

SENATE—Monday, April 5, 1993

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 3, 1993)

The Senate met at 9 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable THOMAS A. DASCHLE, a Senator from the State of South Dakota.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray:

For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.—Romans 3:23.

God of Passover, who emancipated Israel from bondage to Egypt, deliver America from bondage to secularism.

We do not like the word "sin," and yet, it is at the bottom of all trouble and tragedy in human history. Education, legislation, administration cannot touch it.

President Lincoln recognized this in his 1863 proclamation for a day of prayer and fasting. "We have grown in numbers, wealth and power as no other nation has ever grown. But we have forgotten God. * * * And we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us. It behooves us, then, to humble ourselves, to confess our national sins, and to pray for clemency and forgiveness."

Gracious God, when we fail to recognize the problem of sin, all our efforts are like rearranging the furniture while the house is burning down. Give us the wisdom to take account of sin and seek the forgiveness of a loving Saviour, in whose name we pray. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, April 5, 1993.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule 1, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable THOMAS A. DASCHLE, a Senator from the State of South Dakota, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. DASCHLE thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, 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.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized.

The Chair would advise the Senate that there is no time agreement presently in effect.

Mr. BYRD. There is no time agreement.

Mr. President, this is the ninth day on which the Senate has been debating the President's jobs bill. We have been mired down now for several days in a Republican filibuster.

At first, I reported from the committee a committee substitute, which made one change in the bill that the House had sent to the Senate, a change with reference to the formula in respect to summer jobs.

Senator HATFIELD and I then offered an amendment on the floor to guard against providing funds in this bill for the items that we had heard raised during the debate in the other body, and we set up a safeguard against those.

Then there were other lists brought in on the Senate floor of items that were not in this bill and which the administration indicated would not be funded under moneys in this act. But nevertheless, the criticism continued.

And so I then offered legislation which provided that the Office of Man-

agement and Budget Director would publish in the Federal Register the regulations governing applications for funds in the act and also providing that the OMB Director act to prevent the expenditure of funds for such items as were in the lists. There were two books of lists constituting about, I would guess about 1,700 pages.

Mr. President, time and time again we have indicated, stated very carefully—the President has stated, the OMB Director has stated, and the amendment now in the substitute, which I have included therein has made it very clear—that funds will not be spent for such items as ice skating rinks heating, bike paths, golf courses, et cetera, et cetera. But the claim continues.

Now, Mr. President, the warning signals are out. We see them everywhere. We saw them in last Wednesday's Wall Street Journal. The headlines: "Consumer Confidence Index Slips Again, Raising Fears That Recovery May Stall." And reading the first paragraph:

Consumer confidence fell in March for the third straight month, raising concerns that the newfound firmness in the economy may be in jeopardy.

And so there it is. For the second consecutive month, I believe, consumer confidence has slipped after an initial bound brought forth by the Clinton programs that have been enunciated for the recovery. Then the confidence began to slip. What else happened?

What other warning lights are on? Last Friday it was stated that the rate of unemployment in this country was 7 percent for the second straight month. In other words, unemployment today is two-tenths of 1 percent higher than it was at the trough of the recession, 23 months ago, at the bottom of the recession, 23 months ago, at which time it was 6.8 percent. And it is well over 1 point higher, probably well over 1.5 points higher, than it was when the recession first began.

So there is the warning signal—continued unemployment.

Food stamps. More than 1 out of 10 Americans is on food stamps. And today we are told that those in the food stamp lines are a different kind of American. We find millions—management, people who held middle-management positions in large corporations who are out of a jobs; people with college degrees who have lost work—who are on food stamps. The greatest Nation on the face of the Earth has over 10 percent of its people living on food

stamps—26 million on food stamps. That is a disgrace. We all ought to be ashamed of that. We can do better.

Then there are over 14 million people on the AFDC rolls, aid to families with dependent children; and over 32 million on Medicaid throughout this country. Again, the highest on food stamps, the highest on AFDC rolls, the highest on the Medicaid rolls.

These are all warning signals. We find people who have been cut off from IBM, General Motors, Boeing, Sears-Roebuck, a long list of companies that would make it look like the Fortune 500—people on food stamps.

We are told that for every 1 percent increase in unemployment, that means 1.1 million more Americans out of work. And for every 1 percent increase in unemployment, the deficit goes up \$50 billion.

We are talking about wanting to reduce the deficit. We all want to reduce the deficit. And this President campaigned on a program of reducing the deficit. He also campaigned on a program of increasing the investments in our own country and putting people back to work. So his proposal is a broad one—cutting the deficit, long-term investment, and short-term investments to provide jobs now, in the immediate future.

At the summit in 1990, I said time and time again, we have not only a Federal fiscal deficit, we have a Federal trade deficit, and we have an investment deficit, and, for the past 12 years, we have failed to invest in America's future, failed to invest in America's people, failed to invest in the infrastructure of this country, its bridges, its highways, its airports, its waterways, its water and sewerage facilities, education, civilian research and development. All down the line we have failed to invest.

Other countries have invested. Take the 10 largest economies in the world. Japan, at the top with respect to the percentage of gross domestic product, invested in infrastructure, public investment, Japan at the top; Spain the second; Australia, third; Germany, fourth; The Netherlands; France; Italy; Canada; United Kingdom. At the bottom Uncle Sam, good old United States of America, investing less as a percentage of gross domestic product than any of those nine nations that I have listed. These are the 10 largest economies of the world. But as to the percentage of investment of GDP in their infrastructure, the United States is the last.

Mr. President, I noted with some amusement our Republican friends who say they cannot offer amendments. They had the opportunity to offer amendments. First they would not offer the amendments. The opportunity was there. They complained about a stacked tree in which I, as the manager of the bill, had placed two substitutes.

Mr. President, I stacked that tree because I was concerned that the triple

B amendment, Boren-Breaux-Bryan, three Democratic Senators, I was concerned that until such time as their problem with the bill had been resolved, we would be divided on our side and we could not, of course, face off the assault from the other side of the aisle from the Republicans.

Therefore, I stacked the tree, and the Democrats on my side of the aisle, three Senators, were in consultations with me, with the White House, with the majority leader, and others. Senators BREAUX, BOREN, and BRYAN finally resolved their problems. At that time, I took down the tree, opened it up, because we had resolved the division on our side of the aisle.

Then our Republican friends took great umbrage at Senator Byrd's having stacked the tree. I said, well, I was just doing what had to be done. It had to be done in order to cure the division on my side of the aisle.

I only did what the distinguished majority leader, the Republican leader, had done in the Senate here in 1985. I will spend but just a moment on this, but just to show what the distinguished Republican leader did, within his rights, within the rules, on the first concurrent budget resolution in 1985. Here was the chart at that time, to be found on page 70 in the old rules manual.

When I stacked two amendments early on in this debate, I stacked A and B, both substitutes. That is all I stacked. In 1985, if we use this same chart, the Republican leader began by offering a substitute to the resolution. Then he offered a perfecting amendment designated as "C" on the chart. Then he offered an amendment to the C amendment designated as "D" on the chart. As long as these amendments were pending, of course, the positions A and B were closed.

Then the distinguished Republican leader, within his rights and within the rules, proceeded to lay down an amendment at position E and then an amendment at position F. Thus far, he had laid down five amendments, effectively blocking the then minority leader, Robert Byrd, and all Democrats from offering any amendments.

Then following that, the distinguished Republican leader, the majority leader at that time, Mr. DOLE, offered a motion to recommit with instructions. He then offered an amendment to the text of the instructions, A, and then a perfecting amendment, C, to the amendment of the text, thus, effectively blocking out a substitute amendment.

So here the distinguished Republican leader had offered seven amendments over the course of 3 or 4 days, effectively blocking out all Democratic amendments. Did I scream? Did I complain? I said, well, I do not like this, but I said the Republican leader is acting within his rights, he is acting with-

in the rules. He has the right of first recognition, which he should have. That has been the custom, and that is the way it ought to be. But with the then majority leader's right of first recognition, I did not have a hope or a prayer. There were seven amendments erected, blocking three trees effectively. All we Democrats could do was just sit on our hands.

So, Mr. President, enough of that. I wanted to explain for the RECORD the story of the trees.

Mr. President, what you see here now is politics—politics—being played by our Republican friends. Mr. President, I want to make it clear. Not all Democrats are alike. They come in varying shades on the ideological spectrum. Some are way over to the left, some are more in the middle, some are over on the right. Our Republican friends are the same. They are not all the way over on the extreme side. There are some moderate Republicans. I am sure that they cannot say it, will not say it, and I would not expect them to say it, but I am sure that in their hearts some of them would rather we would get on with this bill, and they probably really do not want to be cast in the image of filibustering the bill. But that is the position their party has taken. So I can understand their position.

I can understand the situation in which they are placed. Mr. President, we have a new President here, and I have served in Congress under Mr. Truman—17 days under Mr. Truman—Mr. Eisenhower, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Ford, Mr. Carter, Mr. Reagan, and Mr. Bush. And never have I seen in my career, which is now 40 years in the Congress, an attempt made to shackle an American President in the first 75 days of his Presidency, within the first 100 days—today is the 75th. Here we are. We have had a filibuster going on by the other side of the aisle for days now. First, they did not want to offer amendments. Then when I removed the tree, they offered some amendments and they had them rejected. I think there might have been one that was agreed to, but I believe that they have offered 10, had one agreed to and 9 tabled.

So, for a while, they offered amendments and had them tabled. And then they decided, after filibustering by amendment, to filibuster by letter. So they wrote that well-publicized letter, 42 signatures, 42 Republican Senators, sending a letter to their leader in which they said in part: "Therefore, we will not vote to invoke cloture on this measure as presently constituted, notwithstanding the scheduled Easter recess." I do not think the Easter recess has anything to do with it. We get paid year around, Mr. President, the same salary, whether we are here or whether we are not.

I can remember back in the old days, I think we were out for Easter perhaps

Thursday and Friday, Good Friday and Saturday and Sunday and back on Monday or Tuesday. That was in the old days. Now we are out 2 weeks. That is all right.

But, today we have a serious situation existing in this country with joblessness—7 percent unemployed. That is only those who are full-time unemployed; that does not count the part-time unemployed. That does not count those who have been unemployed, who have grown discouraged and who have stopped looking for work.

Here, Mr. President, we have a new President who has offered a plan, who was elected on a program of change, changing the economic policies of this country, a program of putting people back to work, a program of investing in this country's infrastructure, investing in its physical infrastructure and investing in its human infrastructure. Mr. President, he is being hobbled, he is being chained, and he is being hampered by a group of fine Republicans who have elected to filibuster—filibuster. They cannot change the bill by amendment, but after it has been demonstrated that they cannot change the bill by amendment, they say, well, you have to rewrite the bill and make it the way we want it.

Mr. President, that reminds me of the XYZ affair which occurred in the early days of our Republic. When Charles Cotesworth Pinckney was sent as one of three ambassadors to France to try to work out some conditions for peace, Pinckney said, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute." That was the spirit of the old America. Yet, our Republican friends say, we cannot amend the bill; you have to rewrite it to suit us.

Mr. President, that is a kind of blackmail and, of course, if they succeed in this, it is going to be done again and again and again. Mr. President, the American people do not want to pay tribute to gridlock. The American people thought we were through with gridlock. The American people want this President to have a chance.

When Mr. Reagan was elected, I said to my people in West Virginia, "Mr. Reagan deserves to have a chance." I voted for Mr. Reagan's tax cut. I voted for his massive military buildup. My Democrats did not write me a letter saying that that bill had to be changed, or we would not vote for cloture. I believe we had a larger minority at that time than the Republicans now have.

But we did not choose to go down the road of filibuster, of shackling a new President, of threatening political blackmail. We did not choose that. We gave the President a chance. I say let us give this President a chance. Every new President has been given a chance at the beginning of his term for his program.

So, Mr. President, I plead with our Republican friends to reassess their position in this situation.

Here we are, Mr. President. My Republican friend, and he is my friend, the Republican leader, Mr. DOLE, on January 14 of this year, according to an AP wire, had this to say.

Mr. DOLE said he hoped Democrats and Republicans would stop political finger-pointing about the deficit and other problems to provide a chance for Clinton and the Congress to work together.

"I think we ought to have a truce, stop the politics for 90 days and let us see what we can do," said DOLE.

There it is. The Republican leader himself saying, "I think we ought to have a truce." The Republican leader himself saying, "* * * stop the politics for 90 days and let us see what we can do." Mr. President, has it been 90 days?

It is only the 75th day and there is no truce. The Republicans have elected not to have a truce. The Republicans have elected not to stop the politics. The Republicans have elected to filibuster and not give Mr. Clinton's programs a chance.

Did the distinguished Senator from Maryland wish me to yield?

Mr. President, I hope that we will lower our voices and see what we are doing to the country, see what we are doing to this country's future. The American people are wondering why it is that this President is not being given a chance, as we have given to other Presidents—the same chance that we gave to Mr. Reagan. The American people are wondering. I am sure they thought we had gotten rid of gridlock. Now they see gridlock as tight as ever.

Then the same Wall Street Journal of last Wednesday, March 31, as I say, pointed out "Senate Republicans Threaten to Block Clinton Stimulus Package Until It Is Cut."

This is the President's package, the President's jobs package. He has said that we need it. It is fulfilling a promise that the President made that he would put people to work, and I think we ought to let him have it.

Mr. President, I do not know how many of my colleagues on the other side will remember that 2 years ago, at the request of the Bush administration, the Congress approved emergency legislation to provide financial aid to the nations of Israel, and Turkey, as well as to refugees from Iraq.

In the Senate, the vote on final passage of the bill that provided aid to the nations of Israel and Turkey was 92 to 8, with 82 percent of those Senators on the other side of the aisle, 82 percent of the Republicans, supporting final passage. And 30 Members who today still sit on the other side of the aisle of the Senate voted for that emergency supplemental appropriations bill. Mr. President, I wonder where they are today.

As to the humanitarian assistance provided for Iraqi refugees, that emer-

gency supplemental bill passed the Senate by a voice vote. Where are those voices today?

President Clinton has asked Congress to use the same emergency provisions that were used to provide assistance to people living in foreign lands 2 years ago to now pass legislation that will provide assistance to people living in the United States. Yet, pending before the Senate is an amendment—not pending before the Senate—but the Republican leader has an amendment at the desk, that would strike over two-thirds of the assistance that the President is seeking to help stimulate our economy and put Americans back to work.

Do the proponents of this amendment believe that the American people are any less deserving of a helping hand than the people of Israel, Turkey, or Iraq?

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject the amendment by Mr. DOLE, if it is ever called up. I doubt that it will be. But I hope the Senate will reject the amendment that he has indicated he intends to offer. I hope that the Senate will strike down such an alternative, just as we voted down amendment after amendment designed to maintain the gridlock that has too long gripped our Government.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield to any Senator or to yield the floor.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that prior to the cloture vote at 10:30 a.m., the time for debate be equally divided and controlled between Senator HATFIELD and myself, and this would include the time that I have consumed thus far, and for debate only.

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

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I too would like to see the present impasse that we have reached concluded.

Mr. President, we have been presented again this morning with an analysis that somehow any difference of opinion that the Republican side of the aisle or other Democrats have on this package is motivated by politics.

I can remember years ago there were 17 Republicans on this side of the aisle, 17 at a time when the Senate consisted of 96 Members. Of course, they could not divide the aisle as it is divided today. So there was what they called the Cherokee strip of Democrats that surrounded the Republicans across the back of this side of the aisle and the 17 Republicans were down here in this front part of the Chamber.

This was very interesting because with that kind of strength, President Roosevelt could have had any piece of legislation he wanted. But there were voices of opposition at that time raised on both sides. Just because the Presi-

dent proposes a plan does not mean the Congress has to buckle under and be nothing but a rubber stamp for the President of the United States. Certainly, if at any time a rubber stamp existed, it was during those early days of the New Deal.

Now, that led Mr. Roosevelt to the proposal at some point in time, in 1937 to be exact, because he did not like the Supreme Court as it was constituted, to propose restructuring the Supreme Court—power, power in the hands of the Chief Executive.

The chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from West Virginia, has given some of the most eloquent statements on this floor against the line-item veto by recalling through history unchecked, unlimited power in the hands of an executive, not this country, but any country with an executive without a check and balance of the so-called legislative branch of Government and the judicial branch of Government in our country.

I only cite this historic reference to indicate that whenever the President sends up any proposal, it is our duty and responsibility to analyze it and not merely say, well, because he is new, he has had only a few months in office, or because he is our party's President, he deserves just unanimous assent to anything that he proposes.

Let us move it down to this very specific point. It is interesting to note that it was not just Republicans that wanted to change this proposal of the President, it was the Democrats—Mr. BREAU, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. KOHL, and there were others. Go back to the vote on some of these proposals. Mr. EXON, Mr. KERREY of Nebraska, Mr. NUNN of Georgia, and other Democrats had voted for changes.

This did not have the unanimous support of even the majority party. But, no, we were locked in where a meaningful amendment was not possible to propose by either side, not just Republicans, 99 Senators out of 100. I was in that privileged group of two where we did propose an amendment, that was when it first came to the floor.

It was, in fact, a very meaningful amendment. But it was one of the ones that were not accepted.

Mr. President, what has happened up to this point—I watched the tube this morning on the morning news, and there was a leading Democrat from the Senate saying it is time now to come to a compromise and modify this proposal—a Democrat.

So lest there be a bit of imagery out here that the Republicans are the only ones that do not fully agree and would like to see some modification and some changes, I think the report in the media indicates there are at least some Democrats as well who would like to see some changes.

The chairman of the Appropriations Committee and I have been associated

for many years in our roles on the Appropriations Committee. I think the chairman will agree that we have fought shoulder to shoulder for causes that he has talked about this morning.

The infrastructure—I will take a backseat to no Senator as to my commitment to building this country's infrastructure. And I am also delighted to be able to join hands across the aisle with the chairman, who has been as dedicated a leader as anyone I know in this Senate as to building or rebuilding our infrastructure.

Humanitarian care of our people—just to make a sharper point, Mr. President, there is not one penny of money in this for food stamps. I have voted for food stamps ever since I have been in the Senate, and will continue to do so. I agree, it is a disgrace that so many of our American people have to depend upon food stamps.

Aid to Families With Dependent Children—there is not one penny of money for aid to dependent children in this bill. I, too, have supported aid to dependent children throughout my political life and will continue to do so.

Mr. President, we have heard a great deal about all these so-called projects that have lesser appeal, perhaps as a result of the debate, then they may have had when the mayors proposed them under the community development block grants.

But let me remind the body that, with my vote and the majority of our committee, we had \$4 billion for community development block grants in the current 1993 appropriations bill, and not more than 2 percent of that \$4 billion has been committed, obligated. It is there. Yet, this bill says, "Spend \$2 billion more."

Some of us say, "Wait a minute. If you have obligated only 2 percent of the \$4 billion we have already appropriated, why increase the deficit at this moment in time when we have other appropriation supplements coming down the track, and the 1994 appropriations bills coming down the track? Why should we do it at this moment?"

More spending. People in my State say, cut spending; cut spending.

Now, they say, "Well, the President has a big picture here of a package with the budget resolution."

Mr. President, let us remember the distinction. A budget resolution is nothing but a declaration of intent. That is all. It has to go through the process of the Finance Committee and the process of the Appropriations Committee. And that is way down the road, months from now.

But this is a supplemental appropriations bill, which means raise spending now, this moment. Any reductions of the so-called Clinton package or any reductions in spending or any increase of taxes in all that big package is months down the road.

This is, today, to raise spending \$16 billion—and do not pay for it; do not pay for it. There is no offset on this.

That is not what I hear from the American people, especially on that part of the Clinton package that says we want to raise the taxes of seniors; we want to raise taxes on fuel, taxes on use of fuel. In effect, what I hear the people saying is: Until you demonstrate the seriousness of the Government to cut spending, do not come and ask us to increase our tax bite.

I think that the chairman and I could sit down at this very moment and put together a legitimate proposal as a modification.

I do not have any disagreement—and there is not a Republican on this side that has a disagreement—on the \$4 billion for unemployment compensation; not one.

All right. Let us start with the cornerstone of \$4 billion for unemployment compensation. I think there would be a very substantial number of Republicans on this side of the aisle that would say, "Let's take that \$3 billion for highway construction out of the highway trust fund and add that."

All right. That is \$7 billion. I think you would find a substantial number of Republicans who would say, "Let's take some money for further immunization of our children." I think you would have a substantial number there, let us say \$300 million as a hypothetical situation here.

I think you would find a number of Republicans that would say, "Let's pay for it. Let's pay for that immunization. Let us just not chalk it up on the deficit. Let's pay for it now."

Let me remind you, we went through a war in Vietnam and we did not pay for it. That is part of our problem today. That is part of the great escalation of our national debt. In all of that costly war—costly in lives, but also costly in dollars—we all said, "Put it on the cuff."

You can go back and start back, if you want to, in 1933, and say this is a locomotive that has been coming down this track for 50 years—Depression, World War II, Korea, cold war, Vietnam, always on the cuff. And now, today, we are facing very, very serious consequences.

Let us not continue that kind of practice that brought us here today, even doing it again today, as if we had learned nothing from the past of putting it on the cuff. That is what this bill does.

Not \$1 of offset. Pay for it later. Increase \$16 billion for spending today.

Let me add further, Mr. President, I think that that would give us, say, a package close to \$8 billion. And I think, more specifically, jobs now; not down the road—jobs now.

I am not sure how much immunization we have even committed and obligated—\$342 million in the current bill; that is the regular fiscal year 1993 bill.

I am just mentioning these items because I do believe, Mr. President, we

have reached a place where Democrats and Republicans would like to see some change in this bill that has been declared sacrosanct—President Clinton's package; we cannot change it.

I hope I am never here long enough that I do not think, when a Republican or Democrat sends up a proposal, that I do not have a right, as an elected Representative of the people, to review and analyze and make some suggestions. If not, why have the Congress?

That, to me, is the role of the Congress, the responsible role of divided powers in this country, to stop over-concentration of political power.

What I am saying is, at no time have the Republicans been saying other than: Give us a chance to have some kind of a participating role.

And I also would like to go back to the civil rights bill. Democrats could not get a civil rights bill through. They could not get it through. They had the southern Democrats that were filibustering every time they would come up with the civil rights bill.

But then the day came when Lyndon Johnson, the majority leader, and Everett Dirksen, the Republican leader, said, "Now is the day for civil rights." And the bipartisan effort that was brought together by those two senatorial leaders brought us civil rights legislation.

Mr. President, we could not get a family leave bill, because of the opposition on our side of the aisle, and of the President. And yet the day came when Members of the Democratic Party and Members of the Republican Party got together and said we want a family leave bill, and we achieved it. We did the same thing again with the civil rights—in the adoption last year of the civil rights bill. After it was passed by the Congress, vetoed by the President, again Democratic and Republican got together and said we want the civil rights bill.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATFIELD. And we got one. I will when I am finished.

I think this is the moment when we can find a majority of the people in this body who say we want a supplemental appropriations bill, but it has to be the combined efforts of people on both sides of the aisle, not something that is offered by one side of the aisle—take it or leave it. That is not, to me, the legislative process.

I yield the floor. Does the Senator wish some time?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I just wanted to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. HATFIELD. I will be happy to respond.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Senator. First of all, I do not even need to tell the Senator from Oregon how much I appreciate not only his words but his history here. That is said all the time on the Senate floor, but I really mean it.

This is the question I want to ask the Senator. When the Senator talks about responsibility as a Senator to analyze, debate, deliberate, not to rubber-stamp—I understand that. Is there not a distinction between analyzing, debating, introducing amendments, and voting, as opposed to just using a filibuster—not agree to a time limit—to block? Does the Senator not see a distinction?

And my second question—and these are questions, the political scientist to the historian, if you will—does the Senator not also see a distinction between the way in which filibuster was once upon a time used here in the Senate for the momentous questions of our time, civil rights bills being a good example, as opposed, in the last several years especially—and I just have been here for 2 years and the Senators has this history he can draw from—over and over and over again being used? I think that is part of what is at issue. I put those two questions to my colleague, in good faith.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I think when one goes back to the rules one would have to see there is a distinction made from the historic filibuster when one person, generally—I remember reading about Senator THURMOND talking for over 20 hours, Senator Morse of Oregon for over 20 hours—when the filibuster was sort of the work of one person who was trying to thwart the will of the whole body, or a small group of people, a minority, so to speak.

Then the time came when there was developed in this body by a former Senator from Alabama, Senator Allen, what came to be known as the postcloture filibuster, where once a cloture motion was put down—I can remember Richard Russell of Georgia saying, "I have had my day when a cloture motion is laid down. That means the will of the Senate has to work its way." Even when it was against him. But then came the day when people would mount a postcloture filibuster. But a filibuster was always the last resort.

Today we bring up a cloture motion on a motion to proceed. So the whole system of our filibuster has changed. Indeed it has. This is called a filibuster by amendment. Yet the period of time we have spent on this, I have seen more time spent on other items in my time in the Senate. I must tell my colleague, I filibustered through three cloture petitions on the line-item veto in this body, back during the Republican control of this Senate, to bring it down. And it was brought down.

So they have different results. I am not saying we are in a committed filibuster at this point. You see, usually with a filibuster you want to kill something—you want to kill the idea. With me, regarding the line-item veto, I do not want it at any time. The chairman

of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. BYRD, has in effect threatened and talked for hours upon hours against a line-item veto. That is not the case here.

There are a group of people on this side of the aisle—I will not say everyone—who want a supplemental bill now. We are not trying to filibuster this to kill it. We are trying to filibuster, if you want to use that word against us, in order to have a voice in creating this bill. There is a distinction in that case.

Mr. WELLSTONE. This will be my last question. The Senator has been very gracious with his time and I see the Senator from Pennsylvania wants to speak.

What I cannot understand, both as a Senator and as a political scientist, is this. If the Senator from Oregon and others—whatever the outcome is, whatever the outcome is—believe that "the budget resolution may or may not be serious and therefore we do not know whether the spending cuts are going to take place, we believe this adds to the deficit as opposed to investment that would bring unemployment down and subtract from the deficit," we can have an honest disagreement about that. I have heard people condemn swimming pools. If you own a home next to a lake or river you can condemn a swimming pool, but if you do not, you may believe it is important. But if you believe this is pork, if you believe it is wrong, why not let it come to a vote so the President has a chance to enact his total economic policy as embodied in the present budget resolution, and of course this stimulus? Then the people in the country get a chance to see whether it works or does not work and vote accordingly.

It strikes me what you are doing right now is essentially thwarting the idea of representative democracy and accountability. Am I wrong about that?

And that is my last question. I do not want to take up any more of your time.

Mr. HATFIELD. I say to the Senator, if we were in a normal situation today, where we had a budget of the President up here, which we do not have, therefore it is all speculation yet to some degree. We talk about the President saying he wants to raise taxes on Western lands and then that has now been abandoned. The whole package, in effect, is in a state of evolution. I do not think anybody on this floor, on either side, can tell us precisely what the President is going to have as his final proposal or his bottom line on his economic package. We now have a package which is spending more money with no offsets, it is adding \$16 billion to the deficit. But we really have yet to find out how the so-called other reductions and other revenue enhancements, or new taxes, are going to play out. That is going to be months down the road.

So there is a time lag here. We do know one thing. We will be certain to increase the deficit with no offsets, and increase spending by this package. Everything else is speculative. That is how I would respond.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN). The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair. I thank my distinguished colleagues from Oregon. I begin by complimenting the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee for his comments.

At the outset, I supplement the last answer given by Senator HATFIELD to the question from the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, when Senator WELLSTONE asked, "Why not allow the bill to come up and let it be voted on and let us see how President Clinton's program works out?" I supplement what Senator HATFIELD has responded by adding that the one place where Republicans in Washington, DC, today have sufficient votes to stop a Democratic proposal is in the Senate, where we refuse to allow a measure to come up for a vote. There is a Democrat in the White House, there is an overwhelming majority in the House of Representatives, there is a decisive majority in this body. But as long as we have 41 votes plus, and we have 43, this is the one place where we can have an effect on the legislative process in the Federal Government. This is a very important point. This political authority was exerted on the motor-voter bill, and is being exerted here, too.

I want to respond to a couple of points made by the distinguished President pro tempore, when he said earlier this morning that there has never been a time when the hands of a new President have been tied. I would remind the distinguished Senator from West Virginia about, exactly 4 years ago, the time when we had the last new President who proposed former Senator John Tower to be Secretary of Defense.

That new President's hands were tied. On a very rare occasion, his nominee for a Cabinet position, not a judicial position, but a Cabinet position was rejected. So you do not have to go back very far in history, just to the last new President.

The distinguished Senator from West Virginia then contended that there was a filibuster by amendments and then a filibuster by letter. I would submit that that there has been neither. The amendments which were offered were not phantom amendments, as asserted by Members on the other side of the aisle, but as this Senator detailed on

Saturday, many of those amendments had very substantial support from the other side of the aisle. The last amendment to be voted upon, the amendment by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], to give a cost-of-living adjustment to military and civilian Federal personnel, had six Democrats who supported it, including three Senators from the Armed Services Committee.

The very next amendment which was scheduled to be offered was an amendment by this Senator on health care reform. At that point, the curtain came down and the majority leader exercised his power, the power of recognition and the power of setting the schedule, to foreclose this Senator from offering an important amendment on health care legislation.

Other amendments were also pending: An amendment by Senator DANFORTH, which he described on Friday; amendments by Senator GRAMM of Texas; and other amendments have been proposed which are valid amendments which seek to change this bill.

Then when the distinguished Senator from West Virginia talks about a filibuster by letter, and he refers to the letter signed by 42 Republican Senators to Senator DOLE which says we will not vote to invoke cloture on this measure as presently constituted, that was a statement about the future; that was not a statement as to what the Republicans were doing. We have not gotten to the point where we are debating the bill itself and would have to exercise our rights not to permit cloture to be invoked.

When the distinguished Senator from West Virginia says that the Republicans are "threatening to blackmail," I think that is inappropriate; then it was changed to "political blackmail." I submit, Madam President, that when you talk either about blackmail or even political blackmail, it is not appropriate because we have a right to continue to offer amendments under the rules, and we have a right, if, as, and when we get to the point, to continue to debate. Those are our rights, and it is not blackmail and it is not political blackmail. Blackmail is when someone exercises force, coercion, threats, or intimidation to prevent someone else from carrying out a legitimate right. We are carrying out a legitimate right and there are no coercive or intimidating factors here, nothing is being done which is wrong.

