

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

MORNING BUSINESS

(During today's session of the Senate, the following morning business was transacted.)

TARGETED JOBS TAX CREDIT

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I want to ruminate for a few minutes about the Work Opportunities Tax Credit, now called the WOTC, which is the substitute for the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit, which expired at the end of last year.

Mr. President, the TJTC had some problems, but let me tell you, it got the job done. It encouraged employers to put kids and young adults to work. Youth who probably would not have gotten their first job but for TJTC.

I have a letter, Mr. President, from a good friend of mine in Montana. W.E. Hainline operates 4 B'S Restaurants across Montana and several other Western states. They serve good food and employ a lot of young adults.

Bill has had a lot of experience in the TJTC area. In fact, the 4 B'S is nationally recognized as a leader when it comes to hiring disadvantaged and handicapped youth, many of whom had their first job with 4 B's.

Bill can tell you about these kids and how they went on to other jobs and to success in many fields. In fact, that is what TJTC was about, and what we want to achieve with WOTC—we want to move kids off of the streets, off of welfare and we want to keep them out of the criminal justice system.

Bill is concerned, as am I Mr. President, that the WOTC is currently contained in the Reconciliation Bill before us, will not do the job. Bill notes in his letter that WOTC:

As written, virtually eliminates most companies from participating in [WOTC] by ignoring the youth group (18 to 24 year olds) not located in an empowerment Zone.

Mr. President, I joined with Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN last week in an amendment that would have expanded WOTC to create two new categories of youths which employers could hire under WOTC: individuals 18 through 24 receiving or living with families on food stamps; individuals 18 through 24 who are non-custodial parents of a child residing in a family receiving AFDC or successor programs; and individuals 18 through 24 who are receiving Supplemental Security Income.

Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN and I are working with Joint Tax to find the money to include these youths in WOTC.

Mr. President, as always, Bill Hainline hits the nail on the head. I request that his letter to me be printed in the RECORD. Bill has the credentials. He has used the TJTC program. He knows what it takes to make it work. I would encourage my colleagues to read their letter and to heed what he

has to say. Replacing TJTC with WOTC will accomplish little if employers, like Bill, do not utilize the WOTC program.

If that happens, kids are the big losers.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESTAURANTS, INC.,
Missoula, MT, October 17, 1995.

Hon. MAX BAUCUS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC:

I understand that the Senate Finance Committee is proposing a new TJTC bill, which was similar to the one developed by the House Ways and Means Committee.

Their bill, as written, virtually eliminates most companies from participating in the new program by ignoring the youth group (18 to 24 year olds) not located in an empowerment zone, not to mention the increased retention period from 120 hours to 500 hours.

Those two changes would preclude most Montana companies from participating in the proposed program as there are no designated empowerment zones in our state that I am aware of, nor would the proposed tax incentive offset the expense of tracking an eligible employee for 400 hours. After all, the objective of the program is to give people on government assistance, job training to take advantage of all employment opportunities. Why should the initial employer train those types of people for other employers to receive the tax credit?

In my opinion, the proposed bill eliminates all employers, not located in an empowerment zone, from participating in the new program. The cost of identifying new hires eligible under the remaining categories, and the expense of tracking those eligible for 500 hours, would far exceed the tax benefits proposed.

The only way our company could effectively participate in the new program would be with the inclusion of 18 to 24 year olds that were "means tested", and the retention period is lowered to either 200 or 250 hours.

The above changes to the program would allow all Montana employers to participate equally with large city employers and insure that all people, with employment barriers, have an equal opportunity to seek employment for any profession they choose.

I would greatly appreciate you informing me if these changes can be effected.

Sincerely,

W.E. HAINLINE,
President.

THE SUMMIT BETWEEN PRESIDENT CLINTON AND CHINA'S PRESIDENT JIANG ZEMIN

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise today to call attention to yesterday's summit meeting between President Clinton and Chinese President Jiang Zemin in New York.

