SENATE—*Saturday, April 3, 1993*

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 3, 1993)

The Senate met at 9:15 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore [Mrs. MURRAY].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

A psalm of praise on the Sabbath:

Praise ye the Lord. Praise God in His sanctuary: praise Him in the firmament of His Power.

Praise Him for His mighty acts: praise Him according to His excellent greatness.

Praise Him with the sound of the trumpet: praise Him with the psaltery and harp.

Praise Him with the timbrel and dance: praise Him with stringet instruments and organs.

Praise Him upon the loud cymbals: praise Him upon the high sounding cymbals.

Let every thing that hath breath praise the Lord. Praise ye the Lord.—Psalm 150.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 1335, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1335) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Byrd amendment No. 283, in the nature of a substitute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time until 11:45 a.m. shall be for debate only and shall be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] or their designees.

Who yields time?

If time is not yielded by either side time will be charged equally.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, our Republican friends have argued that the CDBG funds requested in the President's economic stimulus package are not needed.

They also argue these funds will be spent for nothing more than pork barrel projects like swimming pools, golf courses, ice skating rinks, gymnasiums, and other public recreation facilities.

Well, let us see, Madam President, how this thing all began. Let us go back to its roots.

This is a program that began in the Nixon-Ford administration. On June 12, 1974, HUD Secretary James Lynn, under the Nixon administration, said in testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee:

Our Budget includes two program appropriation requests for 1975 in the Community Planning and Development areas. As I said earlier, we are seeking $2.5 billion for activities under the proposed Better Communities Act. * * *

Funds would go to local elected officials for use for community needs, determined locally. * * *

Application requirements would be simple. Second-guessing by Washington would be replaced by decision making by local officials as to which projects would be funded. (Emphasis added) [H.R. 15572/93rd Cong, 2nd Sess./VA-HUD Hrgs, Part 2/p. 1253].

This was HUD Secretary James Lynn under the Nixon administration.

So this program originated under the Nixon administration. And it was ballyhooed as a great program for cutting out redtape at the Federal level. The idea was to let the local officials make the decisions as to what projects would be funded.

Under the Ford administration, HUD Secretary Carla Hills testified, again before the Senate Appropriations Committee, on April 21, 1975:

We are requesting $2.7 billion for the new Community Development Grant program in 1976. * * * Under this new program, funds are now available to communities on the basis of a statutory formula which takes account of their needs in terms of population, poverty, and housing overcrowding. * * *

We will be looking for community initiative in planning and carrying out activities. *The communities themselves will set priorities for the use of funds they receive.* (Emphasis added) [H.R. 8070/94th Cong, 1st Sess./VA-HUD Hrgs, part 1/pp. 636-37].

Who is talking? Carla Hills. Where? In testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee. What did she say, under this program that was a Republican program: "The communities themselves will set priorities for the use of funds they receive."

April 5, 1976, HUD Secretary Carla Hills in testimony before Senate Appropriations Committee:

We are requesting the full authorization of $3.25 billion for the Community Development Block Grant program in 1977. Under this program, funds are available to communities on the basis of a statutory formula which takes account of their needs in terms of population, poverty and housing overcrowding. * * *

We are pleased with the results of this program. * * * We find that combining categorical grant programs into a block grant program gives localities an important opportunity to change their funding priorities. * * *

I am also pleased to report that a majority of the cities surveyed by the Department that had prior program experience indicate that the block grant program in 1975 represented a decrease in Federal red tape. (Emphasis added) [H.R. 14233/94th Cong, 2nd Sess./VA-HUD Hrgs, part 4/pp. 1161-62]

Carla Hills speaking way, way back in 1976, under the Ford administration.

Let me read her lines again:

I am also pleased to report that the majority of the cities surveyed by the Department that had prior program experience indicate that the block grant program in 1975 represented a decrease in Federal red tape.

The CDBG Program is essentially a Republican program. It was created by Republicans in the Nixon and Ford administrations.

It has been supported by Republican Housing Secretaries Jim Lynn, as I have already quoted; Carla Hills, as I have quoted; Samuel Pierce and Jack Kemp.

CDBG was first proposed by President Nixon. First authorized in the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, which was enacted August 22, 1974.

HUD first requested appropriations for it in fiscal year 1975.

So the testimony given before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, by Republican administrations on the fiscal years 1975, 1976, and 1977 budgets all demonstrate that the key to this program's success is giving decision-making to local officials—the local officials.

The flexibility contained in CDBG today was an idea initiated by the Reagan administration. Secretary Pierce laid out the Reagan administration philosophy in connection with the HUD fiscal year 1982 budget request.

In testimony again before the Senate appropriations committee, HUD Secretary Samuel Pierce on May 20, 1981, said this:

Now I would like to discuss our 1982 appropriation request for the Community Develop-

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

ment Block Grant program. Mr. Chairman, as you know, changes in both the Block Grant and Urban Development Block Grant programs are currently under development.

Proposed legislation would substantially restructure Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to increase local flexibility and minimize Federal involvement, consistent with our desire to return power and decision making to localities and States. * * *

In the State block grant program, each State would receive an allocation based on the current dual formula. States would distribute funds to their smaller units of general local government to carry out eligible community and economic development activities. *States would be free to design fund distribution systems tailored to local needs and preferences, and would be responsible for overall administration of funds distributed.* [H.R. 4034/97th Cong, 1st Sess./VA-HUD Hrgs., part 2/pp. 1357-59]

There you are. That was Secretary of HUD, Mr. Pierce. I do not know where he is now or whatever happened to him, but this is a Republican program.

This is a Republican program and they wanted it fashioned so that the States and local communities would make the determination as to what programs would qualify, and thus cut out redtape at the Federal level.

The year after these changes were enacted, the Department of HUD boasted of reducing Washington's control of this program.

In testimony before the House Appropriations Committee on the fiscal year 1983 HUD budget, May 5, 1982, Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development—this is a Republican official—stated:

Under the legislative amendments that were enacted in 1981, the entitlement program (for CDBG) was improved. Complex applications are no longer required of entitlement grantees. Applications have been replaced by a statement of community development objectives and a description of the projected use of funds, resulting in considerable time savings for individual grantees. Communities can concentrate more on carrying out community development activities with greater efficiency because they have been granted relief from much of the previous paperwork requirements.

So, Madam President, the Republicans, for partisan political reasons, as a canard used to defeat this President's economic program, are trying to undo—trying to unravel nearly 20 years of Republican commitment under the Nixon administration, the Ford administration, the Reagan administration, and the Bush administration—trying to undo nearly 20 years of Republican commitment to the goals and details of the CDGB Program.

So our Republican friends have come in here, waving a big book about that thick saying: Oh, these are lists of items that were in this bill. And then when they are forced to say, "Well, they are not in the bill," they say "Well, they are in that miserable, hateful CDBG grant, for $2.5 billion"—that grant which allowed the local officials—local officials, State officials—to determine how the moneys would be spent. "We do not like that program," they say.

It is their program. They initiated it. They defended it. They promoted it. They supported it. And they said that it was a great success.

They do not like that program today. They say that under President Clinton's jobs bill, that program will be abused. They do not want decisions made at the local level anymore. They do not want decisions made at the community level; or at the State level. They now want the decisions made at the Washington level.

So, in this bill that is before the Senate, I have an amendment that is attached to the underlying bill. It is already in the committee substitute which, if adopted by the Senate, would read as follows:

"Section 204. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for this Act"—notwithstanding any other provision of law—"for this Act, the Office of Management and Budget shall administer the obligation of all funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act in a manner that will ensure that no wasteful, unnecessary, or nonmeritorious programs, projects or activities are approved. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall,"—not may, shall—"by notice published in the Federal Register, establish such requirements as may be necessary to carry out the intent of this section."

So, Madam President, our Republican friends are shouting fire and it is not right, it is not legally right to falsely shout fire in a crowded theater. In a crowded theater: "Fire, fire, fire, fire—we do not like that program." It is their program. It was initiated under a Republican President, supported by Republican departmental officials before the Appropriations Committee. They do not like it now, so they are yelling "Fire."

But they are falsely yelling fire.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the distinguished chairman yield?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Because in this substitute there is language that says: No. No. The decisions will not be left to State and local officials like the Republicans had it, like they wanted it. It will not be done that way. Under this legislation, the OMB Director shall—not may, "shall administer the obligation of all funds"—not just some funds, not just part of the funds—"all funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act in a manner that will ensure that no wasteful, unnecessary, or nonmeritorious programs, projects or activities are approved. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall"—also do this by notice—where? In the Federal Register—"establish such requirements as may be necessary to carry out the intent of this section."

What intent? The intent that—"all funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this act will be made in a manner that will ensure that no wasteful"—no "unnecessary," no "nonmeritorious programs, projects, or activities are approved."

So, Madam President, we have put in the assurance, the insurance, the guarantee that the decisions will not be made at the local levels but finally will be made here in Washington again.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the distinguished chairman yield on that?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I thank the chairman for pointing that out this morning. I listened very closely to his remarks and I have found it most curious and most odd, over the last few days, and I think most indicative of underlying motives, that our friends on the other side of the aisle have been loudly proclaiming that they want to make the decisions on how the money is to be spent at the local level. Yet it is our friends on the other side of the aisle who loudly proclaim and tout, at least in their political campaigns, that Washington makes too many decisions and that we ought not to put this money out with all these strings attached, and that it ought to go out to the communities and let people in local communities decide how to spend that money.

That is exactly what we have right here. It is, as the distinguished chairman said, a follow-through on the programs initiated and promoted under a series of Republican administrations.

So we have this curious situation here where the Republicans are arguing that we cannot put this money out in the local level because the people at the local level may misspend it. As the chairman has pointed out, he has put language in the underlying amendment saying they cannot spend it in a frivolous manner but they can spend it within certain parameters.

Mr. BYRD. Parameters in connection with which the regulations will be published in the Federal Register by the Office of Management and Budget Director.

Mr. HARKIN. Precisely. I just wanted to add one little point to this. I heard a lot of talk in the last couple of days about swimming pools and things like that being built.

There is a swimming pool in a park in a small community in Iowa, still operating today. Outside it has a plaque, a little plaque on the outside and it says, "Built by the Works Progress Administration." I forget the date, I think it was 1938, if I am not mistaken.

That swimming pool is still operating today—still operating. Obviously, it has probably been fixed up a few times since then. But take yourself back in time to 1938—again, I think that was the date, I could be mistaken on that—when it was built in the mid-

dle of the Depression. I am sure a lot of people said, "Oh, no, they should not make that decision to build that swimming pool. They should do something else with it." But the local people in that community decided that is how they would spend that money and that is what they would do.

Who knows how many children and families since that time have congregated during the summer months at that swimming pool, and how it has brought the community together, has given kids in that local community some recreation. It is still operating today after all these years. I can imagine there were those at that time saying it was a horrible waste of money. We have proven it was not a waste of money. It helped that community, helped countless families and young people.

Again, I want to buttress what the distinguished chairman said. Within the parameters that have been set out, published in the Federal Register within these guidelines, let us let the people at the local level decide how best to use the money and put people to work and let us not follow our friends on the other side of the aisle.

Let me note a few facts about the Community Development Block Grant Program. It was started during the Nixon administration. The funds are allocated by formula, not just to the big cities, but to all areas of the country. In Iowa, small towns, many with less than 1,000 people will receive funds for important projects based on competitive grant applications to the Iowa Department of Economic Development whose director Allan Thoms is appointed by Terry Branstad, a Republican Governor. So, charges that this program is a political payoff to the big city mayors is simply absurd.

The money goes to every part of our Nation. Every rural area of the Nation as well as the large cities are eligible for funding.

Mr. President, I ask consent that a letter from Allan Thoms, Iowa's director of the department of economic development and a table of projects in small towns and rural areas in Iowa that might receive funding under the Community Development Block Grant Program if this bill becomes law be included in the RECORD.

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

STATE OF IOWA, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT,

April 2, 1993.

Hon. TOM HARKIN,
U.S. Senator, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HARKIN: I am writing concerning the economic stimulus bill currently before the Senate, particularly with reference to the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program. Today's *Washington Post* states that some Senators are concerned that CDBG funds would be used for "frivolous or non-essential programs". Examples are cited such as parking garages, bike paths, and a performing arts center.

I would like to assure you that Iowa's CDBG program has consistently addressed pressing needs among lower-income communities and households. Typical grants awarded by IDED are for basic public works including community water and sewer systems, facilities for developmentally disabled persons, rehabilitation of deteriorating housing, and job creation. All projects involve substantial local financial contributions.

Should the stimulus bill pass, we would have no difficulty finding additional worthwhile projects in Iowa. After making our 1993 CDBG general competitive award several weeks ago, we still have over $23 million in unfunded requests. A list of projects is attached. News of the possibility of supplemental CDBG funding has already prompted numerous cities and counties to contact us about making additional applications.

Again, the quote from the *Post* article definitely does not apply to the excellent Iowa record on CDBG. Based on our contacts with other states, I believe that the article misrepresents the case nationwide. I trust that you and your fellow Senators will take this into account as you debate the bill.

Please contact me or Lane Palmer, Iowa CDBG Manager (Phone: 515 242-4837) if you have questions. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

ALLAN T. THOMS,
Director.

1993 CDBG APPLICANTS PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS—PROJECTS NOT FUNDED

I.D.	Community	$CDBG	Cum. CDBG$	Locals	Others	Brief description of projects
88	Adair	$200,500	$200,500	$95,000		Community Center.
89	Adair County	102,776	303,276	46,739		Day Care Center.
4	Algona	279,333	582,609	139,667		Senior Center, Sanitary Sewer Improvements.
47	Armstrong	302,186	884,795	151,094		Sewer System Improvements.
104	Auburn	142,586	1,027,381	73,454		Water Improvements.
81	Belle Plains	151,160	1,178,541	75,803		Sanitary Sewer Improvements.
150	Boone	321,130	1,499,571	160,570		Storm Sewer Construction.
113	Bouton	31,333	1,531,004	15,667		Fire Station.
32	Britt	277,667	1,808,671	138,833		Sewer System Improvements.
116	Brooklyn	375,166	2,183,637	187,684		Water Treatment Facility.
99	Carroll County	361,350	2,545,187	186,150		Group Home.
125	Carson	163,970	2,709,157	82,230		Water Tower.
37	Cerro Gordo County	200,000	2,909,157	596,763	$282,737	Wastewater Collection System.
159	Cherokee	600,000	3,509,157	1,591,250		Water System Improvements.
75	Clark County	900,000	4,409,157	977,903		Jail Construction.
111	Clemons	171,800	4,580,957	85,900		Rural Water Connections.
86	Corning	326,500	4,907,457	153,250		Water Lines, Sewer System Improvements.
72	Creston	600,000	5,507,457	310,800		Water Distribution Improvements.
95	Davis City	38,000	5,545,457	19,000		Fire Station.
87	Diagonal	55,990	5,601,447	25,495		Community Center.
7	Drakesville	172,000	5,773,447	86,000	545,100	Wastewater Treatment System.
53	Dubuque County	325,000	6,099,447	163,000		Vocational Services Center.
128	Dyersville	263,667	6,363,114	131,833		Water, Sewer, Storm, Street.
28	Elk Horn	248,000	6,511,114	125,000		Rural Water Connection.
36	Elk Run Heights	146,587	6,757,881	73,283		Water Drainage Improvements.
34	Evansdale	207,466	8,965,147	103,734		Storm Sewer Improvements, Water System Improvements.
21	Farragut	250,000	7,215,147	200,000		Outfall Sewer Replacement, Lagoon.
13	Fayette	104,000	7,319,147	52,000		Sewer System Improvements.
11	Floris	172,000	7,491,147	86,000	359,100	Wastewater Treatment System.
185	Forest City	587,626	8,078,773	293,814		Storm Sewer, Sanitary Sewer Improvements.
46	Fostoria	205,000	8,263,773	216,125		Water Main Replacement.
163	Garwin	250,000	8,533,773	219,000		Water System Improvements.
106	Grand Junction	69,303	8,603,076	34,851		Wastewater Treatment Improvements.
130	Grand Mound	105,333	8,708,409	52,667		Well.
25	Grant	123,000	8,831,409	86,260	288,950	Rural Water Connection.
152	Hampton	499,675	9,331,084	249,838		Water System Improvements.
5	Hancock County	55,800	9,386,684	27,800		Water Treatment Facility.
122	Henry County	429,388	9,816,050	214,684		Sanitary Sewer, Water and Street Improvements.
51	Hull	800,000	10,616,050	844,000		Rural Water Connection and Improvements.
40	Indianola	413,200	11,029,250	225,000		Group Home.
43	Ireton	172,819	11,202,069	100,000		Senior Center.
20	Irwin	178,000	11,380,069	89,000		Rural Water.
52	Jackson County	151,735	11,631,805	76,870		Group Home.
105	Jefferson	317,925	11,849,731	158,964		Drainage Improvements.
67	Kirkville	177,000	12,026,731	88,500	532,500	Sanitary Sewer.
158	Lamoni	400,000	12,426,731	1,484,290		Water System Improvements.
42	Lansing	121,200	12,547,931	120,000		Water and Sewer Extension.
85	Lenox	58,320	12,606,251	29,210		Fire Station.
110	Liscomb	249,466	12,855,717	124,734		Water Tower.
14	Little Sioux	26,000	12,881,717	13,000		Well.
15	Logan	400,000	13,261,717	204,500		Water Distribution System Improvements.
126	Lowden	250,000	13,531,717	155,000		Sewer Treatment Improvements.
145	Lucas County	122,645	13,664,382	81,400		Removal of Architectural Barriers (elevator).

1993 CDBG APPLICANTS PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS—PROJECTS NOT FUNDED—Continued

I.D.	Community	$CDBG	Cum. CDBG$	Locals	Others	Brief description of projects
18	Magnolia	100,000	13,754,362	50,000		Water System Improvements.
117	Malcom	114,090	13,868,452	53,554		Water Main Loop, Storm Sewer Installation.
54	Mason City	800,000	14,668,452	400,000		Workforce Center.
44	McGregor	108,032	14,778,484	56,668		Water Main, Well.
123	Middleton	244,540	15,021,024	126,975		Street Improvements.
19	Missouri Valley	600,000	15,621,024	300,000		Fire Station/Community Center.
12	Monona	140,772	15,761,796	70,596		City Hall Renovation, Street Improvements.
22	Montgomery County	600,000	16,351,796	1,409,940	1,462,820	Rural Water System.
74	North English	234,730	16,598,526	120,922		Water Treatment Improvements.
77	Norway	150,857	18,747,383	80,000		Water System Improvements.
142	Odebolt	122,103	16,869,488	51,052		Water System Improvements, Fire Station.
60	Orient	109,256	16,978,772	49,894		Community Center/Library.
103	Paton	103,300	17,082,072	51,650		Water Treatment Improvements.
59	Patterson	41,715	17,123,787	20,000		Street Improvements.
100	Pierson	106,800	17,230,587	53,400		Well, Water System Improvements.
6	Pisgah	80,000	17,310,587	40,000		Water Storage.
55	Pleasant Plain	43,150	17,353,737	21,600		Community Center.
10	Pulaski	250,000	17,603,737	125,000	516,100	Wastewater Treatment System.
31	Rake	100,000	17,703,737	50,000		Water System Improvements.
16	Red Oak	550,000	18,253,737	275,500		Water System Improvements, Sheltered Workshop.
107	Remsen	115,000	18,368,737	57,500		Community Action Agency Expansion.
58	Ringgold County	203,653	18,572,390	101,827		Child Care Center.
129	Ryan	110,000	18,682,390	55,000		Water System Improvements.
120	Salem	157,040	18,839,430	76,520		Storm Sewer Improvements, Sanitary Sewer Improvements.
48	Sanborn	252,000	19,091,430	250,000		Water System Improvements.
139	Spencer	291,900	19,383,330	215,000		Senior Center.
26	Stanton	250,000	19,633,330	150,000		Water System Improvements.
157	State Center	300,000	19,933,330	314,500		Electrical Service.
115	St. Anthony	112,000	20,045,330	92,200		Rural Water Connections.
161	Sully	250,000	20,295,330	173,000		Sanitary Sewer Improvements.
33	Sumner	104,500	20,399,830	52,250		Sanitary Sewer Improvements, Water Improvements.
24	Tabor	250,000	20,649,830	1,050,000		Wastewater Treatment System Improvements.
112	Tama County	600,000	21,249,830	2,500,000	1,187,265	Rural Water Facility.
71	Thornburg	31,331	21,261,161	15,666		Demolition, Community Center.
23	Thurman	239,000	21,520,151	125,000	311,000	Water System Improvements.
35	Tripoli	129,373	21,649,534	64,687		Storm sewer, Sanitary sewer.
131	Truesdale	55,870	21,705,404	27,935		Water Main Replacement.
102	Vail	90,265	21,795,659	44,480		Water System Improvements.
70	Van Buren County	234,935	22,030,604	115,715		Care Facility Improvements, Demolition.
121	Wapello	226,775	22,257,379	108,225		City Building, Well.
76	Washington	192,840	22,450,219	96,420		Social Service Facility Improvements.
79	Washington County	600,000	23,060,219	2,000,000		Rural Water Distribution.
108	Whiting	161,700	23,211,919	147,000		Water System Improvements.
39	Williamson	166,000	23,377,919	210,000	507,400	Wastewater Treatment and Collection System.
17	Woodbine	260,000	23,637,919	130,000		Wastewater Treatment System Addition.

Mr. BYRD. That is not what we are saying in our amendment. Our amendment is saying the OMB decides so as to protect against wasteful spending.

Mr. HARKIN. The local people can decide as long as it is within the parameters.

Mr. BYRD. They can decide within those parameters.

I will yield to the Senator from Maryland. I will yield to the Senator from Nevada shortly.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, I want to add one observation to this debate on the community development block grant. Until 1981, there was up-front review at HUD before they could do these projects. You had to get the clearance ahead of time, file an application. That was counter to Republican theory, which had taken the view that you should have a complete delegation of this authority. And in the Gramm-Latta reconciliation in 1981, they removed up-front review at HUD and gave this discretion to the State and local authorities.

Now, that was done by a Republican administration and a Republican Senate that took that step to provide this delegation now to the State and local governments. Of course, as the distinguished chairman has indicated, he is not putting screening back in, but the grant of the authority to even list these projects in the book was a Republican policy.

Mr. BYRD. Absolutely; absolutely.

Madam President, I promised to yield to the Senator from Nevada 10 minutes. I yield 5 minutes, following the Senator from Nevada, to the Senator from Tennessee, and then 5 minutes to the Senator from Maryland. My time is limited; 5 minutes to the Senator from Iowa; and 5 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky. And I want to reserve 5 minutes, Madam President, for myself before the cloture vote, if the Chair will protect my 5 minutes.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Madam President, let us understand that the programs we are talking about relate to people. I received a letter in the last couple of days from a Republican county commissioner in Washoe County, NV, part of the Greater Reno metropolitan area. A Republican county commissioner wrote me a three-page letter and indicated that the project that they want money for that will come from these funds provides the means to deal with the increasingly serious youth and family problems in Sun Valley, the name of the suburb of Reno. It would include a day care center, family resource center, parenting library, ballfields, park facilities, and a multipurpose recreation building.

We have heard so much negative about these types of buildings. Let us listen to what a Republican county commissioner has to say:

When the project is built, many public and private nonprofit human service agencies have agreed to set up early intervention programs in it for youth and families.

And he lists all those agencies.

Why is that important? The problem is this:

Housing is predominantly mobile homes, and the neighborhood has none of the typical urban amenities such as sidewalks, curbs or street lights. According to the National Recreation and Park Society standards, Sun Valley has less than one-third of the recreational facilities that it needs.

"So what?" That is what we have been hearing from the other side. So what? Here is what it means, according to a Republican county commissioner:

The necessity for programs that help children and their families is best evidenced by the crime statistics of the Washoe County sheriff's department: In the unincorporated area of Washoe County, 26 percent of all calls are to Sun Valley. Almost 40 percent of family disturbance and domestic violence offenses are in Sun Valley. Other statistics show that 26 percent of child abuse, 28 percent of runaways, and 28 percent of juvenile offenses occur in Sun Valley. The two Sun Valley schools, Virginia Palmer Elementary and Sun Valley Elementary, account for first and second place in the number of reported incidence of child abuse in Washoe County's 50 elementary schools. Each of these schools has twice the incidences of the third-place school.

Madam President, we are talking about helping human beings, problems that relate to crime. That is what these programs mean, some of these programs.

"We believe," says the Republican county commissioner, "the President's 'economic stimulus package' could provide a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to build this project quickly as a whole

coordinated package. The construction activities would provide jobs in the community" now "and the completed project would provide" now "long-term benefits to Sun Valley's at-risk kids and low-income families. With the site already in hand, and the planning and design work completed, we could begin construction" now.

That, Madam President, is what we have heard so many times from that side of the aisle in the last week or more; that these programs are worthless, we do not need them. Who needs a recreation area? Who needs a swimming pool? Who needs a place where these troubled youth can come and be taken care of?

We have some good news. Russia is not in civil war; the economy, we thought, was making a recovery but, of course, it is not. The statistics yesterday indicate problems are increasing as far as unemployment. We know that violent crime is exploding all over. I have given one instance of it.

Americans are asking two questions of Congress: Will we end gridlock to give a new President with a new plan a chance to implement that plan; or will we follow the path that the American public thinks we have been following recently, the path of gridlock?

The first step, we passed the President's budget and that is good. But, Madam President, we have problems in this country, problems that this stimulus package is trying to address. I have heard the chairman of this Appropriations Committee on many occasions tell anyone who will listen about the problems we have with domestic discretionary spending. We spend very little in domestic discretionary spending compared to what we used to on programs that mean something. Entitlements are skyrocketing, but on programs in science and education and anticrime, we spend one-half of what we did a decade ago. We spent 26 percent of our budget on domestic discretionary; now it is down to less than 13 percent. That, Madam President, is not good.

Madam President, I consider myself not a partisan person. I was the first Democrat to announce publicly that I would support the President's plan—President Bush's plan—in the gulf, the first Democrat to announce it publicly. I have been the key vote in many of President Reagan's and President Bush's plans over the past 10-plus years that I have been here. And I am proud of that fact. I am not a partisan person. That is what is so troubling to me as to what is going on now because we have rank partisanship forcing this country into gridlock.

I see in the U.S. News & World report a letter to the editor that says:

> In his March 1 editorial "Doing What Is Necessary," Mortimer Zuckerman referred to Republicans who once preached fiscal responsibility. The older generation of Republicans would be turning in their graves if they could see what Reagan-Bush voodoo economics has done to the American economy.

Madam President, they have to get real. They have to understand what is going on and back off from the partisanship.

I heard President Clinton say, "Even those who did not vote for me want me to succeed," and that, Madam President, is the truth. That is the truth. Even those who did not vote for President Clinton want him to succeed. But there are people here who want gridlock to continue. They cannot win. The President is looking good, so they are willing to hurt this country to prove that a small minority can lock up this country.

Madam President, Gerald Ford, a Republican President said, and I quote an address he gave before a joint session of Congress in 1974:

> I know well the coequal role of the Congress in our constitutional process. I love the House of Representatives. I revere the tradition of the Senate, despite my too short internship in that great body. As President, within the limits of basic principles, my motto toward Congress is communication, conciliation, compromise, and cooperation.

Within this branch of Government, the legislative branch of Government, Madam President, we should take a book from Gerald Ford.

And remember that communication is important, conciliation is important, compromise is important, and cooperation is important. We must succeed. The country needs a stimulus. People are out of work. In Sun Valley, NV, a suburb of Reno, kids need our help. They need it now. There are projects ready to go that will cause kids who would go to jail not go to jail, that would cause kids not able to graduate from high school to be able to graduate from high school. We need this economic stimulus package.

I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I hope that our Republican friends will have opportunities to speak also, and I ask unanimous consent that times which I have already allotted to certain Democratic Senators on this side, that Republicans may have an opportunity to come in between any one of those Senators with——

Mr. HATFIELD. Madam President, do we have to have unanimous consent to get recognition?

Mr. BYRD. No. No, they do not have to, but I had asked unanimous consent that certain Senators be recognized and given so many minutes each. I did not mean that that be consecutively. I am trying now to make that clear.

Mr. HATFIELD. Madam President, I say to the chairman, I am on the floor, have been waiting my turn. So far I have not had much opportunity, but whenever the floor is yielded, I will be asking for recognition.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I only see one Member on the other side of the aisle. That is Mr. HATFIELD, who is here dutifully fulfilling his post as manager of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the second Senator to whom I yielded time wait until our friend, Mr. HATFIELD, has his opportunity.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATFIELD. Madam President, I thank the chairman.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HATFIELD. I, too, want to indicate that as far as rotation or whatever other system, we wish to give opportunity to both sides to be heard on this subject rather than utilizing all of the time on one side and then have all the time lopped over on the other side.

Madam President, I frequently find myself listening and wondering just exactly in what kind of a situation we are involved. I have heard this morning from our Democratic friends that the Republicans originated CDBG under the Nixon administration but somehow now here we are abandoning it.

Madam President, that is not true. We have voted for $4 billion in the current fiscal year budget. My chairman of the full committee and my chairman of the subcommittee, both on the floor, know that I am one of the strongest supporters of the CDBG in the Appropriations Committee, and I still stand here this morning as a supporter of CDBG.

But, Madam President, I think we have to understand precisely the circumstances. This is not a debate on whether we should continue the community block grant program. This is a question of whether we should add another $2.5 billion to a program that has unobligated funds at this very moment from the $4 billion that we have already appropriated in 1993. We are 6 months into this current fiscal year, and we have money, billions of dollars, I understand, still unobligated in that account. And we want to add $2.5 billion more?

Now, I do not purport to stand here to represent every one of the Republicans on this side. I am not sure any one Republican can do that. First of all, I want to make it clear it is not an issue with me as to whether we should continue giving the local communities that kind of flexibility to determine those programs. That is not the issue.

The issue is whether we should add another $2.5 billion without it being scored. We call it an emergency. Remember, this is not a regular appropriations bill. This is a supplemental appropriations bill, and we have more supplementals probably coming along the track that, if they should run out of money, we could consider at that point in time. So this is not the final judgment on adding more money to the

existing account that has not obligated all of its existing funds.

I will tell you what this does. This adds another $2.5 billion to the national deficit. Madam President, let me draw the analogy. We went through the Vietnam war, and we did not pay for that war at the time we went through it. We postponed the payment on that. That is part of our problem today. I do not want to add to that problem because we talk about the deficit being the cancer in our economic life, and I think it is.

Madam President, we cannot add more to that deficit at this point in time. If we are really serious about attacking the deficit, we will count this, not declare an emergency in order to circumvent the so-called scoring system that adds to the deficit. It adds to the deficit.

Now, let us take the full package a moment, $19.5 billion. We have been led to believe by our Democratic friends that somehow this came from Mount Sinai, known as the White House, that somehow this is written in stone, this whole package. Madam President, let us remember that the committee itself, chaired by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, made changes in this whole package in the committee. We had a substitute that changed the formula on the Summer Jobs Program. And then when it was brought to the floor, we had another substitute. We cut over $100 million out of the IRS part of the President's package, hardly then sacrosanct about any other changes. We added a substitute amendment, or an amendment to the substitute which cut $5 million from the GSA building program, hardly sancrosanct at that point.

So let us bear in mind—and I do not question the reasons for cutting over $100 million from the President's package by the leadership of the Democratic Party on this bill. I supported it.

So consequently, we then found ourselves in a position that 99 other Senators, any one of the 99 other Senators who wanted to make a further change in this bill, were locked into a parliamentary situation which would have made it rather meaningless.

Now, let us take that one step further. I think we have to clarify the situation we are in as I have listened to it this morning described. I think we have to understand, too, that no one on this side, to my knowledge, denies the need to act on the $4 billion as a part of this total package on unemployment compensation extension.

Madam President, I have a card here that I have been kind of carrying around this week waiting for a hopeful moment at which we could perhaps discuss a compromise. I think you would find a goodly number on this side that would say, "yes", highways should be activated or accelerated in the trust fund—whether $3 billion or not, I do not know, but at least that is another possibility. I think some of us would take the immunization factor out of this program and say that could be a very important part of a compromise. I think some of us could say summer jobs maybe, instead of $1 billion, some lesser figure.

I am just using this as an indication that this rigid gridlock that has been described I think has far more flexibility than an awful lot of speeches and rhetoric on both sides, I might say, have indicated. But I do think we have to start from an agreed baseline as to the situation we are in, not to raise this matter now as to somehow this is a philosophical problem that we face merely because we say those CDBG programs might be nice to have but are they in such emergency situation that we should add $2.5 billion more onto our national deficit.

(Mr. WELLSTONE assumed the chair.)

Mr. HATFIELD. That is my perspective. I am not going to be locked into this categorization that somehow I am opposed to local control or that any—I do not know how many Republicans, I have not taken a poll on that, but I believe there are people on both sides of the aisle if you isolate this and say it is a nice thing to have, maybe, this activity at the local level, to create a casino or swimming pool or something else. But is it worth the addition to our national deficit? That is the perspective I want to make clear that at least a goodly number of the people on this side of the aisle believe that our position truly is.

I think the argument is facetious. It is almost like saying, oh, let us reintroduce the OPA, the Office of Price Administration during the wartime. Nobody is suggesting that would be valid today. It might have been valid before.

Mr. President, let me also make one other point. Just because a Republican President might have offered a program does not necessarily mean that every Republican believes in it, or believed in it at the time. I am one of the Republicans who voted against Mr. Nixon's proposal on revenue sharing. Why? Because I did not trust local government? No. My view is that the point of revenue sharing makes the local governments more dependent upon the central government.

If you want to take a classical definition of liberalism, to me, my position was the liberal position for diffusing power rather than concentrating power in the central government. I was a Governor, as my colleague from Kentucky and others in this body, where at a time we had to go out and raise our own revenues. We had to be accountable to the people, not just to go back to the Federal Treasury and have them come back and collect our revenue sharing.

That is a philosophical point.

But, just because a Republican President proposed it certainly did not mean that I had to support it. In fact, I was ranked by a number of groups that ranked votes—I always think that is sort of a semiserious exercise, to affix a label as the goal of making these rankings of votes—I had the least support for the Republican administration than any Republican on this side of the aisle. That does not prove that, you know, every Republican proposal that is offered by a Republican President is sacrosanct or valid any more than a Democratic President offering us a so-called stimulus package becomes sacrosanct between Pennsylvania Avenue and Capitol Hill.

I have listened very carefully over the years. I consider that the Senator from West Virginia has been a real mentor, not just to me, but to many people. And I have heard him stand on this floor many times and say, I am a man of the Senate, I represent the Senate to the White House.

I am not the person who necessarily takes the White House perspective every time to represent to the Senate. "I am a man of the Senate."

Well I think we all have to say that there are times when we have to represent our administrations. I am sort of in a situation here at the moment, not representing the White House, but representing my party on this side of the aisle.

But I have talked enough to my individual Democratic friends to know that there is no more uniformity or conformity to any one perspective in a package of this size. We have heard the amendments offered by the other side of the aisle already to this package. The Chair has offered amendments to this package.

One last point. We hear about phantom lists, and the fictitious lists. Mr. President, it is very interesting that if we want to change some of those items, if it comes to fictitious lists or phantom lists, where at the same time two amendments were offered by the majority dealing with the same phantom list and the fictitious list, I join the chairman—and it was a Byrd-Hatfield amendment that said we have heard the House of Representatives debating this issue, and they have raised certain items in a list that was created by the mayors, and therefore we eliminate those by name, by category, by subject.

Later on, we had then this so-called generic restriction placed upon expenditures on the CDBG given to the OMB. I supported it.

So I just want to make it clear, that in this whole debate, we are going to present the best face for either side. Of course that is expected. But I want to just make certain that this is understood as not a debate on the generic legislation community block grant programs. We already have appro-

priated $4 billion that has not all been obligated.

I am not going to get into the general economic package, but just to make that clarification at this moment.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. HATFIELD. Would the Senator yield for one further statistic?

Mr. BYRD. Surely.

Mr. HATFIELD. I sent for a statistic that I wanted to include in those remarks if I might.

I have now the information that as of March 9, according to OMB, only 29 percent of the $4 billion appropriation in fiscal year 1993 CDBG funds, has been obligated. Excuse me. I cannot read my staff's writing. Not 29—2 percent, only 2 percent of the $4 billion in the current fiscal year has been appropriated and is available. Only 2 percent of fiscal year 1993 has been obligated.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question? When the Senator says only 2 percent has been obligated, how much is in the pipeline and how many requests are about ready to be? I am talking about the CDBG.

Mr. HATFIELD. I understand. CDBG programs under HUD. There is a total of $15 billion in the pipeline, and 2 percent of the $4 billion that we appropriated in the current fiscal year has been obligated.

Mr. FORD. We have $15 billion requested. They are now going through those to award those that they think are in the best interests of the communities.

Mr. HATFIELD. The simple point, is Mr. President, the simple underlying, or the simple bottom line, is that we are asking for $2.5 billion more in this package, when only 2 percent of the $4 billion has been obligated thus far.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, before I yield further, may I say that my distinguished friend, Mr. HATFIELD, is one of the calmer heads in this Senate. As always, it is with great respect that I speak with him, and speak of him. I just wish sometimes that I could be as calm as can the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

He made reference to the amendments that we made, he and I made, to the bill early on. Let us make it clear, however, that the items that we were addressing those amendments to were not in the bill either. Those items were not in the bill. But we had heard that certain items were being used over in the House as bogeymen when the House debated this bill.

Mr. President, the time to begin with was equal, was it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. So the Republicans have equal time.

Mr. President, I believe the next Senator I yielded to was Senator SASSER.

Mr. SASSER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from West Virginia for yielding.

Mr. President, this morning I think the front page of the Washington Post tells the story about as well as it can be told in the top right-hand headline, which says: "Jobs Report Shakes Faith in Recovery, March Rates Stuck at 7 Percent, Dow Off 69." Then on the left-hand side, we see the headline, "Senate GOP Fights Off Cloture Bid."

Mr. SARBANES. Would the Senator yield for just one second?

Mr. SASSER. Yes.

Mr. SARBANES. Just to underscore this jobs report that is contained in the paper, not only does it say the, "March Rates Stuck at 7 Percent, Dow Off 69 Points," but, "long-term interest rates climbed back above 7 percent and the dollar hit a new low against the Japanese yen."

There are many dimensions to this economic problem reflected in yesterday's jobless figures and, of course, this very legislation is designed to try to do something about that.

Mr. SASSER. The Senator is quite right. What this article is indicating is that this economy that was supposed to produce an additional 100,000 jobs in the month of March; instead it lost 22,000 jobs; 59,000 jobs were lost in the construction industry. The unemployment rate in the construction industry today stands at 15.3 percent. That is a depression rate of unemployment.

In the middle of the Washington Post, it speaks of "Hill Republicans turn majority's hard ball tactics into rally point."

In the body of the story, what they are saying is that our Republican colleagues are upset that they are filibustering this jobs bill because the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee filled the tree. If we wanted to amplify all this, perhaps—and I see a picture of our Republican colleagues here, and some of them look suitably indignant over this whole problem. If you wanted to carry it further, they ought to have a picture, perhaps, of myself and Senator SARBANES down here below, and we ought to be saying: Well, the Republicans did it to us 7 years ago; they filled the tree on us 7 years ago, so it is all right for us to fill the tree on them now. What do you think the American people think of that? What do they think of that?

Here is the New York Times headline: "An Impasse on Jobs Bill; Senate Quarrels Instead."

Did the American people send us here to quarrel over a jobs bill, to quarrel at a time when this economy is on the verge of going down again? Did they send us here to quarrel and have the minority party filibuster and try to kill a bill that this President of the United States has sent over here to create jobs for the American people, to prevent us from falling off into another economic decline, another triple-dip recession? I think not. I think not.

And when the American people read these headlines, they have to wonder what is going on, why will they not let the President's economic proposal come to a vote? Why will they not let the majority rule? Why aré they taking advantage—as they can and are entitled to—of the technical rules of the U.S. Senate to block a jobs bill that can bring economic security and economic insurance to an economic recovery.

I say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, this economy is in a precarious state. We are on the verge now of going into a triple-dip recession. This jobs bill that this President has proposed could be just the thing to foreclose that triple-dip recession and keep this economy moving upward on a path toward recovery.

I plead with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, let us quit this quarreling; let us stop this filibustering; let us do what the American people sent us here to do; let us put the interest of the American people and the interest of this economy ahead of petty political quarrels, as outlined on the front page of the Washington Post; let us do our job; let us pass this job bill, and let us get this economy moving again.

Mr. President, I yield back whatever time I may here.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, my Republican friends are not ready at the moment.

I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I am pleased that the distinguished Senator from Oregon is on the floor, and if at any point as I speak he wishes to interrupt and have a dialog or a colloquy, I say to him I would welcome that. I regret that the debate here, unfortunately, tends to take the shape where people sort of get out and make their pronouncements, and if you try to challenge them or question them on it, they say, no, no, I want to finish, and they finish and walk off the floor. So I am happy to have any observations I might make challenged or discussed.

I want to make one major point, but I want to make some very quick points ahead of time. I think we have addressed this morning the community development block grant problem. This discretion given to local people was a policy decision that was made essentially coming from the Republican side, that they ought to have that dis-

cretion in terms of determining how to use that money. In fact, the chairman of the committee has put provisions in here now for up-front review by the OMB, which is something that was taken away by the Reagan administration.

Second, my colleague has just spoken about the economic need for this jobs program and how essential it is. Third, I do want to make the point that the other side talks about this jobs bill, this stimulus bill, and says, well, this is emergency spending that is going to add to the deficit. But they do that out of the context of the fact that we passed the budget resolution that will reduce the deficit by $496 billion.

If we had only this bill alone, not in that context, it seems to me you would have a deficit argument to make, but this bill, which could not be put in the resolution because it is a current bill—the resolution deals with the next fiscal year. When you put it in that context, you are putting this in the context of a $496 billion deficit reduction.

There is a larger point I want to make, and I have been thinking about this now for some time, and I thought about it quite a bit last night. I think what is happening here really raises the point about the validity of a filibuster in the Senate and the whole cloture process. I do not believe that this process was ever intended to be used by one party or the other, whichever one happened to be in the minority, as a way of frustrating majority action. That in not the origin of this provision in the Senate rules, and that is not its use over the years until recent times.

The American people need to understand what is happening here.

A minority is keeping us from getting to the bill and voting on it. They can vote against the bill when we get there. No one is saying that somehow if you cannot produce a majority you should not be able to work your will. But the minority is keeping us from actually getting to this bill.