So I want to object as strenuously as I can to the use of terms "blackmail" and "political blackmail."

Madam President, we are now going to be looking at our third cloture vote, and I believe that it is a safe prediction that this move for cloture will also be defeated. It would be my suggestion, Madam President, that two things occur. One is that we follow the suggestion by the distinguished ranking

member of the Appropriations Committee, Senator HATFIELD, add try to find a way to effect an accommodation or a compromise. When Senator HATFIELD has articulated the number of items—he mentioned \$4 billion for unemployment compensation—may I say on that point, Madam President, that although most Republicans opposed the authorization bill on unemployment compensation, this Senator supported it. I argued that we should pay for it, but I said that, notwithstanding our inability to pay for it, I would support it because it was so important to so many unemployed people in my State of Pennsylvania and across the country.

Senator HATFIELD then talks about \$3 billion in highway construction and the highway trust fund. He talked about \$300 million for children for inculcations.

I refer back, Madam President, to an article which appeared in the Washington Post on Saturday, March 27, which is headlined "Mitchell Brokers Deal on Stimulus Package." That article referred to the filibuster which had been conducted on Thursday by two Democratic Senators, Senator BOREN and Senator BREAUX. The article refers to "the agreement that has begun to take shape," and says "only \$6.9 billion of the \$16.3 billion package is to be spent during the fiscal year which ends September 30."

I suggest, Madam President, that is an outline for realistic compromise. If you change this bill to appropriate \$6.9 billion, you save \$9.4 billion. That makes sense. That would accommodate the rough outline as to what Senator HATFIELD proposed. If the administration has already committed or suggested in this article to withhold, as a matter of executive power, the expenditures of \$9.3 billion, why not adopt that? These items can be taken up in due course in the regular appropriations process where we think there has been a commitment to pay for whatever is spent. That is the baseline problem with this appropriations bill; that it requires too much money; that there are items here which ought not to be appropriated, as articulated earlier by Senator HATFIELD on community development block grants.

I compliment the administration on their lobbying tactics. I have been contacted by many mayors from Pennsylvania who want to have additional community development block grants to provide millions of dollars for my State, an item that I, like Senator HATFIELD, traditionally support. As Senator HATFIELD has pointed out, there is money available in that account which was appropriated last year, for fiscal year 1993, which can be spent. As Senator HATFIELD said a few moments ago, only 2 percent of \$4 billion has been allocated.

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

Mr. SPECTER. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eleven minutes on each side.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I have been asked by the distinguished Senator from Oregon to reserve 4 minutes for Senator DOLE. Since there is no other Republican on the floor, so none can seek recognition, I grant to myself, Senator HATFIELD's surrogate, an additional 5 minutes.

Madam President, as I was saying, there is ample funding available now for those community development block grants to be allocated. So I say that what we ought to do is to move ahead with that kind of a compromise.

The second recommendation that I have is that Republican Senators be allowed to offer their amendments at the present time. This Senator intends to press my amendment on health care because I think it is very important that the Senate take up that subject. I am not in the position to say how many other amendments there are, but I would speculate that there may be others and perhaps a number of others.

So instead of adjourning after a vote at 11:45 on Saturday, and instead of locking out Republican Senators today to offer amendments that can be called for a vote, I would suggest we continue. If the majority leader is considering a recess after this vote at 10:30, so people can undertake other activities, perhaps the opening of the baseball season in Baltimore, which this Senator would like to do as well, I am, however, prepared to stay and offer my amendment.

Let us not race the clock down to the wire where we come back perhaps on Wednesday, when a compromise has been worked out and that everybody wants to finish up immediately, and there is not a time for amendments to be offered, and we get into the bargaining process about time agreements which are undesirable when you talk about a health care amendment. So let Senators like ARLEN SPECTER have an opportunity.

Now, we cannot talk about Saturday anymore, last Saturday or last Friday or last Thursday. We cannot talk about today. Let this Senator have a chance to offer his amendment.

When the statement is made that we ought to let the new President have his way, Madam President, I pointed out that while President Clinton carried Pennsylvania, so did this Senator. When President Clinton—and I today have the totals—received 2,239,164, that was some 119,000 less than the 2,358,125 this Senator received in Pennsylvania, or a difference of 118,961 votes.

While it is true that President Clinton received support from Pennsylvania, so did ARLEN SPECTER. I was not sent here to be a rubberstamp, Madam President.

Yesterday's Washington Post contains an important and relevant story

about "Rebel Senator Faces White House Wrath," referring to Senator SHELBY. This story does not recount, which I think is very important, that Senator SHELBY has a 6-year term, which is 2 years longer than President Clinton's 4-year term. When the Constitution was devised and Senators were given a 6-year term, it was to provide an additional indicia of independence, so that Senators would have the independence of speaking their minds. I think Senator SHELBY would have it in his last day of his term, not only the last 2 years or the last 4 years. But he has a 6-year term. Senator SHELBY received an overwhelming number of votes in Alabama, and I have that total.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SPECTER. I would be glad to on the time of the distinguished Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator yields for a question. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRD. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is an objection.

Mrs. BOXER. I do not have the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. In the event, I will yield on my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Senator very much.

I agree with the Senator. Of course, the Senator was not sent here to be a rubberstamp, nor was this Senator from the largest State in the Union, California. But the question I have is, Why will the Senator not let this bill come to the floor and then vote his heart against it? You can vote against this bill. But the Republican strategy, the minority of this Chamber, is to stop this bill from coming to the floor. So the question is, Why will the Senator not allow this bill to come to the floor and then vote against it?

Mr. SPECTER. I have the question. The answer is—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. That the Republican minority has the right emphatically prescribed under the Senate rules to offer amendments, which we seek to do, and when our amendments are finished, to continue to debate as long as we have more than 41 Republican Senators who take that position. So that in asserting that authority, we exercise our rights for a very good purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional 5 minutes of the Senator from Pennsylvania have expired.

Mr. SPECTER. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes 5 seconds.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the full

text of the article on Saturday, March 27, headlined "Mitchell Brokers Deal on Stimulus Package," and the full text of the article from yesterday's Washington Post headlined "Rebel Senator Faces White House Wrath" be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 27, 1993]
MITCHELL BROKERS DEAL ON STIMULUS PACKAGE; BOREN, BREAUX WOULD DROP BID FOR DELAY

(By Eric Pianin)

Senate Democrats dissatisfied with President Clinton's \$16.3 billion stimulus package were working toward an agreement with the White House last night that would end the dispute over the plan and set the stage for its approval next week.

Senate Majority Leader George J. Mitchell (D-Maine) stepped in yesterday to broker a compromise after an embarrassing episode Thursday evening in which Sens. David L. Boren (D-Okla.) and John Breaux (D-La.), who favor postponing some of the spending until Congress completes work on cuts in other parts of the budget, filibustered Clinton's bill for 4½ hours.

Under the agreement that has begun to take shape, Boren and Breaux would withdraw their amendment to delay part of the economic stimulus in return for some type of administrative order or other step that would delay authorizing spending not deemed "time-sensitive," sources said. Only \$6.9 billion of the \$16.3 billion package is to be spent during the current fiscal year, which ends Sept. 30.

In that way, Boren and Breaux could claim a small political victory in delaying billions in deficit spending, while the administration can keep its bill intact. The White House also wants another \$15 billion in tax cuts as part of its stimulus plan.

Breaux and Boren said late yesterday they were "guardedly optimistic" an agreement will be worked out by early next week, when the Senate and House gear up for a big push to complete work on the stimulus package, a budget resolution and a new debt ceiling.

"I want something that gives me confidence" that some of the spending will be put off, Breaux said. "It doesn't have to be done through legislation. There are ways of doing it other than through an amendment."

Senate Appropriations Committee Chairman Robert C. Byrd (D-W. Va.), a champion of the stimulus package, said through a spokesman that after returning from a meeting at the White House he was "cautiously optimistic" the dispute would be resolved.

The stimulus package—a key component of Clinton's overall economic recovery strategy, includes funding for summer jobs for youth, extended unemployment insurance benefits, community development block grants, and highway and waste water projects.

House and Senate Republicans have scorned the package as a wasteful administration political payoff to big city mayors and other special interest groups that would do little to help the economy, would create mostly temporary jobs and far fewer than the president promised last month, and mainly add to the \$300 billion deficit.

Even among many Democrats, support for the package is lukewarm. Moderate and conservative Democrats like Breaux and Boren, both members of the senate Finance Com-

mittee, agree that some of the spending is justified. But they say they are under pressure from constituents who want to see more proof of the Democrats' resolve to reduce spending before signing off on all of the stimulus package.

The Boren-Breaux filibuster was touched off Thursday evening after Byrd, the floor manager of the bill, employed a rarely used parliamentary procedure by which amendments can be approved but then wiped out by a vote at the end of the process.

The procedure, which has been used in the past by Republicans when they were in control, tilts the playing field and makes efforts to amend the bill, in the words of one Republican senator, an exercise in futility.

Byrd, in a somewhat haughty and dismissive tone, replied "If this is an 'exercise,' it is not the first time we have engaged in this kind of an exercise of debate in futility, seeing our amendments defeated."

"This senator plays by the rules," he added. "Most senators I have found, based on my observations through the years, do not pay much attention to the rules."

Not surprisingly, neither Republican or Democratic members rushed forward to offer amendments, which produced a stalemate on the floor for much of yesterday. Byrd stood on the floor, complaining that "I need to get off my feet, I need to call my wife," and urging members from either side of the aisle to offer an amendment.

Also, noting that Democrats were staying away from the floor, Byrd asked, "Where are my troops?"

House Democratic leaders, faced with an amendment potentially more destructive than the one offered by Breaux and Boren, used similarly tough tactics last week to kill it off.

House Speaker Thomas S. Foley (D-Wash.) ordered the Rules Committee to prevent from being considered on the floor the amendment that would have eliminated more than half the stimulus unless the cost was offset by spending cuts in other areas.

That amendment, offered by Rep. Charles W. Stenholm (D-Tex.), was gaining in support and was viewed as "dangerous" by the leadership and the White House.

Even as the Democratic dustup was beginning to settle yesterday, Boren criticized White House officials for mishandling the intraparty dispute by attempting to "steamroller" Democratic critics of the stimulus proposal.

He said that while House Democratic leaders, with their huge majority, have greater latitude in overcoming dissent, the balance of power in the Senate is much more fragile.

"I think they [White House officials] made some mistakes in not understanding there are differences between the House and the Senate," Boren said. "Steamroller tactics don't build support from moderate Democrats."

Noting that the Finance Committee will soon begin drafting Clinton's tax bill, Boren said that he and Breaux will be important votes for the administration down the road. Democrats hold a slender 11 to 9 majority on the committee.

"This isn't just one vote," Boren added. "It's a process. It's counter-productive to try to narrow your base of support rather than broadening the road."

Stenholm, a leading conservative Democrat on the Budget Committee, echoed Boren's concern about "steamroller" tactics yesterday, during a luncheon meeting at The Washington Post.

"I think our leadership has to understand you can't do that but a few times," Sten-

holm said. "You can go to the well only so many times on a procedure before it backfires."

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 4, 1993]

REBEL SENATOR FACES WHITE HOUSE WRATH; JOBS SHIFTED FROM ALABAMA IN REPRISAL AGAINST DEMOCRAT SHELBY

(By Lloyd Grove)

The all-out war between Senator Richard C. Shelby and the White House began with three little words.

They were uttered by the Alabama Democrat immediately after the leader of his party, President Clinton, unveiled his economic plan to Congress. They were uttered despite a White House plea for Democrats to give Clinton three days' grace before criticizing the plan. Shelby told reporters waiting in the Capitol's Statuary Hall: "The taxman cometh."

That was six weeks ago—before Shelby publicly humiliated the vice president, before the White House retaliated by moving federal jobs out of Alabama, before Shelby answered by voting consistently against Clinton's program, and before the White House struck back by denying Shelby extra tickets to a South Lawn ceremony honoring his alma mater's championship football team.

Shelby, who may be the first Democrat to feel the new president's wrath, has shown no signs of buckling under these White House reprisals, both grave and petty. On Friday, before heading to Alabama for the weekend, he was the lone Democrat to vote to let Senate Republicans continue their filibuster of Clinton's \$16.3 billion economic stimulus package.

"What are they going to do to me?" Shelby asked during an interview. "Are they going to threaten me? That doesn't get them anywhere. Or do they want to work with me on some issues?"

For the moment, Clinton & Co. don't want to work with Shelby. They don't even want to persuade him. They simply want to punish him—mainly by relocating more than 90 jobs in a \$375 million program of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration from the Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, Ala. to the Johnson Space Center in Houston.

What's more, they want every Democrat to know that Shelby is being punished—and understand the consequences of messing with Bill Clinton.

Usually such disputes are handled discreetly, and few outsiders ever hear about them until long after they are resolved. But half a dozen White House officials, speaking on condition of anonymity, were eager and even anxious to spread the word of Shelby's predicament as they strained against a recalcitrant Senate to enact the first major legislation of the new administration. The incident provides a window on the workings of the Clinton White House, but the strategy of publicizing Shelby's punishment is also fraught with risk.

"You've got to make it stick," said a senior White House aide. "You do not fail on something as publicized as this." The episode marks Clinton's first foray into the practice of lobbying by stick instead of carrot, a technique honed to perfection by President Lyndon B. Johnson in the 1960s and seldom employed as expertly since.

Lyndon Johnson called [Sen.] Harry Byrd [D-Va.] down to the White House because he was resisting the civil rights bill," recalled Sen. Dale Bumpers (D-Ark.), citing one example. "He said, 'You know, Harry, [Defense

Secretary Robert S.] McNamara says we got to close that Norfolk naval base down there, and I don't much want to do it. . . . And Harry Byrd couldn't wait to get back to the Senate and vote for the civil rights bill."

Bumpers added that he couldn't tell yet whether the White House treatment of Shelby would produce the desired result. "Sometimes it causes a senator to dig his heels in deeper, because he feels discriminated against for doing something he really believes in," he said. "But I think more often . . . it's pretty effective."

Another observer, veteran corporate lobbyist Tom Korologos, said his soundings of senators suggest that "they've got to be petrified with the White House playing this kind of shock-treatment game." Korologos, who used similarly tough tactics as a White House lobbyist for Richard M. Nixon, added: "Clinton's better than Nixon. I give these guys six months before they have a team of plumbers. Pretty soon they'll be at the Watergate. Seriously, they're playing hardball and I admire them."

The episode began on Feb. 18, when Vice President Al Gore invited Shelby to his office in the Capitol for an afternoon one-on-one. Clinton aides had seen Shelby's "taxman cometh" line in reports of congressional reaction to the president's speech the night before, and considered it both damaging and disloyal, especially in light of the White House request that Democrats hold their fire. Shelby said in an interview last week that he was unaware of the plea, but that knowing about it wouldn't have made a difference. "I hope no one in the Senate would feel like they had a gag order on them about what they could say or not, or when they could say it or not."

Gore, who had worked during the budget planning process to help Shelby protect NASA's space station—a project potentially worth billions of dollars to the Alabama economy—hoped to discover what might induce his former colleague to support the Clinton plan. But Shelby had other ideas.

His press secretary, Tricia Primrose, ordered up a television camera from the Senate Democratic Policy Committee and notified all 19 Alabama television stations that video of the Shelby-Gore meeting would be transmitted that evening by satellite. A network pool camera also was included in the pre-meeting photo opportunity in Gore's office.

As the two men posed for the cameras, someone asked Shelby's reaction to the Clinton program. "It's high on taxes, low on [spending] cuts," Shelby replied, appearing to lecture a clearly surprised and embarrassed Gore under the bright video lights. The clip of Shelby's attack was widely carried in Alabama, and prominently featured on the "NBC Nightly News."

Gore was outraged, as were Clinton and members of the White House staff. But Shelby makes no apologies.

"I never intended to embarrass anyone, including Al Gore," said the Senator, who was reelected in 1992 with 66 percent of the vote, 25 points ahead of the second-place Clinton-Gore ticket in Alabama. "Obviously, Al took it that way. But if he's that sensitive about things after being in politics. . . . My goodness!"

The White House began plotting its response that very night, on the theory that such insubordination could not go unanswered. "This is a 'Mack-Clinton special'" said a senior White House adviser, referring to the president and White House Chief of Staff Thomas F. "Mack" McLarty. "This

wasn't driven by passion—those guys do not believe in letting emotion cloud judgment," the adviser went on. "It was a very deliberate, considered move to advance the president's political agenda. . . . As the saying goes, 'Revenge is a dish best served cold.'"

The White House revenge play, the adviser added, has been "quarterbacked" by Clinton's legislative affairs director, Howard Paster, with assists from political director Rahm Emanuel and Gore's chief of staff, Roy Neel. Emanuel, for one, is no stranger to the revenge business, having once sent an enemy a rotting fish.

In this case, Shelby didn't even know he was being targeted until he read about the NASA move in the Wall Street Journal. Neel, working with staffers of the Office of Management and Budget, found a way to carry off a surgical strike by transferring employees attached to the External Tank Project Office of the space shuttle program.

On Feb. 24, OMB Director Leon E. Panetta sent a memorandum to Daniel S. Goldin, the acting administrator of NASA, ordering the transfer as part of an effort "to improve management of the shuttle program. . . . Please forward to this office a copy of your directive effecting this change and a timetable for its completion."

Goldin, according to a source familiar with the episode, was baffled.

Meanwhile, Gore briefed Shelby's senior colleague, Sen. Howell T. Heflin (D-Ala.), about the White House action, reassuring him that no offense was intended for him, and that the White House would do everything it could to protect one of the former Alabama Supreme Court justice's pet projects, the federally funded State Justice Institute that serves as a continuing education program for state judges. As if to underscore Gore's assurance, the White House gave Heflin 15 tickets to the University of Alabama's south Lawn visit March 25, Shelby got one.

"I'm not getting involved in that squabble," a clearly pained Heflin said last week, walking away from questions.

Shelby, noting a 67 percent approval rating in a recent statewide poll, said he has been getting a lot of positive feedback from constituents who praise him for standing up to the White House.

"They can keep going after me," he said, grinning like an unruly student who has been unsuccessfully disciplined by the principal. "It's playing pretty well." He predicted that time and circumstance may change the White House attitude: "They might need me on something."

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, how much time does the distinguished Senator from Tennessee wish?

Mr. MATHEWS. May I have 3 minutes.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. President, I rise today to support President Clinton and to salute the distinguished Appropriations Committee chairman, Senator BYRD. I applaud his efforts to move the President's emergency investment package toward final passage, and I

hope my colleagues in the Senate will see the wisdom of passing this much needed stimulus proposal without delay.

Mr. President, much has been said in opposition to this package and the goals of the new President. I suggest that this proposal has one goal in mind, and that goal is the stimulation of the economy through job creation.

I am pleased that in my State, Tennessee, this stimulus package addresses the sagging segments of our economy, the demographics of the unemployed and other obvious areas of pain and suffering.

I talked with our State commissioner of employment security earlier this week. I asked if Tennessee is experiencing job growth. I am pleased to report that the unemployment rate which was reported March 31, shows a decline from 6.6 percent for January to 5.9 percent for February. This is good news. But we have no reason to relax, he said.

Business and industry remain cautious about hiring permanent workers. Instead, employers are resorting to overtime, confining their operations to the present work force. The comfort level has not yet been attained. They are not sure that our economy is on solid footing.

Mr. President, we need the stimulus of this investment package to ensure continued job growth—in Tennessee and in this country.

If my colleagues in the Senate wish to see continued economic recovery, it is imperative we do not back away from the national response in support of the President's package. In addition to the Nation's Governors and mayors, the supplemental bill has been endorsed as a means of further economic recovery by economists across the country.

Mr. President, we cannot simply assume that more spending is good spending. I for one do not adhere to that principle. However, the spending in this supplemental bill is targeted at job creation, and that is a principle which I will fully support.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that every percentage point increase in the unemployment rate will also increase the Federal deficit by some \$30-\$50 billion. A decrease in the unemployment rate is obviously a boost for the economy. Such a boost will be a primary factor in determining our ability to reduce the deficit.

The spending in this supplemental does what the President and the Senator from West Virginia and others claim—creates jobs. I was pleased to see the breakdown of funds which will be provided to Tennessee. Estimates predict my State will receive some \$194 million. These dollars will be targeted to the extent possible to those areas of the State with high unemployment and low incomes, exactly the areas which

President Clinton hopes will benefit from the program.

If we believe in the future of this country, if I am committed to the future of Tennessee, then there is no doubt these are crucial investments. These moneys will not be wasted. They will be injected directly into the economy of Tennessee.

I do not believe in spending simply for spending's sake. Rather, I feel strongly that these funds are an investment. A crucial investment for the future of Tennessee, and the Nation, providing critical improvements to infrastructure, and community development to help our towns and cities grow, prosper, and compete in an ever more complex and competitive marketplace. This stimulus begins to make the human investments necessary for us to move ahead and build a better future for all our citizens.

Mr. President, we cannot ignore that this is supplemental spending. However, the additional funds spent here are accounted for in the budget resolution which we passed just this week. The overall savings, some \$500 billion over 5 years, has calculated these additional expenditures. We have planned for this bill, and now some would say that we are trying to force new spending that is unaccounted for through the Senate. Mr. President, that is simply not the case.

I recently made a statement in support of the Senate budget resolution passed last Thursday. In that statement I noted that we were voting on a package with several components. This is one of those components, Mr. President.

The budget deficit will not go away by itself, but neither will the current recession which is devastating our economy. I congratulate the President for offering to the Congress a long-term, comprehensive plan. I urge my colleagues not to delay the elements of this package any longer.

Mr. President, I again note my respect for the efforts of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and hope that we will soon be sending these funds to where they are needed the most, to the people of America.

Also, I would like to take a moment this morning to do a couple of things. One is to thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for his leadership on this bill, for his friendship to me and to the other freshmen Senators who are here and who are hoping to be able to represent our constituency in this body.

I would like to take just a moment, if I could, to say to the American people that not all of the things that are in the bill are of a frivolous nature, that there are some legitimate—and I hope all of them are legitimate, but that there are real reasons why this bill ought to be passed and that there are people out there wanting to be helped and people who we need to help.

On the weekend of February 20, an awesome looking tornado formed in our State, in the eastern portion. For those of you who have never seen one, I hope you will take an opportunity to look at this picture here because in just a matter of a few seconds, it caused 10 million dollars' worth of damage in a small community there. I visited this community just a day or two after it happened, and I found an area devastated. I found people in shock, but I found people who were pitching in to help each other.

There have been a lot of things happening in the State of Tennessee, the communities of which have marshaled their resources, but there is still need for help that can come through community development block grants, and I ask for us to take this into consideration.

Just a few short weeks later another community in our State, a community which for three times in 1 month 2 years ago was flooded, was hit again by a serious flood.

The letter which I received from the major of that town just a few days ago says, "As you are surely aware, Spring City was flooded again on March 23 and we are in dire need of your assistance in getting Piney Creek corrected to relieve this problem. We have had several near tragedies but we feel our luck will run out eventually. Must we wait until we have lives lost before the Corps of Engineers, TVA, EPA, and FEMA will act to correct this problem?"

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

Mr. MATHEWS. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I understand in talking with the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the ranking member of the committee, that Mr. DOLE wishes to have 4 of the remaining minutes on that side reserved to him. So how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has 7 minutes 12 seconds.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, this jobs package is a key part of the President's economic program. The opportunity to amend the package is available, has been available. The American people deserve to have these amendments offered and debated on the floor, out in the open. Let the sun shine in. But our friends on the other side of the aisle do not want to let the sun shine on this process. Some on that side of the aisle want to move the debate behind closed doors, work out a deal behind closed doors, get behind closed doors where the American people cannot see, cut a deal. They want to do that because they know that their amendments will not win.

The distinguished Republican leader has had an amendment at the desk for

days, and I thought he was going to call it up Friday. I thought he was going to call it up before that.

They know their amendments cannot win. They are holding this package hostage because they are unable to win their points in any other way.

Why do they not bring their alternatives to the Senate floor? Let us hear their ideas. Call up the alternative amendments. Let us look at them. Let us talk about them. Let us put them to a vote.

If they want jobs now, if they want to release some of these funds, let the people hear their ideas expressed on this floor. A majority of the House, the majority of the Senate, and the President of the United States want this package. The American people want to see Congress act to put people back to work. The other side can try to amend the bill, but the tactic of holding the bill hostage to force back-room negotiations denies the American people an opportunity to see and to hear what is happening.

Further, it denies this new President his right for a vote on a critical part of his package. I say offer the amendment. Let the American people see what the plan is. People know where Bill Clinton stands. They have heard his plan for helping this limping economy regain its vitality. Let us hear the specifics of the Republican leader's plan on this floor.

I yield the balance of my time to Mr. SARBANES.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

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

Madam President, I want to underscore the need for this jobs bill. There have been some arguments made on the floor of the Senate that we are in a recovery and that we do not really need a jobs bill. The President has made it very clear that the jobs bill is part of his overall package. People say that this particular bill is not being paid for, but this bill is in the context of the budget resolution that was adopted last week that provided for \$496 billion worth of deficit reduction over the next 5 years.

This bill is an essential piece of the President's overall economic strategy. We think the President ought to have a chance to put his policies in place. If you deny him an essential piece of his strategy and his strategy then does not work, it seems to me the accountability rests on those who deny him the essential elements of his economic strategy.

The President is prepared to be held accountable. He in effect has said: Give me my economic package, and I will answer for the consequences. The people on that side believe it is not going to work. No one can guarantee it is going to work. There is always risk you take with respect to economic pol-

icy. But the President said: Give me my package, and I will be held accountable for whether this works or not. If you deny him an essential piece of his package, I think you no longer can hold him accountable. In fact, I would argue that the responsibility then shifts to those who have said: Oh, no; we are not going to let your strategy work. The President has an economic strategy, and I think the economic circumstances call for passing this legislation.

Just this weekend, there were several articles in the newspaper regarding the strength of the economy. I will quote them very briefly.

Reports provide for signs of slower recovery. Reports issued yesterday on jobs, building, and manufacturing provide fresh evidence that the economy has slowed from its rapid year-end acceleration. First-time claims for unemployment benefits jumped unexpectedly a week ago and construction spending remained anemic in February, the Government reported. In fact, the Labor Department report showed that 380,000 newly unemployed workers filed applications for benefits in the week that ended March 27, the most since 382,000 in the week that ended November 7.

More workers filed claims for unemployment insurance last week than any week since November 7. This morning, the paper says:

Numbers suggest economy waning. America's job growth stalled in March. Factory output slowed, exports weakened, anxious consumers grew spendthrift.

Madam President, we need this jobs bill. We need it now. I urge the Senate to vote for cloture so that we can consider this important measure. We are being denied the opportunity to vote on the legislation itself. I urge the Senate to invoke cloture.

Mr. RIEGLE. Madam President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Along the same line, in today's Wall Street Journal, page 8, there is a story that says "Republican Filibuster Stalls Jobs Bill for \$16 Billion in Economic Stimulus." We are finding ourselves in the situation here where we are being denied the chance to help the economy. As I said last week, I think it is Presidential politics. There are people who want to be President in 1996. They want to hurt this President now. They want to hurt this President now by denying him his economic program.

It is the country that is suffering. It is the unemployed workers who are suffering. We need this economic package. It's a jobs package. We need it now. We lost 22,000 jobs just last month. The stock market was off on Friday, consumer confidence is down, and we are getting more gridlock from that side of the aisle because they are playing Presidential politics.

There will be plenty of time to run for President in 1996. Let's not do it in 1993 when we need to pass the jobs bill here in the Senate.

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

Mr. HATFIELD. Madam President, what time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 4 minutes 39 seconds remaining to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Mississippi, and the remaining part of the time to the Republican leader.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, the President of the United States, in my judgment, would be well advised to ask the Senate leadership to tear up this bill and start over. In its present form, it will not pass the Senate.

Let me suggest first that the funds for unemployment benefits be stripped from the bill and considered separately. Those benefits have already been authorized by this Congress to be paid. So approval will be voted whenever it is called up. The \$4 billion for unemployment benefits was never considered to be an element of a plan to expand the economy or to create new jobs.

Second, take all the funds out of this bill that do not respond to some genuine emergency. The word emergency should be agreed to mean what Webster's dictionary says it means: "An unforeseen combination of circumstances or the resulting state that calls for immediate action."

This bill provides funds for a wide variety of services, programs, and projects that are not emergencies.

Unless substantial changes are made along these or similar lines, I see no way for the bill to be passed.

Others may have better suggestions, but this is my opinion. I don't know how much money that would require be included in this supplemental, but it would markedly change the bill from a grab bag of election spoils to a bill that addresses the needs we can afford and that are justified as true emergencies that cannot be considered more prudently in the due course of the appropriations process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, I want to again restate who is taking most of the time around here on this bill. The Democrats consumed 26 hours and 6 minutes; the Republicans, 10 hours and 58 minutes. Still, I hear in the media there has been some kind of a filibuster. I do not know who has all the time. It has not been on this side of the aisle.

Let us keep the record straight: 26 hours versus 10 hours would indicate to me that most of the talking has been done on that side.

When I hear my colleagues shedding crocodile tears about economic packages and about Presidential politics, I am reminded how for 4 years President Bush could not get his economic plan through the Democratic Congress. Capital gains rate reduction—he tried time and time again, and the very Senators

who are up here today saying, "Oh, we ought to give Clinton a chance to spend \$17 billion or \$19 billion more money without paying for it," I do not know where they were for the last 4 years.

I was here. I know what they said. I know how they delayed the capital gains rate reduction and a lot of other economic plans that President Bush had.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOLE. I only have 2 minutes. Did the Senator hold up the capital gains rate reduction?

Mr. SARBANES. We were the majority. We did not think the bill made good sense. If you were with the majority, you could vote against that bill.

We need a jobs bill now and that is exactly what the President is proposing.

Mr. DOLE. It was bipartisan, Madam President. There were about 50-some Members, both Democrats and Republicans, for that particular aspect.

