

Ismay, MT. Mrs. Bickle was recently honored as the myth buster of the year by the Research, Education, and Endowment Foundation of the Montana Stockgrowers Association.

Mr. President you might ask, "what is a myth buster?" Well Mr. President, a myth buster is a person, a volunteer, who promotes the beef industry in Montana. During this time, a year in which Congress must write a new farm bill, thank goodness we have people out there who not only know and understand agriculture, but are willing to educate others about its importance. I should mention however, that this is Sheila's second job. Sheila and her husband Bill raise cattle near Ismay, MT.

Mrs. Bickle was instrumental in getting a science video produced with beef checkoff dollars into the fall catalog of CTN educational TV network, used by 106 San Francisco Bay area schools.

Mrs. Bickle also was the motivation behind a recent project by the Montana Cattle Women designed to educate third graders about beef nutrition.

Every time we educate our urban citizens about agriculture, we have helped bring the country closer together. When a person volunteers to help educate our children, like Sheila, our country and society is better for it.

Thank you Shelia, thank you for being a myth buster, for helping promote agriculture in our home State and in one of our largest urban areas. I wish we had some myth busters here in Washington to enlighten some of the press about what a great job our farmers and ranchers are doing for not only America but the world.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE SITZ FAMILY RECEIVES THE MONTANA ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP AWARD

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, Donna Sitz and her adult children—son Bob and his wife Jennipher, son Jim, and daughter Sherrie and her husband Mark Stokman were recognized for enhancing the natural resources and contributing to wildlife diversity on their ranch. Their registered Angus seedstock operation in the Madison Valley of southwestern Montana is nationally recognized for excellent cattle. And now they've been recognized for their stewardship as well. The Montana Stockgrowers just awarded the Sitz family their Montana Environmental Stewardship Award.

Among the many projects they completed to enhance the Montana environment include:

They planted thousands of trees along streambanks to help stabilize riparian areas.

They obtained a grant from the Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks to enhance spawning habitat for trout on their private land. The project has made significant improvements in three major spawning areas, increasing fish numbers and enhancing water quality.

They have improved the vegetation of their grazing lands by using a rest rotation grazing system, intensive grazing, controlled burns, and weed spraying.

It's always an honor for me to recognize Montanans who stand for everything we all should be doing, working hard and doing all you can to improve your local environment. One of the well known environmental slogans states "we should think globally and act locally". The Sitz family is doing exactly that, improving their local water quality and wildlife habitat, and by their actions they improve not only their ranch but the environment under Montana's big sky. What a wonderful example for all of our ranchers and farmers all across the Nation.

Donna Sitz credited her late husband Bob Sitz, who was tragically killed in a tractor accident in 1989 for the family's commitment to stewardship. Donna said, "Bob was a strong conservationist. I want the kids to be like their father, to run an honest outfit, and to leave things better than they found them." But let's also credit Donna for carrying on her husband's legacy, saving the ranch, and obviously raising an outstanding family to carry on.

I congratulate Donna and her family, for being recognized for this stewardship award. And I thank them for the shining example they set for all of us to follow.

TRIBUTE TO IRVINE CRAIG PORTER, JR.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I want to pay tribute to my friend Irvine Craig Porter, Jr., a longtime Alabama attorney and community leader who passed away recently.

Irvine was active in numerous professional and civic organizations throughout his life. He was a member of the Birmingham, AL, and American Bar Associations and was the city attorney for Homewood and Irondale, both Birmingham suburbs, for many years. He was secretary, treasurer, and general counsel for The Club; a member and chancellor of All Saints' Episcopal Church; and the chaplain of the Homewood Lions Club.

Irvine was awarded the Selective Service Medal in 1946, the Alabama Commendation Medal in 1968, and the Army's Distinguished Rifleman Badge in 1962. He also served as president of the University of Alabama National Alumni Association and of the board of directors of the downtown YMCA.

Irvine Porter was born on May 22, 1910 in Florence, AL. He attended the public schools in Florence and Birmingham, graduating from Phillips High School in 1926, Florence State Teachers' College—now the University of North Alabama—in 1928, and the University of Alabama School of Law in 1932.

Irvine was a thoughtful and honest adviser during the many years I had the pleasure of knowing him. He had a

keen legal mind, and always seemed to have his finger on the pulse of the people and what they were thinking. I extend my sincerest condolences to his wife, Sarah, and her entire family in the wake of this loss.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I understand we are still in morning business, is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, how much time is left, if I might inquire, in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may speak for up to 5 minutes.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I will inform the Senator that morning business will conclude at 10:30, which is 7 minutes.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended to 10:35.