It is now being used as a standard technique. It used to be an extraordinary thing to do what is happening here today. They would have a Congress where maybe after filibuster cloture would have been invoked two or three times in the course of a 2-year Congress. But in recent Congresses the numbers have jumped enormously, 48 times in the last Congress. Right at the beginning of this Congress, we had the motor-voter bill. The filibuster was used on the motor-voter bill.

The filibuster in the past was used when sectional or regional interests felt the particular concern of theirs was not being addressed or small State Senators said: "Wait a minute. We need to take a more careful look."

What has happened now is it has become a standard technique on the part of the minority party, so much so that they now put it in letter form. We do not even go to a vote. We go to letter form. In effect, what is says is unless you write this bill in a way that the minority accepts, we are going to block any action on it.

The minority is not being blocked from offering amendments to the bill and having them voted upon. They can do that. They may lose the votes, but they have the option of offering those amendments. But now they are saying, "no, no."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator has expired.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 additional minutes?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 26 minutes and 48 seconds remaining.

Mr. BYRD. I yielded how much of that time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An additional 10 minutes of that time was yielded.

Mr. BYRD. So I have 16 minutes plus.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I frankly tell you I think this has reached the point where we need to examine this. I serve on the committee on the organization of the Congress, and I think very frankly we need to examine this.

I do not think the filibuster rule was ever intended to be taken as it is now being used as a standard technique on every measure of significance by the minority party to, in effect, say, "Unless you write the bill in this and this way, we are going to block reaching the bill and trying to pass it, even though you are the majority and we are only the minority, as long as we have a minority of 40 or more to invoke the filibuster rule," which I submit was an extraordinary provision in the rules of the Senate and was used consistently over the years only in extraordinary circumstances. Now it is being used all the time as a matter of course, as the majority leader will tell you.

The majority leader in fact testified before the committee to study the organization of the Congress on this very point, that in effect the Senate was being prevented from simply doing its business.

So what is happening here, and it needs to be understood, is a minority of the Senate is preventing the Senate from getting to the legislation. The minority has the right to offer amendments. They have the right to vote against the bill when it finally comes up. But they are saying, "No, no, we are not going to let you get to that bill unless you rewrite it the way we want it."

And it is not only this bill. It was on the motor-voter bill. We thought it was going to happen on the family and medical leave bill. It did not happen I assume because we got cloture in the last Congress on the family and medical leave bill, and I assume that was adjudged to be sufficient for the purpose.

I appreciate that it was done with the help of the Senator from Oregon. I do agree with the chairman of the committee when he earlier said the respect we have for him as a very honorable and reasonable Member of this body.

But I do want to underscore. I think there is a real problem developing here. I think the reaction on this side must be understood by the other side as being seen in the context which I have been outlining, in other words, in effect, making this a standard tool in the consideration of the amendment.

And now the letter says exactly that. I assume these letters will come on every bill. Therefore, we will not vote to invoke cloture on this measure as presently constituted.

In effect, what it says is: Look. We only have 43 Members. We are a minority, but we are not even going to let you do your business unless you do the business the way we want it done. We are just going to block you from getting to it unless you rewrite it to satisfy us.

So, we do not get where the majority decides what the bill will look like. The minority decides what the bill will look like. The minority says: Unless you make the bill look the way we want it to look, we are not even going to let you get to the bill. We are going to put you in gridlock, even though you have a measure that the President says is an essential part of the economic recovery program.

It is not being done once in awhile. It is being done again and again and again, and that is where this gridlock comes from. I do not think the American people want gridlock. They want us to act. They want us to get on with it. I think they understand there are differences. Some will vote for it; some will vote against. But I do not believe they want action thwarted as is taking place with the constant and consistent, in my judgment, not use but abuse of the filibuster rule.

I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

I hope the Republicans will now take some time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I yield at this time 10 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI].

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Thank you very much, Mr. President. I thank my

friend, the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. President, I rise to talk about two issues related to this entire budget process and the stimulus package, and I will cover the stimulus package last.

The reason that I think consumer confidence is going down in the United States is because the American people are beginning to understand what this so-called plan for an American recovery is all about. Let me just give you an example.

The example is the energy tax that has been proposed, called the Btu tax. The American people are beginning to understand that this entire package is full of politics. What is on the floor today is predominantly politics with the exception of a couple of programs, but they are beginning to understand and if they have not yet, they will very soon, that even the energy tax is filled with politics. They thought we had a real game plan, one that was fair and that everybody was going to be treated the same.

The ink is not even dry on the budget resolution that calls for $273 billion in net new taxes, that is the new number because in the nighttime with no Republicans around, the budget was changed somewhat, and now it is $273 billion in net new taxes. Just the day before yesterday the list of exemptions to the energy tax grew to 13 in number. I will put them in the RECORD. And we do not even take into account these 13 exemptions in the budget. That is because there is pressure being put on. We let someone out from under it. We do not even count in that 13 the fact that for fuel oil use in the country we have decided that they would pay only one-half, the minimum amount of the Btu tax, not only defer it for a year but then only pay half, but the industries in the country that are going to lose jobs, lose profits, and have to lay off people will just have to pay a higher tax. There is the airline industry with thousands of workers. Who knows how much of that industry will survive with the kind of tax we are putting on?

So I think the marketplace and the people are beginning to understand. Let me give you another example.

There is much being said on the floor about an economic stimulus package we are talking about which other than the unemployment compensation is an ordinary exercise of spending money, nothing more or nothing less. In fact they are on a joyride to spend this money right now.

But the truth of the matter is the American people will soon find out that this little stimulus is going to do nothing because wait until they find out that in the President's package in the budget resolution are retroactive income taxes. Guess how many? Guess how many in this year, and we are going to be clear up into July before we even impose them, Mr. President—$27 billion in new taxes which will start in about July or August of this year and be retroactive.

You know how much of this spending package is going to spend out this year under other than unemployment compensation? Less than $3 billion. Who is kidding whom? Do you need that kind of stimulus because the economy needs stimulus or do you need it because you are putting a $27 billion tax on the American people and American business this very year?

I would ask any economist in America, those who favor spending, those who think reducing deficits count: Is this stimulus going to do something alongside of a $27 billion new tax, which makes it pale? And the taxes are on the negative side, not the positive side of the growth.

I ask unanimous consent that an analysis of a Btu tax be printed in the RECORD.

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

BROAD BASED ENERGY TAX VIOLATES TRUTH IN LABELING

We are considering a bill on the floor that is filled with pork and they call it an economic stimulus package. To call it an economic stimulus is a violation of truth in labeling.

The broad based energy tax is touted as an environmental, conservation, energy independence initiative. It is also a violation of truth in labeling.

The newly proposed exemptions are quickly chipping away at the broad base. It is looking more and more like a big gasoline tax and a tax on electricity and natural gas.

The exemptions are being handed out like goodies in the economic stimulus package.

A 50 percent decrease in the proposed home heating oil tax for the northeast;

An exemption for the farm belt for ethanol and methanol;

An EOR exemption for California;

A jet fuel exemption for the big international airlines; and the list grows by the minute—just like those economic stimulus projects "ready to go."

A rifle shot exemption for coal bed methane produced in operating mines most of which are concentrated in West Virginia. Coal bed methane is produced in a lot of states but our resource comes from wells—not operating mines.

As originally proposed, the Southwest was the hardest hit region by the energy tax. We are hit harder than the mid-Atlantic states. The annual tax in the Southwest is expected to be $652, but for the mid-Atlantic it is $390. The new exemptions will make this regional disparity even worse.

The major changes in the Btu tax proposal deal primarily with the number of exemptions and the collection point.

There are now 13 exemptions to the Btu tax.

The original proposal only had three exemptions for (1) non-fuel uses of fossil fuels, (2) non-conventional fuels (solar geothermal, biomass and wind) and (3) exported fossil fuels.

Each exemption costs money. To raise the same amount of revenue, the tax will have to be more severe on those who are not exempt—our oil and gas producers.

If this exemption proliferation continues this "broad based energy tax" will end up as a narrow, but hefty tax on essentials like gasoline, and heating and cooling homes with electricity and natural gas.

There are concessions for a lot of special uses, but there is still no concession for the high tax proposed on our domestic production of oil.

Oil is taxed at twice the rate of coal and natural gas. If we want to encourage domestic production there should be an exemption for independent producers or for stripper production.

There is still nothing in this proposal to significantly reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

As originally proposed the gasoline tax would increase by 7.5 cents per gallon when fully phased in, but all these new exemptions can only mean one thing: an even higher gasoline tax on the billion gallons of motor fuel we use each year.

We drive a lot in New Mexico. We depend a great deal on tourism and the gasoline tax is a damper on tourism. It hurts the trucking industry, too.

Exempts Ethanol, Methanol, ETBE, MTBE and feedstocks used in their producion, but does not exempt natural gas. If the environment is the justification for the two-tier tax structure, there is no reason to discriminate against natural gas but provide a full exemption for ethanol and methanol.

Helps California by exempting natural gas used in enhanced oil recovery for heavy oil. At least some of New Mexico's natural gas will benefit from this provision since it is used in the enhanced oil fields in California.

Exempts jet fuel used in international flight. This does nothing to help domestic-only airlines like Mesa. It also does nothing to help our fighter pilots because DOD is still expected to pay the jet fuel tax.

Since energy produced in the U.S. but exported does not bear the energy tax, it will make it more expensive for our firms doing business in the state to compete with firms using our energy to make goods in nearby Mexico.

The proposed tax on home heating oil has been cut in half to help the Northeast. Home heating oil will now be taxed at the natural gas and coal level. This is good news for the cold climates of the Northeast, but gives no relief to Sunbelt residents who spend a lot on electricity and natural gas to cool our homes in the summer.

The uniformity and fairness of this tax is getting riddled with loopholes and special concessions.

For natural gas, the tax collection point is now the city-gate, which any savvy natural gas producer knows, does not exist any more as a result of restructuring. The LDC is expected to owe the tax, but the pipeline is expected to pay the tax to the IRS.

Why is the pipeline being asked to pay the tax on a product it doesn't own, and under the FERC rules isn't even allowed to know to whom it belongs?

Oil collection point is moved to the tailgate of the refinery. This is probably one of the few moves in the right direction to come out of the new information we have about the Btu tax.

For coal, it is still back at the minemouth.

The tax is still hidden from the consumer.

They say the devil is in the details and I think this energy tax is one very ugly devil.

ENERGY TAX EXEMPTIONS

Tax would not be imposed on the following:

(1) Nonfuel uses (*e.g.*, feedstock uses) of fossil fuels.

(2) Nonfuel products such as asphalt, lubricants, and waxes.

(3) Exported fuels and electricity (an appropriate refund or credit would be provided for fossil-fuel-generated electricity).

(4) Bunker and jet fuel used in international transportation.

(5) Coal used in the production of synthetic natural gas.

(6) Coal seam methane from operating mines.

(7) Hydroelectricity from pump storage.

(8) Natural gas used in enhanced oil recovery for heavy oil.

(9) Imported electricity if the importer establishes that an energy source other than fossil fuels, hydropower, or nuclear power was used to generate the electricity.

(10) Ethanol, methanol, ETBE, MTBE, and feedstocks used in their production.

(11) Biomass including landfill gas, wood waste, and bagasse (sugar cane biomass).

(12) Municipal solid waste and tires burned as fuel.

(13) Solar, wind, and geothermal energy.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, last night our distinguished majority leader gave a summation, wherein he was trying to make the case that you have to look at the whole package. You have to look at the whole package because you should not talk about spending $19.5 billion now that we do not have the money to pay for it, go into more deficit spending now, without looking at the whole package, said the distinguished majority leader.

Well, I am going to look at it just for a minute with all of you. The American people thought the plan had deficit reduction in it. Let me give you one set of numbers.

If you look at the budget resolution that was agreed to by the conferees—again, I repeat, Republicans were not part of it—domestic spending will increase $566 billion over the next 5 years. And that is not including Social Security.

In the current fiscal year, discretionary spending and non-Social Security mandatory spending will total nearly $660 billion. Over the next 5 years, under this budget resolution, domestic spending will total $3.8 trillion. Now, actually, that is, no matter how you slice it, $566 billion more than the annualized current spending level.

I do not think the American people really would sit still for 1 minute for $273 billion in new taxes to get the American fiscal deficit under control, when this budget lets spending, nondefense discretionary and mandatory without Social Security, go up $566 billion over this 5 years.

Now, having said that, let me talk a minute about what could have been done. Again, these are the final numbers after we have had a chance to look at the budget resolution that was changed in about 24 hours in conference.

The President is going to ask us to cut $168 billion out of the domestic and mandatory side of this budget and, lo and behold, Mr. President, he is also asking, and this budget resolution says, add back $153 billion in new spending.

Again, I repeat, I do not believe the American people would sit still for a minute if they knew that the talks of cuts and reductions are in a budget environment where $153 billion in new expenditures are being asked for.

Now, let me just discuss the taxes that are part of this big picture. There are $337 billion in gross new taxes, with $64 billion given back in rebates, for a net tax increase of $273 billion, and it is called a bold new plan. It is essentially a tax plan.

Two-hundred and seventy-three billion dollars net new taxes, and all we get is this little tiny piece you can hardly see on this chart, $15 billion in net domestic cuts. And today, on the floor of the Senate, we are going to take that little $15 billion, that little, mousy thing that has been referred to by others in different contexts, this little $15 billion total domestic cuts over 5 years, and we are going to reduce that some more by spending some more money.

It will be $9 billion when we are finished with this project, if we ever pass this bill. The $15 billion in total domestic cuts, I say to the distinguished chairman, over 5 years will be reduced by this so-called jobs package to a total of $9 billion.

Now, that is the grand plan. In a $1.4 trillion Federal budget each year, in 5 years, we are going to cut $9 billion in domestic spending. And here on the floor, we are being asked to spend money to create jobs.

The plan says, tax Americans and tax businesses to create jobs.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMENICI. I will be pleased to in a moment.

I really cannot believe that that is an economic plan for jobs.

Yes, I will be pleased to yield to the chairman.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator asked, will the deficit be cut?

Mr. DOMENICI. Did you ask me if it will be?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. BYRD. Is that the Senator's question? Will the deficit be cut?

Mr. DOMENICI. No, I did not ask the question.

Mr. BYRD. I thought that was the thrust of his statement.

Mr. DOMENICI. This will not cut the deficit. It will add to the deficit.

Mr. BYRD. Did we cut the deficit under Mr. Bush?

Mr. DOMENICI. Listen, if Mr. Bush's programs had been adopted, we might have.

But I guarantee you, we would not cut the deficit under Mr. Bush or Mr. Reagan or anyone just by adding taxes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. the Senator may proceed for 2 more minutes.

Mr. DOMEMICI. Let me just wind this up.

Consumer confidence is going to be spoken of here on the floor. I gather, because consumer confidence is waning, somebody is going to say consumer confidence in this country is waning because of what is going on, on the floor of this Senate.

Frankly, I do not think 5 percent of the America people know what is going on, on the floor of the Senate.

The truth of the matter is, if consumer confidence is waning, it is because the American people are beginning to see the light about the Clinton economic plan, which is supposed to produce jobs, which is supposed to produce sustained economic growth. The marketplace is beginning to see it will not work. It is all taxes and no cuts, other than defense spending reductions.

And when that finally gets out there and they feel the taxes of the first year, which will be $27 billion in new taxes—and you will not put those on until July or so. So just imagine what is going to happen with reference to the income taxes for the American people and for small business with a retroactive tax of that sort.

So let no one be fooled. This will not help the economy; it is not big enough to do anything. Second, it is borrowing money we do not have in the name of creating jobs.

I yield the floor and I thank the ranking member for the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAUX] has asked for some time. I am prepared to yield him some time.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I believe I yielded to which Senator next?

I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I think I am no different from my colleagues. Having seen polls for the last 18 months, the No. 1 priority in the minds of the American people is jobs—jobs.

I have talked, in the real poll, in campaigning last year, to the men and women in my State. They want a job. They want the dignity of being able to pay their bills and of not looking for extended unemployment compensation. They want the dignity of being able to send their children to school. They want the dignity of being able to raise their social standard. So jobs is the question here.

We get carried away and start talking about the budget and other things. We ought to be brought back to why we are here today and what we are trying to do, and that is jobs.

In talking to them in my State, they need the extended unemployment; need it badly. They need the funds for highway programs.

A highway is laid and if you do not have any maintenance for 7 years, that is long-term. You build a new bridge, that is 25 or 30 years. That is long-term help.

Summer jobs for rural and urban children, that is needed. It is needed now.

Education. We have some tutoring money in this bill to help those children in the single-parent families that have a hard time grasping those things that are out there. Tutoring for the summer is in this bill.

There is child care, to let people have an opportunity to see that their children are well taken care of and maybe they can go out and find a job.

So, Mr. President, my State would like to have this.

And we talk about all the frustrations going on. I read a quote the other day from a Republican aide—it was not from a Senator—that he has never seen the mood on that side so mean and surly. And you read that there is no leadership; we are tying to find a cohesive way.

It even went so far as the Republican leadership in the House writing the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Here is the question they asked. "The House GOP conservatives are enraged with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce for not opposing the Democratic administration down the line." That is in the letter.

Then we have, "the Chamber, however, appears to have its reasons for working with the Democratic Congress and the President. Its counsel is being sought by Democrats on issues such as relieving the credit crunch for small business and seeking ways to control health care costs."

That is what the U.S. Chamber wants.

Then, "In addition, chamber officials, who met"—listen to this—"chamber officials, who met not long ago with more than 1,800 of their members in five regions of the country, said the message at those sessions was the same." That message was: "The members were sick and tired of the Washington gridlock." That is business in this country. That is the U.S. Chamber and 1,800 business people in five regional meetings. They are "sick and tired of gridlock in Washington, tired of the chamber's perennial adversarial role, and they wanted to see some action on economic problems."

So, with the frustration on the other side, and as one Republican aide described it, "We had a tennis racket and a ball but no wall to bounce it against." And then they found it: ROBERT C. BYRD. That is the reason they gave for coming together—all 43. Because he put out a little legislative procedure here—it has been used by that side—and that gave them a reason to be against Democrats.

He said he did not mind being a scapegoat because he was doing what he thought was right, he was doing what he thought his President wanted him to do, and he was doing what he thought the people of this country wanted. Because that side did not get but 38 percent of the vote last time; 62 percent of the American people said we did not like what was going on, we did not like the path that we were being taken down.

So they had to find a reason, a wall to hit the tennis ball against, and that was ROBERT C. BYRD.

There is not a Senator in this Chamber today that he has not helped. There is not a Senator in this Chamber today who has not made a request of ROBERT C. BYRD at one time or another; and he has sat down with them and made an effort to work out the things in their States. And the new Members who come, no one gives them more time and instills the grandeur of this institution than ROBERT C. BYRD. And here we are, going to use him as a wall to bounce a tennis ball against.

If that is a reason, that is a reason, but I do not believe the American people appreciate it.

It is time to listen to the Chamber, listen to the businessmen, stop the gridlock—stop the gridlock and let us get on with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 5 minutes of the Senator have expired.

Mr. FORD. Well, I was just getting warmed up, Mr. President. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD. I hope our Republican friends will take some time. I only see one stalwart warrior on the other side—he has been here from the very beginning—and that is my friend and colleague, Senator HATFIELD.

May we hear some Republican voices?

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, in due time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would like to ask a question of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. On my time.

Mr. REID. Maybe the reason the Republicans are not here is, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me—I am familiar with filibuster by speaking a long time. I am familiar with filibuster by offering amendment after amendment after amendment. But this new procedure—you do not need to talk a lot. You do not need to offer amendments. You just need to write a letter. Filibuster by letter, is that new to the esteemed chairman of the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. BYRD. In over 200 years in the Senate's history, that is the first time it has ever been used, to my knowledge, in this fashion.

Mr. President, my time is running short. I yield to the Senator from Iowa 5 minutes.

I see nobody on the other side except Mr. SPECTER. He is coming now. But I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. I must not yield more than that.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. President, the arguments made by the distinguished ranking Republican on the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Oregon, were most lucid and learned, as all of his arguments are, and very moderate in tone. I caught sort of an undertone, however, of the argument made by the Senator from Oregon that we have to be somewhat fearful, I think, or perhaps on guard, as to, perhaps, the tyranny of the majority, not letting the minority have its part of working its will.

I understand that argument and I sympathize with that and I support that argument. We have to be wary of the tyranny of the majority.

But there is also the flip side of that coin, and that is the tyranny of the minority, of a handful or a few people who want to stop and block up everything until they get exactly what they want. It is perhaps like the antics of a small child who says, "If I do not get my way, no one else gets his or her way." So we have to be careful, I think, about both.

Right now the bill is open to amendment. Amendments are offered, and if those amendments are accepted, they then become part of the bill. The distinguished chairman of the committee made that accommodation over a week ago. Yet we do not see any kind of serious endeavor on the part of the Republican side to offer those amendments. So I would say what we have now is a tyranny of the minority who will not let this body work its will.

Let me shift to the arguments made by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI]. He said the bill now is pure politics. Now? The bill has been the same basically all along. It is the President's package. If the Senator thinks it is pure politics, I would ask him to ask the nearly 9 million Americans who are out of work if they think it is politics that we want to put them back to work. We want to offer them some hope, a job—not a handout. Ask them if they think this is pure politics.

Second, the Senator from New Mexico said if the Bush programs and budgets had been adopted, we might have cut the deficit. I submit the Senator may have a short memory. In every one of the 12 years—8 years of Mr. Reagan, 4 years of Mr. Bush—whenever they sent their proposed budget to the Congress, this Congress appropriated

less money than they asked for. That is right. We appropriated less money in each of 12 years than either Mr. Reagan or Mr. Bush asked for.

So the argument made by the Senator from New Mexico is very hollow. I say he has had a lapse of memory there when he says if we would have adopted the Bush budgets, we would have cut the deficit.

Last, I hear—I must be living in a surreal world here, in a bad dream. The Senator from New Mexico now says one of the problems here with this stimulus package is it is too little, it will not do anything. We have heard for a week, the last 10 days, it is too big, too much money, we have to cut it down. Now the Senator from New Mexico says it is too little. Which is it, too much or too little?

By making those kinds of spurious arguments, it unmasks, really, what a small handful on the other side are up to, and that is to block and thwart the will of the majority, to pull the rug out from underneath this President—at a time when he is now in Vancouver, he will be meeting with Mr. Yeltsin, to pull the rug out from underneath him.

Is this too little or is it too big? Mr. President, again, I say the 9 million Americans out of work can answer that question. We need to get them back to work.

I am reminded of the story of the little boy who put his finger in the dike. I am sure some of those on the other side were making the arguments that maybe this is too little. They would have said to the little boy, sticking your finger in the dike will not do anything, you have to build a whole new dike. There has to be a new dam there. Sometimes it is the little plug that you put into the dike that stops the dam from bursting. Or it is the little breach that causes the dam to break open.

What we have here is a part of the President's overall package of deficit reduction, revenue increases, and, yes, economic stimulus to put people back to work until we get this country moving in the right direction again. Like that little kid who struck his finger in the dike, I do not think you can say this is too little. What it does is it begins to stop—it stops this tremendous unemployment factor we have in America that Senator SASSER referred to earlier this morning. I close on this note: Too many people out of work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague, the ranking Republican on the Appropriations Committee, for yielding time. I had come to the floor earlier this morning to seek time to speak on the pending bill. I exchanged a few pleasantries with all the Members on the floor, including the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. I stepped off the floor just briefly to make an outline of my comments. I had been here and expressed my intention to speak. I am glad to have these few minutes.

In analyzing the stimulus package, Mr. President, I ask three questions: Does the economy need the stimulus? If so, how much? Should the appropriations for the stimulus be paid for now if we decide there should be a stimulus?

On the first question, I think the economy does need a stimulus; not positive but I would say it does, and I would beyond that defer to what President Clinton has said.

How much? That is a question that I think has to be decided, certainly not $16 billion-plus. I think this body has a duty to find an accommodation, a compromise on how much that stimulus should be.

Should the appropriations for the stimulus be paid for now? That is the one question which this Senator can answer categorically, and it is yes. We ought not to engage in any more deficit spending.

When people say that the American voters have expressed confidence in President Clinton and we should follow his leadership, I say again what I have said both publicly and privately, and on this floor, that I am prepared and want to support the President. I understand that the American people want answers to the problems, whether they are provided by Democrats or Republicans.

President Clinton carried Pennsylvania, but so did I. When the voters of Pennsylvania elected me to come back to Washington, they expected me to exercise independent judgment and not give President Clinton a blank check.

Another question has emerged as this bill has been considered, and that is: Are the Republicans responsible for stopping this bill or perhaps are the Democrats responsible for stopping this bill? The Democrats have argued that this is a filibuster by amendment, and I submit to the American people that the answer to that question is conclusively no on the face of this record:

The Democrats have said that the Republicans are offering phantom amendments. I counted up the amendments and found six offered by Republicans which drew votes from the Democrats. The last amendment to be voted upon, the Domenici amendment ensuring sufficient funding for a cost-of-living pay raise in 1994 for military employees and civilian employees, had six Democrats voting for it. As the C-SPAN tape will show, because the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD does not record when a Senator voted, there was a large number voting right at the end, coming right up to the brink, as to how many Democrats could support that amendment without calling on the Vice President to break a tie.

Among those Democrats were three members of the Armed Services Committee who understand that question very well. While the Domenici amendment was being voted upon, I stood on this floor because Senator HATFIELD, my leader on this bill, had scheduled my amendment next on health care reform. I have been in the Senate long enough to know that if you want to get the floor, you better stand up so everybody knows you want the floor, because there is a little bit of deference here, just a little bit.

As soon as the Domenici amendment was finished, I sought recognition, and the majority leader was recognized. I can understand that. I was a little surprised, however, to hear a quorum call to cut off my opportunity to offer an amendment. A few minutes later, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia was recognized. I can understand preference to Senator BYRD, the manager of the bill, to make a presentation, which lasted about 25 or 30 minutes.

When he finished, I sought recognition, but a quorum call was put in. A few minutes later I asked that the quorum call be taken off. Before I could even make the request, the majority leader objected and I asked leave, as the RECORD would show, to finish my question, and I did. There was objection.

Several minutes later I again tried to get the quorum call taken off. Finally, the majority leader put us into morning business, and I would question the appropriateness—I am not going to come to any conclusions; I think there have been too many harsh conclusions articulated on this floor about Senators—but I am going to raise a question as to whether it was appropriate to have a long delay, 35 or 40 minutes before a Republican had a chance to answer very serious and heated charges made by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Among those charges was a statement of improper conduct by the Republican leader in controlling the recognition issue. What was happening by the Democrats when this Senator sought recognition? Was that a control of recognition stopping a Senator from coming forward to offer an amendment?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPECTER. I will on your time.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from West Virginia never charged the Republican leader with improper conduct.

Mr. SPECTER. The Senator from West Virginia said that the Republican leader abused his powers by denying Democratic Senators recognition, and I would ask the distinguished Senator

from West Virginia if that is inaccurate?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from West Virginia will speak on his own time.

Mr. SPECTER. I take that to be an affirmative answer, Mr. President. I will send for the transcript and we will compare my recitation with what the transcript says. I do not come to the floor with all of the transcripts, but the statement is accurate. The Senator from West Virginia said the Republican leader abused his powers in denying Democrats recognition when Senator DOLE was the majority leader.

That is why I ask the question as to whether it was appropriate to deny any Republican a chance to respond in a timely manner to what the distinguished Senator from West Virginia had said. There is a quality about argument and there is a quality about reply, and one of the critical ingredients is timeliness. A lot of people were watching on C-SPAN. The Republicans were entitled to make a reply. We sought to make a timely reply, and we were denied that reply.

I raise the question as to whether or not that is appropriate conduct. Perhaps the distinguished Senator from West Virginia—well, he said he would reply on his own time. So I will await that reply and perhaps have a comment to make on that.

I find it curious, Mr. President, that the action by the distinguished majority leader to stop votes on amendments came just when my amendment on health care reform came up. When the distinguished Senator from Iowa said a few minutes ago that the bill was open for amendment, I respectfully suggest he is incorrect about that. We had a long period of argument yesterday for morning business. For those watching on C-SPAN, that is a category that we talk about on opening matters where bills are introduced. It is obvious that it is more important to talk about the bill than it is on morning business. But we were in morning business to stop any Senator from offering an amendment.

I note the distinguished Presiding Officer is about to pound the gavel. I wonder if I might have 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank my distinguished colleague.

We were in morning business so no Senator could offer an amendment. The bill was brought up today from 9:15 until 11:45 under a unanimous-consent agreement that no amendments could be offered. Had I been on the floor, Mr. President, I would not have objected to that because the majority leader could have put us into morning business. The majority controls the calendar, the docket, and what is going to be done.

In a sense I feel complimented, Mr. President, that it was my amendment on health care reform which brought down the curtain. I think it is obvious that the Democrats do not want to vote on the subject of health care reform. This is not a subject which this Senator brought up for this occasion to embarrass anybody or to make a point on this bill. I have been pushing legislation on health care reform for the better part of a decade, going back to about 1984 when I offered legislation on the issue of low-birth-weight babies because it was a major problem in my State. Last year I introduced major legislation that I pushed for a floor vote last July 29. On the first legislative day this year, January 21, offered S. 18, and I tried to get hearings on it.

I put materials on my efforts for hearings in the RECORD yesterday. I wrote to the majority leader, to the chairmen of the relevant committees. We cannot get a hearing.

In working with the Republican task force chaired by Senator CHAFEE which is preparing a bill for introduction. I took the parts that I considered best from bills, introduced by Senator KASSEBAUM, Senator COHEN, Senator BOND, and Senator MCCAIN and introduced S. 631. When I brought this measure to the floor after I had circulated a "Dear Colleague" letter saying the amendment would be offered on the debt ceiling, because it is appropriate to have a tax issue on the debt ceiling, I found out the debt ceiling bill was not going to be open for amendment through another procedural approach. I will not call it a divisive maneuver. I will call it an approach.

So I offered the amendment on this bill. There are solid indicators that we are likely not to have a health bill this year because of statements made by a number of key Democratic legislators. In yesterday's New York Times there was an elaborate report about how the task force appointed by President Clinton was not going to complete its work within the 100 days and they did not expect a bill this year.

So that the American people, right next to the economy and the stimulus, want health care reform. When the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER] said last year that this is a one-person town—and I put that in the RECORD yesterday—I disagreed with it last year, I disagreed with it yesterday, and I disagree with it today. The Congress of the United States can legislate.

I cited statements made by the distinguished majority leader on "Face the Nation" that he had worked on this issue for 6 or 8 years and the Congress was ready to legislate. The American people are entitled to an answer why we have not legislated on health care reform. The American people are entitled to an answer why the majority leader did not bring the question up last year as he said on July 29 he intended to do, if at all possible. The American people are entitled to an answer why the chairman of the Health and Human Resources Committee and the chairman of the Finance Committee have not scheduled hearings on health reform. The American people are entitled to an answer why the majority leader cuts off debate on pending amendments.

Now, this is not a filibuster by amendment. There are valid amendments to be brought to the floor in addition to mine. Senator DANFORTH was here yesterday. Senator GRAMM was here yesterday.

What does the majority leader say? He says we will vote on amendments if there is a list of amendments presented and a time for final passage.

Mr. President, the majority leader can control the docket, but I raise again the question as to the propriety of that. Why are we not permitted to vote on our amendments? We have plenty of time. We were on this bill for 4 hours yesterday, although in morning business. We adjourned early last night. We adjourned early Thursday night when the majority leader put us into morning business. We have time to vote today except we are precluded from doing so.

Now, Mr. President, I voted for the extension of unemployment compensation benefits.

I ask for 2 more minutes. I am just about out of time. I notice the very patient Presiding Officer holding the gavel but not pounding it, just giving me a little warning.

I voted to extend unemployment benefits even though we were not going to pay for them, although I introduced a sense-of-the-Senate resolution that we ought to pay for anything that we appropriate. And I say, as a fundamental matter, if it is worth appropriating, it ought to be paid for now.

When President Clinton proposes a budget for 5 years that is going to reduce the deficit by $500 billion, that is a misnomer. I will not call it deceptive. What it does is instead of having $300 billion a year deficit, there is a $200 billion a year deficit. So that at the end of 5 years the deficit is 5 times $200 billion or $1 trillion more instead of $1.5 trillion. If that is reducing the deficit by $500 billion, I do not know how to add or subtract. I am prepared to vote for unemployment compensation benefits even though it is not paid for. Most of my colleagues would not do that.

But I suggest, Mr. President, that the delays now are squarely on the shoulders of the Democrats who are not allowing our amendments to be voted on.

Mr. KERRY. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SPECTER. I will on the Senator's time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KOHL). The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KERRY. I do not have any time. It goes to the heart of the point the Senator has just raised.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Who yields time?

Mr. SPECTER. I wonder if Senator HATFIELD will yield enough time for the Senator to propound his question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute.

Mr. KERRY. The Senator says it is squarely on the shoulders of the Democrats. The majority leader has asked for a list of amendments with a time certain to vote on the bill. Republicans can raise all the amendments they want, vote forever, with a list and time certain. Why would they not provide a list with time certain and let us vote? We are ready to vote right now.

Mr. SPECTER. Let me answer that question from the Senator from Massachusetts. He already knows the answer. And that is after we have offered all our amendments, we do not intend to vote on this bill in its present form which includes $16.3 billion. It is too much. And we submit——

Mr. KERRY. The Senator is answering——

Mr. SPECTER. Let me respond. I have the floor. And we submitted the letter saying that we would not end debate with a bill in its present form. We have not gotten to that point. But if we get to the point where this bill costs $16.3 billion, billions of wasteful spending, we are not going to end debate. That is why we are not going to tell the majority leader that we have a finite list of amendments, that is, we will end at some point and then be prepared to vote, because the rules permit us to continue to debate the $16.3 billion which we think is excessive. That is the one pressure point where the Republicans have in this town today a way to stop the steamroller of the Democrats, and we intend to use it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KERRY. I ask the Senator——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, over a period of several weeks, we debated a budget resolution, a guide for spending for 1994 and for 4 successive years.

Members on this side were concerned about and opposed that budget resolution because it included hundreds of billions of dollars in new taxes, and little, if any, spending restraint.

Finally, in the middle of this week, the last form of the budget resolution came in front of this body. As the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico so eloquently pointed out, the total domestic spending reductions in that entire bill amounted to about $15 billion, and all of them were concentrated in the last 2 years of the 5 years covered by the budget resolution.

Immediately upon the passage of that budget resolution, we were once again presented this bill which spends somewhere between $16 and $20 billion. In other words, at the very beginning of the process, presumably covered by that budget resolution, we were asked to spend more money immediately than all of the savings in domestic programs included in an entire 5-year budget resolution and left until the end of that period of time.

Can any reasonable person possibly believe that that predicted under this Congress and this administration is a serious attack on the budget deficit? Of course, it did not. Of course there will be other emergencies as this one, an emergency almost invisible to the naked eye. There will be more this year, I predict, and certainly next year and the year after that.

And the net result is the people of the United States will pay close to $300 billion in new taxes, and they will get no deficit reduction at all. That is what we are debating here in connection with this bill. This $16 to $19 billion in new spending is too much on top of the spending which is already going on, on top of the huge deficits which are already present. And it is clearly not an emergency by any stretch of the imagination.

With respect to the debate, it is a curious filibuster in which those who want the bill passed spend more than twice as much time on the floor speaking on it as those who are opposed to it. For those who wish it were passed, we went for 3 days without allowing any meaningful amendments, had 1½ days' worth of amendments on which they had to vote and on which their votes were most uncomfortable, and then once again have effectively cut off amendments unless we agree to give up on a bill which we are absolutely convinced not only will not create jobs but will deprive people of jobs across the United States because it will add to inflation, add to the pressures on small, medium, and large businesses, and will go at exactly the opposite direction from the fiscal responsibility which is the only base for a vibrant and for a growing economy.

This bill, Mr. President, is not good for the people of the United States. It will not provide them with jobs. It will provide them only with more spending and more inflation. The people of the United States have said cut spending first. We are now asked to increase taxes but to add to spending first.

The President has asked for people to call their Members of the Senate, especially on their side and tell them to pass this program. Even in my quite liberal State and even in my liberal city of Seattle the calls, while moderate, are of a majority against this spending program. The calls to my office here are in the majority against this program. The calls I suspect to almost all Republican Senators are against this program.

The people of the United States, Mr. President, say cut spending first, not add spending first.

This cloture motion should be rejected.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the leader give 30 seconds?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Maryland 1 minute.

Mr. SARBANES. Thirty seconds.

I want to say to the Senator from Washington. If he thinks this is a bad bill; I think it is a good bill. I think the Senate ought to be allowed to vote on the bill. If a majority thinks it is a good bill, it will pass. If a majority thinks it is a bad bill, it will not pass. But what you are doing is you are preventing us from even voting on it. You are putting in the gridlock so we cannot make the judgment. Then the people can hold us accountable. I think we ought at least get to the bill and vote on it.

You are saying, oh, no, we are not even going to allow you to get to the bill. You are so sure you are right that you will not permit a vote on this legislation. I do not think that is what the American people want.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I would like to just say for the record that, as of last night, the Democrats have twice as many hours as the Republicans had. I think the fact of delay ought to be evaluated on the basis of the record of the floor.

Mr. KERRY. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HATFIELD. I am happy to.

Mr. KERRY. The Senator has been here for many years and he is one of the most eminently reasonable people in the U.S. Senate. Surely, the Senator understands that in this situation the real measurement of delay is not who has spoken and who has not spoken. It is whether or not we are able to move forward. Always, the Senator knows, we cannot move forward. We will allow, as the Senator knows—my question is coming—the amendments that you want. But clearly we cannot proceed because of the gridlock.

I ask the Senator, is it not a fact that the majority leader has asked again and again for a list of amendments, with a time when we could vote on this bill? Is that not a fact?

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I would be very happy to respond to the Senator. I think we ought to put this in context.

First of all, we were denied along with the Senator from Massachusetts and 99 other Senators who were offering an amendment in the beginning of this case a meaningful amendment be-

cause of the way the parliamentary procedure was lined up—legal, according to the rules. We are, according to rules, at this moment in time as well.

I want to say second, the great legislation of this body, namely, civil rights, and even the last civil rights case, family leave, and I can enumerate others, it was the composite of both sides of the aisle. All we are asking is that if you want us to be bipartisan on any of these matters, let us be able to proceed, not just hand us a package and say you have got to support the President. I do not think that has been set forthrightly.

The Senator from Pennsylvania has indicated also that from yesterday, the parliamentary procedure was put into place where no amendment can be offered. We are now shutout again. So let us get the record straight. There is enough blame to go around and there is enough credit to go around. But, nevertheless, to say that it is on one side of the aisle or the other, I think it is a composite of both.

I would like to make one observation. From Ecclesiastes:

And I saw that all labor and all achievements spring from man's envy in his neighbor. This too is meaningless. * * * chasing after the wind, the fool folds his hands and ruins himself. Better one handful with tranquility than two handfuls with toil and chasing after the wind.

And I only use that because I would like to say I think the time has come when we should try to put together a package that some Republicans at least can support as well as some Democrats.

We have been in a steamroller situation from a parliamentary perspective, for far too long to ask us to be bipartisan at this time and not that we were being partisan. We are protecting our rights, and we are working according to the rules of the Senate. If you do not like the rules, I would say, then it is time to review them and I will be happy to look at the review of the rules.

I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I just got a final recap from the Congressional Budget Office of the budget. Let me ask that three tables be made a part of the RECORD as if I went into them in detail.

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

DEFICIT REDUCTION ASSUMED IN THE BUDGET RESOLUTION AGREED TO BY THE HOUSE AND SENATE ADJUSTED FOR STIMULUS SPENDING

[By fiscal year, in billions of dollars]

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1994–98
Total discretionary outlays:						
CBO baseline [1]	538.9	540.2	554.8	569.8	585.1	2,788.8
Budget resolution [2]	545.2	544.5	548.1	547.9	547.9	2,733.5
Discretionary savings	6.2	4.3	−6.7	−21.8	−37.3	−55.2
Mandatory outlays: [3]						
CBO baseline	962.2	1,033.9	1,090.6	1,164.8	1,255.0	5,506.3
Budget resolution [4]	959.2	1,025.7	1,071.0	1,131.5	1,207.7	5,395.2
Mandatory savings (including debt service [5])	−3.0	−8.2	−19.6	−33.1	−47.3	−111.1
Total outlay savings	3.3	−3.9	−26.2	−54.9	−84.6	−166.4
Revenues:						
CBO baseline	1,214.4	1,289.8	1,355.3	1,412.7	1,480.5	6,762.6
Budget resolution	1,241.8	1,330.2	1,413.3	1,486.3	1,553.7	7,025.3
Revenue increase	27.4	40.5	58.0	73.7	73.2	272.7
Total Deficit Reduction [6]	24.1	44.4	84.2	128.6	157.8	439.1
Increase in debt held by the public	265.9	243.8	220.0	220.6	232.5	1,182.8
Increase in debt subject to limit	372.3	366.0	355.8	359.1	369.7	1,822.9

[1] Assumes compliance with the discretionary spending limits in the Budget Enforcement Act through 1995; discretionary outlays are assumed to grow at the same pace as inflation after 1995.
[2] Includes IRS compliance spending of $183 million in 1994 and $184 million in 1995 that are excluded from the budget resolution for Budget Enforcement Act technical reasons. Also includes outlays from House-passed Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1993 (H.R. 1335), which are not included in budget resolution.
[3] Includes all non-discretionary spending.
[4] Includes outlays from Emergency Unemployment Compensation Amendments (P.L. 103–6), which are not included in budget resolution.
[5] Includes reductions in net interest resulting from other reductions in spending (including discretionary savings) and increases in revenues.
[6] Including effects of Emergency Unemployment Compensation Amendments (P.L. 103–6) and House-passed Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1993 (H.R. 1335), which are not included in budget resolution.

Note: The budget resolution figures are based on the amounts in the conference report agreed to by the House and the Senate.