But the Senator from Mississippi has laid it out fairly well. Let us go ahead and work. What we ought to do right now, after this vote—and the Democrats are not going to prevail. They will not prevail Wednesday. They will not prevail Friday. And they will not prevail next week.

We ought to bring up the debt ceiling, but the \$4 billion unemployment package together, and send it back to the House so nobody gets blamed around here on the 17th of April because unemployment compensation can go out.

We can do that today. Maybe we can work it out on a voice vote so nobody misses a vote.

This is not any emergency. Take that out, and there is no emergency left. Then we come back after the recess and try to work out some package on a job-related program. OK. We pay for it; OK.

But as I said the other day, there is just a fundamental difference in our parties. The Democrats like to tax and tax and tax, and spend and spend and spend, and we like to cut spending first. If we cannot cut it back, we would like to pay for it. That is a basic difference in our parties. That is just the way it is.

We just passed a great big budget resolution of \$273 billion in new taxes, increased taxes, over the next 5 years, not with any votes on this side of the aisle, but with every vote on that side of the aisle, almost every vote, 56 votes on that side of the aisle.

So, Madam President, we are prepared to discuss working out some compromise, if that is the word. But first we are going to cut it. First we are going to cut it, and then we are going to pay for it. Those are the two principles we espouse.

I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter

demonstrating filibuster by letter, signed by the Republican Senators, be printed in the RECORD. This says they will not vote to invoke cloture.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, March 31, 1993.

Hon. BOB DOLE,
Republican Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR BOB: As currently written, H.R. 1335, the so-called "Emergency Supplemental Appropriations," contains \$19.5 billion in additional deficit spending. This increase is \$8.5 billion more than the net domestic spending cuts contained in the entire five year budget reduction plan.

The American people are asking the Congress to cut spending first, and then consider other options of reducing the deficit. The enactment of H.R. 1335, in its current form, would be contrary to demands from taxpayers all across America.

Therefore, we will not vote to invoke cloture on this measure as presently constituted, notwithstanding the scheduled Easter recess.

Sincerely,

John Warner, Chuck Grassley, Larry Pressler, Al D'Amato, John McCain, Connie Mack, Larry E. Craig, Trent Lott, Nancy Kassebaum, Arlen Specter, Alan Simpson, Kit Bond, Bob Packwood, Paul D. Coverdell, Frank H. Murkowski, Lauch Faircloth, Conrad Burns, Robert F. Bennett, Slade Gorton, Bill Cohen.

Thad Cochran, Pete Domenici, Jim Jeffords, David Durenberger, Don Nickles, Dan Coats, Malcolm Wallop, Dirk Kempthorne, Judd Gregg, Mark Hatfield, John Danforth, Mitch McConnell, Bob Smith, Strom Thurmond, Phil Gramm, Richard S. Lugar, Jesse Helms, John H. Chafee, Orrin Hatch, Bill Roth, Ted Stevens, Hank Brown.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

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 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 Sen-

ate that debate on the 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. **FORD**. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. **DECONCINI**], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. **DORGAN**], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. **HARKIN**], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. **KENNEDY**], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. **KERREY**], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. **KRUEGER**] are necessarily absent.

Mr. **SIMPSON**. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. **BENNETT**], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. **BOND**], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. **COATS**], the Senator from New York [Mr. **D'AMATO**], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. **DURENBERGER**], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. **FAIRCLOTH**], the Senator from Washington [Mr. **GORTON**], the Senator from Texas [Mr. **GRAMM**], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. **GREGG**], the Senator from Utah [Mr. **HATCH**], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. **HELMS**], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. **JEFFORDS**], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. **MCCAIN**], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. **NICKLES**], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. **SMITH**] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. **GORTON**], the Senator from Utah [Mr. **HATCH**], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. **MCCAIN**] would each vote "nay."

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 29, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 102 Leg.]

YEAS—49

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

NAYS—29

Brown	Grassley	Pressler
Burns	Hatfield	Roth
Chafee	Kassebaum	Shelby
Cochran	Kempthorne	Simpson
Cohen	Lott	Specter
Coverdell	Lugar	Stevens
Craig	Mack	Thurmond
Danforth	McConnell	Wallop
Dole	Murkowski	Warner
Domenici	Packwood	

NOT VOTING—22

Bennett	Coats	DeConcini
Bond	D'Amato	Dorgan

Durenberger	Hatch	McCain
Faircloth	Helms	Nickles
Gorton	Jeffords	Nunn
Gramm	Kennedy	Smith
Gregg	Kerrey	
Harkin	Krueger	

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. On this vote the yeas are 49, the nays are 29. 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**. May we have order?

Mr. **SARBANES**. Madam President, parliamentary inquiry. What was the previous vote?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The yeas were 49, the nays 29.

Mr. **SARBANES**. Twenty-nine?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Yes.

Mr. **SARBANES**. I thank the Chair.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Mr. **MITCHELL**. Madam President, although 63 percent of the Senators present and voting voted to terminate the filibuster, the rules require 60 percent or more of all Senators. Therefore, the vote is insufficient to terminate the filibuster.

I will shortly meet with the distinguished Republican leader, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and other interested Senators to determine the best way to proceed.

I regret the results.

Although it is clear a substantial majority of the Senate wishes to proceed to a vote on this matter, we will not be able to because of the filibuster.

Therefore, I believe that the best course of action is for us to discuss the matter and try to determine how best to proceed.

Mr. **DOLE** addressed the Chair.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. **DOLE**. Madam President, I am not certain I understand the definition of the word "filibuster," because, as I look at the **RECORD**, Democrats have consumed 24 hours and 6 minutes, and Republicans, 10 hours and 58 minutes, which would indicate to the objective observer that there has been much more talk on that side of the aisle than there has been on this side of the aisle.

But if it is whether or not cloture can be invoked, I think it is fair to say cloture cannot be invoked today or Wednesday or thereafter.

So there is a willingness—I will say it is divided on this side—to try to figure out some way to end the impasse.

I have an amendment—I did not send it to the desk, I had it printed in the **RECORD**—and I will modify that amendment sometime today and hopefully be in the position to discuss it with the distinguished majority leader Senator **MITCHELL**.

Madam President, it seems to me we just have this basic fundamental difference in our philosophies: We want to

cut spending. My colleagues on the other side want to increase spending. We want to pay for it. My colleagues on the other side do not want to pay for it. That is a fairly big gap in our philosophy.

We would be willing to split off at this moment, or sometime very soon today, the unemployment insurance provision, the \$4 billion which has already passed the House and the Senate. We do not pay for it, but that has already been done. I did not vote for that bill because we did not pay for it.

We would be prepared to add that to the debt ceiling and let the debt ceiling go to the House with that amendment. Hopefully, that can be done, so somebody is not being blamed around here later in the week or next week for holding up unemployment compensation checks. We do not want to do that and I am certain my colleagues on the other side do not want to do that.

So I will be submitting an amendment today to do just that and we will be discussing that and other matters with the majority leader.

Mr. **MITCHELL**. Madam President, it had not been my intention to debate the matter now, but I feel constrained to respond to the comments by the Republican leader just now.

The Republican leader seeks to name this as they are for cutting spending and we are for increasing spending; and we are for paying for it and they are not.

I just point out again, Madam President, as I did the other day, the President's package is a total whole. It is a comprehensive program that will cut the deficit by nearly \$500 billion over the next 5 years.

Every single Republican voted against the deficit reduction package; every single one.

Now, this part of the President's program calls for some increased spending. There are spending cuts and spending increases. The net is a sizable reduction in spending.

What they are seeking to do, of course, is to isolate this part of the package and say that is the President's program.

It does call for some spending, but it is more than offset in the total package by in excess of \$200 billion in spending cuts, which every single Republican voted against.

So, I repeat, the President's economic plan is a coherent whole. It does call for some increased spending. But that increased spending is more than offset by an amount in excess of \$200 billion in spending cuts.

So no one should be under the impression that the description of "We want more spending, they want less" describes the entire program of the President.

We, obviously, have debated this for a while and we can keep debating it, but I did not want that to go unchallenged or without some response.

We are trying to bring this to a conclusion. I hope that we can bring it to a conclusion. I will be discussing the matter further with the distinguished Republican leader later this afternoon.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business between now and 1 p.m., with the time equally divided and controlled by Senators BYRD and HATFIELD.

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

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, will the distinguished Republican leader yield for a question?

Mr. DOLE. Could I have some time?

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield the Senators 5 minutes.

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, could we have order, please, in the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from West Virginia.

THE DOLE AMENDMENT

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, the distinguished Republican leader indicated as far back, I believe, as last Thursday that he has an amendment that he wished to call up. I think he indicated that he would hope to call it up on Friday or perhaps on Saturday.

Does he entertain any present inclination of calling up that amendment at all and letting the Senate debate it?

Mr. DOLE. If the Senator will yield?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. DOLE. I think the answer is in the affirmative. But I will be modifying the amendment. We have been studying over the weekend some modifications we think should be made. So I think the answer is yes, unless there is some other resolution—which is possible. But I would modify, because there are some areas where I think we have made—well, in my view we did not do the right thing. But the answer is "Yes."

And, as I understand from the distinguished chairman of the committee, that if that amendment were offered we would be permitted to proceed with that amendment. At least I understood the chairman and the majority leader—

Mr. BYRD. As far as this Senator is concerned, I would like to see the amendment pending so that the Senate could debate the amendment and—

Mr. DOLE. Will there be a chance the Senator would support the amendment?

Mr. BYRD. There might be a chance the Senator from West Virginia would move to table the amendment.

Mr. DOLE. I was fearful of that.

Mr. BYRD. I daresay to my friend, I think the American people want to legislate in the sunshine. Let us have the amendment out. Let the American people see what is in it, let us debate it, let us not just work on a proposal behind closed doors and work out a deal back there. Let us have the amendment out on the floor and let it be debated.

I do not intend to offer an amendment in the second degree to that—I might even vote for it up or down, but it is my inclination to table the amendment.

Mr. DOLE. If I was certain the Senator from West Virginia would vote for it, I would run and get it right now, but I need to make a few modifications, as I indicated earlier.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I have completed my remarks. I understand now there will be a period for morning business until 1 p.m., with the time to be equally divided and controlled by Senators BYRD and HATFIELD.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, is it the majority leader's intention there be no amendments called up during that period?

Mr. MITCHELL. That is correct; morning business, debate only, unless the distinguished Republican leader wants to offer his amendment. We would be pleased to have that offered at such time as he is ready. I discussed that. Other than that, no.

Mr. BYRD. Is that an order of the Senate, Madam President, no amendments will be eligible to be called up during this 2-hour period, with the exception of a possible amendment by Mr. DOLE?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is currently in morning business. The time has been reserved until 1 o'clock. We are no longer on the emergency supplemental appropriations bill, so therefore no amendments would be in order.

Mr. BYRD. But as I understood the majority leader, he was willing and I am willing, also, for the distinguished Republican leader to be able to call up his amendment and make it the pending amendment and have it debated during the 2-hour period.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To the Senator from West Virginia, no such motion was made and you would need to make that part of the consent order.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I make that request that the distinguished Republican leader be permitted to call up his amendment and that it be in order, then, for the distinguished majority leader or for the chairman of the committee to offer an amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, as I indicated, I am not prepared to offer the modification. I may be soon, but I am not certain. I need to discuss it with a number of my colleagues. Therefore I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is noted. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I understand the Senator from Oregon wishes to speak?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HATFIELD. Madam President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

KEITH MAINLAND

Mr. HATFIELD. Madam President, I was saddened to learn over the weekend of the death of Keith Mainland, who was clerk and staff director of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives from 1972 to 1985.

Keith Mainland joined the staff of the House Appropriations Committee in 1962. The late Representative George Mahon made Keith the clerk of the committee in 1972, and he was serving in that capacity for Chairman Jamie Whitten when I became chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee in 1981. Working with Keith Mainland and the staff of the House Appropriations Committee was one of the most pleasant and rewarding aspects of my chairmanship.

Unflinchingly loyal to the House, Keith was no less committed to the appropriations process, and never once in my association with him did he ever pursue a partisan purpose. We worked together in a true bipartisan bicameral tradition. With all the talk of legislative gridlock these days, it is consoling to remember that it is not an inevitable consequence of our form of government.

Keith Mainland's service to the House of Representatives and the U.S. Congress was a shining example of dedicated public service, and he was honored with the John McCormack award shortly after his retirement in 1985.

Keith Mainland has left us too soon, but he has left us with memories, and a record of outstanding service to the people's branch of our Government. Our sympathies and prayers are with his wife Sandy, and his children Kirk and Marlene.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LIEBERMAN). The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Vermont has been wanting some time. I want to leave the floor for a while. I want to yield all the time to Mr. SARBANES for his control on this side, and Senators who wish time may speak with him. I

understand he has to leave after a while. In that event, I would like then for the time to be controlled by Mr. SASSER on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. LEAHY. Will the Senator from Maryland yield 4 minutes?

Mr. SARBANES. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY].

RURAL INITIATIVES AND THE STIMULUS PACKAGE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I appeal to rural State Senators today to break the Republican impasse on the stimulus package. We must pass this plan—it is the first economic plan that has remembered rural America and the needs of States like my own State of Vermont.

This \$16 billion stimulus package focuses on infrastructure projects that will create jobs and end the constant exodus of high school graduates who leave our State against their will because jobs are somewhere else.

The Senate today is gridlocked by a filibuster based on a letter signed by 43 Republican Senators who steadfastly refuse to end debate and vote on the administration's program.

The Senate cannot hope to get a vote on the President's plan since it cannot muster the 60 votes necessary to end the filibuster in the face of solid, GOP opposition.

Americans living in rural America will be the ones to suffer when one of the first economic packages ever to consider the problems of rural States like Vermont becomes a casualty of gridlock and is never put to a vote.

I don't want our kids to graduate from Vermont high schools and have to leave for jobs in other States. This bill contains the rural imperatives that would allow these Vermonters to stay at home to work and raise their families.

I urge my colleagues to vote to end this filibuster and put rural Americans back to work.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask the manager of the bill, the Senator from Maryland who controls the time, that I be able to ask him a couple questions.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may use.

FILIBUSTER

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Maryland, I have heard at least twice on the floor this morning on the other side of the aisle about the time that had been used on this bill. I think it has been clearly established—and I ask the Senator to answer this question—I think it has been clearly established on this floor during the past 9 or 10 days that there are dif-

ferent ways of conducting a filibuster. Of course, we are familiar with the filibuster by people talking a long time.

The Senator from Maryland is familiar with that; is that true?

Mr. SARBANES. That is correct.

Mr. REID. There is also a filibuster by amendment where an amendment is offered, and as soon as it is defeated another one is brought up. You are also familiar with filibuster by amendment; is that true?

Mr. SARBANES. That is correct, Mr. President, and it is my understanding, as the majority leader has indicated earlier in this debate, that the Republican side was prepared to offer an unlimited number of amendments; in other words, to constantly offer amendments.

The majority leader has tried repeatedly to get an agreement with the Republican side on a limited number of amendments and an agreed-upon time for voting on this bill, and they have consistently refused to provide that agreement. In other words, they have kept this wide open, so we find ourselves in the position where a minority of the Senate can prevent us from getting to this bill.

Mr. REID. Also a question that I propose to the Senator from Maryland is the fact that for the first time in the history of the Senate, that I am aware of, there has been a new method of filibustering, and that is by letter. The Senator from Maryland one night last week had, as part of this RECORD, a letter that was signed by 42 Senators to the minority leader indicating that they were going to filibuster this and they indicated so by letter; is that true?

Mr. SARBANES. The Senator is absolutely correct. In fact, I happen to have the letter in front of me. The letter says, in this concluding paragraph:

Therefore, we will not vote to invoke cloture on this measure as presently constituted, notwithstanding the scheduled Easter recess.

What the other side has made very clear is that they are not going to vote for cloture and this is the first time I have ever seen this technique used in the U.S. Senate, the first time.

Mr. REID. So, Mr. President, this avoids talking and it avoids offering amendments. It is just kind of a quick way to tell everybody that nothing is going to happen on the Senate floor; is that true?

Mr. SARBANES. That is right.

Mr. President, the Republican leader says we disagree with the Democrats on what the strategy ought to be. I understand that. We do disagree. There is a disagreement here, and that has been reflected as we treated the budget resolution, and now as we are treating this jobs bill. But the important point is that the Republicans will not allow us to vote on the disagreeing perceptions. The Republicans say: Not only do we

disagree with the approach that President Clinton is taking and that you are taking, but we are not even going to allow that issue to be put to a vote in the Senate of the United States because we are going to simply block a substantive consideration of the issue, and to demonstrate it, we have sent you this letter that 43 of us have signed.

So now we have a cloture motion. Most of the Democrats were here and voted for it. A goodly number of the Republicans have fled the scene. Of course, you do not need two-thirds of those present and voting under the filibuster rule. If you needed two-thirds of those present and voting, we, in fact, would have invoked cloture on this last vote. But the requirement is that you need 60 people to vote to cut off debate. But there are not 60 Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle.

The other side has signed a letter saying: We are not going to allow you to get cloture. And so a goodly number of their people have simply left and were not here for the last vote. The last vote was 49 to 29 in favor of cloture, and if the rule was two-thirds of the people here and voting, we would have invoked cloture. All cloture means is that we can get to the bill and vote on it "yes" or "no."

If the other side has a differing view of what ought to be done, then obviously they should vote "no" on the bill when it comes up; and those of us who think it is a good bill, that we need a jobs bill, we need to get people back to work would vote "yes." But we are not being given even that opportunity to actually vote on the bill.

They say you have used more time talking on your side than we have on our side. It is really irrelevant when you come up against a filibuster by letter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter, signed by all the Republican Senators to their Republican leader indicating that they will not vote for cloture on this bill, 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, March 31, 1993.

Hon. BOB DOLE,
Republican Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR BOB: As currently written, H.R. 1335, the so-called "Emergency Supplemental Appropriations," contains \$19.5 billion in additional deficit spending. This increase is \$8.5 billion more than the net domestic spending cuts contained in the entire five year budget reduction plan.

The American people are asking the Congress to cut spending first, and then consider other options to reduce the deficit. The enactment of H.R. 1335, in its current form, would be contrary to demands from taxpayers all across America.

Therefore, we will not vote to invoke cloture on this measure as presently con-

stituted, notwithstanding the scheduled Easter recess.

Sincerely,

John Warner, Chuck Grassley, Larry Pressler, Al D'Amato, John McCain, Connie Mack, Larry E. Craig, Trent Lott, Nancy Kassebaum, Arlen Specter, Alan Simpson, Kit Bond, Bob Packwood, Paul D. Coverdell, Frank H. Murkowski, Lauch Faircloth, Conrad Burns, Robert F. Bennett, Slade Gorton, Bill Cohen.

Thad Cochran, Pete Domenici, Jim Jeffords, David Durenberger, Don Nickles, Dan Coats, Malcolm Wallop, Dirk Kempthorne, Judd Gregg, Mark Hatfield, John Danforth, Mitch McConnell, Bob Smith, Strom Thurmond, Phil Gramm, Richard S. Lugar, Jesse Helms, John H. Chafee, Orrin Hatch, Bill Roth, Ted Stevens, Hank Brown.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my final question to the Senator from Maryland would be there then should be no mistake by whom the filibuster is being conducted; is that a fair statement?

Mr. SARBANES. I think that is very clear. I thank the Senator for his questions.

Mr. President, we reserve our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee designated me to control time in his absence. We are going to go back and forth. How much time has been used on their side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time controlled by the Senator from Maryland has used approximately 15 minutes. The Senator from New Mexico has 56 minutes remaining.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland has used 15 minutes and has 45 minutes remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-six, to be exact.

Mr. SARBANES. And the Senator from New Mexico has?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-six.

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the Chair.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I yield as much time as I may use, but if there are any Republican Senators who want to speak, I will yield to them.

I yield myself 10 minutes, and then I will yield to Senator CHAFEES.

Mr. President, let me first address the issue which the distinguished majority leader continues to use on the floor regarding the President's entire economic package, and let me tell you what the Congressional Budget Office says the President's package is. I really thought we were going to use the estimates of the Congressional Budget Office. The President admonished us that night when he gave his speech to the American people that we should do that.

Using CBO's current law capped baseline estimates, this package of deficit reductions is not \$496 billion, rather it

is \$440 billion. A Senate Budget Committee Republican analysis also suggests that when you look at what makes up the \$440 billion in so-called deficit reduction, the following makes up that package, and let me go through it very simply one more time: \$75 billion of that cut is in defense. If this stimulus package is passed, believe it or not, only a net \$9 billion of this deficit reduction package is made up in cuts in the domestic part of the Federal budget.

Two-thirds of the Federal budget is domestic, and the President's package, analyzed by the Budget Committee Republican staff, indicates that after this spending package, we will have cut domestic spending over 5 years by \$9 billion; a net \$9 billion.

Now let me put that in perspective so those listening might understand what that means. In every part of the domestic budget, except Social Security, leave Social Security aside, those programs that we are going to cut a net \$9 billion under the President's plan are actually growing, Mr. President, by \$578 billion. Well over \$120 billion a year.

Now, I thought the American people wanted some cuts. They stand up and say, "We are giving you the cuts." But the cuts are just what I said—\$75 billion, according to Budget Committee analysis in defense; \$9 billion in domestic, once we pass this spending package; and the budget is growing at \$578 billion while we are cutting it a net of \$9 billion.

Why such a small number? Because everybody should know that while we are cutting, we are spending more. While we are reducing some programs, we are putting money into increases for programs and even to fund new programs. And the difference between the new programs, new funding, and the cuts is the astronomical amount of a net \$9 billion.

Now, if we were to just stop there and say, well, that is not much—and it sure is not—much of a deficit reduction package, what else is in this big package to which the majority leader continues to refer?

Well, let us make sure we understand. Eighteen billion dollars of it is new fees, new fees that he plans to assess against users of Federal Government services or properties. That is \$18 billion. Believe it or not, \$59 billion they are taking credit for is nothing more than saving interest on the national debt because interest rates are coming down, and we are planning on cutting the budget. We are giving ourselves credit for all those cuts and all those new taxes, and we are saying the interest will be \$59 billion less than otherwise. Can you imagine? And that is a cut.

What is the real package, however, that makes up this deficit reduction plan? Now is where you really get to

putting the rubber on the road—\$273 billion in new taxes. Frankly, one can almost say it is really a tax package.

Let me go through it again. Nine billion dollars in domestic cuts of all types, net, over 5 years. Let me just give a nice aside about that. Sixty percent of those cuts are sort of believe it or not cuts, or, if you believe it, you believe in fairy tale kind of cuts. Sixty percent are in the year 1998, meaning we will probably never achieve them. They will be forgotten. They are not in entitlement programs; they are just domestic discretionary reductions. We plug them in 5 years out.

So here we are—\$75 billion in defense, \$9 billion net in all of the domestic programs—these are by way of cuts—and the rest is made up of fees of \$18 billion, interest savings allegedly of \$59 billion and new taxes of \$273 billion.

Now, I do not have the exact ratio, but let me suggest that it is somewhere over \$3 in new taxes for every \$1 in spending cuts. In fact, it probably has not changed much from the \$3.88 that we figured, so it is somewhere in the neighborhood of \$3.50 in new taxes for every \$1 in spending reductions.

I do not believe the American people expected that. I do not think anybody though the President campaigned on that. And, frankly, for anyone to say that the Republicans ought not do everything in their power to keep that plan from becoming law is ignoring the fact that we believe it will be ruinous to the American economy, not helpful.

Now, some last remarks before I yield at this moment—unless there are other Republicans who want to speak, and I will yield to the other side. It has been said by some here today on the other side of the aisle that this is an integral part of the President's plan, and it behooves those who would oppose it to understand that they are dismantling the President's program and they may be held accountable.

Mr. President, do you know what is going to cause the American economy not to continue in its recovery mode and add another 400,000 jobs or more to the 409,000 jobs that it added in the months of January and February, far more jobs in those 2 months than this bill is going to create if it works in the remainder of this year? Let me tell you what is going to cause the American economy not to work, and you can mark my words. When we finish the reconciliation bill, the order to the committees that says produce taxes, we will have levied a tax this year, retroactive, of \$27 billion. It will continue to grow until it reaches \$273 billion in new taxes over 5 years, the largest tax bill in the history of the Republic—Senator MOYNIHAN has said in the history of the world—and it is supposed to be an economic recovery plan.

The other side can continue to talk about a great recovery plan, but I really believe that \$273 billion in net new

taxes, offset by net cuts in the domestic programs of this country of only \$9 billion, is far from a recovery plan. As a matter of fact, let us put a couple of numbers in perspective again.

The Congressional Budget Office took this stimulus package—and so everyone will know they said in 1993, the year that they are saying we need the stimulus, let us get things gong, the Congressional Budget Office estimated that out of all of the \$12.3 billion in new discretionary spending in this spending package, only \$2.9 billion will actually be spent in 1993—\$2.9 billion will be spent in 1993, not \$10 billion, not \$15 billion—\$2.9 billion.

Now, what is the matter with this plan is—

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me yield in a moment.

What is the matter with this plan is that that little \$2.95 billion in this year under the umbrella of a \$16.3 billion program is going to be offset in about 2½ months, if the Clinton plan passes, by \$27 billion in new taxes.

One additional minute.

I would clearly ask those who work with economists, those who are members of various economic committees here, I would ask them to ask any economists whether \$2.9 billion in spending this year, which is what the Congressional Budget Office says this big discretionary spending plan is going to do, will have much impact in a \$1.5 trillion economy? I would ask them which is going to do more good or more harm, the \$27 billion in new taxes on this economy effective this year or \$2.95 billion in new discretionary spending?

Mr. President, I believe they would all say forget the stimulus, forget the spending, and cut the taxes. That might be a good tradeoff.

I will take 2 more minutes, Mr. President.

Take the money that is planned to be spent here, except for the unemployment compensation payments, and deduct that whole amount from the taxes we are going to impose on the American people this year. Reduce those taxes by that amount if you want a plan. That will do more for the recovery of the economy than the programs and policies encapsulated in this bill could have done under anybody's imagination, much less real economic facts.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMENICI. I would be pleased to yield on my time for a question from the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Just a very brief question. Where does the Senator get the \$2.9 billion figure as the part of this program that would be effective this year since \$4 billion of it is for unem-

ployment insurance, and that is only to take the program into the first week of October.

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes. What I said was \$2.9 billion will be spent other than unemployment compensation. Unemployment compensation is not a discretionary program like the rest of these programs. Where I got the numbers—

Mr. SARBANES. So the Senator's \$2.9 billion is not counting unemployment?

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes.

Mr. SARBANES. Because the Senator then made the point that there was \$16 billion and only \$2.9 billion of it spent this year. But the \$16 billion includes the \$4 billion in unemployment.

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes.

Mr. SARBANES. So if the Senator is going to make that statement, at least the figure should be \$6.9 billion. I want to check the rest of the Senator's figures.

Mr. DOMENICI. Senator, let me just repeat. I did not intend to mislead anybody.

Mr. SARBANES. No. I listened very carefully because I was wondering, I just thought to myself that figure cannot be right no matter what the spend-out rates are of some of these programs. You said there is 16 billion dollars' worth in this program and only 2.9 is going to be spent this year. But you are telling me that 2.9 does not count the \$4 billion, but the \$16 billion does count the \$4 billion.

Mr. DOMENICI. I think what I said—will repeat this—is that the Congressional Budget Office, in their analysis of this spending package, estimated that for the discretionary spending, in the bill only \$2.95 billion is going to spend out in 1993. Unemployment compensation is going to be for those whose unemployment benefits have expired. I really do not think that spending is intended by anyone to be a stimulus. I think that was voted on separately and now we are funding those extended benefits in this bill. If one wants to call it a stimulus, then clearly when I proposed the other night that we ought not cut the cost-of-living increase for all the thousands of Federal civilian and military employees, that would be more of a stimulus than most things in this package. Give Federal workers their pay raise and cut some of these other things out.

Let me repeat. What is going to harm the economy is not a failure to pass their package. Nobody is going to agree to that, no matter how much the people on the other side of the aisle clamor about it. What is going to hurt the economy is \$27 billion in new taxes, which makes the stimulus qualities of this bill pale. You are pulling down the economy to the tune of \$27 billion in new taxes while you are spending \$2.9 billion on so-called programs to create jobs.

So I do not think those are refutable. The only thing one could say is that taxes do not harm the economy, even when you are trying to pull out of a fragile recovery. Or, one could say, the estimates of the Congressional Budget Office should not be used. We ought to go back to OMB estimates. I don't think either is valid.

As I say to my friend from Mississippi, the Congressional Budget Office is the one that has said how slowly this money will spend out. They are the ones that have confirmed the amount of new taxes to be imposed this year.

I think he knows that the President said follow CBO, the Congressional Budget Office. We are following it. There is not any big bang this year out of this package. It comes later. But I will tell you, there is one big bang, and it is going to be when we put the Btu energy tax on everybody and every business; and, raise marginal tax rates in one instance by 29 percent and another by 36 percent, the largest marginal rate of tax increase in the history of the Republic.

It puts us alongside of England with the kind of tax structure that nobody thinks anybody ought to have in terms of the way it imposes taxes on small businesses around the country that are putting their money back into their businesses. Now they are going to have to take it out and give it to Uncle Sam.

Mr. LOTT. Does the Senator control the time?

Mr. DOMENICI. I do.

Mr. LOTT. Would he yield 7 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield 7 minutes to my friend, Senator TRENT LOTT.

Mr. LOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for his remarks this morning, for his outstanding work this year on the so-called budget plan, and also for his thoughtfulness in describing this particular piece of legislation.

Let us make no mistake about it. This is a spending bill. It is not paid for. There are not even new taxes to pay for it. It is just going to be added to the deficit. The key to this is in the title. This is a supplemental. There is additional new spending above what was already agreed to last year when we had our regular appropriations process. And the American people have figured it out. This is more spending, it is unnecessary spending and, it is spending that is not paid for; it is spending that is going to be added to the deficit.

Mr. President, who in this body worries about the working, taxpaying people of America that are bearing the burden of these increased taxes? And they and their children will bear the burden of the increased deficits. I was home for some events Saturday afternoon. I met with my own constituents. They came up and said, "you are right, please do not give in." They have it fig-

ured out. This bill would allow the Government to spend another \$16 to \$20 billion, and much of it for wasteful programs.

