

SENATE—Friday, October 20, 1995

(Legislative day of Wednesday, October 18, 1995)

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, ultimate judge of us all, free us from the pejorative judgments that put others down when they do not agree with us. We develop a litmus test to judge others. Sometimes, when they don't measure up, we question their value and make condemnatory judgments of them. Most serious of all, we think our categorization justifies our lack of prayer for them. Often we self-righteously neglect in our prayers the very people who most need Your blessing.

Give us Samuel's heart to say, "Far be it from me that I should sin against the Lord in ceasing to pray for you."—1 Samuel 12:23. Remind us that You alone have power to change the minds and hearts of people if we will be faithful to pray for them. Make us intercessors for all those You have placed on our hearts—even those we previously have condemned with our judgments. We accept Your authority: "Judgment is mine, says the Lord." I pray this in the name of Jesus, who with Moses and the prophets, taught us to do to others what we would wish them to do to us. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able Senator from Virginia is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, speaking on behalf of the majority leader, I wish to inform the Senate that morning business on this day shall continue until the hour of 10:30 a.m. with Senators FORD, WARNER, BAUCUS, and KERREY to be recognized for time allocation within that period.

At 10:30 it will be the intention of the majority leader to proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 207, S. 1322, regarding the relocation of the United States Embassy in Israel.

The majority leader wishes to advise all Senators that rollcall votes, therefore, are possible.

Further, the majority leader desires to bring up the State Department reor-

ganization, if the managers' amendment can be worked out, or, in the alternative, the Labor-HHS appropriations bill, again if an agreement can be reached.

Mr. President, I seek recognition as one with allocation of morning business time.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAMPBELL). Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 10:30 a.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein. Under the previous order, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] is recognized to speak for up to 10 minutes in morning business.

Mr. WARNER. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE SENATE AND THE WORLD WIDE WEB

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I am privileged to be joined this morning by my distinguished colleague and friend, Senator FORD. Senator FORD and I have the joint responsibility for the Rules Committee, and we come to the floor today to announce the Senate presence on the World Wide Web.

As of this morning, nearly 6 million Americans will have access to educational information about the U.S. Senate by way of Internet. We envision the Senate Home Page as a tool that can be used by educators all across our Nation in helping with their teachings of the constitutional and historical role of this institution, and its place in American Government and its underlying responsibilities within our society.

The U.S. Senate World Wide Web Server provides information from and about the Members of the Senate, the Senate committees, and Senate leadership. This evolving service also provides general background information about U.S. Senate legislative procedures, the Senate facilities in this Capitol Building, and the history of this institution. It also includes a visual tour of the Capitol for those of our constituents who may be unable to visit in person, and particularly for those who can visit it. It includes many suggestions on how to plan their visits to the U.S. Capitol Building.

The Capitol Building also has, as we all know, a permanent art collection of great renown and of great historical significance. That too is treated in this Internet.

I want to thank Senator STEVENS and my colleague, Senator FORD, and other members of the Rules Committee who began this effort early this year. We have a very valued staff, and this effort has been led by John McConnell and Paul Steele, and most recently by the acting staff director, Grayson Winterling.

Special thanks to additional staff persons with technical ability in the Sergeant at Arms, Tom Meenan, Chris Lee, Charlie Kirsch, Alex Hobson, Jenny Yu, Roger Myers, Jim Judy, and Sara Oursler along with Cherie Allen of the Secretary of the Senate's office, for developing this technical achievement.

Additional thanks to many of those Senators and their high-technology staff members who were early adopters of this emerging technology, and who indeed gave us the impetus to move forward to this day.

Further, Mr. President, I would emphasize that this is but one step under the current leadership of the Rules Committee, myself and Mr. FORD. We hope to enrich and further expand the Senate Internet presence in the coming months with additional information about the Senate, and its Members.

Further, Mr. President, some of the additional services that we hope to add will be a calendar of events in the Capitol and the Senate, video and voice excerpts of Senate proceedings, and expanded home page percentages.

I yield the floor to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. FORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD] is recognized.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with Senator WARNER, our new chairman of the Senate Rules Committee, in announcing that as of this morning, the Senate is now online on the World Wide Web.

The Senate Rules Committee first authorized a Senate presence on the Internet in September, 1993, with the creation of the Senate FTP Gopher Server. In November of that year, the Rules Committee established policies and procedures for Senate participation on the Internet. In the short 2 years since that time, Internet technology has leaped forward producing the significantly improved graphics capability of the World Wide Web. The Web provides the Senate an improved opportunity to provide educational information to the public and I am pleased that we are able to announce this step forward today.

The U.S. Senate World Wide Web Server is produced under the auspices of the Secretary of the Senate's office with technical advice and input from the Sergeant at Arms' Office and the Rules Committee technical staff. The Senate Server will provide the public with general information on the Senate and how it works. The Senate Home Page will provide a direct link to Member's home pages located on the Server and will allow the public to surf such useful information as visual tours of the Capitol, committee membership and jurisdiction, a glossary of frequently used legislative terms, and the history of the Senate.

While we all recognize the somewhat limited reach of the Web today, with an estimated 6 million users nationally, the potential—and I emphasize "potential"—for this technology to eventually reach every school child, office place, and even private home, is obvious. The Senate needs to move into the 21st century and our presence on the Web ensures that the Senate will not be left behind as this technology explodes.

The Rules Committee will continue to monitor the development of the Web with an eye to ensuring that as technology moves forward, the Senate keeps pace with policies and procedures that ensure access to improving technology on a fiscally sound basis. I congratulate our chairman, Senator WARNER, on moving forward with this initiative and encourage my colleagues to take advantage of this important communications tool.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague. I say to Members of the Senate, Senator FORD and I have worked together on many things for now some 17 years and he is a tough, fair working partner, I tell you that.

Mr. FORD. Leave the "tough" out.

Mr. WARNER. All right. He is a man who takes very conscientiously the duties of the Rules Committee and has for many years. It is a pleasure to work with him.

TRIBUTE TO THE CAPITOL POLICE

Mr. WARNER. On Monday, October 16, a very significant number—I shall not make any estimate—of American citizens came from every corner of our land to answer a challenge to join in a day of atonement and brotherhood on the National Mall and the west front of the U.S. Capitol. Many visitors journeyed to Washington from distant States to join in what was characterized as the Million Man March, a successful occasion, indeed, by all press accounts.

The Capitol Grounds, which belong equally to every citizen of this Nation, was one of the focal points of this gathering. Sometimes those of us who work

in the Senate, whatever the capacity may be, tend not to fully appreciate what happens behind the scenes when large demonstrations of this magnitude occur.

I stand today to pay tribute to the infrastructure of the Senate—indeed, I think of both the House and the Senate—that contributed in some measure to making this an acceptable and safe event.

Again, I thank all who helped make it a safe event. It was one of the largest demonstrations on the U.S. Capitol Grounds in contemporary history. I would particularly like to thank our Capitol Police Department; 1,100 U.S. Capitol Police officers were on duty on October 16. All days off were canceled. Officers were required to work extended duty hours. Officers provided routine law enforcement, protective operations, and traffic control. Their professionalism assured that our visitors received the services they deserved and permitted Senators and staff to continue their work during the day.

There was also significant infrastructure to provide for health and first aid.

Planning meetings with the organizations began early in August to assure this public safety. Senator FORD and I convened two meetings of the infrastructure on the Senate side and carefully reviewed their plans. We thank Chief Gary Abrecht, Assistant Chief Robert Howe, and Deputy Chief James Rohan for their overall command, and we are grateful to Lt. Gregg Parman and Officer Terry Rinaldi for their involvement in all phases of the planning process.

While the Nation focused its attention on the west front of the Capitol, the Capitol Police Department worked to assure the safety and security of all who assembled, preserving the tradition of our first amendment rights.

We thank the Capitol Police for their good work. We thank many others in this institution who equally contributed. And I pay a special recognition to Mr. Howard Greene, the Sergeant at Arms, who was sort of the executive officer of this effort.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR NUNN

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, it is a privilege for me to place into today's RECORD of the Senate the remarks made by our distinguished colleague, Senator NUNN of Georgia, when he announced his future intentions, which, to the regret of many, indicated that he would not seek reelection to the Senate.

Mr. President, I say it is a privilege because Senator NUNN has been a very, very close personal friend, a valued and respected professional partner—I always considered him a partner—for a quarter of a century. I first came to know Senator NUNN when I, as Secretary of the Navy, worked with Carl

Vinson. Carl Vinson was chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. He served in the House of Representatives for 50 years. I had a role in the naming of a supercarrier after him, the U.S.S. *Carl Vinson*.

It was in the process of that naming procedure that I first came to know SAM NUNN, who at that time was working in a capacity with Carl Vinson and the House Armed Services Committee. Of course, when I was privileged some 17 years ago to come to the Senate, he was a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and we worked there together for these many years and will continue to work for this coming year. I anticipate his contributions in this coming year to our Nation and to our Senate will be no less as significant in magnitude as the many contributions he has made over his entire career in the Senate.

As I say, I value his friendship, and for 6 years we were privileged to work together with Senator NUNN as chairman of the committee, and I had the position of ranking member. We sponsored many pieces of legislation, coauthored them together, particularly in the areas of personnel and strategic matters. We journeyed together to many foreign lands in connection with our responsibilities on the committee.

So it is with heartfelt thanks that I say to my friend, in joining many others in paying him respect, I wish him and his family the very best of good fortune and simply say thank you, Senator NUNN, for the many things you have done for our country particularly in the area of national security.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in today's RECORD the full text of his statement. Also, I have a short article which appeared in the Washington Times entitled "Inside The Beltway," and I will read it. That would be the final, concluding part of the entry in today's RECORD. It reads:

Family values. On Monday, after Senator Nunn announced that he would not run for reelection next year, we asked him what he felt had been his greatest accomplishment during his 24 years in Congress. Mr. Nunn thought about our question for several days and got back to us yesterday. We must concede we were surprised at his response, having expected the Georgia Democrat to cite one of his many legislative accomplishments.

"Keeping my family together," he said.

Asked to explain, Mr. Nunn said that, with the multitude of demands on a Senator's family, families have to make many sacrifices. He said he is especially proud to have kept his family together.

The Senator and his wife, Colleen, recently celebrated their 30th wedding anniversary. They have two children, Michelle, 28, and Brian, 26.

I think that final comment in connection with his future plans not only symbolizes the humility of this great American but it also speaks to the life and the challenges of every Member of this institution.

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

SENATOR NUNN'S STATEMENT, OCTOBER 9, 1995

I am honored to be in our beautiful State capitol building on the floor of the Georgia house where I began my legislative career 27 years ago. After a lot of thought and prayer, I have concluded that my rewarding and fulfilling legislative career should end at the conclusion of my present term. This has been a difficult decision made much harder because of my deep respect for the many people who have encouraged me to run, but I know in my heart that it is time for me to follow a new course.

I believe that both voters and incumbents have a responsibility for careful assessment before entering into a new Senate Contract. For me, an election establishes a sacred trust between the voter and the elected official. Each time I have been elected to the Senate, I have committed heart and soul to the full range of duties of a Senator for a full 6 years. The job requires this commitment—the people deserve it.

Today, I look forward to more freedom, to more flexibility, more time with my family, more time in Georgia, and more time to read, write, and think. While I will not continue in the legislative arena, I will continue my involvement in public policy.

The essence of democracy is much more than just legislators casting votes. It is the action of men and women who take the time to wrestle with the problems of individuals and communities—and do something to solve them. This is the new arena that I will enter—that of a private citizen who also is engaged in the challenges that face our communities and our Nation.

Today, there is no shortage of challenges. These include issues of national security, foreign policy, the environment, health care, and the plight of citizens struggling to fully participate in the economic opportunity of our Nation.

Too many of our citizens are being left behind as our economy moves from the industrial age to the age of information and knowledge because they lack appropriate education and training. A large part of our economic challenge is fundamentally an education challenge. We must change.

Too many children in America are born and grow up outside family structures without the attention, nurturing, discipline, and love that every human soul must have. Too many parents who are struggling to provide their children with basic needs have no way to protect them from street violence and drugs. If America is to remain the greatest country on Earth, our children must come first. We must change.

Too many executives are spending too many corporate dollars paying for television programs that bombard our homes with sex and violence—not thinking or caring about the effect of this bombardment on our children and our Nation's future. Too many of us as citizens sit by passively while this bombardment takes place. We continue to buy the products which are advertised and sold at the expense of our culture—our values—our children—and our future. We must change.

We are reaping the harvest from this combination of conditions in soaring rates of child abuse, drug abuse, teenage pregnancies, abortions, and unprecedented levels of crime and violence.

These challenges are made more difficult because our citizens are increasingly concluding that our political system responds

primarily to money and special interests. Our system of government is sound, and most public officials are honorable, but there are fundamental problems which must be corrected.

Too much of the time and effort of Members of Congress is consumed by fund raising. The ability to raise big money and buy saturation tv ads has become the dominant theme of our political races.

Too often the tactics of obsessive polling, negative and cynical campaigns, and horse race media coverage overwhelm substantive debate, dialogue with the voters, and real leadership. Too much of the time of both Congress and the executive branch is spent budgeting—not enough time is spent in oversight and evaluation of Federal programs.

The average citizen primarily wants his or her elected officials to use common sense for the common good, but too often those voices are drowned out by the extremes in both parties who are usually wrong, but never in doubt. Our system of government is the best in the world, but our political process is in need of major reform. Continuation of the two party system, as we know it, will depend on whether true campaign reform and congressional procedural reform are undertaken soon.

America is not perfect, but it is the greatest country in the world. During our 200 year history, when we have faced economic, military, political, or social peril, Americans have demonstrated the unrivaled ability to change and to grow stronger in the process.

This is a period of transition for our Nation, similar to the historic periods after World War I and World War II. After World War I, decisions and events took place that led to a devastating worldwide depression, and an even more deadly war. After World War II, Americans led the way, in rebuilding war torn nations, in building international institutions that endured, and in containing communism until it collapsed from its own weakness. American leadership opened the door to an unprecedented era of prosperity for the free world.

We too will someday be measured by how well we meet the challenges we face today at home and abroad.

I am optimistic about America because the checks and balances built into our constitutional system have stood the toughest tests of time, and I am confident they will again.

I am optimistic because our military, with the world's best technology, remains ready and well-led, with men and women who reflect our very best in quality and in character. Our military strength represents a strong defensive shield against aggression. Our free society, our free flow of ideas, our energetic people, and our free enterprise system represent a strong offensive sword for democracy.

I am optimistic because America responds to major challenges. We have the opportunity and responsibility to prove to ourselves and to the world that our ideals of liberty, justice, and human rights can all be made to work in this land of diversity. In a world of ethnic and religious strife, America has no greater mission.

I am optimistic because we are finally recognizing that our fiscal soundness as a Nation depends on restraining the growth of our entitlement programs. Entitlement reform, including Social Security reform, will be difficult and must be done over time with care—but it must be done.

I am optimistic because we are beginning a serious debate on fundamental tax reform, and beginning to realize that there is a di-

rect connection between our savings and our standard of living.

I am optimistic because we are at long last discussing frankly the terrible affliction of family deterioration and illegitimacy. We must reach out as an extended family to the millions of neglected and abused children who desperately need someone who cares. Government must play a role, but I do not believe that it will be the decisive role. This is a battle that must be fought one child at a time.

I am optimistic because I see our young people tutoring children, helping flood victims, building houses for the homeless, and working with at-risk youth. I see our young military personnel on their own time teaching math to inner-city children and mentoring young students.

I have watched my own daughter, Michelle, and her young friends in Atlanta create an organization of 10,000 people of all ages volunteering 20,000 hours per month for children, the elderly, the handicapped, and others in great need. Volunteers like these are filling a void in America today. They are our real heroes.

I am optimistic because we have so many energetic, innovative and bold young entrepreneurs like my son, Brian, who are finding their niche in the dynamic new world of information and technology—thereby building jobs and strengthening America's economic future.

I am optimistic about Georgia's future and Georgia's leadership in both the public and private sector. Our State has benefitted from strong political leadership, sound fiscal policy, and hard-working people. Our leaders in the private sector understand the important role that business must play in strengthening our education system and our communities.

When I leave the Senate at the end of next year, I know that whatever I will have accomplished during my legislative career will have been because I had a lot of help. I am deeply grateful to Colleen, my wife and partner, for her sacrifice, her patience, her wisdom and for her love which made my life of public service possible—to my children, Michelle and Brian, of whom we are very proud—to my wonderful mother and my late father who shaped my life by their love, their expectations and their example—to my sister Betty Mori and her husband, Jean, and to my entire family and close friends for their sacrifice, their steadfast support, and for their love.

I am grateful to my friends and supporters and to the voters of Georgia for their support in each election—for their encouragement and confidence—for their constructive criticism and for their forgiveness of my errors.

I am grateful to my staff—past and present—who have worked with honesty, skill, and dedication on behalf of the people of Georgia and the Nation.

I am grateful to the Members of the U.S. Senate and House—past and present—of both political parties, who have been my mentors—teachers—and friends, and who have been my partners in many legislative initiatives.

I am grateful to my friends in the Georgia legislature, and to Governor Miller, Governor Harris, Governor Busbee, and Governor Carter, Speaker Murphy and Lt. Gov. Howard as well as our State constitutional officers. They have guided our State with vision, fiscal prudence and integrity while I have served in the Senate. I am grateful to our leaders at the local level who play such an important role in the daily lives of our citizens.

I am grateful to Georgia Democrats for their role in leading our State to a point of unprecedented economic opportunity. Georgia Democrats have made education our top priority and brought together people from every region, every walk of life, and every race to work for common goals.

I am honored to represent a State where the vast majority of our people cast their ballots—not on the basis of one or two issues—but rather on their judgment of a candidate's principles and values, integrity and vision. I can never fully repay the people of Georgia for the trust and faith they have placed in me.

I have tried to return this trust and faith with hard work and effective representation.

I hope that I have played a meaningful role in making Georgia a better place to live and to raise our children.

I hope that I have helped build bridges of understanding and cooperation between people of different races, religions and political beliefs.

I have tried to help make America stronger at home and abroad. I have tried to help build a safer and more peaceful world with freedom and justice.

I have tried to instill in our young people by word and by example—the understanding and belief that it remains possible to be involved in the political process and also retain both intellectual honesty and ethical behavior. In the final analysis, this may be the single most important responsibility of public service.

I look forward to continuing these efforts as a U.S. Senator for the next 15 months, and after that—as a private citizen of Georgia for whatever term God may grant.

UNITED STATES TROOPS TO BOSNIA

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, in recent days, the Nation has focused its attention on one of the most serious issues to come before this country since I have been privileged to be in the Senate, and I say that in all sincerity. That is the very difficult decision facing the President of the United States as to whether or not this Nation will make a further—and I underline further—commitment of our Armed Forces to the situation in Bosnia.

As I am privileged to address the Senate this morning, there are still pockets of combat in that war-torn nation, a nation which I have visited five times myself, being the first Senator to go to Sarajevo over 2½ years ago.

Since that time, I am pleased that so many of the Members of the Senate have found the opportunity to go to that region so that they can, likewise, gain a clearer and better understanding of this historic and tragic conflict.

I would like to focus my remarks today, Mr. President, on an issue which has captured the attention of the American people over the last week, that is, President Clinton's decision to send up to 25,000 United States ground troops to Bosnia.

Hearings were held this week in the U.S. Senate, both in the Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, and in the Foreign Relations Com-

mittee. Those hearings revealed the depth of congressional concerns, both Republican and Democrat, with this proposed deployment. May I emphasize, Mr. President, I do not view this issue as a political one. I think each Senator that has spoken out or involved himself or herself in this debate has done so very sincerely, as a matter related to their duties to this Nation, not for any political reason.

I myself, in traveling through my State, indeed, not just in the last month or so, but over the period of the nearly 3 years of this conflict, have detected perhaps the deepest, the most sincere concern that I have ever experienced since the closing days of Vietnam about this conflict and America's role in the conflict.