DEFICT REDUCTION ASSUMED IN THE BUDGET RESOLUTION AGREED TO BY THE HOUSE AND SENATE

[Not including effects of stimulus spending; by fiscal year, in billions of dollars]

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1994–98
Total discretionary outlays:						
CBO baseline [1]	538.9	540.2	554.8	569.8	585.1	2,788.8
Budget resolution [2]	538.9	541.5	547.3	547.3	547.9	2,722.9
Discretionary savings	0	1.3	−7.5	−22.4	−37.3	−65.9
Mandatory outlays: [3]						
CBO baseline	962.2	1,033.9	1,090.6	1,164.5	1,255.0	5,506.3
Budget resolution	956.9	1,025.7	1,071.0	1,131.5	1,207.7	5,392.9
Mandatory savings (including debt service [4])	−5.3	−8.2	−19.6	−33.1	−47.3	−113.5
Total outlay savings	−5.3	−6.9	−27.1	−55.5	−84.6	−179.4
Revenues:						
CBO baseline	1,214.4	1,289.8	1,355.3	1,412.7	1,480.5	6,752.6
Budget resolution	1,241.8	1,330.2	1,413.3	1,486.3	1,553.7	7,025.3
Revenue increase	27.4	40.5	58.0	73.7	73.2	272.7
Total Deficit Reduction	32.7	47.4	85.0	129.2	157.8	452.1

[1] Assumes compliance with the discretionary spending limits in the Budget Enforcement Act through 1995; discretionary outlays are assumed to grow at the same pace as inflation after 1995.
[2] Includes IRS compliance spending of $183 million in 1994 and $184 million in 1995 that are excluded from the budget resolution for Budget Enforcement Act technical reasons.
[3] Includes all non-discretionary spending.
[4] Includes reductions in net interest resulting from other reductions in spending (including discretionary savings) and increases in revenues.

Note: The budget resolution figures are based on the amounts in the conference report agreed to by the House and the Senate.

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me make some points.

First, the Congressional Budget Office confirms that this deficit reduction is not $496 billion, it is $440 billion.

Second, and even more dramatic, the Congressional Budget Office finds that the budget resolution has no—and I repeat—no domestic discretionary cuts planned for 1994 or 1995. Most of the cuts are back-end loaded into 1998. Nearly 60 percent of the domestic discretionary cuts take place in 1998. Anybody that believes that is going to happen has not been around the Senate very long and has not seen budget resolutions.

Third, taxes on the other end are front-end loaded. Total gross taxes, $337 billion. Tax credits for EITC and others, net taxes, 273. But the taxes begin immediately, and according to the Congressional Budget Office, they would go up $27 billion, while spending reductions would total $5 billion. That is the equivalent of $5.20 in taxes for $1 in spending.

Finally, in the congressional budget analysis this morning—it is interesting that the budget conference agreement we adopted by 55 to 45 violates the Budget Act. We did not even have the right numbers. It does not even come within the caps in 1995. It is $1 billion over. The whole budget would have been subject to a point of order had we had CBO's final estimates, and I do not believe the Senate would have adopted it.

One last point. With additional time to study the figures, I asked my staff to assess the increased spending cuts and the increased spending. I now can report to the Senate that it is very different than 3 days ago. The resolution adopted yesterday includes increased domestic spending of $153 billion, rather than $124 billion. So that the upshot of all this is that we cut spending $168 billion; we increase spending $153 billion; and with this huge, first-of-a-kind, deficit reduction package, which means $15 billion in all of domestic over 5 years, with the adoption of this bill, if we were to do it, we would add to the deficit, and we would end up with $9 billion as the total deficit reduction on the domestic side of this budget over 5 years, with most of it in 1998.

I do not think it is a plan. Frankly, I think it is a hoax. We are going to get plenty of taxes and nothing else.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding. I was observing the conversations this morning on the floor, and there were discussions about the frustrations that people were feeling. And there was this sense of pointing at the other side for causing these frustrations.

I must say to the people I saw speaking there must be an incredible sense of frustration on your side. Maybe it is because there is a recognition that the people in the country are beginning to recognize exactly what is in this bill. You are worried that you are not going to get this thing passed; that the $16 billion that had been promised to all the different interest groups around the country may not be there and, gee, if that $16 billion is not paid off to everybody, maybe there will not be the support for the tax bill later in the year.

Well, I for one am not particularly frustrated. I am delighted to have the opportunity to tell the people in this country what is going on. By allowing us to continue to talk and not allowing us to offer amendments, we still can inform the people that this bill is about more spending, more spending, more spending, and about more pork, more pork, more pork. The more people around the country hear this simple fact, the more they are inclined not to support the President's so-called economic plan.

You all talk about jobs. Well, if you pass this bill the way it is, it is going to cost you $90,000 to create one job in the country; $90,000 for every job that is going to be created. Well, it does not cost the private sector that kind of money to create jobs. These are temporary jobs. So while you are in the process of creating these temporary jobs, what is going to happen? The deficit is not going to be reduced. Overall spending is not going to be reduced. It is going to increase. When the people in this country hear that the debt of this Nation is going to be increased because of this pork bill, they will reject it.

In almost every office in the Senate, the calls are coming in expressing one simple message—"defeat this plan." Then I hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say, "Where is everybody? Why are you not here talking?" One minute you are saying we are talking too much; then you say we are not talking enough. One minute we are offering too many amendments, and the next minute we are not offering enough amendments. Come on. You cannot have it both ways.

We would be delighted to have the opportunity to offer these amendments. However, you do not want us to offer the amendments because it is embarrassing to you that the people in this country are finding out that this bill is nothing but more and more and more spending. We are prepared to stay here and defeat this bill because we believe in paying for our spending decreasing the deficit down, reducing the debt, and getting our country moving again.

There is a philosophical difference, and I am well aware of that. You want to raise taxes and increase spending. We want to reduce taxes and reduce spending. That is something worth fighting for.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, when we were debating the budget, we were talking about billions of dollars in baselines and nobody knew what we were talking about. And the President's budget had special protection because of rules that required a vote on the budget. Now we are talking about a bill under the ordinary rules of the Senate that the public understands.

First, the public understands that this bill is illegal, that you are having to put in here an emergency designation because this bill violates the law of the land that the American taxpayer paid $150 billion-plus to get a spending freeze, and this bill violates that law and raises the deficit by $19.5 billion.

Second, we are no longer talking about billions of dollars in baselines. We are talking about good, old-fashioned pork barrel. We are talking about ice skating rink warming huts, we are talking about boat docks; we are talking about biking paths. And people understands that issue.

I spent a lot of yesterday talking to pork producers. They are very unhappy that we are comparing their product to this bill. They are very unhappy because they have spent 30 years getting the fat and waste out of pork to make it America's other white meat. Well, I suggest to my colleagues, if we want to break the impasse, let us do to this bill what the pork producers have done to their product. It probably is unfair to compare the kind of waste in this bill to modern American pork. Let us work together and get this fat out.

I submit, Mr. President, that we are not going to let this bill pass until we get the pork out. Now, we may be here on April 15, a day that is enshrined in the heart of every working American, because it is on that date that they have their closest relationship with Government. It is on that date that Government takes their money. If we are here on April 15 with our Democratic colleagues trying to explain why they will not ban in this bill the painting of water towers, the building of ice skating rink warming huts, bike paths, jogging paths, and parks—if we are here on that day debating those issues, I think the American people will understand.

And I, for one, am not going to vote for this bill. I am going to do everything in my power to keep it from passing in its current form, because this bill will hurt America. We are borrowing money from small business and family farms, taking it away from them to spend on make-work, giveaway projects. We should not do it.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 9 minutes, 7 seconds.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I want to reserve some time to close my side of the argument. I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN] and the remaining minutes to Mr. Riegle. That is all the time I have left.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I really would like to address my comments to the respected Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK], if I might, for a few minutes, because he said some things that I would like to respond to.

Let me tell you, Senator, how I look at this package. I have spent a lot of time on the floor and I have listened to all the debate and have looked at all the charts.

There are two charts that speak to the heart of this package, and if the Senator thinks these comments have any merit, I would really appreciate it if he would take them to his colleagues.

The first chart is this one. This chart, in essence, says that in past recoveries the job cycle went up, people returned to work. In this recovery, people have not returned to work. The net difference between this line and that line is 3 million jobs.

The second chart that makes some sense is what is happening to consumer confidence. Consumer confidence, it is going down. That is reflected in the righthand column on the front page of this morning's Washington Post in which the headline is "Jobs Report Shakes Faith in Recovery."

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. If I could just finish for 1 second; it is very quick.

The President's program is essentially in direct jobs, one-half million direct jobs. That is 500,000 jobs. It is not very much if you have a 3-million-jobs deficit. If you cut this economic stimulus program, as has been proposed by the other side, you reduce the number of jobs to be created to less than 250,000 or 200,000. If you do that, you might as well not do the program. You will not provide any stimulus to the econc .

If anything, the program is too short in what it produces in net new jobs to have that kind of effect.

If the Senator wants to talk deficit, let's talk about the billion which has been added on the deficit in the past and the $40 billion to be added this year in bailing out the savings and loans. Every member on the other side of the aisle was aware of that amount added to the deficit, but I only hear them attacking this much smaller, but vital economic stimulus package.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, is the Senator willing to yield?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I am happy to now yield to the Senator.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much for giving me the opportunity.

I will respond both to the jobs and confidence issues which the Senator from California has just raised. It is clear in my mind what happened to jobs in this country. This Congress has used its power to impose more and more burden and regulation and costs on employers in this country. This has resulted in employers thinking, "If I hire one more employee, it is going to be way too expensive."

This Congress, this Government has encouraged the employers of this country to find other ways to get higher productivity without hiring employees. That is point No. 1.

Point No. 2, with respect to confidence, it is very, very obvious to me what has happened to confidence in this country. People found out what this plan is all about and have seen there are tax increases, more spending and more debt in the President's plan and they are losing confidence.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I had to plead for this small amount of time that I have and I trust the Senator understands my utilizing the time.

The point I want to make about this stimulus package is that it produces jobs rapidly. The true reason it is called stimulus.

What the President did is find within the Federal parameters a program that could rapidly produce jobs to the tune of one-half million, a small portion of the 3 million that I referred to earlier which are really necessary. To me, the heart of the recession is the lack of jobs—good jobs, that can support our families and our children.

I would be happy to work with the Senator on any kind of package that can produce one-half million jobs rapidly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

It is obvious to anyone following this debate that gridlock is back and our friends on the other side of aisle are insisting upon it.

It is bad economics and bad for the country. At the heart of it, I think, is really Presidential politics in 1996. We have some people, some in this Chamber on the other side of the aisle, who want to run for the Presidency in 1996, and they just cannot wait to get started. They get started by trying to hurt this President, who just got elected and who has come in here with an economic plan for the country, which the country desperately needs. They are doing everything they can by means of a filibuster here to prevent him from having a chance to put an economic recovery plan in place.

Do we need an economic recovery plan? We certainly do.

Look at all the data. Last month's unemployment numbers that just came out for the month of March showed no job growth. In fact, we lost 23,000 jobs in the economy. The stock market yesterday was down 68 points because investors are looking at this and they see the return of gridlock and the old-fashioned politics coming from the other side here and they are worried about the economic future.

As has been said by the Senator from California, who just spoke, the consumer confidence numbers are down again now; long bond rates were jumping up again yesterday. There is no question in my mind a large part of the people are watching this debate and they are saying, even though the Republicans in the Senate only have 43 votes, they can use that to jam the works and they can use that to prevent an economic recovery plan from being put in place, and they can stymie this President and they can try to wound this President because they are looking ahead to 1996. Someone on their side of the aisle can get out there and run for President and try to take the power of this country back.

The problem is—first of all, I think—that that is absolutely unconscionable in terms of the needs of the country. But strip off the veneer and that is what is going on here.

The people on the other side of the aisle had 12 years. They had their President for 12 years. We had 8 years at the movies with Ronald Reagan, and then we had 4 years with Bush and Quayle, and the other side controlled the Senate for 6 of those 12 years. So they have had a chance to try their plan, and their plan did not work. Their plan gave us monstrous deficits, monstrous trade deficits, high unemployment, stagnant wages, and a decline in our country.

We are trying to change that. People voted that out and they voted Bill Clinton and AL GORE in to put the country on a new path. They come in here with a plan, and it is a sensible plan. We need every penny of this stimulus. We need every penny of it.

Let me tell you what the Japanese are doing, out of the New York Times yesterday. Last year, according to the New York Times, the Japanese had a stimulus plan of $93 billion. We are talking here about $16.3 billion. The Japanese had $93 billion last year, and their unemployment rate is all the way up to 2.5 percent. Ours is at 7. They are worried about it. They want to put their people to work. They just decided to have another stimulus plan. They are going to have, according to the New York Times, $130 billion of stimulus.

The Republicans are in here fighting tooth and nail to prevent $16 billion-plus worth of stimulus for this country,

to get some jobs out there now, to help people get to work. And every job we create we know that person takes the income, they spend it on groceries, on clothes for their kid, on rent, on house payments. That money moves through the economy. They help create the next person's job, and it keeps moving all through the United States. That is how we get some lift into this economy.

But the other side wants gridlock because they want the Presidency back. They want to make this President unable to function. And even though they do not have a majority here—they only have 43 votes—if they stick together and use the filibuster and require us to have 60 votes to break it, they can stymie his plan and try to stymie this President so they can elect one of themselves, or try to, 4 years from now.

That is what this is all about. This is Presidential politics, plain and simple. And they are prepared to wound this President and wound his chances to help this country because of their own ambitions, and it is wrong, and in time I think we will defeat this strategy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Republican leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, how much time is remaining on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority controls 9 minutes.

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield 9 minutes.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I know that there are other sharp differences on each side of the aisle on issues, and I am not certain they can be resolved. I have read the same stories about consumer confidence and other things happening, the stock market yesterday, and it is going to be a hard sell to tell the American people that, because we refused to spend $16 billion and not pay for it and add it to the deficit, all this is happening.

The truth of the matter is that the American people are beginning to understand what President Clinton is all about and what his economic package is all about and that it is $273 billion in increased taxes net over the next 5 years. That is why confidence is down, that is why the stock market is in trouble, and that is why a lot of things are going to be changing.

So, I think it is just a fundamental difference in parties in this debate. We believe we ought to pay for them. First, we believe we ought to cut spending first, and, second, we believe if we are not going to cut spending, at least we ought to pay for the increased spending. We do not do either in this exercise. This is not a stimulus. This is a downer as shown by the stock market, shown by consumer confidence, and shown by other indicators. This is not a stimulus package.

So I just suggest that we have the financial markets now beginning to grasp the full significance of the economic plan. We get all these higher taxes—the Senator from New Mexico pointed out earlier this morning that when we get through, we pass this plan, the net nondefense spending cuts over the next 5 years are $9 billion.

Now we can do better than that and the American people expect us to do better than that.

This is a debate that probably we ought to have.

I hear some of my colleagues on the other side—the sharpest critics President Bush ever had, almost personal sometimes—on this Senate floor attacking President Bush and his economic policy.

We have not done that. We do not intend to do that; at least, this Senator does not intend to do that. I am not attacking President Clinton. I agree with the general concept of reducing the deficit.

I stood on this floor yesterday supporting President Clinton in his efforts today with President Yeltsin. I share his view totally in that area. He has strong Republican backing. So it is not a question of disagreeing with President Clinton.

This is one issue—one issue.

I heard the crocodile tears shed this morning about, well, we invented a new filibuster by letter. There are a lot of letters written around this place, a lot of letters written on both sides of the aisles. I have signed a lot of each.

The letter was directed to me, saying that, as presently written, we cannot accept this package.

The Founding Fathers—and others who were around here for the last couple hundred years—thought that, at least in the Senate of the United States, there ought to be a chance for debate.

This has been debated for 24 hours on that side and about 11 hours on this side. So it is hard to suggest we are filibustering, when about 2 to 1 the time has been taken on that side.

But in their wisdom, the Founding Fathers felt, in the Senate, at least, there ought to be a chance for debate and an opportunity for the American people to hear what the issues were.

So in my view it is fundamental. There is no reason to raise our voices. It is just a fundamental difference. Republicans believe in cutting spending. If we cannot cut spending, at least we ought to pay for it and not add it to the deficit.

That is not the view of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

It just happens to be a fundamental, basic, philosophical difference between the two parties.

I believe, in this instance, the American people are with us. They may not be with us next week—they may be with the other side—but on this debate, the American people understand that we cannot continue to spend money and spend money and spend money and raise taxes and raise taxes and raise taxes and stimulate the economy.

So that is why we are prepared, with 43 votes or 44 votes, to block consideration of this bill, if it comes to that.

As I indicated yesterday, we are also, at least this Senator is, prepared to try to determine if there is some middle ground or some way it can be resolved. We are not at that point yet.

Mr. President, I just hope that cloture will not be invoked. This is a bad bill. That is why phone calls, at least in my office, are running about 3 to 1 against the package.

Mr. President, for all the reasons that have been stated on this side of the aisle, I hope that we do not invoke cloture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on committee substitute to H.R. 1335, the emergency supplemental appropriations bill:

Wendell Ford, Pat Leahy, Patty Murray, Barbara Boxer, George Mitchell, Daniel Inouye, Dianne Feinstein, Claiborne Pell, Robert C. Byrd, David Pryor, Jim Sasser, Tom Daschle, Paul Sarbanes, John F. Kerry, John Glenn, Byron L. Dorgan, Paul Wellstone, Carol Moseley-Braun.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the quorum call has been waived.

VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate on committee substitute to H.R. 1335, the emergency supplemental appropriations bill, shall be brought to a close.

The yeas and nays are required. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. KRUEGER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG], the Senator from North Caro-

lina [Mr. HELMS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] would vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WOFFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 101 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Akaka	Feinstein	Mikulski
Baucus	Ford	Mitchell
Biden	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Graham	Moynihan
Boren	Harkin	Murray
Boxer	Hollings	Pell
Bradley	Inouye	Pryor
Breaux	Johnston	Reid
Bryan	Kennedy	Riegle
Bumpers	Kerrey	Robb
Byrd	Kerry	Rockefeller
Campbell	Kohl	Sarbanes
Daschle	Lautenberg	Sasser
DeConcini	Leahy	Simon
Dodd	Levin	Wellstone
Dorgan	Lieberman	Wofford
Exon	Mathews	
Feingold	Metzenbaum	

NAYS—37

Bennett	Durenberger	Nickles
Bond	Faircloth	Packwood
Brown	Gorton	Pressler
Burns	Gramm	Roth
Chafee	Grassley	Simpson
Coats	Hatch	Smith
Cochran	Hatfield	Specter
Cohen	Jeffords	Stevens
Coverdell	Kassebaum	Thurmond
Craig	Kempthorne	Wallop
Danforth	Lugar	Warner
Dole	Mack	
Domenici	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—11

Conrad	Helms	Murkowski
D'Amato	Krueger	Nunn
Gregg	Lott	Shelby
Heflin	McCain	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 37. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. MITCHELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, and Members of the Senate, just prior to the vote, I spoke with the distinguished Republican leader, and we agreed to meet following this vote to discuss how best to proceed with respect to the pending matter and we will do that.

In the meantime, I will momentarily propose that there be a period for morning business, during which time debate can continue on the measure with the time to be equally divided under the control of Senators BYRD and HATFIELD until 2 p.m., at which time, either then or prior to then, I hope we will have had a chance to talk and I will be in a position then to make a decision and announce the schedule thereafter.

Mr. BUMPERS. The Senate is still not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will please come to order.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, this is important. The majority leader deserves to be heard. Will Senators take their seats?

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I have discussed with a very large number of Senators individually the scheduling for Monday, and with the distinguished Republican leader. I have concluded that the best way to proceed on Monday would be for the Senate to come in at 9 a.m. to have 90 minutes of debate, equally divided, and have the cloture vote on that day at 10:30. This accommodates, by far, the largest number of Senators, although it is inconvenient for several others. To them I apologize. There is simply no way to do this in a manner that can precisely meet each Senator's needs.

Mr. DOLE. If the majority leader will yield, in the event there should be amendments offered that were debated, say, today or Monday morning, those votes would occur at the same time or prior to the cloture vote.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes; that is my intention. I have discussed with the distinguished Republican leader his amendment and have indicated to him that we will be pleased to have him offer his amendment, which is essentially an alternative to the pending measure, at his convenience and to debate and ultimately vote on that. We will be very pleased to do that at such time as is convenient for the distinguished Republican leader.

Mr. DOLE. But the vote would occur on Monday.

Mr. MITCHELL. If we proceed in that fashion, yes.

And as I have also discussed, if that is the case, there may be others as well.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, that being the case, I now ask unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business until 2 p.m. with the time to be equally divided in the usual form under the control of Senators BYRD and HATFIELD.

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

The Senate will come to order.

Mr BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, with the concurrence of the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] I ask unanimous consent that the speakers in this period of morning business alternate from side to side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think we have to bear in mind that if we follow this procedure, this morning there were many on the Democratic side ready to speak. We had a little more time; we had to rustle up our own speakers this morning.

If there is to be this unanimous consent, I suggest then that any time there has to be a quorum call, it be equally charged to both sides in order to fulfill that alternate speaking.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I withdraw my request.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? If no time is yielded——

Mr. BYRD. I take it that our friends on the other side do not wish to utilize any time at this point.

Senator HOLLINGS, how much time?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Three or four minutes.

Mr. BYRD. I yield 5 minutes, Mr. President, to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

WHY DO THEY FILIBUSTER AGAINST JOBS AND ECONOMIC STIMULUS?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I hesitate to talk because this filibuster orchestrated on the other side of the aisle is being measured in terms of who has been talking the longest.

Mr. RIEGLE. Can we have order, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will come to order.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, the filibuster is designed to continue the talk. We are trying our dead level best to stop talking and vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will Senators please take their conversations off the floor and come to order?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I just wanted to make a few comments about some of these squibs that I hear. There is one correction that should be made. Fault is not to be measured by who is talking the longest in a filibuster. We have not been supporting this filibuster.

How many days have we been on this bill?

Mr. RIEGLE. Eight days.

Mr. HOLLINGS. How many? Eight days; 8 days and it by now is quite obvious we are confronted by a Republican filibuster by amendment.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield? It is actually now a filibuster by letter.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Filibuster by letter.

Mr. SARBANES. A letter, yes. The other side all signed a letter and they

sent it in and they said: Therefore, we will not vote to invoke cloture on this measure. So it is now a filibuster by letter. The Republicans have all signed that letter.

Mr. HOLLINGS. They have that power, Mr. President. They have that power. There is not any question about it. This filibuster is their way of trying to obtain political recognition in the wake of their defeat by the vote of the people last November.

The people voted for dramatic change. There is not any question about it. Only a year before, in November 1991, no one thought that the distinguished President, George Bush, would ever be defeated, certainly not by the little Governor from Arkansas. And what happened was the distinguished Governor of Arkansas did not win on any of his promises that we are being reminded of. Instead, he was elected on the singular promise that President Bush made, and that was the promise that he was not going to do anything about the economy. There was not any doubt about it.

I mean, President Bush was preoccupied with foreign policy and wars in the Mideast, swaggering that he would, and I quote, "kick ass" in Iraq and so on. But you could see that this course was sending the country down the tubes economically, and so the people said, "Look, let us have the gentleman from Arkansas come in and let us see if he can turn the economy around." And that is exactly what President Clinton is doing.

You have a program that has been endorsed by none other than Al Greenspan and other eminent economists. It has been endorsed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, so the Republican leadership sent a letter to the Chamber of Commerce, threatening reprisals if the Chamber continued to support elements of the Clinton plan. If you open your mouth and want to get a new program and a new direction for the country, they will send you a letter like they have this morning with regard to cloture. They have the power to block cloture. And they even had the American Textile Manufacturers Institute—my crowd, my Republican crowd. I tell you, you need Sherlock Holmes to find a Democrat in that group. I know them. And I know them well. After all, my State went overwhelmingly for President Bush.

So what really happens is the President comes forth with a comprehensive program and some Senators get picky, picky, picky. Along comes one Senator talking about, well, we might permit unemployment compensation and highway funding and let that go. And by the way, he had no offsets for it. I remember him talking. I was waiting for his offsets but he offered none. Yet he was so concerned about spending, so concerned about spending.

For 12 years, heavens above, they have spent us blind with interest costs alone, the debt that they ran up during the Reagan-Bush years. They are trying the same old nonsense that has carried the Republicans thus far on a wing and a prayer. They are trying to continue their singsong about tax and spend, tax and spend.

The truth of the matter is that when they talk about how we are going to add $16 billion to the deficit, or when they add up the costs they say: We have looked at the whole economic program and there is some $295 billion in new taxes. You know what, Mr. President? The net interest costs are running over $200 billion annually. So over the next 5 years, thanks to the prolificacy of the Reagan-Bush years, we are going to increase spending, for absolutely nothing, by $1 trillion to cover our interest costs. Mark it down; mark it down. So the new taxes proposed by President Clinton are not aimed at financing new spending programs; they are aimed at paying for the huge interest cost obligations incurred under Presidents Reagan and Bush.

The fact is that President Clinton comes to town and he has a runaway animal that he has to bridle and ride at the same time.

Mr. BYRD. I yield 3 more minutes to the Senator.

Mr. HOLLINGS. He has to bridle this runaway interest animal and ride it at the same time. It is a sort of balancing act. He has to keep the economy going, both here and internationally. There is zero growth in Europe. Japan has economic difficulties. And the Prime Minister of Britain comes and tells the President of the United States: Look, for the sake of the global economy, you have to keep the U.S. recovery going. And I think that is what President Clinton is trying to do.

Now, in that light, the President has presented a very valid program of $16 billion in investment and stimulus. And, incidentally, I have been trying diligently to pay the bills and strengthen the economy by pushing a value-added tax. So I am ready to put up the tax and pay the bill. But, in the meantime, the President has an impressive $500 billion in deficit reduction. He also has a stimulus program for investment and jobs. And we are going to try to get a grip on health costs, which are costing this Government $400 billion annually. Add it up.

They are all complaining on the floor about $800 billion the country spends; $400 billion of it—you add up veterans' health, and you add up CHAMPUS, you add up Medicare, you add up Medicaid, write off Hill-Burton, write off the taxes.

The prince of pork. I heard a distinguished Senator from Texas comment, the gentleman who is for the super collider and the space station—and the additional $45 billion that we must now spend on the S&L bail out—half that total will go to Texas. So it is another $22 billion in bailout money for Texas alone, dwarfing the $16 billion in this stimulus package designed to get America back to work. But they have a proposal afoot where he is going to get another $22 billion for pork in Texas. Pork is a many-splendored thing. Enough about pork in that one State alone. I am trying to get jobs for the whole country, along with the President. Bear in mind that when taxes are paid on April 15, 61 cents of every dollar you and I are going to pay in personal income taxes will go for interest costs—61 cents of every dollar to pay for the waste of interest costs.

Here was a crowd that said it was going to get rid of waste in tune with the Grace Commission. Instead, they memorialized waste into perpetuity in this town, I can tell you that right now. The greatest waste program we have ever heard of is the astronomical interest costs on the debt run up under President Reagan and Bush.

The minority party has the power. They have the power to continue the filibuster.

I ask for 1 more minute.

Mr. BYRD. I yield another minute.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I suspect they will come out here and measure the minutes of time used on our side. All we want to do is vote and not talk. They will not let us vote, and they can continue to filibuster.

But if we are going to have Government, the filibuster was intended for extended debate to better understand an issue. We already understand this issue. The other side can prevent us from moving forward with a program of the President's and majority of the Congress. We were elected to do the job of the people.

Let me commend the Senator from Michigan because he put it right on target. They are starting their Presidential race on this bill. They will not let us vote. Reference was made earlier to the famous midnight vote in 1985 on the fiscal year 1986 budget resolution. The Republican majority put a freeze on Social Security, and they said they had one Democrat, but let me point out that we were not filibustering. We were allowing them to vote. The only reason they had only one Democrat is because the President, their own President Reagan, said, "I am not going along with it." They were in shock the next morning to learn President Reagan's opposition. So we were not going to throw ourselves on the Social Security and tax sword when their own President was going in the other direction. They knew we were not filibustering in 1985. We were allowing them to vote. That is all we are asking for today.

Mr. BYRD. That is it. That is right. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. President, does any Senator on the other side wish to speak?

Mr. President, I understand that our friends on the other side are in caucus at this point. So they have asked us to go ahead and use our time.

I yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, Ms. CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN—how much time?

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Five minutes.

Mr. BYRD. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S PLAN

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, where I come from in Illinois we have a saying that I grew up with, and the old expression was, "Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me."

And as I listened to their debate, I am convinced that what is going on here is an attempt to fool the American people twice. The American people saw through the charade, the failed economic policies represented by the people who are screaming the loudest about President Clinton's plan. They decided in November to change courses to get our economic house back in order, to get our ship of state together, to put our country on the right footing. They elected Bill Clinton for a reason—because they wanted to have change.

The people on the other side of the aisle are trying once again—I listened to these comments, pork barrel jokes, we have got to pay for it. I listened to all of it, and it really amounts to no more than trying to fool us twice.

The opponents of this bill say that the problem is that this bill is emergency spending and that they want it paid for. That sounds fine. The people of the country ought to know that, based on our procedures, if this bill were increasing military spending, the emergency declaration would not even be necessary. So what they are really opposed to is an increase in spending on the domestic issues, an increase of spending here at home, spending on the things that are going to matter to people in their communities all over this country in this upcoming year. That is what this debate is about.

The opponents of this bill say they will support a stimulus bill so long as it is paid for. That sounds wonderful. We all want to make certain that we pay for our bills. We all want to be fiscally responsible, and this President's plan is fiscally responsible. But the opponents on the other side of the aisle know that the spending in this bill is totally offset by the cuts. They are not talking about that. They are trying to fool the people again.

What they are really saying is that they want to continue this economic shell game that they have been playing on the American people over the last 12 years. Let us talk about that for a minute. We have heard a lot of conversation about deficit reduction. We are all concerned about deficit reduction, and indeed deficit reduction is in the President's plan. But ask yourself the question, just a little common sense: Where do the deficits come from in the first place? The deficits were up over a factor of 4, the annual deficits up by a factor of 4, for the last 12 years. They had a chance to pay the bills, to pay for the spending as they went. And they did not. What they did was they borrowed out the back door and said to the American people it is the Democrats who want to increase your spending, not us.

While they increased taxes—they increased taxes, but they did it at the back door and by borrowing, and that is how we have a deficit to begin with. Now they are screaming the loudest we have to reduce the deficit more.

Mr. President, I say to you that is called "fool me twice." And the fact of the matter is the people on this side of the aisle want to take the responsible course that President Clinton has laid out for us, the responsible course that ways we will do deficit reduction, invest in people in this country, and we are going to provide a short-term stimulus to this economy that so badly needs it. The stimulus bill really is less spending than, frankly, in the end, the overall cap for this year that even President Bush agreed to.

So when they talk about wild-spending Democrats, what are they talking about? There is less spending here. This fits within the cap that was agreed to when President Bush was in office. Yet, now they are going to raise the flag like somehow or another this is new, wild, uncontrolled pork barrel spending by the Democrats.

"Fool me twice," Mr. President, is what is going on here, or what is attempted to go on here. I say the American people are not going to buy it, if we tell them the truth. And we are telling the truth. What we are telling them in this—today's newspaper tells them what is going on in this economy. And it is bad news, Mr. President. Unemployment is still at 7 percent. In my State of Illinois, it is up to one of the highest levels we have seen in the last decade. The number of private sector jobs has actually decreased, private sector jobs, decreased by 22,000. The construction industry, which is always supposed to see a boom come springtime and give people jobs working building houses, has lost 59,000 jobs. The stock market, the papers tell us today, has fallen by 2 percent and long-term interest rates have risen to over 7 percent. Why? Because the markets, the people who will invest in money and make this economy run, are afraid the American people are in danger of being fooled twice.

We are going to stay on this floor, I tell you, Mr. President, until it freezes over if we have to break this filibuster, to let the American people know the truth, to make the point that this is responsible, this is the direction our President has put us in, we want to give this President a chance to govern. That is all this issue is about.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Two more minutes?

Mr. BYRD. I yield 2 more minutes.

PLAIN AND SIMPLE OBSTRUCTION

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Thank you very much. I do not think it is any accident that the stock market is falling and interest rates are rising. I think, in no small part, that money managers are concerned that the opponents of this bill may be able to derail the President's economic plan. It is just almost ironic this is happening. He is out trying to give us the opportunity to save democracy in Russia and here at home; the opponents of this bill are trying to pull the rug from underneath him.

I believe, Mr. President, that we have a critical issue here. We already have a triple-dip recession. Do the opponents of this bill really want to see our economy falter again? I do not think so. I think the people of this country, the American people, want to see change. They want to see a future that is brighter and not driven into one that we faced in November. They want to have their confidence restored that we can manage this Government, that we can have fiscal responsibility, fiscal prudence, and we are not going to just spend money without paying for it, that we will have a plan and a program to get our economic house in order. And that is what the President's plan does. That is what this bill is doing.

It is absolutely irresponsible, Mr. President, for this filibuster, or talkathon, filibuster by amendment, filibuster by letter, I have heard all the words you want to put on it, it is plain and simple obstruction. It is a plain and simple attempt to fool the American people twice, Mr. President. And I hope that they are not allowed to get away with it.

Thank you very much.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I hope that our colleagues on both sides of the aisle will read—those who have not heard—the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I hope they will read her statement in the RECORD. It is a fine statement.

Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post, as the distinguished Senator from Tennessee pointed out earlier today, has the headline, "Jobs Report Shakes Faith in Recovery, March Rates Stuck at 7 Percent, DOW Off 69."

Mr. President, the recovery is at stake here while the Senate sits on its

hands, mired in a filibuster—a filibuster by letter.

Mr. President, in another story by David S. Broder, I see this paragraph. I will not read the Senator's name, but a certain Senator, Republican Senator, said, "Republicans would rather be accused of causing gridlock than to be treated like a bunch of doormats."

Mr. President, if the Republican Party here in the Senate thinks that is good publicity—and I beg to differ with them—the Dow Jones Industrial Average dropped almost 69 points yesterday; long-term interest rates climbed back to 7 percent, and the dollar hit a new low against the Japanese yen.

On Wall Street, the 2-percent decline in stock prices was also fueled by estimates of disappointing sales and profits over the next 6 months in several key industries. Unemployment remains at 7 percent. Reports released earlier this week showed a sharp increase in unemployment claims, falling consumer confidence, and a drop in the index of national business purchasers and managers.

All of this economic news leads me to believe that this economic recovery is in danger of sputtering completely out. Meanwhile, 43 Senators—43 Senators on the other side of the aisle—are standing in the way of help for the American people and for this very troubled economy; 43 Senators have banded together to wage a filibuster by letter, to wage a filibuster by a letter, a threat by a letter, to block this new President's much-needed jobs bill—jobs bill.

What does the President say about it? In the same newspaper, the Washington Post of today says Republicans are "keeping hundreds of thousands or more Americans out of work just to perpetuate political gridlock. Clinton told reporters at the forest summit in Portland, OR—this is what the President said—"Republicans are keeping hundreds of thousands or more Americans out of work just to perpetuate political gridlock. This is just pure politics, and if they"—meaning the Republicans in this Senate—"keep more Americans out of work, that is fine with them."

Mr. President, the economy sputters and 1.8 million people are in danger of losing their life-support system within a few days. These 43 Senators have decided to imperil this recovery, this anemic recovery, because they—43 Senators—and I do not believe all of them really want to do this, but the whip is cracked, and 43 Senators on the other side have decided that their judgment is better than the judgment of the President, the majority of the House of Representatives, the majority in the Senate, and the American people, who elected this new President based on believing that his programs would be good for this Nation.

Let us all come to our senses; let us give this President a vote on his jobs bill. The partisan bickering is not what is important. The good of the Nation is what we should be thinking about. Let us stop this delay and vote on this jobs package.

Senator HATFIELD was right this morning—the President's program is not sacrosanct. No President's program is sacrosanct. I have voted against Democratic Presidents' programs in the past, and I have voted for Republican Presidents' programs. But there is an important point of difference to consider here. This Presidency is only 73 days old today. This President ran on a platform of change, major change, in the economic policies of the past. This program, this jobs bill, is a major element in his package, and his package deserves a vote. Let us vote, Senators, on the bill. Let us vote on it.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] is recognized.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I yield myself 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 20 minutes.

KEEPING FAITH WITH THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, this debate is about keeping faith with the American people. This debate is about ensuring that the Federal Government does not destroy our economy. We have heard today that the stock market took a heavy hit yesterday and was down, and that consumer confidence is down.

I think I can tell you the reason that confidence is down. I think I can tell you why the markets are saying we are not going to see profits, we are not going to see growth, we are not going to see jobs, because this body—appropriately enough on April Fools' Day—passed a budget resolution saying that we would increase taxes a whopping $273 billion—$273 billion. The tax rates that would be jacked up under that resolution may contend that they will raise $273 billion. But we have learned something about taxes, and that is that taxes discourage economic activity.

It was this body, with the leadership of the opposite side of the aisle, that had a wonderful idea in the 1990 deficit reduction package, and that was to soak the rich with luxury taxes. They were going to stick it to people who bought big boats, cars, jewelry, and furs, by adding a 10-percent excise levy on top of it. But guess what? Taxes affect behavior, and people stopped buying the big boats, the so-called luxury boats. We did not get the revenue. The men and women who worked in the boat-building industry were thrown out out of work. They had to get unemployment compensation instead of getting good salaries and wages and paying tax on them. The companies that built those boats, instead of paying taxes on their corporate profits, went out of business.

Yes, there is good reason. If you look at the economic game plan that President Clinton has asked for and that the majority in both Houses have adopted, the economic game plan is a recipe for disaster. This so-called stimulus package, which I think is more appropriately labeled an "emergency deficit increase package," is going in exactly the opposite direction of what is needed.

We also have the prospect that the Clinton administration will provide even more tax requests for health care, and perhaps even more mandates, mandates on small businesses that would cost jobs. No wonder people who are seasoned observers are making the judgment that America is becoming a less and less attractive place to invest money and create jobs. It is because we have seen a rebirth of the old tax-and-spend philosophy. I do not believe that in the discussions of the deficit last year any Presidential candidate said: I am going to raise taxes $273 billion, but I am going to keep spending increasing so that the deficit goes up. This is what the deficit would be without doing anything, and it goes all the way up, and by the year 2000 it would have reached $450 billion.

But with 273 billion dollar's worth of tax increases, the Clinton plan, endorsed by this body, turns back up again and by the year 2000 the deficit is back up to $300 billion a year. By the year 2003, it would be $400 billion a year.

None of the Presidential candidates when asked about the deficits said what this economy needs is a heavy dose of taxes to allow us to increase spending.

We are talking about this package before us today, the emergency deficit-increase package. There are some good things in it, some things that I have supported in the past and will support again.

But, Mr. President, we are living in a very difficult time under the budget constraints of past actions. We have a deficit that is too high now. If we want these good programs—and I favor highways; I worked for summer jobs programs in the past—I say we ought to pay for them. If these programs are important enough that we need them right now, let us pay for them. This stimulus package, this deficit-increase package before us does not pay for them.

The President prior to submitting his State of the Union Message told us we were going to get $2 of spending cuts for every $1 of tax increase. In the State of Union Message, he said, "It is about divided." He came to the Republican caucus and said, "If you have any

good ideas of spending cuts let us have them."

Mr. President, I took him up on that offer. I wrote to him on March 5, and I said: We can cut spending and here is how we can do it, and here is how much we would save over 5 years. Terminate the superconducting super collider, $2.2 billion; the Appalachian Regional Commission, $600 million; the Economic Development Assistance Program, $800 million; the Advanced Solid Rocket Program, $1.7 billion; the mission to Mars, $600 million now but it goes to tens and perhaps hundreds of billions later on; HOPE 1 grants, $1.2 billion; State and local immigration assistance grants, $900 million; and environmental technical research, $700 million. The EPA Green Lights Programs is $160 million.

I offered an amendment on the floor several days ago, about Green Lights, and I pointed out that it was a corporate welfare program. It will create jobs, yes. It will hire 45 additional EPA bureaucrats to help people like Amoco, Boeing, Arco, Humana, Warner-Lambert, Xerox, U.S. West, Sallie May, Martin Marietta, and Lockheed. The idea was that the EPA bureaucrats give them advice, and they could save money. Boeing said they would save $500,000 a year; I believe they will. That is great. I believe in energy conservation.

I believe we ought to be encouraging businesses to cut the use of energy. But it makes money for them. It makes sense. So why do not we have the private sector do it? Is it an emergency? Is there such an emergency that we have to hire 45 new EPA bureaucrats?

Yes, those are jobs, but those are jobs that taxpayers have to pay for. If that responsibility were turned over to the private sector, it would still be worthwhile for the corporations to pay for it and for a private company to earn a profit and pay salaries by doing it and pay taxes on it.

That is why I say this program is just another pork program.

We talked about the methane emissions, a badly misguided effort to try to shift the blame for global warming to livestock.

Looking back at the other cuts I proposed, I proposed that we privatize Federal crop insurance and save $2.4 billion over 5 years.

The total in terminations was $14 billion. I believe we ought to do something about entitlements. We ought to have the Medicare reimbursement rates for FEHB employees and retirees. That would save $4.6 billion. If it is good enough for the people on Medicare, we who are covered by Federal Employees Health Benefits ought to be entitled to the same kind of reimbursement for our insurance claims. We ought to limit the subsidy of high income Medicare. It would save $2.2 billion. Managed care in Medicaid—if we went to a managed care system, according to the Federal agency that oversees it, the Health Care Finance Agency, that would save $35 billion over 5 years.

I offered that amendment in the Budget Committee as we debated the Clinton budget. People were not listening to arguments. They were voting the straight party line. All efforts by the Republican side to show where we can cut spending have been rejected on a straight party-line vote.

The specific reforms I have suggested in entitlements would save $65 billion over 5 years.

Then I presented to the President other reforms and reductions, things like eliminating the community development block grant entitlements for wealthy communities, communities that have plenty of money to take care of their low-income people. That would save $2 billion. Allowing the ANWR sale to go ahead would bring in $4.1 billion. Freezing international organizations in economic support funds, $1.2 billion; cutting Congress' budget by 25 percent over 2 years would save $1.8 billion. The total of these reforms would be $18 billion.

And then, I've pared back the President's new spending proposals. This would amount to a total saving over 5 years of $221 billion. But these would require choices. We would have to make decisions on a budget like families have to make decisions when they do not have enough money for all they want to buy. We would have to make some tough choices, Mr. President, and that is what this body is refusing to do.

Like children who go into a candy store, they want it all. A parent has to step in and say, "You can choose one or two, but you cannot have everything."

State governments have to live within their budget. As a Governor I had to make tough choices and cut spending when we did not have the revenue to fund all the programs we needed.

It is an issue of prioritize and determining what is most important.