We have already heard the long list of pork that is going to be funded through the CDBG Program. A lot of these other programs that are going to be funded or have their funding increased are not going to create any jobs. Even in the Democratic proposal of the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Oklahoma, they admit many of them do not create new jobs. It is additional spending. The only thing that it might actually do is provide some sugarcoating for the spending and the tax increases that were approved in the budget bill. That is the way even the Washington Post described it. Their editorial on January 28, 1993, described this stimulus package as a political stimulus, not an economic stimulus.

The only part of this package that might do some good by creating some jobs quickly, would be the part that would advance funding for highways out of the highway trust fund and for improvements in airports from the trust fund. We need to do that. The money is there, it should be used, and I support that.

I think we could put together a package, an agreement, that would substantially reduce the size of this package and pay for it. We should certainly, move only those parts of the proposal that are really going to create jobs. Some of this package does not do that. We are talking about almost \$16.3 billion not counting what we have for the highways and airports that would come out of the trust funds. So this is not an insignificant amount of money.

Let me make some points about the specific spending proposals. We already have programs like the Army Corps water projects. \$3.487 billion in funding for the Army Corp's water projects has already been approved for this year. This bill would add \$94 million to that. We have the immunization program. Most people would be willing to support more immunization. But we are adding \$300 million to that program. It already has \$341.1 million in fiscal year 1993. How many jobs would this additional funding create. It will create 250, supposedly, in 1993, none in 1994. The WIC Program already has \$2.860 billion in fiscal year 1993. This bill would add another \$75 million. How many jobs will that create? They say 300. I think that is doubtful. None in 1994.

Many of the programs that are proposed here, such as the Ryan White Care Act, would create no new jobs, in 1993 or 1994. There is a list here of about eight or nine of these that create no jobs. That is acknowledged by what was excluded from the Democratic proposal. So much of this program is just not going to do what it is billed to do.

We should not pass this package in the way it has been offered. We ought

to allow amendments to be offered and have an opportunity to be accepted, including the Democratic amendments have been rejected. The difficulty is, you are going to get this whole hog, pass it all, or you are not going to get any of it.

My reaction is, none of it, then. When you get ready to negotiate seriously, take the debt ceiling out, maybe move the unemployment compensation, maybe some other parts that really create jobs. Yes, then I think that you will find everybody is willing to talk. But if it is going to be a deal, "You take this all or nothing," then you are going to get nothing, because this is a wasteful spending program. It is not paid for.

The American people have figured that out. We have a hard time getting our message through the news media. But I found that it is getting through, while I was home this past weekend. The people understand what is going on here.

Mr. President, I do not understand what has been going on this year. We have been talking about lifting the ban on homosexuals in the military, arguing about bringing in immigrants with AIDS, and now we are going to have Federal funds through Medicaid for everybody to get an abortion. We have had tax increases, spending increases, and now on top of all of that, a bill that alleges it is going to create more jobs than it will and that will add to the deficit.

So I think it is proper that we draw the line here. I know this: While the Republicans are the ones that are taking the lead in stopping this bad bill, there are a lot of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle that are very uncomfortable with it.

They privately say: Look, we are not comfortable with this. We know it is too big. We know it ought to be paid for. We know it is not going to do what we are being told it is going to do.

This is pork barrel. This is porklock. This is wasteful spending, and this is the place to draw the line. Some people say, "You are just trying to embarrass the President." That is not true. I do not want to do that. I wanted him to have a successful summit meeting in Vancouver. He ought to be embarrassed to put everything on the line, to hold on to this package lock, stock, and barrel, every nickel of it, no matter whether it is paid for or not. Just add it to the deficit and, supposedly, it will create a lot of new jobs.

It will not do it. It will hurt the economy, Mr. President. This time, the American people have it figured out. We can work out something that is fair and understandable, that might have some positive effect, or we can stay here and have amendments or debate it, however the leadership would like to do it. This time we are not going to let a bad bill go forward that is nothing

more than a political payoff. That is what it really is.

I yield the floor.
Mr. SARBANES. Did I understand the Senator's comments to mean that the transportation package that is in this bill meets his approval?

Mr. LOTT. I said that—
Mr. SARBANES. Highways, mass transit, and airports?

Mr. LOTT. I did not mention mass transit.

Mr. SARBANES. That comes out of the trust fund.

Mr. LOTT. I said I think there are areas where we can work out an agreement. It might not be the way I would like to do it if I were totally in charge of the package. But in cases where the funding is not going to be added to the deficit because it is in a trust fund, and if you can show it will produce some benefits, I think we can support that advanced funding. I would rather not include the entire area that you just spoke about, but I think we can work that out.

If we would go with the parts of this bill that really create jobs, then I would be willing to support that. I think that could be an area where maybe we could reach an agreement. But the problem is, everybody says you have to add this and that, and the next thing you know it is up to \$12 or \$14 billion again, and not paid for; it is just added to the deficit. At least with the two trust funds, you are moving money that is there, that can be used and can be used quickly to projects that have been identified. So if you want to talk about that, then we can talk about it. But I certainly would not support all these other spending increases.

Mr. BUMPERS. Will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. SARBANES. What is the time situation, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland has 46 minutes, 35 seconds remaining. The Senator from New Mexico has 31 minutes remaining.

Mr. SARBANES. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BUMPERS. For the time being, not to preempt the Senator from Michigan, will the Senator yield 1 minute?

Mr. SARBANES. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUMPERS. I wanted to ask the Senator from Mississippi, who has talked a great deal here, as have other Members of that side of the aisle, about paying for this package. I have a sporting proposition for the Senator.

I have a series of bills pending in the U.S. Senate to cut really massive amounts of spending. But I will just give the Senator four of them: space station, super collider, advanced solid rocket motor—which, unhappily, is made in the Senator's home State—and

SDI. If the Senator will vote for those four items which, incidentally, will cut a lot less spending than is in this package for 1994, if you vote for all four of those, you will save about \$4.5 billion. In the next 30 years, you save about \$300 billion. If you vote for those four, you will get about \$4.5 billion in 1994.

If the Senator will give me his word on the floor right now that he will vote against every one of those projects, I will vote against this stimulus package. I wonder if the Senator would yield an additional minute for the Senator from Mississippi to respond.

Mr. SARBANES. Yes.

Mr. LOTT. I would be happy to respond. First of all, the Senator from Arkansas said I have talked a lot about what is in this bill. I have spoken, I think, 7 minutes. This bill has been debated since last Wednesday or Thursday, for 30 or 35 hours. This is the first time I have spoken on this legislation.

If the Senator from Arkansas wants to offer some amendments to pay for what is in this bill, he should put them up and I think he will maybe have a chance. No, I will not vote for all of those. I might vote for some of what is in this package, and I might vote for some of the other items. Put them up. Somebody ought to offer something to pay for this bill. The Senator from Arkansas would be the first one that offered something that might pay for it. I urge him to do that.

Mr. BUMPERS. I have already done it. Every one of those things are pending in the U.S. Senate right now.

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I yield 8 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. DOMENICI. If the Senator will yield, I just wanted to state that Senator CHAFEE is going to control our time.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator from Michigan yield me 30 seconds?

Mr. RIEGLE. Off his time or mine?

Mr. SARBANES. Off my time.

Mr. President, I just want to underscore that the Republicans have said they are going to do "everything in our power to prevent this measure from becoming law," including not allowing us to vote on it. It is very important that that be understood. I was told what people heard when they went home for the weekend. What I heard is: Why do they not give this new President a chance; give Bill Clinton, who was elected by the American people as President in the first week of November, an opportunity to get his program into place? He is willing to be accountable for it. Why do they not give him a chance to do that, and at least why do they not give the Senate a chance to actually vote on the substance of his program instead of frustrating it.

People see this as a return of gridlock. As I hear it, they want the

new President to have a chance. They want him to have a chance to try to change the country, move it in a different direction, and try to address these problems that have confronted the Nation. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I want to continue in that vein. This is this morning's Wall Street Journal, page 2. It says: "Republican filibuster stalemates bill for \$16 billion in economic stimulus."

I have heard the other side of the aisle say they are not blocking things. It is not gridlock. They do not have the works jammed up here. That is not true. In fact, we are confronting a filibuster. The first line in this story in the Wall Street Journal says, "Republican filibuster tactics plunge the Capitol back into stalemate."

That is the Wall Street Journal's opinion of it. Let me give you something more current off of the Associated press wire service within the last 40 minutes. It comments on the vote we just had here this morning. The headlines: Senate Republicans Again Block Vote on Clinton Stimulus Plan. The writer, Jim Luther, says: "Senate Republicans refuse for a third time today to allow a vote on President Clinton's stimulus plan."

I want to talk about two things here in the time I have, and the time is limited. I want to talk about the merits of the issue and then about the politics of the issue. In terms of the merits, the economy is in real trouble. We have seen this chart before, and it shows in past recessions, noted here by this blue line, that as the months have gone by in the recession, you come down to the bottom of the recession and you come out of it and you cover the jobs you have lost; and by this point, some 2½ years after the recession started, you are way up here with a good, strong job recovery.

The red line here is what has happened in this recession. We are way down here. There is a huge gap here. We are not getting the job recovery. In fact, we just got the numbers for March indicating that in our entire economy, we lost another 22,000 jobs. That is why President Clinton has put this jobs program before the country and before the Congress and why we need to enact it.

I realize people on the other side are a little sensitive about it, because they just lost the Presidency, because they had a President who had an economic plan for every country in the world except our own. He had a plan for Kuwait, a plan for Mexico, a plan for this country and that country, but no plan for America. The people said they had enough of that, so they got rid of that crowd, brought in a new President who had a plan for America, and now the plan is here on the Senate floor, and that side of the aisle refuses to allow us to enact this plan.

In addition to this chart that shows a lack of job recovery, this is what the last 12 years have looked like in terms of our merchandise trade deficit with the rest of the world.

Back in 1980, we had roughly a balance of trade. By the time we got up to the end of 1992, we had \$1.2 trillion in cumulative merchandise trade deficits with the rest of the world.

We are hemorrhaging money out of this country and hemorrhaging jobs with it. The worst part of the problem is within the country of Japan. If you take our deficits each year with Japan, from 1980 up through 1992, it hit a high point of \$60 billion in their favor—\$5 billion a month going out of this country to Japan in 1987. It came in at \$49 billion last year. Japan has taken a half trillion dollars out of the United States since 1980. Five hundred billion dollars' worth of jobs, of economic strength, has left America and gone to Japan.

What is Japan doing right now with their economy, even after draining all this wealth out of our country? Here is another story out of the New York Times just this week. Last year, because the unemployment rate in Japan got all the way up to 2.5 percent—imagine that; ours is a little over 7 percent; theirs got up to 2½ percent—they decided they needed an economic stimulus plan. How much did they put in it? They put in \$93 billion. We are talking here about a U.S. stimulus plan of \$16.3 billion. Last year, the Japanese, according to the New York Times, had a \$93 billion stimulus.

The Japanese have come along this year and decided they need to put some muscle into their economy, so they are going to have a new stimulus program. This story says the new program is going to be \$130 billion more. The Japanese are going to invest that much in their country to provide jobs and economic lift.

And here we have, on the other side of the aisle here, this adamant objection by the Republicans to even a \$16 billion plan by President Clinton to help this country, and it helps all 50 States. In my own State of Michigan, roughly a third of a billion dollars would come in, some for transportation and highway projects, some of it for summer jobs, some of it for the Head Start Program, some of it for community development block grants to help the cities get things going and get the employment up there. Some of it is to help the veterans.

This money is going to help the country not only create jobs, but it is going to put money in circulation. Every person's job helps create another person's job in this country. That is why we need it.

On the merits of the case, there is no question we need the jobs now. We are seeing jobs disappear. Last month, consumer confidence was dropping. The

stock market was off nearly 70 points on Friday. Now we are finding that the Treasury Department cannot even proceed with their normal Treasury funding because the debt limit issue is all tangled up in this.

On the merits, it is clear the public voted in November for change, a change in jobs, and a change in President, a President for America. They had it with having a President for every country in the world, but no President for our own country. Now we have a President, Bill Clinton, a President for this country. And he came in with a focused, sensible economic plan.

It is just killing our friends on the other side of the aisle. This President has only been in some 11 weeks, and they are doing everything they can to cripple his Presidency and not let him get started with the plan he was elected to do.

I know we have at least a couple of Presidential candidates on this side of the aisle itching to start the 1996 Presidential race. They cannot go up to New Hampshire just yet. That is a little awkward and it would look pushy to do that. I know they are dying to do that.

What they do instead is come in here and do everything they can to damage this President, who was just elected, because they are furthering their own personal political ambitions, trying to help themselves for 1996.

Oh, they are concerned with other candidates in their party who are not stuck in the Senate. One I will mention is Jack Kemp, who is out there going around the country giving speeches. Some Senators here do not want to be outdone by Jack Kemp, and they are going to do what they can to help thwart this President now in the notion they are helping their Presidential prospects in 1996. That is what is going on here when you strip all the verbiage and veneer off it.

When Japan last year did 93 billion dollars' worth of job stimulus, and this year is going to do another 130 billion dollars' worth of job stimulus, and unemployment is only 2½ percent, for Republicans to come in here and say, "Look, we are not going to give you the \$16 billion to try to do something about a much bigger unemployment problem in America," the only possible reason they are doing that is sheer politics, and it is Presidential politics. It is just killing them that they do not have the White House after 12 years.

They do not deserve to have the White House. They squandered the White House. But do not hurt this President. This President has a sensible plan.

I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I yield the time for managing to the Senator from Michigan. I yield him an additional 2 minutes now, and then he can yield time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan will now control the time.

Mr. RIEGLE. I thank the Chair and the Senator from Maryland.

So we are in a situation now where the other side will do anything they have to to create and maintain the gridlock. That is what the Wall Street Journal said. They did not invent this headline. This headline is a statement of fact: "Republican Filibuster Stalemates Bill for \$16 Billion in Economic Stimulus."

There is this headline on the story off the AP wire now: "Senate Republicans Again Block Vote on Clinton Stimulus Plan."

It is obvious what is going on here. I know some on that side think things are going to come to a head with this, and they are going to score a few points, politically stocking up, because they hurt this President.

You cannot hurt this President without hurting America. When you hurt the President, you hurt America and hurt unemployed people out there. People are fearful they are going to lose their jobs. It is time we did something for this country, and it is time that people on that side of the aisle decide to do something for people in this country.

Their party was taken out of power in the executive branch because they failed on the economic issue, and they ought to be honest enough to recognize it and to not try to cripple the new President, who has come in here and has an economic plan to try to get job growth going again. Give him a chance. He has only been there 11 weeks. He has only been there 11 weeks. He won the election and has come in with a sensible plan. We need the jobs. So let us do something for America.

They can worry about the Presidency, the Republican Party, and nomination sometime later on down the road, when we get closer to 1996. But let us take the Presidential politics out of here and let us pass this jobs plan and let us put people to work in this country.

We need jobs in America. We do not need any more politics coming off the other side, politics of division, stalemate, gridlock, and filibuster.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE].

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator controls 30 minutes and 37 seconds.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, one of the strangest things that happens in this Senate is people seem to think if they shout at the top of their lungs, events can be changed; and that if they can launch into enough wild charges, it will make a difference in this place.

The fortunate thing is the people of the United States are fairly intelligent,

and they can see through some of the nonsense that is said on the floor of this Senate, and that is a great tribute to the American people.

I have heard some statements about President Bush doing everything for foreign countries and nothing for America. It is very strange that those comments should be made about President Bush hard on the heels of President Clinton just returning from Vancouver where he pledged \$1.6 billion to the country of Russia.

I support that. I do not attack that, just like I did not attack and felt that the President of the United States, President Bush, was taking the right steps when he was supportive of foreign measures. But we do not look for consistency on the other side. We are used to palaver being poured out attacking our President Bush and everything is perfect with President Clinton. The Republicans are all for increasing unemployment—if you listen to some of that nonsense, you are liable to believe it. But I think nobody does believe it.

Now, Mr. President, it is apparent that this year, which is the first in Mr. Clinton's Presidency, that things have gotten off to a bad start in the Senate. The first major spending measure to come before this body has found every Member of the Republican Party against it. It is no secret that perhaps a half dozen Democrats are likewise deeply concerned about the measure that is before us. We have had the bill before us for more than a week, and not one vote has shifted. It is akin to a vehicle being deep in the snow drift; we are not moving 1 inch.

Nothing is achieved by fiery statements about the supposed evils of gridlock, nor is any progress being made as a result of this Democratic Senator bellowing at the top of his lungs that Republicans do not care about the jobless, or another Democratic Senator sardonically inferring that Republicans are extending the recession. Nobody is extending the recession. Nobody believes such nonsense including, I suspect, the speakers themselves.

For the Democratic administration, Mr. President, gridlock represents a failure, a failure to lead, and a failure to fashion legislation that is acceptable to enough Senators to achieve passage.

What counts, Mr. President, is not invective in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but passage of bills that will hopefully result in solving national problems. So gridlock represents a failure, a failure of the President, and a failure of the leadership in the Senate. Somehow, on this particular measure, a compromise will eventually be worked out. But it seems to me, Mr. President, it is more important to ascertain how we got into this situation and how does the majority seek to avoid such imbroglios in the future.

May I offer some observations which are based upon having served in the Senate under Democratic administrations and under Republican administrations, with Republican majorities and with Democratic majorities?

To date, the Clinton administration has evidenced, it seems to me, in its relationship with the Senate, two characteristics: First, a cavalier attitude. Perhaps hubris is the better word, but it is all the same. Overbearing pride; the belief that the virtues of its position are so manifest, so evident, that the results sought will be achieved and a large group in the Senate can be ignored.

Second, associated with this attitude has been an unwillingness to consult with and to reason with Republicans.

Perhaps this is understandable. There is a Democratic President in the White House, there are overwhelming Democratic majorities in both branches of Congress—60 percent in the House and 57 percent in the Senate. Why waste time talking to a group that is usually noncohesive and, if it was united, would constitute only a minority in either legislative branch?

But experience has shown that consultation produces better results than confrontation. Some of the most significant legislation sought by Democratic and Republican administrations has come about through bipartisan coalitions that have provided the necessary numbers to produce passage, sometimes prevailing over a majority of the administration's own party.

For example, in 1978 the Carter administration was extremely anxious to have lifted an arms embargo imposed on Turkey. That action was agreed to by the Senate by a vote of 57 to 42, with only 30 of 62 Democrats voting with the majority. Less than half of the Democrats voted with the majority. The Republicans, with 27 votes, supplied the margin of victory for President Carter.

Likewise, in that same year, the Carter administration wished to sell certain aircraft to Egypt, Israel, and Saudi Arabia. The so-called F-15 sale, as it is remembered. Thirty-three Democrats voted against the sale and only 28 for it—less than half of Democrats voted for it, 28—but the Carter position prevailed with 26 Republican votes.

Frequently, Republican votes have proven very helpful when a politically unpopular position is taken by a Democratic President. Example: Ratification of the Panama Canal Treaty in 1978. Sixteen Republicans, including Howard Baker, the Republican leader, joined 52 Democrats to provide a substantial majority to pass the treaty. Indeed, Howard Baker, the Republican leader, voted with President Carter on each of these three votes I have cited, each of them big, important votes to the Democratic administration.

All virtue—which is a surprising admission for anybody on the floor of the Senate—all virtue does not reside in either of the parties. Members of both parties are anxious to advance the welfare of our Nation.

If the President, President Clinton, is to wrestle successfully with a host of extremely contentious matters, it is essential that he have some Republican support. Looming on the horizon are at least three issues that will probably see a significant number of Democratic defections: the President's economic plan, which will be coming along later; his health care reform proposal; and the approval of the North American Free-Trade Agreement [NAFTA]. There is much in each of these proposals that deeply appeals to Republicans. If consulted, they can be extremely helpful.

It behooves President Clinton to alter drastically his present approach to congressional Republicans, especially those in the Senate. Arrogance will not succeed. Consultation will. The result will be a constructive session that will be beneficial to our Nation.

So, Mr. President, I do urge that those on the other side take some heed to these thoughts that have come as a result of the time that I have served here in the Senate.

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

Mr. BUMPERS addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMHAM). The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maryland, I yield myself 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

A MONUMENTAL TRAGEDY

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I want to say, in opening, what a tragedy, what a monumental tragedy is being played out here in the U.S. Senate. A young, new President gave hope to the people of this country. He promised that he was going to be a President of change. He sends a whole economic program over here for the U.S. Congress to consider. His program, so far, has passed the House, but it cannot get past the Senate. The budget resolution was not filibustered, but now the Republicans have decided to filibuster the so-called stimulus package.

People say, as they said in the paper this morning, and as Ross Perot has said, and captured the imagination of an awful lot of people, "You cannot do business as usual."

And yet, out of 535 Members of Congress, 435 on the House side and 100 on the Senate side, 43 out of 535 say, "No, Mr. President, we are not going along with you on this. It has to be paid for."

I have not heard anybody suggest how it is going to be paid for, just the generic argument it needs to be paid for.

Many of you here heard me make the proposition to the Senator from Mississippi a while ago: You vote with me on four amendments to kill the space station, to kill the super collider, to cut SDI by a couple billion dollars, to eliminate the advanced solid rocket motor in Mississippi—all of that comes to about \$4.5 billion for 1994—Republicans, you promise to vote with me to kill that spending, and I will vote with them to torpedo the package against the President of the United States, whom everybody knows has been my good friend for 20 years.

Yes, I will rupture that relationship and vote against this stimulus if they will vote against what will ultimately be \$350 billion in spending over the next 30 years.

No, they are not going to do that. They simply want the argument. They want to talk about finding the money to pay for it.

If they are looking for the money, there was \$500 billion in the budget resolution which would cut the deficit over the next 5 years by \$500 billion.

Who have you heard longer and more lamentably than the Republicans about cutting spending and getting the deficit under control? And when we come with a budget resolution to cut \$500 billion out, how many Republican votes do we get? Not one. How many Republican votes did we get on the stimulus package? Not one.

Can it be that of 43 men and women on the Republican side, not one—not one—believes that they ought to support the President who just took office a little over 2 months ago?

We all know what is going on here. The minority leader said this morning. "The Democrats have talked longer than we have. That is not a filibuster." In the old days, to filibuster you had to be at the floor and keep it. Today it is much more sophisticated. All you have to do is get 41 votes on that side of the aisle, and we are dead, dead, dead.

If we could not get a single vote on that side to cut the deficit by \$500 billion, if we cannot get a single vote on that side for extended unemployment benefits, to build roads—you do not have to pay for that. That is coming out of the trust fund. It is already paid for, \$3 billion in here. The Small Business Administration, the only game in town as far as small business people are concerned in this country because the banks will not loan money to small businesses—there is \$144 million in this that generates \$2.56 billion in loans for small businesses. Do you know that on May 3, a month from now, the Small Business Administration is out of business if we do not pass this?

That is not an emergency to these people on the other side of the aisle. They are not in small business. But to poor old mom and pop out there, who are going to have to get it at the Small Business Administration because the

banks will not loan it to them—it is an emergency to them.

I said it the other day, I make \$135,000 a year, probably overpaid—I promise you 95 percent of the people in the country think I am overpaid. And they think the rest of this body is overpaid too. I must say, based on what has happened here in the last week, it would be hard to argue with them.

My children, all well situated, great educations, stable, commonsensical, well-paying jobs—they do not have an emergency. No, of course they do not. It is the people across this country, it is the people across this country who have been desperately looking for jobs—it is an emergency for them.

Mr. President, sometimes I listen to these arguments on the other side about how much we are cutting. Do you know that budget resolution costs \$250 billion in spending and they are saying we are not cutting anything? They are worried about a big book that the mayors of this country put out about all the projects, some of them silly—golf courses, bike paths. Bike paths are not silly. We build them in national parks and we think it is wonderful. We build them in some cities because it saves gasoline and energy. But those are not in the bill. That is a distraction. That is designed so when C-SPAN cameras beam this debate across the country, people sitting in their living room say: Look at those clowns. They are up there appropriating money for bike paths and golf courses and swimming pools. It is nonsense. It simply is not true.

Then I see in the paper where the Republicans are filibustering because they are angry with Senator BYRD—always reluctant to say things like that on the floor—angry with him because in the parliamentary situation he filed the tree up so they could not offer amendments. I am not going to comment on that but I am going to say this. The fact that people on that side of the aisle may be angry with Senator BYRD has nothing to do with the fact that 250 million people in this country are not concerned about who is angry with whom. They are concerned about this country doing something to help them.

I heard the Senator—I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. BUMPERS. I heard the Senator from Missouri—I am sorry he is not on the floor. I heard the senior Senator from Missouri on the floor Saturday afternoon saying, why, when you count the number of jobs you get with this \$16 billion it comes to \$100,000 a job.

Do you know who the biggest contractor on the space station is? McDonnell Douglas. Do you know where they are? In Missouri, home of the senior Senator. Do you know what the jobs on the space station cost? One hundred thousand smokes each.

Do you know what the super collider down in Texas—and incidentally Texas gets the lion's share of the space station too—do you know what the jobs on the super collider cost? One hundred thousand smokes each. I wanted to ask the Senator from Missouri, is he going to vote against the space station and the super collider because they cost \$100,000 for every job they create? Of course he is not. I know the answer without asking. So that is not the test.

Mr. President, it is so sad to see this body—what shall I say—tying itself in knots. I am ready to vote the whole package down so we can get on. But when you do that, what have you accomplished? You have said to this new President, no, we are not going to support you. You got elected telling the American people you favor change. We have new information for you, Mr. President. If you cannot get a single Republican vote for a budget resolution which reduces the deficit by \$500 billion, if you cannot get a single Republican vote to keep the Small Business Administration afloat, help people who are out of work with unemployment compensation benefits, to build housing, the most job-intensive money in the bill—if you cannot get a single Republican vote for that, you tell me how we are going to pass 250 to 300 billion dollars' worth of taxes, when I promise you we will not get a single Republican vote.

So what 43 Senators are doing is saying to the American people: Forget it. You elected a new President; 43 people out of 535 will be calling the shots. It is a travesty and a monumental travesty.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Maryland?

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, could I inquire what is the time situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland controls 23 minutes, 17 seconds. The Senator from Rhode Island, 21 minutes, 32 seconds.

Mr. SARBANES. We have been trying to rotate. I will yield 5 minutes and then I guess we will go back to the other side.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Unless the Senator from Rhode Island would like to respond to the Senator from Arkansas? I would be pleased to yield.

Mr. SARBANES. We will go to the other side after the Senator from Minnesota. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

ECONOMIC STIMULUS

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Senator from Maryland.

I just want to say to the Senator from Arkansas before he leaves the floor, if he is going to leave the floor, I am going to build my remarks on what the Senator from Arkansas said.

So, Mr. President, these comments are not well rehearsed or polished.

I think the Senator from Arkansas was speaking with some passion because he was trying to take this debate—which all too often has been discussion of political advantage and strategy, and I think the Senator from Arkansas was trying to make this debate real in human terms.

When I go home to the State of Minnesota, all too often what happens—and every Senator on this floor has probably experienced this, and it really is very difficult to take because it is real pain—people come up, rural and urban, and they say to me, "Senator, I am out of work. I do not have a job."

Or they say, "Senator, I lost my job and I am working, I am not counted as unemployed, but I do not even make poverty wages and I have no health care benefits."

Or they say, "Senator, my child graduated from college but she cannot find any work. Or she can only find a temp job."

Or they say, "Senator, I am really worried about my teenager this summer, whether or not he or she will have any job at all."

Or, "Senator, I really feel like I am not going to be able to be successful, I cannot keep my small business going."

Or, "Senator, I do not know what we are going to do in our community because we do not have the resources to work with."

This is a very real debate. I just want to make two points because I only have 5 minutes.

My first is, I really think the \$16 billion is probably not even near what we should be doing by way of economic stimulus and economic investment, strategic investment in our own economy. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE] has been making this point over and over and over again. We had a group of Nobel laureate economists within the last year here arguing we needed to invest at least \$60 billion. I do not know whatever happened to this economic analysis, that you invest in your economy on the front end so you can be further ahead; that for every percentage of unemployment you bring down, it reduces the deficit by \$50 billion.

Where did we get away from the fundamental tenet that what is good for the economy and people in this country is to move toward an economy that generates jobs, the kind of jobs people can count on—jobs with decent wages with decent health care benefits? President Clinton has presented a smaller stimulus package. It is part of his overall economic package. It already is a compromise.

Mr. RIEGLE. That is right.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I think he offered it in the spirit of compromise.

Now my political science point. I heard the Senator from Rhode Island

say we need to think more about consultation and not confrontation. But it is the President of the United States who is held accountable by people in this country for the economic performance of this Nation. President Bush found that out.

If, in fact, you have a filibuster and you essentially obstruct and you do not let the new President have the opportunity to go forward with his economic program, then you essentially undercut the very essence of representative democracy.

For the life of me, I do not understand why our colleagues on the other side do not debate it—they should—offer amendments—they can—and tell the people in the country it will not work, and vote against it. And then we will see what happens. We are asking for an opportunity. President Clinton is asking for an opportunity. The people have given him this opportunity to present a plan, to have that plan enacted and for us to try and do well for the people in this country. That is what is being sabotaged on the floor of the Senate. That is what has been sabotaged for a week plus, and I think it is unconscionable. I yield the rest of my time.

Mr. CHAFEE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I need.

Mr. President, the problem with this so-called economic emergency stimulus package is, it is neither an emergency nor is it a stimulus. We all recognize that. What is more, all these wonderful programs that are in it, they laud on that side as being so splendid, whether it is an extension of the Pell grants or doing something about summer jobs or immunization programs. They all think they are wonderful, but they are not willing to pay for any of it. They have not come forward with a proposal to pay for them, and that is the problem.

I notice on the other side there are several Senators who serve on the Banking Committee. As such, they have had before them Mr. Alan Greenspan, who is Chairman of the Federal Reserve. Let me just give a few quotes from the testimony that Mr. Greenspan gave before the Finance Committee in the Senate on March 24. This is what Mr. Greenspan had to say:

*** our burgeoning structural budget deficit, unless addressed, will increasingly threaten the stability of our economic system. Time is no longer on our side. *** On a cyclically adjusted or structural basis, the deficit has hovered around 3 percent of potential GNP for the last 10 years, a phenomenon without precedent in our peacetime history. *** The deficit is a corrosive force that already has begun to eat away at the foundations of our economic strength. Financing of private capital investment has been crowded out and, not surprising, the United States has experienced a lower level

of net investment relative to GDP than any other of the G-7 countries in the last decade.