Last summer, relations between the two countries fell rapidly and unexpectedly to their lowest point since the Tiananmen massacre, largely over the visit of Taiwan President Lee Teng-hui to Cornell University, his alma mater. Most of us in the Senate, myself included, supported that visit as a private one for a distinguished alum. I continue to believe that the Chinese leadership in Beijing overreacted to the visit and allowed the bilateral relationship to unravel unnecessarily. I

was sorry that Beijing chose to react to Lee's visit by withdrawing the Chinese ambassador to the United States, suspending ongoing bilateral discussions on proliferation, canceling visits of United States officials to China and visits of Chinese officials to the United States, and by canceling bilateral discussions with Taiwan. But now, after several months of discord, it appears we have the opportunity to bring some stability back to the relationship and I support the President's decision to hold this summit in New York.

I did not believe that this summit meeting would produce a significant breakthrough on any of the issues with which we continue to disagree with Beijing, including Tibet, ballistic missile proliferation, nuclear testing, suppression of dissent in China, and trade issues. It did not. Recent press reports state that Chinese leaders had demanded certain concessions from the United States, such as written assurances that members of Taiwan's top leadership will never again be granted a visa to the United States or that the United States will refrain from criticism of China's human rights record in international fora. The administration rightly gave no such assurances. These are important policy issues, with significant domestic and international ramifications for both governments. Both governments seem convinced that the other is being unreasonable and obstinate. It is unrealistic to expect any major accords could have come under current circumstances.

This is an unfortunate state of affairs between two of the world's most influential countries and hopefully a passing one. But for the time being we must focus on keeping the relationship steady and effective. That is why a summit meeting between the two presidents was so important at this time. The United States raised all of the issues that we believe to be important and let the Chinese leadership know our commitment to them, and we should continue to do so. But it was also right to listen to President Jiang's concerns and to strive for mutual understanding, if not mutual agreement. Those who criticize our President for failing to win major concessions likely fail to recognize the realities of the current relationship and the necessity of strengthening contacts at all levels that will outlast this period and carry forward a stronger relationship in the future. I commend the President for holding the summit yesterday and hope that this meeting will mark the beginning of a more solid and productive period of United States—China relations.

THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, before discussing today's bad news about the Federal debt, how about another go, as the British put it, with our pop quiz. Remember? One question, one answer.

The question: How many millions of dollars does it take to add up a trillion dollars? While you are thinking about it, bear in mind that it was the U.S. Congress that ran up the Federal debt that is \$27 billion away from \$5 trillion.

To be exact, as of the close of business yesterday, October 24, the total federal debt—down to the penny—stood at \$4,975,508,732,304.35. This figure is approximately \$27 billion away from \$5 trillion. Another depressing figure means that on a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$18,887.12.

Mr. President, back to our pop quiz, how many million in a trillion: There are a million million in a trillion.

TRIBUTE TO DON BROWN

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Donald S. Brown, who throughout his exceptional career dedicated himself to public service. Mr. Brown has been a pioneer in the field of economic development. He worked tirelessly to help the poor around the world achieve a better way of life. He has also been instrumental in shaping the agenda of both bilateral and multilateral development institutions, encouraging them to focus closely on the needs of the people.

For the last 12 years, Don Brown has served as the vice president of the International Fund for Agricultural Development [IFAD], a specialized agency of the United Nations in Rome. As the most senior American in the organization, he has been an innovator of new and creative ideas that IFAD has implemented effectively on the ground. He has helped sharpen the focus of IFAD, which is the only international agency which devotes all of its resources to the rural poor. Most recently he has worked diligently, with other senior IFAD officials, to streamline IFAD, increase its efficiency, and reduce its administrative costs. Don Brown has labored unselfishly to promote development and reduce poverty and has been an inspiration to all of us working for a better world.

Mr. Brown also ably served in the U.S. Government for over 20 years. He willingly accepted very difficult assignments in various U.S. Agency for International Development [U.S. AID] posts throughout Africa and the Near East. During this time he held the position of mission director to Morocco and Zaire. In his last field assignment, Mr. Brown served as the director of the U.S. AID Mission to Cairo, Egypt, one of AID's largest missions. Mr. Brown also served at AID headquarters in Washington as the Deputy Assistant Administrator of AID to help formulate U.S. development policy. He also was the Executive Director of the Commission on Security and Economic Assistance, established by the Secretary of State.