We had opportunities on the floor to address some of these reforms and others. I joined with my colleague from Iowa in an amendment to freeze domestic spending, although not each and every program. There are certainly things in the domestic spending area that I think ought to increase, and I will continue to support them. Things like the women, infants' and children, feeding program, immunization, child care programs, highways—we have not funded the highway program. But we can do those, if we were to set priorities within the freeze domestic spending. We could still do those if we cut other programs and we would reduce the deficit.

Our leader, Senator DOLE, with our Budget Committee leader, Senator DOMENICI, presented an alternative budget deficit reduction plan that would save more than the Clinton budget adopted by this body would save, and they did it without increasing taxes. If we had cut spending as they proposed—look at this blue line on the chart—the deficit would go down more than it would under this so-called deficit-reduction program, and it would stay well below what the budget adopted by this body has done and will do in the future.

This, to me, is a responsible way to go about setting priorities and to deal with the deficit. The budget passed by this body does not do it. It increases spending and it has a whopping tax increase.

The bill before us today would add another $16 billion to the deficit numbers under that budget. It is being proposed as an emergency. Well, there is an emergency in this country today and most people outside the Beltway understand it. They realize what would happen to this Government if we continued to add to the deficit $400 billion, $500 billion, $1 trillion a year. The CBO baseline goes up and shows a $1 trillion a year deficit before the year 2010.

At some point, the Government is not going to be able to finance its debt. We are essentially going to be bankrupt.

But, in any event, we are going to be putting a tremendous burden on our children and our children's children. They are going to have to pay taxes on that. They are not going to enjoy the standard of living we have, or certainly the standard of living we would like to see them have, because our increased taxes in the budget resolution—the increases in spending there, plus the increased spending that is proposed in this package before us—will go on to their credit cards. And that is a dirty trick.

I see many young people coming to Washington, full of hope, full of optimism. I am embarrassed to tell them that we have already put $4 trillion of debt on their credit cards.

And during the first—and I trust the only—Clinton administration, we would add another $1.25 trillion to that debt.

The Republican Members of this body are united. We have fought to bring some economic sense out of our current budget. We have said: "Cut the additional spending. Don't jack up taxes, particularly when they are going to kill jobs."

The waterway user fee is a good example. I joined with the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON] to try to knock that out, because that 525-percent increase on waterway users would bankrupt the barge industry and put it out of work and everybody in it.

Well, my colleagues were not willing to deal with it and defeated our amendment to take it out. But the other side then adopted a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, saying, well, we ought to deal with it, still saying we do not like it,

but unwilling to take out the numbers in the budget. Who is kidding who?

The Btu tax is another good example. I have talked to a lot of farmers in my State. It has been estimated at $700 a year more, $900 a year more. Most farmers I know, who have a family farm and they are trying to run it to make a good profit on it, know precisely how much it is going to cost. They tell me $1,100, $1,400, at a time when agriculture is in great difficulty.

This Btu tax would boost direct energy costs. It would raise the cost of fertilizers and the other inputs, and bring even more hardship to agriculture.

Airlines, trucking companies, bus companies, energy intensive industries, like aluminum and many others, are going to be laying off people if this Btu tax ever goes through. I hope we can block it, because it is a tax on jobs.

We talk about 7 percent unemployment. I believe that the taxes in this measure will drive that unemployment figure even higher, and thus add to the deficit. Spending, if it is left unchecked, is going to drive the deficit back up even with taxes.

We believe the time has come to get serious about the deficit. And the only way to get serious is to cut spending.

Senator DOMENICI, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, has, I believe, already today highlighted what the Congressional Budget Office says about this budget package that we have just adopted.

It does not reduce the deficit $496 billion. The true number is only $440 billion. No domestic discretionary cuts are planned for 1994 and 1995. And probably the budget that we passed even violated the 1990 Budget Act, because it increases spending a billion in the first year. Sixty percent of the domestic discretionary cuts contemplated in the budget do not occur until 1998, a classic example of: "I am here from the Federal Government and I have come to help you," or "The check is in the mail."

We are buying a pig in a poke if we think somehow in 1998 we are going to get 60 percent of the domestic discretionary cuts. But, we will get front-end taxes of $273 billion, and those begin right away and those are going to kill jobs.

If the measures in this bill are important enough to do, then I think they are important enough for us to pay for. That is what this debate is all about. That is our responsibility, to set priorities and make choices.

The American people are tired of the politics of the past, where Congress continued to vote more and more money without regard to revenues. The tax-and-spend philosophy has not worked. We are attempting to keep faith with the American people who thought we would get a handle on spending.

If we spend money now, and more money that the Government does not have, we will leave the bill for someone else down the road—and that is our children.

Mr. President, there is much more that could be said about this, but I know others want to speak.

I would only say that, in this bill, the emergency for 1993, only 39 percent would be spent this year. We would still be spending almost $600 million of this emergency in fiscal year 1997.

What does that have to do with an immediate stimulus? Nothing, I suggest.

I urge my colleagues to stay with us and cut spending.

I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President pro tempore.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator said the time has come to get serious about the deficit.

Mr. President, let us go back over the past 12 years and talk about this deficit that the distinguished Senator has said the time has come to get serious about.

Up until the first fiscal year for which Mr. Reagan was responsible, there had been no triple-digit billion-dollar deficit. Throughout the previous 39 administrations and the previous 192 years of history, this country had never run a triple-digit billion-dollar deficit.

We had gotten into some double-digit billion-dollar deficits under Mr. Ford, $70 billion, $50 billion the next year; under Mr. Carter, $55 billion, $38 billion, $73 billion, and $74 billion.

Then came the Reagan era. The first fiscal year for which Mr. Reagan was responsible, a $120 billion deficit. Never heard of before; unheard of before.

The next year, $208 billion; the next year, $186 billion; the next year, $222 billion; the next year, $238 billion; the next year, $169 billion; the next year, $194 billion; the next year, $250 billion; the next year, $278 billion.

That is the first fiscal year for which Mr. Bush was responsible. He had been trained very well under Mr. Reagan, his predecessor.

So in his first fiscal year for which he was responsible, a $278 billion deficit; the next year, $322 billion; the next year, $340 billion; and the next year, $352 billion.

Now, Mr. President, we hear all of this palavering about the deficit; the time has come to get serious about the deficit.

After all of this?

Our new President is trying to get serious. He has just been in office 73 days. He has sent up a package which is a well-balanced package. It is composed of three elements: deficit reduction, long-term investment in infrastructure, and short-term jobs investment. That is what the bill before the Senate does.

Now, the distinguished Senator from Missouri says, and I am quoting him: "The tax-and-spend philosophy will not work."

Well, Mr. President, what I have just shown about this chart concerning the Federal deficits, fiscal years 1976–93—there are the deficits. We are told now that the tax and spend philosophy will not work. Under the Reagan administration, under the Bush administration, we were following a borrow and spend philosophy, a borrow and spend philosophy.

Mr. President, what happened to the total debt as a result of these deficits? When we run deficits, we increase the debt. We are talking about the last 12 years. We are not talking about the previous 192 years in this Republic's history, during which time the country ran up a total of $932 billion in debt; $932 billion. Less than $1 trillion. But because of the budgets that occurred during the Reagan and Bush years, the triple-digit billion-dollar deficits, we ran up a debt of $4,114 billion as of March 1, 1993.

So when the distinguished Senator says he is embarrassed when schoolchildren ask him, why do we not do something? What is happening to our economy? He is embarrassed about the deficits; he is embarrassed about the debt; he is embarrassed about the interest on the debt. Mr. President, there it is. Under whose Presidencies did that debt mushroom, like the prophet's gourd, overnight; from less than $1 trillion, from January 20, 1981, when President Reagan first took office, to $4,114 billion on March 1 of this year?

Tell the schoolchildren about that. Tell them when the deficits occurred. Tell them under whose administration those deficits occurred.

Mr. President, when those schoolchildren talk to the Senator from Missouri he is going to tell them about the interest on that debt, and rightly so. But the interest on the debt when Mr. Reagan took office was $69 billion in that year. And in fiscal year 1993 it is $198.7 billion. Almost $199 billion. Almost $200 billion.

So, Mr. President, tell those children—I hope the Senator will not be embarrassed to tell them when those deficits occurred, when that debt quadrupled, and when the interest on the debt rose from $69 billion to almost $200 billion.

That is a hidden tax, $200 billion a year. That is a hidden tax, a hidden tax. And it is caused by those burgeoning deficits that took place over the last 12 years—a hidden tax.

This President is trying to do something about that hidden tax. He is trying to reduce the budget deficits and eventually, in time, to reduce the debt and, concomitantly, the interest on the debt. So I just hope what I said will be

helpful to the distinguished Senator from Missouri when he faces those children who are—embarrassed about the deficits.

My grandchildren, my two daughters, and my two sons-in-law are embarrassed, too, about the debt. But I tell them how it rose. And the President, this President who has been in office just 73 days—73 days—is trying to do something about it.

The distinguished Senator from Tennessee has brought out a budget resolution here that deals with reducing the deficit. We passed it in this Senate. And this bill deals with jobs, the need to put people back to work now. Let this President have a chance. Give him a chance.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MATHEWS). The Senator from Missouri.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET PLAN

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may need.

I do not intend to speak long but I do want to call to my colleagues' attention a few things that I thought about since I sat down and heard the very eloquent words of our distinguished President pro tempore. He said—I believe the quote is correct—"This President is trying to do something about this hidden tax," referring to the interest.

So I went back and I got this book called A Vision of Change for America, the President's budget plan. In the appendix, page 140, it talks about net interest. It projects net interest at $202 billion this year, and by 1998 it projects that with the Clinton plan enacted net interest, that hidden tax, at $272 billion a year. That is about a 35-percent increase in the hidden tax.

I am indebted to my colleague from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, for giving me this chart that talks about what we have done in the past. And we did run up the debt. The debt grew because each year we ran a deficit, and I think that is bad. I have heard it said that these were the responsibilities of the Presidents. Certainly I do not think they did enough to curb the deficit. I disagreed with them. I argued with Republican Presidents, saying they ought to cut spending and they ought to get serious about it; they ought to support the Domenici-Nunn-Robb-Rudman budget of last year because that would have capped spending, particularly entitlements.

But now we are at this point. We have a choice. Which direction are we going to go? Under the Clinton plan that debt goes from $4.4 trillion to $6.2 trillion over 5 years. We have a choice. Do we want to go that way or do we want to slow the growth in it by cutting spending? I hope we will slow the growth.

Some of my colleagues in this body say when the President submits a budget, boy, that locks us in. We have to spend the money he tells us we should spend.

It reminds me of that lame school excuse, "The dog ate my homework" or "The devil made me do it."

This is only my seventh year in this body, Mr. President. Something very different happened this year. The first 6 years I was here, the leadership of both bodies immediately proclaimed the President's budget DOA, dead on arrival. They made it clear they were not going to adopt the President's budget and, indeed, the President cannot spend money until Congress appropriates it. In the 6 years under the Reagan and then the Bush administrations, and I was here each year, the majority party in both Houses established their budget. They were the ones who established the budget that increased the debt to $4.4 billion.

Frankly, I think it is time we get off the blame game. There is plenty of blame to go around. Over $4 trillion on our children's credit cards is bad enough. One of the things the people told me as I campaigned this past year is stop blaming each other and do something. Do something constructive.

I think we all agree we have a problem. We made mistakes in the past. I do not think you can blame them on a Republican President, certainly not when both Houses of Congress are controlled by the Democrats.

But let us put that behind us. Let us start making some responsible choices about where we go in the future. Do we want to continue, as the Congressional Budget Office has said, increasing spending, putting through a monstrous increase in taxes, and holding out the hope—and I suggest it is a very faint hope—that somehow Congress is going to get religion, get some spine, and cut maybe 60 percent of the domestic spending cuts in 1998?

That is a promise that I do not believe the people of America will accept. They know what happens when Congress raises taxes—they raise spending next. And they just keep doing it. Congress raises taxes and it just encourages them to spend more.

I believe it was my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma on the other side of the aisle who, in commenting on this so-called stimulus package, said going forward with a massive deficit increase in spending right off the bat is like asking your 5-year-old to eat his ice cream first and then hope that he will eat his spinach later. We are asking for the ice cream in the bill before us today, the emergency deficit increase bill, as I call it, but we are ducking the spinach. We are not willing to take the tough medicine to make choices, cut out some of these things that we have recommended to the President, that we offered in the Budget Committee, that we offered on the floor.

I believe and I hope that, as a result of the very strong concern by the Members on this side and some of the Members on the other side of the aisle, we will come to our senses and take a look at this package and say, if there are important things we need to do, then let us pay for them, let us put behind us the blame game. There is plenty to go around. Let us work together to find out how we can pay for things like highways, immunization, unemployment compensation, and summer youth employment.

We do not need things like the Green Lights Program. We do not need an emergency dump of $28 billion to the District of Columbia that we tried to eliminate. These are items that are not emergencies and should not even be included in a budget. But for things that are needed, if we need them now, let us pay for them. That is what this debate is about. This debate is about keeping faith with the American people and not sticking our children with the heavy burdens of a $6.2 trillion debt or, as has been described earlier, the hidden tax of interest rates which, under the Clinton administration projections, would reach $272 million by 1998. I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I think the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM] has been waiting to be heard, and I will not detain her because she has been on the floor waiting. I merely want to say, in response to my friend from Missouri, I have a great deal of respect for him. I like him personally. He said something here that caught my attention. Referring to the American people, he said, "They know what happens when Congress increases spending."

Mr. President, this chart to my left will show that during the years 1981 to 1992, calendar years, during those years, covering the three administrations—Mr. Reagan and Mr. Bush—the administration requested $7,476,374,580,074; in short, $7.4 trillion. The Congress appropriated $7,447,582,699; in other words, Congress appropriated $29.3 billion less during those years than the Presidents requested.

Now let it not be said that the Congress has increased the spending over what the President requested. I just want to make that clear.

There is one thing I will say in that regard. When the Senator talks about discretionary spending, during the fiscal years 1981 to 1992, using this zero line, this baseline, during those years, entitlements increased over baseline, over inflation $983 billion. The military spending increased during those years over baseline, over inflation $679 bil-

lion. Foreign operations stayed about level. It was under baseline $14 billion. But the real element of the total budget that suffered disastrous cuts was the domestic discretionary spending. It was cut $430 billion under baseline, under inflation during those years.

Mr. President, I hope these charts will show graphically what has happened with discretionary spending and also make the point succinctly that the Congress has appropriated less money than the Presidents requested during those 12 years of the Reagan-Bush administrations. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

NOT THE ANSWER TO ECONOMIC ILLS

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, there is, I suppose, ample blame to go around, but I know that on both sides of the aisle we care about the good of this Nation. The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee said earlier that it is the good of the Nation that is at stake. I would argue that, indeed, we all share those concerns, but many times we approach it from different angles.

I feel strongly that this economic emergency stimulus package is something that, in general, is not the answer to our economic ills at the moment—although we would all agree on the need for the unemployment benefit funding included in the bill. The reason that it is designated an emergency is to avoid our having to offset the costs of this package. That fact has been pointed out many times, and I do not want to revisit that debate as such.

I would just like to highlight a portion of this emergency supplemental as one among many other examples of what I would consider ill-advised spending increases.

My concern is the proposed $1 billion in supplemental appropriations for the summer youth employment and training program, which is funded under the Job Training Partnership Act [JSTPA]. What is not pointed out, Mr. President, is that there is already $900 million that was appropriated last year still to be spent for summer job training and summer jobs. That money is already available. What we are asking for in this emergency supplemental is an additional $1 billion, which would bring the program close to $2 billion in total spending. So it is not as if there will be no money for summer jobs for youth if we do not approve this emergency supplemental.

Although I think we would all agree that having a quality Summer Jobs Program is important, I would just like to share with you, Mr. President, my concerns about doubling the size of this program at this time.

These concerns are twofold:

First, I think there are serious flaws in the program which raise real questions about the value of it to young participants. Before doubling the size of the program, I think we need to undertake a thorough examination of its purposes and operations. I believe strongly that we can and should provide a far more meaningful experience, for instance, of academic enrichment than the disadvantaged youth of our Nation are currently receiving. By this, I do not mean just the same classroom structure. There are some very innovative programs in which academics are an important part of that summer job, as well as job skills training. If, indeed, we do not make sure that these programs, work, Mr. President, I would argue that we are not being fair to our young people. Just to give them money that has been called walk-around money is a real disservice to them.

So while we would all agree on the importance of providing support for summer jobs, I would argue it is equally important to assure that funds for this purpose are well spent. We have very little time to assure this is the case.

This is my second concern. Quite simply, it is unrealistic to expect that, in the few weeks remaining between now and the onset of summer, cities can develop programs which will effectively utilize substantial funding increases. Over a decade ago, I cautioned that an overly rapid buildup of defense spending would surpass the ability of the military to absorb additional resources without leading to wasteful and inefficient practices. I stand here today to make that same point regarding the summer jobs program. I think we would all hope that this program will not produce the domestic equivalent of the $800 toilet seat.

I believe that the wisest course would be to defer a major portion of the $1 billion in supplemental funding for summer jobs until we can be assured that these funds will support effective programs which offer long-term results for young people. We must create programs that combine career jobs skills with academic enrichment and that instill discipline, good work habits, and the incentive to succeed. These programs must offer real job skills instead of short-term, low-skilled, make-work positions.

Further, I believe the rules of the title II–B Program of JTPA should be changed to permit private sector businesses to create work-study programs to offer young people the confidence and knowledge that they have what it takes to succeed in today's labor market.

Currently, businesses are not eligible to apply directly for title II–B funds. A handful have received subgrants from public agencies to develop programs. One such example is a 7-week program in Chicago where professional aviation specialists teach 340 inner city youngsters about the requirements of various careers in the aviation field. The program requires participants to use their reading and math skills to master subjects ranging from federal aviation regulations to problems associated with coordination global air travel. During the 2 years this program has been in operation, reading and math scores of participating youngsters have risen dramatically.

I would also support funding to enable the Secretary of Labor to award competitive grants to public or private entities to develop the kind of comprehensive, year-round work-study programs that are needed by the nation's disadvantaged youth. Programs supported by such grants could serve as a foundation for restructuring title II–B in a way which would avoid having the gains made during the summer disappear by Christmas.

Take, for example, the summer work-study program in the east San Gabriel Valley section of Los Angeles, which is a cooperative effort among the public and private sector and the local school system. It is not simply a summer work-study program but, rather, a year-round effort in which high school students gain on-the-job experience while continuing their high school education. It does not just stop with some moneys for the summer. There is a follow-through to make sure that gains are sustained. The students receive mentoring from small business owners who volunteer their time because they know they will receive a return on their investment in the long run in the form of motivated and well-trained young people ready to work.

Senator MIKULSKI and several other of my colleagues have spoken eloquently about the positive results of some other summer youth programs. Yes, there are innovative programs that do more than simply hand out money. Unfortunately, I would argue, these innovative programs are not the rule but, rather, the exception. This legislation does little to assure that these creative work-study programs become the rule, not only during the summers, but in a year-round context. I think that is what we must work to achieve.

Secretary Reich has taken a step in the right direction by providing that $300 million of this appropriation be used exclusively for the academic enrichment component of the summer program. I would argue though, Mr. President, this is just a small part of what is needed. The hard truth is, considering the tight deadline, it is highly unlikely that any academic enrichment programs put together on a crash basis can have any significant impact on literacy enhancement.

69-059 O—97 Vol. 139 (Pt. 6) 6

I think we would be far better served by taking the time to do things right. President Clinton has spoken forcefully about the need to reinvent Government, moving away from business as usual in terms of how the Federal Government operates. Reform of the Summer Youth Employment Program would seem to be an excellent place to start, but this program cannot be reinvented in 8 short weeks. We need answers that are effective for the long term, are constructive for the long term, and do not add direct additional debt over the long term.

I think all three are components we owe to our youth and to future generations.

I would welcome the opportunity to work with the President and the Secretary of Labor to take a fresh look at the Summer Jobs Program, with a view toward putting in place reforms that will make a lasting impact on its young participants.

I close, Mr. President, by saying that the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee is someone who knows the rules and procedures of the Senate better than any other Senator in this body. He is someone who has cared a great deal about his own people in West Virginia, and the well-being of others in this country. But there are times, I would argue, that we have to stop and make sure that what we are doing is not just borne out of our frustration of the moment with obvious weaknesses in our economy and in our labor force. Rather, we must focus on how we can act most constructively in positive assurances that we have addressed in a constructive way shaping programs important to our future.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM]. She made, as always, a fine statement.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania, 10 minutes.

Mr. WOFFORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

THE EMERGENCY IN OUR LAND

Mr. WOFFORD. The Senator from Kansas noticed that I share her approach to the summer jobs and to the job training partnership program for young people, and I look forward to working with her and other members of our committee, and our new Secretary of Labor, Robert Reich, in shaping mandated programs for youth. Having administered them in Pennsylvania, I have a lot of ideas how they can be done better. But I do not agree that we do not need a very substantial new source of funds for summer jobs and summer work, and I do not believe that we are not able to do even better this summer with those funds.

For those on the Senator's side of the aisle—she has not, but others have—who ridicule the notion that there is an emergency in this land, I ask them come to Los Angeles with me, walk in Los Angeles where I walked the weekend of the riots and smelled the smoke and saw the crisis of our cities and the crisis of our young. John Kennedy said come to Berlin. Well, I say let us go to Los Angeles, or to Philadelphia, with the jobs lost, the summer coming, the young people going out on the streets. Come to Pittsburgh, where the problem of the young is growing. There is an emergency in this country that calls for urgent action.

Mr. President, there is a danger hanging over us today. The Good Book tells us of the cloud no larger than a man's hand which will soon come to darken the whole sky. Well, that cloud which is darkening our future today is not on the horizon; it is here, in this Chamber, hanging over us today. And it is far larger than one man's hand. It is 42 men's hands and perhaps 1 woman's hand.

It is a cloud that is over the country, too. It is this threat of Government by blackmail, by filibuster, not by one Senator standing up on conscience to try to stir the country. It is by 42 men and possibly 1 woman on the other side of the aisle who are joining to block the change that Bill Clinton was elected to bring about, to block the new course that deals with the deficit for the first time in modern history and also deals with the urgent needs for investment in jobs and economic growth in our young people.

If this dark cloud is not dispersed now, if this filibuster can work today, then it will be used to block health care reform tomorrow; it will be used to block every major step in the new course our new captain has charted.

Mr. President, I am sorry the Republican leader has just left the floor, because I want to appeal to the Republican leader and to other leaders among the Republicans to turn back from this tactic of gridlock by filibuster and turn inward to rediscover the kind of Republican leadership that was once given to our country by the first great Republican leader, Abraham Lincoln.

At our prayer breakfast this week, I reflected with my colleagues from both sides of the aisle on Lincoln's words about his hope that the mystic chords of memory would stir once again the better angels of our nature. I want to strike two of those mystic chords of memory.

The first has to do with the civil rights struggle in the 1940's and the 1950's. I do this on the eve, tomorrow, of the 25th anniversary of the death of Martin Luther King. Martin Luther King lived under the shadow of the threat of filibuster and struggled and endured, as everyone who struggled for human rights of this country lived under that shadow, throughout the 1940's and 1950's. That is what blocked civil rights action until Martin Luther King went into the streets, and hundreds of thousands of people went into the streets and into jail, until John and Robert Kennedy responded. And from the era of filibuster came the era of civil rights in the 1960's.

Here we are again with that same shadow, that same tactic, being used to block the new course for our country.

Then I want to strike the other chord of memory. It was 60 years ago last Wednesday, this week, that Franklin Roosevelt signed the Civilian Conservation Corps Act. He came to office 60 years ago and found millions and millions of Americans unemployed, and 500,000 young men had dropped out of school, unemployed and on the streets of the cities.

He said, I want to get those young men, those boys in the woods. And he asked Francis Perkins to come in and design a plan for him in the first weeks of his administration to get those boys in the woods. He said let the Army get the camps ready. Let the Labor Department recruit the young men. Let the Interior Department find the hardest projects that our country needs to get done, and get those boys in the woods.

He sent a message to the Congress in his first 10 days, and 10 days later Congress enacted the Civilian Conservation Corps Act. And Roosevelt said, let us get a quarter of a million men by the end of summer into our CCC camps. And 5 months later, July 31, there were 1,300 camps, and there were more than 300,000 young men doing the work our parks and forests needed, and transforming their lives in the process.

That was a time when there was no filibuster. That was a time when there was no gridlock. That was a time when people gave Franklin Delano Roosevelt a chance.

I ask my colleagues on the other side to turn back from the course that they are now taking to help this country move on to the new course, to give Bill Clinton, to give change a chance.

We gave Franklin Roosevelt that chance. Yes;, it was a Great Depression of the economy. Today the problems are difficult and more complex. But we have a great crisis in our country. We have a depression of the spirit in this country. We have needs that need to be met. We have a program that is ready to go forward. Do not use this tactic to block the new course this country needs. Turn back, my friends, and rediscover the better angels of our nature so that we can move forward in this country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. RIEGLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, in the absence of the chairman of the Appro-

priations Committee, I would yield myself such time as I may use.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

JOBS IN AMERICA

Mr. RIEGLE. I thank the Chair.

Let me thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his important, and inspiring, significant comments that give us some sense of broader perspective as to what brings us here today on Saturday, and the problem of the logjam, the gridlock that we are seeing again here today as we try to get this economy going and get jobs going again in our country.

He reminds us, going back in time, of the struggles of Dr. Martin Luther King and those who fought for civil rights advances in this country. At the heart of Dr. Martin Luther King's efforts was not just the civil rights struggle, which he is most remembered for and which he more than any other person led in this century, but the fact that he was fighting for economic justice. Very much a part of his message was economic justice, about seeing to it that people get enfranchised in terms of voting rights, equal rights in our society, but also economic opportunity and economic rights, and economic security.

That is what we are talking about today; trying to change the economic direction of this country to open the economic system up, to get people who are unemployed, underemployed, who are homeless, who have given up looking for work, to get this economy moving at a faster rate to create more jobs, more opportunities and more ladders into the system, up through the system.

So people, whether they are in the inner cities or they are out in our rural areas today who do not have work, who desperately need the work, actually have the chance to become part of the American economic system. Dr. King fought for that, as many others have.

I am so struck by the fact that our Senate colleagues on the other side of the aisle are doing everything they can do stymie and thwart this new President. President Clinton has not been in office very long, just a matter, really, of weeks. He is doing everything he can to try to give the country a new and stronger economic direction. He has developed a thoughtful and balanced economic plan, a jobs plan. He has brought it forward. It is here now. A key part of it is the jobs creation part, to try to get more jobs coming forward in our society, to give people an opportunity to get into this economic system, to support themselves, their children, their families; to be able to have a sense of being able to participate in the economic promise of this country.

We have gone for years now without a real economic strategy for America, particularly the over the last 12 years—8 years under Reagan and Bush, and then the final 4 years under Bush and Quayle. A great emphasis, was given to foreign policy, almost no attention was paid to the problems here in America.

I think fundamentally that was what the last election was all about. The American people wanted to elect a new President who had a sense of direction, and urgency about the American economy; about problems here in our country that need attention.

So they elected a new President. They removed a sitting President and elected Bill Clinton; because he had a plan for the country, an economic plan, and a health care plan, and other fresh ideas.

You really have to go back I think to 1961 to find the last moment in our modern history where there was a time quite like this one. That of course was the time when we had another young President, John Kennedy, who came in, and the tragedy that followed we all know. We did not have him for very long, about 1,000 days. It was just getting started and it was cut short by an assassin's bullet.

Lyndon Johnson, to his great credit, came in as the Vice President, assumed the Presidency, and the great stride that he made was to try for a period of his Presidency to focus on the terrible human problems in our country, on the civil rights injustices. He led the fight to get landmark civil rights legislation passed. And he should always be acknowledged and revered for having done that. But then we got drawn into Vietnam. That was the great tragedy, and the destruction really of the Johnson administration.

Following that, we went into the Nixon-Agnew period. And into Watergate. And after that, the Ford Presidency. Then for a brief time, the Carter Presidency. Then that ended after one term.

And then we had the 12 years of Reagan-Bush, Bush-Quayle.

Now it is 1993 and over 30 years have passed. And the great promise that was there in the early sixties somehow got away from us. Things are worse today in America than they were in the 1960's. We have more people on food stamps in America than ever in our Nation's history today. The largest city in America with the highest rate of child poverty today is in my home State. It is the city of Detroit and No. 4 on that list is my own hometown of Flint, MI.

My heart aches for those facts. The unemployment rate is 7 percent, but the figure is far higher than that, because we do not count the people who have become so discouraged they have stopped looking for work. They do not count the people in that number who are working part time, part time because they cannot find full-time work. We are told that there are at least 17 million people in this country who need and want full-time jobs and cannot find them and cannot support themselves, cannot provide for their families, cannot give the country the economic lift that the country needs.

No here comes a new President with some vision, some fresh energy, some ideas. And he comes in with a plan. It is a good, sensible plan. It is aimed at helping America. And the jobs part of the plan is $16.3 billion. It is a modest amount. I think in fact we need much more than that.

Let me tell you what the Japanese are doing right now. They have a problem of unemployment in their country. It is a much smaller problem than we have. Our unemployment rate is 7 percent. It is actually much higher than that. But in Japan the unemployment rate today is only 2½ percent. But the Japanese Government cares so much about their people and their unemployed people that they have decided they need a stimulus plan. Do you know how much their stimulus plan amounts to in Japan?

Let me read you the numbers from yesterday's New York Times. Last year, the Japanese put in place an economic stimulus plan for their country, according to the New York Times, of $93 billion. They spent $93 billion last year to get their economy going. They decided they needed some more, so they are just now announcing a new stimulus program. This story says that is going to be another $130 billion.

Here we are now, with the Republicans in the Senate blocking even a $16 billion stimulus program and jobs program for this country. I think, as I said earlier today, it is Presidential politics. They want to wound this President. They want to keep him from being able to fulfill his promise of change and job creation. We have at least two Members on that side—and it is no secret—who are running for President in 1996. It is a little awkward for them to go up to New Hampshire right now and campaign openly, so they come in and campaign by filibuster here. They come in and do everything they can to sabotage this new President—although he has literally only been in office a matter of a few weeks—as he is trying to fulfill his mandate and his promise to the American people to present an economic plan and to foster job creation; they are doing everything they can to prevent that from happening.

I know there is another candidate, the former Housing and Urban Development Secretary, Jack Kemp, a friend of mine. He is out there campaigning for the Presidential nomination in 1996, and some of our Senate colleagues on the other side cannot stand that. He is out there and able to go around and give his speeches in New Hampshire and Iowa and wherever else, so they

have to come in here and they have to do everything they can to perpetuate the gridlock and to try to stymie this President and make it impossible for this President to put his program in place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I remind the Senator that the time allotted to Senator BYRD has expired.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, is it appropriate to seek unanimous consent for additional time?

Mr. BYRD. The other side has time, but they have not used any of it yet.

Mr. RIEGLE. I ask unanimous consent, if I may, that the period for morning business be extended. I would like to speak, and I would like another 10 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I certainly do not have any objection to it. I would like to have more time, likewise.

The distinguished majority leader, at some point, I think, wants to put the Senate out. I certainly have no objection to the Senator's request. I may have a request for some additional time myself.

Mr. EXON. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. BYRD. The Senator's request is 10 minutes for each side, the Republican side and this side?

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I ask for 20 minutes for each side.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator from Nebraska also want some time?

Mr. EXON. Yes. I would like to reserve the right to object, and I very likely will not. However, the Senator from Nebraska would like some time in morning business, if possible, to discuss another very important matter that is going on today—the meeting between President Yeltsin and President Clinton. I can take that after the present time has run out. But I reserve the right to ask unanimous consent to make remarks for up to 10 minutes in that regard.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I add the request of the Senator from Nebraska to what I am suggesting, which is an additional 20 minutes on both sides on the issue before us, taking into account the request of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Reserving the right to object further, I am not sure that the time that has been suggested by the Senator from Michigan would be adequate. At the appropriate time, I will ask unanimous consent for up to 10 minutes to be assigned to the Senator from Nebraska over and above any other constraints with regard to the matter at hand. I shall not object.

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

Mr. RIEGLE. If I may, I will shorten my remarks because others want to speak. I ask to be told by the Chair when 3 minutes have elapsed, so I can try to finish within that period of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will so inform the Senator.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I have brought a series of charts, but I will not take the time on them. This huge stimulus program the Japanese are engaged in is money essentially coming from America through a large trade deficit we have with them.

We have to get our people back to work here. I want to say to the people on the other side of the aisle, they have 4 years to run a Presidential campaign and 4 years to try to decide who is going to get nominated on their side in the 1996 Presidential race. But let us give this President and the country a chance now to get some things done. We just had an election. It is too soon to start another Presidential election, quite frankly, and we ought to allow this President to have a chance to put the economic plan in place that he ran on and that the American people voted for.

We need the jobs. We desperately need the jobs. Each job will help create every other job, because the money does not stop when somebody gets a job and earns their weekly income. They spend that money on the necessities of life, and that money moves around. It helps create their neighbor's job, and that helps to create the job for somebody in the next town or somewhere else in the State, or in another State. That is the way we lever this economy up, with more jobs.

But we just learned that last month 22,000 jobs disappeared in the economy. Consumer confidence is down, and the stock market was off 68 points yesterday. We are in a situation here now where we have to drive this economy up to a higher and stronger level of performance.

So the President has a plan and it ought to be supported. I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle, at least for a few more months, put away your Presidential ambitions; just put them away, and let the people have a chance to let this President we just elected have an opportunity to fulfill the commitments that he made and that the people have asked him to carry out. Let us get the job creation going. But make no mistake about it, if the other side, using 43 votes in the filibuster, if they wreck this plan and if they insist on crippling this plan and this President, there will be no mistake in the minds of the American public as to where it came from.

The public does not want that. They have had enough of that. So I say to my colleagues on the other side, put the Presidential ambition away for a while. If you want to practice your Presidential interests and Presidential campaign, go to New Hampshire and go to Iowa, but do not bring it in here on the Senate floor in the form of gridlock and in the form of filibuster to prevent us from getting a job program in place.

Finally, this. The other day, ABC News did a news story on two veterans who are homeless and unemployed here in Washington, DC. They were veterans of Desert Storm. They served this country in uniform with distinction. They came back to this country, were unable to find work, and today have no income; they are unemployed living in cardboard boxes here in the District of Columbia. That is just not right. That situation is multiplied all across this country.

We need jobs in America, and we need them now. We need jobs in America, and we need them now. We need this job stimulus plan. The President has given us a plan. Let us enact it and let us help America.

I thank the Chair and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator want?

Mrs. BOXER. Three minutes.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from California.

OUR STATE IS REELING

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank my friend, the Senator from Michigan, for yielding. I associate myself with his remarks.

As I mentioned before, I am very disappointed that I was not able to leave with my colleague, Senator FEINSTEIN, and go back to my home State where I have a very vigorous schedule planned. She and I were going to address the Democratic Convention that is meeting in California, in Sacramento.

We had both hoped so very much to be able to tell the people of California that we were part of a history-making legislative year, that we were able to be part of breaking the gridlock in Washington and coming home with a message of hope for our children, who have been neglected for too long, for our working families, who have been neglected too long, to the defense workers, who so much cry out for help as we move from a military-based economy to a civilian-based economy.

We had so hoped to be able to come home and announce that not only had we passed the budget resolution, which contains the largest reduction in history and which contains long-term important investments for our people; but, yes, that we had passed a modest but very important stimulus program for this Nation.

Our State is reeling. We have 1.5 million Californians out of work, losing hope. This jobs bill that has been stalled here today and the last several days by the Republicans will bring 50,000 jobs to our State of California. And what does that mean? Fifty thousand jobs which will ease the burden on 50,000 families, on spouses and on chil-

dren and on communities. Yet, the Republicans in this U.S. Senate, the filibuster fellows, as I call them, the darlings of delay, have decided that they are going to take a stand.

I say to Senators, it is fine to take a stand. But do not take a stand against job creation; do not take a stand against turning around this recession; do not take a stand in favor of stopping a President dead in his tracks after he has been in office for such a short period of time. Give his program a chance.

But the American people are seeing it for what it is, and I only hope that they will let those Republican Senators know that their tactics are not good for America and their tactics are not good for the Republican Party.

I ask for an additional minute.

Mr. RIEGLE. I yield an additional minute.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I say to my colleague from Michigan, who is such a leader in this body for those who do not have a voice, for those who need a fair break, for those who need housing for their families and credit for their small businesses, that I am very proud to be a Democrat, that I am very proud to be a part of an institution where we have a number of us here, united as Democrats, united, more importantly, as Americans, speaking out in favor of this jobs program.

I say to him that I will stand with him and with my fellow colleague, friend, and Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN], and with the leadership and with Senator BYRD, and my chairman, Senator SASSER, for as long as it takes until we get these funds out to our communities where they belong, where they are needed, where they will help our people because that is why I got elected and that is why I am here.

Mr. RIEGLE. I thank the Senator.

I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, as the Senator from California points out, this President has come along now and offered a plan for this country to try to help people, and especially working people, just everyday citizens in the country that have been ignored for such a long time.

The last administration, you know, had an economic program for every country in the world except this one. That is why they were voted out. Now a President has come along and he has come up with an economic program for this country, and we need it. You certainly need it in your home State in California; we do in Michigan. All the 50 States today are struggling in one way or another. And we are talking about trying to get some economic lift into our system.

That is why the Japanese are doing so much. I cited earlier the fact that over 2 years, they are going to spend over $200 billion in stimulus effort because their unemployment rate got all the way up to 2.5 percent. Here we are up at 7 percent, and our friends on the other side of the aisle do not want anything in this package that is designed to create jobs in America. They just do not get it.

They did not understand the message of the last election. Now they have their eyes on the next election, in 1996. If they want to take that argument up to New Hampshire, that is fine with me. It has no place on the Senate floor. We need the jobs plan, and we need it now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has expired.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FEINSTEIN). The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Madam President, as I had indicated earlier, I ask unanimous consent that 12 minutes be allowed the Senator from Nebraska at this point, without the 12 minutes being charged to either side on the matter that has been discussed.

My remarks have to do with the meeting today between President Clinton and President Yeltsin.

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

Mr. EXON. I thank the Chair.

THE RIDDLE OF TRADE WITH RUSSIA

Mr. EXON. Madam President, I believe that these remarks are particularly important and particularly on point today as President Clinton conducts what perhaps will be the most important meeting of his Presidency. The Vancouver summit now going on between President Clinton and President Yeltsin offers an unprecedented opportunity to launch a new era of peace, understanding, and cooperation. I think we all wish them well.

The previous administration heralded The collapse of communism, but our new young President has an opportunity to help lay the cornerstone on a new structure—a structure built with freedom, democracy, and a market economy.

The new era is one of the greatest opportunities we have ever had. The former Soviet Union offers a huge new market for virtually any product and service produced in America and the post-Communist era allows the United States to turn its attention away from the Soviet threat and toward many of our needs here at home.

To open the vast Soviet market to American goods and services, the President must solve a riddle; namely, how can the United States sell its food, products, and services to a country with virtually no money to pay for food, products, and services.

At least an important and practical answer to that riddle lies in a concept that I have been promoting for a number of years. That idea is barter. What is barter? In its simplest form, it is trading goods for goods, such as trading food for oil. In its broadest use it is a host of financial devices which build on that idea—such as countertrade, collateralization, escrow and other self-liquidating transactions.

Russia needs just about anything our Nation can produce. They need food, technology, heavy equipment, consumer goods, and services. At the same time Russia and the Republics of the former Soviet Union are rich with many of the resources our country and the world want and need such as energy, gold, diamonds, metals, and minerals. In addition, the former Soviet Union has a highly literate and educated work force.

The solution to increasing trade between the United States and Russia and the other Republics is to use that great nation's resources and potential production of energy and minerals to finance its much needed food requirements and infrastructure investments.

Many of our Nation's trade competitors have already solved the riddle. We are way behind. Last week, Canada announced a wheat for cotton and diamonds arrangement with Russia and Uzbekistan. Australia also recently announced a wheat for aluminum deal with Russia and other countries.

Australia also recently announced a wheat for aluminum deal with Russia. They join France, Poland, Korea, and other, all of which have barter arrangements already in effect with the Republics of the former Soviet Union.

In pressing the case for new thinking in trade finance, I have encountered years of the old fashioned cash on the barrel head thinking in the Reagan and Bush administrations. Despite this, I have persisted with many statements and speeches to spur this concept. It appears it is finally beginning to produce some constructive results.

In 1987, I proposed legislation to create an Office of Barter in the U.S. Department of Commerce and, after some discussion, the Reagan administration was grudgingly convinced not to object to provisions creating that office and an Interagency Group on Countertrade as a part of the 1988 Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act. The barter office in the Department of Commerce is now there, languishing in inaction but there to be used if we can but develop a little foresight.

In 1989, I pressed the Reagan administration to implement the trade bill's barter provisions and use the new barter office to expand agriculture and business markets for U.S. trade in Eastern Europe. In 1990, I suggested that President Reagan propose a food for oil initiative to President Gorbachev. In 1991, I traveled to the Soviet

Union and met with the Soviet Ministers of Oil and Gas and Agriculture. Both were enthusiastic about the prospect of a U.S.-U.S.S.R. barter arrangement. I had similar meetings with the new Ministers of post-Communist Russia on a subsequent visit and also received encouraging responses. In 1992, I finally won approval of a provision in the energy bill to require the administration to report on the feasibility of using barter to finance the repair of the battered energy sector in the former Soviet Union and help the United States diversify its source of imported oil.

Over the years, I pressed, prodded, and encouraged the Reagan and Bush administrations in letters, conventions, hearings, and legislation to embrace the concept of barter but they just did not get it. They did not understand that to solve the riddle of trade without cash, new thinking would have to embrace a very old way of doing business.

Madam President, I am pleased to report that our new President and his administration does get it. Soon after President Clinton was elected, I wrote to him about barter and countertrade and received a response which endorsed "greater access to countertrade." I was also thrilled with Secretary Brown's enthusiastic endorsement of barter as a means to open new markets when he testified at his confirmation hearing. In addition, I was pleased to congratulate Secretary Espy for his suggestion in a speech in Nebraska that barter be considered as a way to restart grain shipments to Russia and address the issue of creditworthiness.

In recent days, the World Bank agreed to waive its so-called negative pledge clause to permit barter-type escrow arrangements. Most encouraging, however, have been published reports that barter-type transactions are under active consideration for inclusion in the President's Russian aid package.