This, by the way, is the Chairman of the Federal Reserve. And he ends up as follows, after some eight pages of testimony:

Let me conclude by reiterating my central message. The deficit is a malignant force in our economy. How the deficit is reduced is very important, that it be done is crucial. Allowing it to fester would court a dangerous erosion of our economic strength and a potentially significant deterioration in our real standard of living.

Now there it is, Mr. President. No one, I think, argues with the conclusions that Mr. Greenspan reaches, and yet we have before us \$16 billion, that truly even the most urgent enthusiastic proponents of this legislation on the other side would have to conclude that a great portion of it has nothing to do with an emergency and less to do with a stimulus. And yet it is not paid for.

They do not like to hear that, and they would rather show charts and display—this is the great chart season, Mr. President. We have charts for every possible purpose. If you showed what charts were showing last week they would not be in agreement with the charts. For instance, last week's charts were the horrors of the deficit, but those have been put aside to foster some other program that they are on now.

Mr. President, they rail on the other side against what is taking place, and the junior Senator from Minnesota says it is unconscionable. He just does not like the way the rules of the Senate are. Now that is difficult but these rules have been in effect for a good long time and I suspect are going to be here after the Senator from Minnesota moves on.

It seems to me they ought to deal with the cards that are dealt. It is obvious this package, as it comes before us, is not going to pass. Frankly, I believe the American people do not want it to pass. They see this trash that is in it.

Let me just read down—they do not like to hear this business about pork. Let us see what Arkansas has in here. They have a baseball and a soccer park in Jonesboro, AR. That is some baseball and some soccer park, \$5,300,000.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAFEE. You just be quiet over there. You will get your chance. You have been speaking.

Mr. BUMPERS. Tell us what page of the bill that is on? Tell us what page of the bill that is on?

Mr. CHAFEE. You will have your chance; you will have your chance.

Mr. BUMPERS. Let us be honest in the debate.

Mr. CHAFEE. The list below is taken from the National Conference of Mayors' ready-to-go book of more than 4,000 public projects. It gives a sense of

exactly where much of the money would be going. Is it specifically listed? The Senator from Arkansas knows thoroughly well that these are not specifically listed as such. There are the items that are in the community development block grant section; that there is a possibility for.

Let us see how Minnesota makes out. Well, Minneapolis, MN, is going to convert a brewery to an industrial park for \$5 million.

How about Maryland? See, Maryland is not on this current list. I do not know what happened there in Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Your research must have broken down.

Mr. CHAFEE. Or else the Senators from Maryland were not vigilant. But I can hardly believe that. Let us see who else we have here.

Mr. SARBANES. You need a new research team.

Mr. CHAFEE. Detroit, MI, here is one: Purchase four bus wash racks for \$480,000 and that will provide three jobs.

Mr. RIEGLE. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. CHAFEE. I am just about finished and then you can have all the time you want.

Mr. RIEGLE. I would like to make one point—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island has the floor. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. CHAFEE. I will be finished in a few minutes. The Senators on the other side can have all the time they want.

But the point is, Mr. President, nothing is going to be achieved by cat-erwauling on the floor here that they are being treated unfairly, that 43 Senators are keeping them from achieving what they want. They all know the rules. They have all used them to great effectiveness in the past. Indeed, no one has used them more effectively than the chairman of the Appropriations Committee; no objections on that side to that undertaking; no objections to things being included in reconciliation. So those are the rules. So we are playing by the rules as we see them.

So, Mr. President, I hope that both sides will get together, come up with those things that make sense out of this package and get on with it, because we have a lot of work to do in the Senate.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. SARBANES. I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Rhode Island that Detroit today has the highest rate of child poverty of any large city in America, and we have more people on food stamps in the whole country than we have ever had in our history.

This bill before us provides urgent help to people out there. It provides summer jobs. It provides help for Head Start. People need this. The Senator from Rhode Island may not need it. But you cannot judge the whole country by our own circumstances. The city of Detroit is in deep trouble, as cities are all across this country. It is time we did something about it.

The last time the other side was in Detroit was in 1980, when we nominated Reagan. We spent 8 years at the movies with Ronald Reagan.

We know where we are today. And it is time to create some jobs in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 30 seconds have elapsed.

Who yields time?

Who yields time?

Mr. SARBANES. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has been yielded 4 minutes. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank the Senator from Maryland and I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, we are hearing about process and we are hearing about the rules, and I am shocked that that is what the American public is treated to daily on television as we meet. Gridlock is winning, the American people are losing, and partisan conflict is again delaying the needed action. We argue each day and attempt to point to colleagues' motives in the extreme so that we can continue to postpone a vote that is a positive vote for America that gets people back to work.

In my State of New Jersey, the unemployment rate is up to 8.3 percent, a full percentage point and three-tenths higher than the national average. And whatever the signs are about recovery, I can assure you, Mr. President, we do not see it in New Jersey, and we do not see it in Michigan, and we do not see it in other States around the country. A jobless recovery is an empty recovery, Mr. President, and we have to do something about getting people back to work.

Mr. President, Americans spoke clearly in November, and they continue to stay engaged, communicating their desire for change through the pollsters, our phone lines, our fax lines, and the mail. They want us to break the gridlock and take real and positive steps to change the economic policies of the past two administrations.

Mr. President, they want us to do something big. Even as they are concerned about unemployment, about loss of a job, about the cost of health care, or loss of coverage, they are also hopeful and engaged. They are willing to make sacrifices as long as they believe that we are acting on their behalf, and not on behalf of special interests.

They are willing to share in the burdens of building a better future as long as they know their tax dollars are not wasted, that deep spending cuts are being made, and that the Government is going to slim down and not continue to grow at their expense.

Mr. President, the economic policies of the last 12 years have failed. Those policies, boiled down to their essence, were based on giving tax breaks to the wealthiest among us, spending substantial sums on the military, and, largely as a result of the first two, running huge budget deficits.

Under the last two administrations, we've had skyrocketing deficits, phony numbers, and trick accounting. These evasions have misled the American people about the real scope of our problems and the need for hard decisions.

But, the 1992 election was like a national teach-in.

The country responded in loud and clear terms. The people said we're tired of gridlock. We're tired of being misled. We want bold action to revitalize our economy. We want to get our fiscal house in order and invest in our long-term growth and our people.

They said that we are willing to share in solving these problems as long as spending is cut as much as possible, waste is eliminated, we invest for a better future, and we achieve significant deficit reduction—not just a bigger bureaucracy or more perks for the Government.

President Clinton's economic plan responds clearly to these desires. It promises to reduce the budget deficit, to remove an unfair burden from our children and grandchildren. And it promises to invest in the economic foundations of our country—our people's education and job training, our infrastructure, and our technology and research base.

With the passage of the budget resolution, the Congress has begun the process of making good on these promises. The deficit reduction plan goes beyond what the President has called for to cut almost \$500 billion in red ink over the next 5 years. And it will provide the necessary funds to begin to reduce the investment deficit as well.

The third critical element of the President's plan is a modest package of tax cuts and investments designed to stimulate the economy in the short run, to get the unemployment rate down, and create jobs so we can escape from this deep and sustained recession.

Mr. President, I just don't have one or two or even three good reasons for supporting the pending economic stimulus package—I have 325,000 of the most important reasons in the world. This is the number of unemployed New Jerseyans. That is 325,000 mothers, fathers, daughters, sons, sisters, and brothers ready, willing, and able to go to work, earn a living, and improve their lives and their families' lives.

A recent survey in New Jersey found that one out of every three households in my State has had at least one family member out of work during the past year. One out of three.

Anyone who thinks that we are in a recovery should climb aboard the next Metroliner and head north.

I support this package because I believe that we must give this key component of the President's plan a chance to provide a needed spark to ignite our sagging economy.

This is not a make-work package, as some have suggested. It is a true investment package that will create jobs today that make our people and our public infrastructure better ready to compete in a global marketplace. It puts funds in the hands of State and local governments who, strapped as they are, can be counted on to make wise use of funds and not squander them on unneeded pork.

For New Jersey alone, this package will mean the investment of more than \$308 million. One of the areas of investment I am most pleased to see is transportation investment. As chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, I have long supported increased investment in transportation as proposed in the intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act, or ISTEA.

The economic stimulus package will pump more than \$4 billion into our highways, buses, trains, airports, and Amtrak right away. This investment will create thousands of jobs immediately. And it will lay the groundwork for increased productivity and economic growth down the line.

In New Jersey, the plan will make as much as \$145 million available immediately. And I can assure my colleagues that the State is ready to go to create an estimated 6,000 jobs and complete needed projects.

The President's plan will provide another \$75 million for the Community Development Block Grant Program this year. This program provides flexible funds to our local communities that they can use to attract new jobs and industries, meet critical infrastructure needs, and build a base for economic growth.

Almost \$35 million of this package will go to building wastewater treatment facilities in our State. In New Jersey, as throughout the Nation, we need this capacity to meet current demands and to create capacity for hoped for growth.

Another \$26 million of this package will go to create tens of thousands of summer jobs in my State. These are the kind of jobs that not only put kids to work but that give kids the skills to work that they carry with them throughout their lives.

Last, the package will fund the extension of unemployment insurance to some 70,000 New Jerseyans who have

been looking for jobs for more than 26 weeks. For these New Jerseyans, this package isn't about economic recovery, it's about keeping their homes, keeping food on their tables, and keeping their dignity.

Mr. President, the time for talk is over, because the American people have already spoken. They had a choice in November. They could have chosen to continue the "do nothing, everything is fine" policies espoused by the last administration and their allies in the Congress.

The people didn't choose that path. Instead they voted for change. And their cards, letters, phone calls, and faxes tell this Senator that they haven't regretted the decision.

I support the President's plan because it is the best I've seen, and the critics offer nothing but more of the same tired old rhetoric. They don't have a plan. The President does.

The economic stimulus package is a critical part of that plan. The time for action is now. Each day we delay is another day this economy does not recover, another day our family members are out of work, another day someone loses hope for a better tomorrow.

As we review this program and hear the critics, we hear some statements that absolutely contradict their deeds. For instance, one distinguished Senator from the West, someone who railed against the bill, saying spending, spending, spending, tax, tax, tax—that very Senator has a request here to me in letter form that asks for 92.7 million dollars' worth of projects in his area. The letter refers to community transit moneys to purchase four natural gas buses and \$5.7 million for community transit to purchase two passenger-only ferries.

Mr. SASSER. Will the Senator yield for a question on that point?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SASSER. I thought mass transit was part of this stimulus bill, I say to my friend from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. The chairman of the Budget subcommittee is absolutely correct.

Mr. SASSER. So a Senator on the other side, railing against the spending here and railing against not paying for it, has requested \$92 million in projects—

Mr. LAUTENBERG. No, \$92.7 million.

Mr. SASSER. \$92.7 million—from the chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Yes. It would come right out of the stimulus package, the package that the Senator who wrote me does not want in the first place. So when we use the term "railing," whose rails are we talking about? We obviously are not talking about the rails that this particular Senator wants.

Mr. SARBANES. Is it right out of the bill?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. It is right out of the supplemental.

Mr. SARBANES. I want to be clear on one point. The requests that the Senator is referring to are requests from this supplemental appropriations bill. Is that correct?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. That is right, \$92.7 million.

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. But if I may say to those who are in attendance or listening, I have a request for the stimulus bill, a letter sent in early March from one of the distinguished persons on the other side of the aisle. This one is smaller; it is only \$18.95 million. It is one of the States in the center of our country. That has a couple of nice projects.

Mr. President, I think what we are looking at here is, unfortunately, hypocrisy at its worst.

Mr. SASSER. If the Senator will yield for a question.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I am happy to.

Mr. SASSER. Let me see if I understand this. In other words, some of the same Senators who on the other side of the aisle are denouncing this bill, this emergency supplemental bill, this jobs bill, who are denouncing it as being useless and unpaid-for spending, they are writing the Appropriations Committee requesting projects to be funded out of this same bill?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Apparently this is selective denunciation, I say to my friend from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. SARBANES. I yield the Senator 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two additional minutes.

Mr. RIEGLE. It sounds to me as though what is happening is those Senators on the other side are coming out here denouncing this bill, then they go off the floor, write the Senator a letter, and they ask the Senator for some of the money in the bill.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. No. First they write me the letter.

Mr. RIEGLE. I see. So they wrote the Senator first.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. So they were clearly on the record and shamelessly stand here and say, "We don't want this jobs bill for America, except in my State." Yes, they can use the jobs.

Mr. RIEGLE. But the Senator has not received a second letter back from them saying they retract the first letter?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. No. I am waiting.

Mr. RIEGLE. The Senator will wait a long time.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. If I may, in the couple minutes that I have, even this city boy from the State of New Jersey, the most densely populated State in

the Union, a State that is struggling with unemployment, trying to keep the heads of families above water, needing jobs desperately, needing unemployment benefits to carry them through this difficult period, even I, Mr. President, can give a lesson on barnyard feeding. We talk about pork, pork, pork. I think I heard one Senator repeat the expression three times this morning. This is nothing but pork, pork, pork. But what we have seen is when the pork is nice and lean and it looks like ham or bacon, there are Senators who are complaining about this bill who want their share. What we are seeing, Mr. President, very simply is when the trough is full of swill, the hogs knock each other over getting to it, and they want their share no matter what happens.

Mr. President, I just wish we could put this into focus and have our colleagues on the other side stand up and say to the American people, "We do not want this bill because we want to destroy this Presidency in its early infancy. We do not want this bill because we are partisan and we want gridlock. That is what we want to serve up for the American public." I would like them to admit the truth, that when it comes to their constituents, they want to tell them how good they are at getting money for their States. But when it comes to the public at large, they are saying, "No, no, no, because we want to destroy this Presidency in its infancy." They are putting party ahead of country. It is a pitiful sight that we are seeing.

Mr. President, I hope we can dispense with this debate, get on it, and let us vote it up or down and see what happens. We should let the public know who is responsible for the defeat of this jobs bill.

Mr. CHAFEE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I really take deep umbrage at the fact that the Senator from New Jersey has referred to some of his Democratic colleagues as hogs getting up to the trough to get the swill. I just do not think that is fair to his fellow Members of the Senate on that side, many of whom are not present. True, they have asked for many, many items that truly look like pork, but to call them hogs and that they want to get next to the swill I think is very rough, to refer to his fellow Democratic Members that way. For those absent Democratic Members, I would like to come to their defense and say that I do not think they should be referred to in such a fashion.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAFEE. I do not yield, Mr. President.

Now, the problem that the other side has is they do not have the votes. And

it seems to me that if we want to achieve something here, as in politics, in Government, what is Government? It is the art of compromise. It is the art of attempting to achieve passage of that which both sides seek. There is much in this program that will receive approval from the Republican side. That has been made clear. There are certain items that clearly have support. We voted on them in the past.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator—
Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, could I speak without interruption for a while.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island does not yield for questions or inquiries.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, items like the unemployment compensation, I voted for that. I would vote for it again. I would vote to pay for it or, if that is not the attitude of those on the other side, then accept it. That out of the total program is \$4 billion—\$4 billion out of a total program of \$19.5 billion.

There are other items in it that there can easily be a compromise arrived at—summer jobs, immunization possibly, programs dealing with trails in the public forests and national parks.

It seems to me nothing is gained here by continuing this as it is. We truly are like a vehicle that is stuck in the snow. We are not going anywhere. There has not been a single vote changed after a week of this.

So it seems to me incumbent upon the other side to come forward and say, look, let us get on with governing the Nation. It does no good to just bitterly complain about the status of the rules. They know the rules. They have been there for years and years. These Senators are not novices around here. As a matter of fact, all of them have been here as long as I have. They understand the situation.

So, Mr. President, it is my hope that instead of spending time on this floor during the recess hammering back and forth at each other, suggesting that the Republicans are cold-hearted and do not care about unemployment, do not care about the recession, do not care about the situation in Michigan or wherever it might be, New Jersey—that they get on and make a proposal. And as happens in all kinds of legislation, arrive at a settlement that all sides can approve of and we can get on with the job.

I thank the Chair.

How much time do I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island controls 9 minutes 37 seconds.

Mr. SARBANES. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I want to set the record straight. Perhaps the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island did not hear me when I said that the requests I received for supplemental transportation funding

were made by those on that side of the aisle. As a matter of fact, I had a request from a Republican leader for something out of this supplemental. I have a request from another Senator. The last time I looked he was not a Democrat.

So I am not talking about the swill being served up on their side. We here on this side admit that we want to get people back to work and are proud of it. They over there say, oh, no, that is not the purpose of this. This is tax and spend.

Mr. President, one last word. When we talk about jobs, and you have heard people support transportation, we are talking about getting 40,000 to 50,000 jobs per billion dollar's worth of expenditure. And we ought to move that along, just as those who send me letters at the beginning of each fiscal year from State after State, Republican and Democrat, want to invest in their State.

So, Mr. President, I hope we will be able to move this legislation and get a vote on it, and make sure the public knows who is voting for jobs and who is voting against them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. SARBANES. What is the time situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland controls 8 minutes 44 seconds. The other side 9 minutes 44 seconds.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I yield such time as the distinguished Republican leader may use.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, there have been a lot of quotes from the Wall Street Journal this morning by my friend from Michigan. I thought I would include in there a piece that appeared called "Pork Carry-Out" which is in the Wall Street Journal. The Senator from Michigan gives that a lot of credence these days.

I ask unanimous consent that the article on "Pork Carry-Out" be printed in the RECORD.

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

PORK CARRY-OUT

Polls show that support for the Clinton economic program fades the more people learn the details. While 81% of Americans say they know the Clinton budget will raise taxes, a Wirthlin Group poll found that only 45% know the plan would raise federal spending by \$250 billion. Once aware of the spending increases, 68% say they're less likely to support it. That number might be even higher if they knew the details of the President's \$16.2 billion "stimulus" package.

The list below, taken from the National Conference of Mayors "Ready to Go" book of more than 4,000 public works projects, gives a sense of exactly where much of the money would be going. While the "Ready to Go" projects aren't specifically included in the

stimulus package, HUD Secretary Henry Cisneros told Congress in February it is the list the administration will work from in dispensing the \$2.5 billion earmarked in the bill for community development.

State	Project	Jobs	Amount
Auburn, AL	Construct new gym	13	\$460,000
Huntsville, AL	Indoor baseball field	53	1,081,500
Birmingham, AL	Picnic shelter repair	5	150,000
Jonesboro, AR	Baseball and soccer park	60	5,300,000
Phoenix, AZ	Renovate theater	75	3,500,000
Highland, CA	Graffiti abatement	4	100,000
Modesto, CA	Build three bike paths	0	1,337,000
Navato, CA	Physically challenged fitness center	0	250,000
Riverside, CA	Boathouse restoration	41	200,000
San Francisco, CA	Fund the "art ark"	40	1,200,000
San Leandro, CA	Civic center expansion	75	12,800,000
Denver, CO	Build a media center	55	1,000,000
Bridgeport, CT	Theater restoration	20	1,000,000
Hartford, CT	Building facade improvement	80	3,652,000
Manchester, CT	Build an ice-skating warming hut	5	30,000
West Haven, CT	Construct a casino building	20	1,000,000
Key West, FL	Parking garage	25	3,500,000
Atlanta, GA	Repair historic wall around cemetery	0	2,500,000
Atlanta, GA	Replace gym	0	4,500,000
Elk Grove Village, IL	Pump house demolition	8	15,000
Evanston, IL	Resurface tennis courts	5	28,000
Shawnee, KS	Period-type street lighting	40	750,000
Portland, ME	Ten projects	0	9,865,000
Brookline, MA	Renovate Coolidge library	15	275,000
Worcester, MA	Sidewalk repairs at various locations	12	1,000,000
Detroit, MI	Purchase four bus wash racks	3	480,000
Minneapolis, MN	Convert brewery to industrial park	60	5,000,000
Las Vegas, NV	Art center	4	1,000,000
Camden, NJ	Park rangers	20	100,000
Newark, NJ	Performing arts center	600	15,000,000
Elmira, NY	Sports and recreation building	12	756,000
White Plains, NY	Pool	5	35,000
Columbus, OH	Parking lot development	4	300,000
Columbus, OH	Movie theater	33	2,700,000
Eugene, OR	Research for bike path	30	800,000
Caguas, PR	Build alpine slide	100	2,500,000
Guayama, PR	Improve art center	15	200,000
Guayama, PR	Two trolleys	3	150,000
Rio Grande, PR	Three trolleys	6	135,000
San Juan, PR	Traffic safety center for children	25	1,200,000
E. Providence, RI	Carousel renovations	25	400,000
Midland, TX	Three swimming pools	0	1,000,000
Sandy City, UT	Culinary master plan	150	75,000
Seattle, WA	10,000 trees	288	5,090,000
Wheeling, WV	Playground renovation	20	142,000
Janesville, WI	Land acquisition for Ice Age Trail	0	65,000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CHAFEE. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. SARBANES. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER].

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland.

We have pretty much descended into political rhetoric here on the floor in the Senate this morning and perhaps worse. I think we have now gotten into meaningless political rhetoric. My distinguished friend from Rhode Island a moment ago was calling out what he thought were numerous projects that would be perhaps contemplated in certain States and seemed to imply that if this bill passed, why, these projects of course would go forward. Nothing is further from the truth.

These projects are included in something that the National Conference of Mayors compiled called Jobs Ready To Go. What these mayors are saying is—this is a thick book—if funding is available, perhaps some of these

projects could be considered because they could go forward.

As the distinguished Senator from Maryland pointed out the other day, our friends on the other side of the aisle in 1981 in their so-called omnibus reconciliation bill in which they wrapped in all of the Reagan initiatives—we could not really debate that. We could not offer any amendments because it came out under a reconciliation process, and was highly privileged. We simply could vote up or down.

But in that bill, in that omnibus reconciliation bill, our friends on the other side of the aisle took away from the responsible Federal agencies the authority to veto some of these projects.

The rationale in 1981, as I understood it, was that these matters should be better decided at the local level by local government, by the mayors, by the city councilmen. But now they come in when the mayors and the city council make these recommendations, and make light of these recommendations.

My friends, you cannot have it both ways. Either local government decides, or the Federal Government decides. You decided in behalf of local government.

The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee has passed through this body last week a sense-of-the-Senate resolution saying that none of these projects that are not meritorious should be funded.

My distinguished friend from Rhode Island, he is my friend—I am sorry he chose to point out the projects that some mayors in certain States had submitted here. I well remember when my friend from Rhode Island came before the Banking Committee with the distinguished Governor of Rhode Island—I see the chairman of the Banking Committee on the floor—and asked for \$180 million in Government guaranteed loans to help bail out the State of Rhode Island from its credit union crisis.

I did not make fun of the Senator from Rhode Island when he did that because I thought he was doing his job then, and I think today he is still doing his job. And I think had the Federal Government not guaranteed those loans it would have been a serious problem in the State of Rhode Island causing widespread unemployment, and financial suffering on a wide basis.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SASSER. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. SARBANES. In fact, it was asserted to us at the time that it would even mean the collapse of the economy in the State of Rhode Island, and therefore it rose to a Federal level, and that was the way it was treated in the committee in order to be of assistance. We had sort of an understanding that it in

fact might involve an important national interest. It was asserted to us very strongly by the two Senators from Rhode Island that this was a matter of absolute financial catastrophe in their State.

Mr. RIEGLE. I might just say if the Senator will yield—we supported the Senator from Rhode Island on a bipartisan basis when he came in with that appeal. Because of an emergency condition we put the politics aside and, we helped him get that enacted because it was so important to the economy of his State. But we cannot just have responses to one State and turn our back on the other 49. We cannot do that. That is not fair.

Mr. SASSER. The Senator makes a good point. I am sorry that the fact that a project submitted, I suppose, by the municipal government of Detroit—which may or may not be funded—was made light of here on the floor of the U.S. Senate when the city of Detroit has some of the highest unemployment in the Nation. In fact there are Third World countries that have a higher per capita income than certain areas of the city of Detroit.

My friends on the other side decry the fact that, oh, my goodness, this is a spending bill. When you boil it all down, there is probably about 6 billion dollars' worth of spending in this bill, that they will not endorse. They are for the unemployment compensation insurance extension. They are for the highways money. They are for the mass transit money, a whole host of it. But they decry the fact that this is going to spend about \$6 to \$8 billion more than they think we ought to spend. Where were they last week when we passed the budget resolution on the floor of this Senate that cut \$496 billion off the deficit in 5 years? Four hundred ninety-six billion dollars in savings passed this Senate last week, with not a single vote, not one vote from the other side of the aisle. I say to my colleagues, if they are so concerned about cutting spending, where were they then? That bill cut \$110 billion in defense spending over 5 years. It cut \$81 billion in nondefense discretionary cuts; \$92 billion in mandatory and entitlement cuts.

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

Mr. SASSER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. CHAFEE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized and has 9 minutes 11 seconds remaining.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I am going to yield to the Senator from Georgia in a minute, but let me say that the Senators speaking on the other side, all of whom are members of the Banking Committee, discussed the loan guarantee given to the State of Rhode Island last year. I hope they will

stress that that was a guarantee; there was not a penny that was not collateralized in that loan. They remember setting up that loan very carefully, as does the administration, working with it, requiring that that loan be collateralized. To date, it has not cost the U.S. Government a penny. Indeed, we had to pay interest on it, as the Senators on the other side know.

To somehow portray that as a giveaway similar to a grant is not accurate. I am not sure they intended to give that impression. But that was a loan guarantee.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. CHAFEE. Yes.

Mr. SARBANES. First of all, it was scored as an outlay in the budget process. Second, it carried with it, obviously, the risks that you would have to pay on all of those guarantees. Fortunately, that has proven not to be the case thus far, and I hope it does not prove to be the case. At the time we undertook to do it, we understood there was a risk involved and that, in fact, we might be carrying a very heavy cost.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, perhaps the Senator does not recall that it was required under the terms—and Treasury was very stern on this—that there be high-grade collateral for that loan. This was not just a loan signed by the State of Rhode Island. There had to be actual collateral put up for it, and the collateral had to be appraised by one of the rating agencies that is out there in the Wall Street area.

The Senator from Georgia wanted 5 minutes.

I yield to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, this morning I thought the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, ranking member on the Budget Committee, made an excellent comment when he said that we perhaps ought to be reviewing what our Nation's major economists are saying about this deficit spending plan.

Just a few moments ago we heard from the distinguished Senator from New Jersey that there are a lot of recriminations on both sides of the aisle, pointing fingers back and forth as to what the motives may or may not be of the various Members of the Senate. I thought the Senator from New Mexico made an excellent suggestion.

I was reviewing the Sunday paper, the Atlanta Journal-Constitution, and I saw an article entitled "Clinton's Job Program Only Treats Symptoms."

Who is saying that? Some politico, some partisan, one of these people that everybody has been pointing to here? No, it is from Donald Ratajczak, the director of economic forecasting, Georgia State University, a nonpartisan, a person that is not engaged in the political

foray, does not have an ax to grind, just talking about our deliberations. I quote from him. He starts off with an interesting comment. He says:

Creating jobs is not a difficult problem. The Egyptians created lots when they built the pyramids. The real trick is creating value with those jobs.

He goes on to say:

Until recently, I marveled at President Clinton's ability to differentiate between a job program and a Government "investment." However, he has begun to call his \$16.3 billion stimulus package a job program, and I think he has lost some understanding of what Government ought to be doing.

He goes on to say:

If emergencies are not dire, enough projects of merit should be found to create value from the jobs. The summer youth program in Mr. Clinton's stimulus package is only loosely related to creating value. To teach youth to work, but not allow them to create value is not providing them with a worthwhile work experience.

I have one more comment about it. He says:

Instead of weaning people from Government handouts, it increases the number of handouts. Instead of building programs that enhance performance at other stages of Government or in the private sector, it substitutes Federal activity for other actions.

It closes by saying:

But the opportunity to get more value from our tax dollars is lost in this plan, and we ought to do better than that.

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

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD.

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

CLINTON'S JOB PROGRAM ONLY TREATS SYMPTOMS

(By Donald Ratajczak)

Creating jobs is not a difficult problem. The Egyptians created lots when they built the pyramids. The real trick is creating value with those jobs.

Until recently, I marveled at President Clinton's ability to differentiate between a job program and government "investment." However, he has begun to call his \$16.3 billion stimulus package a job program, and I think he has lost some understanding of what government ought to be doing.

In dire emergencies, a job program may be needed to put purchasing power in the hands of American consumers. The great economist John Maynard Keynes proposed during the Great Depression that people should be hired to fill tin cans with money and place them in mines around Great Britain. Other people would be hired to find them. Their reward would be the contents of the cans.

Such an elaborate plan was proposed because Keynes did not want to destroy the incentive to work. If only he were around to redesign our welfare system, he would not hesitate to demand work in exchange for the dole.

Anyway, if emergencies are not dire, enough projects of merit should be found to create value from the jobs. Yet the summer youth program in Mr. Clinton's stimulus

package is only loosely related to creating value. To teach youth to work but not allow them to create value is not providing them with a worthwhile work experience. Other training programs in that package also fall on the value-creating meter.

INFLATION IS A THREAT

Aside from damaging incentives to work, jobs that do not create value create inflationary pressures. To be sure, \$16.3 billion in a \$6 trillion economy will have only a muted impact. Nevertheless, providing income without producing desired goods or services for that effort means more dollars are created to chase goods and services, but no more goods and services are provided.

Moreover, the major reason for our unemployment problem is not weak demand. In the second half of 1992, the economy expanded at more than 4 percent. This is well above the 2.7 percent average rate of economic growth during the past two decades.

Rather, the difficulties are with the types of jobs people desire or the lack of training for jobs. Today, increased spending will not re-employ all those investment counselors from the consolidating banking industry. Nor will it solve the lack of education too many of our unemployed youth have.

(Actually, increased spending can solve those problems, if the spending is strong enough. However, the side effects will include roaring inflation as producers scramble to find high-quality workers first.)