In my view, the American people are entitled to a voice in a decision of this magnitude. The American people have followed this conflict for over 3 years. They are well-informed, they understand the complexities involved, they should have a voice in this decision. Their voice can best be manifested right in this institution, the U.S. Congress, with a very thorough and extensive debate. That is the principal reason I rise today to address the Senate. We, their elected representatives in the Congress, must ensure that the voice of the American people is heard.

I call on the congressional leadership, both Senate and House, to establish a plan for debating and voting on a freestanding resolution regarding the authorization for the use of United States ground troops in Bosnia.

I have consulted with my leader in the Senate, Senator DOLE. And he, at this time, is considering this need for the leadership to establish the procedure and the timing for this debate. In my view, in this special instance, the leadership must exercise control—I say that most respectfully—control over the procedure by which the Senate commences this debate to ensure that it is meaningful, well-informed, and timely.

I would like to emphasize that the timing of this congressional debate is critical. If the Senate considers the issue too soon, that is, before we know the outlines of the peace agreement, before we know all of the details of the proposed NATO operation, there will be too many unanswered questions to enable this debate to reach an informed conclusion. If we wait too long, however, our troops may well be on the their way, that is, our ground troops, and Congress will not have performed the responsible role that I believe the Constitution requires us to perform. Only by daily monitoring of this situation can the leadership best determine that critical hour when this debate should be initiated.

I do not see this debate, I repeat, Mr. President, as a political fight. This is not Republicans versus Democrats or

Republicans versus the President. The misgivings regarding this operation cross party lines. At issue in this debate is not who scores the most political points. What is at stake are the lives of the men and the women of the U.S. Armed Forces and the present and future credibility of America's security policy.

The most important question we must answer in this debate is whether or not the United States has a vital national security interest in this conflict in Bosnia, which justifies putting United States combat troops in harm's way in this operation and justifies imposing a very significant cost on the American taxpayer, a cost which cannot be fully calculated at this time but which would easily be in the billions of dollars.

We must keep in mind that past military operations have taken dollars from our modernization and O&M accounts in the Department of Defense, dollars which directly affect the future readiness, preparedness, and capabilities of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Again, Mr. President, I focus on the fact that the use of United States ground troops in Bosnia would be an additional step by our Nation. Our military forces are already there and have been there in a very significant way in those military operations involving airpower, and in those military operations involving the naval embargo. In both the air and the naval operations, for several years we have been the dominant military participant.

I question, is this deployment of United States ground troops the best of the remaining options for resolving the fighting in Bosnia? The President and his negotiators deserve credit for the achievements they have had to date with respect to achieving a peace agreement and lessening the fighting. So that is definitely to their credit.

But should the United States play a role on the ground in Bosnia given that we are already, as I say, playing the major role in the air operations and the naval blockade, or are there other options we should consider which would not involve such a significant number of upward of 25,000 United States ground troops?

Mr. President, Senator LEVIN and I recently completed a report for the Senate Armed Services Committee involving the United States military involvement in Somalia. That report, I think, if I may say, should accomplish one thing. It should cause the administration and this Senate to consider more carefully the policy decisions that put men and women who serve in our Armed Forces at risk.

As the father of one of the young Rangers killed in Somalia, Col. Larry Joyce, told the Senate Armed Services Committee in an open hearing, and I quote him:

Too frequently, policymakers are insulated from the misery they create. If they could be with the chaplain who rings a doorbell at 6:20 in the morning to tell a 22-year-old woman she's now a widow, they'd develop their policies more carefully.

That is why I emphasize that the American people need a much stronger voice in this critical decision. And that can only be fulfilled, in my judgment, by a very comprehensive debate here in the U.S. Senate. I hope that President Clinton will actively seek such a debate.

I point out that, very wisely, President Bush, when he was faced with the similar situation in the gulf war, received congressional authorization for the use of force prior to the initiation of that conflict. That debate, though difficult and contentious, was, in my view, one of the finest in the contemporary history of this institution.

The final vote taken after, I think, almost 3 days of debate, was by a narrow margin of five to authorize the President to use force. But the debate and vote served to unite the Congress and, indeed, the American people behind our President.

Fortunately, the casualty level in that conflict was far below the predictions. But had the Congress not been on record in support of the President and the war effort, and had that conflict resulted in greater—there were significant losses—but had there been greater losses, I fear the drumbeat could well have started right here in the Congress to bring our troops home. We need only remember the experience of Somalia.

In calling for this vote, I do not seek to question the President's role as Commander in Chief—in particular, his authority to deploy United States troops in emergency situations, such as we saw in Grenada and Panama, when the circumstances did not allow for a protracted, prior debate in the Congress. That was quite appropriate, and it was that type of action that was contemplated by the Founding Fathers when they wrote into the Constitution the specific roles of the President with respect to being Commander in Chief.

But that is not the case with Bosnia. That war has been going on for 3½ years, since April 1992. We are, at best, weeks away from a peace agreement. There is plenty of time for the Congress to exercise its constitutional responsibility for such a deployment by thoroughly debating the issue and voting on a resolution.

Although I have traditionally been a supporter of Presidential prerogative in the deployment of United States troops, I have yet to be convinced that this President's plan, President Clinton's plan, for putting this additional contingent of military forces, namely, up to 25,000 ground forces in Bosnia, is the proper option to follow.

I listened carefully to the administration's testimony during the course

of our hearing in the Armed Services Committee, but I still cannot identify a vital United States national security interest in Bosnia that justifies putting United States ground troops at risk in that nation. I do not want to see U.S. troops inserted in the middle of a civil war, a civil war which is based on centuries' old religious and ethnic hatreds.

I would like to recount just a personal note. On my last visit, Senator ROBERT KERREY and I went into the Krajina region which, just days before our visit, had been the battleground for Croatian forces driving Serbian forces out, Croatian Serbs having taken that land several years earlier. There was an enclave of Serbs that had been trapped and prevented, in one way or another, from fleeing into Serb territory. We met extensively with these refugees. In one particular meeting, there was a doctor, there was a schoolteacher and there was another very well-educated individual. As hard as we pressed them for answers as to why this conflict exists and continues to exist, they could give no answers to explain why well-educated people have participated all throughout that region—all sides—in barbaric acts which those of us in this country find incomprehensible.

That is my major concern as to why we should not put our troops in there in harm's way. President Clinton has yet to make a convincing case that we should proceed with this deployment.

In my view, the burden of proof on the administration to turn public opinion around is virtually insurmountable. Therefore, it has to be a joint responsibility of the Congress and the President, no matter how definite the President and others may wish to make this commitment at this time. And another thing that concerns me, how the administration can predict, should we go in, that this situation would be of such a nature that we could pull out all of our forces 1 year from today. I just find that incomprehensible.

So, Mr. President, I shall have more to say on this subject in the coming days. I yield the floor and thank my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). Under the previous order, the Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS] is recognized for up to 10 minutes.

BLM LANDS

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, October 22, which is just around the corner, is a pretty important day in Montana, and I will tell my colleagues why in just a minute. But I will say it is one of the reasons why I am dead set against S. 1031, a bill to transfer the lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management to the States.

Let me say a word about multiple use. When Congress passed the Federal

Land Management and Policy Act of 1976, it defined multiple use as "the management of the public lands so that they are utilized in the combination that will best meet the present and future needs of the American people."

That is what the statute says. Let me tell you about what it means to Montanans—citizens of a State with nearly 30 million acres of Federal public lands. To many Montanans, it means jobs, jobs from the timber that we harvest, minerals that we mine, oil and gas that we extract, livestock that we graze and city slickers that pay for a week under the big sky with our outfitters and our guides.

And to all Montanans, folks who earn their living off the land and the majority who live and work in towns, these lands represent what we love most about our State. These lands provide recreation, an escape from work, a reminder that we live in the last best place.

It means teaching your kids to hunt like your dad taught you. It means being able to take your family out for a weekend and hike and camp and explore in the most beautiful, pristine places known to man.

Montanans head to the Pryor Mountains hoping to catch a glimpse of the wild horse herds; they float the historical Whitecliffs of the Missouri River; and they fish the blue-ribbon Madison River.

This weekend in particular reminds Montanans of just how lucky we all are to have so much Federal lands available to us. It is the start of the big game hunting season.

Montanans head to the Missouri Breaks in search of trophy mulies, set up their elk camps in the Centennial Mountains, or take a trip to their favorite spot to go antelope hunting, shoot upland game birds, pheasant, or ducks.

Montanans are lucky because these Federal lands are near our homes. Within an hour's drive from any town in Montana, these lands provide full access and outstanding opportunities for a successful hunt. In fact, there were more than 375,000 hunting trips on Montana's BLM lands in 1994.

Just think of that, 375,000 hunting trips on Montana's BLM lands in 1994.

There is, however, a bill pending in the Senate which takes this away from Montanans. It is S. 1031. It directs the Secretary of the Interior to give all the BLM lands to the States who, in turn, may deal with them as they see fit.

Montana may choose to manage these 8.8 million acres of BLM lands much the same way they are currently managed. Of course, that would mean coming up with the \$34 million in funding that the U.S. Government currently spends each year to manage BLM lands in Montana. Finding an additional \$34 million a year is a real stretch to our State when our total State budget is under \$2 billion a year.

Of course, Montana has other options, as do other States, under this legislation. The State could simply not pay for range improvements, weed control, recreation, and wildlife projects that are currently being paid for and carried out by the BLM.

Montana can also choose to raise some quick revenue by putting these lands on the auction block and selling them to the highest bidder. Sleeping Giant, the Terry Badlands, the Missouri Breaks, Beartrap Canyon, the Pryor Range, the Centennial Mountains sold. Once public lands and streams, then fenced off; "no trespassing" signs put out. This bill takes away what Montanans love most about our State: Open, easy access to public lands to hunt, fish, hike, birdwatch, snowmobile, four-wheel drive.

I want to put my colleagues on notice that S. 1031 is a bad deal. It is bad for Montana. It is bad for the West. It is bad for the Nation. Our public lands are the key to perpetuating our outdoor heritage.

As Teddy Roosevelt said, "The Nation behaves well if it treats the natural resources as assets which it must turn over to the next generation increased, not impaired, in value."

That is what Teddy Roosevelt said. S. 1031 ignores future generations and yanks their inheritance out from under them.

Marion and Rose Coleman of Laurel, MT, recently wrote me and said this:

Please stop S. 1031 for the benefit of the 22 members of our family who love to hunt, fish, and camp on public lands.

I am here today to let Marion and Rose Coleman, and all Montanans, know that I intend to fight this bill every step of the way. It is anti-hunting, anti-Montana.

If it ever reaches the floor in anything close to its present form, it is dead on arrival. That is something I will guarantee my colleagues, and, more importantly, that is something I will guarantee the people of Montana.

Mr. KERREY addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE BUDGET

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, Tuesday night in Houston, and last Friday as well, the President of the United States made a comment where he said specifically, "I had to raise your taxes more than I wanted and cut spending less than I wanted to, which made a lot of you furious."

Well, the comment made those of us who voted for that proposal even more furious than it made, apparently, the audience to which the President was speaking.

Mr. President, the President of the United States has since said that he

did not intend to say that the package was bad. He did not intend to mean that he was not proud of the people who voted for it. But he left the unmistakable impression that he would have cut more given the opportunity.

The fact is that, in 1993, Congressman Penny and Congressman KASICH presented \$105 billion in additional spending cuts after the budget deficit reduction bill was passed. I think it has done a tremendous amount of good for the U.S. economy. It did reduce the deficit—as now estimated, by nearly a trillion dollars.

But Congressman Penny and Congressman KASICH, and later myself and Senator BROWN on the Senate side, offered nearly identical proposals to cut over \$100 billion over 5 years, and the administration opposed it. They did not just send a letter about it. They sent various Members up here, saying this was draconian and it was going to hurt—all the things that are mentioned, typically, when a spending cut is made. Maybe this is part of a triangulation strategy that we hear about a lot. But, Mr. President, it is strangulating the confidence that we have in Congress that whatever it is we do is going to continue to enjoy the support of the President.

Now, I do not want to drag it much farther than that. I actually had a very harsh speech that I had written yesterday, and, fortunately, I think both for myself and the President, there was not time to get to the floor to give it. I have calmed down a bit since then. But a larger point needs to be made here, rather than, did the President misstate or not what it was he was trying to do?

Not only did Congressman Penny and Congressman KASICH and Senator BROWN and myself present spending cut proposals, but the President put together a bipartisan entitlement commission, with 32 people on it. Senator Danforth and I chaired that effort. We presented to the President, in 1994, the recommendations of that commission, and those recommendations are what I would like to talk about here today. They still need the full consideration of this body.

Mr. President, it is fairly obvious that this place is still controlled by men. I am a man myself, and so it does not bother me most of the time. But we men behave differently than women in certain things. One of the things women have noticed over the years is that we have a tendency to exaggerate the size of things sometimes. That is, in fact, occurring in this entire budget debate.

The Republicans get up and talk about this being revolutionary, and we heard Speaker GINGRICH talking about a great revolution, and the Democrats say, no, it is draconian, it is terrible, destructive, and on and on. The American people get kind of confused and wonder what is going on.

Mr. President, these are the facts. We will spend \$1.5 trillion in 1995, the fiscal year ending September 30. At the end of 2002, under the Republican budget resolution, it will be roughly \$1.858 trillion. If you use the Congressional Budget Office baseline, with no change, it is about \$2.1 trillion. So it is some \$240 billion less. That is a lot of money, but hardly what I would put in the category of revolutionary. Nor is it fair to say they are draconian, and on and on.

In some cases, I have had serious disagreements with the way the money is being allocated, but it is a relatively modest change. If you look at the tax revenue generated and total spending over the next 7 years compared to the past 7 years, we will spend nearly \$2.4 trillion more, and we are going to have \$3.2 trillion more in tax revenue—a lot more tax revenue coming in and a lot more money going out as well.

Mr. President, the goal that has been set over and over again by the Republicans in this budget resolution and debate—and last night you heard it again—is that we are going to balance the budget. Yes, that ought to be one goal. There is no question that it is accomplished under this budget resolution. I am for balancing the budget. I would like to be able to vote for the particular resolution that is going to come back to us at some point. In its current form, I will not be able to do it.

Mr. President, there is another goal this budget resolution ought to address, and it was identified by the bipartisan budget commission as more troubling than the budget deficit. That is, as a percentage of our budget, overall entitlements—not to the poor, but to the middle class—overall entitlement growth is at an unsustainable level. Today, it is 64 percent of our budget. In 2002, at the end of this resolution, it will be 74 percent of our budget. In 2008, when my generation—the biggest generation in the history of this country—starts to retire, it will very rapidly go to 100 percent—100 percent, Mr. President. The Federal Government is going to be an ATM machine. Some will say that is fine, let it transfer payments out.

Mr. President, there are things that we appropriate that not only strengthen our economy but improve the quality of life. I made a lot of money as a consequence of my parents helping to build the interstate highway system. And as a consequence of their grandparents doing the GI bill, I have made a lot of money. This country has made investments in the past that have improved the quality of our life. We spend \$1.7 billion a year on parks, and 17 million Americans a year enjoy them, but we are going to cut it back. We are going to cut \$1 billion out of the FAA. We already have \$3 billion a year in increased costs to shippers as a result of delays. God knows what kind of disasters may occur as a result of underfunding that program.

We are going to have a real decline in education expenditures from \$34 to \$32 billion over the next 7 years. Transportation is going to be cut. We will be spending less on space and research and all sorts of things that we ought to be doing. The reason is, of the \$358 billion increase in spending between this year and the year 2002, that incremental increase—all of it, more than 100 percent—goes for entitlements and net interest on the debt. Almost half of it, Mr. President, goes for an item that we have decided we do not want to talk about—Social Security.

If you want to have a revolution, let us bring Senator SIMPSON's and my proposal into consideration. People say, well, let us postpone that, and "we are going to do it in 1997," says Speaker GINGRICH. When you are saving money for retirement, time is not on your side. You can exercise, jog, watch your diet, quit smoking, get massages, or whatever else, but you do not get the time back. Every year you wait, that is less wealth you generate. You may want to generate it in a collective pool or a individual pool, as Senator SIMPSON and I are proposing.

Mr. President, to leave Social Security off the table makes it impossible to do what we want to do with this budget resolution—not only balance the budget by 2002, but balance the relationship between mandated programs and appropriated programs. We ought to decide collectively that it is going to be some fixed percentage of our budget, so we have money for schools, so we have money for roads, so we have money for Head Start, or whatever else it is we decide we want to spend it on.

Mr. President, when the former chairman of the Appropriations Committee came to this body 35 years ago, 75 percent of the budget was allocated in appropriated accounts; 30 percent was entitlements and interest.

The second objective we ought to be setting for ourselves is a big one. It is going to require us to change the eligibility age in these programs from 65 to 70, to phase it in. You cannot afford to do it any other way. It is why I said in the beginning that we describe it as big, either on the positive side or a negative side. But it is kind of a male sort of thing. The truth is that it is smaller than it needs to be.

We need to take stock of the growth of entitlements. Otherwise, we are not going to have the money to be able to improve the quality of our lives, whether it is parks, natural resources development, or to increase the productivity of our people and narrow this widening gap that we see right now with the economic haves and have nots.

Next, Mr. President, now that Republicans say they want to preserve and protect Medicare, what that means is the market does not work.

When I hear the majority leader say the market is rational, the Govern-

ment is stupid, here is one Government program he does not think is stupid. For people over the age of 65 who depend upon Medicare, the market does not work.

The same is true for somebody who is 25, that is out there in the work force today making \$8 an hour, being told they cannot have health insurance because they cannot afford it. That is the principle underneath the Medicare Program.

What we need to do is to say that we are going to radically alter—what a revolution—radically alter the system of eligibility and say to every American, if you are a legal resident or American citizen you are in. You do not have to doubt that you will have coverage. The goal of universal coverage is just as desirable today as it was in 1993 and 1994 when we debated it all the time.

Medicare, Medicaid, the income tax deduction, the Veterans Administration programs are fiscal political and structural barriers to getting that job done.

Democrats who for 35 years have supported Medicare because we understand the market does not work, need to say to recent convert Republicans that to get everybody covered we have to do things much differently. That would be a revolution. That would be something big that men and women would seize properly.

The last thing I say, Mr. President, contained in the debate yesterday in the Finance Committee was lots of conversation about the need to promote growing. I am for it. We should have a debate about fundamental tax reform.

You cannot cut tax on those who have stocks and bonds and have a substantial amount of our income coming from stocks and bonds while raising taxes on people that make \$7 an hour, depending on the earned income tax credit. It is not fair. It does not wash. All you can hope is they do not notice and they do not vote as a consequence.

We are not being asked to reduce the capital gains tax by low-income people who may benefit when they sell their home. We are being asked by wealthy Americans who have stocks and bonds and who have accurately said, in my judgment, that the economy does need to grow through productive investment. We regard productive investment as replacing our income tax with a progressive consumption tax.

It gives Americans an unlimited opportunity to save money and accumulate wealth over the course of their working life and promote economic growth at the same time.

Do not put a capital gains tax cut out at the same time we cut and raise taxes for people that are at or below \$25,000 a year, and to use that money—they do not use it for television sets.

I heard a colleague who is critical of the program say all they are doing is

buying television sets. They use that few dollars to pay medical bills, buy cars that have 80,000 miles so they can go to work and drop the kids at the child care center. Many are using it to make a downpayment on rental deposits. They are using it the way the working people ought to, to consume the things that are increasingly making it difficult for them to cover their costs.

Finally, I say it again, I wish that the Republicans on the other side that currently control the majority of this Senate, I wish they would turn across the aisle and say we should start negotiating. What do you want, Senator KERREY? My answer is simple. What I want is to fix the cost of entitlements as a percent of our budget. What I want is to say now you support the idea that the marketplace does not work, agree that we will get universal coverage so every American knows they are covered in health care. You cannot make the system work any other way.

Rather than block granting Medicaid to the States, we ought to bring that and say to the States that \$40 billion we will pay for, but you have to take \$40 billion, whether for education, job training, transportation—something you do well. We have agreement; we will use the marketplace.