Madam President, I send President Clinton my best wishes for his discussions with President Yeltsin. I look forward to working with the President to finally solve the riddle of trade with Russia. The solution to that riddle will create jobs in America and new markets for American products while at the same time promote stability, democracy, and economic development in Russia and the other Republics.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that correspondence between President Clinton and myself be printed in the RECORD as well as other relevant material in this regard.

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

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 19, 1987]

THE UNITED STATES IS MISSING THE BARTER TRAIN

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, after years of economic dominance, the United States finds itself in a most uncomfortable situation. For 6 years our Nation has been intoxicated with the "feel good" policies of supply side economics. While the Washington crowd talked of "the dawn of America" and told the Nation that "America was on the move," some serious warning aches and pains were ignored in the Nation's economic body.

Now that the intoxicant is wearing off, America is waking up to one of its worse economic "hangovers" ever. The economic statistics of 1986 illustrate how negligent the Nation's leadership has been. In 1986, the annual budget deficit topped a record $220 billion and the accumulated national debt broke through the $2 trillion barrier, the trade deficit hit a record $168 billion, and the Nation became the world's largest net debtor nation.

These records were set against a backdrop which included a continuing depression in rural America and a new crisis in the Nation's oil producing States. After years of strength in agriculture trade, the United States actually imported more food than it exported for several months during 1986. Also of concern is the fact that our Nation's dependence on foreign oil returned close to its preembargo levels.

Rather than search for new answers to the Nation's economic problems, the administration has clung to its dogmatic principles of supply side economics and "free trade."

The solutions to the Nation's decaying economic status are as complex as the causes for our current difficulty. Certainly the most effective measure to restore the Nation's economic health would be to place the Federal Government on a balanced diet of deficit reduction. In addition, there are other smaller, less dramatic, but important therapies which can help nurse our Nation out of its supply side "hangover."

One small step which could help the Nation restore its international position would be to better utilize the trade technique of barter. It has been estimated that barter accounts for 25 percent of world trade. The United States has been woefully slow to respond to this trend. A recent article by Columnists Jack Anderson and Dale Van Atta appropriately noted that "Shunning barter agreements means turning our back on a rapidly growing portion of world trade."

The 1985 farm bill included authorization for the Secretary of Agriculture to institute a pilot program to use surplus commodities to acquire strategic or other materials that the United States does not domestically produce in sufficient amounts.

I am sad to report, Mr. President, that the Department of Agriculture has been very slow to use this authority. Secretary Lyng reported to Congress on January 29, 1987, that "no agreements have been concluded for this pilot program." In fact, in several other areas, the administration has been active in its opposition to barter. This attitude represents another lost opportunity for the American economy. It is like a passenger arguing the merits of steam locomotion while the diesel trains pull away from the station. The United States cannot afford to be left off this train.

We live in an era where America must think creatively about trade problems. The United States faces a serious deterioration of its economic strength while our prospective customers are strapped by massive international debt or economic recession due to declining commodity prices. As Economist Eliot Janeway, a long-time advocate for barter has noted, these negatives can be multiplied into positives. Just as in mathematics, $-2-2=+4$, difficult problems can be paired to produce positive solutions. Take, for example, Third World nations and the troubled U.S. rural economy.

The U.S. Government operated a barter program from 1950 to 1973 to dispose of surplus agriculture commodities, acquire strategic materials and to acquire goods and services for U.S. overseas development and military programs. During that period, $6.65 billion worth of agricultural commodities were exported. The programs were suspended in 1973 when Government-held agricultural surpluses dwindled to nothing.

The current agricultural stockpile greatly exceeds the levels of the 1950's and 1960's. The time is right to take a new look at barter. The United States should expand its efforts to use barter as a way of engaging developing and nonmarket economies into mutually beneficial commerce. Rather than fight the growing interest in barter transactions, the administration should board the barter train to give a lift to our troubled agricultural sector.

Debt-ridden Third World nations, particularly those rocked by the recent decline in oil prices, should be offered barter opportunities to exchange grain for their oil or materials. Such a strategy would allow Third World nations to obtain agricultural staples in exchange for a product which they hold in abundance. In the case of nonmarket economies, with currencies of little use to the United States, barter could be a new avenue for mutual cooperation.

In the 1985 farm bill, the Congress attempted to prod the administration into exploring the benefits of barter.

The Congress should continue to encourage the administration to dispose of surplus commodities through bartered exchanges. The administration should also examine the possibility of bartering processed and semiprocessed goods. New forms packaging can make American food products virtually indestructible. This value added also means jobs for American workers.

A barter office and information bank should be established in the Department of Commerce to facilitate and encourage private sector barter transactions. In addition, our State and Defense Departments should examine their expenditures to see if barter transactions using food products could better pay for goods and services purchased abroad. Essentially anywhere cash is spent, commodities paid in kind could be used. Where such a transaction would not compete with existing U.S. commerce, or in cases where such transactions could open the door in a new market, the Department of State and the Department of Defense should use surplus commodities to help pay its foreign bills. Our Government should look at our commodity surplus as a special bank account that can be drawn upon when the use of commodities or food products will not displace existing U.S. trade.

In the long term, the United States should also examine the possibility of negotiating a multilateral treaty between the key agriculture nations and the developing Third World which would barter agricultural commodities for environmental protection. The Third World, starving for development, has often turned to the conversion of delicate tropical environments into agricultural land. In an era of shrinking tropical forests and surplus crops, such action does not make sense. In defense of the developing nations, there are few options available to these struggling nations. It is unrealistic to expect that these nations would forsake their future

for the benefit of the developed world or some abstract concern about the global environmental protection.

This long-term creative use of the world's food surplus could preserve the global environment, establish reliable relationships built on food security, stem the growth of the global grain surplus, and spur constructive development in the Third World.

Mr. President, I raise these points for discussion and consideration. The U.S. Congress must look for new solutions to the growing trade deficit. In the short term, the administration already has the authority to facilitate and use barter to open markets where traditional trade transactions have failed. The United States should use all of its tools available to fix the trade problem. In the long term, we also need to look at ways which can move food to hungry people and prevent the destruction of fragile land.

As a member of the Senate Commerce Committee, I look forward to our discussions on the 1987 trade bill and will encourage my colleagues to look at the uses of barter as a tool of international trade.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the February 20, 1987, article on barter written by Jack Anderson and Dale Van Atta be printed in the RECORD, as read. I also ask unanimous consent that the January 29, 1987, letter from Secretary Lyng to the Speaker of the House be printed in the RECORD as read.

Thank you, Mr. President.

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

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 20, 1987]

WORLD BARTERING LEAVES U.S. IN THE COLD

(By Jack Anderson and Dale Van Atta)

For most Americans, the word "barter" conjures up a vision of explorers swapping colored beads and other trinkets with innocent natives for ivory, furs or precious gems. For tax dodgers, barter is the foundation of an underground economy that trades one service for another—dental work for plumbing repairs, perhaps—with no cash changing hands to attract the attention of the Internal Revenue Service.

On the international scene, barter has a fancy name—countertrade—and it involves much more than trinkets or a new swimming pool. Barter is big business. Unfortunately, the U.S. government has been slow to pick up on this growing trend, and as a result is being left out in the cold, stubbornly insisting on cash deals.

In 1976, countertrade accounted for a mere 2 percent of the world's total trade of about $1 trillion. Now it's a different story entirely. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development estimates that countertrade accounts for up to 10 percent of world trade.

At the high end of the estimates, a Commerce Department cable we've seen suggests that country-to-country barter agreements cover at least 25 percent of total world trade. In fact, states the cable. "If crude oil barter and other types [such as arms deals] are included, countertrade-related trade should exceed $1 trillion in 1986." In other words, the barter share of world trade today is the equivalent of all world trade just 10 years ago.

The estimates are just that, of course, because many participating governments—like Iran's—won't disclose their barter arrangements.

"The best barter deal is the one you don't hear about" is an industry maxim.

Barter is attractive because it helps a country preserve its foreign exchange reserves, assures a stable supply of essential imports, expands exports and facilitates technology transfers.

For whatever reason, barter is growing despite behind-the-scenes U.S. opposition. A separate Commerce Department study showed that in 1984, at least 100 countries ordered state-owned or private companies to engage in barter agreements. It has become an essential part of world trade.

One such deal that actually made it into the headlines—mainly because of the Reagan administration's vain attempt to stop it—was the Soviet natural-gas pipeline to Central Europe. The customer governments provided equipment, labor and financing for construction of the pipeline in return for a guaranteed amount of gas once it became operational.

Although officially neutral on the subject, the U.S. government actively tries to discourage barter agreements. U.S. representatives to international economic bodies argue against the booming countertrade trend. And the IRS understandably makes life difficult for U.S. merchants involved in international barter deals.

Our sources believe it's time for the government to rethink its position. Shunning barter agreements means turning our backs on a rapidly growing portion of world trade, to say nothing of the American heritage of bartering expertise: Manhattan island was acquired by canny Dutch settlers for $24 worth of junk jewelry.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, January 2, 1987.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: We are reporting here the status of the pilot barter program authorized in Section 1129 of the Food Security Act of 1985. This pilot program provides for the barter of Commodity Credit Corporation commodities for strategic and other produce domestically in sufficient amounts. The materials received may be used to meet domestic requirements or fulfill stockpile goals.

As of this date, no agreements have been concluded for this pilot program. It remains our intent to comply with the Act by developing the two specified pilot projects, along with appropriate evaluations. Efforts to initiate substantive discussions will continue with several countries with food and currency reserve shortages which offer potential for obtaining strategic materials.

We remain hopeful that agreements can be negotiated with mutually agreeable terms to usefully test this pilot program.

An identical letter has been sent to the President of the Senate.

Sincerely,

RICHARD E. LYING,
Secretary.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, April 20, 1989.

Hon. ROBERT A. MOSBACHER,
Secretary, Department of Commerce, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY MOSBACHER: I understand that the Department of Commerce is considering its strategy to implement the provisions of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act provisions relating to the Office of Barter and the Interagency group on Countertrade.

As you may know, I authored the Senate's Barter Office provision. My concern was that the United States was significantly falling behind our international competitors in this type of trade. Barter and countertrade offer the United States an opportunity to open new markets for American goods and services, especially where hard currency is in short supply. The Commerce Department, with its network of specialists around the world, is well suited to advise and assist American businesses on barter opportunities. Barter also offers an opportunity for the United States government to reduce the cash costs of its foreign operations.

The barter and countertrade provisions of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act recognize that the United States must aggressively move to become competitive in the international barter arena. There is a serious need for a pragmatic approach to expand trade through civilian barter and countertrade. These provisions offer the United States a chance to turn its past dogmatic opposition to barter and countertrade into an opportunity to expand trade and create new markets for American products.

In reviewing the legislative history of the barter and countertrade provisions of the Trade Bill, you will note that the Conference Committee deleted those provisions which were overtly hostile to this type of trade. As you consider the mission of the Barter Office and Interagency Committee, I trust that you will keep in mind the desire of the U.S. Congress that barter and countertrade be used to expand U.S. export opportunities.

There has been growing public interest in the barter and countertrade issue. I will soon be asking Senator Hollings, the Chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, to schedule hearings on this important matter. I am available to assist you in anyway to successfully implement the Commerce Department's barter and countertrade responsibilities.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

J. JAMES EXON,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, February 20, 1990.

Hon. PAUL POWELL,
Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC.

DEAR DIRECTOR POWELL: Through correspondence with Secretary Mosbacher, I understand that you will be overseeing the implementation of the Office of Barter and Interagency Group on barter and countertrade provisions of the 1988 Trade Bill.

As the author of the Office of Barter legislation, I have greatly appreciated the Secretary's repeated support for the Trade Bill language. In the past, barter and countertrade opportunities have been overlooked and discouraged by the U.S. government to the disadvantage of American business. The provisions of the 1988 Trade Bill offer the United States a new opportunity to seize the initiative in this important sector of international trade.

I strongly recommend that the Bush Administration use the Office of Barter and the Interagency Group as keys to identifying, facilitating and expanding trade opportunities in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Given the absence of hard currency and the significant penned-up demand for American products and services, barter and countertrade are natural devices to gain a foothold in these developing markets. I am especially bullish about the agriculture and processed food opportunities in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

The Barter Office and the Interagency Group should adopt Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union as their pilot project to demonstrate a more realistic, and as the Secretary suggested in his May 1989 letter, "a pragmatic approach toward commercial barter, countertrade and civil offset practices."

It is crucial that the United States move quickly to take advantage of fast-breaking opportunities. I am informed that our European and Asian competitors have already aggressively moved in the Eastern European market and barter and countertrade arrangements are important parts of their trade strategies. The United States must not let unique and existing Eastern European opportunities slip by.

I trust that you will carefully consider these recommendations and that you will keep me fully informed of the organization, activities, staffing, mission and meeting schedule of the Barter Office and the Interagency Group. When I proposed legislation to create the Barter Office, my objective was to help the United States move aggressively into new markets. I look forward to working with you to make America's barter and countertrade policies work to help expand trade opportunities in new markets.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

JIM EXON,
U.S. Senator.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 19, 1990]

BARTER AND COUNTER TRADE WITH THE U.S.S.R.

Mr. EXON. Madam President, last week I wrote to President Bush congratulating him on the successful summit with the President of the Soviet Union and an excellent address to the Nation last week. I fully support the President's call for bipartisan cooperation, and in that spirit I offered the President a suggestion which I would like now to briefly discuss.

There is one area of potential cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union which should be immediately pursued. Madam President, the Soviet Union sits atop of one of the world's largest supplies of oil. The United States, the breadbasket of the world, will soon harvest a bumper crop. The Soviet Union needs food, and the United States needs oil. Therefore, the simple equation of mutual benefit is good for both food producers and oil producers.

Trade with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe and the Third World has been difficult of the lack of hard currency in many of these markets. However, barter transactions like food for oil is a strategy which I recommend and one which I think could prove very helpful and be done with very little difficulty right now. Indeed, barter and counter trade and other similar nontraditional means of trade and finance present ideal opportunities for the United States and the Soviet Union to expand trade and development.

Not too long ago a Soviet food processing expert bound for a food conference in Nebraska said that if the United States waits for a convertible ruble, there will be no trade left. For quite some time official U.S. trade policy frowned upon barter and counter trade transactions while other trading partners in Europe and Asia used barter and counter trade to capture new and expanding markets.

Fortunately, a provision in the 1988 Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act, which I authored, fundamentally changed U.S. policy. U.S. trade law now encourages and supports the use of barter and counter trade to expand U.S. exports.

That legislation created an Office of Barter within the U.S. Department of Commerce and an interagency group on barter and counter trade to coordinate policy throughout several Federal agencies with trade and development responsibilities.

The Commerce Department office is now operational. And the interagency group is scheduled to have its first meeting early in October. In my letter I urged the President to instruct the Barter Office and the interagency group to immediately pursue the possibility of bartering or trading American food products for Soviet oil.

With expectations of a price depressing bumper crop of farm products, a food-for-oil strategy would be welcome news for the American farmer. Expanding the available supply of oil in the United States would put downward pressure on oil prices.

For the Soviet Union, with its chronic food difficulties, such a transaction would prevent another winter of discontent which could cripple the process of perestroika. Certainly over the long term the United States must reduce its overall dependence on imported oil.

Like my food-for-oil strategy, the American farmer is a central force in meeting America's energy needs through the further development of ethanol fuels. However, food for oil is an option which should be pursued right now to replace oil formerly flowing from Iraq and Kuwait.

Madam President, an exchange of food for oil can help the Soviet Union reduce its bread lines and help the United States prevent future gas lines.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter to the President be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, September 12, 1990.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I congratulate you on your successful summit with President Gorbachev and your inspiring speech last night. I applaud your call for bi-partisan cooperation and in that spirit offer you a suggestion.

There is one area of mutual benefit to the United States and the Soviet Union which I encourage your Administration to immediately pursue. The Soviet Union sits atop the world's largest supply of oil and the United States is truly the bread basket to the world. The Soviet Union needs food and the United States need oil. The simple equation is for the United States to exchange food for oil.

Given the Soviet Union's lack of hard currency, barter, countertrade and other similar non-traditional means of trade finance present ideal opportunities to conduct commerce. Not too long ago, a Soviet food processing expert said that if the United States waits for a convertible ruble, there will be no trade left.

The Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act included legislation which I authored to encourage the use of barter and countertrade to expand U.S. exports. The Trade bill created an Office of Barter within the U.S. Department of Commerce and an Interagency Group on Barter and Countertrade to coordinate policy throughout several federal agencies.

The Commerce Department Office is now operational and the Interagency Group is scheduled to have its first meeting early in October. I urge you to instruct the Barter Office and the Interagency Group to immediately pursue the possibility of bartering American products, especially food or American oil drilling technology for Soviet oil.

An exchange of food for oil can help the Soviet Union reduce its bread lines and help the United States prevent gas lines. By expanding the available supply of oil in the United States, there should also be downward pressure on oil prices as well.

Best wishes.

Respectfully,

JIM EXON,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, November 30, 1990.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I ask that you immediately grant the Soviet Union access to American farm export credit programs to help American agriculture compete in this important and developing export market. Swift action now on a temporary or emergency basis can prevent this massive market from being captured by our global agriculture competitors.

American agriculture is enduring low crop prices and bumper crops. New Soviet grain and food sales will provide a much needed boost for the American grain market. In light of the fact that the new Farm Bill offers no help in boosting farm income, it is absolutely critical that the United States move aggressively to seek new markets for American food products.

In addition to making agricultural export credit programs available to the Soviet Union, I again encourage your Administration to consider a "food-for-crude" program. The 1988 trade bill included legislation which I offered to encourage the use of international barter transactions as a way to expand trade. Trading food for oil would be an exciting new way to advance trade with the Soviet Union.

These two actions will send a clear message to the people of the Soviet Union that the United States is open for business, and to the American farmer that their needs are not being ignored.

Respectfully,

JIM EXON,
U.S. Senator.

EXON IS URGING BUSH TO CONSIDER BARTER

(By David C. Beeder)

WASHINGTON.—President Bush has failed to consider barter as a way to provide the Soviet Union with $1.5 billion worth of U.S. grain, Sen. J.J. Exon, D, Neb., said Tuesday.

"The trouble with the president is he is surrounded by people who have worshipped at the altar of the almighty dollar for so long they don't understand anything else," Exon said.

Exon, who sponsored 1988 legislation creating a federal office of barter, said he plans to urge the White House to consider trading U.S. commodities for Soviet petroleum.

"It makes all the sense in the world unless you are so wedded to the concept of the dollar," Exon said in an interview from Lincoln.

Bush said Monday that he might not be able to authorize a Soviet request for $1.5 billion in additional loan guarantees to buy U.S. grain.

"They've got to move forward to be creditworthy," Bush told a meeting of farm broadcasters. "We are thinking about this. There may be some way to extend credits."

Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev wrote Bush last month seeking another $1.5 billion in credit guarantees to supplement $1 billion the Soviets were authorized in December.

If granted, the credits would allow the Soviet to buy U.S. wheat, corn and soybeans, or soybean meal, paying for the commodities with U.S. bank loans backed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Exon said that the office of the barter, a division of the U.S. Department of Commerce, has been ignored by the Reagan administration and the Bush administration.

"I don't think they have been called upon to do anything," he said. "It is there in a place where it can be nurtured if we can get the administration to start nurturing it."

Exon said that the office of the barter was not "wanted or asked for" by the Reagan administration. "It's something I put in that they weren't excited about at all," he said. "I'll be hitting them over the head again trying to get their attention."

A spokesman for the office of the barter, contacted by telephone, said the responsibilities of the office have been assigned to an economist in the division of finance and countertrade in the Department of Commerce.

The spokesman was unable to provide immediately any detailed information on the mission or activities of the office.

The economist, Pitt Verzariu, was unavailable for comment, the spokesman said.

Meanwhile, Dean Kleckner, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, said he would favor providing U.S. grain to the Soviet Union either through additional credits or in a barrier transaction.

"Barter appeals to me," Kleckner said at a press conference. "I think we ought to take a look at it."

He said he also would favor extending additional loan guarantees to the Soviet Union.

"I suspect there will be hungry people in the Soviet Union within a year." Kleckner said, "We may have TV cameras recording starvation."

Kleckner said that if that happens, "the American people will insist on sending humanitarian aid."

"The Soviet Union is going through some very rough economic times," he said. "They are on the verge of an uprising. I think we need to look seriously at extending them credits."

[From the Lincoln Star, May 3, 1991]

EXON: TRADE U.S. FOOD FOR SOVIET OIL

(By Don Walton)

Sen. Jim Exon on Thursday urged President Bush to negotiate a barter agreement with the Soviet Union that would exchange its oil for U.S. food and energy production technology.

Exon wrote the president in response to Bush's comments this week suggesting that the Soviet Union may not be creditworthy enough to qualify for a requested $1.5 billion in additional guarantees to purchase U.S. grain.

"I ask that you give careful consideration to this suggestion: Simply put, a food for oil arrangement makes sense," the senator wrote the president.

"I welcome an opportunity to work with you on this very important matter."

Exon released copies of the letter at a press conference in Lincoln.

American grain farmers need access to the Soviet market, he said, and the United States has "all obligation to help (the Soviet people) if we can.

"I think it is time for us to move aggressively outside the traditional means of exchange."

Exon said Bush's concern about the Soviet ability to manage additional credit guarantees is understandable.

During a recent trip to the Soviet Union, he said, he found support for his idea of barter exchanges.

"The Soviet Union holds the world's largest reserves of oil," Exon wrote the president.

"The United States has a great supply of food and agriculture products and a need to diversify its supply of oil.

"In the new world order, these strengths and needs should be paired to advance the interests of both nations."

In the immediate term, new loans to the Soviet Union could be secured with future oil production, Exon said.

"Hunger in the Soviet Union is a real possibility," he said.

"As I have long said, a hungry bear is a very dangerous thing."

Over the long term, he said, the Soviet market represents "a rich opportunity for the American farmer."

On other matters, Exon said he believes the United States is "doing all we can" at the moment to help Iraq's Kurdish refugees.

But he said he believes it is essential that the president lead an international effort to provide long-term relief aid.

Bush should marshal nations to that cause in the same manner that he organized the coalition that fought the war against Iraq, he said.

Exon returned last Monday from a trip to the refugee camps.

While the United States through the United Nations can guarantee the Kurds safety in their refugee camps or enclaves, Exon said, it cannot guarantee their safety if and when they return to their homes in northern Iraq.

"The Kurds," he said, "have to work out their own deal with Saddam Hussein."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 8, 1991]

FOOD SALES TO THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I rise to address the appropriate response to the Soviet request for grain credit.

The Soviet Union is a critical market for American farmers. Our Nation learned a valuable lesson in the 1970's when it found that using food as a weapon was a counterproductive measure which did not foster reform in the Soviet Union and unfairly punished the American farmer.

America can not afford to make the same mistake again.

Chaos in the Soviet Union, famine in the Soviet Union, unrest in the Soviet Union does not advance the forces of reform.

Former Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, who I met with about a month ago, warned that out of chaos could come the forces of dictatorship.

Given the economic situation in the Soviet Union, I understand the President's concerns about the credit worthiness of the Soviet Union. This difficulty is by no means insurmountable.

Last week, I sent the President a letter outlining my proposal for a "food for oil" arrangement between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. I raised this proposal with the Soviet Ministers of Oil and Gas and Agriculture and received a warm response.

In short, barter is the key to opening the door to the Soviet market. It is the only realistic means to overcome the Soviet Union's lack of hard currency. In the short term, food credit could be secured with future soviet oil production or for that matter, any other valuable commodity such as gold, minerals or metals. Over the long term, I believe a food for oil agreement between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. makes a great deal of sense.

Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the text of my letter to the President be printed in the RECORD. The letter gives more detail to my proposal and is self-explanatory.

I urge my colleagues to support an appropriate grain credit resolution and give serious consideration to supporting a long-term food for oil arrangement with the Soviet Union.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, May 1, 1991.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I read yesterday with great interest your comments about granting agriculture credits to the Soviet Union and that nation's credit worthiness. I ask that you give serious consideration to an idea which may provide the answer to your present dilemma. Simply put, the idea is food for oil.

As you well know, the Soviet Union represents a significant export market for America's food producers. The potential loss of this important market would have a devastating effect on American grain prices.

Having recently visited the Soviet Union, I understand your concerns about that nation's economic situation. The Soviet transition to a market economy has been an unsteady journey of half steps toward reform. In spite of several recent poor economic decisions, the Soviet Union remains a nation rich in natural resources.

You know that I have been a long time advocate of barter and countertrade as a means to expand U.S. exports. Barter and countertrade (the exchange of goods for goods) and other nontraditional means of finance can facilitate trade where there is a shortage of hard currency. The United States Congress went on record in support of using barter and countertrade to expand exports when it approved legislation I offered as part of the 1988 trade bill to create the Office of Barter in the United States Department of Commerce.

On September 12, and November 30, 1990, I wrote to you about investigating a "food for oil" arrangement with the Soviet Union. When I was in the Soviet Union. I explained this concept to Mr. Leonid Filmanov, the Soviet Minister of Oil and Gas and Mr. Vyacheslav Chernoivanov, the Soviet Minister of Agriculture. They were most receptive to the idea.

The Soviet Union holds the world's largest reserves of oil. The United States has a great supply of food and agriculture products and a need to diversify its supply of oil. In the new world order, these strengths and needs should be paired to advance the interests of both nations.

In the immediate term, new loans to the Soviet Union could be secured with future oil production. Over the long term, I urge your administration to explore an agreement with the Soviet Union which would facilitate the exchange of energy production technology and U.S. food for oil.

I have enclosed for your consideration transcriptions of the notes from my meetings with the Soviet Prime Minister of Oil and Gas and the Soviet Minister of Agriculture. Given your background in the oil and gas industry, I am certain that you will

see that there are great energy resources in the Soviet Union which are untapped and in many cases simply wasted. I am convinced that a bit of creative thinking and yankee ingenuity can unlock the value of these and other resources to secure additional American food sales as well as a more productive relationship between our two nations.

Hunger in the Soviet Union is a real possibility. Several reports indicate that there will be poor harvest in the Soviet Union this year. Given the tension I observed in the Soviet Union, food shortages could unleash a series of reactions and emotions within the Soviet Union which could further undermine the road to reform. As I have long said, a hungry bear is a very dangerous thing.

Over the long term, the Soviet market provides a rich opportunity for the American farmer. The development of this market now will provide dividends in the future. Given the drastic cuts in farm programs over the last several years, our nation can not afford to let an important export opportunity like this slip from our grasp.

I ask that you give careful consideration to this suggestion. Simply put, a food for oil arrangement makes sense, I welcome an opportunity to work with you on this very important matter.

Best wishes.

Cordially,

JIM EXON,
U.S. Senator.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 8, 1991]

OBSERVATIONS ON THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, last month, I was privileged to represent the Senate Armed Services Committee as part of an official delegation to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe headed by the chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee Senator Boren. This is the second of my reports on that interesting and enlightening trip. My earlier report focused on Eastern Europe. Today, I would like to discuss the political situation in the Soviet Union.

Our delegation arrived in Moscow on March 27, the eve of a major showdown between Soviet President Gorbachev and Russian President Boris Yeltsin. Upon arriving in Moscow, the delegation sensed a chilling tension in the air.

The current political landscape of the Soviet Union cannot be sketched in black and white terms. The situation is complex with several forces pulling at the political leadership of the nation. While the delegation was in Latvia, one of the Baltic Republics seeking freedom from the Soviet Union, we met Senator Mavriks Vulfsons, of the Latvian Parliament. He provided the delegation with a succinct summation of the nation's turmoil. When asked about Soviet politics, he prefaced his answers with the comment that "you must understand, this is the Soviet Union. Things are very complicated."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 6, 1991]

THE NOMINATION OF ROBERT STRAUSS

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I rise to congratulate the President and my good friend Robert Strauss. I was delighted to learn that President Bush has nominated Robert Strauss, to be the next United States Ambassador to the Soviet Union.

Robert Strauss is a statesman and a most shrewd businessman. He was appropriately described by a fellow Texan as the "ultimate capitalist." Bob Strauss also understands the strategic and economic interests of the United States and is a visionary who can help guide United States-Soviet relations through a most interesting and exciting time.

I can think of no individual more qualified, or more respected by Democrats and Republicans alike than Ambassador Robert Strauss. In terms of world peace and prosperity, the nomination of Robert Strauss could well be considered the President's single most important nomination.

I am especially cheered by the fact that Bob Strauss has keen understanding of how important agriculture is in the United States. The Soviet Union represents one of America's most promising long-term export markets for American food products.

I look forward to discussing an agenda of cautious but constructive cooperation with Ambassador Strauss. As a leading advocate of barter and countertrade, I also look forward to discussing my ideas on trading American food for Soviet oil and other natural resources to expand American food-export markets.

Bob Strauss's incredible knowledge of economic and commercial matters will help guide our Nation in its rapidly developing commercial relationship with the Soviet Union and his deep commitment to United States national security will assure that the United States does not let our high hopes for closer friendship, trade and exchange with the Soviet Union cloud our judgment on security matters.

Mr. President, as the chairman of the Strategic Forces and Nuclear Deterrence Subcommittee with very serious responsibilities for America's nuclear arsenal, I am most encouraged by the President's nomination of Bob Strauss and I look forward to working with Ambassador Strauss and the Bush administration to form American policy toward the Soviet Union.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 6, 1991]

AREAS FOR UNITED STATES-SOVIET COOPERATION

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, today I present the third report on my observations, recommendations, and reflections following a spring visit to the new democracies in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. In my first address I discussed my views on Eastern Europe, my second speech focused on political developments in the Soviet Union, and this report will discuss what I consider to be key areas of U.S.-U.S.S.R. cooperation.

As I have discussed in my previous address, the Soviet Union is undergoing rapid and dramatic change. The economic, political, and social underpinnings of Soviet society are crumbling and that nation is scrambling to rebuild and reshape its very foundation. This is no easy task for a multiethnic nation which covers one-sixth of the globe.

The present represents a unique time in history where the events and actions of the next dozen months can shape the future of the world for decades. The United States should take every opportunity to encourage the Soviet Union to continue down the path of peaceful political and economic reform.

It is a time for caution, but also a time for vision. The United States, unlike any other nation has the ability to influence and coax events in the Soviet Union. As I say in my last address, the United States has provided the Soviet Union and the world a shining example that the path to a better life is the path marked democracy and freedom. The Soviet Union should fully understand that closer ties and cooperation with the United States and the free world are made more likely with each Soviet step toward a free and democratic society.

In light of the dramatic changes which have occurred thus far in the Soviet Union there are several areas where cautious but constructive cooperation is appropriate. These areas emphasize the mutual peaceful aspirations of the United States, the Soviet Union, and the world community. As confidence is built through these initiatives, additional cooperation can be explored.

WORLD PEACE

First and foremost, the central focus of American and Soviet cooperation must be to continue to make the globe a more peaceful and safe place. Arms control, arms reduction, and risk reduction must remain at the top of the United States-Soviet agenda. In my earlier address, I outlined my serious concerns about the Soviet view of the Conventional Forces Europe [CFE] Agreement. While in the Soviet Union, I repeatedly made it known, that the United States Senate would have a difficult time placing confidence in a START Treaty. Since my return, I have been encouraged to learn of a measure of flexibility from the Soviets and will be watching carefully as CFE discussions continue. It now appears that the Soviet Union understands, that a high degree of confidence with regard to the CFE agreement is an absolute prerequisite to progress on the START Treaty.

As the chairman of the Strategic Forces and Nuclear Deterrence Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee. I am especially concerned that in spite of reductions in other areas of military activity, the Soviet Union continues to modernize their strategic forces. As such, the United States has no option but to continue our modernization program. That is a key reason I strongly support the B-2 bomber and research and development for the star wars system. The United States must consider military capability in planning our national defense, rather than present day personalities or intentions.

Over the long term, change in the Soviet Union coupled with significant verified arms reduction can open entirely new vistas for our two nations. Soviet cooperation in the Persian Gulf represented a remarkable turning point for U.S.-U.S.S.R. relations and for global politics. By working together, our nations can make the world a much safer place.

ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

While in the Soviet Union, I met with Deputy Minister Mikhailov of the Soviet Atomic Energy Ministry. I sought this meeting to discuss a proposal Secretary Watkins and I have been discussing over the last few years, namely that the America and the Soviet Union should cooperate on the cleanup of the nuclear waste created by the production of nuclear weapons. I told the Minister that our nations both know how to make nuclear weapons and components, but as nations we have not done a good job of cleaning up the waste produced by these endeavors. I said that if the United States and the Soviet Union can enter into a START Treaty which attempts to reduce nuclear weapons inventories, certainly, we can get together and work together on nuclear waste cleanup.

Minister Mikailov welcomed the opportunity to cooperate. He said that it is a good idea to get the best minds together on this common problem. He emphasized that it would be very useful to have experts discuss some of the new "exotic" methods of nuclear

waste disposal. He also raised another important point that as both nation's disarm weapons, even more waste will be produced, not just former nuclear warheads, but also nonnuclear components which may have been contaminated.

Cooperation on nuclear waste cleanup would serve the interests of the United States, the Soviet Union, and the world. America has a great deal to learn from the Soviets and to teach the Soviets. The tragedy of Chernobyl should be carefully studied to learn more about accident prevention, reaction, and the treatment of radiation disease. It also gives the world a warning about the many dangers of nuclear technology.

Since my return, I have discussed this nuclear waste cleanup initiative with Admiral Watkins, the U.S. Secretary of Energy and gave him copies of transcripts of our meeting notes. In the coming months, I will be working with the Secretary to find appropriate avenues for United States-Soviet exchanges of scientists to find answers to our mutual nuclear waste cleanup problems.

AGRICULTURE TRADE

Mr. President, with regard to our economic relationship with the Soviet Union, the old saw that bread is the staff of life is a most apt description of United States-Soviet trade relations. Food is a basic human need and the basic ingredient of an important trade relationship. For political, economic and humanitarian reasons, agriculture trade is a most appropriate first step toward building a closer economic relationship with the Soviet Union. Food shortages could spark chaos which could derail reforms in the Soviet Union.

In the economic arena, nowhere are the needs of the United States and the U.S.S.R. more closely matched than in the agriculture and food sector. American farmers need new markets and the Soviet people need American food.

During our visit to the Soviet Union, Senator Heflin and I had fascinating meetings with Vyacheslav Chernolvanov, the new Soviet Minister of Agriculture and Leonid Filmanov, the Soviet Minister of Oil and Gas.

We sought these meetings to explore opportunities to increase agriculture and food related exports from the United States to the Soviet Union and to discuss a proposal I had made last year regarding an exchange of American food for Soviet oil.

At our meeting with the new Minister of Agriculture, Senator HELFIN and I were perhaps one of the first United States officials to be informed of the Soviet Union's interest in additional credit guarantees. It was clear that the Soviet Union's food situation is very serious. Hunger in the Soviet Union is a real possibility. Several reports indicate that there will be a poor harvest in the Soviet Union this year and waste in the Soviet system is widespread. The Minister spoke of 20 percent waste and American experts at the American Embassy told us of upward of 40 percent waste in Soviet agriculture production.

Given the political tension I observed in the Soviet Union, food shortages could unleash a series of reactions and emotions within that country which could further undermine any movement toward reform. That would not be in the interests of the United States. As I have long said, a hungry bear is a very dangerous thing.

On May 15 the U.S. Senate overwhelmingly passed a resolution endorsing the extension of additional credit guarantees by the U.S. Government for additional American food sales.

This resolution backed the extension of credit guarantees in a manner which both encourages continued political and economic reform in the Soviet Union and in a manner which would limit risk to United States taxpayers. It stands as a prime example of the type of cautious but constructive cooperation that I recommend.

As a member of the working group which helped craft the language of the resolution, I am pleased to report that the legislation took into consideration the legitimate human rights concerns raised by several Senators.

The resolution urged the Bush administration to secure clear and binding assurances from the Soviet Union that the credits will not be used to export the military, security, or Communist Party apparatus at the expense of the people of the Soviet Union and that the credits will not be used to pressure the Baltic States or the Soviet Republics to support the new U.S.S.R. Union Treaty.

I was especially pleased that the Senate resolution included language I offered to urge the Bush administration to explore barter, countertrade, collateralization, and other nontraditional means of finance to facilitate additional Soviet purchases of United States agricultural and food products. The resolution also included language I suggested regarding the repayment of past and present credit extended under U.S. guarantees by currency or barter acceptable to grain providers and the United States.

Mr. President, as the Senate knows, I have for some years been an advocate of barter and countertrade as a means of expanding U.S. export markets. Some estimates suggested that 25 percent of world trade moves via barter and countertrade arrangements. For a number of years, the United States officially and unofficially discouraged firms from engaging in barter transactions. In 1988, the Congress changed the policy and adopted legislation I offered to the 1988 trade bill which created the Office of Barter in the U.S. Department of Commerce and made it clear that barter and countertrade should be part of our Nation's strategy to win new export markets.

Barter offers the United States the key to opening markets in areas such as the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe where hard currency is simply not available. Such arrangements would be ideal for expanding United States agricultural trade with the Soviets. For some months I have been encouraging the Bush administration to pursue a food for oil initiative with the Soviet Union.

As I mentioned, I discussed this proposal with the Soviet Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Oil and Gas. Both of whom expressed great interest in my proposal.

The Soviet Union has the globe's largest oil reserves and the United States has the world's most productive food sector. The Soviet Union needs American food and the United States could use Soviet oil. As I have outlined in several previous speeches, it is time to match up these needs in a mutually beneficial manner. The United States could trade energy technology and food for future Soviet oil deliveries. It can be done on a project by project basis, or under a long-term framework agreement between the United States and Soviet Government. I should point out that the French have already concluded a similar framework agreement. U.S. export promotion programs such as the Export Import Bank and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation should be adapted to facilitate sound but creative financing.

Bartering food for oil is a very practical approach. If the United States waits for a convertible Soviet currency, valuable trade opportunities, especially in the food sector where the present Soviet need is so great will have been lost. The barter and countertrade language in the Senate-passed resolution attempts to further prod the Bush administration to explore barter arrangements.

The Soviet Union is an important agriculture market for the United States constituting about 10 percent of America's agriculture exports. The extension of credit guarantees will have a significant positive impact on America's grain markets and represents an important investment and development of a most promising long-term market. When considering food sales to the Soviet Union, it should not escape the attention of the Senate that the French and the Canadians have seen fit to extend agricultural credits to the Soviet Union in recent weeks.

Over the long term, the Soviet market provides a rich opportunity for the American farmer and by using barter and countertrade, the United States can begin to explore the frontier of an expanded trade relationship.

FOOD PROCESSING

In a related area, the Minister of Agriculture made it very clear to Senator HEFLIN and me that his country desperately needs food storage, and processing equipment. The Minister asked about credit opportunities to secure American storage and processing equipment. Nebraskans, including Omaha's former Congressman John Cavanaugh have been very involved in efforts to sell processing equipment in the Soviet Union and there are other Nebraska related business concerns looking into the Soviet food distribution network.

I am pleased that President Bush detailed a team to evaluate and advise the Soviets on their food distribution system. Improving the food distribution system is an excellent area for humanitarian assistance and an area where the United States has unparalleled expertise. Such an initiative can also form the groundwork for developing a mutually beneficial trade relationship. Food production, marketing, and distribution are clear American strengths. Rationalizing the Soviet distribution system can also be good for American farm exports. The geography of the Soviet Union is so vast, that there are regions of that nation which can and should be served largely by food exports from the United States. Presently, Soviet trains hauling grain pass each other going in opposite directions. Regional distribution makes sense for the Soviet Union and could create a trade opportunity for the United States. A rational distribution network forms the infrastructure of a market economy. It is my understanding that the Burlington Northern Railroad, a firm with significant operations in Nebraska, has been working on such a plan with the Soviet Government to improve Soviet food distribution and transportation. The Soviet Union can learn a great deal from the United States in this regard and the President is to be congratulated for this initiative.

MILITARY CONVERSION

In another critical economic area, one point I heard at several meetings in the Soviet Union was that the military industrial interests are somewhat immovable because arms production employs so many Soviets. Our delegation heard of disappointing and failed efforts to convert Soviet military op-

erations to the production of consumer goods.

If the Soviet Union is to successfully convert its economy, it must make drastic cuts in defense spending, just as reformers, including Boris Yeltsin and Stanislav Shatalin have suggested. Such a reduction will also bring dramatic improvements in the U.S.-U.S.S.R. relationship and add to the level of global security and risk reduction.

While in the Soviet Union, it struck me that the United States should lend technical expertise to the effort to convert Soviet factories from military production to consumer goods production. Upon my return, I saw an excellent article written by former Gov. Richard Celeste which advocates the creation of an International Conversion Management Institute to help both the United States and the Soviet Union identify and implement conversion opportunities. There may be business opportunities in this area as well. Through this cooperation, joint venture partners may be able to identify Soviet military technologies which could be spun off into the consumer and medical sector.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article "A United States-Soviet Joint Venture" be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. While I do not embrace every suggestion by Governor Celeste, I believe his article is an excellent place to begin consideration of conversion cooperation. Such cooperation, of course, must be carefully implemented, and progress on the basis of mutual confidence building. In no way would we want to assist the Soviet Union to convert obsolete defense plants and apply American manufacturing innovations to newer more efficient defense operations. Appropriately implemented, such cooperation could help tame the Soviet military bear, meet the growing needs of the Soviet people and build a closer relationship.

In this regard, there exists an even more pressing need for conversion cooperation in Eastern Europe where the needs for employment and hard currency earnings make it very difficult for the governments of the new democracies to end arms production and turn down sales to countries in global hot spots. In the coming weeks I will discuss and explore the possibilities of conversion cooperation with defense and foreign policy experts.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

To enter the modern age, the Soviet Union, and Eastern Europe for that matter, must modernize their telecommunications infrastructure. Cooperation in this area is also consistent with American expertise and philosophy. The information revolution is a freedom revolution. Even at the height of repression in the People's Republic of China during the Tiananmen massacre, the truth got out via phone calls, faxes, and satellites. Assisting the Soviet Union update its consumer and business communications network serves American interests in promoting free speech, free minds, and free markets.

The beauty of a telecommunications development project is that it is partially self-financing. The Soviet Union has perhaps the worst telephone system in the modern world. It was recently reported that there are only 17 public international phone lines out of Moscow. I can personally report on how difficult it is to call the United States from the Soviet Union. The interesting thing about long-distance phone traffic is that the receiving country earns a tariff on each incoming call. Those revenues are in hard currency. Each improvement in a country's phone system brings an increase in revenues in addition to opportunities for economic development.