What is more troubling is the growing concern that a large part of the \$176 billion "investment" program that will come after the stimulus package also is short on creating value. Instead of weaning people from government handouts, it increases the number of handouts. Instead of building programs that enhance performance at other stages of government or in the private sector, it substitutes federal activity for other actions.

Inflation will not soar from this misdirection of effort, because military activity will be shrinking. Thus, one set of spending is replaced by another. But the opportunity to get more value from our tax dollars is lost. We ought to do better than that.

Mr. HATFIELD. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. What is the time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island controls 2 minutes 33 seconds. The Senator from Maryland, 1 minute 27 seconds.

Mr. HATFIELD. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. At the end of that period of time, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, morning business would close at 1 p.m. The Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1335.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I am prepared to return the remaining part of my time, if the other side is ready to return their 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has expressed a willingness to release the remainder of time under his control.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I see the distinguished Republican leader on the floor and—

Mr. HATFIELD. If the Senator will yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I renew that I am ready to return the remaining part of my time and then let the parliamentary procedure move as it will.

Mr. SARBANES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. I was going to make a request that we extend morning business for, say, 15 minutes, equally divided, if that is agreeable. I have a couple of people here who still would like to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is that a request?

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SARBANES. Yes. I ask unanimous consent that the time for morning business be extended until 1:15 under the same terms and conditions as previously, and that at 1:15, upon the expiration of morning business, the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, what is the time situation now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland has 41 seconds remaining on the previous time, and now 7 minutes 30 seconds on the time as ordered.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Maryland, and I appreciate the time.

I just was listening to the debate as some of us do back in our offices. I really wanted to clarify one point which I think is important here.

A number of colleagues on the other side of the aisle have stood in the course of debate, particularly most recently my friend from Rhode Island, who serves on the Finance Committee, who said, "We on this side do not want to spend money or have programs that we are not paying for."

In principle, I think that is terrific. In fact, I agree with that principle except under certain circumstances where you have to. But I was struck by, I guess, the sort of double standard that is being set here, which is the only way to put it politely—there are other words to be found that are less polite, but it is a double standard.

The Senator from Rhode Island last year voted against an amendment,

which I proposed, to pay for the RTC bailout as you go. So I guess it really depends on what suits you at some particular moment. Last year we put \$25 billion at that time and were then looking for another \$25 billion to add to the deficit, and I came to the floor with an amendment that sought to say that we cannot do this; we have got to pay for this as we go. Ninety-three percent of my colleagues on that side of the aisle voted against paying as you go because it was their President at that moment who thought this was the way they ought to proceed—93 percent of them.

Today they are here on the floor of the Senate saying we cannot afford to pay for summer programs to keep kids out of trouble, and we cannot afford to have mass transit programs that will put construction workers back to work. They say they are willing to have \$4 billion for unemployment insurance compensation, but they are stopping us voting for it and having it at this point because they want to have pay as you go.

Go back to David Stockman's comments in the early 1980's when he said that the great Trojan horse of that period was the program by which they reduced revenues but increased spending on the military as a way of increasing the deficit so you could not pass money for programs that "liberals or Democrats like to spend money on." Indeed, we went from \$1 trillion of debt to now almost \$4 trillion of debt.

The folks who say they do not like to have programs that you cannot pay for presided over the Senate and the White House during the period of the greatest growth in deficit and debt in the history of this Nation.

So there really is a double standard being applied here. This is not just a question of finding a program or two that people do not want to pay for. This is a question of trying to let the minority of the Senate have their way over the President of the United States, who has a package, as the Senator from Maryland has pointed out, a package which, I might add, pays for all of these programs because there are more cuts than there are expenses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FEINSTEIN). The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SARBANES. I yield the Senator 2 additional minutes.

Mr. KERRY. I thank the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, there are programs of the President that have been pointed out again and again, but clearly we cannot point them out enough.

All of the taxes raised go to reduce the deficit. Why? Because there are more cuts here than there are expenditures.

So if you take this \$16 billion out of the package as they want to do and debate it all alone, then you can try to confuse people, but the American people understand that President Clinton has proposed a package and in his package there is over \$500 billion of deficit reduction, more than the Republicans ever achieved in any year that they held office, and all of the programs that are being proposed which are critical to this country getting moving again are paid for by the cuts that we are making.

America, we are cutting. We have heard you. But we have also heard the cry of people who are unemployed, people who desperately need a job. So we are trying to balance the needs of putting people back to work at the same time as we try to reduce the deficit.

This is a predicament that was created during the most irresponsible period in the management of our economy in history. Democrats probably bear some blame for some of that, sure, but it was the President's signature that went on those bills. No one picked up his hand and forced him to put his signature to them. He certainly was never forced to choose between signing the bill into law and vetoing it. And this was a President who certainly knew how to veto because he sent us 35 consecutive vetoes up here of good legislation—child care, long-term care, a host of things.

Mr. SARBANES. The family and medical leave bill.

Mr. KERRY. I say to my friends on the other side, do not throw these phony arguments at us about pay as you go when you look at the record of the last year. This President deserves a chance to put this program into play.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, what is the time situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time situation is 2 minutes and 21 seconds for the Democratic side of the aisle and 8 minutes and 18 seconds for the Republican side of the aisle.

Mr. SARBANES. If it is agreeable to the Senator, maybe I will take 1 minute and we could yield back our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, I just want to make a couple points.

First of all, the President has a comprehensive package. This is part of the package, but another very important part of the package, really a much larger part of the package, was a deficit-reduction resolution that was passed last year that provides for \$496 billion in deficit reduction over 5 years. This jobs bill has to be seen in the context of that deficit reduction program. That deficit reduction program, in effect, pays for this jobs bill 31 times over. Thirty-one times over it is

paid for by that deficit reduction program.

So, in effect, we have tried to put it within a total context where we get a jobs bill where we have an investment strategy for the future strength of our country and where at the same time we reduce the deficit. That is the problem that President Clinton was confronted with. He was handed a deck of cards with large deficits, a runup in debt, an investment deficit, and no jobs growth. And he has tried to put together a total package to address that. We need to have the opportunity to vote on that total package and not simply be blocked from reaching it by the invoking of the filibuster and the supermajority rule of 60.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is up.

Mr. SARBANES. I yield another 30 seconds.

Madam President, I simply submit to the Senate that the new President ought to be given a chance. I think that is what the country wants. I understand that there is a rule that the Republicans are invoking, but I am simply pointing out that the use of that rule in this instance is, in effect, thwarting the ability of the Senate to address the President's program directly. They are against this program and should vote against it if that is the way they feel. They ought to give us an opportunity to vote for it, and they ought to allow the program to pass if, in fact, a majority of the Senate and the House—and they have already voted it in the House—can be mustered to support the program. Otherwise, we will find ourselves locked in gridlock, we will find the President unable to put his program in, and I think the President needs to be given a chance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time is up.

Mr. HATFIELD. Since the time is up, I am happy to yield time on my side.

Mr. SARBANES. I am ready to yield back time if the Senator wants to.

Mr. HATFIELD. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

TRIBUTE TO ISAAC WITHERS

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, on March 25, 1993, south Florida lost a cherished public servant, Isaac Withers.

Mr. Withers died of cancer in South Miami Hospital. He was 66.

In a fitting tribute to Mr. Withers, the Miami Herald wrote

Withers broke through Dade's Jim Crow segregation in the 1950's to end up on the

29th floor of Metro Government Center—one of 6 assistant county managers.

That achievement was testimony to Isaac Withers's devotion to his community and his faith in Government's ability to serve the people.

Mr. Withers achieved the assistant county manager job in 1986 after more than three decades of service in Metro-Dade government. He served in five county agencies, from directing the Kendall Children's Home to heading the Community Action Agency.

Mr. Withers retired last August as Metro-Dade's highest-ranking black employee. The Miami Herald lists his many accomplishments, all reflective of his commitment to justice for the elderly, the poor, the handicapped, and especially children.

Isaac Withers came to Florida in the early 1950's. In 1957, he landed his first job as a public servant as a probation officer for the Dade Juvenile Court. In 1965, Mr. Withers became superintendent of the Kendall Children's Home, where he was responsible for integrating the home. Later, Withers became deputy director of the community relations board, where he spent 16 years fighting poverty.

In 1986, Mr. Withers was promoted to an assistant county manager.

Mr. Withers retired briefly last August, only to return as a volunteer when Hurricane Andrew hit south Florida.

Isaac Withers's commitment to service and to community helped change the face of Miami. He set an example for all of us. We honor his work and his family. We are grateful for his shining example and will strive to uphold his standard of justice and kindness for all.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I wish to express my strong support for President Clinton's economic stimulus package and the larger program of which it is a part. It is no accident that my distinguished senior colleague from West Virginia, Senator BYRD, has been a leader on this legislation, which is so important to West Virginia and the country. For over a generation, Senator BYRD has been a leader in the fight for a strong America, often in the face of great obstacles. As we renew that fight today, I commend him for all he has done for our country.

I have been waiting for a chance to enact a program like President Clinton's economic program for a long time. In fact, I have been waiting for this opportunity for over 20 years.

I remember an America that was in control of its own destiny—one that did not have to look to international banks in Tokyo and arbitrators in Europe to know what its financial policy would be.

I remember an America that was not hostage to the explosive politics of the

Middle East for the energy lifeblood of its economic vigor.

I remember an America where industry and Government worked in partnership to preserve freedom in a dangerous century.

I remember an America where political leadership recognized that discrimination and poverty and illness threatened not only the minority who were afflicted, but the majority who were not. I remember leadership that rallied the Nation to grapple with those threats and expanded the frontiers of liberty and justice for all.

I remember it. You, my fellow Senators remember it. But a whole generation has now come of age that does not remember it, and it is time to restore the great country we knew.

This administration has offered the Congress a program to do that, and it is now time for Congress to begin to act.

For 12 years we have heard rhetoric about fiscal responsibility. For 12 years we have heard about radical surgery on the Constitution of the United States to implant a balanced-budget amendment gimmick.

But when it came time to do something real instead of gimmicks and just talking about it, there was nothing. They never even sent a balanced budget to Congress.

For 12 years we also had rhetoric about economic growth, but instead we got a record-long recession. The talk turned out to be a cover for a massive tilt in the tax burden against people of ordinary means.

Now instead of talk there is an opportunity for action. An opportunity to cut the deficit, an opportunity to invest in infrastructure and technology to produce good jobs and solid economic growth, and an opportunity to restore fairness to the tax laws by seeing to it that the well-off pay their fair share.

The President took counsel at the economic summit with the leaders of labor and industry and with top economists. He faced the difficult task of simultaneously reducing the deficit and increasing long-neglected investment in our economic future. He returned to the commonsense idea that we must cut fat but strengthen economic bone and muscle.

The President struck the right balance. Public opinion supports the program. Many Members of Congress rallied to support his leadership and to seize the opportunity we finally have for action.

And yet on the floor of the Senate, we hear loud if not numerous notes of discord. Why is that?

The habits of the 1980's die hard. Then, there was no leadership, so many resigned themselves to gridlock and talk without action. Today, they are still practicing the politics of paralysis when the public is demanding action.

Every Senator can find a part of any economic package they don't particularly care for. If every Senator insists on their agenda, we can have 100 different agendas and keep talking about fixing the economy rather than actually fixing it. If I were doing the choosing, I would not have chosen the British thermal units tax. But I and some others who share my misgivings have been working with the administration to try to assure that the provision is as fair as possible. The alternative of everyone picking and choosing will destroy the overall package. The result would be a return to talk without action. The result would be to sacrifice the greater good of deficit reduction and the investments in strengthening our economy which have been so long neglected.

The habits of the 1980's die hard. Then, there was no leadership, so in the confusion, people got away with criticism without offering alternatives. Oh, sure, now we are hearing alternatives, but they are the same discredited proposals to dump the burdens on those least able to bear them and ignore investment in economic growth. The critics want to cut nutrition programs. They want to cut housing programs. They want to cut technology and infrastructure.

And what about the attack on the President's proposals to stimulate the economy to turn this pathetic recovery into a solid era of growth?

They say we don't need the stimulus program or can delay it because the economy is doing fine now. Let me tell you that we have not seen that in my State of West Virginia and it has not occurred in much of the country. In West Virginia, we still have 12 percent unemployment. Across the country, monthly job gains average 23,000, compared to 10 times that in a normal recovery.

Yes, the habits of the 1980's die hard. The critics are satisfied with this lame recovery. The critics also want to return to neglect of long-term investment. They want business as usual and back to the policy of the 1980's—the policy of drift.

In West Virginia, we know from the experience of the 1980's, the price of that kind of national policy. With exploding deficits and high interest rates, the inflated dollar decimated our exports in the markets of the world, and padlocked plant gates spread across the Mountain State as a tragic monument to failed national economic policy.

Across the country, people were shut out, without an opportunity to retrain for tomorrow's jobs. Roads and bridges were allowed to fall into disrepair, and just as surely, America's schools and schooling were allowed to crumble, leaving our students far below world-class standards in science and math.

If there is a Senator on this floor who doubts that the American people are in

dead earnest about reversing this decline, I suggest you do as I have done in recent weeks. I convened five economic summits in all parts of my State. Hundreds of West Virginians from business and labor and all walks of life turned out for these meetings, to hear officials and experts explain and discuss the President's program so that people could learn first hand.

The result of these economic summits was clear. I did not find the hesitation and confusion that I have seen too frequently on the floor of the Senate. Our citizens are determined that this country not continue to drift. Our citizens are determined that this Government take prompt and bold action to restore America's strength. Our citizens are saying very clearly that they are fed up with timidity and gridlock and decline, when the tools of restoration in this country, so rich in resources and talent, are everywhere at hand.

Enough is enough. With a return to fair, responsible tax and budget policy, we seek to put the Nation's books in order so that the debt of the 1980's will not destroy opportunity for our children and their children. By cutting fat and strengthening economic muscle and bone in technology and infrastructure, we seek to assure a path of long-term growth. At the same time, the need for long-term effort for tomorrow must not become an excuse for throwing out the stimulus package and returning to a policy of neglect for the persistent problems of today.

The Senate faces a test, and in fact, the country faces a test. In the past, the country has faced and overcome civil war and global conflict. But now we face a different test—a slow-burning fuse that in the end could be ruinous, even though the threat is not as obvious to some. And this may be a test uniquely important for the future of our democratic form of Government.

The enemies of democracy have always said that its weakness is one of self-indulgence and lack of discipline. For 12 years, our economic and budget policy has looked like a caricature drawn by the critics of democracy—with giveaways to the affluent and a false prosperity driven by debt, buying trouble for the future.

The enemies of democracy have always said that a pandering to short-term popularity eventually causes democracies to commit suicide by neglecting the long term as well as the real problems of today. Our challenge is to prove that prophecy wrong.

Fortunately, in America we have been proving the critics of democracy wrong again and again, generation after generation, for over two centuries. This generation need only look to the fundamental principles of the American tradition. As Gen. Omar Bradley said, "We need to start steering again by the light of the stars and

not by the lights of every passing ship."

The principles I am talking about are those of hard work, enterprise, opportunity for all, fairness, dedication to the common good, and a sense of the rights and responsibilities that come with freedom.

Those are the principles on which the President has based his program. As we face new times and new conditions we must act anew, not to discard, but to preserve, our traditional values.

Any Member of Congress who hesitates between gridlock and the President's program of action need only look to the American people. They are rallying in support of this program as they always have to the call of great leadership striving to preserve this Nation's values and its future.

Every Senator here remembers an America on the march, a champion of freedom and justice, a strong nation in control of its destiny and an example for the world. We now have the chance to transform that memory into renewed action by supporting the President's program.

Where does the Senate stand? There can be only one answer. The Senate must stand with the President in restoring the strength of America and the promise of American life.

Mr. HATFIELD. Madam President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time, then I understand we would go into a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, at 1:09 p.m., the Senate recessed until 11:07 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the President pro tempore.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately upon the granting of this consent request, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 56, H.R. 1430, the Reconciliation Debt Limit Extension; that all time be yielded back and the bill be read for a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, all occurring without any intervening action or debate; that the Senate then resume consideration of H.R. 1335, with the only motions or amendments in order prior to the cloture vote being the following: an alternative amendment to be offered by Senators HATFIELD and DOLE, and an alternative amendment to be offered by Senators BYRD and MITCHELL;

That when the Senate finishes its business today, it stand in recess until Wednesday, April 7 at 1:30 p.m.; that when the Senate completes its business on Wednesday it stand in recess or adjournment until Monday, April 19, at 2 p.m. pursuant to an expected adjournment resolution; that the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; the Journal of proceedings be approved to date; and that the Senate, upon the completion of the prayer, resume consideration of H.R. 1335, the supplemental appropriations bill; that the time prior to 6 p.m. on that day be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that it be in order to have both the Hatfield-Dole and the Byrd-Mitchell amendments in the first degree pending at the same time; that at 6 p.m. the bill be laid aside until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, April 20; that at 10 a.m. on Tuesday, April 20, the Senate, without any intervening action or debate, vote on or in relation to the Hatfield-Dole amendment, if offered, or in relation to a point of order thereto; to be immediately followed, without any intervening action or debate, by a vote on, or in relation to the Byrd-Mitchell alternative, if offered, or in relation to a point of order thereto; that upon the disposition of the Byrd-Mitchell amendment there be 1 hour for debate, equally divided between Senators BYRD and HATFIELD; that at the conclusion or yielding back of time the Senate, without any intervening action or debate, vote on cloture on the committee substitute, with the mandatory live quorum being waived; finally that Senators have until 4 p.m. on Monday, April 19 for file first-degree amendments in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do not believe I shall object but I wanted to ask—or at least make one comment and then note—ask some questions of the distinguished majority leader.

First, I think it is spelled out in the first paragraph that if this request is agreed to, the debt ceiling extension will be taken up, passed and sent to the President. So I want to note this is done with the cooperation of Republican Senators and Democratic Senators, otherwise this could not be accomplished this evening and would have to wait until Wednesday, at which time I assume we might be able to work out something.

So I just point out all the talk about gridlock and lack of cooperation, that that is not the case in most instances and this is another instance of cooperation between the leaders and others who have a direct interest in that particular legislation. I am authorized to speak for Senator PACKWOOD, the ranking Republican on the Senate Finance

Committee which has jurisdiction of the extension.

I guess the question I have then of the majority leader—I guess, first of all, does the majority leader anticipate any votes on Monday?

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not. That is Monday, April 19.

Mr. DOLE. Monday, April 19.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not.

Mr. DOLE. No record votes on that date. I guess the question I have is, in the event, without suggesting whether amendments will be offered by Senator HATFIELD or myself or by the distinguished chairman of the committee and the majority leader, in the event an amendment is offered by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the majority leader, then that will be followed by a cloture vote. As I understand it, after the cloture vote, it would then be in order for this Senator or the majority leader, obviously to have prior recognition, or the occupant of the chair to offer an amendment dealing with unemployment compensation, which can in effect scale back anything that might be in the supplemental and it would include, if adopted, only the unemployment provision; is a correct assumption?

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, it is my understanding, and I will ask the Parliamentarian to correct me if I am incorrect, that at that point, the bill would be open to amendment and that the Senator from Kansas, the Senator from West Virginia, the Senator from Maine could offer that or any other amendment at that time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is correct.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object, it is my understanding from discussions earlier today that the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Mr. Panetta, and the Secretary of Labor, or someone at the Labor Department, has indicated that on April 20 that they would not be in a position to mail out additional unemployment checks unless action were taken by Congress; is that the understanding of the majority leader?

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I have been so advised by the Office of Management and Budget, not by the Labor Department. I have received at least an indirect report that the Labor Department suggests it may not be on that day but may be shortly thereafter.

Mr. DOLE. Further reserving the right to object, the reason I make that point, in the event it happens between now and that time, well, maybe April 20 is not the precise date and, say, maybe it is April 25, then I could foresee a possibility of additional amendments to the supplemental, as amended by the Byrd-Mitchell alternative, if adopted, if offered. I wonder at what point we might conclude action on the supplemental? Will there be additional

cloture votes in the event the Byrd-Mitchell amendment was offered and adopted; is that a possibility?

Mr. MITCHELL. That is a possibility. What I propose we do is that on Monday, April 19, that the distinguished Republican leader, myself, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee meet to assess where we are at that time to consider all options and to make a decision on the best way to proceed.

Mr. DOLE. Further reserving the right to object, I guess the point this Senator is trying to make is we want to make certain—I know it is true of Senators on the other side so this is not a partisan statement—that the last thing we would want to happen is we would fail to act promptly enough so that unemployment checks, for some reason, would be suspended and not mailed to those who are entitled to receive the unemployment compensation. So I assume that at some appropriate time it might be also in order to offer maybe a freestanding bill on unemployment insurance extension.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, it would be possible at any time for any Senator to make that request, and I believe it will be the desire of every Senator—and I mean every Senator—that there be no action which would cause unemployment checks not to be issued timely.

Mr. DOLE. Further reserving the right to object, it is obvious we enter into these agreements in good faith. Certainly I understand that to be the intention of the majority leader and the Presiding Officer and certainly this Senator.

But some concern has been expressed that by not immediately going to the unemployment insurance amendment we, in effect, I guess are about where we are right now.

Mr. MITCHELL. I believe that is correct, Mr. President.

Mr. DOLE. Where the bill is open to amendment, and I assume still open to some further discussion about some compromise that might be acceptable to both parties, the House and the White House.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, that is the case.

Mr. DOLE. I have no further objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and the agreement will be the order.

DEBT-LIMIT INCREASE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, Calendar No. 56, H.R. 1430, the debt limit extension, is the matter before the Senate.

The clerk will read the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1430) to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the agreement, all time is yielded back.

The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 1430) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(At the request of Mr. DOLE, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD at this point:)

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, if a roll-call vote were held on passage of H.R. 1430, the debt limit extension, I would have voted in the negative.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, the Senate has just passed by voice vote H.R. 1430, a measure to increase the current ceiling on the Federal debt. I request that the RECORD reflect that I do not support passage of this measure.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I oppose the increase in the debt limit. Had the Senate had a recorded vote on increasing the debt limit, I would have voted no.

It is a great mistake to exceed budgetary spending limits, and Congress' continued pattern of ignoring those limits threatens the future of all of our citizens.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I recognize that the Senate of the United States has just voted by voice vote to increase the debt limit of the Federal Government, adding burden onto the American people had there been a recorded vote I would have voted in the negative. It was my vow to the people of the State of Idaho that I would not vote to increase the debt limit and I want it to be crystal clear and recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that I do not approve nor do I vote in favor of increasing the debt limit.

The people of the State of Idaho sent me to Washington to deliver the message that we must not increase the burden on our children but rather that we must cut spending first. Mr. President, I want my no vote on the debt limit extension to be reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a reminder to the Congress and the people of the State of Idaho that I remember the message and I will act accordingly.

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, just for the record here, somewhere between 11 and midnight in the middle of a championship basketball game, we are passing a debt ceiling extension, and there has been no mention as to how much of a debt ceiling extension we are passing. As I understand it, it is to be enough money to carry us through sometime to the first of October, at the beginning of the new fiscal year. I would like to ask the managers of the bill if that is correct and what is the amount of the increase in the debt ceiling that we are now considering?

Mr. MITCHELL addressed the Chair. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. MITCHELL. The legislation just enacted provides that the public debt limit be increased to \$4.37 trillion as of September 30, 1993.

Mr. EXON. So basically it is true then we are increasing the debt ceiling temporarily here, or for a period of time, from about \$4.1 trillion, where it is now, to a little over \$4.3 trillion, and the matter then will have to be revisited again sometime before adjournment this year. Is that correct?

Mr. MITCHELL. The Senator is correct. The precise figures are—the current figure is \$4.145 trillion, the new figure is \$4.370 trillion, for an increase of up to \$225 billion.

Mr. EXON. For the record, the Senator from Nebraska would like to be recorded in the negative on the vote.

I would like to ask a further question first with regard to the amendments that the majority leader indicated would have to be filed by 5 p.m., as I understand it, on Monday, April 19, does that mean that unless amendments are in place and on file at that time, no further amendments would be available for consideration? If you do not have it in by 5 o'clock on April 19 and filed, then it will not be considered as a part of the bill?

Mr. MITCHELL. That is the case only if cloture is invoked on the cloture vote the following day. That is pursuant to and strictly in accordance with the cloture rules of the Senate, that if cloture is invoked, those amendments which would then be eligible for consideration in the postcloture period would have to have been filed the previous day.

Mr. EXON. And if cloture is not invoked, then the measure would be open for amendments thereafter?

Mr. MITCHELL. That is correct.

Mr. EXON. One last question of the majority leader.

I recognize that the two leaders have been under an awful lot of stress, and I have been, frankly, frustrated with the procedures. And I am sure the frustration level of the leaders is as high or higher than the individual Members. However, I would like to say I assume then that there is no rollcall votes anticipated to be held on Wednesday, when the Senate reconvenes, and that the next rollcall vote then would not be held, as has been indicated and outlined by the majority leader, until Tuesday, April 20?

Mr. MITCHELL. That is correct.

Mr. EXON. I would only like to make an editorial comment in that regard. As the majority leader knows full well, there was a general decision that everybody remain at their post after the Saturday vote. And I only observe once again that those of us who remained at the post at the request of the majority leader find ourselves in a situation

that I had more or less anticipated at the time, and that is that the rule then is usually played out in the Senate: Go about and do our business, and scatter to the four winds, because the rest of them will stay there and take care of things.

Certainly, this is no criticism of the two leaders because certainly you have been here. I only cite that as a little editorial comment that I think it is going to be quite difficult to hold Members, including this Member, in the future, when I am asked to do something, and I find that when I do it, I am the only one that destroys—I am one of those who destroyed my schedule, along with a lot of my colleagues, and those who did not do that took the wisest course of action.

With that statement, and with the understanding that I will be recorded as negative on the vote—is that agreed to—I yield the floor.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, first let me make clear to my colleague from Nebraska that the requirement for the provision for filing of amendments as of the date prior to the cloture vote by the terms of the agreement applies to first-degree amendments.

Mr. President, this has been the end of a very long and difficult day for all of us. I apologize to all of those of my colleagues who have been inconvenienced by the uncertainty throughout the day until this time. But, as I said, many times the rules of the Senate create an inherent uncertainty, and it is not always possible to be precise and certain with respect to what may occur. I concluded, following discussions with the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the distinguished Republican leader and a large number of other Senators, that there was no useful purpose to continue on this bill at this time; that the course of action outlined in the agreement which defers final action on the matter until we return on April 19 and 20 is the best course of action for all concerned.

If, on reflection, we on the Democratic side decide to offer an alternative, we have the right to do so and to vote on that; and if that is adopted, that will be the subject of the cloture motion. The same option exists on the Republican side. I believe this gives us time—all of us respectively—to make our case to the public and to consider whether or not we wish to proceed with our alternative.

I am certain that this procedure will completely satisfy few people, and I am certain that no course of action which we could take would completely satisfy some. It does seem to me to be the best course of action under the current circumstances.

Finally, I say that it is significant that we were able to enact the debt limit extension prior to the deadline,

so that we did not have to go through what in the past has been all too typical "Perils of Pauline," with the debt limit up to and sometimes past the hour of extension.

And for that I am grateful to all concerned, including the distinguished Republican leader, the chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator MOYNIHAN, who handled the matter with great skill; Senator PACKWOOD, the ranking Republican on the Finance Committee; and all the Senators concerned in that regard.

Mr. President, I yield now to the distinguished Republican leader for any comments he may wish to make in this regard.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader. I think I made most of my comments and reservations. I just had questions about the process.

It is my view if we cannot resolve our differences, that sooner or later we have to end the debate somewhere, and I took the liberty of entering into the agreement with not knowing for certain when the debate might end. That is without checking with any of my colleagues on this side.

It had been our hope early on that we might have ended the debate in the event cloture was not invoked on Tuesday, April 20. That still may happen. I think the majority leader has left that open.

Again, if there is some flexibility in the time the Secretary of Labor finds it necessary to stop mailing checks, if that should be extended from the 20th to the 22d or the 23d, that would provide opportunities not only for the majority but I assume the minority to offer additional amendments or at least to discuss if there are any possibilities of reaching some agreement. We are not there yet and not close to an agreement but there is still that possibility.

So I believe and hope it is a good agreement. I believe that we have done about what we could do.

I share the view expressed by the Senator from Nebraska because Senators on both sides have altered their schedules and some have had to miss town meetings and other things in their State. But as the majority leader pointed out, we are never quite certain what can be done, and it seems to me this is the best disposition. There is no doubt about it. On Wednesday of this week, there are going to be considerable absentees on our side. I am not certain about the other side. Cloture would not be invoked and we probably would be right back either Thursday or maybe following Easter voting again on cloture. It seems to me this is the best course to pursue.

I congratulate the majority leader and the Presiding Officer for their efforts.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate now resumes consideration of H.R. 1335.

The clerk will report.

The bill 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. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk and ask unanimous consent that the vote on this motion occur on Tuesday, April 20, in accordance with the consent agreement just agreed to.

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

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.

Harlan Mathews, Dianne Feinstein, Barbara Boxer, Jeff Bingaman, Bob Kerrey, Barbara A. Mikulski, Robert C. Byrd, Patrick J. Leahy, Frank R. Lautenberg, Wendell Ford, David Pryor, Carol Moseley-Braun, Tom Daschle, John D. Rockefeller, Jim Sasser, Bill Bradley, Patty Murray.

MORNING BUSINESS

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON DOMESTIC TERRORISM

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, on February 26, a massive bomb exploded in the World Trade Center in New York City; 6 people died, over 1,000 people were injured, and at least a billion dollars of damage resulted as the explosion ripped through seven concrete floors and destroyed the building's power, communications, and safety systems.

The terror felt by those present at the explosion—visible on the faces of survivors who streamed out of the building—was palpable. While not matched, this terror was mirrored in the minds of all Americans who felt suddenly and gravely at risk.

For many years, we have watched as deadly terrorist attacks flared in Europe, the Middle East, and elsewhere.

Americans have been the targets of terrorism abroad, suffering devastating loss of life, including the leveling of the Marine barracks in Beirut, and the bombing of Pan Am 103.

But, although a few incidents of deadly terrorism occurred in the United

States in the 1970's, we have been largely safe from such violence here at home.