We do not have to get down and fill the air with rhetoric about Government taking over health care. We know the market is doing a good job of controlling cost. There is consensus that that is what ought to be done. Unless we change our notion of how people are going to become eligible for health care, you cannot get that job done.

Last, I say for my friends on the other side of the aisle, there is consensus on our tax system, whether it is the U.S.A. tax that Senator DOMENICI and Senator NUNN have worked on or other tax proposals, we know we should not just be concerned about how much money we generate to pay whatever is mandated or whatever we want to appropriate.

We need to think about generating the money so the economy grows and so Americans out there who are producing the tax revenue have the opportunity to save enough to accumulate wealth over the course of their working life.

Finally, Mr. President, I hear an awful lot, and I put out a lot myself from time to time about how bad the Government is and how terrible it does. I want to declare to my colleagues and people I represent in Nebraska that one of the reasons I stay in the job and am excited about the job, you can use the Government of the United States of America to save lives. It saves lives.

It will be interesting to see what Colin Powell says when we ask him about health care. The Government of the United States of America, the hospitals that provide health care for U.S.

Army servicemen have saved lives. Those people are Government employees. You could change lives, enrich lives, improve lives. That is what it ought to be about.

We need to improve the Government and make it operate more effectively, but we need to tell the American citizens there is no free lunch in this deal. This Government in this country cannot be any better than our people are willing to make it. Our people are willing to make it a heck of a lot better than we allow.

We are frightened of universal health care. We got our brains beat out in 1993 and 1994. We do not want to talk about it. The American people want to talk about it. We do not want to talk about fixing the costs of entitlements based on facts and truth as the Speaker calls for. We know if we give the facts and truth, we have to do Social Security, we have to change eligibility age, we have to change the method of eligibility.

Instead of working Republican and Democrats, I just hope that in the next 60 days or however long it takes to do this deal, rather than looking to always negotiate with the White House and try to cut a deal—I fear that more than I do anything right now—look across the aisle and work with us.

We are prepared to cast the tough votes. We want to embrace the future. We are not for the status quo. We are for change. We want to alter the course of our Nation's future and give investments to our children and be able to give them a brighter future than they have right now.

We are prepared, I believe, to cast the tough votes to change the course of this Nation's future, not based upon some calculation of triangulation, trying to determine whether the President is more popular or less popular, trying to figure how to get reelected, but trying to decide what is best for the people we represent, and most important what is best for our future.

Every single day of our lives has Americans—I do not care what your status is, what your name is, where you live—not a bad exercise to do as opposed to jogging is get up in the morning and go to bed at night and thank God for the things we have. We are a wealthy Nation, blessed with enormous freedoms and opportunities.

I got out of high school in 1961. The cold war was on and our class thought whether we would go in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps because we knew we were likely to go to Vietnam.

That is not the future of today. There is tremendous opportunity. Seize that opportunity rather than hyperventilate and exaggerating each other's position. Seize the opportunities and try to put in place a change in the law that sends this Nation in a different direction, that does not just balance the budget but satisfies other needs and concerns

and desires that the American people have today.

I yield the floor.

REGISTRATION OF MASS MAILINGS

The filing date for 1995 third quarter mass mailings is October 25, 1995. If your office did no mass mailings during this period, please submit a form that states: "none."

Mass mailing registrations, or negative reports, should be submitted to the Senate Office of Public Records, 232 Hart Building, Washington, DC 20510-7116.

The Public Records Office will be open from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. on the filing date to accept these filings. For further information, please contact the Public Records Office on (202) 224-0322.

THE SOUTH PACIFIC NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, as the Chairman of the Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs, I come to the floor to inform my colleagues that at noon today the administration will announce that the United States, the United Kingdom, and France will sign the three protocols to the South Pacific Nuclear-free Zone Treaty [SPNFZ], known as the Treaty of Rarotonga. I wholeheartedly welcome that decision.

The SPNFZ, which took effect in 1986, is signed by Australia, New Zealand, Fiji, Papua New Guinea, Western Samoa, Kiribati, Nauru, Niue, Tuvalu, the Cook Islands, and the Solomon Islands. The treaty includes three protocols which are open to signature by nuclear countries outside the region. Protocol I prohibits any nuclear power with territories in the zone from manufacturing, stationing, or testing any nuclear device within those territories. Protocol II commits the protocol signatory not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against any treaty signatory. Finally, Protocol III commits each protocol signatory not to test a nuclear explosive device anywhere in the zone. While no nuclear power has adhered to Protocol I, both Russia and the People's Republic of China have adhered to Protocols II and III.

The SPNFZ is modeled after the Latin American Nuclear-Free Zone Treaty, the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which includes two protocols open to signature by the nuclear powers. While the United States is a signatory to both the Tlatelolco protocols, we have not signed the similar Rarotonga protocols. The reason appears to have been the tendency of the western nuclear powers to be hesitant to sign unilaterally. Although both we and the British appeared to be amenable to signing, because of French interests we refrained from doing so.

The continued obstinacy of the French, coupled with their decision to go ahead with France's announced nuclear tests in the South Pacific, caused me great concern for several reasons. First, I believed that a resumption of testing would result in the disintegration of the current testing moratorium and a renewal of underground testing by other states. Moratoria are like truces—they are only good as long as all the parties to them observe their provisions. Second, it called into question France's commitment to the extension of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty [NPT]. In May, the world's five announced nuclear powers persuaded the rest of the world to extend indefinitely the NPT. To win that consensus, the five promised to sign a comprehensive test ban treaty [CTBT] by the end of 1996. I believed strongly that the resumption of French testing, only 4 months after France signed the agreement, called into serious question its commitment to the CTBT and threatened to undermine international efforts to curb proliferation. Finally, the decision was vehemently opposed by most, if not all, of the countries in the region.

As a result of these concerns, on August 10 the distinguished ranking minority member of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator PELL, and I wrote President Clinton asking him

... to give serious consideration to an early decision to seek Senate advice and consent to ratification of the protocols to the Treaty. The timetable of such action would be consistent with the achievement of a complete ban in 1996. It would send a clear signal to the French that, while we commend their decision to join in a complete test ban next year, they should accede now to the overwhelming sentiment of the peoples of the South Pacific that there should be no further testing of any nuclear explosive devices in the region. Moreover, it would send an unequivocal message to regional nations that we support them in their desire to make their zone nuclear-free. Finally, it is important to give substance to the commitments we gave the regional nations when they supported the U.S. this spring in the effort in New York to secure the permanent extension of the [NPT].

The announcement today is an important step toward achieving a ban by the end of 1996. While I would like to think that our letter had something to do with the decision—and here I would like to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island for his efforts in that regard—I must realistically credit the Government of France with making the agreement possible. France was the only country testing nuclear weapons in the zone, and had maintained that they would not join the protocols until the entry into force of the CTBT. Their decision to join us in signing the protocols represents in my mind a major step forward in our drive toward 1996. I would hope that the parties would move quickly to sign the protocols, and pledge to respect

them pending each country's ratification process.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, as of the close of business yesterday, October 19, the Federal debt stood at \$4,974,014,009,081.49. We are still about \$27 billion away from the \$5 trillion mark, unfortunately, we anticipate hitting the \$5 trillion mark sometime later this year or early next year.

On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$18,881.44 as his or her share of that debt.

IAN DAVIDSON

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, it is with great respect and admiration that I rise today to congratulate a friend, Montana businessman Ian Davidson. As company president and CEO of D.A. Davidson & Co. [DADCO], a financial services company, Ian has ridden a wave of success in a field where he has dared to be different. Recently, the *Billings Gazette* honored Ian in a tribute to his tragedy and success. I would like to do the same.

It has been almost a year since the D.A. Davidson corporate plane crashed, killing three of the company's top executives. On November 8, 1994, Eugene Lewis, Robert Braggs, and Donald Knutson died along with pilot Harold Graf in what Ian described as "the worst tragedy of his life." But the Great Falls based company has made great leaps in the past year. New leaders have been assigned to the vacated positions, and despite the obvious grief experienced by the company and community, 1995 has been a tremendous year for DADCO. In addition to adding between 65 and 70 new employees since the beginning of the year, DADCO boasts more than 100,000 accounts in the Northern Rockies and Pacific Northwest.

Based on record earnings in the last 2 years and total capital of more than \$31.5 million, DADCO is ranked among the top 60 firms operating outside New York City. Recognition that solidifies its corporate slogan—where "Wall Street Meets the Rockies."

Beyond this, while Ian would be the first to tell you that Montana has been good to him, he has also been very good to Montana. He runs a business that gives a lot back to our State and our Montana communities. Ian and his wife, Nancy, have been especially generous to the University of Montana.

Again, I want to recognize Ian Davidson for his contribution to Montana's communities. If we could all live our lives as fully and productively as Ian Davidson, the world would be a better place.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period for the transaction of morning business be extended to the hour of 11 o'clock.

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

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I came to the floor this morning to offer a resolution concerning the President's budget, and I have been informed that my offering of this resolution and asking for its immediate consideration would be objected to by the other side.

I will not offer the resolution. The resolution is actually very simple. It goes to a very important item that is being discussed in the general public and by the Members of Congress and the White House; that is, the President's budget and whether the President's budget comes into balance, and whether we as a Congress should be adopting what the President wants to do in the area of the budget.

The President has been traveling around the country for several months now, talking about, waving around his balanced budget proposal, saying he has a budget that will balance over 10 years.

Incredibly enough, the American public actually believes what the President is saying. I say "incredibly enough," because the only person who has said that the budget balances is the Director of his own Office of Management and Budget, not any other independent agency, and certainly not the Congressional Budget Office.

Nobody believes this budget is balanced. In fact, it does not come to balance in 10 years or 20 years or 30 years. It never balances, except in his own interim shop. He has cooked the numbers, made all of these ridiculous assumptions about how fast the economy will go and how low interest rates will be and, all of a sudden wishes away all the budget problems.

Yet he goes out there every day and talks about how he balances the budget: "It is just a matter of whether you want my balanced budget or the Republicans' balanced budget," and the Republicans' balanced budget is cruel and draconian and mean-spirited and all these sorts of things, "and mine is kinder and gentler and I really care about people," and we can accomplish the same things.

The fact of the matter is he does not balance the budget. What I wanted to do was to present a resolution as a sense of the Senate that we should adopt the President's budget his second budget.

You may recall his first budget was voted on here on the floor of the Senate. His first budget that he came out with back in February of last year,

which did not produce a balanced budget, he did not claim it produced a balanced budget, and it was defeated 99 to 0 on the floor of the Senate. He then went back and revised his budget to present his new, improved, balanced budget over 10 years and has been running around since.

I think it is time for some truth here. Let us have a debate. Let us have a debate on the President's budget. Let us examine what the President has done and whether he really does make the decisions that are necessary to bring this budget into balance over 10 years. Now we say he was willing, yesterday, to accept 9, or 8, or even 7. We do not know where he is at this time, but his budget says it balances in 10, so let us talk about it.

Unfortunately, there are Members on the other side who do not want to talk about it, they do not want to debate the resolution, do not want to vote on the resolution, refused to give us an opportunity to bring it to a vote. I do not understand why. If they support their President and believe his budget is in balance, then why the fear of coming to the Senate floor and having a good and open debate about what the President's budget does?

I am confident that there is someone on the other side of the aisle who believes enough in the President's budget that they will be willing to take up the mantle and run with it and offer the President's budget. So, what I will do is I will put this resolution over here on the desk. If there is someone on the other side of the aisle who would like to offer the President's budget and begin a debate, here is the resolution that will begin this debate. We can have a full and open debate on the President's budget. We can see whether it brings us into balance. We can see what cuts he wants to make. We can see how he is going to accomplish it. Then we can look at what he wants to do and what the Republicans are doing and see what the American public thinks.

That is the kind of dialog I think the American public would like to see. They would like to see what the options are. And the Senator is right, you are hearing one side saying one thing, the other side saying the other. Let us put them out here on the table. Let us see what the specifics are with both. I will give someone on the other side of the aisle the opportunity to do that.

If, for some reason, no one on the other side of the aisle picks up that resolution and decides to offer it, next week I will find an appropriate vehicle and offer it as an amendment to a bill that is coming through and have this discussion, because I think it is a discussion that needs to be opened up to the American public.

There is a lot of tomfoolery going on in this debate. There is a lot of misinformation being spread around in this

debate. And there is no better place to straighten it out and talk about the facts than right here on the Senate floor.

What are the facts as we know them? We have a letter from the Congressional Budget Office that says the President's budget does not balance. It does not balance over 5 years, or 6 years, or 7 years, or 10 years, or 20 years, or 50 years. It never comes into balance. What we hope is the intent here, of this whole debate, is to balance the budget. The budget does not do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 5 minutes under the order for the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

AN EMERGING CONSENSUS

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, let me congratulate my colleague from Pennsylvania. I think it is appropriate, at this very, very historic time—and I think we all understand the next 2, 3, 4, 5 weeks may be the most important weeks that any of us ever serve in this body, or in this Congress, and they may be some of the most important weeks for the future of this country—I think it is appropriate, and I think it is important we do have a full debate.

As the Senator from Pennsylvania so eloquently said, you cannot do that, really, unless you view different options, unless both sides are willing to debate the specific facts. Therefore, I think it is appropriate that the President's budget be literally on the table and that we look at that and look at the assumptions in there and look to see whether or not that budget does what the President says, and that is balance the budget.

There are those of us on this side who do not think it does. We think it is based upon assumptions that, frankly, are very optimistic and that are not based upon reality and that the savings, so-called savings that the President achieves he achieves in that manner, a changing of the accounting rules, in a sense, or changing of the assumptions, at least. So I think it is important we debate this.

We have, I believe, made some progress in this country in the tenor of the national debate. As I travel throughout my home State of Ohio—and, I imagine, my colleague from Pennsylvania finds the same thing in Pennsylvania—we are seeing emerging a consensus about the problems that exist and a consensus that this Congress finally has to do something about these problems.

There are three areas where I think really, today, there is a consensus.

A balanced budget: The American people understand we cannot continue to do what we had been doing in the

past. They understand that. So the real question in this debate is, whose budget is realistic? Whose budget will, in fact, bring about a balanced budget, as we believe ours will, by the year 2002?

The second area where there clearly is a consensus is in regard to welfare reform. We saw this on the floor a few weeks ago as we looked at the overwhelming vote. Over 80 Members of this body of 100 cast a vote in favor of the final welfare reform bill that passed. There is a consensus in this country about welfare reform.

Medicare: A year ago, I do not think there was really an understanding about the problems that we have, that we face in regard to Medicare. Today, while there is a debate about what we should do about Medicare, I do not think there is any longer a debate about the fact that something has to be done. The Medicare commissioners have said clearly that Medicare will, in fact, be bankrupt in a short period of time unless we take some very dramatic action.

So there is consensus on these three issues. As my colleague from Pennsylvania says, it is important that we get the facts out and we debate these facts on this floor.

Let me talk for a moment, in light of this, about the bill that is going to be coming in front of us. The American people may not have heard the term "reconciliation." It is kind of an inside-the-beltway term, but it is a term that is going to be used quite often in the next several weeks. This particular bill we are going to discuss is going to be the vehicle for this Congress to bring about the changes I believe people voted for last November. This legislation is bold, it is farsighted, and it is absolutely necessary for America's future. Furthermore, it is based on sound data. It is based on facts. It is based on good budget figures.

The American people decided last November they wanted a Congress that was finally willing to put America back on track towards fiscal solvency. I believe the American people are ready for this change. In fact, I believe the message of 1994, and frankly the message of 1992, was that the American people were demanding this kind of change.

We cannot ignore the basic truth contained in the report of the bipartisan entitlement commission. That commission said, if we do not change our present course, by the year 2012, every single penny in the Federal budget will be consumed by entitlements and interest on the national debt.

Mr. President, I ask consent to speak for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. DEWINE. If, in the year 2012, we want Government to have any money for discretionary spending—money to run the Army, Navy, Air Force, Ma-

rines, or the WIC program—it would then mean a tax increase, because there would not be any money left, no money left at all, if we continue to do what we have been doing.

In the days ahead, I intend to continue to talk about this issue, to talk about the need for this reconciliation bill.

At this point, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

BUDGET RECONCILIATION

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I listened with interest to this morning's discussion. I would say to my friend from Pennsylvania, I do not support the budget plan the President sent to the Congress. I did not think it was a good budget when he sent it back in February. I do not support it now.

But I would say the budget that is coming, the reconciliation bill that is coming to the floor, is substantially worse than the proposal the President offered, even though I do not support the proposal of the President. We could have a vote on a proposal here in the Senate that does make some sense, that does balance the budget in the right way, that does not attack the Social Security trust funds. It can be done the right way, but the proposals here we are debating, in my judgment, steer this country in a direction that is not healthy.

The Senator from Nebraska a few minutes ago talked about the proposal that says to a lot of working families we are going to increase your taxes. And that is what this proposal will do.

Yesterday, the Treasury Department released an analysis indicating that about 50 percent of the families will find increased taxes as a result of this proposal. Then it says, if you are wealthy enough to get your income from stocks and bonds, you will get a tax cut. It will be beneficial to you. There is a beneficial approach for you. And the Senator from Nebraska says that is not what Members said they wanted.

Is it unusual for people to be skeptical when 97 percent of the members of a political party voted against the Medicare program saying, We do not want it, we do not think it is necessary, we do not support it, and then they now later say, "We are the ones that are going to save it." And people are skeptical about that? I think they have a right to be skeptical.

That is what the debate is about, the priorities. I do not think we ought to talk about a tax cut at this point this year. I think what we ought to do is balance the budget, do it the right way, and then when we have done that job figure out what we should do about the taxes. But some people here want to take the popular things first, and say, Let us serve the dessert first; that is, wait and serve dinner.

I watched with some interest earlier this week people who have been in Congress for 30, 35, 25, or 20 years come to the floor of the Chamber and cast their vote saying they would like to have term limits, and what is wrong with our country is that there are not term limits. Somebody who has been here for 30 years now votes for term limits, and says the problem with America is we did not have a limit of 12 years on their term. What are they telling the American people—stop me before I run again?

It is interesting to me that people say this is about changes and reform. In many respects, it is the business-as-usual crowd. Although the priorities are changing, the way they see it, the rich have too little, the poor have too much, and we are going to change that with this reconciliation bill. We will take some from the poor and from middle-income working families and give some to the more affluent families.

But aside from that, we will debate plenty of that in the coming days. I want to point out to my colleagues that the day before yesterday the majority party came to the Chamber and said, We have from the Congressional Budget Office now a letter, and it says in the year 2002 with our plan we will have a budget surplus. They were very proud of that letter.

So I wrote a letter to the Congressional Budget Office, and said if you compute this the way you are supposed to compute it—which is honestly, and the law requires you cannot use the Social Security trust fund to compute that because those can only be used for Social Security—if you compute it without the Social Security trust fund, what do you have?

Yesterday I received a letter in return saying,

... including an estimated off-budget surplus of \$180 billion, which is the Social Security surpluses, the CBO would project an on-budget deficit of \$98 billion for the year 2002.

So in 24 hours this proposal has a slight surplus. Then it has a \$98 billion deficit in the year 2002.

But the point is the only way you can claim the budget is in balance with this kind of arithmetic is if you take money out of Social Security and use it. People say that has been going on for a long time. If that is the case, it is business as usual. This is change? No. It is not. This is business as usual.

I started in 1983 offering the first amendment in the Ways and Means Committee saying if you are going to put in the trust fund money you intended to save for the Social Security System, do not raid it, do not pollute it, do not take the money for any other purpose, but protect it, keep it out of the calculation of the operating budget deficit. I happened to lose in that vote in 1983, and I have tried a number of times since. The Senator from South Carolina actually succeeded in putting it into the law.

That is why I said to the Congressional Budget Office that you cannot add it up this way. If you add it up the right way, the Director of CBO says what you get is in the year 2002 a \$98 billion deficit. I am most anxious to hear people explain that to the American people.

Mr. SANTORUM addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I had a question for the Senator from North Dakota.