Telecommunications is a key area where the United States holds a competitive advantage over the rest of the world, and an area of development which can support future exports. If the Soviet Union and the new democracies in Eastern Europe would devote increased phone tariffs to telecommunications infrastructure development, a good deal of the needed improvements could be self-financed.

The United States should target telecommunications opportunities for export promotion in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. As they say in the investment business, this is a chance to get in on the ground floor. Make no mistake, our European competitors are also scouting these important high-technology markets. If the United States does not move aggressively in this sector believe me, our competitors will step into the void. The continuing chill in Soviet-Japanese relations and the anxiety of East Europe and the Soviet Union regarding Germany, create a competitive breech into which the United States should move.

Telecommunications development will not only facilitate commerce, it will foster freedom.

SPACE AND SCIENCE

Another area where the United States already has had some experience is in the area of space and science cooperation. There are a number of exciting exchanges which have already occurred between the United States and the Soviet Union and we all remember the successful joint space mission in the 1970's. Exchanges in space and science should continue and be expanded.

From space, the Earth is not marked by political boundaries, it is but a fragile blue sphere floating in space. Cooperation in space exploration provides a poetic reminder of what is at stake in the U.S.-U.S.S.R. relationship. It appears that both the United States and the Soviet Union have similar ambitions for future space exploration. Both nations face critical fiscal restraints. It simply makes sense to consider joint space missions and to share data from civilian space missions.

PEOPLE TO PEOPLE CONTACTS

The recent liberalization of Soviet travel restrictions may usher in a new opportunities for international travel and people to people exchanges. In many ways, international understanding has built one friendship at a time. While on the last leg of our trip, I had one of the most pleasant surprises of our journey. I was proud and pleased to meet Silvija Purkalitis, the assistant professor of business at Doane College which is located in Crete, NE, when our delegation visited Riga, Latvia, one of the Baltic Republics. Ms. Purkalitis was teaching English to Latvian students. It was thrilling to meet a fellow Nebraskan halfway around the world. The friendships between American and Soviet citizens are one of the best ways to build understanding.

I am also proud of a group of pioneering students from Omaha's Westside High School who are now participating in an exchange program with Soviet students and living with Soviet families. I am certain that these students will return with new friendships, valuable insights and a renewed appreciation of the blessings of America.

In this regard, I also must mention Omaha's SCOLA satellite network which broadcasts global news programs including programming from the Soviet Union to colleges, universities, and secondary schools across the United States to help students and scholars learn foreign languages, economics, and political science.

I salute Ms. Purkalitis, the students of Westside High, and the dozens of Nebraska educators, farmers, and business people who have taken the extra effort to share their knowledge and wisdom with our new friends in the Soviet Union. The United States should encourage more travel, more study, and more student and professional exchanges.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion Mr. President, I have outlined several areas of constructive cooperation with the Soviet Union which make sense under current conditions. If the Soviet Union continues its movement toward a free and democratic society the areas of cooperation are boundless. In implementing my recommendations for constructive cooperation, the United States must work to expand contacts with individual Soviet Republics because that is where increasing Soviet power is moving. At the same time increased contacts with the Republics can serve to make it clear that the United States expects the Soviet Union to respect human rights and negotiate peacefully the future confederation of the Soviet Union.

The liberation of Eastern Europe and the end of the cold war mark the dawn of a new era. Circumstances have given the United States unique leverage in this new era. Our Nation should use that leverage to encourage reform and global security. Certainly, our power must be used carefully and responsibly. However, failure to use that leverage would be squandering a unique and valuable moment in history.

Following World War II, the United States truly created a new world order, not by punishing the vanquished but by welcoming all who embraced freedom including our former foes into the world community. At the dawn of this new era, America can not afford to be timid or short sighted. Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union are embracing freedom. While the scope of our actions are restrained by America's decade of debt, there are prudent investments which the United States can now make in the United States-Soviet relationship and the economic development of Eastern Europe which promise to pay huge dividends for years to come.

My visit to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe was an enlightening and inspiring journey. It presented a contrast between the joys of new found freedoms in Eastern Europe and the growing anxieties of a former superpower with an economy on the edge of collapse. Our delegation had an opportunity to only touch the surface of the scope of change in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. America must now plan a strategy to lock in the victories of liberty over the last 2 years.

These are exciting times. There is a new opportunity for the United States to close the door on decades of adversity and to work together to create the environment for peace and prosperity around the globe.

Mr. President, I ask that the article entitled "A U.S.-Soviet Joint Venture" by Richard Celeste and a partial list of delegation meetings be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Foreign Service Journal, May 1991]

A U.S.-SOVIET JOINT VENTURE

(By Richard F. Celeste)

The scope of change in the Soviet Union today is mind-boggling. And although the change may be too slow for ordinary Russian citizens lining up for daily necessities or for radical reformers articulating "500-day" visions, its pace is astonishing as well.

In February 1990, I led a delegation of 14 Ohio business people to Moscow and Riga, Latvia to explore trade opportunities. We were the guests of the mayor of Moscow and the prime minister of Latvia, both senior Communist Party officeholders. Arriving the same evening that the Soviet Parliament responded favorably to President Gorbachev's request to eliminate the primacy of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union, we saw the beginning of change. Nevertheless, I returned skeptical of the opportunities for joint enterprise between U.S. business and Soviet counterparts.

In November 1990—only 10 months later—I returned to Moscow as part of a joint business-academic delegation, sponsored by the Council on Economic Priorities, to meet with Soviet counterparts. Our dialogue focused on the transfer of public investment from military to civilian production in both our nations. In contrast to my earlier visit, this time I was cautiously optimistic.

TOOLING UP FOR CONSUMER GOODS

Today, the Soviet Union is struggling to bring about a virtual industrial revolution, as governments work to shift the focus of the economy from military to civilian production. Some Soviet experts say that military expenditures have constituted 20 to 25 percent of GNP in real terms. Much of those productive resources must be shifted to satisfy huge pent-up consumer demand.

In the United States as well, we are seeing efforts at the state level to come to grips with the impact of shifting patterns of defense spending, as we begin to adjust to a post-Cold War defense budget. In January 1990, Ohio sponsored the first such effort: a study and needs assessment culminating in a conference of 250 small defense contractors. The conference focused specifically on the needs of small businesses that are eager to lower their level of dependency on the military-contract treadmill. Now, several other states have followed their lead.

The Soviet Union is grappling with efforts to bring about four revolutions at once. One is the switch from military to civilian production throughout the economy. The second is a change from a command-administrative economy to one that will be decentralized and market-oriented. The third revolution is a change from a single, all-powerful central government and political party to increasingly assertive republican and local governments led by multi-party coalitions (almost as if the United States were to move from our Constitution back to the Articles of Confederation). And finally, the Soviet Union is changing from a closed society hunkered down behind the Iron Curtain, jamming incoming broadcasts to a vastly more open society in which vigorous debate now occurs on the streets and in the newspapers all across the country.

In one manifestation of this new openness, the Soviets now welcome foreign business delegations at previously high-security military production facilities to talk about the potential for civilian joint ventures using state-of-the-art military and space technology. And on a crisp November morning 10 of us, including senior officials from Digital Equipment and TRW, climbed the already chipped concrete and marble stairs of one of the new buildings in the Almaz defense production conglomerate.

In a small fourth-floor office, we were hosted by academician Boris Bounkin, astrophysicist and senior manager of this far-flung "scientific industrial corporation," which until 1988 was devoting 70 percent of its production to military contracts such as printed circuit boards for SA-10 missiles. For nearly an hour Bounkin and his top associates described the impact of military-civilian conversion—and that of the other profound changes taking place in this society—upon their enterprise.

In 1988, the Almaz marching orders, handed down from the central planning agency, Gosplan, called for increasing defense contracts from 700 million rubles to 750 million; the very building in which we were sitting was then under construction to increase the manufacturing capacity of the *5,000-person enterprise. Suddenly, Gorbachev announced substantial unilateral Soviet military cuts at the United Nations. No one quarreled with the decision (other than whether the cuts were deep enough). At Almaz, however, they complained of lack of notice.

Military contracts for the enterprise fell immediately to 650 million rubles, then to 580 million rubles in 1990. This year the expectation is for just 500 million rubles of military contracts, representing a cut of one-third from the plan under which Almaz was operating three years ago.

As a consequence, the new plant is still unfinished. Now totally dedicated to civilian production, only 10 percent of its space is utilized, due to lack of product or orders. Almaz executives look forward to producing 200,000 TV sets for Great Britain in 1992, but have only just begun to reconfigure factory space for that production. And they are producing sample circuit boards for UNISYS in place of the old product, which was destined for the SA-10 missiles and is now stacked up under plastic covers gathering dust.

GROPING IN THE DARK

To cope with the necessity to switch to civilian production without adequate central government financing or clear-cut direction, the Almaz team contemplates bank-borrowing to finance new production equipment, early retirement to reduce the workforce while retaining highly skilled employees (including some 7,000 scientists and engineers), and management training in Moscow for senior management personnel who need new skills to survive in the new economic environment.

Finally, over tea and coffee, the Almaz senior management sought almost desperately to invite American interest in the possibility of joint production. "We believe we could produce 16-layer circuit boards for $20 apiece." "Here is a new-ink jet printer we designed in just six months." "We can make a deal directly without approval from the * * * or the Russian Republic (read "state capital") on any non-military product."

MEETING OPENNESS WITH OPENNESS

There was a certain messiness and even chaos in the Almaz attempts to move into civilian production. But they left me with general optimism about the capacity for change—not because the obstacles had diminished in the short period between my two visits, but rather because I became convinced that the sweeping changes in the Soviet Union are irreversible. They are unpredictable, yes. But still, the changes are moving irreversibly toward the market, toward civilian goods, toward decentralized political decision-making, and toward participation in the global marketplace.

For joint enterprise between the United States and the Soviet Union to flourish, however, certain steps are essential. On our side, we must offer Most Favored Nation status to the Soviets and provide trade credits or investment guarantees. We must reciprocate the openness on their side with authorization for our own military contractors to welcome Soviet counterparts to their plants and focus on state-of-the-art collaborations. That means further easing COCOM restrictions on the export of high technology as well.

On the Soviet side, they must provide investment guarantees (especially for any large-scale projects) and ensure the opportunity to bring our profile in hard currency. They must investment immediately in telecommunications infrastructure so that phone and fax contacts in that country are prompt and dependable. Perhaps both sides could set aside (for us, through the Export-Import Bank) to finance joint ventures that expedite conversion of military plants to the civilian sector.

We also should create an International Institute of Conversion Management, under the cooperative auspices of the Soviet Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Sciences, and based at two or three outstanding business schools in each country. The institute ought to offer both theoretical and hands-on training in new market development (especially exports), product modification and redesign; technology transfer, cross-cultural understanding and worker retraining. These are skills certain to be increasingly in demand in both of our nations.

Finally, the profound changes under way in the Soviet Union invite a bold response from our own leadership, as we wrestle with decisions about cuts in our own defense budget. As a means of strengthening the prospects for peace and cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union. I believe we should launch a major joint conversion project at the government-to-government level. We could both pledge to devote 1 percent of our respective defense budgets for the next five years to address some shared urgent need. I have in mind, for example, the clean-up of nuclear weapons production sites and the disposal of nuclear waste. Citizens in both nations would be the beneficiaries for generations to come.

Two years ago it was hard to imagine the fall of the Berlin Wall or German reunification. A year ago it was hard to imagine taking to Soviet military contractors about bank loans, early retirement, and contracts for TV sets and circuit boards. Now is the time for bold imagination in our own private investment decisions and in our own public policy initiatives.

(Richard F. Celeste is former Governor of Ohio. He operates Celeste & Safety Ltd., an international business advisory firm specializing in providing business linkages to world markets.)

EXON SAYS BUSH'S TACTIC ON TRADE WAS POLITICAL

(By David C. Beeder)

WASHINGTON.—Sen. J.J. Exon, D-Neb., said the Bush administration has rejected for political reasons the use of barter as a way to increase trade with cash-short countries.

"The Republican philosophy has always been to worship at the altar of the almighty dollar and let the trickle-down theory take over," Exon said in an interview.

He disputed Secretary of Agriculture Edward Madigan who said the federal government could find no U.S. business interested in swapping food products for oil from the newly independent republics in the former Soviet Union.

Exon, a member of the Senate Commerce Committee, sponsored a 1987 law that established a U.S. Office of Barter at the Commerce Department.

TOTAL OF ONE PERSON

"The Bush administration has had a total of one person working in the office," Exon said. "They just want to close their eyes to any kind of immediate steps to aid America in the creation of new jobs."

Exon attributed the administration's reluctance to use barter for U.S. farm products to the policies of Madigan and his predecessor, Clayton Yeuter, a native of Eustis, Neb., who now is chairman of the Republican National Committee.

"There isn't any question that it would be better to trade U.S. products for cash," Exon said, "The problem is the Soviet republics don't have any cash."

Madigan, at a year-end press conference Tuesday, said U.S. firms consider barter, "rightly so, as a very inefficient way of doing business."

Exon described Madigan's statement as "ridiculous on the face of it."

SEVERAL FIRMS

He said a Senate Commerce subcommittee hearing he held in November included testimony by several firms indicating they had participated in barter transactions.

Wayne Cooper of Arcon Manufacturing Inc., Charlotte, N.C., testified that barter had been used for a shipment of his firm's grain silos to the Soviet Union.

Cooper said the silos were sold for cash to Poland, which bartered them to the Soviet Union for natural gas.

Gary Pacific of McDonnell-Douglas Helicopter Co., Mesa, Ariz., testified before Exon's subcommittee that his firm traded crop-spraying aircraft to Hungary for spark plugs, aluminum foil, glassware and steel containers.

FIVE YEARS OF STUDY

Meanwhile, John Cavanaugh, chairman of Omaha-based Summit Ltd., said his firm has been studying the possibility of using barter instead of cash for deals the firm has been making in the Soviet Union for five years.

Cavanaugh said Summit Ltd. has been selling food products and farm equipment to the Soviet Union, which had an annual total of $65 billion in international trade before it was dissolved.

He said Summit Ltd. now will concentrate on making business contacts in the newly independent republics, primarily in Russia and Ukraine

Cavanaugh said Summit also is helping to establish food-processing facilities in Former Soviet republics.

NEARLY EVERY COMPANY

"As far as I know, nearly every company that is doing business over there is beginning to look at barter deals," he said. "It is not a matter that it is not possible. It's more a matter of lack of American experience with barter."

Cavanaugh said the most widely known barter arrangement with the Soviet Union was its agreement with Pepsico in which U.S.-made soft drinks were traded for Russian vodka.

He said DuPont, the largest U.S. chemical company, also has been interested in negotiating barter transactions with Soviet republics.

SENATOR WANTS U.S.-CIS BARTER DEALS

(By Bill Pietrucha)

WASHINGTON.—The United States is severely limiting its trade opportunities with the former Soviet republics—particularly in trading food for oil—because of the Bush administration's "can't do" attitude toward barter, says Democratic Senator James Exon of Nebraska.

Some U.S. companies have arranged independent barter deals in the Commonwealth nations but Exon says the federal government must develop a comprehensive policy.

"Barter now constitutes about 20 percent of all international trade," Exon said. "And if we want to deal with the republics of the former Soviet Union, we need to be creative and think of alternative ways to do business besides direct cash for good."

Exon, a former governor of Nebraska, has been a leading proponent of barter for years and authored legislation that created an Office of Barter and Countertrade in the Department of Commerce.

Exon said America's emphasis on the dollar has limited its ability to think creatively in terms of international trade.

"The capitalist system has a preoccupation with worshiping the almighty dollar," he said, "Unfortunately, the former Soviet Union doesn't have many dollars for us to worship. They simply do not have the capital reserves for us to expand our trade opportunities."

Exon visited the Commonwealth in January and has developed an understanding of its problems.

"There are more possibilities for trade between our countries if we barter, especially in commodities in which we both have an abundance, such as oil for U.S. wheat," he said.

Opening up to the possibility of barter "recognizes the simple fact that America needs oil and the former Soviet Union needs food," Exon said.

"A barrel of oil purchased or bartered with the former Soviet Union could facilitate additional American sales of food and products, whereas a barrel of oil from a Persian Gulf nation would simply add to a bilateral trade deficit.

"In other words, oil from the former Soviet Union could equal new American exports," he said.

Exon says the United States will be missing "a golden opportunity" if it doesn't pursue barter agreements.

"We can continue to give the people of Russia and the other former Soviet republics hope for the future," he said, "and we can't turn our back on any avenues available to accomplish that goal, including barter."

Other nations that are more agreeable to bartering are getting ahead of the United States, Exon said.

"France, Poland, Germany and Cuba all have announced food-for-oil transactions," he said.

Exon said despite "limited leadership from the U.S. government," a growing number of U.S. firms, particularly oil companies, are engaged in or considering trading equipment, goods and services for oil. But Exon's proposals go far beyond these individual endeavors.

"We've got to be more innovative as a country and promote these efforts at the federal level to more efficiently and effectively coordinate barter between the U.S. and the Commonwealth republics," he said.

Federal coordination could include establishment of a national database of U.S. and CIS companies interested in barter opportunities, or a barter insurance program to guarantee some percentage of the barter arrangement. This could be similar to the Overseas Private Investment Corporation's economic risk insurance now offered to more traditionally financed venture.

The Bush administration, however, has thwarted Exon's plans for years.

"When my bill to establish a barter office within the Commerce Department was passed in 1988, the administration didn't like it," he said.

"The administration thinks the concept behind barter is primitive. When officials at the Treasury Department asked me. 'Why barter when dealing in money is better,' I told them, 'Well, one side doesn't have any money.'"

Although the barter office ultimately was established in the Commerce Department in 1989, Exon said the administration thought it was overstaffed.

In a classic "good news-bad news" scenario, Exon said the good news was that the administration only wanted to cut one job from the barter office. The bad news, he said, is that the office had only one person.

"I'm giving Commerce Secretary [Barbara] Franklin a little time to show her support or lack of support for the barter office," Exon said, "and then determine if the administration will need additional prodding."

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, March 23, 1993.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I was delighted with your January 13th letter in response to my suggestions on using barter, countertrade and other self liquidating means of finance to solve the riddle of increasing trade with Russia while there is little hard currency in that country. Your support for "greater access to countertrade" was most welcome. Its importance takes on an even greater significance in light of recent events in Russia.

The Russian market is of critical importance to American Agriculture. The interruption of grain shipments to the former Soviet Union has had an adverse impact on commodity prices and farm income as well as increasing the cost of U.S. agriculture programs.

Energy and mineral resources from the former Soviet Union are nearly cash equivalents which could be traded, leveraged or escrowed to finance imports of food, machinery and products from the United States. In addition, revitalizing the Russian energy industry could help keep fuel prices under control and diversify our own energy sources.

Commerce between the United States and Russia cannot expand as we want with old "cash on the barrelhead" thinking. Our trade competitors are already using barter and countertrade with the former Soviet Union. Last week Australia announced a wheat for aluminum barter arrangement and this week Canada announced a wheat for cotton and diamonds barter arrangement. The United States should not let this critical market slip from our grasp.

As you prepare for your meeting with President Boris Yeltsin next weekend, I encourage you to look at ways to facilitate, assist and promote public/private barter and countertrade arrangements to increase U.S. exports and jobs and to foster economic stability and economic growth in the former Soviet Union.

I wish you the best on your discussion with President Yeltsin and offer my help and sup-

port for using barter, countertrade and other self-liquidating finance measures to increase U.S. food and product exports to Russia. This could be our "ace in the hold" in constructing a bold initiative to continue progress toward democracy and free markets in the former Soviet Union.

Sincerely,

JIM EXON,
U.S. Senator.

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT-ELECT
AND VICE PRESIDENT-ELECT,
Washington, DC, January 13, 1993.

Hon. J. JAMES EXON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR JIM: Thank you for your letter regarding the expansion of exports and jobs to the Republics of the former Soviet Union. I appreciate your sharing your views.

The Republics of the former Soviet Union pose a formidable challenge for the United States and indeed the rest of the world. We must help foster growth and opportunity in this area. This region of the world could be an enormous market for our goods over time, thus providing a vast new export market for our products.

I appreciate your bringing to my attention your amendment requiring the Department of Commerce's Office of Barter and the Interagency Group on Countertrade to report on non-traditional methods of trading. American companies need greater access to countertrade and other trading methods. The report required by your amendment should help further the debate on this important issue.

I have shared a copy of your letter with Secretary of Commerce-designee Ron Brown, and we both look forward to working with you on this issue during the 103rd Congress.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, November 18, 1992.

President-elect CLINTON,
Transition Headquarters,
Little Rock, AR.

DEAR PRESIDENT-ELECT CLINTON: As you organize your priorities during the transition period, I wanted to offer you a suggestion which would help address two of the most pressing problems your Administration will face, namely, expanding exports and jobs and dealing with the growing economic crisis in the Republics of the former Soviet Union.

The Republics of the former Soviet Union and the new democracies of Eastern Europe make up a huge new potential market for American food, services and products. The problem has been the lack of hard currency in these newly-freed economies to conduct trade. The solution is to use non-traditional means to finance trade such as barter, countertrade, collateralization, dedicated imports and other self-liquidating means of finance.

Barter holds the key to opening new markets for American products. Rather than use cash, goods are traded for goods, natural resources are collateralized or future production is dedicated to finance U.S. exports. The former Soviet Union is resource rich and cash poor. These resources should be tapped to finance American food, service and manufactured exports. Several sectors of the former Soviet economy including energy, telecommunications, food and food processing are ripe for development and well suited for a barter-type finance mechanism.

The recently enacted Energy Policy Act of 1992 contains an amendment which I authored which requires the Office of Barter within the U.S. Department of Commerce and the Interagency Group on Countertrade to report on the feasibility of using barter, countertrade and other self-liquidating finance methods to facilitate the strategic diversification of U.S. oil imports through cooperation with the former Soviet Union in the development of its energy resources.

This provision gives your Administration an opportunity to enunciate a bold new policy for encouraging American exports and helping the former Soviet Union.

The newly-freed economies of Europe and Asia could be the economic engine that provide the United States and the industrialized world a way out of our current doldrums. Commerce between the United States and these nations cannot expand with old "cash on the barrelhead" thinking. The United States must encourage, facilitate and assist creative public/private barter arrangements to expand U.S. exports and jobs and to foster stability and economic growth in the former Soviet Union.

The Strategic Diversification Report is due next spring. I have enclosed a copy of the provision and an August article from an Izvestia/Hearst publication in Russia on barter for your consideration. If you or your transition team have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. I welcome the opportunity to work with you on this important matter.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

JIM EXON,
U.S. Senator.

Enclosure:

SEC. 3019. STRATEGIC DIVERSIFICATION.

The Office of Barter within the United States Department of Commerce and the Interagency Group on Countertrade shall within six months from the date of enactment report to the President and the Congress on the feasibility of using barter, countertrade and other self-liquidating finance methods to facilitate the strategic diversification of United States oil imports through cooperation with the former Soviet Union in the development of its energy resources. The report shall consider among other relevant topics the feasibility of trading American grown food for Soviet produced oil, minerals or energy.

Mr. EXON. Madam President, I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. HATFIELD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

EXPERTS CAN BE WRONG

Mr. HATFIELD. Madam President, I would just like to break the rhythm for a few moments here.

We heard, after the Bay of Pigs, a very profound statement offered by the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, to the effect that experts can be wrong.

I suppose, to draw the analogy to the moment, perhaps some things could be wrong as we hear the experts on both sides of the aisle.

But I heard last night another example of how experts can be wrong. One of my favorite programs is Jeopardy. I think Alex Trebek is one of the classiest, most human figures on television today.

A few months ago, there was a gathering here in Washington on the "high and mighties," as they are referred to in the media. And when I heard that Alex Trebek was in the audience, I sought him out, just to be able to meet him, because I have such great admiration for him. And I still have admiration for him, but I am happy to say that even Alex Trebek can be wrong.

Last night, the question was put to the panel: "What Republican from the State of Virginia is the ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee?"

No one could answer that question, Madam President. And so, Alex Trebek said it was JOHN WARNER.

Of course, we all know that was true maybe a year ago. It is not true today. Senator THURMOND, of South Carolina, is the ranking member of that committee.

So I just wanted to insert, at this moment in time, that any expert can be wrong. I can be wrong; people on this side of the aisle can be wrong, sincerely wrong; people on that side can be wrong; and even Alex Trebek can be wrong.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

SMALL-TOWN AMERICA IS FIGURING OUT THE REALITY BEHIND THE ADMINISTRATION'S RHETORIC: THOSE TAX HIKES WILL REALLY HURT

Mr. DURENBERGER. Madam President, Americans in every walk of life are waking up to the fact that the administration's tooth-fairy economic plan is going to take money from under their pillow, not leave anything there.

Consider, for example, the administration's Btu tax. The tax is structured in a way that makes it almost impossible for average Americans to determine the taxes that they will have to pay, because the tax is imposed so far up the energy production chain. Thus, by design, the tax will raise prices throughout the economy, and it will be devilishly hard to figure out how much of a price hike is due to taxes.

But people in the business community must, of necessity, keep a close watch on their costs, present and fu-

ture. And in small towns in Minnesota and elsewhere in the country they are already altering their behavior. They will have to adjust to the President's taxes by cutting back on hiring, on buying equipment, and on other economic activity.

An article in a recent issue of the Minneapolis Star-Tribune detailed the pernicious effect that higher taxes will have on Lake Wilson, MN, population 319, and on the surrounding area in Minnesota's Second Congressional District. That largely agricultural area will be especially hard hit by energy taxes: Those taxes raise the prices of fertilizer, transportation, crop drying, and everything else that a farmer does, but as price takers on the world market, the farmer will be unable to pass along those greater costs.

The article begins as follows:

The economic expansion in Lake Wilson, population 319, suffered a setback a couple of weeks ago when Roger and Don Bose canceled an order for a truck. The Boses, who run a small trucking business, concluded that they couldn't afford both the $81,000 vehicle and the $31,000 in higher fuel taxes they expect to pay under President Clinton's deficit-reduction plan. So scratch the driver's job they would have added to Lake Wilson's tiny work force.

What is the administration offering, other than taxes? The administration's so-called economic stimulus plan adds about one-fourth of 1 percent of gross domestic product to spending. At best, it will have the same stimulative effect that adding 6 cents to a child's $25 monthly allowance would have. And, of course, it adds to the deficit, just as the economy is beginning to recover.

As has been made abundantly clear, the spending cuts, which ought to come first, come later—if at all. Under the spending plan adopted by the Congress, only $81 billion in planned spending is to be cut back during the coming 5 years.

To give an example of the general reluctance to cut spending, last week, Mr. President, by a largely party-line vote, the Senate defeated an amendment I offered which would have lowered revenues and spending in order to provide for an exemption for ethanol from the Btu tax. My amendment would have reduced spending, and taxes, by a grand total of $82 million over 5 years—only $1 million in fiscal 1994 and $10 million in fiscal 1995—from the trillions of dollars in spending during the years covered by the budget resolution. But the Senate was unable to support even those modest cuts.

Small-town Minnesotans, together with Minnesotans living on farms or in suburbs and large cities, will soon discover what this economic plan is all about—higher taxes and more spending.

Madam President, I ask that the article, "Clinton's Tax Plan Means a Job Lost in Outstate Town," be reprinted in full at this point in the RECORD, and ask that my colleagues reflect on what we are going to be doing to small-town and rural America if we put this administration's economic plan into full effect.

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

[From the Minneapolis Star-Tribune, Mar. 14, 1993]

CLINTON'S TAX PLAN MEANS A JOB LOST IN OUTSTATE TOWN

(By Dennis J. McGrath)

The economic expansion in Lake Wilson, population 319, suffered a setback a couple of weeks ago when Roger and Don Bose canceled an order for a truck.

The Boses, who run a small trucking business, concluded that they couldn't afford both the $81,000 vehicle and the $31,000 in higher fuel taxes they expect to pay under President Clinton's deficit-reduction plan.

So scratch the driver's job they would have added to Lake Wilson's tiny work force.

And add the Boses to the list of Minnesotans who embrace Clinton's deficit-fighting plan in theory but balk at paying higher taxes. "I don't mind paying my fair share, but that's a little out of line," Roger Bose said of the proposed fuel tax.

The complaint that Clinton's energy tax is unfair cropped up repeatedly at town meetings that freshman Rep. David Minge, a Democrat, held in southwestern Minnesota last weekend. The protests echo what members of Congress are hearing from virtually every rural district in the nation, from cotton farmers in the South to ranchers in Montana.

The reaction of these and other constituencies in communities across the United States, and the extent to which they pressure their representatives in Congress, will shape the final deficit-reduction plan. Real people—not just tassel-loafered lobbyists—will help determine the success of Clinton's program. So from time to time, the Star-Tribune will check back with the Boses and others profiled in this survey of southwestern Minnesota to seek their reaction to the progress of the plan.

In addition to resisting the energy tax, the dozens of people who attended Minge's town meetings shared the conviction that Clinton's spending cuts are too shallow.

Interviews with more than a dozen people suggest that while there is widespread support for Clinton's goals, including the need for tax increases, an abiding distrust of the federal government keeps people from embracing his plan entirely. Their stated willingness to pay extra taxes is overtaken by the fear that those taxes will be squandered and that the deficit will continue to swell.

That suspicion was reflected by Michele Ager, a 28-year-old bank employee who founded the Pipestone chapter of Ross Perot's United We Stand, America. "We've been taxed before, and it didn't help out the deficit," Ager said. "If we pay more taxes and it doesn't pay off the deficit, we'll be worse off than we were before."

Before she pays higher taxes with the money she and her husband, Joe, earn from her bank job, his job at the Pipestone County museum and their janitorial business, Ager wants to see more than superficial cuts in government spending.

If Clinton's plan is adopted in its present form, the energy tax is the one that would fall hardest on most of the 546,887 residents of Minge's largely rural Second Congressional District, which stretches from the Twin Cities' westernmost suburbs to the Iowa and South Dakota borders.

Fewer than 2 percent of the district's households earn enough money—more than $140,000 in taxable income for couples filing jointly—to get bumped to a higher income tax bracket, according to the Minnesota Planning Department. Most earn between $15,000 and $50,000, which means they would get pinched by higher gasoline, electric and heating costs resulting from the energy tax.

The White House says the energy tax would cost a typical middle-class family $118 a year in higher fuel costs. An additional $322 would be embedded in higher production costs of items the family buys. In southwestern Minnesota, however, where agriculture dominates the landscape and the economy, the energy tax would be felt more keenly. Minnesota Agriculture Commissioner Elton Redalen predicts that it would cost a typical farmer about $1,600 a year.

That tax seems especially severe to farmers now, because they already are being squeezed by grain prices that have dipped below the cost of production and local property taxes that have jumped by double digits this year.

Those at Minge's meetings were well-versed in examples of government extravagance. With anecdotes culled from Paul Harvey's radio show and a popular book, "The Government Racket: Washington Waste From A to Z," they complained about the $20,000 given annually to Lyndon Johnson's widow for expenses, the free Secret Service protection for former President Gerald Ford as he picks up $50,000 as top on the lecture circuit and the research program on why people don't ride bicycles to work.

Among those who pressed Minge for more spending cuts was Fenton Groen, a 43-year-old Chandler resident who knows about stretching budgets, both as a business manager for the past 18 years and as the father in a family of nine. "I can't afford to go out and buy original oil paintings or to decorate our house with expensive furniture, and I don't think the government should either," he said. "They should cut, cut, cut, cut."

For a start, Groen suggested slashing funding for the National Endowment for the Arts, ridiculous university research programs and a jobs program that, he said, subsidizes employers to hire workers they would hire without federal aid in most cases anyway.

The favorite targets of others at the town meetings were foreign aid—several mentioned Israel—the size of the congressional staff and the $11 billion superconducting super collider project in Texas.

While most of those interviewed were unable to cite cuts that would make a major dent in the deficit, they were confident that waste is not marbled throughout the bureaucracy but can be cleanly and easily excised.

"I guarantee if you put me on any government program, I'd find ways to cut it without completely destroying the services the program provides," Groen said. There would be pain, he said, but this is a time for painful choices.

Still, few sounded willing to endorse limits on expensive government programs. Mel Winter, a 63-year-old retired farmer and mechanic from Minnesota, would protect programs for the mentally ill, disabled and elderly. "I don't think they're overfunded," he said. "I don't think they could stand a hit."

And an official of a Rural Electrification Association cooperative argued that funding for the program was unfairly added to Clinton's hit list.

But most of the complaints about fairness centered on the proposed energy tax. It is highly unpopular among farmers, who use large amounts of petroleum products to plant, fertilize, harvest, dry and transport commodities.

Clarence Fluit, who raises corn, soybeans and hogs near Luverne, predicted that the tax would cost more than the official projection of $4 an acre. But even at that level, it would add $4,000 to the cost of running his 1,000-acre farm—money he doubts he would recoup.

Fluit, a successful farmer earning more than $50,000 a year, would rather pay the extra taxes on his income. "If you make any money, then you can afford to pay it," he said. "The (energy) tax is the most unfair tax there is. It's not linked to income." While Minge mostly heard complaints such as these at his meetings, the results of a Star Tribune/WCCO-TV Minnesota Poll conducted Feb. 26 to March 4 offer more encouragement.

In southern Minnesota, which includes Minge's district and the First Congressional District in the southeastern corner of the state, 55 percent said Clinton's plan was fair to them, while 29 percent said it was too much of a burden on them.

Perhaps those who attended Minge's meetings were angrier than most, or, like 46-year-old Roger Bose, were feeling betrayed by Clinton's campaign pledge to spare the middle class from tax increases. "I thought it (the tax increase) was supposed to be on higher-income people," said Bose, the co-owner of the Lake Wilson trucking firm he and his brother started 20 years ago.

Bose figures the tax on diesel fuel will be a dime a gallon; he used 314,000 gallons for the 13 refrigerated trucks his company ran cross-country last year. The Boses added two more trucks before Clinton proposed his budget but then canceled the order for a 16th truck.

Bose said that Bose Bros. Trucking Co. will survive. "It's just that a guy will have to work more for less money," he complained. And that's what made him mad when he heard Minge support the energy tax at the town meeting in Lake Wilson's City Hall.

"That's all I need to hear," Bose said to Minge with disgust. "You won't get my vote." Bose abruptly stood up, brushed past the congressman and walked out of the meeting, his cup of coffee still steaming.

TRIBUTE TO DON MULLALLY

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, Vermonters get most of their information from radio. We have no rapid transit systems in our State. Most of us must commute by car—and our constant companion as we drive to and from work each day is our local news broadcaster.

No one has ever filled this role better than Don Mullally who has retired after almost a half century of broadcasting in the Northeast Kingdom of our State. Since 1949, Don has been reading and reporting the news, alerting travelers to avoid road construction and drifting snow, reporting the latest quirks of Vermont weather, announcing club news and schedule of community events, and keeping track of births, deaths, and the vital statistics that affect our community.

He has been broadcasting the news and current events over station WSTJ in St. Johnsbury, VT, since I was a boy. In recent years, I have been a regular guest on Don's talk show—and I always looked forward to chatting with Don and our neighbors.

A wonderful, public-spirited gentleman, Don Mullally is a Vermonter who participates actively in the life of the community and is no mere chronicler of events. He has remained the quintessential Vermonter in changing times—consistent and faithful to Vermont values.

I wish Don and his family many enjoyable years of retirement and ask that these two portraits of Don that appeared in the Chronicle of Barton and the St. Johnsbury Caledonian-Record be printed in their entirety as a tribute to this wonderful gentleman, and a very close friend of the whole Leahy family.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Johnsbury (VT) Caledonian-Record, Mar. 26, 1993]

LAST WAKE-UP CALL FROM VOICE OF WSTJ

(By Janice McCormick)

Don Mullally may have awakened more people in the Northeast Kingdom than anyone—with his morning radio show, that is.

But today is the last awakening—at day's end, Mullally is retiring from this decade-spanning career at WSTJ, where he has earned the nickname the "Voice of the North Country."

"I'll find something to do—fishing, golfing," said Mullally, who turned 65 this month. "Will I miss it? Oh yes, there's no question about that."

Mullally joined the AM station in 1951, when it was called WTWN. Except for the year he worked at a Glens Falls, N.Y., radio station, Mullally has spent his entire career at St. Johnsbury's first radio station.

"The ego trip never took me very far," Mullally said about his desire to stay in St. Johnsbury.

There was also the time Mullally lost his job—but just for a day.

"It's funny now," he said. "But then . . ."

According to Mullally, the story goes like this: he was out golfing one day in the hot sun, had a couple of drinks. Then, he was suddenly called back into work to cover for an ill employee.

A little too much heat, Mullally said, made him pass out while reading the sportscast.

"They said you could hear my head hit the control board," Mullally said.

Mullally was also quite well-known for his practical jokes at the station.

Broadcasters would have to be on the lookout for "hot news items" from Mullally—they were usually on fire, former colleague Arnie Munkittrick said.

"Don was a carefree type to work with," former colleague Doug Drown said.

"Some of the things he did you probably couldn't print," he jokingly added.

Although Mullally can't imagine being anything but a radio broadcaster, it wasn't always his lifelong dream to become one. When he first walked through WTWN's doors, he was looking for an engineering job.

"The engineering never panned out," he said, smiling. "I was all thumbs."

But at a microphone, Mullally quickly found home.

Through the years, he has not only hosted radio shows, disc jockeyed, and broadcast the news, he has also emceed local events, and gone on the road to cover local sporting events.

Over those years, the longtime St. Johnsbury resident has been witness to many changes in the radio business. Today, radio is much more technical, he said. Most of the station's music is picked up from a satellite "feed," and it has acquired an FM signal that broadcasts country music.

"We were also much more local 40 years ago," Mullally said.

"I know it sounds corny," he explained, "but someone would call and say 'if so-and-so is listening, would you please shut the gas stove off.'"

"One morning," he added, "we had 38 kittens, lost and found and given away . . . it was crazy."

Local businesspeople were also featured on a daily basis.

"The late Joe Caplan had a 60-second phone call," Mullally said. "Those calls ranged from 60 seconds to 1½ minutes . . . and with Mr. Caplan, you just never knew (what he'd say.)"

Another program included a daily call from Milt Rogers, a Hardwick meat packager who would talk about the specials.

"People still mention those shows," Mullally said.

Mullally also recalls the early radio days when he interviewed a United States president by telephone the morning after the election—something that would be nearly impossible for a small-town radio station today.

"To this day, nobody knows how we got through," Mullally said, laughing.

He's had the chance to meet Dwight Eisenhower, and has established "fine friendships" with Vermont's U.S. Senators Patrick Leahy and James Jeffords.

But despite the national figures Mullally has met, this down-to-earth man has found greater satisfaction in the friendships he has made in the community.

"I just love being around people, that's all," he said.

"He's more than a friend to me," said Drown.

Drown, who now works for St. Johnsbury Academy, spent about 28 years on the road with Mullally, covering local sports for the radio station. The job took them to just about every high school in the state, Drown said.

"He is a very valuable asset to the community," Drown said.

Mullally, on the other hand, doesn't really see himself as an "asset." Although he emcees just about any event he is asked to, is active in dozens of organizations, and was once named Citizen of the Year by the Chamber of Commerce, he sees his involvement as just a way of giving something back to the community.

"It's a means of saying thanks," he said.

For those who want to say thanks to Mullally, there will be a free WSTJ listener party in his honor on April 9 at 7:30 p.m. at the Lincoln Inn in St. Johnsbury.

Reservations can be made through WSTJ at 748-2345.

[From the Burton (VT) Chronicle, May 1, 1991]

DON MULLALLY: PROFILE

(By Bethany M. Dunbar)

ST. JOHNSBURY.—A radio man since just after World War II, Don Mullally has hob-

nobbed with politicians from former Governor Phil Hoff to Presidents Dwight Eisenhower and Harry Truman.

But he's more likely to be found announcing for the cavalcade of cattle, sheep and roosters at the Caledonia County Fair, or singing, "Sentimental Journey" with the area's 17-piece Big Band.

In fact, Mr. Mullally is involved in so many local clubs and activities on top of his job at WSTJ radio that there's not many nights he isn't already booked up for some engagement or another.

Hel'll be missing the Big Band's next gig in Montpelier May 4 in order to attend a dinner to be given in his honor by the Northeast Kingdom Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Mullally was chosen citizen of the year.

Mr. Mullally shook his head when the award was mentioned. It came "straight out of the blue and a real shocker," he said, looking a little embarrassed at the attention.

"There are many, many more that are more deserving," he added.

Possibly, but it's hard to imagine there are very many people involved in more community activities.

Mr. Mullally is a member of Passumpsic Lodge number 27 F&AM (Masons), the Order of the Eastern Star, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, past president of Kiwanis, an honorary member of the Lions Club, director of the Caledonia County Fair Association, works on the annual Stars and Stripes festival, ice shows, and used to be in the St. Johnsbury Players.

He said he got into all these things simply because he was asked. His philosophy is that if someone calls and asks if he'll do something, as long as he has the time free, he agrees to do it.

"I think it's a way of paying back," he said.

Mr. Mullally grew up in St. Johnsbury. His parents were originally from Montpelier but lived in Massachusetts for a little while, moving back to St. Johnsbury in 1938. Mr. Mullally was in the class of 1947 at St. Johnsbury Academy, but went to war before he graduated. He ended up graduating with the class of 1948.

"I classify myself as a member of both," he said, for the purposes of alumni activities.

A radio operator in the Navy, Mr. Mullally decided to go to Massachusetts Radio and Television School, and learned about the electronic end of radio. But he thought it wasn't for him.

He got a job for a while in the receiving department of an auto parts store. Then decided to apply for a position at WSTJ, which opened in 1949.

He said he went in and had an interview with the owner at the time, E. Dean Finney.

"The next thing I knew I was hired as a night man," he said. That shift was from 3 p.m. to sign-off. The longer he worked there, the better hours he got. He moved from night to mid-afternoon and then to where he's been for years, the morning slot, 4:30 a.m. to 12:30.

When he first worked at the station, it was completely independent. Later it joined with NBC and then CBS.

"We used to carry some of the major programs, like Arthur Godfrey," he said.

Most recently, the station gets national news and disk jockeys from the Starlight Music News via satellite. The format is adult contemporary—music from the 1950s, '60s, '70s and '80s, and the show is broadcast to some 300 stations across the country.

Mr. Mullally likes it all right but misses the independence the station used to have.

"We don't dig back into the library," he said, for music of the Big Band Era. Well, actually, he said, "I guess we do throw something on once in a while."

The station maintains its local emphasis, particularly in the area of sports. Mr. Mullally is a Red Sox fan and likes to hear those games, but he's especially proud of the station's policy of following local high school football and basketball clubs, even on away games.