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

BUDGET PRIORITIES

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, this debate is about priorities, fairness, and choices, and I am talking about the debate on the budget that we are on today. I guess we will be voting on it a little bit later this afternoon.

It is not just about numbers. This debate is about, really, the choices we will make as a society, how we deal with the fundamental issue of fairness, being fair to people in our country, and on what we will choose to spend the tax dollars that we collect from our hard-working citizens. We all agree on the bottom line. We agree on balancing the budget and bringing deficit down. I voted that way. But, unfortunately, how we get there is really what we are debating.

If you take a look at the national budget, what you see are pages and pages of numbers, numbers of statistics. But on every page and behind every number there are real people, there is a real individual someplace. So this budget debate is not just about numbers, it is about, as I said, choices and priorities, and about people and how people are going to be affected in their daily lives in this country.

All through this year I have listened to people in meetings I have held across my State. Iowans have shared their thoughts and concerns about the budget. Everywhere I have gone I have heard the same message: Yes, we want to balance the budget; yes, we want to bring the deficit down; but let us do it responsibly and let us be fair about the way we do it. So the question we have

to ask ourselves is how fair and how responsible is this budget? How fair or responsible is it to cut and gut the investments that we have made in education?

The previous speaker, Senator DORGAN from North Dakota, I think laid it out very well. What will we say? What will our children and grandchildren say 50 years from now—he said 100, I do not think it will even be that long; 25 to 50 years from now—when we find an ill-educated society; when we find we cannot compete in the world marketplace because we just did not invest in education in this country?

As a Nation, how can we deal with the growing number of children who will grow up to be burdens on our society instead of being productive tax-paying citizens? How can we deal with that when, No. 1, we are going to eliminate the in-school interest subsidy?

What this is, Mr. President, is we are levying a tax. There is a new tax in this budget on college students. And it is going to amount to \$3,000 or more on about 4 million college students and their families. It is an additional tax burden they are going to pay that they do not have to pay right now. One million college students can lose their college aid or have it drastically reduced because of cuts in Pell grants. We are going to cut as much as half a million preschoolers from the Head Start Program. We are going to gut the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program.

Again, let me talk a little more about this tax we are levying on students. Some people say, "Why should we, as taxpayers, support the sons and daughters of sometimes middle-income wage earners in this country to go to college? After all, when a young person goes to college that person stands to gain and make more money during his or her lifetime, so why should we foot the bill?"

I think to look at it that way is to look at it very narrowly, too narrowly. The more young people who get through college and become better educated, the better off we are as an entire society. So we have an interest in education. We are better off if we fund education for young people. We had the GI bill after World War II; this was not even loan money. We just gave money to young people to go to college. We did not even ask them to pay it back. But they paid it back a thousand fold over in increased earnings, increased taxes, and increased productivity for our entire Nation. So it is a national responsibility that we ensure that our young people have affordable quality education.

How responsible or fair is it to break our contract with seniors and impose the largest cuts in Medicare and Medicaid in history, socking seniors with perhaps as much as \$900 more every year in out-of-pocket costs, and burdening families who are struggling to take care of their ailing parents? The original Senate budget resolution cut Medicare by \$256 billion. This con-

ference goes from bad to worse by slashing Medicare by \$270 billion.

Just think about that, we are slashing Medicare \$270 billion, affecting one of the most vulnerable parts of our society, seniors, the elderly. How responsible or fair is it to these seniors? To students? To families? While we lavish tax cuts on a privileged few, the upper 1 percent of our income earners? And we refuse to even consider the swamp of waste in the Pentagon. This budget actually increases military spending by \$36 billion in just the first 4 years by \$7 billion next year alone. We are giving money to the Pentagon for programs which even the Pentagon does not want. The Pentagon does not want the B-2 bomber, but we are going to say, "You have to take more; you have to have more." So we are throwing money at the Pentagon when they do not even need it.

Mr. President, I have used this chart a few times in the past. I want to refer to it again today in the budget debate to give you a graphic illustration of what we are talking about in defense spending. Right now the United States is spending about \$206 billion for the Pentagon. I have along the bottom here all of our potential enemies in the world. There is Russia, China, North Korea, Iraq, Iran, Libya, Syria, and Cuba. You add them all up. The total they spend is about \$54 billion next year on their defense, their military spending. So right now we are spending about five times more in this country than all of our potential enemies put together.