Does the Senator from North Dakota believe that the President's revised budget balances the budget in 10 years? Does the Senator believe that? He is running around the country saying he has a balanced budget that balances in 10 years.

Does the Senator agree with that?

Mr. DORGAN. No. But let me ask the Senator from Pennsylvania a question. Does he believe that what he is bringing to the floor of the Senate balances the budget in the year 2002 in light of what the Director of CBO says she thinks, that we will have a \$98 billion deficit?

Mr. SANTORUM. I happen to believe, as I think most Americans do, that the Social Security program is a Federal program. Maybe some people do not think it is. It is a Federal program, and it should be counted as a Federal program. We have the luxury—it is a luxury—over the next several years of having a surplus in the Social Security trust fund. But, as the Senator from North Dakota knows, that luxury is a short-lived luxury. Those of us who are going to be working to balance the budget, over the next several years and beyond, are going to have to start working with a Social Security fund deficit shortly, in the not too distant future, in about 15 years. So we are going to have the luxury now. But we are going to have to face the music.

I think the important thing is to begin that over a long period of time so that we can start dealing with those deficits. And I think it is important to look at the Government as a whole—look at all of the Federal Government programs.

The Senator from Nebraska just a few minutes ago was saying you should do what he wants to do on Social Security, which is eventually privatize Social Security and change it.

So there are a lot of things out there. We may have to deal with the Social Security issue. But all I am suggesting is that I think it is absolutely appropriate to use all Federal accounts, to look at it as a unified budget as it has been done in the past to see whether we balance the budget. Remember, it is a surplus now, but it will not always be a surplus. We will have to deal with this problem over the long term.

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

Mr. SANTORUM. Yes.

Mr. DORGAN. I wonder. The Senator, I think, understands that the Social Security trust funds are trust funds. If the Senator says we have a surplus now, he either assumes that there is going to be a surplus in the trust funds and not used for the operating budget deficit—in which case there is going to be \$100 billion deficit in the year 2002—or he is not going to have the money in the trust fund. Either one of the two is going to happen.

Mr. SANTORUM. If I may reclaim my time. As the Senator from North Dakota knows, Social Security issues the notes, and the notes are paid interest. And we are going to have to pay the interest back as we continually do now. We will have to continue to pay that back. If you want to make the Social Security trust fund argument, you have to make the highway trust fund argument, you have to make the aviation trust fund argument, and you have to make the unemployment trust fund argument. The Government is made up of a bunch of trust funds in many, many respects. If you want to take them all out and say just because it is a trust fund it is not a Federal program, that just does not mesh with how we run our Government. The Government is segregated in the trust funds because we have certain taxes dedicated to those funds. That does not mean they are not part of the Government. Of course, these are part of the Government. If they were not, people would not pay the Social Security taxes because they would not have to because there would not be anybody there to enforce it. We are there to enforce it, to make sure that the IRS enforces the payment of those taxes. We can talk to a lot of businesses who have not paid their taxes. They will tell you that the IRS is in their pocket in 2 minutes making them pay that.

If you want to say that somehow is not a Federal program, or the unemployment program is not a Federal program, or the highway trust fund or aviation trust fund is not a Federal program, that all of those should be removed and we should balance the rest of the budget, that to me is a gimmick where you are trying to get around the whole issue. The real issue is are we going to make the changes in law to get this budget in the balance, not just for the next 7 years but into long-term when a lot of these funds are going to be running deficits? My feeling is that we have to make the tough decisions.

I am going to be proposing an amendment I think eventually, to offer it as the President's budget because the President does not make the tough choices. He does not even come close with surpluses, and all of these are fudged. Without them you cannot achieve a balanced budget. Yet, he runs around this country talking about his balanced budget. He has this budget

that is going to balance over 15 years. There is not anybody in the Congress, there is not anyone who has studied this issue in the country, who has looked at these numbers who believes they balance. They do not. The only person that believes they balance is the President, and the only reason he believes it is because he wants to fool the American public into believing that he has some balanced budget, that he is accomplishing the same thing we are when the fact is he is not. And you have the Congressional Budget Office, which said back in June, after he introduced this second budget of his that came into balance, that his budget will produce in the next 7 years the following deficits: 196 in 1996, 212 in 1997, 199 billion—these are all billion-dollar deficits—a \$199 billion deficit in 1998, \$213 billion in 1999, \$220 billion in 2000, \$215 billion in 2001, and \$210 billion in the year 2002.

That is the Congressional Budget Office. They are the folks we have to deal with in trying to get a certification of whether we balance the budget or not. Unfortunately, the President is running around using—I ask unanimous consent for 30 additional seconds.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Reserving the right to object, might I ask to be followed by 5 minutes following the presentation by the Senator from Pennsylvania, the same unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from North Dakota will be recognized.

Mr. SANTORUM. The point I am trying to make is the President in his first State of the Union Address to the Congress said that he would use the Congressional Budget Office numbers because they were the most reliable numbers. Now, he said he was going to do it. He is not doing it, and if he did use it, those numbers would not balance.

We have an obligation to the American public to play straight with them. The President is not playing straight. We are going to offer an amendment that is going to show the President that nobody here believes his numbers. Quit going around the country saying you have a balanced budget when you do not.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the indulgence of my colleagues but because we are not able to have a discussion back and forth very easily—I hope one day we could put an hour aside jointly controlled and have a discussion to figure out where are the facts. I would love to do that with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, but because of this discussion I want to take a couple minutes to try to clarify this.

It is not, as my colleague from Pennsylvania says blithely, well, this is all Government spending; it is a Government program, Government revenue. Therefore, it must be counted this way or that way.

Let me tell my colleagues what happened. In 1983, it was determined that we were going to have a problem with Social Security. Just after the Second World War, when the war ended, a lot of folks came back to our country, and I am told that they were very affectionate, had very romantic notions about seeing their loved ones again, and over a period of some years, with deep affection, this country produced the largest baby crop in the history of America: the war babies. And so when these, the war babies, the largest crop of babies in American history, reach retirement rolls just after the turn of the century in 2010 and 2015, we need to be prepared for that.

So in 1983 we prepared for it. We said we are going to build surpluses in the Social Security trust funds. This year we will collect \$70 billion more than we need to spend in Social Security. Why? Because we like to do that? No, because we are saving for the future.

Now, if instead of the \$70 billion that we collect this year above what we need to spend in Social Security, if instead of keeping it in the trust fund, we say we will use it over here as general revenue to balance the budget, have you saved it in the trust fund? Of course not. It is a fraud.

No business in this country would do what you propose we do. None. I am going to take the employees' retirement funds and use them in my operating budget. No one would do that. And that is why I asked the Congressional Budget Office to tell me, if you do not use the Social Security trust funds, then what do you have? What you have is a budget deficit of nearly \$100 billion in the year 2002.

I am telling you this is business as usual. This is parading around and masquerading as doing something you are not. You are not balancing the budget if you are misusing the Social Security trust funds. And do not tell me they are ordinary funds. They are collected from every worker's paycheck in this country and they are labeled Social Security taxes.

Mr. SANTORUM. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DORGAN. The wage earners are told they are going to be put into a trust fund, and they are told the trust fund is going to be used for only one purpose. Now, when it is used instead for the purpose of balancing the operating budget, that is misusing the trust fund. It is looting Social Security. It is fundamentally dishonest. And it is business as usual, regrettably.

Mr. SANTORUM. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DORGAN. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the Senator.

When the gas tax was enacted, did not the Congress and President, when they signed that, say that that money would be dedicated, every penny you pay at the pump for gas taxes is dedicated to the highway trust fund, to be used only for construction of highways and other purposes within that act? Is that not what the law says?

Mr. DORGAN. No. In fact, the law has been changed to take part of that and move it for other purposes.

Mr. SANTORUM. There is 2.5 cents—

Mr. DORGAN. If the Senator wants to win a debate we are not going to have, I say good for you. I will give you a medal. But we are not going to have a debate about the gas tax fund.

My interest is in having a debate about the \$70 billion this year in the Social Security trust fund that we deliberately collect above what we need to save for the future and the fact that they again will be misused. That is the question. We could have a debate about trust funds for others.

Mr. SANTORUM. If the Senator will continue to yield.

Mr. DORGAN. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. SANTORUM. Is there not a surplus in the highway trust fund?

Mr. DORGAN. Yes.

Mr. SANTORUM. Is that surplus being used to offset the deficit?

Mr. DORGAN. Yes, by law.

Mr. SANTORUM. Well, only a portion of it is by law. As the Senator knows, 2.5 cents—

Mr. DORGAN. A portion by law.

Mr. SANTORUM. Is dedicated to deficit reduction. The vast majority of that fund is dedicated for the purposes only of improving our highways and other things related to transportation. Yet, we use that surplus to offset the deficit.

Mr. DORGAN. Yes.

Mr. SANTORUM. Just like, as the Senator suggested, we use the surplus in Social Security to offset the deficit.

My question is, why are you not here with a resolution that also deals with it, and why did not the other side when they debated the Social Security issue take all the trust funds that were running surpluses? But why just pick out Social Security, if you are really serious and you want to have fairness, not say—

Mr. DORGAN. Let me reclaim the time.

Mr. SANTORUM. It is too small.

Mr. DORGAN. It is a good question. I happen to feel the same way about trust funds. But you do not worry about a mouse in the corner when there is a gorilla at the door. The 500-pound gorilla on this issue is the hundreds of billions of dollars of surplus in the Social Security trust fund. That is what you want to get at because

accessing that money—to be precise, about \$1.2 trillion of that money—allows you to balance the budget, or claim you have balanced the budget. But it is dishonest. It is not balancing the budget.

The President did the same thing. I do not disagree with you to say, did he do it? Yes. It is wrong. It has been wrong since 1983, and the question is, when are we going to stop?

When do you stop coming to the floor and parading around with pocketfuls of money from the Social Security trust fund and claim you have done something to balance the operating budget deficit?

June O'Neill, the head of the CBO that you all hired, now says if you do not include those funds—and you should not—you do not have a balanced budget in 2002. What you have is nearly a \$100 billion deficit.

Now, we have a legitimate disagreement about priorities. I do not think we ought to have a tax cut. I do not think 50 percent of it ought to go to families over \$100,000 in income. I do not think you have to take \$270 billion out of Medicare. I do not think we have to build B-2 bombers or Star Wars or ships, planes, and submarines the Defense Department did not order.

We have a difference in priorities about what we should invest in and spend money on. I do not believe you ought to kick 55,000 kids off Head Start.

But beyond those differences in priorities, nobody ought to disagree that it is wrong to take trust fund money to the tune of \$1.2 trillion and claim you have done something good for the American people. You have weakened this country. You have cheated old folks out of a future they delivered in Social Security trust funds, and I would hope one day we will stop this business as usual and tell the American people what this budget is about.

Is my time expired?

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I thank you.

Mr. THOMAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). The Senator from Wyoming.

BALANCING THE BUDGET

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise also to talk about the budget because I think the budget is what is on our minds now, and properly so. I rise because we have come to a defining time when we will decide. And I am very interested in the colloquy that has gone on here. I congratulate my friend from Pennsylvania for raising this question about the President's budget. This is what we ought to be considering.

Let me say to my friend from North Dakota that the gentleman is not for a balanced budget in any time. We are

not going to get a balanced budget if we follow that pattern because there is none there. We are following the pattern that has been followed.

Furthermore, I think it is unfair to say this money is being used. I do not know of any trust fund of any kind or any annuity which the proceeds are not invested. In this case, they are invested in the U.S. securities. And the reason they are invested is because the law requires that. They are not stuffed in the mattress somewhere. And from an accounting standpoint, they do belong to that trust fund. And the Senator knows that, of course.

But I want to talk a little bit about the President's budget.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for 1 minute?

Mr. THOMAS. Of course.

Mr. SANTORUM. I ask unanimous consent that the transaction of morning business be extended to 11:15 a.m., under the previous terms.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS. I certainly would not want to stop this exciting debate.

Anyway, we do need to talk about where we are going. Now, there has been a great deal of activity in the administration going about the country saying, "We have a balanced budget. We balance the budget in 10 years." And so that, then, in our minds is measured against the Republican proposal to have a balanced budget and do so in 7 years.

But there is a substantial difference between the two. One is that the Republican budget does indeed balance in 7 years, as certified by CBO. The President's budget, what he has talked about for a 10-year balance, does not balance at the end of 10 years. So that is really the issue. And probably we will become involved in great detail about it.

But you really start with the question, Are we committed to the notion that we need to balance the budget? We have not been committed for 25 years to do that. As a matter of fact, we have heard this same debate for 25 years, the same excuses for 25 years, the same idea that we cannot do it for 25 years. In the meantime, the debt has increased to \$5 trillion. In the meantime, the interest paid on that debt will become the largest single-line item in the budget, larger than defense.

So we do not really have now a choice. We can talk about the idea of Social Security being off-budget. I happen to favor that. The fact is that it is not. The fact is that it has not been. And the fact is that the folks on that side of the aisle would not balance the budget if it is on, let alone if it is off. It would make it much more difficult.

The President promised a 5-year balanced budget as a candidate. That did not happen. Instead, we had the largest

tax increase in history in the 1993 budget.

The original budget by the administration this year was brought to the floor, defeated 99 to 0. So the administration sent down a new budget. It uses OMB numbers, not CBO numbers which the President told us a year ago, 2 years ago, that these are the numbers we all ought to use. We all ought to be on a level field. And I agree with that. CBO's are the numbers.

So the budget does not balance. There are a number of other problems. The proposition backloads cuts. The cuts come in after the year 2000. Eighty-five percent of the cuts come in in the next century. That is not a very tough approach to budgeting. It leaves the tough work for later, increases the deficit by 31 percent during this 10-year period. Well, the Republican budget eliminates it. It adds \$2 trillion to the debt.

So that is the comparison that we make. We really need to come down to dealing with the fundamental changes that have to be made and that, indeed, will be voted on in the next 2 or 3 weeks.

Protecting Medicare—we have to make some changes. There is a trust fund there. The trust fund will go broke in the year 2002. The trustees say so. You have to make some changes if you want some different results.

Reform welfare—we need to do that. We needed to do it for a very long time. We have the opportunity to do it.

Balance the budget—perhaps the most important. We have an opportunity to do that. There is legitimate debate about how you do it, legitimate debate about the cuts you make or the reductions you make in growth. But there is not really a legitimate debate about whether or not you financially and morally are responsible to balance the budget of the United States.

The real question is, what kind of a Government do we pass on to our kids? What kind of a financial situation and Government do we hand on as the new century comes on us? And those are the decisions we will answer in the next 2 weeks.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator in Minnesota.

DEBATING THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I want to join in and congratulate my colleague from Pennsylvania for bringing this issue to the floor today.

I just want to make a few statements in support of his effort, to put the President's so-called balanced budget on the table for debate, because I think we do need a healthy debate on both sides of the issue.

I would like to read from what the President has had to say in the last 2

weeks in his radio addresses, when he talks about continually maintaining that he does have a balanced budget.

He said on October 7, "I am deeply committed to balance the Federal budget." A week earlier, on September 30, he said, "I strongly believe we must balance the budget." He said, "Let's be clear. Of course, we need to balance the budget."

Well, of the three budgets that the President has put on the desk this year, none actually balances, according to the CBO, even his 10-year plan which he again touts as a balanced budget. It still leaves \$200 billion-plus deficits as far as the eye can see. So the President really does not have a balanced budget at all. But at least we would like to have the opportunity to talk about it.

We would like to give the other side of the aisle an opportunity to put those figures on the table. Let us debate them. Let us talk about them. Let us let the American people see the difference between the Republican plan and the Democratic plan.

As you remember, back in 1993—this week the headlines have been talking about the budget of 1993 again. In fact, the President has been coming from both sides of the issue again, flip-flopping on whether he raised taxes too high. Yes, he did raise them too high. Did he make too many cuts? No. It was the spendthrift Democrats, that he could not stop their spending. So he had to raise taxes in order to balance the budget.

If you look back at that balanced budget in 1993, the President has said many times we did not get one Republican vote in favor of that budget. And he is right, not one Republican voted for the President's budget.

But what did Republicans do? As a Member of the House in 1993, I introduced a budget called Families First, which, by the way, now makes up much of what is in the Republican budget this year, including the \$500 per child tax credit. And many of the others—Congressman JOHN KASICH of Ohio, now the Budget chairman in the House, also introduced a budget plan in 1993. Congressman JERRY SOLOMON of New York, Republican, also introduced a budget of his own in 1993.

So we had three definite Republican budgets on the table proposed and were voted on. We got 178 votes on my alternative Families First budget. So what we are saying is Republicans did not vote in 1993 for the President's plan, but we did vote for a budget plan that we had proposed.

So what I would advocate here today, and my colleague from Pennsylvania has talked about, let us put the Democratic or the President's plan on the table so we can have a healthy debate and at least a comparison of the two plans. And then, hopefully, let us get a vote on it so the American people know where the numbers really lie and where they are.

I know we are talking a lot about, and we are going to hear a lot in the debate, about the Social Security trust fund. This is a complicated issue. But the American people should know that the way the budget is set up, that all the funds from the Social Security trust fund has been used by past Democratic Congresses for the same purpose.

The President's proposed budget that he maintains balances uses every dime, the same as the Republicans' do at this time for the unified budget. But what remains in the Social Security trust fund are IOU's. As my colleague from Pennsylvania pointed out, we are going to have to repay those IOU's in the very near future. That is going to mean new tax revenues in order to do it. That is the only way the Government can pay it back.

So we do have a problem. We do have a luxury right now for the next few years of maintaining a surplus. But it will be easier to address this problem that we are going to be confronted with in Social Security if we stay on course and balance the budget by the year 2002.

So I just hope that over the next couple days, and probably yet today, we are going to get a chance to look more at what the President's plan is, what he advocates, and get a healthy dialog and debate going on these budget issues so the American people do get a very clear picture of what the President has proposed and what Republicans propose, because this is going to be the most important issue, for not only this Congress, but for the Congresses to follow, for our children and grandchildren, because what we cannot do, morally or financially, is to leave them our debts. We have to address this problem with every ounce of energy that we have.

So I hope we get a healthy debate on these issues. I thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor. And I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period for the transaction of morning business be extended until noon, under the terms of the previous agreement.

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

THE BUDGET

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I want to get back to some of the points

that the Senator from North Dakota was making with respect to the President's budget. I think it is significant that the Senator from North Dakota said that the President's budget does not come into balance in 10 years, as he is claiming it does all over the country. We should use the congressional budget numbers. In fact, the Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE, shortly after the President introduced his budget, said that the President should use Congressional Budget Office numbers. They have been the most reliable. The President addressed a joint session of Congress on February 17, 1993. This was shortly after he was sworn in, inaugurated as President of the United States. He said:

The Congressional Budget Office was normally more conservative in what was going to happen and closer to right than previous Presidents have been. I did this—

In other words, he agreed to use Congressional Budget Office numbers.

so that we can argue about priorities with the same set of numbers. I did this so no one could say I was estimating my way out of difficulty. In the last 12 years, because there were differences over the revenue estimates, you and I know that both parties were given greater elbow room for irresponsibility. This is a tightening of the rein on the Democrats as well as the Republicans. Let us argue about the same set of numbers so that the American public will think we are shooting straight with them.

The President wanted to shoot straight back in 1993. In 1995, he wants to shoot any way he can to hit the target of getting reelected. He believes he needs to get reelected by campaigning that he has a balanced budget when he knows darn well he does not have one. He has done exactly what he said he would not do, which is "estimating my way out of this difficulty."

He has reestimated what the growth of this country will be over the next 7 to 10 years and reestimated what the interest rates will be. You have to understand that if you reestimate just a tenth or two-tenths of 1 percent more growth, what does that mean? If you say that instead of having 2.5 percent growth, actually, we are going to have 2.6 or 2.7 percent, you might say that is close. Yes, it may be close, but it means hundreds of billions of dollars in differences to the Federal budget deficit, because that additional growth means more people are going to be working and paying taxes, and less people are going to be receiving Government benefits. Therefore, the deficit would be lower.