"We do both boys and girls," he said. "We stand pretty proud about that because we're one of the few stations that travel all over."

He talked to politicians mostly when he was covering their campaigns. He said he doesn't often get tongue-tied, but he felt that way around Eisenhower and Governor Deane Davis. He's not sure why he was nervous around Mr. Davis. He thought maybe it was because of his age.

He met Eisenhower when Ike was campaigning in New Hampshire. WSTJ's sister station, WIKE in Newport, had been named after him. So the reporters went up with a microphone and stuck it in Ike's face to take a picture.

"The Secret Service almost had a fit," said Mr. Mullally, recalling the scene. But no bombs went off, and the picture hangs at WIKE.

"The night Harry Truman won, we called him and got him out of bed," Mr. Mullally recalled. He said the headlines were that he had lost, but they turned out to be wrong. He said he can't remember exactly what the President said, but basically the same things he said to the newspapers.

He met all the governors for the last several years, but he got to know Mr. Hoff the best and believes he is coming to his award dinner. He remembers when they met, at an event celebrating the Fairbanks company and museum.

Mr. Mullally's three children were on a balcony near Mr. Hoff, and the Governor grabbed Michael to hold up in front of the crowd. One of the big magazines—Time or Life—ran a picture of them.

Mr. Mullally met his wife, Velvier, when she was working as a lab technician at the former Brightlook Hospital.

"It was a blind date. I was home on leave at the time," he said. The romance developed into a marriage, and the Mullallys have raised three children. Lynda is a private secretary for a large law firm in Washington, D.C., Don Jr. works at IBM in Essex, and Michael works at the medical center in Colchester as a radiology technician.

Mr. Mullally got his love of entertainment from his father, who used to be a minstrel man and was one of the founders of a barbershop singing group in Littleton. He also ran businesses, including a dairy bar and antique shop, and he worked at Fairbanks long enough to get a union going there.

His mother, Abbie Mullally who just died in March, gave her son Don his outgoing nature, he said.

"It made no difference whether you came in with manure on your shoes or hightop boots," he said. "You got the same kind of treatment."

His mother was called Molly, a pun on her last name, by all her friends. She was a buyer for different companies, most lately Hovey's. She was 95 when she died of complications from a collapsed lung.

Mr. Mullally said she wasn't much for hospitals or doctors but agreed to go see a doctor when she became "a little short of breath" lately, as she put it. Her doctor had not seen her for six years.

When he's not announcing something for someone (the only thing he hasn't done is a harness race, he said), Mr. Mullally likes to hunt, play golf, and go look at the foliage in the fall.

Hunting camp is a great retreat, he said.

"Every once in a while I forget and take the gun," he said, laughing. On the Friday night before the season, he and his friends have a tradition. The six who are in the jazz band part of the Big Band come up to the camp in Lunenburg, which belongs to Loren Phelps. His father, Robert Phelps started this tradition, Mr. Mullally added.

They crank up the saxophones, trumpets and trombones and let 'er rip. Sometimes Mr. Mullally will even sing. "Who's Sorry Now?" maybe.

He did not say what effect this concert has on the wildlife or the hunters' chances the next day, but clearly it's a big part of the overall experience of hunting camp.

Mr. Mullally said people sometimes ask him when he's going to retire. He tells them as soon as the rubber band in his jaw wears out.

FOR GOOD MEASURE

Mr. PELL. Madam President, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a recent Washington Post editorial. To my mind, the editorial rightly points out that without national education standards, the American educational system will continue to suffer. It is absolutely critical that we have national standards which tell us what we expect students to know and be able to do, and that we measure our progress in meeting those goals.

Over 25 years ago, Senator John Sherman Cooper and I joined forces to introduce the Quality in Education Act of 1967. The purpose of that legislation was to give local school districts, parents, and policymakers an indication of how their students compare with those in other areas. If we do not know how our students are progressing on a district-by-district basis, it will be very difficult to know exactly where and what kind of changes are needed in our schools.

Madam President, standards will coordinate American education. Assessments can improve instruction, increase the targeting of resources, and help identify talented students who might otherwise go unrecognized.

I urge my colleagues to read this Post editorial in preparation for our work in the coming weeks on the administration's school reform bill, Goals 2000: Educate America Act of 1993. I ask that the full text of the Post article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 20, 1993]

FOR GOOD MEASURE

Whatever became of national achievement tests? Remember that less than two years ago there was a headlong rush to develop and administer examinations by the 1993–1994 school year. That was the utterly unrealistic goal of Gov. Roy Romer and others on the

now-disbanded National Council on Education Standards and Testing. They didn't allow time for popular misgivings, congressional skepticism or presidential elections. They didn't prepare for culture shock among certain members of the education establishment.

The idea of testing what schoolchildren actually know in the core subjects—not just how students compare with one another—is still a good idea. Most other industrialized countries have established curriculum standards and examinations based on those standards. Students in the European Community, for instance, know what's expected of them in an effort-driven system. This country, with its pluralistic traditions, has shirked national exams—until now. Worries about student achievement and global competitiveness have intensified the push for more sophisticated accountability mechanisms. Tests tied to tough standards just might improve performance.

Congress slowed the considerable momentum toward national exams when it failed to pass even a modest education bill last year. Now the current administration is set to revive interest in standards and testing. The Education Department is preparing legislation that would encourage states not only to determine what kids should know but to measure their performance as well. Most states are moving in this direction anyway, if they're not already doing it. The danger is that multiple standards (and a variety of tests) will mean no standards at all. Nationwide consensus is important, so that educators and policymakers can make comparisons across states and school districts.

There remains a lot of confusion about, and opposition to, national examinations. The concept has nothing to do with a federal test written in Washington. It has to do with agreeing on and adopting certain expectations for all students and then seeing if those expectations are met. That amounts to something radical—and right—for America's schools.

BOSNIA: A TIME TO ACT

Mr. JEFFORDS. Madam President, for the last few weeks, Congress has been preoccupied with the budget debate, and rightly so. However, I am distressed that no attention has been given to the situation in the former Yugoslavia, where war crimes are being committed that are reminiscent of the Nazis a half-century ago. Although the Serbian forces are not so organized as the murderers of the Holocaust, their attempts to expel, terrorize, and kill non-Serbs have an all-too-familiar cast to them. Concern worldwide quite justly deepens with each passing day, and I am compelled to bring it to the attention of this body.

Last August, as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I visited the former Yugoslavia. Our delegation was shocked by conditions there, and by the tales of horror told us by refugees from the fighting. I returned in February and what I saw and heard only increased my concern. One car mechanic told me of his confinement in a prison camp containing about 3,500 people. Released after 3 months, he estimated that only 1,500 prisoners remained. Few of the other 2,000 people walked out alive. Stories such as his, and of mass rapes of Moslem women in these camps, are too numerous to be discounted.

Serbian forces continue their relentless quest to control more and more land and establish purely Serbian enclaves in what were once villages of Moslems, Christians, and others. Serbs have repeatedly violated cease-fires, and have ignored U.N. resolutions calling for an end to their aggression and brutality.

Many efforts have been made to negotiate a peace agreement, especially by U.N. envoys Cyrus Vance and David Owen. But the plan they have devised seems not only unworkable, but to set a most dangerous precedent for resolving future religious or ethnic conflicts. That plan would divide Bosnia into 10 enclaves, separating people by religion and ethnic group. This would be like limiting the residents of townships to only Presbyterians, or only Catholics. A certain percentage of non-Presbyterians could live in the Catholic township, but there would be a maximum number allowed. This type of setup goes against everything America stands for and seeks to promote worldwide. It also sets a horrendous precedent for other multidenominational or multiethnic states.

The leaders of nations with whom I've spoken, including Egyptian President Mubarak, feel the Vance-Owen plan would lead to eventual disintegration of Bosnia into chaos. You can't just draw lines on the map and start moving people out of their ancestral homes, throw up barriers between them, tell them they can't live together, and expect this to bring peace. Such a peace would merely set the stage for more war.

What would such a system of conflict resolution lead to in other regions? In the Middle East, where many states have borders set up by colonists and populations with mixed ethnic groups, the result of Vance-Owen type divisions would be an unbelievable patchwork of little states. And the effects of such a plan on Africa would be an unthinkable disaster.

Instead, we should work toward a Bosnia that allows people of diverse faiths and races to live together. The Vice President of Bosnia, with whom I just met in Washington, fully agrees. He also feels the Vance-Owen plan is not the solution. But Bosnian Government is willing to accept the military accords proposed by Vance and Owen and to work out their problems with the proposed ethnic enclaves.

While all parties in the former Yugoslavia are to some degree at fault, the major aggressive force remains the Serbians. The arms embargo has not worked to control their continued onslaughts. The economic sanctions are equally ineffective, in part because the Serbs are self-sufficient in most critical materials. While the other major parties are willing to compromise, the Bosnian Serbs are still unwilling to negotiate seriously. Just yesterday, the Bosnian Serb Parliament rejected a motion to enter into direct negotiations with Bosnian Moslems and Croats to resolve their problems with the Vance-Owen plan.

I am at the present time opposed to the use of American ground troops in Bosnia. But the use of air power is another matter. I wish this were a more perfect world, when all our military flights could be limited to those of cargo planes dropping crates of food and medicine. But when Serbian actions only increase human suffering, other measures must be considered.

I support the recent U.N. Security Council authorization to use military force to enforce the ban on military flights over Bosnia. However, because the Serbs are not reliant upon air power, a strictly enforced no-fly zone would do nothing to impinge upon the Serbs, ability to conduct the war. The time has come when, if the Bosnian Serbs continue to ignore all pleas for stopping their onslaught, we must no longer rule out using force. I therefore would favor the use of American warplanes to attack the facilities that allow Serbs to continue making war. If they will only understand force before they will talk peace, we will need to make sure we are very clear.

We might well begin by striking at the petroleum depots and manufacturing facilities used to perpetrate the war in Bosnia. It is not an easy option—the use of military force never is. Nor is it a precise tool—we must be realistic about its limited utility. It will not end the suffering in Bosnia. But the grim realities of the situation, including the sad testimony of victims of this bitter war, have led me to the conclusion that it is time to use force.

The war in Bosnia sets an important precedent for the role of the United Nations in conflict resolution. Serb leaders have shown complete contempt for the authority of the United Nations, and for the U.N. peacekeeping troops on the ground. We must not let this stand. We must support the United Nations' efforts to limit the fighting. The United States must now be ready to bring its air might to bear in the name of humanity.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ASSASSINATION OF MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Madam President, tomorrow will mark the 25th anniversary of the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. This event offers us a good opportunity to reflect on the triumphs of the man and his dream and the status of that dream in 1993. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., dedi-

cated his life to fighting for justice and equality not only for minorities and the poor who had been denied for so long, but for all Americans. His dream for the future of America is the same dream we all share: To open the doors of opportunity and prosperity to every American.

It was the voice of Dr. King which stirred Americans from all walks of life to believe in themselves and their future. He challenged this Nation to change, and would not allow the words "not now" to turn him back. For 13 years, from the Montgomery bus boycott, that propelled him to national prominence, to his death in 1968, he devoted his life selflessly to the civil rights movement. His commitment to nonviolent social change spoke to the conscience of this country and produced a reevaluation of the Nation's priorities. He stood and worked against hate, divisiveness, and discrimination. And in the end, gave us the most potent weapons with which to fight evil: A belief in the dignity of every person and the courage to love.

Thanks to the efforts of men and women like Dr. King, America has come a long way from the era when blacks had to ride in the back of the bus, use bathrooms for colored only, and live in fear of indiscriminate lynching.

King fought against the second-class citizenship of African-Americans, crusaded to end the gap between the wages of African-American and white workers, and strived to end segregation in our Nation's schools. It is now 25 years since his violent and untimely death and some way, somehow, it seems too many of us have forgotten many of the lessons his life taught us. And we know those who forget history are doomed to repeat it.

This forgetfulness has contributed to the widening gap that remains between the salaries of white and African-American workers, the increasing gap between the incomes of middle and lower income African-Americans, the continuing segregation of our cities' schools and communities, and the violence among our youth which has reached heights unimaginable even a few years ago.

And we have not yet made enough progress in another area Dr. King championed: racial harmony. Over the last 12 years our national Government too often turned a blind eye to the need for equal justice and an end to discrimination. In his "Letter from Birmingham Jail," Dr. King describes the horrifying brutality African-Americans were unjustly subjected to, often by police who struck with impunity. I never thought my 15-year-old son would have to witness that type of brutality. But it continues today as we know all too well from the Rodney King and Howard Beach incidents.

Dr. King's message of unity was and is for all Americans, of whatever ethnic background or color. We must strive hard to reunite all people of this great Nation.

The United States was founded on diversity and cannot survive in the 21st century without greater understanding and tolerance among all of its people. Our diversity is our strength—not a weakness—and when we appreciate that fact, we build our foundation for progress. To quote Abraham Lincoln, "A house divided against itself cannot stand." By coming together, we strengthen the American fabric and give opportunity for all people to contribute to our society.

I look at this time as a new era and a new period in this country's history. Because of Dr. King's fight for justice, many more African-Americans than ever before are achieving positions of real power. We now have 39 members of the Congressional Black Caucus—an unprecedented number. At the State and local level, from Denver city hall to the Virginia statehouse, we have made gains that didn't seem possible 25 years ago.

There is no excuse not to further King's legacy. It is on his shoulders that each and every one of us stand as we enter our Capitol Chambers to cast a vote. In King's sermon "I've Been to the Mountaintop" which he gave exactly 25 years ago today, he asked us to "rise up with greater readiness * * * and move on in these powerful days, these days of challenge to make America what it ought to be. We have an opportunity to make America a better nation. * * * ."

His challenge of 1968 is the same challenge we face today. His dream that one day America will live up to its promise is my dream and should be the dream of every American. We have made progress.

My own story is a testament to King's dream. I was elected to the Senate by an electorate that was only 11 percent African-American. The coalition of Illinoisans that stood behind me included every race, religion, and ethnic group.

But it is not yet time to rest. If we do not heed the call in these momentous times, and implement the policies which will continue to move America forward, we will never fully realize King's dream or fulfill the promise we have made to the Nation as legislators.

Dr. King spent his life fighting for a better future for all Americans. The tools he used for his fight were words and ideas, not force and guns. He is truly one of the greatest leaders of this century. It is only fitting that he has been honored with a national holiday.

Dr. King was killed in the fight to free all Americans. Though his death was a tragic one, the heroism of his words and deeds remain with us. We must never forget the meaning of his life and continue to recognize his achievements. For this reason I have cosponsored S. 27, legislation introduced by Senator SARBANES and legislation introduced yesterday by Senator WOFFORD. Both seek to continue Dr. King's dream, the first by a memorial to be established by the Alphi Phi Alpha fraternity in the District of Columbia and the second to promote a day of service on the King holiday. The memorial will serve as a reminder to all who visit the Nations' Capitol of the extraordinary contributions of this great man. The principles on which he based his struggle: Justice, peace, and righteousness are still noble ones, and our youth in particular, need to be reminded how difficult it was to gain the freedoms they now take for granted. The memorial will also serve to remind those of us who toil in these hallowed halls of the work that remains to be done. Most importantly, however, it will remind all Americans of King's legacy of love, courage and hope.

We have a chance on this day to keep the dream alive. Let us commit ourselves to work and strive, and to speak and teach the message of love and the legacy of action that Dr. King's ultimate sacrifice gave to us.

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, I ask if I can be yielded a couple of minutes? Three minutes?

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

THE QUANDARY

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, this morning I was sitting in my office listening to some of the debate and sort of contemplating the quandary that we find ourselves in. A few words came to me that I thought I would share with the Senate. I do so with profound apologies to William Butler Yeats and Percy Bysshe Shelley and others.

GRIDLOCK IN THE SENATE

What kind of Senate is this
Sinking fast into the abyss?
What has become of all of the fun
They promised before we all came?
Now that we're here, it's chaos I fear
Our behavior is always the same!

What kind of Senate is this?
Something is surely amiss
There's not enough time to duck all the slime
The "distinguished friends" are throwing
We seem really stuck and there ain't enough luck
To get our economy growing

What kind of Senate is this?
Now it's schedules at home that we miss.
Some debate is too hollow, like lemmings we follow
The previous patterns of grid-lock
One side says go, the other says no!
While the Nation goes into big-hock

What kind of Senate is this
With increasing venom they hiss?
Our citizens scream—you ain't no team
By now, we thought you would know!
We sent you to work—not behave like a jerk
While the Nation is sinking so low

What kind of Senate is this?
Locked in your state of paralysis.

The voters all know that this kind of show
Will not be rewarded next fall
They've had quite enough of your filibuster stuff
And the shadow you cast is a pall
What kind of Senate is this
That everyone wants to dismiss?
There's just too much talk and legislative balk
While the nation is looking for change
So stall at great length with all of your strength
But really you look pretty strange
So what kind of Senate is this?
The minority in love with paralysis
The good G–O–P once used to be
The Grand Old Party we'd give-a-cheer
Now that it's lost in delay at any cost
Their destiny's to just disappear
So what kind of Senate is this
Where minority rule runs amiss?
Your numbers too few, in bitterness you stew,
And you hold up the jobs that we need
So get out of the way and remember this day
President Clinton was elected to lead
So what kind of Senate is this
That's sinking toward the abyss?
Do we not understand that all over this land
The people don't want us to fight
They want us to move, legislation approve
They want us to do what is right

Again, my profound apologies to all prior poets of distinction, and probably to the Senate for having kept us here overtime.

(Disturbance in the Visitors' Galleries.)

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, may we have order in the Senate. May we have order in the Senate and in the galleries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. The galleries will refrain from any expression whatsoever.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I compliment the distinguished Senator, a new poet, the new poet laureate of the Senate. I think he has written an excellent poem, well taken, and the thrust of it was right on point.

It reminded me of a poem, the author of which I believe is unknown.

There wanst was two cats of Kilkenny,
Each thought there was one cat too many,
So they quarreled and they fit,
They scratch'd and they bit,
Till, barrin' their nails,
And the tips of their tails,
Instead of two cats, there warnt any.

That is about what is going to happen to us if we do not get on with the business.

Madam President, I would like to inquire of the distinguished majority leader, and the distinguished Senator from Oregon as well, if he could enlighten us——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. No, I am recognized. This Senator is recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Oh, I beg your pardon.

Mr. BYRD. But I want to inquire of the majority leader if the distinguished Republican leader intends to call up his amendment? He has indicated for several days that he had an amendment. And it was my understanding that he had hoped to call up the amendment either yesterday or today. I only would like to see the amendment before the Senate, so we will have an opportunity to study it, so that we can discuss it, perhaps discuss it some this afternoon.

As it is, I do not know what the Republican leader is going to offer as an amendment. I do know that he has sent an amendment to the desk which is purported to be what he will call up. But of course, as every Senator knows, any Senator can go up to the desk, including the author of the amendment, and change it at any point, and any Senator can call it up—any Senator other than the Republican leader can call it up. But I would hope that the Republican leader would call up the amendment so that Senators might know what is in that amendment and we might discuss it and debate it, and perhaps after debating it some, vote on it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. MITCHELL. I believe the inquiry would of course be properly directed to the Republican leader since any decision on his offering of his amendment is a decision for him to make. I earlier stated here on the Senate floor that we would be pleased to have the Republican leader offer his amendment so it could be considered. He has not indicated to me his intention in that regard and I believe it would be appropriate that any statement in that regard come from him.

I will be pleased to yield to the distinguished ranking manager, if he has any comment in that regard.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, the only reason I directed my question to the majority leader is because I would presume that the majority leader and the minority leader have been discussing the proposal or the amendment, and what may happen down the road. And I just wondered whether or not the majority leader knew of any indication that the Republican leader would call up his amendment.

I thank the majority leader for his response.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. MITCHELL. I did have a brief meeting with the distinguished Republican leader after the last vote, and at that time we agreed to meet later today, after the Senate goes out of session—which I expect will be sometime in the near future. And he has not—in that meeting the Republican leader did not indicate to me one way or the other his intentions with respect to his amendment.

Mr. BYRD. And does the distinguished Senator from Oregon have a response to my question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. No, this Senator is recognized, Madam President.

I yield to the Senator for a response to my question.

Mr. HATFIELD. Madam President, I would say to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I do not have a time certain of which I have been informed, as to the Republican leader offering his amendment. I would like to make an inquiry, though. We do have other amendments that are ready, available to be offered. Does this mean that we are now in a position to consider other amendments that may be in the minds and on paper?

Mr. BYRD. The distinguished majority leader has answered that question already. He has offered to the Republican side an opportunity to call up amendments, perhaps, if he knows what amendments, if those amendments are identified, if he can get a time agreement on the amendments and a time to vote on the bill.

Mr. HATFIELD. Assuming, then, the majority leader has that agreement with the Republican leader of a time certain, and he has a copy of the amendment—I cannot speak for the Republican leader at this time.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, there has been a considerable amount of misunderstanding about the current legislative situation, particularly with respect to amendments. I had been advised directly that our Republican colleagues had an unlimited number of amendments to offer to this bill and was not able to obtain any identification of amendments or a time certain for disposition of the measure.

I then stated that it appeared clear that this was, in fact, a filibuster by amendment and that it would just go on indefinitely were we to continue in that mode. Therefore, I did not feel it appropriate or useful to do so. However, I stated at that time and since then that we would, of course, consider any amendment that was presented of which we could be made aware, if it was relevant and a serious and substantive amendment. That is clearly the case with the distinguished Republican leader's amendment. As he had described it here on the floor, it is a serious amendment. It is essentially an alternative to the pending bill.

I had made clear my complete willingness to have that amendment offered and we would debate it and upon completion of the debate vote on it. But any decision in that regard will, of course, be that of the distinguished Republican leader. We will do the same thing with respect to other amendments.

What I have sought to avoid is simply getting into a situation where we spend days and days and days. We are now in what I believe is our eighth day of consideration of this measure, considering one amendment after another, a large number of which are either not

relevant to the bill—this is my own characterization—or do not have serious legislative purpose and simply delay the bill indefinitely by amendment.

For now I believe that the matter has been sufficiently discussed and debated today. Unless some other Senator at this time wishes to seek recognition, Madam President, I will first state that, and I repeat now what I stated just a few moments ago, that following the last vote, I met with the distinguished Republican leader and we met briefly and agreed that we would confer again following the completion of this session.

So I expect to discuss with the Republican leader again later today how best to proceed with respect to this measure. Until then, it is now my intention to recess the Senate until Monday morning. I understand the Chair has an appointment to make, and I will now withhold pending that appointment.

Mr. EXON. Will the majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. MITCHELL. Might we permit the Chair to make an appointment?

APPOINTMENT BY THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to Public Law 101-549, appoints the following individuals to the Risk Assessment and Management Commission:

Norman T. Anderson, of Maine; and

David P. Rall, of the District of Columbia.

Mr. MITCHELL. The Senator from Nebraska was asking to be recognized?

Mr. EXON. May I ask the majority leader to yield for a question?

Mr. MITCHELL. Certainly.

Mr. EXON. Has the determination been finally made as to what time we are anticipating coming in Monday morning, as you had indicated earlier, and at what time the scheduled cloture vote will be held?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, it has. The Senate will return to session at 9 a.m. on Monday and the cloture vote will occur at 10:30 a.m.

Mr. EXON. I thank the majority leader.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:55 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1430. An act to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 801(b)(8) of Public Law 100-696, the minority leader appoints Representative YOUNG of Florida to the U.S. Capitol Preservation Commission for the 103d Congress, on the part of the House.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 1404(b)(2) of Public Law 99-661, the minority leader appoints Mr. STUMP on the part of the House to the board of trustees of the Barry Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Foundation for the 103d Congress.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 1430. An act to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-711. A communication from the Chairman of the United States Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of information relative to the Consumer Product Safety Act; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-712. A communication from the Executive Vice President of the Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a statistical summary for the fiscal year 1992; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-713. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the status of the process for resolution of commercial interests disputed in Saudia Arabia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-714. A communication from the Acting Director of the United States Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "The Rights and Benefits of Temporary Employees In the Federal Government"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-715. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Abstracts of Reports and Testimony: Fiscal Years 1992"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-716. A communication from the Executive Director of the Kaho'olawe Island Conveyance Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Kaho'olawe Island: Restoring a Cultural Treasure"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-717. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations, Logistics and Environment), Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of a discovery at Fort Meade, Maryland; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-718. A communication from the Interim Chairman of the Physician Payment Review Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report to Congress; to the Committee on Finance.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. KRUEGER, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. METZENBAUM, Mr. REID, Mr. SIMON, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. WOFFORD):

S. 773. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a program to encourage voluntary environmental cleanup of facilities to foster their economic redevelopment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. WOFFORD (for himself, Mr. BRADLEY, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 774. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Martin Luther King, Jr., Federal Holiday Commission, extend such Commission, establish a national Service Day to promote community service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. SIMON (for himself, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Mr. FEINGOLD):

S. Res. 94. A resolution expressing the Sense of the Senate with respect to the tragic humanitarian crisis in Sudan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. KRUEGER, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. METZENBAUM, Mr. REID, Mr. SIMON, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. WOFFORD):

S. 773. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a program to encourage voluntary environmental cleanup of facilities to foster their economic redevelopment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

VOLUNTARY ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP AND ECONOMIC REDEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1993

• Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Voluntary Environmental Cleanup and Economic Redevelopment Act of 1993. This legislation will foster the voluntary cleanup of potentially thousands of toxic waste sites around the country. It can lead to significant economic development and create jobs at a time when we need them. In my State of New Jersey, it could be especially significant, as urban and suburban areas still bear the scars of neglect of decades of industrial waste disposal.

Mr. President, the Federal Government has an array of Federal laws in place to regulate the discharge of pollutants into our environment and to assist the cleanup of environmental contamination caused by previous disposal activities. The Superfund Program provides Federal authority to assist in cleaning up abandoned waste sites that pose the most serious threats to public health and the environment. So far, EPA has identified about 1,200 of the worst sites on the national priorities list.

But there are over 100,000 sites that do not fall under the Superfund Program because they have very low levels of contamination. Even though the risks posed by these sites are relatively slight, in many cases their full economic use is being stymied because there is no ready mechanism for getting them cleaned up—even when the owner of the property is ready, willing, and eager to do so. Prospective developers and bankers are reluctant to get involved in transactions with these properties because of the concern, however minimal, for potential environmental liability.

These fallow or underutilized sites have an enormous potential for economic redevelopment. To unleash this potential, several States—including New Jersey, Oregon, Illinois, Indiana, Massachusetts, and Minnesota—have developed expedited procedures to clean up sites that do not pose a significant threat to public health or the environment. Under these voluntary cleanup programs, site owners can volunteer to pay for the costs of remediation and State oversight. In return, they get a letter from the State which they can use to assure prospective buyers and lenders that the property has been cleaned up to the Government's satisfaction and that other parties need not fear for potential cleanup liability. This so-called clean bill of health removes a major impediment to economic development and can help restore stagnant local economies.

In New Jersey, over 550 parties have signed up for the State's voluntary cleanup program in just the first year and a half of its existence, and in Illinois and Oregon, over 1,000 parties have signed up over the past several years to participate in voluntary cleanup programs. The economic benefits associated with these programs are undeniable. In my State alone, a $3 million investment by the State in its voluntary cleanup program has, in just 18 months, already generated several thousand jobs and hundreds of millions of dollars of economic development.

One such example is a project going forward in Hackensack, NJ. The city's department of public works yard and an adjoining oil tank farm are being redeveloped for a new Price Club discount retail and food store, complete with a riverwalk promenade and park area. The redevelopment of this site is estimated to be worth about $15 million, and will result in the creation of up to 350 new permanent employment opportunities. Fallow, unattractive land is being converted into a new vital center for the community and its visitors.

I have visited a series of similar sites in New Jersey. This is the kind of program that we should encourage and promote. My legislation would provide financial assistance in the form of grants to encourage States to develop voluntary cleanup programs or expand existing voluntary cleanup programs that are in place. It would also make grants available to qualified municipalities to conduct site assessments on contaminated property within their jurisdictions, to facilitate their cleanup and redevelopment. The grants could be used to determine the feasibility of voluntary cleanups at these sites. Finally, the legislation would provide financial assistance in the form of low interest loans to current owners, prospective purchasers, and municipalities to facilitate voluntary cleanup actions where traditional lending mechanisms are not available.

The minimal seed money envisioned by this program would leverage substantial economic payoffs. Indeed, existing State voluntary cleanup programs, after the first year, have become largely self-sufficient, supported by the payment of oversight costs offered by private site owners as part of their voluntary cleanup arrangement with the States. My legislation would replicate this on the Federal level with the hope that such programs will become self-financing. We can start the ball rolling, and then let the private market run with the ball.

I am joined in introducing this legislation by Senators BAUCUS, CHAFEE, DURENBERGER, WARNER, REID, METZENBAUM, LIEBERMAN, WOFFORD, SIMON, and KRUEGER. The bipartisan support for this bill indicates the strong appeal of this legislation to States throughout the country and to the business and environmental communities.

I also want to make mention of the leadership shown by Senator RIEGLE in encouraging the reuse of abandoned land in economically and socially distressed communities. I look forward to working closely with him to consider ways to combine the approach taken in his legislation introduced earlier this year with the approach I have chosen in my bill.

Mr. President, this bill represents a strong marriage of environmental and economic goals, and should empower interested States to achieve quicker cleanups and promote economic opportunities at a time when our citizens want progress on both fronts.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Superfund, Recycling, and Solid Waste Management, I will be reviewing the Superfund Program during this session of Congress. During that process, I am committed to considering whether some of the innovative ideas represented by my voluntary cleanup legislation can be integrated into the Superfund process. But I believe that for the hundreds of thousands of low priority sites not governed by Superfund, the time has come for us to create a mechanism for the States to foster voluntary cleanups under an expedited process that also protects the public health and environment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a brief section-by-section analysis of the legislation and a copy of the bill itself.

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

S. 773

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 "Voluntary Environmental Cleanup and Economic Redevelopment Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) past uses of land in the United States for industrial and commercial purposes have created many sites throughout the United States that have environmental contamination;

(2) Congress and the governments of States and political subdivisions of States have enacted laws to—

(A) prevent environmental contamination; and

(B) carry out response actions to correct past instances of environmental contamination;

(3) many sites are minimally contaminated, do not pose serious threats to human health or the environment, and can be satisfactorily remediated expeditiously with little government oversight;

(4) promoting the cleanup and redevelopment of contaminated sites could lead to significant environmental and economic benefits, particularly in any case in which a cleanup can be completed quickly and during a period of time that meets short-term business needs;

(5) the private market demand for sites affected by environmental contamination frequently is reduced or eliminated, often due to uncertainties regarding liability or potential cleanup costs of current owners and prospective purchasers under Federal and State law;

(6) the abandonment or underutilization of affected sites impairs the ability of the Federal Government and the governments of States and political subdivisions of States to provide economic opportunities for the people of the United States, particularly the poor and unemployed;

(7) the abandonment or underutilization of affected sites also results in the inefficient use of public facilities and services, as well as land and other natural resources, and extends conditions of blight in local communities;

(8) cooperation among Federal agencies, departments and agencies of States and political subdivisions of States, and owners and prospective purchasers of affected sites is required to accomplish timely response actions and redevelopment or reuse of affected sites;

(9) there is a need for a program to—

(A) encourage voluntary cleanups of affected sites; and

(B) facilitate the establishment of programs by States to foster voluntary cleanups of affected sites;

(10) there is a need to provide financial assistance to local governments to characterize certain affected sites in order to facilitate the cleanup of the sites so that the sites may be redeveloped for economically beneficial uses; and

(11) there is a need to provide financial incentives and assistance to qualified parties to clean up certain affected sites so that the sites may be redeveloped for economically beneficial uses.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are to create new business and employment opportunities through the economic redevelopment of affected sites that do not pose a serious threat to human health or the environment by—

(1) encouraging States to adopt and develop a program for sites that would not currently be remediated under other environmental laws (including regulations) in effect on the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) encouraging private parties to participate in State voluntary cleanup programs that facilitate expedited response actions that are consistent with business needs at affected sites;

(3) directing the Administrator to establish programs providing financial assistance to—

(A) encourage the development of State voluntary cleanup programs;

(B) facilitate site characterizations of certain affected sites; and

(C) encourage cleanup of appropriate sites; and

(4) reducing transaction costs and paperwork, and preventing needless duplication of effort and delay at all levels of government.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

Except if the context specifically provides otherwise, as used in this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) AFFECTED SITE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term "affected site" means a facility that has environmental contamination that—

(i) could prevent the timely use, development, reuse or redevelopment of the facility; and

(ii) is limited in scope and can be comprehensively characterized and readily analyzed.

(B) EXCEPTION.—Such term shall not include—

(i) any facility that is the subject of a planned or an ongoing response action under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.);

(ii) any facility included, or proposed for inclusion, in the National Priorities List maintained by the Administrator under such Act;

(iii) any facility with respect to which a record of decision has been issued by the President under section 104 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 9604);

(iv) any facility that is subject to corrective action under section 3004(u) or 3008(h) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6924(u) or 6928(h)) at the time that an application for a grant or loan concerning the facility is submitted under this Act, including any facility with respect to which a corrective action permit or order has been issued or modified to require the implementation of corrective measures;

(v) any land disposal unit with respect to which a closure notification under subtitle C of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6921 et seq.) has been submitted and closure requirements have been specified in a closure plan or permit;

(vi) any facility that contains polychlorinated biphenyls subject to response under section 6(e) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2605(e));

(vii) any facility with respect to which an administrative order on consent or judicial consent decree requiring cleanup has been entered into by the President under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.), the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.), the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2601 et seq.) or title XIV of the Public Health Service Act, commonly known as the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.);

(viii) any facility controlled by, or to be remediated by, a department, agency, or instrumentality of the executive branch of the Federal Government; and

(ix) any facility at which assistance for response activities may be obtained pursuant to subtitle I of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6991 et seq.) from the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund established under section 9508 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(3) CONTAMINANT.—The term "contaminant" includes any hazardous substance, as defined in section 101(14) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601(14)) and oil, as defined in section 1001(23) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2701(23)).

(4) CURRENT OWNER.—The term "current owner" means, with respect to a voluntary cleanup, an owner that is an owner at the time of the cleanup.

(5) DISPOSAL.—The term "disposal" has the meaning provided the term in section 1004(3) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6903(3)).

(6) ENVIRONMENTAL CONTAMINATION.—The term "environmental contamination" means the existence at a facility of 1 or more contaminants that may pose a health or environmental risk.

(7) ENVIRONMENT.—The term "environment" has the meaning provided the term in section 101(8) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601(8)).

(8) FACILITY.—The term "facility" has the meaning provided the term in section 101(9) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 9601(9)).

(9) GROUND WATER.—The term "ground water" has the meaning provided the term in section 101(12) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 9601(12)).

(10) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term "Indian tribe" has the meaning provided the term in section 101(36) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601(36)).

(11) LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—The term "local government" means the governing body of a political subdivision of a State, including the governing body of any county, parish, municipality, city, town, township, Federally-recognized Indian tribe or similar governing body.

(12) NATURAL RESOURCES.—The term "natural resources" has the meaning provided the term in section 1001(16) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601(16)).

(13) OWNER.—The term "owner" has the meaning provided the term in section 101(20) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 9601(20)), except that the term shall also include a unit of State or local government that acquired ownership or control involuntarily through bankruptcy, tax delinquency, abandonment, or other circumstances in which the government acquires title by virtue of its functions as a sovereign.

(14) PERSON.—The term "person" has the meaning provided the term in section 101(21) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 9601(21)).

(15) PROSPECTIVE PURCHASER.—The term "prospective purchaser" means a prospective purchaser of an affected site.

(16) RELEASE.—The term "release" has the meaning provided the term in section 101(22) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 9601(22)).

(18) RESPONSE ACTION.—The term "response action" has the meaning provided the term "response" in section 102(25) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 9601(25)).

(19) SITE CHARACTERIZATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term "site characterization" means an investigation that determines the nature and extent of a release or potential release of a hazardous substance and meets the requirements referred to in subparagraph (B).

(B) INVESTIGATION.—For the purposes of this paragraph, an investigation that meets the requirements of this subparagraph shall include an onsite evaluation, and sufficient testing, sampling and other field data gathering activities to accurately analyze whether the site is contaminated and the health and environmental risks posed by the release of contaminants at the site. The investigation may also include review of existing information (available at the time of the review) and an offsite evaluation, if appropriate.

(20) VOLUNTARY CLEANUP.—The term "voluntary cleanup" means a response action at an affected site—

(A) undertaken and financed by a current owner or prospective purchaser subject to oversight and approval by a State; and

(B) with respect to which the current owner or prospective purchaser agrees to pay all costs of oversight by the State.

SEC. 4. VOLUNTARY CLEANUP GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF GRANT PROGRAM.—The Administrator shall establish a program to provide a grant to any State that submits an application that is approved by the Administrator to establish or expand a State voluntary cleanup program that meets the requirements of paragraph (3).

(2) CERTIFICATION.—In an application for a grant under this section, a State shall be required to certify that the voluntary cleanup program of the State will meet the requirements of paragraph (3).

(3) REQUIREMENTS FOR STATE VOLUNTARY CLEANUP PROGRAM.—A State voluntary cleanup program meets the requirements of this paragraph if the State—

(A) provides adequate opportunities for public participation, including prior notice and opportunity for comment, in selecting response actions;

(B) provides technical assistance throughout each voluntary cleanup;

(C) has the capability of assuming the responsibility for undertaking a cleanup if the current owner or prospective purchaser fails or refuses to complete the necessary cleanup; and

(D) provides adequate oversight and has adequate enforcement authorities to ensure that voluntary cleanups are completed in accordance with all applicable Federal and State requirements, including any ongoing

operation and maintenance or long-term monitoring activities.

(b) GRANT AWARDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the program established under subsection (a), the Administrator shall, subject to the availability of appropriations, award a grant to the Governor of each State that submits an application to the Administrator that meets the requirements of this section to conduct a State voluntary cleanup program that the Administrator approves.

(2) GRANT AMOUNT.—The amount of a grant awarded to any State under subsection (a) shall be determined by the Administrator on the basis of the financial need of the State for establishing or expanding a voluntary cleanup program, and shall be in an amount not less than $200,000, but not to exceed $500,000 for each fiscal year.

(3) REPORTING.—Each State that receives a grant under subsection (a) shall submit to the Administrator, not later than 2 years after receipt of the grant, a progress report that includes a description of the cleanups made in accordance with the voluntary cleanup program of the State.

(4) TERMINATION OF GRANTS.—If the Administrator determines that a State voluntary cleanup program no longer meets the requirements of subsection (a)(3), the Administrator may terminate a grant made to the State, and require full or partial repayment of the grant award.

(c) STATE CERTIFICATION.—Each Governor of a State that receives a grant under this section shall not later than 1 year after receipt of an initial grant, and annually thereafter, submit to the Administrator a certification that states—

(1) the State voluntary cleanup program meets the criteria referred to in subsection (a);

(2) all cleanups achieved or undertaken pursuant to the State voluntary cleanup program fully comply with all applicable requirements of Federal or State law;

(3) public participation opportunities have been adequate during the process of selecting a cleanup method for each voluntary cleanup;

(4) voluntary cleanups achieved or undertaken pursuant to the State voluntary cleanup program have been undertaken in a manner that has reduced or eliminated health and environmental risks to the satisfaction of the State; and

(5) for any voluntary cleanup initiated pursuant to the State voluntary cleanup program that has increased health and environmental risks, the State has taken timely and appropriate steps to reduce or eliminate the health and environmental risks.

(d) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act is intended—

(1) to impose any requirement on a State voluntary cleanup program existing on or after the date of enactment of this Act if the Governor of the State has not been awarded a grant under this section; or

(2) to preclude a Governor of a State with a voluntary cleanup program referred to in paragraph (1) from submitting an application for a grant under this section.

SEC. 5. SITE CHARACTERIZATION GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall establish a program to provide grants to local governments to conduct site characterizations for affected sites at which voluntary cleanups are being conducted or are proposed to be conducted under a State voluntary cleanup program that is the subject of a grant award under section 4.

(b) SCOPE OF PROGRAM.—

(1) GRANT AWARDS.—In carrying out the program established under subsection (a), the Administrator may award a grant to the head of each local government that submits to the Administrator an application (that is approved by the Administrator) to conduct a site characterization at an affected site within the jurisdiction of the local government.

(2) GRANT APPLICATION.—An application for a grant under this section shall—

(A) include a description of the affected site;

(B) include information demonstrating the financial need of the owner of the affected site for funds to conduct a site characterization;

(C) include an analysis that demonstrates the potential of the affected site for stimulating economic development on completion of the cleanup of the site; and

(D) provide such other information, and be in such form, as the Administrator determines appropriate to carry out this Act.

(3) APPROVAL OF APPLICATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In making a decision whether to approve an application submitted under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall consider—

(i) the financial need of the owner of the affected site for funds to conduct a site characterization;

(ii) the demonstrable potential of the affected site for stimulating economic development on completion of the cleanup of the affected site if the cleanup is necessary;

(iii) the estimated fair market value of the site after cleanup;

(iv) other economically viable, commercial activity on real property—

(I) located within the immediate vicinity of the affected site at the time of consideration of the application; or

(II) projected to be located within the immediate vicinity of the affected site by the date that is 5 years after the date of the consideration of the application;

(v) the potential of the affected site for creating new business and employment opportunities on completion of the cleanup of the site;

(vi) whether the affected site is located in an economically distressed community; and

(vii) such other factors as the Administrator considers relevant to carry out the purposes of the grant program established under this section.

(B) GRANT CONDITIONS.—As a condition for awarding a grant under this section, the Administrator may, on the basis of the criteria considered under subparagraph (A), attach such conditions to the grant award as the Administrator determines appropriate.

(4) GRANT AMOUNT.—The amount of a grant awarded to any local government under subsection (a) for characterization of an affected site shall not exceed $100,000.

(5) TERMINATION OF GRANTS.—If the Administrator determines that a local government that receives a grant under this subsection is in violation of a condition of a grant award referred to in paragraph (2), the Administrator may terminate the grant made to the local government and require full or partial repayment of the grant award.

SEC. 6. ECONOMIC REDEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The Administrator shall establish a program to provide a loan to be used for the cleanup of affected sites to an owner or a prospective purchaser of an affected site (including a local government) at which a voluntary cleanup is being conducted or is proposed to be conducted under a State voluntary cleanup program that is the subject of a grant award under section 4.

(2) DISQUALIFICATION.—If the Administrator determines that an applicant has adequate resources to conduct, in the absence of financial assistance provided under this section, a cleanup that is the subject of a loan application, the Administrator shall not approve the application.