But then when you add the United States and our allies together, we are spending over \$500 billion, a half a trillion dollars. That is almost 10 times more than what our potential enemies are spending. Yet we are being told that we have to spend more; this is not enough; we have to increase Defense Department spending next year.

So is it fair, or is it responsible when we throw money at the Pentagon to buy items that they do not even want? Yet, we take food away from hungry people, we increase taxes on our college students and make them pay for their college education, we cut down on Medicare and health care for the elderly, we cut Medicaid and health care for the poorest of our citizens? Is this fair? Of course, it is not fair. It is not fair at all.

So in simply human terms, what does the budget say? Forget about the numbers. What does it say? It says if you are a part of the privileged few, this is your lucky day. It is going to be Christmas in June. If you are in the top 1 percent of the income earners, you are going to stuff your stocking with a brandnew credit card with thousands of dollars of new credit.

But guess what? You do not have to worry about paying, this budget resolution says. We will send that bill to the students. We will sock them with another \$3,000 for their college education. We will send the bill to the seniors who

depend on Medicare. They are going to pay another \$900 per year. They will pay the bill. We will send the bill to the family farmers and the working families making the minimum wage. They will pay the bill.

This budget, in simple human terms, says that one child in Waterloo, IA, who needs a Head Start Program will be forced to pay more through budget cuts than the entire Pentagon. One senior living in Dubuque, IA, on a fixed income, one family farmer struggling in Albia to get by this year, one student in Storm Lake working their way through college, one family in Mason City who has lifted themselves up from welfare to work, each one of those will be forced to pay more for deficit reduction than the entire Pentagon. Talk to me about fairness and responsibility. That is what is lacking in this budget—fairness and responsibility. What happened to the notion of shared sacrifice, responsibility, and fairness?

Mr. President, this budget is about priorities and choices. This budget chooses the Pentagon over hungry kids. It chooses tax cuts for the top 1 percent of wage earners over health care for seniors. It does not close the corporate tax loopholes, but it does tighten the family budget for those trying to pay for a college education.

Some call this resolution a compromise. They are right about that. It compromises the promise of good, reliable health care for our seniors. It compromises the opportunity for middle-income families to afford a college education. It compromises our commitment to the family farmers who feed the world.

Yes, we need to balance the budget for the good of our Nation and our future. But, plain and simple, this is not the way to do it. Let us scrap this plan and do what the American people want us to do; that is, work together not as Democrats, not as Republicans, but as concerned Americans. That is what we are going to do with the rescissions bill. The Senate passed it 99-0. It went too far to one side in conference. Now it has been reworked. I think we have an excellent chance of passing it.

So now let us craft a responsible budget, a fair budget that does not tax seniors, students, and families. Let us craft a responsible budget that recognizes that the cold war is over. We can do it if we work together, not as Democrats or Republicans, but as responsible legislators adhering to the concepts of justice and fairness and equality for our people. So we can do it. We ought to surprise the American people and do it right for once.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I will be very, very brief. I just want to compliment my friend and colleague from my neighboring State of Iowa for his excellent remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator that the time for morning business is concluded.

Mr. EXON. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed as if in morning business for 2 minutes.

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

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I want to thank my friend and colleague from Iowa for his excellent remarks, especially with regard to the fairness on the budget that we are going to vote on today. I think this is a very, very critical vote that is upcoming. I thank the Senator from Iowa for his input, and the excellent remarks by the Senator from Massachusetts yesterday, and all of the other constructive suggestions that have been made.

Let us scrap this bill and try to come up with something, almost anything, that would be better.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I see the Senator from Delaware on the floor at this moment. I would like to address the Senate for 8 minutes. I could ask consent to proceed in morning business, or we can lay the bill down, whatever is the desire of the floor manager about the way to proceed. I am glad to have the bill laid down and ask that my remarks be printed in the appropriate place in the RECORD.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator just proceed on that basis.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to extend the morning hour for 8 minutes.

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

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Ross Eisenbrey, a fellow on the staff of the Labor Committee, be granted privileges of floor during the pendency of the regulatory reform bill.

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

REGULATORY REFORM BILL

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is no accident that the United States today has the cleanest air and water we have had in decades, perhaps the cleanest in the world. We have the safest and most affordable food and the safest, most advanced, and most effective drugs. American workplaces are safer than they have ever been before. Our national productivity is the envy of the world. In short, our regulatory system is achieving the goals we have set. There is no justification to scrap it or trash it.