I think it would be easy for me to balance the budget in 1 year. All I have to do is say the economy is not going to grow at 2.5 percent, but at 5 percent, interest rates will be at 2 percent, and I will have balanced the budget. I would not have to cut a thing or raise taxes, and just by estimating things differently for the future, I could balance the budget. The economy is a lot

bigger than the Federal budget. When this multitrillion-dollar economy grows by even a little bit more, it has a tremendous ripple effect on this little part of the economy, which is the Federal Government.

So what we are seeing here is the President trying to involve himself in debate, to become relevant to this debate, and he is using numbers that just do not add up. Now we are coming down to crunch time when we are going to bring up the budget reconciliation bill. We have a letter from the CBO that says it balances the budget. I want to make this clear, because people are saying that we have had Gramm-Rudman and all these things that were going to balance the budget. We have never passed a piece of legislation that, within its confines, has changes in law that will result in a balanced budget, if we do nothing else.

We have passed budget rules that say, well, we have to do certain things every year and cut programs in the future and reduce spending in the future. And if we do not, we will have this mechanism in place to make you do it. That is what we have passed in the past. We have had procedures by which we are forced to make decisions to balance the budget. That is not what we are doing here. We have those in place just in case the economy does not grow as fast or just in case interest rates are higher, but what we have in place, given the conservative assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office, is a plan that will, in fact, result in a balanced budget, if we do nothing else. We do not have to make any more changes in law or raise any taxes or cut any programs. We will have done it all in one bill.

It is fundamentally different than anything we have done here since 1968, which I think was the last time we balanced the budget. We will have balanced this budget and put in place a law that does it—not a procedure that does it, but changes in programs in Washington that balance the budget.

That is what the public has asked us to do. No more gimmicks, no more processes to do it. We have done it. We have made the tough decisions, and we have stepped up to the plate and taken a good swing at it.

Is it perfect? Absolutely not. Anyone who suggests that anything that comes out of the House and Senate is perfect does not understand the House and Senate. It is a compromise. It is putting things together to get the number of votes that are necessary to move the ball forward.

Are there things I would like different? Absolutely. But we made the tough decisions. We brought a group of people, hopefully, I believe, the majority of people, together to pass a budget and send it to the President.

What we want out of the President is simply honesty. If the President wants

to claim he will be involved in this debate, then he better come up with a budget that is real and quit running around saying that the Republicans are mean and Draconian and all these things. "I want to balance the budget." He cannot have it both—mean, Draconian, nasty cuts from the Republicans and say, "I want to balance the budget, too," and not do it.

If you want to balance the budget, balance the budget, put forth a plan that does it. He has not done that.

I have in my desk, and some may remember these numbers, I had a chart here that had a question about where the President was in balancing the budget. The previous campaign, several on the other side of the aisle were asking the question, where is George? Why is he not involved in solving the problems of this country?

So I asked the same question. I put up, day after day after day, and the President refused to come to the table and balance the budget. Those numbers are still adding up. He still has not done so. Well, he has a chance. He has a chance. We are willing to sit down with the President and work through what it will take to pass a balanced budget. We understand we cannot pass a balanced budget on our own. The President has to sign the budget. He has to sign the reconciliation package.

We want him to do that. We are not going through this as a political exercise to get one-upmanship on the President. I can tell you, I am not anxious to vote for changes in a lot of laws, many of which I support and do not necessarily want to see reductions in, just to see the President veto it and nothing happen. It is not a particularly satisfying thing to have happen. If you are going to make the tough votes, at least you want to see it happen. You want to see the changes that you put forward go into law.

No one over here wants to do this as a political exercise. We want to do it because we want to see this country be saved for future generations. We want to see that person who is sitting out there now listening, who is at home and does not have a job and cannot find a job, have a better chance to get a job because the economy will be better. Everyone—the President, Democrats, Republicans—knows if we balance the budget, the economy will be better. Interest rates will be lower. Growth will be higher. More jobs will be created. We all know that.

The people listening who think, how am I going to get this employment opportunity? What will happen to turn this economy around? This is probably the most important thing we can do to turn that economy around.

This is not an esoteric debate about balancing the budget, but about affecting people's lives. This is the young child who may be sick from high school and sitting at home at night and

maybe just surfing around on the channels and happens to stop here—probably not long—stop here and listen for a few minutes. That is for that person who wonders whether they will have a job when they get out of high school or college, whether they will have the opportunity to be able to raise a family and buy a home at a reasonable interest rate.

That is what this is all about. This is about real people and real lives. This is not just about balancing budgets and numbers and charts. It is about real people, and giving them the opportunity that this country was founded on.

We have the chance to do that. That is what this is about. We need the President. We need the President. This should not be about politics. This should be about working together for the common good of this country. We want to do that. We have put forward planned specifics.

Want to talk specifics? I remember listening early in the year when the budget resolution was out there and they said, "You guys are throwing these numbers out. You do not have specifics."

Folks, the Senator from New Mexico will come down next week with a whole bunch of specifics, tell you exactly how we get from A to Z, how we balance. The specifics are there. Here is how it happens.

Want to make some changes? We can make some changes. We are not going to make a change on this. We are not going to make a change on balancing this budget in 7 years. That is something we will not change. We are committed to the American public to do that.

I implore the President to stop waving this budget around. I know it may look good in the polls today. People may believe he has a balanced budget, and I know his polls are saying that people now believe he has a balanced budget. All he does is go around talking about it, and unfortunately, the American public sometimes believes the President even when he is not telling the truth. I think it undermines the credibility of the office.

Tell the truth. Tell the truth. Want to balance the budget in 7 years? The opportunity is here. You do not have to run around the country and campaign that you will balance the budget. Stay in Washington and you can sit down with the people who are working on this problem and you can balance the budget. You do not have to go around and raise money all over the country for your next campaign and talk about how you should not raise taxes and all these things.

You can come here and solve the problem. This is the time for work. This is a time when this body, in a bipartisan fashion—I think the Senator from Nebraska talked earlier, Senator

KERREY. I do not question his sincerity at all about trying to balance this budget. I think he is one of the real statesmen when it comes to dealing with the problems of entitlement reform and changing the way the Government does business.

We differ on priorities, but I think he is one who is sincere about the final objective. I think he knows the importance of that final objective. I think he is someone who we can negotiate with and sit down with.

But we need the President. We do not need politics. We do not need waving around budgets that do not balance. It is not the time for politics. You have a whole year, Mr. President, where you can campaign for reelection. The time now is to get serious about doing the business of the country. You were elected President. It is time to serve the Presidency. It is time to serve your Presidency, not politics. Roll up your sleeves. Come on down here, send your people down and we can get going. Quit playing games with the American public and trying to manipulate the polls. You may win this November, but if you keep playing that game, you will not win next November.

The country will not win, which is a heck of a lot more important than either of those things. We should get down to business. We are open. We are here. We are open for business. We are ready to go. All we need is someone who is willing to step to the plate and make it happen.

Later today if we end up getting an agreement to have a bill before the Senate today, I will put forward the President's budget and we will have a debate. I want to make it very clear, as I think we are hearing from both sides, that this budget is not real. This budget does not do anything to balance the budget for the next 7, 10, 20, or 30 years.

Get that out of the way. Get the politics and the charades and the broken promises out of the way. Deal with the facts. The fact is, Mr. President, if you want to balance the budget, get up here and do it. Quit running around the country campaigning on what you do not have, not telling the truth to the public about your budget, and get up here where the action is, where history is being made, and make a difference. Serve your Presidency, not your reelection.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMS). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak

up to 10 minutes as in morning business, ending before the 12 clock deadline.

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

THE BUDGET

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, we have heard much debate this morning. I think healthy debate, about the budget that is working its way through the House and through the Senate. I sit on the Budget Committee. This afternoon we were told by the Republicans that we will have our meeting where we will then act on the budget bill. As a matter of fact, we are going to meet in about an hour and a half.

I worked very late last night and I never got a copy of the budget. I started work very early this morning and I do not have a copy of the budget. And the American people need to understand that this budget is not just about numbers. It is about changing laws.

For example, in that budget, national standards for nursing homes are repealed. Changes in the laws are made so it will cost students more for college loans. Tax laws are being changed so the working poor will have to pay more taxes. Indeed, 51 percent of the people of America will pay more taxes because of this budget. And they all are on the middle-income to the poor level of our society. Champagne bottles are being chilled in penthouses all across the country—except in those where someone has a conscience. Because if somebody can explain to me why people who earn millions of dollars a year deserve a tax break, I am ready to listen, when we are trying to balance the budget.

The attack on elderly in our country is extraordinary. When I was growing up I learned some basic values. My parents said you have to work hard, you have to play by the rules, you have to respect your elders and honor your children.

This Republican budget is a slam at every one of those values. We are attacking the working poor. We are raising taxes on people who work so hard to bring home \$30,000 a year or less, and we are hurting those people. Honor work? We are cutting \$270 billion out of Medicare. We need to cut \$89 billion, we are told by the experts, to make it sound and whole. But the Republicans are cutting \$270 billion out of Medicare and funneling it into the tax cut for the rich—the Republican funnel plan.

Medicaid—repealing nursing home standards so it is easier for nursing homes to make more money, folks. That is what it is about. Why else would you do it? You do not have to be very old to remember the days in the 1980's when the scandals erupted about nursing homes. We found our senior citizens were being drugged, overdosed on drugs so they could be controlled in the nursing homes. They were being

scalded in hot baths. They were being sexually abused. They had bedsores. They were lying in their own excrement.

Well, I made a pledge to my magnificent and beautiful mother, whom I love, a few years ago who spent her last days in a nursing home after she had spent down every penny she had, and all of her dignity, that I would not let this budget go by without telling the American people the truth, that the profits of the nursing homes will not be put over the well-being of the elderly in our society, those who have given birth to us, those who have nurtured us, those who worked so hard so we could get an education. My mother never graduated from high school, and she sacrificed so both her children could go to college.

Is this what the American dream is about? Is this what family values is about? Well, maybe it is popular to vote for that budget. Maybe I am out of step. Maybe compassion is out of fashion. Maybe respecting your elders is out of fashion. Maybe believing in your children is out of fashion. But not for this Senator. Six million people voted to bring me here, and I am going to stand up and I am going to fight. If it is popular, it is, and if it is not, it is not. That is OK, too.

The Republicans have put their budget on a fast track—no time. You tell me why we have to be on Friday afternoon waiting for the numbers when we could take this budget home over the weekend, examine it, and know what the heck we are doing on Monday morning. I will tell you why, folks. They want this budget to slip through with the least notice possible. They do not want the American people to understand it. And President Clinton is going to veto it. He is going to veto their budget. He is going to say no to their budget. And he might do it in the name of his mother, a nurse who healed the sick, a woman who died of breast cancer, who believed in the values of this society. He is going to veto this budget. This budget is not in any way including those American values that we learned when we were growing up; to honor our elders, to believe in our children.

Do we have to do this to balance the budget? We do not. That is not even an argument. I voted for two balanced budgets in the Senate—one by Senator BRADLEY and one by Senator CONRAD. As a matter of fact, they cut even deeper into the deficit than that which the Republicans have produced. But they contained within them some values—family values, American values, compassionate values, commonsense values.

So this is not about balancing the budget. We all want to balance the budget. We all voted for various amendments that would do that. It is about how do you get there and who

gets rewarded and who gets hurt. I know this is a cynical time in America. I know it is a cynical time. When a Republican stands up, they do not believe the Republican. When a Democrat stands up, they do not believe the Democrat. Look at the numbers. Read the law. That is why they are rushing these things through. They do not want you to see the numbers. They do not want you to read the law. They do not want you to know the nursing home standards are repealed. They do not want you to know they are going to charge people who are waiting for their child support a fee to collect that child support. Imagine. A woman is desperate for her child support. They finally get it. They are going to make them pay a fee. For what? To give \$5,500 a year back to people who earn over \$350,000 a year. Have they no shame? Have they no values?

We have a funnel Medicare plan. It funnels the money from Medicare right to the hands of the rich. We have a Medicaid plan that I call the Dr. Kavorkian plan. I am not doing it to scare people. I am doing it because it is the reality. I told you what these nursing homes looked like before. And I will tell you, when faced with that choice, what would you do?

We put a lot of pressure on NEWT GINGRICH, and he finally changed the spousal impoverishment law that he tried to do away with. We are looking at whether or not he really saved it. But can you believe they were ready to do that, too? They were ready to say to an elderly man who put his loving wife of 60 years into a nursing home that he could not keep his house, he could not keep his car, and he could not keep his \$1,200 a month; the Government was going to go after it before his wife could get help in that nursing home. Family values? I do not think so.

So I am going to walk into that Budget Committee this afternoon, and I am going to talk about the values that I have as a daughter of an immigrant mother who never went to high school but who is as smart as anyone in this Chamber. I am going to talk about the sadness I feel that America is turning its back on who we are and what made us great as a nation. But I am also going to fight.

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for morning business be extended for 15 minutes and that I be allowed to speak for as much time as I consume.

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

THE RECONCILIATION BILL

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I listened to the Senator from California and to some others today discussing the issues of priorities. And this Chamber, while now empty, will be full with aggressive debate and much interest next week when we deal with what is called the reconciliation bill. Frankly, most people do not know what reconciliation means. It is a long term that relates to reconciling, to spending, to revenues, and to what was determined in the budget resolution passed by the Congress. That is what reconciliation means. So the bill is brought to the floor, cuts spending, changes the Tax Code, and it reconciles.

We have substantial differences in priorities and differences of opinion about what is important, and that represents the debate. Some people get very upset because there is a debate going on. I think it is a sign of health. That is what politics is. Politics is not a pejorative term. It describes the process by which we make public decisions.

I said before that John F. Kennedy used to say every mother hopes her child grows up to be President, provided the child does not have to get involved in politics.

Of course, getting involved in politics is a method by which we make decisions in America. There is nothing wrong with that. It is a noble, honorable thing to do, and I happen to feel proud and privileged that I am a part of it in the Senate.

The Senator from California talked about her heritage, and I was thinking yesterday about this. I was on a radio call-in program and someone called who had read an account of my great grandmother settling in North Dakota. I had attended a Scandinavian event and someone in the press had done a story about how my grandmother came to North Dakota.

The story just in thumbnail sketch was that she, Caroline, and Otto met and fell in love in Oslo, Norway, and got married as young Norwegians and then moved to the New World and settled in St. Paul, MN. After some time Otto died and Caroline, with her children—I believe it was six children—moved to the prairies of North Dakota and pitched a tent and with her children built a house and homesteaded 160 acres of land.

Someone had read that account in a press story last week as a result of my attending a Scandinavian festival and they called the radio station I was on and said is it not interesting, the story about your grandmother, this gritty, courageous Norwegian woman who comes from Norway to the United States, and then her husband dies and she takes her children to go to North Dakota to homestead on the prairie—pitches a tent, builds a house, raises a family, and homesteads 160 acres.

And she said, what do you think would have happened to your grandmother had we had a welfare system back at the turn of the century? Would there not have been the incentive to do that?

I thought about the question. It was an interesting question. I said, who do you think she got the land from? Who do you think created the Homestead Act? Who do you think passed a bill that said we are going to have a Homestead Act to say to people if you go out and homestead on the prairies and do the right things, we will give you 160 acres of land?

Yes, that is right, the Government. The Federal Government. Did it play an instrumental role in my great grandmother's life? You better believe it did. The Government has played a constructive role in a lot of lives. We are the Government, all of us. Every citizen in America is the Government. I know people want to just compartmentalize and say, boy, everything is awful, everything is evil, nothing works.

The fact is, from the Homestead Act to the GI bill, together, people working together, people making the right choices and right decisions about what is a priority for this country, have had an enormously important influence in the lives of people.

It is the Government, us together, we have built the education system in our country. We have something like 140 world class universities in this world. Over 120 of them are stationed where? In the United States of America. Let me say that again. We have something like 140 world class universities. Over 120 of them are located in our country. Chance? Accident? No, it is people working together. A lot of them are public institutions. People working together doing the right thing, saying education is important. We not only have done it at the top level, building world class universities, the best in the world, judged by everyone, but where are people going to school? Are they rushing to Iraq to go to college? I do not think so. No, people are coming to America to attend some of the greatest universities in the world. We have not only done it at the top, but we have done it at the bottom.

We created a Head Start Program, and we said to little kids 3, 4, 5 years old, who were in trouble, living in circumstances of poverty, living in dysfunctional families, we are going to give you a head start. We are going to give you an opportunity. And we created a Head Start Program to give those little kids an opportunity. And guess what? It works. It works really well. Everybody understands it works.

Now, the majority is saying that we cannot afford that. We are going to kick 55,000 kids off the Head Start Program. Every one of those kids has a name, and they have in their hearts

some hope that things are going to change in their lives. And Head Start has been helpful to those kids—helped them to hold on to that hope.

It is a long way of getting to the point of saying this is all about priorities, this debate. It is not a debate, as the Senator from Wyoming alleged a while ago, about people do not want to balance the budget and people do. What a bunch of nonsense. That is not what the debate is. Everybody in here believes we ought to balance the budget. The question is not whether. The question is how.

I voted for a balanced budget in this Chamber. I voted for a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution for that matter. We had two versions, one that did not raid the Social Security System and one that did. I voted for that one that did not. But in any event, this is not about those who believe we should balance the budget and those who do not. All of us want the same goal. We want to balance the budget. This is about priorities.

The priorities that have been chosen by some in this Chamber—and it is their business. They have a vote. They have a right to choose priorities—say this. When the defense bill came to the floor of the Senate, they said to us we are conservative, we are frugal, we are penny pinchers, but when it comes to defense we want to spend \$7 billion more than the Secretary of Defense asked for. The Secretary of Defense says we need a certain number of trucks. These folks say, I am sorry, you need a lot more than that. We insist on building you trucks you did not ask for. Ships, we demand that you buy ships you say you do not want. Jet airplanes, F-15's, F-16's, we will write them in. You did not ask for them. Well, we are going to build them for you anyway. How about the B-2 bomber? I supported 20 B-2 bombers. I supported 100 B-1 bombers. But now we are told by people who are conservative, penny pinching, frugal Members of Congress, we want to build 20 more B-2 bombers at a cost of \$20 billion. It does not matter the Secretary of Defense says he does not want them. We insist you take them. And the hood ornament on this excess is the star wars program. We insist on an astrodome over America, a new star wars program, and we demand, by the way, that we go out and put it in the field by 1999, accelerated development—\$7 billion they want to stuff in the trousers of the Pentagon that the Secretary of Defense did not ask for.

Again, is this frugal? Is this penny pinching? Is this conservative? I do not think so. I think that is reckless, wild-eyed spending. This is my judgment.

The same people who say we want to build star wars, when it comes to talking about star schools, say we are sorry; we do not have enough money. And 55,000 Head Start kids, we are

sorry, you are out of luck. The poor kid going to school, we say you are no longer entitled to a school lunch in the middle of the day. We are going to remove the entitlement. Somebody might not want to give you lunch. As far as we are concerned, they do not have to.

In the whole series of priorities, including and especially the issue of Medicare and Medicaid, do we have to fix Medicare? Yes. There is no debate about that. Is there a solvency problem? You bet. Do we try to address it? Yes. But should we cut \$270 billion from Medicare? I do not think so. Some people say, what do you mean, cut? There is no cut in Medicare. Of course, there is a cut—\$270 billion less than what is needed to fund Medicare in the next 7 years.

Now, who do you think that is going to come out of? It is going to come out of somebody. Rural hospitals maybe. Senior citizens are going to pay more and get less. That is exactly what is going to happen—pay higher premiums and get less health care. Should we cut health care? Should we cut \$270 billion? Of course not. Why are we doing that? Why the proposal to cut \$270 billion? Because some feel they erected a tent with the center pole being a tax cut. The center pole of this new tent is a tax cut. And they insist on a tax cut. In order to pay for a tax cut, you are going to have to cut Medicare and Medicaid and those other things with the depth that they are discussing.

Let us take the tax cut just for a moment. We are told that the tax cut is perfectly appropriate because those who propose it are proposing to balance the budget. Well, why then in their proposal do they add hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars to the debt at the same time they are talking about a tax cut?