So the attack in New York—on American soil indeed on a major American landmark—makes us feel vulnerable to the threat of violent terrorism with a depth and immediacy not felt strongly before.

In the month since the bombing, law enforcement officials have made substantial progress in uncovering who carried out the World Trade Center bombing.

Several suspects are now under arrest and indictment, and many facts about how the attack was carried out are known.

Nonetheless, it is clear that many questions remain to be considered and, hopefully, answered. Restoring peace of mind to all Americans depends on our ability to address these questions effectively.

Later this month, the Judiciary Committee will convene several days of hearings to examine the questions raised by the bombing of the World Trade Center. Experts from Government and from academia will testify on all aspects of domestic terrorism.

At the outset, we will seek an overview of the problem.

First, what are the causes of such terrorist acts? Although terrorist violence—often claiming innocent men, women, and children as victims—seems senseless, there is usually an underlying logic. Sinister means are engaged to serve what the perpetrators believe is a persuasive purpose—however murky that purpose may seem to outsiders.

We must learn to read the danger signs—to identify individuals who trade in terror before they act, to be sensitive to the potential motivating factors that may cause them to act, and to identify potential targets and reduce their vulnerability.

In short, we must better understand the nature of the threat we face on American soil and the means to attack these threats.

Second, can we respond to terrorist acts, when they do occur, so as to deter future violence? For example, when airport security measures were improved following a wave of hijacking, the incidence of such acts decreased dramatically.

Is focusing quickly on counteracting a developing pattern of a particular form of terrorism where our emphasis should lie?

Is a demonstrated willingness to retaliate—as with the 1987 bombing of Libya—effective in deterring terrorist acts?

Third, does law enforcement have the tools it needs to prevent terrorist acts from occurring? The key question here is—do we have resources sufficient to target all those reasonably capable of inflicting injury here?

Fourth, can we improve international cooperation in the fight against terrorism? The recent return from abroad of one of the suspects in the New York bombing is a tremendous success in the area.

Still, we must ask: Is our intelligence capability adequate? Do we have the necessary ability to obtain foreign cooperation in the investigation and extradition of suspects?

Examining these broader questions will provide the necessary underpinnings for the committee to review existing Federal law on terrorism, identify any gaps in coverage, and propose needed legislation.

Last Congress, many of us worked to pass a comprehensive crime bill that contained my Counterterrorism Act of 1991.

This bill was explicitly designed to address the threat of domestic terrorism. Unfortunately, due to the opposition of the previous administration, the omnibus bill was not passed. Had it been enacted, the bill would have, among other things:

Made it a Federal crime to use, or attempt or conspire to use, a weapon of mass destruction against persons or property within the United States;

Established a new criminal offense for providing material resources or support to terrorists;

Provided the death penalty for terrorist acts committed within the United States or against U.S. citizens abroad; and

Authorized additional funding for the counterterrorist activities of the FBI, the State Department, the Secret Service, and State and local law enforcement agencies.

I will ask my colleagues again this year—and soon—to support the comprehensive crime bill containing these important measures on terrorism.

At the same time, at the committee's hearings, we will expand our review to other areas that may need legislative attention.

For example, in my view, existing Federal regulation of explosives is insufficient. Restrictions on the purchase of explosives and requirements for obtaining permits are minimal and must be enhanced.

Today, a person can obtain a 30-day license to manufacture or sell explosives for \$5. A one-time-only user permit is available for \$2. Convicted felons—who are prohibited from buying guns, can easily obtain an exemption from ATF to purchase explosives.

Strengthening these laws is an important step, but not a complete defense to the risk of bombings. Explosives can be made at home from relatively common chemicals that are readily available. Indeed, press accounts suggest that the World Trade Center bomb was just such a mixture.

The committee will look to whether there are other appropriate steps we

can take to limit the ability of terrorists to wreak havoc through explosion.

We should also explore the feasibility and effectiveness of using taggants—enabling explosives to be tracked from manufacture, to purchase, to use.

Another issue raised by the World Trade Center incident is whether the Immigration and Naturalization Service has the resources necessary to identify those individuals who should not enter or remain in this country and follow through on that determination.

We are a nation of immigrants whose strengths is founded in our diversity. We must not close our borders to today's immigrants who will continue that tradition. We must also continue to offer a safe haven to those who face persecution at the hands of authoritarian regimes.

But, with procedural safeguards intact, we must ensure that those who come here to do violence are excluded quickly and with finality.

The full committee, and Senator KENNEDY'S Subcommittee on Immigration, will review the INS policies and practices and seek answers to key questions:

When an individual is on the list of suspected terrorists, is entry to the country denied?

Is such information available to embassies abroad which issue visas for entry?

If such a person enters somehow, what is the procedure for deportation?

Finally, the committee will examine whether building and communications security needs improvement and what technologies for improvement exist:

Can garage security procedures be reasonably changed to facilitate detection of explosives?

Can communication, fire, and escape systems be located or otherwise protected so as to better withstand attack?

In short, we will try to identify measures that architects, engineers, and building managers can use to increase the odds that communications and safety systems remain operational in the event of a terrorist attack.

For many years, there has been a perception that the United States was somehow immune from terrorism—that because of good law enforcement, refusal to negotiate with terrorists, and a willingness to retaliate—terrorists steered clear of our shores.

Whether or not the bombing in New York crosses a threshold to a new era is unclear. But it serves as a reminder that we should not take our safety for granted. We must reassess the threat of terrorist violence in the United States.

And we must prepare to deter and to respond to specific acts of terrorism that put American lives at risk here at home.

I hope the hearings convened by the Judiciary Committee later this month will begin this process. Following the

hearings, the committee will make its findings available in a public report, and will draft and introduce necessary legislation for consideration by the full Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination:

Calendar No. 64. James Lee Witt, to be Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

I further ask unanimous consent that the nominee be confirmed, that any statements appear in the RECORD as if read, that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and that the Senate return to legislative session.

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

ORDER FOR STAR PRINT—S. 714

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Report No. 103-36, the report to accompany S. 714, the Thrift Depositor Protection Act, be star printed to reflect the changes I now send to the desk.

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

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, APRIL 7, 1993

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the prayer on Wednesday, April 7, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that there then be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Edwin R. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT ON HAZARDOUS MATERIALS TRANSPORTATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM-12

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the requirements of section 109(e) of the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act (Public Law 93-633; 49 U.S.C. 1808(e)), I transmit herewith the Annual Report on Hazardous Materials Transportation for calendar year 1991.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, April 5, 1993.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:15, a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

H.R. 239. An act to amend the Stock Raising Homestead Act to resolve certain problems regarding subsurface estates, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 156. Joint resolution concerning the dedication of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum.

The enrolled bill and joint resolution were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-59. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of West Virginia relative to a federal magnetic elevated train system; to the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation.

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 3"

"Whereas, The need to improve the nation's transportation system for the next century, the need to create jobs, the need to reduce reliance on foreign oil for energy and the need to improve the nation's infrastructure requires investment in projects which hold promise of success; and

"Whereas, Morgantown, West Virginia has had a long standing and successful elevated train system located on the West Virginia University Campus; and

"Whereas, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania is a modern metropolitan center strategically located in a thriving coal producing area of this nation; and

"Whereas, The research facilities at West Virginia University and recent innovations and improvements in coal mining and coal burning technology will provide an excellent environment for the pilot study and will assure sufficient clean energy supplies to operate a magnetic elevated train system well into the future; and

"Whereas, Clean coal technology will benefit the entire nation by increasing employ-

ment, by decreasing reliance on foreign oil, by providing upstart by-products that can be used in a multitude of ways by the United States Department of Defense, the United States Department of Transportation and the United States Department of Energy as well as many other segments of federal and state governments; and

"Whereas, Undertaking the pilot project in an area which includes rural, mountainous and metropolitan terrain strategically situated between large centers of population in the midwest and the east coast offers the best opportunity to expand the pilot project to a modern transportation system worthy of the worlds most innovative and powerful nation; therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of West Virginia, That the President and the Congress of the United States are hereby urged to select a route between Morgantown, West Virginia and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania for the federal magnetic elevated train system pilot project; and, be it

"Further Resolved, That this project be powered by electricity produced from coal or natural gas or a combination thereof; and be it

"Further Resolved, That the Clerk is hereby directed to send a copy of this resolution to the President, the leadership of both Houses of the Congress and West Virginia's delegation in Congress."

POM-60. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Virginia relative to American POWs/MIAs in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 198

"Whereas, SJR 125, passed by the General Assembly in 1992, memorialized Congress to enact legislation which directs federal departments and agencies to make public any information relating to POWs, or MIAs and directs the Department of Defense to make a list of all people so classified; and

"Whereas, there are at least 2,273 American servicemen and civilians who have yet to be accounted for in Southeast Asia as a result of the aftermath of the war in Vietnam and Southeast Asia; and

"Whereas, 54 of those unaccounted for in Southeast Asia are Virginians whose names, hometowns, and branch of service are as follows: Angell, Marshall Joseph (USA, Roanoke), Ashby, Donald Roberts, Sr. (USN, Newport News), Bessor, Bruce Carleton (USA, Fairfax), Blodgett, Douglas Randolph (USA, Alexandria), Booth, Lawrence Randolph (USA, Stoney Creek), Bowles, Dwight Pollard (USAF, Staunton), Boyd, Walter (USMC, Norfolk), Brown, Robert Mack (USAF, Portsmouth), Buckley, Victor Patrick (USN, Falls Church), Burd, Douglas Glenn (USAF, Hampton), Chaney, Arthur Fletcher (USA, Vienna), Clarke, George William, Jr. (USAF, Hampton), Compton, Frank Ray (USN, Chatham), Consolvo, John Wadsworth, Jr. (USMC, Ft. Belvoir), Cooley, David Leo (USN, Warwick), Davies, Joseph Edwin (USAF, Alexandria), Dodge, Edward Ray (USA, Norfolk), Donahue, Morgan Jefferson (USAF, Alexandria), Dotson, Jefferson Scott (USAF, Pound), Dove, Jack Paris, Sr. (USAF, Bluefield), Driver, Dallas Alan (USA, Stephens City), Ellen, Wade Lynn (USA, Norfolk), Evans, Billy Kennedy, Jr. (USA, Roanoke), Forame, Peter Charles (USA, McLean), Fowler, Roy G. (USN, Annandale), Greenwood, Robert R., Jr. (USAF, Portsmouth), Gregory, Paul Anthony (USN, Virginia Beach), Harley, Lee D. (USAF, Danville), Holtzman, Ronald Lee (USA,

White Post), Jackson, Paul Vernon III (USAF, Hampton), Jones, Orvin C., Jr. (USAF, Newport News), Kennedy, John W. (USAF, Arlington), Kosko, Walter (USAF, Columbia), Lee, Leonard Murray (USN, Pulaski), Malone, Jimmy M. (USA, Norfolk), Mauterer, Oscar (USAF, Charlottesville), McCants, Leland S. III (USA, Alexandria), McPherson, Everett Alvin (USMC, Norfolk), Midgett, Dewey Allen (USA, Chesapeake), Mulhauser, Harvey (USAF, Charlottesville), Owen, Robert D. (USA, Chatham), Parish, Charles C. (USN, Lexington), Pepper, Anthony John (USMC, Richmond), Perkins Cecil Carrington (USA, Portsmouth), Pruett, William David (USAF, Bluefield), Rash, Melvin D. (USAF, Yorktown), Roark, James David (USN, Abington), Scott, Vincent Calvin, Jr. (USAF, Richmond), Stuller, John Charles (USA, Falls Church), Taylor, Fred (USA, Castlewood), Versace, Humberto Roque (USA, Norfolk), Weston, Oscar Branch, Jr. (USAF, Norfolk), Whitmire, Warren T., Jr. (USA, Fairfax), and Winkler, John Anthony (USN, Alexandria); and

"Whereas, there is a body of credible evidence suggesting that live Americans or identifiable remains of Americans remain in Southeast Asia; and

"Whereas, the executive branch of the United States government and the Congress of the United States have declared that resolution of this issue is of the "highest national priority"; and

"Whereas, the agencies of the United States government, including the Department of Defense and the Defense Intelligence Agency have had since the official termination of hostilities in May of 1975 to resolve these issues; and

"Whereas, the Department of Defense has created and maintained an unnecessary veil of secrecy and ignorance by classifying most of the available information concerning live sightings, status reports, and other data relating to those who are still missing, the declassification of which would not compromise resources, means, methods, and identities of intelligence operatives; and

"Whereas, it would appear that by promulgating a classified plan referred to as a "road map for normalization of relations" between the United States, Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam, the government of the United States is poised to "normalize" relations with those governments in spite of the unresolved issues concerning prisoners of war, those missing in action, and the repatriation of the remains of those Americans who made the ultimate sacrifice; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate, the House of Delegates concurring, That the General Assembly memorialize the President of the United States, by executive order, to declassify information, data, and intelligence pertaining to all matters relative to these issues, except for that data or information which would reveal the means, methods, and identities of intelligence operatives; and, be it

"Resolved further, That the General Assembly urge that the respective branches of the armed service be assigned to resolve these issues; that any and all future remains returned from Southeast Asia be placed, for purposes of identification, with the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.; and that normalization of relations with those countries of Southeast Asia be deferred until such time as the issues identified herein are satisfactorily and adequately addressed; and, be it

"Resolved finally, That the Clerk of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the

President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the Virginia congressional delegation so that they may be apprised of the sense of the General Assembly."

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. CRAIG (for himself, Mr. WALLOP, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BURNS, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. STEVENS):

S. 775. A bill to modify the requirements applicable to locatable minerals on public lands, consistent with the principles of self-initiation of mining claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Mr. WALLOP, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BURNS, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. STEVENS):

S. 775. A bill to modify the requirements applicable to locatable minerals on public lands, consistent with the principles of self-initiation of mining claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HARDROCK MINING REFORM ACT OF 1993

● Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, as we all know the mining laws of the United States have been under attack for the past several years. The charges have ranged from the biggest giveaway of Federal lands to mineral production not paying its fair share of the Federal largess. Neither of these charges are correct, as indeed, is the case with most of what we have heard about the mining law.

Today along with several of my colleagues I am introducing the Hardrock Mining Reform Act of 1993. My colleagues and I offer this bill as an honest and fair legislative answer to the numerous concerns that have been raised pertaining to the current mining law.

The production of minerals in the United States is a vital part of our economy. As we move to make changes to the mining law, we must assure that we do not destroy this part of our economy. Minerals touch every facet of our lives. We will continue to use minerals to fuel our economy. We have a simple choice as it relates to mineral production—will we produce minerals from Federal lands in this country or will we institute policies that will drive mineral production to other countries who will welcome the good paying jobs that come with the production? I chose to support a bill that keeps jobs in this country and that is exactly what my legislation accomplishes.

This bill addresses all of the issues that have been raised as it relates to the mining law. It assures a secure and reliable source of minerals in the United States. It recognizes that mining activities on Federal lands should be consistent with land use plans and conducted in compliance with all Federal and State environmental laws and regulations including those governing mined land reclamation. It recognizes that the United States should recognize a fair economic return from minerals mined on the Federal lands.

The purposes of the bill are clear. They are:

First, provide for increased revenues from fees and royalties.

Second, provide for payment of fair market value for the surface of any land patented under the general mining laws.

Third, assure mined lands are reclaimed in concert with State and local reclamation authorities.

Fourth, establish a hardrock reclamation program for abandoned mines.

This bill accomplishes these purposes while protecting small business and assuring that we will not drive mineral production to foreign shores. It is a fair bill and I encourage my colleagues to join with me in support of this legislation. •

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today to join Senator CRAIG in introducing the Hardrock Mining Reform Act of 1993. This bill represents a middle ground solution to the debate over mining on our public lands.

Throughout the history of our country and my State of Montana, mining has been a driving force. Mineral exploration and development played an important role in our country's expansion westward. In fact, in Montana's 25-year history as a territory, its capital was located in communities in the heart of mining activities. Mining is not only part of my State's history, it will be an important part of Montana's future.

Mining activities are important to my State's economy by supplying communities with a tax base that helps to fund schools, construction of roads, and other necessary programs at the local level. In my home State of Montana, operating mines employ about 3,500 people with a payroll equaling \$150 million. These employees pay \$5 million a year in State taxes, and the mines added \$24 million a year in State severance and property taxes. In 1990, nonfuel mineral production in Montana was valued at \$573.8 million.

As many Westerners are aware, the general mining law of 1872 has come under increasing criticism over the last few years. Some people are saying too many abuses of the law are occurring and that it is time for a wholesale re-vamping of the law. However, if they looked more closely at the issue, they would find that is not true.

The general mining law is not an outdated 120-year-old law—it has been amended over 100 times. While I will admit that some changes are needed, the basic tenets of the general law are still appropriate today. The law is not perfect, but it has provided guidance to exploration and development of mineral resources found on public lands. The provision included in the Reform Act introduced today will help to modify and strengthen the 1872 law.

This reform act makes the general law current and up to date, both environmentally and fiscally. The bill strengthens the environmental safeguards for hardrock mining operations. Established will be a program to help in the reclamation of abandoned hardrock mines. Not only is reclamation emphasized, all operations conducted under this plan shall be done in accordance with all applicable State and Federal environmental laws—these laws include the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, and many others.

In addition, this bill includes financial provisions that are fair and balanced. Federal revenues will be raised through increased fees and a 2-percent royalty. The bill calls for the payment of a fair-market-value of patented lands. Also, individuals would not be allowed to hold mining claims on public lands for other purposes.

States and local jurisdictions will benefit by the passage of this reform act. One-third of the revenues raised by the royalty will go back to the State where the mining activities took place. This still leaves two-thirds of the revenues raised by the royalty for the Federal deficit reduction.

Recently, Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt has indicated that President Clinton is in favor of a major overhaul of the general law. In addition to royalties, the President wants to increase the claim fee to return funds to the Federal Treasury. The reform bill introduced today does this by returning an adequate and fair amount of revenue to the Federal Government.

I have heard from many miners in Montana in the last few months. And while they may not agree with every part of this legislation, I believe they understand changes have to occur.

And as a nation, we have a continued need for nonfuel hardrock mining. The reform bill introduced today addresses increased Federal revenues, while still protecting the possibility for future exploration.

I would like to thank Senator REID, Senator WALLOP, and the other Members who help put this piece of legislation together. The reform act is not only responsive to mining needs, it is environmentally and fiscally responsible.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WALLOP. Mr. President, since ancient times people have been devel-

oping, producing, and trading our natural resource commodities. As far back as 2800 B.C. Phoenicia developed into a premier manufacturing and trading center. The prosperity of the Phoenicians resulted chiefly from developing natural resources such as cedar which supported a thriving trade in lumber and its byproducts—oils, tars, and resins. But even then a break in trade with Lebanon had a resounding effect on the mortician's industry, reverberated in a text of the 12th dynasty:

They sail no more to Lebanon nowadays. How shall we have pines for our mummies, with whose products we bury the Pure Ones (Dead), the oils with which we embalm the Great Ones?

With timber, skills were also exported. Phoenician carpenters and shipwrights constructed extraordinary things from woods and the prophets chronicled the city of Tyre as both an island and a shipyard. From Tyre came merchant vessels powered by sail and oar, and good navigators with a broad knowledge of sea routes and winds. These vessels took the Phoenicians to Spain, Egypt, Africa, and Arabia. They established trading centers around the Mediterranean.

Trade was based largely on goods derived from natural advantages—the presence of desirable natural resources such as tin, gold, amber, ivory, or ebony. Eventually the great trading centers of the Mediterranean were eclipsed by the growth of new centers farther west, mostly on or near the Atlantic. With these new trade centers came a new composition of commodities—tomatoes, potatoes, cocoa, green beans, and corn were all introduced from the New World. These products and many others transformed European and American life.

Mr. President, today, nearly 50 centuries later, our National, State, and local economies still thrive on the development and production of our vast natural resources. Yet this administration and some Members on the other side of the aisle have suggested an agenda that appears aimed at gutting the very industries that have brought us jobs, economic growth and prosperity since Roman times. I find this puzzling, indeed deplorable, coming from an administration that campaigned on job creation, economic stimulation, equal opportunity, and upward mobility.

I for one have had a difficult time rationalizing what this administration is trying to accomplish with its unreasonable proposals on royalty rates and fees for the multiple use of our public lands.

I am unable to fathom either their objectives or their agendas. To satisfy their campaign commitments of increased jobs and growth in the economy, one would think they would be encouraging development of our natural resources—the only true way of cre-

ating new wealth to pay for the new programs being proposed for the public.

But we will succeed at none of that if this administration and others proceed with excessive and unrealistic mineral royalties, sky-high grazing fee increases and elimination of some timber sales. Virtually all studies indicate their proposals of high royalties and increased fees will trigger the loss of jobs and reasonably priced commodities. Ultimately the United States will be forced to increase its importation of critical and strategic minerals and materials. What we will then have is a classic example of the absolutism of the East versus the free institutions of the West.

But I will not belabor those points. Today my attention turns to the debate on mining law reform. I am pleased to join my distinguished colleague from Idaho, Senator CRAIG, and others, in cosponsoring the Hardrock Mining Reform Act of 1993.

This legislation is the product of many hours of work among staff and comments from industry. I believe this bill is a workable compromise and offers a balanced approach to mining law reform.

Our legislation retains the existing claim location and patenting system. We incorporated bonding, without exception, reclamation, including elimination of the 5-acre minimum disturbance and an Abandoned Hardrock Mine Reclamation Program. Also included are limitations on occupancy, something the Bureau of Land Management has sought to revise administratively. Our bill includes a permanent \$100 holding fee, with some exceptions for small businesses. We added a realistic royalty, giving the Secretary authority to adjust it based on a claim holder's ability to pay the royalty and continue operations. For future patents, royalty payments and reclamation are mandatory.

Mr. President, these are reasonable changes and I urge my colleagues to study them carefully and weigh both sides of the equation.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 39

At the request of Mr. ROTH, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] was added as a cosponsor of S. 39, a bill to amend the National Wildlife Refuge Administration Act.

S. 91

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 91, a bill to authorize the conveyance to the Columbia Hospital for Women of certain parcels of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 216

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the names of the Senator from Alaska [Mr.

STEVENS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] were added as cosponsors of S. 216, a bill to provide for the minting of coins to commemorate the World University Games.

S. 300

At the request of Mr. MACK, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 300, a bill to provide for the utilization of the latest available census data in certain laws related to airport improvements.

S. 302

At the request of Mr. MACK, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 302, a bill to provide for the utilization of the latest available census data in certain laws related to energy and natural resources.

S. 303

At the request of Mr. MACK, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 303, a bill to provide for the utilization of the most current census data in certain laws related to the environment and public works.

S. 304

At the request of Mr. MACK, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 304, a bill to provide for the utilization of the latest available census data in certain laws related to urban mass transportation.

S. 305

At the request of Mr. MACK, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 305, a bill to utilize the most current Federal census data in the distribution of Federal funds for agriculture, nutrition, and forestry.

S. 306

At the request of Mr. MACK, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 306, a bill to provide interim current census data on below poverty, urban, rural, and farm populations.

S. 307

At the request of Mr. MACK, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 307, a bill to require that, in the administration of any benefits program established by or under Federal law which requires the use of data obtained in the most recent decennial census, the 1990 adjusted census data be considered the official data for such census.

S. 402

At the request of Mr. DURENBERGER, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 402, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to increase the domestic service wage exclusion, and for other purposes.

S. 412

At the request of Mr. EXON, the names of the Senator from South Caro-

lina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] were added as cosponsors of S. 412, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, regarding the collection of certain payments for shipments via motor common carriers of property and nonhousehold goods freight forwarders, and for other purposes.

S. 455

At the request of Mr. HATFIELD, the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 455, a bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to increase Federal payments to units of general local government for entitlement lands, and for other purposes.

S. 469

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. PACKWOOD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO] were added as cosponsors of S. 469, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the Vietnam Women's Memorial.

S. 545

At the request of Mr. BOREN, the name of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 545, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow farmers' cooperatives to elect to include gains or losses from certain dispositions in the determination of net earnings, and for other purposes.

S. 572

At the request of Mr. DURENBERGER, the name of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 572, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the deduction for health insurance costs for self-employed individuals.

S. 573

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the names of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] were added as cosponsors of S. 573, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a credit for the portion of employer Social Security taxes paid with respect to employee cash tips.

S. 657

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 657, a bill to reauthorize the Indoor Radon Abatement Act of 1988, and for other purposes.

S. 670

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 670, a bill to amend the Head Start Act to make quality improvements in Head Start programs, and for other purposes.

S. 689

At the request of Mr. BRADLEY, the name of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 689, a bill to improve the interstate enforcement of child support and parentage court orders, and for other purposes.

S. 729

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 729, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to reduce the levels of lead in the environment, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 47

At the request of Mr. JOHNSTON, the names of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 47, a joint resolution to designate the week beginning on November 21, 1993, and the week beginning on November 20, 1994, each as "National Family Week".

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 58

At the request of Mr. RIEGLE, the names of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMBERS], the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. FEINGOLD], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 58, a joint resolution to designate the weeks of May 2, 1993, through May 8, 1993, and May 1, 1994, through May 7, 1994, as "National Correctional Officers Week".

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 61

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the names of the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DANFORTH], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 61, a joint resolution to designate the week of October 3, 1993, through October 9, 1993, as "Mental Illness Awareness Week".

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 74

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Arizona [Mr.

DECONCINI] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 74, a joint resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the Government of Malawi's arrest of opponents and suppression of freedoms, and conditioning assistance for Malawi.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 16

At the request of Mr. SHELBY, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 16, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that equitable mental health care benefits must be included in any health care reform legislation passed by Congress.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 21

At the request of Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, the names of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 21, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that expert testimony concerning the nature and effect of domestic violence, including descriptions of the experiences of battered women, should be admissible if offered in a State court by a defendant in a criminal case.

SENATE RESOLUTION 94

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 94, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to the tragic humanitarian crisis in Sudan.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO UNIVERSITY OF MAINE BLACK BEARS NCAA HOCKEY CHAMPIONS.

• Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, the movie "Hoosiers" tells the true story of a small-town Indiana high school basketball team whose miraculous State championship victory captured the hearts and stirred the emotions of an entire State.

Over the past few days, we in Maine have savored our own "Hoosiers" experience as the University of Maine Black Bears won the NCAA college hockey championship.

This championship has been, quite simply, a defining moment for my State. These are hard times in Maine's economy, and there has been little to cheer about at the end of a long and brutal winter. The triumph of the Black Bears is much more than a simple sports victory; it is a moment of much larger implications. The 42-1-2 season and resulting championship offers clear evidence that our State university has fashioned a program which produces amazing young adults who also happen to be champions. Through

this experience, the group of young men learned the joy of clean competition, the sweet rewards of victory, the value of hard work and discipline—the whole range of experiences each of us will come to know over a lifetime.

The stories of the semifinal game last week against the University of Michigan and the final game Saturday night against Lake Superior State will be told and retold in Maine over the years and become a permanent part of the State's lore. Both games revealed the true character of the Maine team—grace under pressure, courage in the face of adversity, and the fellowship among team members which allowed them to stage two dramatic come-from-behind victories.

As in "Hoosiers," this remarkable championship has galvanized an entire State. During last Thursday's semifinal game, activity throughout Maine nearly ceased as people gathered around televisions and radios to follow the heart-stopping contest, which Maine won in overtime. The same was true Saturday night, as fans statewide enjoyed the euphoria of a quick two-goal lead, then suffered through a second period in which Lake Superior State scored three unanswered goals, and finally endured a dramatic third period when Maine senior Jim Montgomery, assisted by freshman phenomenon Paul Kariya, scored a three-goal hat trick and the Maine defense and goalie Garth Snow held off the strenuous advances of the Lakers as Maine held on for a one-goal victory.

When the team returned to Maine Sunday, not only did about 3,000 fans greet them at Bangor International Airport and another 6,000 at Alford Arena, the team's home ice in Orono, but fans also dotted the 10-mile stretch of interstate highway between Bangor and Orono to hold signs, honk horns, and show support. In a State starved for good news, the arrival of the returning heroes was a most welcome event.

Whether in sports, scholastics, politics, or in life itself, it is important to win without engaging in conduct that shows you are unworthy of winning. Coach Shawn Walsh and his entire program can take great pride in not only producing a national champion, but doing so in such a way that has gladdened hearts throughout Maine and the entire country.●

"JEWISH COMMUNITY HOUR RADIO SHOW" CELEBRATES 30TH YEAR

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, this year commemorates the 30th anniversary of the "Jewish Community Hour Radio Show." Under the able direction of Mr. Bernard Finkel, the "Jewish Community Hour" has continued to provide music, commentary, humor, special features, interviews, weather reports, and news from Israel to over 50,000 people throughout the Chicago area.

Since its first airing in mid-1963, the "Jewish Community Hour" has served as a bastion of cultural pride and identity to its listenership, and has instilled a sense of community and public service in Chicago and beyond. Programs like the "Jewish Community Hour" have been instrumental in promoting a cultural mosaic in the United States. Chicago is proud to play in part in America's cultural diversity.

Finally, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the "Jewish Community Hour Radio Show" and wish it 30 more years of successful broadcasting.●

HONORING THE URBAN LEAGUE OF FLINT

● Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, on April 14, the Urban League of Flint will celebrate its 50th anniversary. I commend the Rev. James Kennedy, the board chairperson; Melvyn S. Brannon, the board president; members of the board, staff, and thousands who have provided years of valuable service to this organization and to the community.

The Urban League of Flint has contributed a great deal to my hometown and has played a critical role in building a stronger community. For 50 years, it has provided meaningful assistance to people in search of better job opportunities, quality housing, and decent medical care. It has been a powerful force against racism and bigotry.

In 1943, when the Urban League of Flint was founded, there was a great need for people to organize themselves to tackle difficult problems related to race and poverty. Under the leadership of William Valentine, the first executive director, and Edward Cumings, the first board president, the Urban League of Flint began to tackle the deep-rooted problems that have prevented America from truly becoming one country. At the very beginning of that quest, they focused on the basic human needs of the people: education, employment, health care, and housing.

The Urban League of Flint has always recognized that the ability to obtain a good job was at the core of what we want in our society. The Urban League developed their first employment program back in 1946, that helped returning veterans and others find jobs. In 1950, it worked with the State of Michigan to get an agreement to minimize discriminatory hiring practices. In the ensuing years it has developed and implemented countless programs to provide job training and provide opportunity to young people through youth job programs.