Throughout his career, Don received numerous awards recognizing his outstanding achievements. His colleagues both within international organiza-

tions and the government found his sound advice and the many insights gained from his rich experience invaluable to their work. We and they will always remember him as someone who was ever willing to lend a helping hand or a word of comfort. Mr. Brown is a thoughtful, pragmatic, and dedicated individual who touched many of our lives and who made an enormous contribution to the lives of many poor people around the world. I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Don Brown and in wishing him well in his future endeavors.

THE ISTOOK-MCINTOSH AMENDMENT

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I rise to respond to the statement made yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, my old friend Senator CARL LEVIN. We came here to the Senate together. I have the greatest admiration and personal regard for him.

I trust that my colleagues will listen very carefully to what I have to say about this issue—the so-called "Istook-McIntosh" amendment which may be included in the Treasury-Postal appropriations conference report.

I ask for your close attention because I am certain that your offices are hearing about this language, just as the Senator from Michigan has been hearing about it. And, if the material coming across my desk is any guide at all, a clump of what you are hearing about it is plain hogwash, or more civilized, rubbish. I would surely include the commentary of the New York Times within that description.

I have been in the negotiations concerning the Istook-McIntosh language. I have been working side by side with my colleague from Idaho, Senator LARRY CRAIG. One could not ask for a better ally in this or any other cause. The Senator from Idaho brings many singular qualities to this work—a commitment to genuine reform, great realism about what it is possible to achieve in legislating, and unflagging consideration for the concerns of his colleagues—especially including me.

We know what this proposed amendment does, and what it does not do. And I can certainly assure my colleagues that much of the lobbying on this amendment has been hysterical at the worst, misleading at best. It is no wonder that my friend, the Senator from Michigan, is agitated about it, given the abjectly horrifying portrayal by those lobbying this issue.

It almost tempts me to coin a new aphorism—"hell hath no fury like an individual whose access to Federal bucks has been conditioned in any way." Because that is what this issue is about—access to the Federal Treasury. It is not about "free speech" or the first amendment, or anything of the sort. Those are merely the terms which are being applied during the argument by those who wish to continue to ensure themselves of continued delivery of Federal money.

Let me begin my description of this amendment by going back to first principles. I have a few views which might be termed eccentric or quaint or even naive in this era of behemoth government, and one of them is that there are "responsibilities" which follow from being a custodian of Federal money.

I know that is a strange and even bizarre thing in this day and age, to talk about "responsibility" instead purely of "rights," or purely of "victims." We are all experts on our own rights, but rarely do we acknowledge that these rights confer responsibilities. And that is what this issue is about—the responsibilities of those who receive Federal money.

The Senator from Michigan is justly concerned about the influence of lobbyists over the public policy process. This concern animates his sincere desire to pass lobbying reform legislation—and he is proceeding remarkably toward that end.

I agree with that concern, and I would add to it by saying that the American public knows that "something is wrong" with the process. They know that the process itself interferes with good policy. They know that the interests of the public at large are not served well when Washington has so contrived matters as to amplify the access and the influence of certain special interests, which comes effectively at the expense of the interests of the whole.

The average person on the street would be scandalized to find out that we, the Congress, have been blithely engaging for years in the practice of favoring political organizations with taxpayer-provided money.

I am not talking about simply the narrow practice of using Federal dollars to lobby. That is illegal already, as the Senator from Michigan has so ably pointed out.

But I think we need to agree that it is wrong to be giving Federal dollars to political organizations, whether or not we "mark" those bills they receive and then say that only those dollars can't be used for lobbying Congress.

Can you imagine the outcry, wailing and gnashing of teeth that would exist if the Federal Government were found to have channeled millions in grant money to the Christian Coalition? Or the Heritage foundation? It wouldn't matter whether that money was used to hold seminars or to buy stationery. The public would swiftly know that this was wrong, that Government should not be in the business of propping up the operations of political organizations.

And yet that is precisely what we in America have been doing. I found this year that the AARP received \$86 million in Federal grants—this, the largest and most powerful lobbying organization in the country—the King Kong of lobbying "gorillas."

At the time, I was criticized for "singling out" the AARP. I was told that