Some of us happen to feel you ought to deserve less. You say, "Set up the table. We will serve dessert first." Politically, I guess, it is very attractive. I would like to be one of those who say my existence here is predicated on the ability to deliver a tax cut for the people whom I represent. My guess is most of them would prefer much lower taxes. They would like a tax cut.

But they would also believe, I think, that, just as in a family budget, you should deal with your spending problems first, balance your budget first, and then deal with a tax cut. I think that is how they would feel.

Now, with respect to this issue of priorities, I mentioned the other day I come from a town of 300 or 400 people. Actually, it was 400, but, like most rural communities in small counties, it is shrinking. But let us take this town of 300 or 400 people and use that as an example of what we are doing here in this Chamber. Let us consider this budget, the budget for my community.

Here is what we do. We get in the car, and we get all of our little envelopes

telling people what this is going to do to them, and we just start driving around town. First, we come to the part of town where people do not have it so good. The houses are not quite so big. Some people are home because they cannot find work. Some people do not have much. They are hungry. But it is a part of town where there is not much in resources and people are struggling to make ends meet, working hard but not gaining ground.

And we stop at their home and we say to them, "Here is an envelope. This tells you what our plan is for you. Our plan for you is we're going to cut back on the earned income tax credit. That means you will pay higher taxes." In fact, all families with under \$30,000 in income largely will face higher taxes, or put another way, 50 percent of the American taxpayers will end up with a slightly higher tax bill.

We also say to some of those people that "Your child is now in Head Start, but we cannot afford to keep him or her there. We will have to take your kid out of Head Start. Your grandma is on Medicare. Her premiums are going to be increased and she'll have managed care and she won't have the choice of a doctor or hospital anymore. Your daughter who is unemployed is now on Medicaid. We have a problem with Medicaid funding."

We go on down the list in terms of what the bad news is for those families who are struggling and not making it very well.

But then we keep driving around this same town and when we stop at the biggest houses in town, the folks who have the most money, the folks who have the house on the hill, who have done very well, we say to them, "Here is the envelope for you. Here is what this means. By the way, this is awfully good news for you because you happen to get your income from stocks and bonds. You have been enormously successful. And you are very wealthy. You get your money from stocks and bonds. So we have decided that people who get their money from stocks and bonds, they need a lower tax rate. So you are going to be blessed with a very substantial cut in your taxes."

And then we say that when you add all of this up, we come out with a balance. We have taken from those who do not have very much. We have given to those who have a lot. And then we have established essentially a balance. But no one is told that in order to get to that point we have taken all the trust funds out of a pension program that existed in that town and brought them over to use them as revenues when we count whether or not we have reached a balanced budget.

And that, in a nutshell, is the plan we have coming to the floor of the Senate. Some of us feel there is a better way and a different way and a way with

better priorities and choices for the future of this country to address these budget issues.

No one disagrees we should reach a balanced budget. And we ought to reach a balanced budget, by the way, without raiding the Social Security trust funds to do so.

I had a short discussion with my colleague from Pennsylvania today. I showed my colleague from Pennsylvania the October 18 letter, which was Wednesday's letter trumpeted on the floor of the Senate, which says this reconciliation bill brought to the floor is going to have a balanced budget, in fact, a slight surplus.

Then yesterday, at my request, the same person, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, wrote a letter that said, if you count this the way the law requires you to count it—she does not say that, but I asked her that—and do not use the Social Security trust funds, because they are not part of the budget and shall not be counted, what then do you have? And the answer is, well, in the year 2002 you do not have a balanced budget, you have a \$98 billion deficit.

Mr. President, we will have a very substantial debate on all of these issues. I believe that we have to trim spending in many areas—Medicare, Medicaid, they will be trimmed some, the farm program, yes, somewhat—but I do not believe that you take the most vulnerable Americans and put them right smack in the bull's-eye and say, "By the way, when all the dust is settled and all is said and done, you are going to pay up." And then we say to others, "You have been so blessed in this country. By the way, when all the dust settles and all is said and done, guess what? You are going to be much better off because these sets of policies decide that you are more worthy than others."

I think there is a better way. And many of us will offer amendments next week, amendments that will get us to a balanced budget, really get us to a balance where it is not misusing the Social Security trust funds but really balancing the budget and doing it with different priorities. I do not want the message to be to family farmers, "You are in trouble? Well, move to town. We could not care less." "You are poor? Tough luck." "You are poor and old? That is even tougher luck."

I mean, I would like our sense of policies to be to say to people that are important, little kids going to Head Start, "You matter. Your life matters to us. We care about you." We can make room in these priorities because we can shift some of that money, because we can buy one less B-2 bomber and maybe not buy the fuel gauge or landing gear as spare parts for one B-2 bomber and pay for all of it for 55,000 children. Maybe that is the priority. Maybe we decide star wars is not the

priority. Maybe we accept the judgment of the military people and the Secretary of Defense, who says we should not do this.

We say, all right, that is \$48 billion. So what could we do with \$48 billion? Maybe we reduce the deficit, first of all, or, if you insist on spending it, did not want to do that, if it is not star wars, how about star schools? How about deciding kids are as important as bombers? Those are the priorities that we will debate next week.

No one in this country should lament the fact that we are going to have a debate. If we at the end of the day can maybe reach some understanding between all of us of what the right priorities are, what really advances America's interests, which investments make life worthwhile for all Americans, what expands opportunities in our country, if we can develop better understandings of what achieves all of that, then our country is better served, in my judgment.

I am not someone who believes the Republicans are all wrong and we are all right. That is simply not the case. All of us have made mistakes in this country. This country is blessed with people who make good decisions, Republicans and Democrats. And I hope at the end of this reconciliation fight we can find a way to create more of a bipartisan approach to addressing some of the wrenching, real problems we have.

I have often thought it would be useful, perhaps, for us to restrict ourselves someday, and it would be useful, probably, for talk radio, for example, to restrict themselves, maybe to have a day a month and talk about what is right with America, what is right with our country. Would that not be hard for some people because there are so many who are only willing to talk about what is wrong. The fact is, most people are coming here, not leaving. Can you think of someplace you would rather live? I cannot. This country is the best place in the world to live.

The question is, What is right with it? How do we build on what is right with it? I think it would be nice for talk radio and, I guess, the U.S. Senate from time to time to set aside a period and say, this is a period where we are going to talk about what works and what makes it work and how we build on that. And, I mean, maybe someday we can get to that kind of discussion, which I would also like to have.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH). The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank my colleague from North Dakota for his remarks. And I will pick up on his last point.

First of all, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended for 15 minutes.

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

WHERE IS THE STANDARD OF FAIRNESS?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Thank you, Mr. President. I appreciate what the Senator from North Dakota said about our country. And I would say to my colleague who is presiding, the Presiding Officer, that I have said probably every week, when I go home, to someone that when I come to the floor of the Senate I still get goose bumps. It is a real honor to serve in the U.S. Senate and for Minnesota. If you look at these buildings here in Washington, DC, and you think about what they stand for—my father was a Jewish immigrant who fled persecution in Russia. It is a wonderful country, and we ought to emphasize the positive.

Mr. President, next week we will have debate—not hate, but rather a debate. And I would like to lay out my framework just for really not more than 10 minutes.

Mr. President, I came to the floor of the Senate at the beginning of this Congress, and I had a resolution. It was nothing more than a sense-of-the-Senate amendment that it was the sense of the Senate that we would not take any action that could create more hunger or homelessness among children. Actually, it was defeated twice. Then the third time it was passed by a voice vote. I now regret that I accepted a voice vote, because I think it was a symbolic vote, because if I look at this deficit reduction, the issue becomes deficit reduction based upon what standard? Is it deficit reduction based on the path of least political resistance? Are we asking some of the citizens to tighten their belts who cannot? And are we leaving a lot of special interests untouched? I think we are.

I certainly will be active in the debate next week with amendments to force some discussions on these issues, and I want to know where Senators stand.

We have something like \$35 billion slated for cuts in nutrition programs for children. Food stamps and the Women, Infants, and Children Program, the WIC Program, is an incredibly important program, because if you were to ask me as a former teacher what is the most important education program, I would say to make sure every woman who is expecting a child—I just had a grandson, our third grandchild, a week ago. That grandson, Joshua Paul, I think is going to have a good life. He was born healthy, but my daughter, Marcia, had an adequate diet. She had the resources to make sure she did.

My God, children at birth are not going to have the same chance if their mothers have not had a decent diet. We are cutting the Women, Infants, and Children Program.

The Food Stamp Program is not perfect; we ought to make it more accountable. The fact of the matter is, imperfections and all, we dramatically expanded the Food Stamp Program after the expose on hunger and malnutrition in America, and we did it in the early 1970's. We had some national standards, and we implemented this program across the country. We do not have all the children anymore with distended bellies. We do not have the same amount of hunger and malnutrition, though we still have too much. We are cutting into these programs.

When it came to the Pentagon budget, which was \$7 billion more than the Pentagon asked, when it came to the military contractors, when it came to star wars or Stealth or Trident, we just gave the money away. They have the clout. They are the heavy hitters, they have the lobbyists, and they did just fine. But the children in America did not, especially poor children.

I just do not think there is a standard of fairness. I think there is consensus that you have to pay off the interest on the debt. That is what this is all about. There is not a Senator here that could be proud of the building up of the debt in this country. The question becomes, when you make the cuts and you do the deficit reduction, where is the Minnesota standard of fairness? That is the question.

Mr. President, the Finance Committee met and came out with \$245 billion of tax cuts. But here is the interesting thing. If you have family incomes below \$30,000 a year, which is about half the people in this country, you have the earned-income tax credit taken away from you and you pay more. You are paying a tax all the way up to families \$30,000 a year and under. But, by golly, if you are in the top 1 percent of this population with incomes over \$350,000 a year, you get a \$5,626 break. And if it is \$200,000 a year, you get \$3,416. This is a subsidy in inverse relationship to need.

If you are at the top of the population income-wise, the top 1 percent, you get a huge tax break. If you make over \$200,000 you do, and if you make over \$100,000 you do. But if you make under \$30,000 a year, you do not get any break; you pay more. This is like a subsidy in inverse relationship to need. Same issue.

This is what I am going to zero in on next week: Why have the military contractors got everything they wanted? Why do the children lose some of their nutritional programs? Who has the power in America? Who has power in the Congress? Special interests dominate.

Why does the top 1 percent of the population get a huge tax break and the bottom 50 percent of the population get an additional tax? Who has power? Who has the lobbyists? Who are the special interests? Who is well rep-

resented here? There is no Minnesota standard of fairness in this plan.

Finally, Mr. President, I have two other issues to mention. One is student financial aid. It is not coming up enough. I was a teacher for 20 years, and when we marked up the cuts in financial aid out of committee, I asked colleagues—and maybe they have done this—but I said to colleagues, "Have you had any town meetings on your campuses? Because the picture you seem to have of students is not the same picture I get from holding community meetings back in my State"—Moorhead State, Inver Hills Community College, Minneapolis Community College, University of Minnesota at Duluth. Because what happens to me is fully half the students, if not more, come up to me and they say, either publicly or someone who is not good at speaking in a public meeting will come up afterwards and say, "Senator, I'm a nontraditional student." That is the first sentence.

The next sentence, especially at the community colleges, is, "I am older than you"—they always like to say that—"and I lost my job. I am going back to school. I don't have the resources. Don't cut the financial aid. I am a single parent. I am the welfare mother you say you want to go into workfare. Don't cut my financial aid. Senator, we can't afford it."

Or if it is the 18-to-22-year-old group—many of our undergraduates are going to school 6 years, not 4 years and they have two and three minimum wage jobs and we are cutting financial aid for students. And then, Mr. President, there are the students who sell plasma to buy textbooks to begin the semester.

What in the world are we doing ending the grace period on the interest on loans 6 months after graduation? Why are we ending the parent plus loan program for moderate- and middle-income families? Why are we putting a tax on the institutions based on their loan portfolio? Why do we not understand that 75 percent of the student financial aid package are loans now, not grants? What in the world are we thinking?

The missing piece here is the impact on people. I have held these town meetings on campuses. I do not know, maybe other Senators have gotten a different picture from students, but that is the picture I get.

So, again, \$245 billion of tax cuts, but cuts in students financial aid; \$7 billion more than the Pentagon wants, but cuts in student financial aid.

Mr. President, I am not talking about Medicare and Medicaid and health care today, but I will tell you this, this is a rush to recklessness and it will not work in my State of Minnesota. We have done something of which I am proud. We have 300,000 children that receive medical assistance. It is a safety net program. Is that going to be cut?

I meet with people from the developmental disabilities community, and I have people say to me—I remember a woman in another town meeting. Are we holding town meetings? Are we talking to people back in the States that are going to be affected by this? She says to me—and this Chair is a close friend of mine, I respect the Chair, the Senator from New Hampshire—she says to me, "PAUL, the Americans With Disabilities Act is going to be a cruel lie for me if I don't have someone to help me get out of bed in the morning, a personal attendant. I can't go and own my own small business, and I do own my own small business. I am intelligent and I am smart and I live a life of dignity. Do you know what you are doing with cuts in medical assistance? Are you going to restrict eligibility, less access to personal attendants? Are you going to have to be poor to be eligible for any of this? What are you doing? That is the question. Don't be so reckless with our lives."

I hear the same thing in rural Minnesota. I could go on and on, Mr. President. But the question I have, by way of summary, because I do not want to dominate the floor today, is why, if we are going to do deficit reduction, not do it based on some standard of Minnesota fairness? Why do we have a disproportionate number of cuts that affect the most vulnerable citizens in this country, the poor, namely women and children? Why are we cutting financial aid for higher education? Why are we cutting into health care and the quality of health care that is delivered to people?

I am willing to argue this issue of quality later on for 20 hours plus in terms of what this is going to do for Medicare and medical assistance. But at the same time, Mr. President, you have the tax cuts that mainly go to people on the top. You have more than the Pentagon asked for. And then, finally, and this is going to be the piece that I am looking most forward to in this debate, what about all of the subsidies that go to the oil companies and the tobacco companies and the pharmaceutical companies and the insurance companies? What about all those loopholes in deductions and giveaways?

I will tell you something. I think what makes people more angry about the political process in the Nation's Capital is the feeling that some of these special interests who are the heavy hitters and hire the lobbyists and are the big players and the big givers get their way.

This is a perfect example. I am going to come out here on the floor and I am going to say—and we are going to have votes on these amendments—if you want to have deficit reduction, why do you not ask some of these large corporations that get tax giveaways to tighten their belts? Should they not be

a part of deficit reduction? You know what? Every time you do that, all sorts of colleagues think of a million reasons why we should continue to give them special tax breaks. Middle-income people do not get these breaks; working people do not get these breaks; low-income people do not get these breaks. But, oh, boy, oil companies do, pharmaceutical companies do, gas companies do, coal companies do, tobacco companies do. They all get these breaks.

So I think the debate next week ought to be about, where is the standard of fairness? Who is being well represented and who is not being well represented?

We will have a sharp debate, I say to my colleague from Georgia. It will not be hate, it will be debate, because I believe all of us have mutual respect for one another. We feel strongly about what we are doing, and I am sure we are all doing it in good faith. But I have a lot of indignation about the priorities of this deficit reduction plan. I believe it goes against the grain of the basic Minnesota standard of fairness.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. COVERDELL. I ask unanimous consent that the period for morning business be extended for another 15 minutes.

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

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I think everybody would acknowledge that we are entering a very historical moment in America's history, certainly in the context of the Congress of the United States, because we are, over the next 4 to 6 weeks, going to be making decisions—very significant decisions—about the way the American people are governed.

Of course, I always appreciate the remarks of my colleague from Minnesota. But it is almost as if he has forgotten that a new Congress was sent here this past November, and with startling results. The Congress was not sent here by any large corporation. This new majority was sent here by an overwhelming pronouncement by the American people—all these folks he is talking about, such as the workers, who said, "We want something different done in Washington," and families, saying, "We do not like what is happening in Washington." In overwhelming numbers, Americans went to the polls and said, "We want things in Washington to change."

Every speech I hear from the other side of the aisle, including from the President and the administration, is

saying, "Leave everything the way it is, it is just fine." Every time you try to change it, we come out with some new class of evil Americans who try to frighten America from the change that has to be made.

Let us talk about the President for a moment or two. When the President ran for President in 1992, he promised the American people, "I will give you a balanced budget in 5 years." Well, he has been here for a little over 2 years now, and he has not given us a balanced budget in 5 years, in 7 years, in 10 years, in no years. Why did he make that promise? He made the promise because he knew that the American people overwhelmingly are demanding that this city, this town, this Congress balance the budget. But once he got elected, he started listening to speeches like we just heard. We will just keep everything the same. No one will notice.

But the new Congress came here and said that we are going to balance the budget in 7 years. I think, somewhat to their surprise, that is exactly what we are doing. What is more—and he knows this—it is exactly what the American people want us to do. They want us to balance the budget.

Well, first, the President said he was not going to offer any budget at all after this new Congress got here. Then he went back out into the country and found out that the American people did not like that, so he offered a budget. That budget did not receive a single vote in the Senate—from our party or his. It was 99 to 0. No deal. It is not a balanced budget, Mr. President.

So then he came and said, well, I am going to offer a budget that is balanced in 10 years. The Congressional Budget Office, who the President says provide the most reliable numbers we can get, said, "We are sorry, Mr. President, but your budget does not balance in 10 years." In fact, it never balances. The President has been traveling the country back and forth saying he is giving us a budget. "Theirs is 7, mine is 10." But that is just not so. His budget never balances. I know this morning the Senator from Pennsylvania suggested that the other side of the aisle go ahead and introduce that budget if they believe so strongly in it. No one is willing to introduce the budget. Why? Because they know it does not balance. It does not do what the President said.

And then, last week, he said, "Well, maybe I will do one that is 9 years or 8 years." So now we are on about the fifth or seventh reincarnation of the President's budget. It is not really that complicated. It either balances or it does not. The Congressional Budget Office can tell us. It has now told us that the Republican budget will balance in 7 years, just like the American people are asking us to do.

I was fascinated listening to the Senator from Minnesota, because he was

talking about students and student loans. I wonder if the Senator is aware of the fact that if America—if their Congress—balances the budget, what happens to students who have to borrow money. Let me tell you what happens. A student that borrowed \$11,000, or the family that had to borrow \$11,000 for that student, if we had balanced budgets, would pay so much less interest for the loan that they would save \$2,000 on the student loan in lower interest payments. If we balance our budgets, interest rates, according to DRI/McGraw, interest rates will drop between 2 and 3 percent. That means that the American families that the Senator from Minnesota is talking about will save billions. Well, billions gets to be a number that is so big, it is kind of hard to bring down home. But let us say we are talking about an American family that had a \$75,000 home and mortgage. That family, because we balanced the budgets and because we had lower interest rates, would save between \$1,500 and \$1,700 every year. And here you have an average family. The average family income in America is \$40,000. The Government is already taking half of that money between Federal, State, and local, leaving them only half to deal with all their needs, and we can take an act up here that will lower their interest payments on their home \$1,500 to \$2,000.

We have increased their disposable income by 10 percent—increased. There is nothing we could do, there is no Government program, there is no new bureaucracy, no new system taking care of people from Washington that will do so much good for the American family—the average family—than lowering the financial burden on that family, which happens if you balance the budget. It does not happen if you do not balance the budget.

Mr. President, balancing the budget will do more for every American than any Government program we can think of. We will save them \$1,500 on a home mortgage of \$75,000. We will save them \$900 in lower interest rates if they buy a car. We will save them \$2,000 in lower interest rates if they are borrowing money to send students to school.

The American family knows this. That is why 70 to 80 percent of them have been banging on the door of this town saying, "For Heaven's sakes, get your spending under control. Quit taxing us to death. Quit spending money you do not have. Quit spending the future opportunity of our children."

Balancing the budget will produce a rainbow and a nest egg in the checking account of every average family in America. Make no mistake about it. The great burden of running this Government falls on the average American family—not on the rich. You could take all the money the rich produce and you could not run this Government.