Through the leadership of Art Edmonds, the executive director from 1952 to 1960, the Urban League of Flint sought to improve housing for all. The Urban League of Flint was among the first to point out the disparity between the housing needs of African-American

and the opportunities available to them. In 1954 it found that many more African-Americans would buy homes if good housing were available to them. Two years later it documented the poor living conditions that many residents of Flint faced.

In the 1960's, under the leadership of executive director John Mack and others, the Urban League of Flint played a major role in the civil rights movement in Michigan and the Nation. Of special note is the role the Urban League played in the adoption of an open occupancy ordinance 25 years ago, making Flint the first city of its size in America to adopt such an ordinance. In countless other ways, the Urban League confronted inequality and helped our Nation move ahead during that period.

Since 1970, led by its current president, Mervyn S. Brannon, the League continues to help to forge a better future. The Salute to Black Scholars Program brings the community together to recognize high academic achievement by young African-Americans. The annual dinner honoring these young people has become an important event in the Flint community.

The League's tradition of concern for the living conditions of our people remains strong. From its inception in 1943, the Urban League of Flint surveyed the health care opportunities of the community and began to address the problems. Today, the Urban League is fighting contemporary problems such as AIDS and barriers that many face in obtaining access to health care.

The Urban League of Flint has made perhaps its biggest impact by serving as the conscience of the community by chronicling and confronting racism and bigotry. By making the living conditions of African-Americans and other people of color in Flint and Genesee County known to the wide community, it has sparked the attention of others and spurred action. The Urban League of Flint has given many a stronger voice. It has helped to provide opportunity where little had existed in the past.

I know I join thousands in Flint and Genesee County in honoring the Urban League's 50 years of fighting for equal opportunity and equal justice. We are grateful for the service of so many in Flint who have given much through the Urban League. And as we look ahead to the progress that still must be made, we are grateful that the Urban League will continue to work to make Flint and Genesee a better place to live.●

CLEAN SITES: UP AND RUNNING WELL

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I would like to recognize the Clean Sites' Chicago office on a very successful first year of operation. Clean Sites has be-

come involved in several environmental projects involving citizens and organizations in the Great Lakes region.

In January 1992, the Clean Sites Chicago office began its environmental involvement with a project in northwest Indiana to increase stakeholder participation in cleanup activities planned by the Environmental Protection Agency. Working with the EPA, Clean Sites launched the cleanup project and held two workshops, one on the treatment of contaminated sediments in the Indiana Harbor Canal, and the other concerning the implementation of the new Clean Air Act.

Clean Sites' commitment to a better environment will not end with that project. Senior analyst and mediator Tim Brown explains:

We intend to make stakeholder participation a hallmark of our work here as we bring diverse parties together in an effort to expedite cleanup efforts.

Upcoming activities include roundtable meetings with senior EPA staff and community leaders in northwest Indiana, as well as a workshop on petroleum contamination.

As we all know, Mr. President, our efforts now to improve the environmental are critically important, both to our health and the well-being of future generations. I commend the Chicago office of the Clean Sites organization on its sincere dedication to a cleaner environment.●

HONORING THE 944TH FIGHTER GROUP

● Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the courageous reservists of the 944th Fighter Group from Luke Air Force Base, AZ. Their dedication to their country and exemplary training skills were demonstrated during Operation Provide Comfort II, for which they were called to enforce the no-fly zone over northern Iraq as mandated by U.N. Security Council Resolution 688.

In November 1992, about 100 military personnel and their F-16C fighters departed from Luke AFB to add their support to the air operation based in southern Turkey near the city of Adana. The mission of the 944th was to provide relief for the active duty forces who have been enforcing the no-fly zone since April 1991.

The air crews of the 944th worked around the clock to get the job done, despite harsh weather and limited living space. They performed exceptionally well whether it was providing maintenance, intelligence, or enforcement of U.N. Resolution 688. The dedicated personnel of the 944th did all this under the threat of a potential engagement with hostile Iraqi forces.

The pilots of the 944th were on constant alert for any sign of the Iraqis breaking the no-fly zone. Crews flew

four to eight sorties daily, with each flight lasting 3½ to 4½ hours. They performed this duty with skill and expertise, ensuring that the Iraqis would not challenge the Security Council Resolution.

Mr. President, I applaud the efforts of the men and women of the 944th. The 944th provided an outstanding demonstration of the high-quality performance and training achieved by our Reserve Forces. They deserve the gratitude of the entire Nation for their unselfish sacrifice in enforcing the U.N. sanctions against Saddam Hussein. ●

GUN DEATHS AMONG YOUNG AMERICANS

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, once again, I wish to speak to the tragedy of gun-related deaths in our Nation. The National Center for Health Statistics [NCHS] has recently reported that the rate of firearm deaths among those age 15 to 24 has risen to the highest rate ever recorded. Guns are now involved in 1 out of every 4 deaths in that age group. Firearms cause more deaths among those age 15 to 24 than all natural causes combined. Even more alarming is how fast rates have jumped. For 15 to 19 year olds, the rate rose from 13.3 deaths per 100,000 population in 1985 to 23.5 deaths per 100,000 in 1990.

Mr. President, these statistics are a national disgrace. The youth of America are our future. We can and must do a better job of protecting our children from the terror of guns which plagues our streets. It is time for those of us on both sides of the aisle to recognize the magnitude of this crisis and enact responsible gun control legislation. Our children's lives depend on it.

At this time I would like to enter into the RECORD a copy of the Washington Post article of March 24, 1993, reporting the results of the NCHS study.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 24, 1993]
RATE OF GUN DEATHS RISES SHARPLY AMONG 15-24 AGE GROUP

(By Barbara Vobejda)

The rate at which young Americans are killed by guns has risen dramatically in recent years, and firearms are now involved in one of every four deaths among persons age 15 to 24, the federal government reported yesterday.

The National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS), which has been tracking firearm death rates since the late 1960s, reported that the rate among people age 15 to 19 has climbed to the highest ever recorded in this country. In that age group, and among those age 20 to 24, firearms are the cause of more deaths than all natural causes combined. Only motor vehicle accidents cause more deaths in those age groups.

The rates of gun-related deaths among 15- to 19-year-olds rose gradually through the late 1960s, 1970s and early 1980s, according to Lois A. Fingerhut, an epidemiologist at NCHS and author of the study. But then the figures jumped—from 13.3 deaths per 100,000 population in 1985 to 23.5 deaths per 100,000 in

1990, the last year for which complete data are available. Fingerhut called the difference "startling."

The study did not examine why the figures have risen so rapidly, and Fingerhut said there is not a single explanation. "There are multiple variables in this," she said. "For some unknown reason, they've all come together. You can't open a newspaper without reading about someone else being killed."

At a recent congressional hearing examining the increasing violence in children's lives, experts and children's advocates cited a host of causes, including the easy accessibility of guns, increasing drug traffic, glorification of violence in the media and the breakdown of the family.

"It is frightening and intolerable to see this waste of young lives," Health and Human Services Secretary Donna E. Shalala said in a statement released with the report. "Our young people need to see opportunity ahead of them and rewards for hard work, not the emptiness and unpredictability of violent injury."

In 1990, guns involved in homicides, suicides or accidents caused the deaths of nearly 4,200 teenagers, the report said, compared to about 2,500 in 1985.

The rate rose 77 percent among all those age 15 to 19 from 1985 to 1990. Even among the very young, guns were involved in a rising number of deaths: For black males age 10 to 14, the rate more than doubled over that period. And for all black teenage males, the firearm homicide rate nearly tripled over that period, reaching 105.3 deaths per 100,000.

Rates among white teenage boys rose rapidly—an annual average increase of 24 percent from 1988 to 1990—largely in the Hispanic community, Fingerhut said. But the figures were much higher among blacks. Sixty percent of deaths among black teenage males were caused by guns, compared to 23 percent among white teenage males.

Among persons 15 to 24, the number of firearm deaths in 1990 was 9,542. Deaths by natural causes totaled 7,959, and motor vehicle accidents claimed 12,607.

Fingerhut said a previous study showed that the rates were highest in big cities such as Washington, Los Angeles and Detroit, but that rates were increasing in small cities too.

Focusing only on death rates may understate the larger problem, she said, because it does not reflect the extent of serious injury caused by guns. There are seven times as many nonfatal firearm injuries as there are deaths caused by guns, she said, adding: "The cost to society is unbelievable." ●

DEFENSE REDUCTIONS

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, our colleague from Michigan, Mr. LEVIN, recently wrote an excellent article for the Los Angeles Times, in which he shatters recent arguments heard on this floor that uncertainty in Russia is justification to stop the very modest decreases in military spending planned by President Clinton.

The President has proposed a very modest cut of \$127 billion over 5 years, compared to President Bush's \$1.4 trillion military spending plan. That amounts to a reduction of just 9 percent, hardly a gutting of our Defense Establishment, considering that the Pentagon justified about 60 percent of its budget to stop a sudden Warsaw Pact attack on Western Europe.

During recent debates over the fiscal year 1994 budget resolution, some of our colleagues argued that since Boris Yeltsin might be replaced, or since his Democratic and market reforms might not succeed, therefore we should not proceed with the modest defense reductions.

Mr. President, a change in leadership in Russia could present the United States with formidable foreign policy challenges, but the conventional military threat to Western Europe that existed for decades could never be reassembled without many years if not decades of warning. As Senator LEVIN said:

The Cold War is over, but old Cold War thinking is not. Red ink, not the Red Army, is the greater challenge to preserving America's strength.

Mr. President, I ask to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Senator LEVIN's excellent analysis, along with a March 30 New York Times editorial.

The material follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 30, 1993]

RUSSIAN CHAOS WON'T JUSTIFY DEFENSE EXCESS

(By Carl Levin)

Some critics of President Clinton's budget blueprint are using the crisis facing Russia's Boris Yeltsin as a rationale for higher military spending here at home. It is clearly in our interest to have Russia's trend toward democratization continue. But even if Yeltsin falls, there is no immediate prospect of a renewed security threat from Russia that justifies higher U.S. defense budgets.

Plans still in place for the U.S. military are based on assessments that President Bush and his advisers made years ago. They assumed that we would be facing military forces of a size and capability almost unimaginable now. Since they devised our "base force" to meet those perceived threats, the Soviet military has rapidly deteriorated.

The Warsaw Pact is gone and the former Soviet Union is divided, splintering the military and reducing weapons production. Russia can no longer rely on armies from East Germany and Poland—if it ever could. Political and ethnic divisions are boiling within Russia and funds for the military are extremely scarce. The Red Army has dwindled to about half its former size, smaller than the forces of the European NATO countries. Morale among the remnants is low. Infrastructure, air defenses, supply and communications networks to support Red Army forces are also divided haphazardly among several states. Russia's navy is crippled by insufficient fuel supplies and spare parts.

The Bush defense budget did not take into account these very real changes in the threat. The Clinton budget begins to do so, making an additional modest reduction from 1.6 million to 1.4 million in the active-duty U.S. military. Many of our allies in Western Europe are making deeper cuts in their military forces. None of them have determined that Yeltsin's situation merits reversal of the build-down in their armies.

It is unclear what the effect will be on Russia in the unfortunate event that Yeltsin does not survive as president. But there is no indication that any of his potential successors would be hostile to the United States, our allies or our direct security interests. Chaos and further disintegration of Russia into its ethnic component parts will keep Russian leaders busy, whoever they are.

Finally, if a security threat to the United States and its allies were to materialize, we would have ample time to respond politically or militarily. Secretary of Defense Les Aspin concluded last year, while he was chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, that the United States would have years of warning of a new Russian threat, enough to generate substantial forces from scratch.

The greatest potential threat from Russia, especially if Yeltsin falls and instability increases, is the thousands of nuclear weapons still deployed there, along with those that have been retired to storage. Command and control of these weapons, and their potential spread to other countries, pose a security threat to the United States and the world right now, even with Yeltsin in power. We cannot effectively counter the pressing threat of nuclear proliferation from Russia by keeping another 200,000 personnel in uniform or by spending billions more dollars for the Strategic Defense Initiative.

What we can do is speed the use of funds already available for dismantling and securing of Russian weapons. And we need far stronger controls on ballistic-missile technology and a much tougher system of inspections by the International Atomic Energy Agency. We can have both for a fraction of the cost of planned "Star Wars" research.

Our nuclear deterrent will remain strong, even at greatly reduced levels. And if a change of leadership in Russia stops or slows down missile retirements planned under the START and START II treaties, we could take similar action at a very low cost.

The best way to assure a continued decline in any military threat from our former adversary is to play a leadership role in supporting the development of democracy in Russia, and getting our allies to help.

The Clinton defense budget is the right response to changes in the former Soviet Union, because it begins addressing post-Cold War threats and makes appropriate reductions from Bush's plans, so as to help get our civilian economy going again. The challenge faced by Boris Yeltsin does not justify increasing the Clinton budget.

The Cold War is over, but old Cold War thinking is not. Red ink, not the Red Army, is the greater challenge to preserving America's strength.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 30, 1993]

WHAT RED ARMY?

The Red Army, once one of the world's most formidable fighting forces, is in an advanced state of disintegration. Its finest divisions have splintered. Its draft calls go largely unheeded. Much of its equipment is inoperative. Only its strategic nuclear forces remain potent.

The shocking deterioration of this once-powerful military machine has profound implications. Unless the dimensions of the decline are recognized, there can be no sound military policy in the West or in Russia.

The key lesson to absorb is that the Red Army is no longer ready to rampage beyond Soviet borders. Its strongest divisions, once based in Germany, have withdrawn, their morale shattered. Its next-best divisions, based in Ukraine, have turned over their weapons to that newly independent state. And many Ukrainian soldiers, once 40 percent of the officer corps, have gone home. In Russia, only a minority answer the army's draft calls, and those who do so in hopes of three square meals a day soon go hungry, and AWOL. Military exercises have been drastically curtailed for lack of fuel.

Yet in Washington, Congressional supporters of the Pentagon are drawing the wrong

lessons from the daily reminder of just how fragile Boris Yeltsin's reformist rule might be. Fearful that a military coup could bring to power aggressive nationalists who would restore authoritarian rule and the Red Army, they want to delay deeper cuts in the Pentagon budget. But it could take years to reconstitute the Red Army and even then it could not pose the same threat as it did when the Soviet Empire and the Soviet Union were still intact.

The Red Army is as riven as the rest of Russian society. It has so far kept out of politics. For it to take sides for or against Boris Yeltsin would risk further fragmentation, even civil war. The army has some revanchists who can't wait to restore the Evil Empire. But it also has its share of Yeltsin sympathizers. And it is commanded by a new breed of military modernizers who want economic reform and ties to the West that will help them keep pace with military technology.

There are two chief dangers in the Red Army's disintegration. Some disgruntled divisions are fueling separatism in Moldova and Georgia, threatening to embroil Russia in wars on its new periphery. The West could help ease this problem by paying to house and even pension off Red Army officers to keep them from fomenting trouble.

If extreme nationalists regained control, the nuclear missiles might again pose a threat to the U.S. That's why it's urgent to begin dismantling the Russian and other ex-Soviet republics' arsenals even before the Start treaty is ratified. By getting Congress to vote defense funds for this purpose, Senators Richard Lugar and Sam Nunn have pointed to creative ways to rethink U.S. security.

Washington spends as much on defense as do Russia, Britain, Germany, France, Iran and Japan combined. A little money spent to encourage Russian reform could do a lot more for U.S. security than new tanks, ships or planes. •

COSPONSORSHIP OF S. 455 PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES [PILT]

• Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I rise to cosponsor legislation introduced by my friend and colleague from Oregon, Senator HATFIELD. S. 455, adjustments to the Payments in Lieu of Taxes [PILT] Program, will go a long way toward correcting inequities that have existed between counties and the Federal Government for many years.

Enacted in 1976, the PILT Program provides compensation to county governments which have tax-exempt programs, Federal lands such as national parks, forests, wildlife refuges, and Bureau of Land Management [BLM] lands within their boundaries. More than 1,700 counties throughout 49 States benefit from this program.

PILT funds help county governments meet the real and growing needs of their citizens for education, transportation, health care, law enforcement, waste disposal and many other essential services. PILT payments are an extremely important source of revenue for counties who are being continually asked to provide increased services with diminishing budgets.

The problem with PILT since 1976 is that the program's authorization level

has not increased, whereas the Consumer Price Index has increased by 120 percent. In 17 years, the value of PILT has eroded to less than half of when originally enacted.

Senator HATFIELD's bill will phase in over 5 years an adjustment increasing the formula from 75 cents for each acre of entitlement land to \$1.65 per acre. For the alternative method of determining PILT payments, the increase will be from 10 cents per acre to 22 cents per acre. Additionally, the population cap will be amended proportionally. And finally, the program would be indexed for inflation starting after the first year and will still be subject to the appropriations process.

An important feature of this bill is the 5-year phase-in of the full adjustment. Previous legislation, which I cosponsored, mandated the full adjustment in a 1-fiscal year period. The appropriations process was simply not able to accommodate an additional \$115 million, and the legislation was subsequently stalled. I believe that this feature makes the bill more acceptable and fiscally responsive.

While there are other States that benefit more from PILT payments, many Minnesota counties have come to rely on them as a significant source of revenue. Minnesota has 2,582,664 entitlement acres of Federal land, most located in northern Minnesota. Several counties comprise the majority of this land: Cook County contains 629,000 acres, representing 69 percent of its entire acreage; Lake County contains 727,025; and St. Louis County contains 837,935 acres. In fiscal year 1992, counties in Minnesota received roughly \$680,000 from the BLM.

Under S. 455, Minnesota will see a first-year increase to \$685,811, and by the fifth year, an increase to \$2,885,074. These payments are essential to counties in providing the important day-to-day services in places such as the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. Some of these counties have additional burdens because of the large increase in visitors and part-year residents during the summer months, increasing the demands for services.

Mr. President, this legislation is a fair and equitable solution to a problem that has hampered counties for many years and I look forward to securing its passage. •

THE ECONOMY

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, despite all the 1992 campaign rhetoric, President Clinton inherited an economy in recovery. Almost every statistic since November confirmed that fact. That is why the recovery can rightly be called the Bush recovery.

Since the inauguration, Wall Street, big and small businesses, and America's consumers were hopeful that perhaps the new President could build on

the Bush recovery. For a while, there was hope, hope based more on President Clinton's clever salesmanship than anything substantive. But, then something happened. The details started emerging—details about Bill Clinton's economic plan that proved that he was not a new Democrat—he was an old Democrat, a Democrat who sees taxing and spending as the only answers to a sluggish economy.

THE IMPACT OF CLINTONOMICS

There are signs that the economy may be more sluggish than projected earlier this year. I believe that there is a simple explanation for the markets' actions, and you can sum it up in one word: Clintonomics.

Mr. President, the financial markets are beginning to grasp the full meaning of the misguided Clinton economic plan and the impact that a record tax increase—\$291 billion in higher taxes and user fees—could have on the U.S. economy.

On top of that concern comes another distressing signal. Immediately following the vote on the President's \$440 billion deficit reduction plan, the Democrats are pushing \$19.6 billion more deficit spending for a political stimulus package. To me, this decision raises serious questions about the Democrats' commitment to cut spending and reduce the deficit. Republicans want Uncle Sam to put his charge card away. If this bill is necessary, then Democrats should be willing to pay for it. It's that simple—it is a basic philosophical difference.

Let us face it, while the American people are starting to tune into the deficit reduction channel in record numbers, the Democrats are still glued to their favorite network—"Pork-TV."

THE EFFECTS OF A TAX HIKE

Let us look at some of the early returns on Clintonomics.

Last week, the conference board's index of consumer confidence dropped for the third straight month. The Commerce Department's index of leading economic indicators increased for the fifth time in 6 months, but the increase was lower than expected.

The Labor Department reported that 22,000 private sector jobs disappeared in March, factory output slowed, and exports weakened. On Friday, the Dow Jones Industrial average dropped 68 points.

Mr. President, I am not here to wring my hands and suggest that the sky is falling. It is not. But, all of this information does suggest that the economy's progress this year may fall below the brisk pace set in the final quarter of 1992. I agree with those economists who point to worries about a tax hike as a major factor contributing to the slowdown.

The March blue chip survey of 50 private economic forecasters showed that the consensus forecast of real GDP growth in 1994 fell two-tenths of a per-

centage point. The panel members cited—and I quote, "The potentially negative effects on the pace of economic growth stemming from the Clinton administration's plan," as a reason for their lower growth projections.

The Democrats have gleefully pointed to Alan Greenspan as a key supporter of the President's plan. But, I would remind my colleagues that on March 24, Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan testified before the Senate Finance Committee. He said:

It is important to recognize that trying to wholly, or substantially, address a structural budget deficit by increasing revenues * * * is more likely to fail than to succeed.

I agree with Chairman Greenspan. Unfortunately, it appears that President Clinton and those who support his plan do not.

HIGHER TAXES WILL NOT CREATE JOBS

Mr. President, here is the bottom line: \$291 billion in higher taxes and fees means that businesses and consumers will have \$291 billion less to spend and invest over the next 5 years. It also means that most of those companies that made the tough decisions—to cut their debt load and streamline—in order to increase their competitive position, those companies that are now poised for expansion, will either reduce or delay decisions to hire new employees if they see higher tax bills on the horizon.

THE INFORMATION BLACKOUT

Mr. President, last week, we were forced to vote on the President's budget plan without all the legally required details. That was an unprecedented move on the part of President Clinton and the Democrat leadership to try to put the President's program in place before people understand what is in it. But, they are not going to be able to sustain the information blackout for long.

THE PORK BARREL SPENDING STIMULUS

Mr. President, the markets are not reacting to the President's \$19.6 billion pork barrel spending stimulus. I do not think that \$19.6 billion more deficit spending can do much to help a \$6 trillion economy. But, one thing is for certain: It will add to our \$319 billion deficit. And, that is distressing news to American taxpayers and financial markets alike.

TAX AND SPEND AND BUSINESS AS USUAL

The markets are reacting to 291 billion dollars' worth of higher taxes and user fees. People outside Washington, DC, are beginning to understand that despite all the slick packaging and the good-sounding rhetoric, the President's recipe for deficit reduction is nothing more than a mixture of tax-and-spend and business-as-usual.

Republicans support change—constructive, positive change. Change that keeps the economy moving. Change that creates jobs, change that cuts spending and reduces the deficit.

We offered a plan to do just that. It would have cut the deficit by \$460 billion over 5 years without raising taxes. Fifty-five Senate Democrats voted to defeat our version of real change.

The Clinton plan does not solve the deficit problem. It will not keep the economy moving. And it will not create jobs.

CONCLUSION

It is amazing how so many can stand on this floor and say with a straight face that stopping a \$19.6 billion pork barrel spending bill is somehow bad for the economy.

The good news is that the American people know better. They are watching and they are waiting for leadership. If Congress does not have the guts to stop this kind of shameless spending, then we can expect more troubling news from an economy that already has too little confidence in Congress.

So, this is it. This is the test. It is not much of a test, but we believe it is worth the fight.

THE U.S. HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the beginning of spring also means the beginning of tourist season here in Washington, DC.

Every day, men, women, and children arrive here to see their Government at work, and to tour some of American's most cherished monuments.

And in just a matter of weeks—on April 26—Americans will be able to visit a new memorial in our Nation's Capital—the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum.

For many years, courageous Jewish-Americans—along with Americans from every race and creed—hoped for the day when a permanent memorial would help ensure that the memory and the lessons of the greatest of human tragedies would never be forgotten.

And in 1980, their dream took the first step to becoming a reality, when legislation creating the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council was signed into law by President Carter.

The council was charged with overseeing development of the Holocaust Memorial, which would serve as a living museum.

While the memorial is on public land, and will be operated by the Federal Government, it has been entirely financed by private funds.

Indeed, under Presidents Carter, Reagan, and Bush, the planning and construction of the Holocaust Memorial has been an example of what can be accomplished when Government works in a partnership with private citizens.

And, under President Carter, Reagan, and Bush, it had also been a strictly nonpartisan and nonpolitical process.

Sadly, that has now changed.

According to today's Washington Post, the Clinton administration has told Harvey Meyerhoff and William Lowenberg that they will be removed from their positions as council chairman and vice chairman as of May 1.

Mr. Meyerhoff has served as council chairman for the past 6 years. He and his family have also donated \$6 million to the museum.

No doubt about it—this month's opening of the Holocaust Museum would not have occurred without the leadership and generosity of Harvey Meyerhoff.

While asking Meyerhoff to step down as chairman is certainly a decision within President Clinton's right, it is just as certainly a decision without class and without good sense.

I could not say it better than did Democrat Congressman SID YATES, who is chairman of the subcommittee that oversees appropriations for the museum. Congressman YATES said:

The museum is still in the delicate and sensitive process of being opened. Its staff is working day and night. It seemed to me they could wait a couple of weeks. Right on the threshold of opening the museum—it doesn't make sense to me to resort to pressure politics.

But, Mr. President, one thing we have learned in the first few months of the Clinton administration—especially with the firing of all U.S. attorneys—is that pressure politics is the name of the game.

I am saddened that the Clinton administration has now chosen to inject pressure politics into what should be a very solemn and meaningful dedication ceremony on April 22.

Mr. President, I look forward to visiting the Holocaust Memorial Museum, and, on behalf of all Members of this body, I want to thank Harvey Meyerhoff and William Lowenberg for their leadership and generosity.

PROGRAM

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I would like to describe briefly the circumstances which led to the agreement we have just entered, and the schedule for the immediate future, although the latter has been pretty well described in our colloquy that we just had. So let me deal with that first.

There will be no rollcall votes on Wednesday. The Senate will return to session on Monday, April 19, for debate only, on the pending measure and the possible two amendments, alternatives, that may be offered on that date pursuant to this agreement.

There will be rollcall votes on Tuesday morning. The agreement permits but does not require that alternatives may be offered on the Republican side

by Senators HATFIELD and DOLE, and on the Democratic side by Senators BYRD and MITCHELL.

If those are offered, they will be debated on Monday, and votes will occur on or in relation to those amendments, or on a point of order to those amendments, beginning at 10 a.m. on Tuesday, first on the Hatfield-Dole amendment, if offered; then on the Byrd-Mitchell amendment, if offered.

Then a cloture vote will occur. A cloture vote will occur in any event. If no amendment is offered, or no amendment is adopted, then the cloture vote, of course, would be on the bill as presently constituted. If an amendment is offered and adopted, then the cloture vote would be on the bill as amended by that amendment.

If cloture is not invoked, then as previously stated, the bill would be open to amendment.

**RECESS UNTIL WEDNESDAY,
APRIL 7, 1993, AT 1:30 P.M.**

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. 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, 11:36 p.m., recessed until Wednesday, April 7, 1993, at 1:30 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 5, 1993:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
JERRY D. KLEPNER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, VICE STEVEN B. KELMAR.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
ELIZABETH ANN REIKE, OF ARIZONA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, VICE JOHN M. SAYRE, RESIGNED.

U.S. INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY
J. BRIAN ATWOOD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

IN THE AIR FORCE
THE FOLLOWING INDIVIDUALS FOR RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE APPOINTMENT, IN THE GRADE INDICATED, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 593, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, WITH A VIEW TO DESIGNATION UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 8067, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO PERFORM THE DUTIES INDICATED.

MEDICAL CORPS
To be lieutenant colonel

RONALD W. HANROTE xxx-xx-x...
RONNIE J. KIRSCHLINE xxx-xx-x...
JAY H. MEAD xxx-xx-x...
JOHN B. PAYNE xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN L. PHUI xxx-xx-x...

THE FOLLOWING REGULAR OFFICERS FOR RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE APPOINTMENT, IN THE GRADE INDICATED, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 593, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.

LINE
To be lieutenant colonel

WILLIAM J. CAROLAN xxx-xx-x...
DOUGLAS JAMES xxx-xx-x...

THOMAS H. LARNED xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES R. LIPE xxx-xx-x...
DAVID L. MOSSBY xxx-xx-x...
JONATHAN N. PIETSCHMAN xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM T.M. REUSCH xxx-xx-x...
DAVID A. RUDDOCK xxx-xx-x...
MARIE C. SHADDEN xxx-xx-x...
GILBERT J. TALKINGTON xxx-xx-x...
ALAN R. WESTROM xxx-xx-x...

IN THE ARMY
THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS, ON THE ACTIVE DUTY LIST, FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTIONS 624 AND 628, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE. THE OFFICER IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK IS ALSO BEING NOMINATED FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 531, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.

ARMY
STEVEN G. BROOKS xxx-xx-x...
KEITH R. GORDON xxx-xx-x...
JOHN B. MACLEOD xxx-xx-x...

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL
To be lieutenant colonel

ROBERT J. DAUTRICH xxx-xx-x...
ARMY

To be major
*MICHAEL J. KALIL xxx-xx-x...

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS, ON THE ACTIVE DUTY LIST, FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTIONS 624 AND 628, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE. THE OFFICERS IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK ARE ALSO BEING NOMINATED FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 531, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.

ARMY
To be lieutenant colonel

PATRICK M. HOLDER xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT J. ROSENAU xxx-xx-x...

MEDICAL CORPS
To be lieutenant colonel

*EDWARD FLETCHER xxx-xx-x...
MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel
PATRICK A. SUPON xxx-xx-x...

ARMY NURSE CORPS
To be lieutenant colonel

*VICTORIA J. RANSOM xxx-xx-x...
THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS, ON THE ACTIVE DUTY LIST, FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTIONS 624 AND 628, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.

MEDICAL CORPS
To be major

RAYMOND L. CAPPS xxx-xx-x...
WALTER J. LAWRENCE xxx-xx-x...
JOHN M. LOWERY xxx-xx-x...
ERIK P. PETERSON xxx-xx-x...

DENTAL CORPS
To be major

STEVEN S. KIM xxx-xx-x...
MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be major
CLEM D. MCDUFFIE xxx-xx-x...

CONFIRMATION

Executive Nomination Confirmed by the Senate April 5, 1993:

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY
JAMES LEE WITT, OF ARKANSAS, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY.
THE ABOVE NOMINATION WAS APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE NOMINEE'S COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.