned by Alaska villages, the Secretary shall issue general permits for disposition of dredged and fill material for critical infrastructure including water and sewer systems, airports, roads, communication sites, fuel storage sites, landfills, housing, hospitals, medical clinics, schools, and other community infrastructure in rural Alaska villages without a determination that activities authorized by such a general permit cause only minimal adverse environmental effects when performed separately and will have only minimal cumulative adverse effects on the environment.

''(4) OTHER CONSIDERATIONS.—The Secretary shall consult with and provide assistance to Alaska Natives (including Alaska Native Corporations) and the State of Alaska regarding promulgation and administration of policies and regulations under this section.''.●

TAX EXPENDITURE CONTROL ACT

● Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, the bill that I have sent to the desk makes a very simply point. We can spend money just as easily through the Tax Code as we can through the appropriations process or through the creation of mandatory spending programs.

I think we should be honest about the hundreds of billions of dollars that we spend each year through tax expenditures. Spending is spending, whether it comes in the form of a Government check or in the form of a special exception from the tax rates that apply to everyone else.

Tax expenditures or tax loopholes allow some taxpayers to lower their taxes and leave the rest of us paying higher taxes than we otherwise would pay. By requiring that Congress establish specific targets for tax expenditures as part of the budget reconciliation process, this bill simply places tax expenditures under the same budgetary scrutiny as all other spending programs.

Tax spending does not, as some would say, simply allow people to keep more of what they earned. Rather, it gives them a special exception from the rules that oblige everyone to share in the responsibility of the national defense and protecting the young, the aged, and the infirmed.

Mr. President, we all have been heartened by the recent drops in projected budget deficits. Recent CBO figures show the deficit dropping to $166 billion in 1996, largely due to the success we had in passing the largest deficit reduction package during the 103d Congress.

However, we cannot rest on that success. Although it was a good downpayment on deficit reduction, it is not enough. Even if we succeed in reducing the deficit further by cutting discretionary spending, we will not even begin to touch the national debt.

We cannot afford to be timid, Mr. President. Our children's way of life is dependent upon our acting on the Federal deficit today and tomorrow and every year thereafter until we restore fiscal sanity to our budget. We cannot wait until we grow our way out of the debt. And we should not and cannot wait until deficits start drifting up in the latter half of this decade before we do something.

The Congressional Budget Office tells us that the national debt held by the public will rise from approximately $3.5 trillion to roughly $6 trillion in 2004. At that time, the national debt will equal almost 55 percent of our gross domestic product. By 2004, interest payments on that debt will be approximately $334 billion, or over 3 percent of our gross domestic product. One recent report stated that these interest payments will cost each of today's children over $130,000 in extra taxes over the course of their lifetime. Our national debt is nothing less than a mortgage on our Nation's, and our children's future.

Mr. President, let us not kid ourselves. Addressing our burgeoning debt will not be easy. If it was, we would have done it years ago. Balancing the budget is going to require sacrifice from every American. It also means that we are going to have to take a hard look at what we spend the taxpayers' money on. And that means all of our spending programs, tax expenditures included.

Today, I am introducing legislation that requires Congress, in our budget resolution process, to simply establish targets for reducing tax expenditures, just as we do for other spending items. Those targets would be enforced through a separate line in our budget reconciliation instructions for reductions in tax expenditures. We already do this for other entitlement programs. There is no reason not to do so for tax expenditures. The Senate would pass a budget resolution asking the Finance Committee to reduce tax expenditures, for example, by $10 billion a year or $20 billion or whatever the Senate decides is prudent. It would be up to the Finance Committee to meet those targets through the reconciliation process.

This separate tax expenditure target would not replace our current revenue targets. Instead, it would simply ensure that the committee would take at least that specified amount from tax expenditures. Or, in other words, we would ensure that the committee would not raise the targeted amount from rate increases or excise tax increases.

I expect to hear from those who will say that I am trying to increase taxes. I strongly disagree. I am simply trying to draw the Senate's attention to the very targeted spending we do through the Tax Code, spending that is not subject to the annual appropriations process; spending that is not subject to the Executive order capping the growth of mandatory spending;spending that is rarely ever debated on the floor of the Senate once it becomes part of the Tax Code. The preferential deductions or credits or depreciation schedules or