In the end, it is the average American that bears the burden—not the poor. It is the average American. The greatest good that we can do for that family is to balance our budget.

Now, Mr. President, several days ago the President admitted—which I was shocked about, but he did—the President said in speaking to a fundraising audience, "I will surprise you, because I think I raised taxes too high in 1993." That is a pretty big mistake, Mr. President.

We raised taxes at a historical level—\$250 billion—some-odd in new taxes—the highest in American history, and now the President says maybe that was a mistake. Not maybe it was a mistake, it was a mistake.

Why did he raise taxes? So that the Federal Government could spend more so that our deficits would continue to increase, so that interest rates are higher on every family, and they are paying thousands upon thousands of dollars because we do not have a balanced budget.

The President has now said that tax increase was a mistake. We agree with him. What we are saying is we are going to help the President fix that mistake. We are going to lower the economic burden on the American family.

He raised taxes \$255 billion. We are going to lower it \$245 billion. A lot of people try to connect that to the Medicare argument, which is a totally separate thing. The real connection here is between the President's tax increase of 1993 and the Republican tax refund of 1995. He raised them \$255 billion and we are going to lower it \$245 billion.

He said it was a mistake. It was. It has affected the economic stability of every middle-class family. Now we are going to lower it. We are going to help those very American families by lowering the economic pressure on them and relieving them from the pressure that he exacted in 1993.

We are going to balance the budget. We are going to lower interest rates in every American home. We are going to, therefore, expand the economy and therefore people are going to have shorter lines waiting to get a job. We are going to put hundreds of thousands of Americans to work because we balanced this budget.

Mr. President, we are going to reform welfare. Every American knows it needs to be done. Mr. President, we are going to secure Medicare for a quarter of a century. The trustees said it will go bankrupt in 6 years, but we are going to change that and strengthen it and keep it healthy for 25 years, according to the CBO yesterday. We are going to lower the economic burden and pressure on the American family by lowering taxes.

Every one of those things that we are talking about, every one of them, the American people want to have happen. Mr. President, it is time the Congress

did what the American people wanted up here.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak not to exceed 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As in morning business?

Mr. BYRD. It does not matter.

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

Mr. BYRD. I did not mean to give the Chair a short answer. I thought my request covered the situation very well.

UNITY ON BOSNIA POLICY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, there has been substantial movement toward a peace agreement among the warring factions in Bosnia, and the President deserves great credit for exercising strong leadership for moving this process forward in the last 2 months. The conflict has gone on too long, and the horrendous spectacle of ethnic cleansing and prolonged, widespread inhumanity in the Balkans offends and disgusts all civilized society. It is clear that our European partners in NATO have been unable to bring the fighting to a halt and will be unable, Mr. President, to bring a lasting peace in the Balkans without strong American leadership. One might well argue that it is a European problem—and it is—and the European nations should be able to achieve a peaceful settlement without us—and they should. That would be what I think most people would like to see. But that has demonstrably not been the case over the last 2-3 years of carnage in Bosnia. Therefore, the President has taken a strong role in leading our allies to bring the parties to the peace table. A peace agreement has not yet been reached, but negotiations, so-called "proximity talks," will begin at the end of this month of October, in Dayton, Ohio.

Mr. President, Administration officials have testified that the United States should participate in any NATO operation which would implement an accord that is reached among the warring parties. The Secretaries of Defense and State, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have all testified that the operation would be a NATO operation, and that there would be no so-called "dual key" command and control structure which includes a decision-making role by the United Nations. Those command and control arrangements were an abject failure in the U.N. operation in Bosnia over the last several years. The United Nations has tried valiantly to play a peaceful role in Bosnia, but it is clear that up to now there has been no peace to keep and that the ferocity and hatreds which have consumed the Bosnian factions have overwhelmed the ability of the United Nations to operate in a peace-enforcing role there. Therefore,

it is appropriate that NATO assume any peacekeeping responsibility, since only the clear promise of overwhelming and swift retaliation against any group or individual that violates a peace accord is necessary for such an accord to work in the environment of the Balkans.

Mr. President, the question has arisen as to what role the Congress will play in determining the policy and possible deployment of American forces to the Balkans in connection with a peace treaty. There is substantial risk of casualties there, in spite of the fact that the purpose of any NATO force would be to police and implement an agreement among the parties. Cease fires in the Balkans have been routinely entered into and they have been just as routinely violated. The parties to the conflict cannot resist, it seems—cannot resist the temptation to take advantage of temporary weaknesses of their opponents to gain more territory or to commit more atrocities. Furthermore, the terrain is treacherous, made more so by the harshness of winter weather, which is the likely season that this accord will be reached, and, hopefully, such an accord will be reached.

I believe that any President, Democrat or Republican, is on dubious constitutional ground in deploying forces to be at risk abroad without the positive action in support thereof, by the Congress.

We could debate this all we want to debate it. I know we say, on the one hand, any President does not need Congress' approval. On the other hand, there are those who say he needs congressional approval. And there are arguments to be made on both sides. But I think of the wild animals in the forest, the lion, the tiger, the elephant—the wild animals in the forest. At some point or another they have to come to the waterhole. There is a big waterhole in that forest. Some may have to come sooner than others. But eventually they all have to come to the waterhole.

Well, the power of the purse is the waterhole in the constitutional process. The appropriation of money is the waterhole. So we can argue all we want, until we are blue in the face. But in the final analysis, unless that appropriation is there, unless the funds are provided, the use of military forces would automatically have to be cut off, you see. So that is the waterhole. We can argue all we want, but that power of the purse is the most effective power in the whole constitutional system—the power of the purse. That is why I have stood on my feet many, many times in the Senate and argued against shifting that power of the purse to the executive branch.

Well, I will not go further into that at this point. But we should all keep in mind the waterhole. All government agencies have to come down to the waterhole, sooner or later.

Well, only the Congress can fund such operations, and Congress has the sole responsibility, under the Constitution, to raise and maintain land and naval forces. But, aside from this constitutional requirement, from a commonsense political perspective, I think that any President is well advised to gain the prior support of the Congress, and therefore the American people, before committing forces that risk casualties, which will result in the expenditure of substantial sums of money, and which might be employed over a period of rather extended duration. Regardless of the differences between this proposed operation and the American deployment in 1990 to the Middle East to counter the aggression of Iraq against Kuwait, the risks, the costs, and the duration of peace implementation in Bosnia argue for the same need—the same need—for the President to solicit and gain the support of the Congress before going forward. As I wrote to the President on October 13th, I believe he should welcome the opportunity to rally the Nation behind him and ask for the approval of Congress for this proposed mission. As I stated in that letter, "while this effort, of course, risks rejection, a sure political foundation seems essential to carry it over the shoals and storms of difficulties which could possibly confront our forces during an extended period of American military involvement." In my letter to President Clinton, I encouraged him to seek Congressional support and endorsement of any deployment of U.S. forces to the Balkans which might be required to enforce a peace agreement.

I am pleased to report to my colleagues that the President has responded to my inquiry, and he has responded in a most positive way. He wrote a letter to me, dated October 19, 1995, in which he says that he "would welcome, encourage, and, at the appropriate time, request an expression of support by Congress promptly after a peace agreement is reached."

Promptly after a peace agreement is reached. Let me say that again. He states that he "would welcome, encourage, and, at the appropriate time, request an expression of support by Congress promptly after a peace agreement is reached. Such an expression of support would be in the national interest." Mr. President, I congratulate and commend President Clinton for taking this position. It will require a debate over the detailed plans adopted by the President to lead a NATO deployment, if and when an acceptable peace treaty is reached among the parties.

I emphasize the preliminary nature of these assurances. Delicate negotiations are underway among the parties, with the strong intermediary role played by this Administration and others in the European region. We in this body, in what we do and say, need to be

cognizant of the delicacy of this process. It would be unfortunate if Congressional action at this time made that process more difficult. It would be most unfortunate if the peace process were to be derailed by premature action here as to what we would or would not do or should or should not do in the event of an agreement. Let us wait and see what the Administration can accomplish with the parties in the upcoming negotiations.

Given the preliminary nature of this process, I certainly cannot say today what my position will be on an American deployment. The President will have to make a clear case and a strong case, and a convincing case for it, if he desires to employ American forces on the ground in Bosnia. There will be a debate. There will be a thorough examination and understanding as to what the American national interests are in that event. I, personally, will approach such a request for Congressional support with an open mind.

The President goes on in his letter to me to say that "our foreign policy works best when we are united in purpose . . . I intend to work with the Congress to make this happen." Mr. President, there will need to be a very detailed understanding of the risks, duration, the nature of forces to be deployed, the command and control arrangements, the funding, and many other aspects of the ingredients of the participation of our forces in implementing any of these treaties involved. There undoubtedly will be a major debate, as occurred in the Senate before President Bush deployed forces in combat against Iraq. Now is not the time for that debate, or for second guessing. Let us let history take its course, certain that the President will, as he has promised, request Congressional support, endorsement, and participation when the details of an accord are reached and when the allies have determined whether and how NATO should implement it.

Mr. President, the President's letter is short. I shall read it into the RECORD.

DEAR ROBERT: Thank you for letter regarding whether or not I will seek Congressional authorization prior to committing United States troops to a NATO implementation force in Bosnia. I welcome the opportunity to set forth my position.

While maintaining the constitutional authorities of the Presidency, I would welcome, encourage and, at the appropriate time, request an expression of support by Congress promptly after a peace agreement is reached.

So, Mr. President, what could be more clear as to the President's intention?

Such an expression of support would be in the national interest. I believe, however, action at this time is premature pending the proximity peace talks to be held in Dayton, Ohio at the end of this month. I hope as the peace talks commence we can continue the process begun in Congressional hearings to

brief and consult with Congress so that we secure the widest support possible for peace.

Those hearings have begun. They began in the Armed Services Committee just a few days ago, and the able Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH], who is presently presiding over the Senate with a degree of dignity and grace and skill that is "so rare as a day in June," was present at the hearing, as I was, when we heard testimony.

As you know, our foreign policy works best when we are united in purpose. We have an historic opportunity in Bosnia to change the course of events, to prevent the spread of the conflict and to end the human suffering that has plagued the people of the region for so long. I intend to work with Congress to make this happen.

Thank you again for your words of support.
Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD not only the President's letter but also my letter addressed to him, and to which I have alluded earlier in my remarks.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC, October 13, 1995.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT CLINTON: Press reports today quote Secretary of Defense William Perry as stating that your Administration will not seek Congressional authorization prior to committing United States troops to a NATO peacekeeping operation in Bosnia, although such authorization would be "welcome." If the reports are accurate, I urge you to reconsider this decision and actively seek prior authorization for this mission.

Given the gravity, risks, and costs associated with an extended peacekeeping operation in Bosnia, I think it would be wise to have the support of the American people and Congress behind you. I believe the Congressional majority should share full responsibility, from the outset, for any decision to accept the costs and risks of this proposed operation. As you know, President Bush sought and received the support of Congress and the American people for Operation Desert Storm in Iraq. That support would have been invaluable to him had the initial casualty predictions been realized, or if international contributions had not reimbursed U.S. costs associated with the mission.

Without outlining the risks and benefits of U.S. involvement in Bosnia and gaining the consent and cooperation of Congress in advance, it may well be difficult, if not impossible, to sustain or to pay for such involvement, particularly if factional fighting recurs. Secretary Perry was also quoted in the press as saying that it is "not only a possibility, but likely" that paramilitary groups would target U.S. forces in Bosnia.

I believe you should welcome the opportunity to use your considerable persuasive skills to rally the nation behind you, and that you should ask for the approval of Congress for this proposed mission before it commences. While this effort, of course, risks rejection, a sure political foundation seems essential to carry it over the shoals and storms of difficulties which could possibly confront

our forces during an extended period of American military involvement. It should also serve as a signal to those who might consider testing our staying power that a strong measure of bipartisan and popular support underpins it.

As always, I appreciate your thoughtful consideration of my views on matters of this importance to our nation and your Presidency.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. BYRD.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, DC, October 19, 1995.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR ROBERT: Thank you for your letter regarding whether or not I will seek Congressional authorization prior to committing United States troops to a NATO implementation force in Bosnia. I welcome the opportunity to set forth my position.

While maintaining the constitutional authorities of the Presidency, I would welcome, encourage and, at the appropriate time, request an expression of support by Congress promptly after a peace agreement is reached. Such an expression of support would be in the national interest. I believe, however, action at this time is premature pending the proximity of peace talks to be held in Dayton, Ohio at the end of this month. I hope as the peace talks commence we can continue the process begun in Congressional hearings to brief and consult with Congress so that we secure the widest support possible for peace.

As you know, our foreign policy works best when we are united in purpose. We have an historic opportunity in Bosnia to change the course of events, to prevent the spread of the conflict and to end the human suffering that has plagued the people of the region for so long. I intend to work with Congress to make this happen.

Thank you again for your words of support.
Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GREGG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I first want to congratulate the Senator from West Virginia on his fine remarks relative to the issue of Bosnia. It is not my purpose to rise on that issue but I would make a comment that I think it is good that the President is willing to come to the Congress for prior authorization, as the Senate is familiar with the sense of the Senate which passed last week which I offered requesting the President to come to the Congress for prior approval.

I also suggest, however, that, if we wait until the agreement is reached on a peace accommodation or a peace accord, we may well be past the time when the Congress can take action effectively; that there has been discussion of the fact that we would have a very short time after a peace agreement has been reached to expect troops to be introduced into the region; in fact, 96 to 100 hours has been the discussion. Obviously, that would give a

very short window for the Congress to express its views on whether or not we should be putting American soldiers at risk on the ground in Bosnia.

So I hope that we can take up this subject more substantively before a peace agreement is reached, if it is reached.

THE BUDGET

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I rise to associate myself with the remarks made earlier in the day by the Senator from Pennsylvania, Senator SANTORUM, who was addressing the fact that we have heard a great deal from the administration on the issue of their budget, and whether or not they have a budget which reaches a balanced budget.

As we all know, we on the Republican side of the aisle have produced a budget that reaches a balance, is scored by CBO as reaching balance over the next 7 years, and is the first budget to do so in the last 25 years. It is a budget that does this by reforming—and, I think, significantly improving—many of the functions of Government. We end for, example, welfare as an entitlement, and say to people in this country who seek to receive the support of the Government through welfare payments that they are expected to work after a certain amount of time on welfare, and they will only have the right to be on welfare for a period of up to 5 years throughout their lifetime.

It also addresses the issue of Medicaid by returning the authority for managing Medicaid with the dollars to the States, a major step forward in my opinion. For example, in the State of New Hampshire I know that we will be able to deliver better health care to our indigent, to our people who are in need of health care who qualify for Medicaid, and to the disabled, especially young mothers with children, mothers with young children, and our young men also, in a much more efficient and effective way with probably more dollars in those programs by having the State manage that program at the State level and not having it be a Federal program.

We have in our budget reform improved significantly and strengthened the Medicare Program. In fact, we have taken the Medicare Program—which is on the brink of bankruptcy, according to the Medicare trustees headed in that direction, and will be there by the year 2002, and will begin next year to spend more money than it takes in, and thus starts this death spiral toward bankruptcy—taking that program, reform it, strengthen it, and will be giving our seniors dramatic new choices which they do not have today for alternative forms of health care delivery while retaining their right, preserving their right, to continue in their pre-Medicare delivery system, if they wish it, with their present doctors.

That Medicare reform and strengthening is done in I think a way that is fairly consistent with what is happening in the private sector. It is using the marketplace, saying to the senior citizens of this country, "Listen, you should have the same choices those of us in Congress have. You should not be limited in your ability to choose other types of health care."

So we have put forward plans which I believe are very aggressive, very effective, and very positive in reforming Government, in downsizing the rate of growth of the Federal Government, and in delivering a balanced budget.

Why have we done this? Republicans recognize that, if you do not do something about the problems of this country in the area of the deficit, we are going to be driving this country into bankruptcy.

This chart reflects that fact. The red lines represent entitlement spending; the blue lines discretionary spending; and, the yellow line is interest on the Federal debt. You will note that the green line represents the revenues of the Federal Government. You will see from this chart that, if we continue on our present path with the present rate of growth as a Government, beginning in the year 2010 we will only have enough money as a Government to pay for interest on the Federal debt and entitlement spending. That means all spending such as defense spending, spending on education, and spending on the environment, we will not be able to afford.

Beginning in about the year 2017, we will only have enough money to pay for the entitlement spending of the Federal Government, which means we will not be able to pay interest on the Federal debt.

What does that mean? That means we end up like Mexico was about a year and a half ago. We will be insolvent as a nation. We will have passed on to our children a country that is essentially bankrupt. It is not fair, not right, not appropriate, and it is not something this Congress is going to allow happen. That is why, as Republicans, we came forward with this rather dramatic idea of balancing the budget, and we delivered on it. We have produced a budget that is in balance.

However, the issue is, has the President done the same thing? Has he been a substantive player in this process? Has he contributed to it? That is the issue raised earlier today by the Senator from Pennsylvania when he suggested a sense-of-the-Senate resolution which would basically allow the other side, if they felt confident in the President's numbers, to put forward the President's budget and say, all right, we stand by the President's budget as an approach to balancing the budget.

I have not heard anyone from the other side of the aisle take up the Senator from Pennsylvania on that issue,

and I do not expect we will because, as a practical matter, the President has not come forward with anything that reflects any type of a balanced budget.

CBO, which is the fair arbiter of scoring in this institution, and which the President designated as the fair arbiter of scoring at the beginning of his term in office in his first address to the joint session of the Congress, has calculated that the President's budget as sent up in February was out of balance by at least \$200 billion per year as far as the eye could see, adding \$1 trillion of new debt to the backs of our children over the next 7 years, and that his most recent submission, which was not sent up in budget form but was sent up basically in outline form, is also entirely out of balance and does not accomplish any sort of cloture on the deficit over that same timeframe of 10 years, which he professes as being the period when we should be balancing the budget. And so there is no proposal on the table from this administration which would lead us to a balanced budget.

That gets to the core of the issue. When you hear from the other side of the aisle, as we heard earlier today from the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from California and the Senator from Minnesota, that our budget is insensitive, that we are not caring, that we are dastardly individuals on this side for trying to balance the budget because it impacts this group or that group—many of which representations, by the way, were inaccurate, especially in reference to the WIC Program—but when you hear those allegations, you have to ask yourself, what is the true insensitivity and unfairness in this country today? Is it not really that we as a generation, our generation—I am talking now about the postwar baby-boom generation, the Bill Clinton generation, of which I happen to be a member—is running up a huge debt for our day-to-day expenses, for expenses which we incur and enjoy the fruits of today but are not willing to pay for today, that we are taking that bill and passing it on to our children?

Is not the true injustice that is occurring today to the people of this country, and especially to the children of this country and to the next generation of this country, that if we continue on our present course we will be the first, the first generation in the history of this great and wonderful country—now, again I am referring to the postwar baby-boom generation—the first generation to pass on less to our children than was passed on to us by our elders.

That is the true insensitivity, and so we have addressed it, and we have addressed it in a very positive way, I believe.

Mr. President, I would simply conclude my remarks by saying that I believe the President of the United

States has an obligation to engage in this process substantively rather than politically. He has engaged very well politically. There is no question about that. He has managed to go to almost every interest group in this country, including one group in the Midwest, to this group in the South, to that group in the West, far West, and represent that he is on their side in this budget issue.

I suggest that he come to the Congress and make specific proposals which do lead to a balanced budget rather than proposals which are simply structured for his reelection campaign. If he were to come to this Congress with proposals which would lead to a balanced budget, which were substantive, where he actually put on the table a budget with numbers balanced by CBO, we could close this matter rather quickly and, as a result, pass a better opportunity for a good life to our children, which is our primary obligation as Members of the Senate.

I notice the Senator from Louisiana has some guests present, and I would be happy to pause in my comments and in fact yield back my time so that the Senator from Louisiana can introduce his guests.