We can improve the current system, especially to streamline it, and reduce redtape, bureaucracy and delays. But I will not support a bill that carves gaping loopholes in the current system.

We all know what is going on here. The extremist Republican majority in Congress has given the keys of the door to profit-sharing business lobbyists and an unholy collection of special interest groups.

We know that many well-heeled enterprises have no use for Government regulations that cramp their profits or protect the public interest. There is no love lost for regulations that make them clean up pollution they cause, or that prohibit them from marketing dangerous or unhealthy products, or that make them spend part of their profits to protect the health and safety of their workers.

Are the costs of this kind of regulation way out of line? Have we spent too much safeguarding health and safety and protecting the environment? On the whole, we have not. We heard estimates yesterday about the cost of regulations. But we heard nothing about the benefits of those regulations.

It is no surprise or wonder that those who care about the environment and public health and public interest are deeply concerned about this bill. We can only hope that the cost-benefit analyses mandated by the bill will be more balanced than our debate about the costs and benefits of regulation. If the Congress does not protect the public interest, who will?

In fact, there is good evidence that the estimates cited yesterday are greatly exaggerated. In the first place, about half of the entire regulatory burden comes from a single agency—the Internal Revenue Service—which is not even covered by the bill.

The Environmental Protection Agency, and environmental regulations generally, are said to be the next biggest culprit. But the Bureau of Labor Statistics has been surveying businesses about the causes of their layoffs for years, and the businesses themselves attribute only one-tenth of one percent of their layoffs to the burdens of environmental laws and regulations. If environmental regulations caused the kind of impacts that the supporters of this bill claim, we would expect the businesses themselves to be aware of them.

We have all heard stories of regulatory excesses, and a small number of them are true. There have been regulators who have overreached and made unjustifiable decisions, such as the inspector who cited a company for a violation when employees violated OSHA standards to rescue the victim of a trench cave-in.

But honest, accurate examples of regulatory excess are relatively rare, considering the size and complexity of the economy. We hear the same handful of anecdotal examples over and over again. But we hear less about the benefits of our regulatory system, which are taken for granted and are undeniable. We have never had a Chernobyl or a Bhopal or a thalidomide tragedy in the United States. We should be proud of that record—and cautious about

making changes that could make tragedies more likely.

The reckless practices that led to dangerous workplaces, to American rivers catching fire, and to the near-extinction of the bald eagle have given way over the past quarter century to rules which help ensure that today's children can look forward to safe and healthy places to work and a clean environment that reflects the best of our heritage. We need to keep these priorities in mind and in perspective as we consider this bill.

We also need to remember that we are not writing on a clean slate. Congress and the President have recently made important changes to improve the regulatory process, and other sensible changes are on the way. In March, President Clinton signed the Unfunded Mandates Act, which requires all rules that have an impact on the economy of \$100 million or more to have a cost-benefit analysis and a risk assessment. The President's executive order on regulation, signed last year, has similar requirements.

The Senate has passed the Nickles-Reid bill, which requires every regulation to lay over for 45 days before becoming effective, in order to allow Congress to block regulations that do not make sense or which impose excessive costs. We need that kind of oversight of the regulatory process, and it is being put in place and should be given a chance to work.

Unfortunately, much of the pending bill is overkill. The Dole-Johnston draft is an improvement over the Judiciary Committee bill. But without additional, significant changes, it could severely undermine the health of large numbers of American families, leave major areas of the environment ravaged by pollution, and threaten the health and safety on the job of millions of American workers. In too many ways, the Dole-Johnston is still, like the bill reported from the Judiciary Committee, a blueprint to paralyze the regulatory process.

Rulemakings under the Occupational Safety and Health Act would have more than 20 new steps, making an already slow process much slower. OSHA's 5-year-long rulemaking on cadmium, which causes cancer and kidney disease, would have become a 10-year ordeal.

The Food and Drug Administration has proposed a rule requiring label warning statements and single-dose packaging on certain dietary iron supplements, which cause about 10,000 poisonings of children a year. Iron tablet overdoses can cause intestinal bleeding, shock, coma, seizures, and death in children. Because of the bill's retroactive effective date, FDA will have to redo its risk assessment and cost-benefit analysis to meet the rigid, one-size-fits-all requirements of the bill. This will create unnecessary costs, and delay a rule that will save children's lives and prevent \$250 million a