(b) SCOPE OF PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) LOANS.—The Administrator may award a loan to be used to clean up an affected site to each eligible applicant described in subsection (a)(1) that submits an application to the Administrator that is approved by the Administrator.

(B) LOAN APPLICATION.—An application for a loan under this section shall be in such form as the Administrator determines appropriate. At a minimum, the application shall include the following:

(i) A description of the affected site, including the nature and extent of any known or suspected environmental contamination at the affected site and the legal description of the real property associated with the affected site.

(ii) A complete description of the financial standing of the applicant that includes a description of the assets, cash flow, and liabilities of the applicant.

(iii) A written certification that attests that the applicant has attempted, and has been unable, to secure financing from a private lending institution for the cleanup action that is the subject the loan application. The certification shall specify—

(I) the name of each private lending institution to which the applicant submitted an application for a loan; and

(II) with respect to each application to a lending institution referred to in subclause (I)—

(aa) the date that the loan application was submitted and the date that the applicant was notified of the refusal;

(bb) the amount of the loan requested;

(cc) the term of the loan requested;

(dd) proof of the refusal of the loan by the lending institution; and

(ee) the reasons given, if any, by the private lending institution for the refusal of the loan for the cleanup.

(iv) A justification for the amount of the financial assistance requested, including evidence that the amount of financial assistance requested by the applicant is not available to the applicant through other sources.

(v) The proposed method, and anticipated period of time required, to clean up the environmental contamination at the affected site.

(vi) An estimate of the proposed total cost of the cleanup to be conducted at the site.

(vii) An analysis that demonstrates the potential of the affected site for stimulating economic development on completion of the cleanup of the site.

(2) LOAN APPROVAL.—In determining whether to award a loan under this section, the Administrator shall consider—

(A) the need of the applicant for financial assistance to clean up the affected site that is the subject of the loan application, taking into consideration the financial resources available to the applicant;

(B) the ability of the applicant to repay the loan in a timely manner;

(C) the inability of the applicant to secure a loan from a private lending institution or through other means of financing;

(D) the extent to which the cleanup of the affected site would reduce health and environmental risks caused by the release of contaminants at, or from, the affected site; and

(E) the demonstrable potential of the affected site for stimulating economic development on completion of the cleanup, including—

(i) the estimated fair market value of the affected site after cleanup;

(ii) other economically viable, commercial activity on real property—

(I) located in the immediate vicinity of the affected site at the time of consideration of the application; or

(II) projected to be located within the immediate vicinity of the affected site by the date that is 5 years after the date of the consideration of the application;

(iii) the potential of the affected site for creating new, or expanding existing, business and employment opportunities on completion of the cleanup of the site;

(iv) the estimated additional tax revenues expected to be generated at the site by the economic redevelopment;

(v) whether the site is located in an economically distressed community;

(vi) whether the cleanup and the proposed redevelopment is consistent with any applicable State or local community economic development plan; and

(vii) such other factors as the Administrator considers relevant to carry out the purposes of the loan program established under this section.

(3) LOAN AMOUNT.—The amount of a loan made to an applicant under this section shall not exceed—

(A) 75 percent of the cost of the cleanup that is the subject of the loan; or

(B) $750,000,

whichever is less.

(4) STATE APPROVAL.—Each application for a loan under this section shall, as a condition for approval by the Administrator, include a written statement by the State under whose voluntary program the voluntary cleanup is being conducted, or proposed to be conducted that—

(A) the voluntary cleanup or proposed voluntary cleanup is cost effective; and

(B) the estimated total cost of the voluntary cleanup is reasonable.

(c) LOAN AGREEMENTS.—Each loan under this section shall be made pursuant to a loan agreement. At a minimum, the loan agreement shall include provisions that address the following items:

(1)(A) The loan shall bear interest at the applicable rate specified in subparagraphs (B) through (D).

(B) For local government entities, the rate of interest shall be 1 percentage point below the average current yield on marketable obligations of the United States Treasury having comparable maturities.

(C) For prospective purchasers of an affected site, the rate of interest shall be 1 percentage point above the average current yield on marketable obligations of the United States Treasury having comparable maturities.

(D) For current owners of an affected site, the rate of interest shall be 2 percentage points above the average current yield on marketable obligations of the United States Treasury having comparable maturities.

(2) The maturity period of the loan (as determined by the Administrator) shall not exceed 10 years.

(3) The repayment of the loan during the maturity period shall be in accordance with any schedule for payments that the Administrator may specify in the loan agreement.

(4) Each payment referred to in paragraph (3) shall be made to the Secretary of the Treasury for deposit in the general fund of the Treasury.

(5) If the sale or redevelopment of the affected site results in a net profit to the applicant (taking into consideration any amount of reimbursement that may be required under this paragraph) in an amount greater than or equal to 10 percent, in addition to paying interest on the loan (as specified in paragraph (1)), the applicant shall make a payment to reimburse the Federal Government for the full and actual costs incurred by the Federal Government of making the loan to the applicant, including any administrative costs.

(6) The applicant shall comply with all applicable Federal and State laws (including regulations) applicable to the cleanup and shall proceed in accordance with any voluntary cleanup program in effect in the State.

(7) The applicant shall guarantee repayment of the loan.

(8) The applicant shall use the loan solely for purposes of cleaning up the environmental contamination at the affected site, and shall return any excess funds to the Administrator immediately on a determination by the Administrator that the cleanup has been completed.

(9) The loan shall not be transferable, unless the Administrator agrees to the transfer in writing.

(10) Such other terms and conditions that the Administrator determines necessary to protect the financial interests of the United States.

(d) FEDERAL LIEN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A lien in favor of the United States shall arise on the contaminated property subject to a loan under this section. The lien shall cover all real property included in the legal description of the property at the time the loan agreement provided for in this section is signed, and all rights to the property, and shall continue until the terms and conditions of the loan agreement have been fully satisfied. The lien shall arise at the time the United States grants a loan under this section, and shall not be subject to the rights of any purchaser, holder of a security interest, or judgment lien creditor whose interest is or has been perfected under applicable State law, except that any interest held by the United States as security for a loan under this section shall be subordinate to any lien on the property for taxes due on the property to a State or political subdivision thereof.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this paragraph, the terms "security interest" and "purchaser" shall have the meaning provided the terms in paragraphs (1) and (6), respectively, under section 6323(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(e) ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If any person fails to comply with any condition of a loan agreement entered into pursuant to this section, the Administrator may request the Attorney General of the United States to commence a civil action in an appropriate district court of the United States to enforce the loan agreement.

(2) JURISDICTION OF DISTRICT COURT.—The district court shall have jurisdiction to enforce the loan agreement and grant such relief as the public interest and the equities of the case may require.

SEC. 7. REGULATIONS.

The Administrator shall promulgate such regulations as are necessary to carry out this Act. The regulations shall include the procedures and standards that the Administrator considers necessary, including procedures and standards for evaluating an application for a grant or loan submitted under this Act.

SEC. 8. ECONOMIC REDEVELOPMENT REVOLVING FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the "Economic Redevelopment Revolving Fund" (referred to in this section as the "Revolving Fund") consisting of such amounts as may be appropriated to the Revolving Fund, or transferred or credited to the Revolving Fund pursuant to this section.

(b) TRANSFERS TO THE REVOLVING FUND.—

(1) TRANSFERS.—There are hereby transferred to the Revolving Fund amounts equivalent to the amounts received in the Treasury pursuant to section 6(c)(4).

(2) MONTHLY TRANSFERS.—The amounts transferred by paragraph (1) shall be transferred at least monthly from the general fund of the Treasury to the Revolving Fund on the basis of estimates made by the Secretary of the Treasury. Proper adjustment shall be made in amounts subsequently transferred to the extent prior estimates were in excess of, or less than, the amounts required to be transferred.

(c) MANAGEMENT OF THE REVOLVING FUND.—

(1) INVESTMENT.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall invest such portion of the Revolving Fund as is not, in the judgment of the Secretary, required to meet current withdrawals. The investments may be made only in interest-bearing obligations of the United States. For such purpose, the obligations and may be acquired—

(A) on original issue at the issue price; or

(B) by purchase of outstanding obligations at the market price.

(2) SALE OF OBLIGATIONS.—Any obligation acquired by the Revolving Fund may be sold by the Secretary of the Treasury at the market price.

(3) INTEREST ON CERTAIN PROCEEDS.—The interest on, and the proceeds from the sale or redemption of, any obligations held in the Revolving Fund shall be credited to and form a part of the Revolving Fund.

(4) REPORT.—It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to hold the Revolving Fund and (after consultation with the Administrator) to report to Congress each year concerning—

(A) the financial condition and the results of the operations of the Revolving Fund during the preceding fiscal year; and

(B) the expected condition and operations of the Revolving Fund for the five fiscal years following the preceding fiscal year.

(d) EXPENDITURES FROM THE REVOLVING FUND.—Amounts in the Revolving Fund shall be available, as provided by appropriation Acts, only for purposes of carrying out the loan program established under section 6.

(e) AUTHORITY TO BORROW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Revolving Fund, as a repayable advance, an amount equal to $15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, and 1997.

(2) REPAYMENT OF ADVANCES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary of the Treasury determines that there are sufficient funds available in the Revolving Fund to repay a repayable advance, the Secretary

shall transfer from the Revolving Fund to the general fund of the Treasury an amount equal to the amount of a repayment plus interest (as determined by the Secretary under subparagraph (B)).

(B) RATE OF INTEREST.—The amount of interest on an advance made under this subsection shall be at a rate determined by the Secretary (as of the close of the calendar month preceding the month in which the advance is made).

SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) VOLUNTARY CLEANUP PROGRAM.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency, to carry out section 4, an amount not to exceed $15,000,000 for fiscal year 1994, and $7,500,000 for each of fiscal years 1995 through 1997.

(b) SITE CHARACTERIZATION PROGRAM.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency, to carry out section 5, an amount to exceed $15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1994 through 1997.

(c) ECONOMIC REDEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency, to carry out section 6, an amount to exceed $15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1994 through 1997.

(d) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—The amounts appropriated pursuant to this section shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 10. REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and not later than January 31 of each of the succeeding 3 calendar years thereafter, the Administrator shall prepare and submit a report to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives describing the achievements of each grant or loan program established under this Act.

(b) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—The report shall, with respect to the programs established under this Act, include a description of—

(1) the number of grant and loan applications received by the Administrator during the preceding calendar year;

(2) the number of grants and loans approved by the Administrator during the preceding calendar year;

(3) with respect to each voluntary cleanup program of a State that was the subject of a grant under section 4—

(A) the purposes to which the grant awarded to the State was applied; and

(B) the achievements of the program;

(4)(A) the affected sites identified by local governments; and

(B) the status of the sites referred to in subparagraph (A) regarding subsequent cleanup and economic redevelopment;

(5)(A) the affected sites at which a cleanup was initiated pursuant to the economic redevelopment assistance program under section 6; and

(B) the status of the sites referred to in subparagraph (A) regarding ongoing or completed cleanup actions and economic redevelopment activities;

(6) the grants and loans disapproved during the preceding year, and the reasons for disapproval;

(7) the amount of grants and loans made during the preceding year, and an estimate of the total cleanup costs incurred by parties receiving a loan under the economic redevelopment assistance program; and

(8) the number of applicants for grants and loans that may be in need of financial assistance in establishing voluntary cleanup programs, performing site characterizations, and conducting cleanups to achieve economic redevelopment under this Act.

SEC. 11. FUNDING.

(a) ELIGIBLE COSTS DEFINED.—For the purposes of each grant and loan program established under this Act, the term "eligible costs" shall include administrative and nonadministrative costs.

(b) NONADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—As used in this section, the term "nonadministrative costs" shall include the cost of—

(1) oversight for a cleanup by contractor, owner, or prospective purchaser;

(2) identifying the probable extent and nature of environmental contamination at an affected site, and the preferred manner of carrying out a cleanup at an affected site;

(3) each cleanup, including onsite and offsite treatment of contaminants; and

(4) monitoring ground water or other natural resources.

(c) ADMINISTRATIVE COST LIMITATION.—Not more than 15 percent of the amount of a grant or loan made pursuant to this Act may be used for administrative costs. No grant or loan made pursuant to this Act may be used to pay for fines or penalties owed to a State or the Federal Government.

(d) OTHER LIMITATIONS.—Funds made available to a State pursuant to the grant program established under section 4 shall be used only for establishing or administering a voluntary cleanup program.

SEC. 12. STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act is intended to affect the liability or response authorities of any other law (including any regulation) for environmental contamination including the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et. seq.), the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.), the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2601 et seq.), or title XIV of the Public Health Service Act, commonly known as the "Safe Drinking Water Act" (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.).

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS RELATING TO THE VOLUNTARY ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP AND ECONOMIC REDEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1993

This Act, to be known as the "Voluntary Environmental Cleanup and Economic Redevelopment Act of 1993," provides a financial assistance program to encourage states, local governments, and private parties to expedite cleanup of environmentally contaminated sites that do not pose serious health or environmental risks.

Section 1 provides the short title for the Act.

Section 2 contains Congressional findings and objectives that describe the need for this legislation. In particular, there are many sites throughout the country whose productive economic use is being frustrated by minimal levels of contamination that do not pose serious health or environmental risks. Facilitating cleanup at such sites would create new business and employment opportunities, while at the same time achieving better health and environmental protection.

Section 3 defines the key terms used in the legislation. One of these terms ("affected site") also clarifies the scope of this Act. Thus, this bill excludes a number of types of sites, including those that are the subject of planned or ongoing CERCLA response actions, are on or may be placed on the National Priorities List, are subject to RCRA corrective action or closure authorities at the time they are being considered for initial participation in the program, and are owned or operated by the federal government.

Section 4 establishes a voluntary environmental cleanup grant program, to be administered by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. This section contains minimum requirements that, if certified by the State to be satisfied, would trigger a grant by the Administrator subject to available appropriations. In its program, the State would have to: provide for adequate opportunities for public participation in selecting cleanups, have the capability to assume responsibility for undertaking a cleanup if the owner or prospective purchaser fails or refuses to complete the necessary cleanup, provide technical assistance for voluntary cleanups, and have sufficient oversight and enforcement capabilities to ensure proper cleanup actions at affected sites.

Grants of up to $500,000 each year may be awarded by the Administrator during the four-year-term of this program, and may be used to establish or expand a State voluntary cleanup program. A state with a preexisting voluntary cleanup program would not be required to meet the criteria of the Act, unless it sought funding provided by this Act. Assuming the Act's criteria are satisfied, individual states would be free to design the details of their programs according to the particular needs of their communities. Pre-existing state programs in New Jersey, Massachusetts, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, and Oregon could well have elements that could be adopted by other states initiating programs with the seed money provided by this Act. In general, voluntary cleanup programs are designed to operate on the basis of funds initially made available by current site owners or prospective purchasers to cover the State's oversight and administrative costs.

States receiving grants under this section would be required to prepare and submit to the Administrator a progress report. They also would be required to certify on an annual basis assurances as to the continuing adequacy of the program, including a certification that cleanups achieved under their voluntary cleanup programs fully comply with all applicable Federal and State requirements, and reduce or eliminate risks to the satisfaction of the State.

Section 5 establishes a site characterization grant program to be used exclusively to characterize sites that are participants in a State voluntary cleanup program which has received a grant pursuant to Section 4. Under this program, EPA would make grants available to local governments needing financial assistance in order to conduct site characterizations at affected sites within their jurisdiction. Such characterizations may often be pivotal in facilitating cleanup because they provide a clearer picture of the extent of contamination, the estimated costs of cleanup, and the scope of potential liability. This information is particularly important in obtaining relevant financing from lending institutions for cleanup or other purposes. It is also extremely useful in facilitating transactions with prospective purchasers who might be interested in economically redeveloping an affected site.

Because of financial constraints, many local governments are unable to conduct site characterizations at abandoned sites within their jurisdictions. This grant program is designed to assist financially needy local governments by allowing them to obtain site characterizations which can foster the cleanup and economic redevelopment of affected

sites. The grants are made available even for sites that are not owned by the local government; it is anticipated that some privately owned sites will be viewed by a local government as being of such economic value to the community at large that the local government is willing to submit a grant application for the benefit of the private owner.

Section 5 also specifies several criteria the Administrator would consider in awarding a grant under this section, including the financial need of the affected site's owner, the site's potential for creating economic benefits once cleaned up, and whether the community surrounding the site is economically distressed. Local governments could apply for grants of up to $100,000 for each site characterization.

Section 6 establishes an economic redevelopment assistance program to be carried out by the Administrator of EPA exclusively for sites that are participants in a State voluntary cleanup program which has received a grant pursuant to Section 4. Current owners or prospective purchasers of affected sites—including local governments—could apply for low interest loans to cover cleanup costs of up to $750,000. The loan amount could represent up to 75% of the total cleanup costs to be incurred at the affected site.

In deciding whether to make financial assistance available to the applicant, the Administrator would consider a number of factors, including the applicant's ability to repay the loan, the site's potential for creating economic benefits once cleaned up, and whether the community surrounding the site is economically distressed. In addition, applicants would have to demonstrate they do not have other adequate financial resources with which to conduct the cleanup, and would have to show they had been unable to obtain financing from a private lending institution. As a condition for approval of an application, each applicant would have to provide a written statement issued by the State under whose voluntary cleanup program the cleanup is to be conducted, stating that the cleanup is cost effective and the estimated total cost of cleanup is reasonable.

Current owners of affected sites, as well as prospective purchasers and local governments, would be eligible to apply for low interest loans subsidized by the Federal government. Different rates would apply to these three categories of applicants, but the loans would be available at rates designed to encourage cleanups to take place. The loans would be made for a ten-year term, and applicants would be required to reimburse the United States for its actual costs in making the loan if the subsequent sale or development of the property resulted in a net profit (calculated on the basis of having paid the loan off and reimbursing the United States for its actual costs) of more than 10%. The legislation also would provide for a Federal lien that would attach to the property until the loan and other obligations had been fully repaid.

Section 7 would provide authority for the Administrator to issue regulations, procedures and standards needed to implement this legislation.

Section 8 would create the Economic Redevelopment Revolving Fund to be used in carrying out the loan provisions of Section 6, and would establish various requirements regarding the management of the revolving loan fund.

Section 9 would authorize appropriations of $45 million for the grant and loan programs established by this legislation for fiscal year 1993, and appropriations of $37.5 million for each of the following three fiscal years.

Section 10 requires the Administrator to prepare and submit annual reports to the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee and the House Energy and Commerce Committee, describing the accomplishments achieved under the grant and loan programs established by this bill.

Section 11 would contain limitations on eligible costs. Specifically, no more than 15% of funds made available under the grant and loan programs established by this legislation could be used for administrative costs; the rest of the funds are to be used for actual cleanup and monitoring expenses.

Finally, section 12 would address the relationship of this legislation to other Federal law. In particular, nothing in the Voluntary Environmental Cleanup and Economic Redevelopment Act would affect the liability or response authorities of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act and other applicable Federal statutes.

• Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I am pleased today to cosponsor the Voluntary Environmental Cleanup and Economic Redevelopment Act of 1993. The bill introduced today is the first step in addressing an extremely important issue facing our local communities—how to clean up and redevelop contaminated sites so that economic revitalization can go forward in an expeditious manner.

Mr. President, I think that most of my colleagues have heard stories about abandoned sites in their States. A developer seeks to make productive use of a contaminated industrial site that is now abandoned. The fear of liability under Superfund and other environmental laws—whether justified or not—scares the developer and his or her bankers and investors away from developing the property. Instead, the developer invests in a greenfield site, causing the loss of precious and dwindling open space. Mr. President, in my view, our policies should be strongly encouraging the redevelopment of industrial sites, not forcing development in the greenfields.

The bill introduced today is designed to respond to this problem in several ways. First, it provides seed money to States to develop voluntary cleanup programs for sites with low-level contamination. Second, it establishes a loan program for local governments to characterize contaminated sites that would participate in the voluntary cleanup program. Information gathered in a site characterization provides useful information concerning the precise level of contamination at a site for lenders and other potential investors. That information will often provide the additional comfort necessary for investment to go forward.

Finally, the bill provides a revolving loan program to encourage local governments, existing property owners, and prospective purchasers of property to cover up to 75 percent of the cleanup costs at a site. A tiered system of favorable interest rates would be offered to these prospective borrowers.

Mr. President, several groups—including those in the banking, development, and real estate industries, as well as environmental groups—have expressed support for the concept of a voluntary cleanup program for sites that present relatively low health and environmental risks. These groups all recognize the need for getting the less contaminated sites cleaned up quickly and returning them to economic productivity.

While I think that this bill is an important first step in bringing economic revitalization to areas with contaminated property, I believe that we may need to go further. In the hearings to be held on this legislation, I will seek to determine from prospective investors in contaminated sites whether this bill provides adequate incentives to truly achieve the desired goal of revitalization. Will developers, bankers, and others make financial commitments if a State signs off on a voluntary cleanup or are other legal assurances required? How will the cleanup levels set by States in these programs encourage or discourage cleanups?

And, Mr. President, although this is a question for Superfund reauthorization to come later on, should we be looking at some of the same incentives for redevelopment of Superfund sites that are presenting the more difficult redevelopment challenges? This is a stickier problem, but clearly one of equal or greater importance to future economic prosperity.

Mr. President, I appreciate the efforts of the principal sponsor of this bill, Senator LAUTENBERG, in developing this bill, along with several members of the Environment and Public Works Committee, including myself. I look forward to working with him and others on this legislation in the coming months.•

• Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator LAUTENBERG, Senator CHAFEE, a bipartisan majority of the members of the Environment and Public Works Committee, and others in introducing the Voluntary Environmental Cleanup and Economic Redevelopment Act of 1993.

This legislation will provide much needed assistance to economically distressed and rural areas in this country by expediting cleanup of contaminated property. There are over 100,000 parcels of such property throughout the country, including many in my State of Montana.

Mr. President, we have all heard concerns about the credit crunch and the difficulty of moving real estate transactions in the current economy. One of the obstacles to property transactions has been concerns about environmental liability associated with contaminated property. Prospective buyers and tenants, and their bankers, are simply afraid to get involved with a site even

if the level of contamination is minimal. The result is that many properties are lying fallow or underutilized—even though just a little effort spent on cleanup and some level of assurance by the Government would free up those properties for potentially enormous redevelopment.

Our Nation cannot afford to let those properties continue to lie fallow. We must provide a ready mechanism for cleanup and assurances by the Government that prospective buyers and lenders need not fear to get involved in these low priority sites that can so readily be cleaned up. I think this legislation will provide that mechanism, and I applaud Senator LAUTENBERG and others for bringing this issue to the forefront.●

By Mr. WOFFORD (for himself, Mr. BRADLEY, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 774. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission, extend such Commission, establish a National Service Day to promote community service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

KING HOLIDAY AND SERVICE ACT OF 1993

Mr. WOFFORD. Mr. President, today I am introducing in the Senate and Congressman JOHN LEWIS will be introducing in the House the King Holiday and Service Act of 1993. It has the strong support of Coretta Scott King, who chairs the King Holiday Commission. It is fitting and proper to introduce this legislation today, even as we work and struggle to move forward on pressing matters of our economy.

Twenty-five years ago last Sunday, Martin Luther King, Jr., was shot down in Memphis. Five years earlier John F. Kennedy fell to another assassin's bullet in Dallas. And 2 months later, Robert Kennedy would meet the same fate.

That was a season of terrible tragedy, but it had been a decade of amazing achievement. A worship service at the Mount Ararat Baptist Church in Pittsburgh which I attended a few days before the King anniversary brought back a flood of memories:

As I read the church's explanation of why it was named for the resting place of Noah's Ark, I recalled the first time I heard Martin Luther King preach at his Dexter Avenue Baptist Church in Montgomery, AL, in 1957.

"Noah is the patron saint of people who stick their necks out," the Mount Ararat program said. "Noah stuck his neck out, convinced a few people to go along with him, and sailed and sailed."

So did Martin Luther King.

"My body's weak, I haven't had much sleep this week, but my spirit's strong," said Mount Ararat's young preacher, Donald O. Clay, Jr., who is on dialysis. "Father, let this cup pass from me," he said in his sermon on the Garden of Gethsemene. "But if I must drink of it, thy will be done."

I remembered the night my wife and I drove Martin and Coretta King from Baltimore to Washington, DC, after Martin had castigated a national black fraternity for spending more money on its weekend convention than the whole annual budget of the NAACP.

Sitting with my wife in the back seat, Coretta told of her recurring nightmare that at the end of the road, Martin would be killed. He leaned back from the front seat and said she should dream instead of all the things that they could do while he was alive. Then he added, "I didn't ask for this. I was asked and said yes." He hummed a line from a spiritual: "The Lord asked me and my soul said yes."

In 1956, Martin had been a promising, prospering young minister of a middle-class congregation when Rosa Parks was arrested for refusing to give up her seat and accept segregation on a Montgomery city bus. When she said no, a group of civil rights activists asked King to take the lead in calling a boycott of the buses, and he said "Yes."

At a workshop on Gandhi and nonviolence that Martin had me give at his church on the first anniversary of the boycott, a member of the congregation got up and said, "Well, Gandhi's good, but we get all this straight from Jesus Christ."

At Mount Ararat in 1993, the plain wooden altar faced us with six carved words: "This do in remembrance of me." Now, 25 years after Coretta's nightmare became a reality, what should we do in remembrance of Martin?

We should certainly celebrate and never forget the victories won in that decade of nonviolent direct action. While Martin was alive, the right to vote was won in one-third of our country and segregation laws were struck down everywhere in the land.

But Martin would want us to raise our sights to the work yet to be done. In his sermon the night before he was killed, he said he had been to the mountain and seen the Promised Land but might not reach it himself. He was no longer afraid of any man, or death itself, he said. He was ready to drink the cup. And he was ready to climb the whole range of mountains still ahead.

Are we, at long last, ready to resume the climb?

Having seen and smelled the smoldering fires of both the 1965 Watts riots and of South-Central Los Angeles less than a year ago, I know that Martin would have found it a scandal to let another generation of young Americans fall into a vicious cycle of poverty, drugs, crime, prison and death. If he had been with us these last 25 years, he would have been leading the action to meet the crisis of our cities and of the young in our cities.

This year, from June 11–13, we will have days of action and learning at Pennsylvania's first statewide Martin Luther King, Jr. Youth Assembly. Some 500 teenagers from throughout Pennsylvania will gather in Harrisburg to learn of King's nonviolent philosophy and how to apply it to resolving conflicts in their own lives and communities.

During our 3-day conference, we will work to help young people value not only their civil rights, but also their civic responsibilities. They will learn valuable skills for school, for work, for life. They will join together in discussions of a central question of our cities: "How Do We Stop the Violence?"

Since Martin was a man of action, it's important that a conference in his name include more than just talk. So the participants will work with social service agencies who serve the homeless and others in need. And after the conference is over, the volunteer service will continue in communities across the State.

The Federal King Holiday Commission, which has sponsored five national youth assemblies, hopes that our action in Pennsylvania will become contagious. So my office will be ready to help other States organize their own MLK, Jr. youth assemblies.

The King Commission has been very cost-effective. It has taken strong action. It is good that all 50 States have adopted the national holiday. But this milestone doesn't mean the Commission's work is done. On the contrary, I think the most important work is just beginning.

Nothing would have ticked Martin off more than people supposedly honoring him by sitting on their duffs watching the tube or sleeping late.

The King holiday should be a day on not a day off. A day of action, not apathy. A day of responding to community needs, not a day of rest and recreation.

So my old civil rights colleague of the Selma march, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, and I have introduced legislation designed to remember Martin the way he would have liked: a day that reflects his proposition that "everybody can be great because everybody can serve." A day that brings the greatness out in people by bringing them together to make a difference in their communities. Fixing parks, tutoring children, rebuilding schools, feeding the hungry, immunizing children, housing the homeless.

Imagine what 10 million Americans could do in just 1 day of community service. And think what they could do if they carried on that service throughout the whole year. Our legislation is designed to enable the current Commission to organize the holiday as a fitting tribute to Dr. King, a day of interracial cooperation and community service.

It will link the King Commission with another innovative Commission, the Commission on National and Community Service created by the Con-

gress in 1990. Working together, the Commissions will use existing funds to provide grants to States, local governments, colleges and universities, school districts, local and State education associations, private industry councils, labor unions or community-based organizations to encourage service opportunities in conjunction with the holiday.

The night that Dr. King was assassinated Robert Kennedy went into the streets of Indianapolis, to give the news to a waiting throng of black citizens. He was determined to try to stop the kind of burning and bloodshed we saw once again last year in south-central Los Angeles.

At that meeting arranged by my friend, colleague and House sponsor of this legislation, JOHN LEWIS, he said:

What we need in the United States is not division. What we need in the United States is not hatred. What we need in the United States is not violence or lawlessness, but love and wisdom and compassion toward one another. And the feeling of justice towards those who still suffer in our country, whether they be white or be black. Let us dedicate ourselves to that and say a prayer for our country and for our people. Let us dedicate ourselves to what the Greeks wrote so many years ago—to tame the savageness of man and to make gentle the life of this world.

On January 18, 1993 at my alma mater Howard University, President Clinton said:

More than anyone else, Martin Luther King lived and died in the fight to remind us of what is the greatest struggle in our lives in the present day—how to close the gap between our words and our deeds.

Some have said it's time to sunset the King Commission and no longer try to organize the holiday to be something more than a day of rest, recreation and work. Instead, we need this Commission to work actively to make the day a sunrise of reflection and service.

Words, Martin's words, will always be part of what we celebrate. Next to Lincoln's, his are probably the most moving words in American history. But let us remember Martin most of all his deeds and by our own.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a summary be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 774

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 "King Holiday and Service Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. FEDERAL HOLIDAY COMMISSION.

The Act entitled "An Act to establish a commission to assist in the first observance of the Federal legal holiday honoring Martin Luther King, Jr.", approved August 27, 1984 (36 U.S.C. 169j et seq.; Public Law 98-399; 98 Stat. 1473) is amended—

(1) in section 3(1) by inserting "including service opportunities" after "activities";

(2) in section 4 by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(e)(1) No less than 3 of the members appointed to the Commission under the provisions of subsection (a)(6) shall be under the age of 29 years on the date of such appointment.

"(2) The requirement under paragraph (1) shall apply with regard to appointments made during fiscal year 1994 and each fiscal year thereafter.

"(f) The Chairperson of the Board of the Commission on National and Community Service established under section 190 of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12651) shall be an ex officio member of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission. Such ex officio member shall be a voting member.";

(3) in section 6(a) by striking out "grade GS-18 of the General Schedule under section 5332" and inserting in lieu thereof "a position above GS-15 of the General Schedule under section 5108";

(4) in section 7 by striking out "$300,000 for fiscal year 1989 and each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years." and inserting in lieu thereof "$300,000 for each of fiscal years 1994 and 1995 and such funds as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 1996 and 1997.";

(5) in section 8 by inserting after "under this Act" the following: "or under section 168 of the National and Community Service Act of 1990"; and

(6) in section 9 by striking out "April 20, 1994" and inserting in lieu thereof "until terminated by law".

SEC. 3. NATIONAL SERVICE DAY.

Part IV of subtitle E of title I of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12621 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 168. NATIONAL SERVICE DAY.

"(a) GRANTS.—The Commission may make grants under section 102 to eligible entities to pay for the Federal share of the cost of planning and carrying out service opportunities on the Federal legal holiday honoring the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr.

"(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—To be eligible to receive a grant under subsection (a), an entity shall be a State, community, institution of higher education, local educational agency, State educational agency, a private industry council established under section 102 of the Job Training Partnership Act (29 U.S.C. 1512), or a community-based agency.

"(c) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under subsection (a), an entity shall submit an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Commission may require.

"(d) CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS.—

"(1) CONSULTATION.—In making grants under subsection (a), the Commission shall consult with the Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission.

"(2) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission shall review the applications submitted under subsection (c) and make recommendations with respect to the entities that shall be eligible to receive a grant under subsection (a).

"(3) SELECTION.—The Commission shall not make a grant under subsection (a) to an entity unless the Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission has recommended that the entity be eligible to receive such a grant.

"(e) FEDERAL SHARE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of the cost of planning and carrying out the activities described in subsection (a) shall be 30 percent.

"(2) CALCULATION.—The State and local share of such cost may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including facilities, equipment, or services.".

(b) DEFINITION.—Section 101(23) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 12511(23)) is amended by striking out "students or out-of-school youth" and inserting in lieu thereof "participants or volunteers in programs under this Act".

(c) REPORT.—Section 172(b)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 12632(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Each such report shall also contain an evaluation, conducted under section 179, of the service opportunities carried out under section 168.".

(d) EX OFFICIO MEMBER.—Section 190(b)(1)(B) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 12651(b)(1)(B)) is amended by striking out "and the Director of the ACTION agency" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Director of the ACTION Agency, and the chairperson of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission".

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 501(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 12681(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof "and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1994 through 1999."; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) at the end of subparagraph (C), by striking out "and";

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

"(D) $300,000 shall be available to carry out section 168; and".

(f) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—Section 1(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 12401 note) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 167 the following:

"Sec. 168. National service day.".

THE KING HOLIDAY AND SERVICE ACT OF 1993—BILL SUMMARY

The best spirit of Martin Luther King is captured in one of his most famous quotes: "Everybody can be great because everybody can serve." Throughout his life, Dr. King sought to forge the common ground on which people from all walks of life can come together as equals to address issue of community need.

This bill, the King Holiday and Service Act of 1993, will make the annual King holiday reflect Dr. King's values and ideals. The bill's central purpose is to transform the observance of Martin Luther King's birthday into a national day of service.

Specifically, the bill amends the Martin Luther King Jr. Federal Holiday Commission Act of 1989 and the National and Community Service Act of 1990 to: create a National Service Day on the King Holiday; make the promotion of community service an explicit part of the King Commission's purpose; extend the Martin Luther King Jr. Federal Holiday Commission until terminated by law and to authorize funding for this Commission for four years—two years at $300,000, it's current authorization levels and two years for such sums as may be necessary; and require evaluation and reporting to Congress on the success of the Commission and the National Service Day program.

Representative John Lewis, another former colleague of Dr. King's is introducing this legislation in the House of Representatives.

SENATE RESOLUTION 94—RELATIVE TO SUDAN

Mr. SIMON (for himself, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Mr.

FEINGOLD) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 94

Whereas a civil conflict in Sudan has resulted in a severe humanitarian emergency that has placed an estimated 4,000,000 people at risk;

Whereas the resulting emergency conditions require an increase in the action and attention devoted to Sudan by the international community;

Whereas the United States Centers for Disease Control found during a recent visit to Sudan that as many as 80 percent of the children in many areas of Sudan are malnourished;

Whereas certain populations of Sudanese are acutely vulnerable as a result of the military policies of the Sudan Government and of fighting between factions of the Sudan People's Liberation Army (SPLA) in southern Sudan;

Whereas on June 30, 1989, the National Salvation Revolutionary Command Council suspended the Sudan constitution, dissolved all political institutions in Sudan, and banned or dissolved all political parties, civic organizations, trade unions, professional associations, social organizations, and privately-owned mass media in Sudan;

Whereas the National Salvation Revolutionary and Command Council has taken control of the judiciary in Sudan, has granted itself sweeping powers to detain Sudanese citizens under the National Security Act and other laws, and has promoted a pattern of arbitrary arrest, detention with charge or trial, and torture;

Whereas, according to Amnesty International, such detention includes the detention of at least 250 people in Khartoum, Sudan;

Whereas the Sudan Government has engaged in a campaign of ethnic cleansing, forcibly relocating tens of thousands of Nuba people from Kordofan Province and killing hundreds;

Whereas the 1993 World Report of the International Labor Organization states that "traditional slavery survives in modern-day Sudan" and that such slavery "seems to be on the increase" as a result of raids by armed militia in the border areas between northern and southern Sudan;

Whereas Amnesty International reports that hundreds of people were executed without trial or other judicial process by Sudan Government forces in Juba and that more than 100 men arrested in Juba in mid-1992 have disappeared;

Whereas, in October 1992, the Congress agreed to a resolution condemning human rights and humanitarian abuses in Sudan;

Whereas, on December 4, 1992, the United Nations General Assembly agreed to a resolution condemning human rights abuses in Sudan;

Whereas, on March 10, 1993, the United Nations Human Rights Commission agreed to a resolution appointing a Special Rapporteur for Human Rights for Sudan;

Whereas, despite these resolutions and other measures, reports indicate that widespread human rights violations continue in Sudan;

Whereas the Sudan Government denies the existence of such violations;

Whereas the Sudan Government and factions of the SPLA have signed a series of agreements with the United Nations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in Nairobi, Kenya, and Khartoum whose purpose is to improve access to populations of Sudanese people in need of emergency aid, and the parties have demonstrated a willingness to take further actions in responding to the humanitarian crisis in Sudan through an on-going process of negotiation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) strongly condemns the egregious human rights abuses of the Sudan Government and calls upon the Sudan Government to cease such abuses;

(2) deplores the internecine fighting among factions of the Sudan People's Liberation Army (SPLA) which has caused an increase in the number of deaths of Sudanese civilians;

(3) urges the Sudan Government and factions of the SPLA to grant immediate and full access to areas of needy people in Sudan to humanitarian relief organizations; and

(4) calls upon the President—

(A) to act expeditiously to avert a humanitarian disaster of unprecedented proportions in Sudan by expanding relief operations (including airlift, airdrops, and other means of delivering humanitarian supplies;

(B) to increase the amount and expedite delivery of financial assistance to non-governmental organizations that supply emergency aid to southern Sudan;

(C) to urge the United Nations to address actively and energetically issues relating to Sudan by encouraging the United Nations—

(i) to pass a United Nations Security Council Resolution on Sudan;

(ii) to appoint a United Nations Special Representative for Sudan;

(iii) to negotiate agreements with the Sudan Government and the SPLA for the expansion of corridors of access to Sudan (including access along the Sudan-Uganda border) for the supply of humanitarian relief and for the safe passage and free movement of civilians in and through Sudan;

(iv) to explore the creation of internationally monitored demilitarized zones and resettlement zones in southern Sudan in which Sudan Government forces, factions of the SPLA, and militia would not be allowed;

(v) to place human rights monitors under the jurisdiction of the United Nations in areas of Sudan affected by the fighting and human rights abuses in Sudan; and

(vi) to support the on-going negotiations for a cease-fire between the Sudan Government and various factions of the SPLA;

(D) to appoint a United States Special Negotiator to work with the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity, the Sudan Government, factions of the SPLA, and governments of nations of the region; and

(E) to take immediate action in the international community with a view toward putting pressure on any party in Sudan that obstructs the delivery of humanitarian assistance into ceasing such obstruction, including imposing sanctions against such party or taking such other actions as the President considers appropriate.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, it was 6 short months ago that I stood in this Chamber to introduce a resolution on the grave humanitarian crisis in Sudan. That resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 140, passed readily in mid-October of last year, and I have heard since from many sources that officials of the Sudanese Government were aware of that resolution and its provisions.

It should not be necessary, therefore, to have to stand before you again in this new congressional session to introduce another resolution on the situation in Sudan. Yet I am compelled to do so, because the suffering of the Sudanese people has not been alleviated either by the Government of the Sudan or by those forces in opposition to the Government. Indeed, the suffering of the people has increased, and many have died, because of the indifference of their leaders.

The world has come to know of the starvation in Somalia, a country bordering on Sudan. The United States, working with many other countries in the United Nations, took the lead with bold action to deliver humanitarian relief supplies to that country, and in the process, ensured with its own troops that international relief would get to those in need. Most of the world does not know, however, that similar suffering and starvation exists in Somalia's neighbor, Sudan. Many otherwise well-informed people would be surprised to learn that perhaps twice as many people in southern Sudan face starvation as did in Somalia. No one knows for sure, but estimates of as many as 4 million people at risk in southern Sudan alone are credible.

Suffering and dying in Sudan is happening because the Government of Sudan is abusing its citizens while prosecuting a civil war against rebels in the southern part of the country. Suffering and dying in Sudan is happening also because the various factions of the rebel Sudan Peoples' Liberation Army are fighting each other and the Government without apparent regard for the lives of the civilians caught in the middle of the fighting. In the meantime, international relief provided by the United Nations and many nongovernmental organizations is not getting through or is denied outright by Government or rebel action.

This terrible situation cannot be allowed to continue. The resolution that I am introducing today in conjunction with my colleagues Senators KASSEBAUM, JEFFORDS, and FEINGOLD, urges the Government of Sudan and the factions of the SPLA to allow humanitarian relief organizations immediate and full access to areas of need in Sudan. In addition, the resolution calls upon the President to act urgently to expand relief operations including airlifts, airdrops, and other means to deliver humanitarian supplies where they are needed most. Our resolution also asks the President to appoint a United States special negotiator to work with the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity, and the Sudanese parties to establish internationally monitored demilitarized zones and resettlement routes where life can begin again for at least some of the desperate Sudanese people while negotiations for a cease-fire are pursued.

The world must take greater active responsibility for the suffering people of Sudan. Our resolution represents one

step in that direction. However, it is the leaders of Sudan, both in the Government and within the factions of the SPLA, that must in the end bear responsibility for the welfare of the citizens of their country. We call on those leaders to step forward, negotiate on behalf of their people, institute a cease-fire, and cooperate with international efforts to save the people of Sudan.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, APRIL 5, 1993

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, if there is no other Senator seeking recognition, I now ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 9 a.m. on Monday, April 5; that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date and the time for the two leaders reserved for their use later in the day; that the Senate then resume consideration of H.R. 1335, the emergency supplemental appropriations bill; that at 10:30 a.m., without intervening action or debate, the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the committee substitute to H.R. 1335, with the mandatory live quorum being waived.

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

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I now ask that the Senate return to consideration of H.R. 1335.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1335) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes.

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I now send a cloture motion to the desk and I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on Committee Substitute to H.R. 1335, the emergency supplemental appropriations bill:

Wendell Ford, Pat Leahy, Patty Murray, Barbara Boxer, George Mitchell, Daniel Inouye, Dianne Feinstein, Claiborne Pell, Robert C. Byrd, David Pryor, Jim Sasser, Tom Daschle, Paul Sarbanes, John Kerry, John Glenn, Byron L. Dorgan, Paul Wellstone, Carol Moseley-Braun.

RECESS UNTIL MONDAY, APRIL 5, 1993 AT 9 A.M.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate today, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess as previously ordered.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 2:25 p.m., recessed until Monday, April 5, 1993, at 9 a.m.