Mr. JOHNSTON addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friend.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF THE PRESIDENT AND FIRST LADY OF MONGOLIA

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator HATFIELD and myself, I would like to introduce to the Senate the distinguished President of Mongolia, President Ochirbat and the First Lady, First Lady Tsevelmaa. Mr. Ochirbat is not only President of Mongolia, but he is generally credited with being the architect of democracy in Mongolia.

Senator HATFIELD and I, and a number of other United States Senators, had the great pleasure and honor of going to Mongolia in August of this year, and frankly we were overwhelmed not only with the friendship extended to us but with the importance of this country, its strategic location in Asia and its friendship toward America.

So we welcome the President of Mongolia and the First Lady, and look forward to many years of friendship with the President and his great country.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HOLLINGS addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask consent that morning business be ex-

tended for another 20 minutes and I be recognized for that period.

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

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Chair.

TREATMENT OF THE DEFICIT

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I want to touch on an article in the morning news relative to how we have historically dealt with the problem of budget deficits. But first, let me touch on the point raised by my distinguished colleague from New Hampshire relative to the Congressional Budget Office's scoring of the Republican budget as balanced. I hope everyone within the sound of my ears and the view of this particular C-SPAN coverage will look at the RECORD. Yes, on the day before yesterday, on October 18—and you will find it in your CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 15263—a letter was included in the RECORD from the Director of the Congressional Budget Office doing exactly as the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire claimed. CBO said that not only was the GOP budget in balance but that by the year 2002, there would be a \$10 billion surplus.

That was day before yesterday. On yesterday, October 19, if you please, Mr. President, another letter was sent from CBO to Senators CONRAD and DORGAN. I ask unanimous consent at this particular point that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
U.S. CONGRESS,

Washington, DC, October 19, 1995.

Hon. KENT CONRAD,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: Pursuant to Section 205(a) of the budget resolution for fiscal year 1996 (H. Con. Res. 67), the Congressional Budget Office yesterday provided the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee with a projection of the budget deficits or surpluses that would result from enactment of the reconciliation legislation submitted to the Budget Committee. As specified in section 205(a), CBO provided projections (using the economic and technical assumptions underlying the budget resolution and assuming the level of discretionary spending specified in that resolution) of the deficit or surplus of the total budget—that is, the deficit or surplus resulting from all budgetary transactions of the federal government, including Social Security and Postal Service spending and receipts that are designated as off-budget transactions. As stated in the letter to Chairman Domenici, CBO projected that there will be a total-budget surplus of \$10 billion in 2002. Excluding an estimated off-budget surplus of \$108 billion in 2002 from the calculation, CBO would project an on-budget deficit of \$98 billion in 2002.

If you wish further details on this projection, we will be pleased to provide them. The staff contact is Jim Horney, who can be reached at 226-2880.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Chair. Let me just highlight the pertinent part:

As specified in section 205(a), CBO provided projections on spending specified in that resolution of the deficit or surplus of the total budget, that is, the deficit or surplus resulting from all budgetary transactions of the Federal Government, including Social Security and Postal Service spending and receipts that are designated as off-budget transactions.

As stated in the letter to Chairman Domenici, CBO projected that there will be a total budget surplus of \$10 billion in 2002. Excluding an estimated off-budget surplus of \$108 billion in 2002 from the calculation, CBO would project an on-budget deficit of \$98 billion.

So, unlike 2 days ago, when the CBO scored the GOP budget as having a \$10 billion surplus in the seventh year, yesterday CBO scored it as leaving us with a \$98 billion deficit. It piqued my interest because the CBO used the expression in the letter to Senator CONRAD "including Social Security and Postal Service spending and receipts."

What bothers me about that clause is that, this Senator, along with my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, the former Senator John Heinz, co-sponsored an amendment that passed the Congress and was enacted by the President—namely, section 13301 of the Congressional Budget Act, which orders that Social Security funds shall not be used in citing in deficits or surpluses of the Government. That particular section puts Social Security off budget and in trust.

But today we learn that a mistake was made over at CBO. In considering the size of the Social Security surplus in the year 2002, they did not catch the fact that the Finance Committee had banked on a small change in the CPI, otherwise known as the Consumer Price Index. In turn, a reduction in the CPI reduces the amount of cost-of-living adjustments paid to Social Security recipients.

Under the law, this change in Social Security payments does not divert money to lower the deficit or to fund the general budget. Instead, if you save money in Social Security, the money merely adds to the surpluses in the Social Security trust fund.

Right now, Mr. President, we have a surplus of \$481 billion in Social Security. We have a surplus in Medicare of \$147 billion. And instead of recognizing that fact, we run around knocking over desks to get on TV and carry on about things that will happen 7 years from now for Medicare, 30 years from now with Social Security. What we don't do is to pay attention to the crisis that is happening right this minute.

And that brings me to the morning editorial by our friend, Mr. J. W. Anderson of the editorial staff of the Washington Post.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial in its entirety, entitled "This

Is Leadership?" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 20, 1995]

THIS IS LEADERSHIP?—SINCE 1973, THE DEFICIT HAS BEEN CENTRAL TO AMERICAN POLITICS

(By J.W. Anderson)

President Clinton's repudiation of his 1993 tax increase, followed by his ungainly scramble to repudiate the repudiation, has inflicted a severe injury on himself and his party. It becomes increasingly difficult to know exactly what he stands for.

His first budget with its tax increase and its attack on the deficit is arguably the bravest, and certainly the most useful, of his accomplishments as president. Now, alas, he's running after the Republicans' tax-cut bandwagon and throwing the best of his own record into doubt. But it's not unprecedented. President Bush, running for reelection in 1992, repudiated the tax increase that he had accepted in the very constructive budget compromise of 1990.

This country seems to be going through a series of presidencies eroded and diminished by the savage politics of intractable budget quarrels. How long will it continue? It's hard to say. The process has been going on for more than 20 years, and progress has been slow.

The origins of today's budget fights lie in the pivotal year 1973—the year that the great postwar boom ended.

For a quarter of a century, from the late 1940s into the early 1970s, standards of living improved faster than ever before in history. It happened throughout the world, but most spectacularly in the developed industrial democracies. As the long boom continued, governments began to think that they had at last solved the mysteries of economic growth and that they now knew how to keep their economies expanding steadily and rapidly.

The only question was the pleasant one of how best to spend the flood of wealth, private and public, that this boom was generating. Most of the democracies decided to put much of the new revenues into new and expanded social benefits—mainly pensions for the elderly and health care. In those years here in the United States, Medicare and Medicaid were enacted, and Social Security was greatly increased. In Western Europe, where the war years had created a hunger for security beyond anything in the American tradition, this expansion of benefits went much farther.

Then, in 1973, the boom suddenly ended. Economic historians still aren't quite sure why it happened. The oil crisis had something to do with it and perhaps the American decision to take the dollar off the gold standard. But whatever the reasons, throughout the rich democracies—here in North America, in Western Europe and in Japan alike—the economic growth rates dropped to half the level of the previous 25 years.

The consequences have been huge. One of them was that high growth no longer produced the immense increases in tax revenues on which all those governments had been counting to finance the new social entitlements. But, having put those pensions and health insurance laws in place, they couldn't retreat from them. The result was the era— which still continues—of big budget deficits.

The United States is struggling with a deficit that now, counting all levels of government including states and municipalities,

comes to about 2.2 percent of gross domestic product. All of the other big industrial democracies have bigger deficits—some of them much, much bigger.

The budget deficit has become central to American politics. It's the same in Europe, and more so because all of the European Union countries have agreed to get their deficits down as a condition of joining the common currency at the end of the decade. Most of them clearly won't make it, and they fear being shut out of continental prosperity. Just as deficit politics is weakening the American president, it's having the same effect in Europe. The most notable example at the moment is France's new president, Jacques Chirac, who is caught between economic reality and a series of unwise campaign promises.

The strongest political leader in Europe is Helmut Kohl, Germany's chancellor, who has responded forcefully to deficit dangers by slamming a heavy surtax on top of a tax burden that was already high. It's to pay the costs of modernizing formerly communist eastern Germany. Other presidents and prime ministers don't have the advantage of a widely accepted public need like that one.

Here in the United States, the past 22 years' record suggests that the country will coast along, weakened and distracted by its budget troubles until they produce a real financial crisis. Americans, and particularly American politicians, are good at meeting crises. Nothing short of a genuine crisis, it seems, can generate enough public attention and concern to make a real solution possible and return the federal budget to the small deficits of the years before 1973.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Chair.

Summarizing, if you please, Mr. President, Mr. Anderson states that "from the late 1940's into the early 1970's, standards of living have improved faster than ever before" in the history of this Nation. We had surplus moneys, and the only question was "how best to spend the flood of wealth, private and public. . ." And, as a result, we greatly increased Social Security, health care, Medicare, Medicaid and all these particular programs.

Then Mr. Anderson goes on and says, now wait.

Then, in 1973, the boom suddenly ended. . . (T)he oil crisis had something to do with it, taking the dollar off the gold standard had something to do with it. . . . The budget deficit has become central to American politics.

He cites how Europe has confronted this particular problem whereby the European countries have agreed that their deficits must be reduced as a condition of joining the common currency and, emphasizing, I quote,

The strongest political leader in Europe is Helmut Kohl, Germany's Chancellor, who has responded forcefully to deficit dangers by slamming a heavy surtax on top of a tax burden that was already high.

Now, that is historic, having the media praise somebody for increasing taxes. Let me go to the concluding sentence here of the Anderson article that I included in the RECORD.

And I quote:

Nothing short of a genuine crisis, it seems, can generate enough public attention and

concern to make a real solution possible and return the Federal budget to the small deficits of the years before 1973.

Now, my point here, Mr. President, is, we have a crisis right here and now. The gentleman says, "Nothing short of a genuine crisis * * * can generate enough public attention." The only hope we have is to use the free media to reveal that crisis. The press corps absolutely refuse to do it. They continue to report deficits in the terms of what they call a unified deficit, which, contrary to the law, includes the borrowing from the trust funds.

I can show you what I mean in article after article where \$161.4 billion is cited as last year's deficit. The true deficit was \$283.3 billion—because that is what you get if you subtract out your Social Security moneys, your civil service and military retirement, your Medicare and all the rest of the trust funds that you are going to have to pay back. And as of this minute, we owe the trust funds \$1.255 trillion.

Now, under the Republican 7-year budget, we are going to use another \$636 billion of Social Security moneys. So instead of owing Social Security \$481 billion today, in 2002 we are going to owe over \$1 trillion all the while

beating our breast and saying that we are balancing the budget.

We have got to cut out the gamesmanship and get down to truth in budgeting. Mr. President, it is a heck of a note to have to write the Congressional Budget Office and ask, "In accordance with the law, would you please cite the deficit?"

On one day, they cite a surplus of \$10 billion. Then when we asked them to comply with the law, they said, "Excuse us, there is a deficit of \$98 billion." Now they have corrected that little mistake and got it up to \$115 billion.

Just the other Sunday, I was listening to Mr. Russert on "Meet the Press" asking Mr. Panetta: "Will you withstand those political charges and go along with this reduction in cost-of-living increases in order to balance the budget?"

Going along, with lowering cost-of-living increases in Social Security, does not balance the budget. It enhances the Social Security surplus. He said time and again on that particular program to Mr. MOYNIHAN.

My point is that historically we have gotten into the hands of the Phil-

istines. I saw this start back in West Virginia with our friend, President John F. Kennedy, when he was Candidate Kennedy. They never expected in West Virginia that upbeat Harvard graduate was going to best the populous Hubert Humphrey. But Jack Kennedy had Lou Harris and played all the hot-button issues like a Stradivarius.

He came out on top, and then the rule of thumb came for all national elections, "Get yourself a pollster."

Our trouble is that the media act in complicity with the politicians. They get irritated or annoyed if you try to explain an issue. They want a quick, pithy, confrontational answer to any particular item. They do not care about an issue, they do not understand it, and they continue to report what is not the fact, namely, that you are balancing your budget when they know otherwise.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the budget table be printed in the RECORD.

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

BUDGET TABLES
(Outlays in billions)

Year	Government budget	Trust funds	Unified deficit	Real deficit	Gross Federal debt	Gross interest
1968	178.1	3.1	-25.2	-28.3	368.7	14.6
1969	183.6	-0.3	+3.2	+2.9	365.8	16.6
1970	195.6	12.3	-2.8	-15.1	380.9	19.3
1971	210.2	4.3	-23.0	-27.3	408.2	21.0
1972	230.7	4.3	-23.4	-27.7	435.9	21.8
1973	245.7	15.5	-14.9	-30.4	466.3	24.2
1974	269.4	11.5	-6.1	-17.6	483.9	29.3
1975	332.3	4.8	-53.2	-58.0	541.9	32.7
1976	371.8	13.4	-73.7	-87.1	629.0	37.1
1977	409.2	23.7	-53.7	-77.4	706.4	41.9
1978	458.7	11.0	-59.2	-70.2	776.6	48.7
1979	504.0	12.2	-40.7	-52.9	829.5	59.9
1980	590.9	5.8	-73.8	-79.6	909.1	74.8
1981	678.2	6.7	-79.0	-85.7	994.8	95.5
1982	745.8	14.5	-128.0	-142.5	1,137.3	117.2
1983	808.4	26.6	-207.8	-234.4	1,371.7	128.7
1984	851.8	7.6	-185.4	-193.0	1,564.7	153.9
1985	946.4	40.6	-212.3	-252.9	1,817.6	178.9
1986	990.3	81.8	-221.2	-303.0	2,120.6	190.3
1987	1,003.9	75.7	-149.8	-225.5	2,346.1	195.3
1988	1,064.1	100.0	-155.2	-255.2	2,601.3	214.1
1989	1,143.2	114.2	-152.5	-266.7	2,868.0	240.9
1990	1,252.7	117.2	-221.4	-338.6	3,206.6	264.7
1991	1,323.8	122.7	-269.2	-391.9	3,598.5	285.5
1992	1,380.9	113.2	-290.4	-403.6	4,002.1	292.3
1993	1,408.2	94.2	-255.1	-349.3	4,351.4	292.5
1994	1,460.6	89.1	-203.2	-292.3	4,643.7	296.3
1995	1,530.0	121.9	-161.4	-283.3	4,927.0	336.0
1996 estimate	1,583.0	121.8	-189.3	-311.1	5,238.0	348.0

Source: CBO's January, April, and August 1995 Reports.

Year 2002 (billion)	
1996 Budget: Kasich Conf. Report, p. 3 (deficit)	-\$108
1996 Budget Outlays (CBO est.)	1,583
1995 Budget Outlays	1,530
Increased spending	+53
CBO Baseline Assuming Budget Resolution:	
Outlays	1,874
Revenues	1,884
This Assumes:	
(1) Discretionary Freeze Plus Discretionary Cuts (in 2002)	-121
(2) Entitlement Cuts and Interest Savings (in 2002)	-226

(3) Using SS Trust Fund (in 2002)

Total reduction (in 2002)

Mr. HOLLINGS. You can see how the spending has gone up. For example, from 1995 to 1996, spending goes from \$1,530,000,000,000 in spending to \$1,583,000,000,000 in spending. In other words, while we say that we are cutting spending, in fact we have increased spending 53 billion bucks.

Under the GOP plan we are supposed to cut \$45 billion in spending this year. If you see in the last year of their plan you have to have a freeze of \$96 billion, additional cuts of \$25 billion—cuts in

entitlements of \$159 billion and interest savings of \$67 billion, for a total of \$226 billion—plus the Social Security trust fund of \$115 billion.

Now those are a lot of facts and figures, but what I am saying is you have to have total reductions in 2002 of \$462 billion. Let's get real. If you cannot, with a new group of freshmen spurring us to cut, get \$45 billion, how are you going to get \$462 billion?

That is why I told my colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, if this particular plan balanced in the year 2002, I would jump off the Capitol dome. There is no chance of that. They know it and I know it.

In the Commerce Committee, for example, we have presumed to save \$15 billion. The truth is—and we all know it in the Commerce Committee—that \$4.5 billion of the \$15 billion is already expended in the telecom bill.

That has occurred in a lot of these other committees. In the Finance Committee yesterday, they have a mechanism for Medicare called BELT. You find out that the poor, the sick, and taxpayers in America are the ones that are going to be belted. That little phrase requires that if Congress comes

in say \$40 billion shy, they push off the heavy lifting on to the next Congress.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that a chart which I compiled earlier this year with respect to "The Realities on Truth in Budgeting," be printed in the RECORD.

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

HOLLINGS RELEASES REALITIES ON TRUTH IN BUDGETING

Reality No. 1: \$1.2 trillion in spending cuts is necessary.

Reality No. 2: There aren't enough savings in entitlements. Have welfare reform, but a

jobs program will cost; savings are questionable. Health reform can and should save some, but slowing growth from 10 to 5 percent doesn't offer enough savings. Social Security won't be cut and will be off-budget again.

Reality No. 3: We should hold the line on the budget on Defense; that would be no savings.

Reality No. 4: Savings must come from freezes and cuts in domestic discretionary spending but that's not enough to stop hemorrhaging interest costs.

Reality No. 5: Taxes are necessary to stop hemorrhage in interest costs.

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Deficit CBO Jan. 1995 (using trust funds)	207	224	225	253	284	297	322
Freeze discretionary outlays after 1998	0	0	0	-19	-38	-58	-78
Spending cuts	-37	-74	-111	-128	-146	-163	-180
Interest savings	-1	-5	-11	-20	-32	-46	-64
Total savings (\$1.2 trillion)	-38	-79	-122	-167	-216	-267	-322
Remaining deficit using trust funds	169	145	103	86	68	30	0
Remaining deficit excluding trust funds	287	264	222	202	185	149	121
5 percent VAT	96	155	172	184	190	196	200
Net deficit excluding trust funds	187	97	27	(17)	(54)	(111)	(159)
Gross debt	5,142	5,257	5,300	5,305	5,272	5,200	5,091
Average interest rate on debt (percent)	7.0	7.1	6.9	6.8	6.7	6.7	6.7
Interest cost on the debt	367	370	368	368	366	360	354

Note.—Figures are in billions. Figures don't include the billions necessary for a middle-class tax cut.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I showed the cuts necessary at that time and showed that if you wanted to balance the budget without using the trust funds you had to increase revenues as well as cut spending.

Governors pay their bills, mayors pay their bills, but not us in Congress and the President. We have no idea of paying the bills. We blissfully continue this one grand political charade, this one grand fraud.

The only way I know to expose it is through the free press. Thomas Jefferson once commented that between a free government and a free press, he would choose the latter. You can have a free government, but you cannot hold it long unless you get a free press. But unfortunately, the free press here is a pollster press. In today's paper it says that the best of the best reporters were out eating supper instead of listening to the President's speech in Houston. They do not care. They get little snippets and stories, and you cannot get the truth. The truth is, Mr. Anderson, there is no crisis we are going to have to reach. We are in crisis now.

We have spending on automatic pilot. Next year we will have to pay \$348 billion in interest costs on the national debt. That is a billion dollars a day. If that is not a crisis, I don't know what is. We can straighten out Medicare, but we do not have to devastate the Government in doing so. Neither side, including the President, has a balanced budget. The Democrats do not have a balanced budget, and the Republicans do not have a balanced budget. So we should not act like there is a choice at the present time.

The truth of the matter is that next year we will pay \$348 billion in inter-

est. They say you cannot avoid death and you cannot avoid taxes. Well, you cannot avoid interest costs. As such, you have tax increases on automatic pilot of \$1 billion a day. That is the hemorrhage we have to stop. That is the real problem confronting us. And we are not doing it. We are arguing whether it is for the middle class or rich, and who is going to get the political credit. We ought to stop these shenanigans and get down to the business at hand.

I thank the Chair.

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. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

POTENTIAL DEPLOYMENT OF AMERICAN TROOPS TO BOSNIA

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, this week the Senate and the House began conducting hearings on the potential deployment of American ground forces to Bosnia and Herzegovina in the event a peace agreement is reached. This is the beginning of a very important process of congressional review and debate. I am pleased that the administration sent the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to testify on behalf of the administration's proposal.

Any decision to send American Forces into harm's way requires the utmost consideration. American interests may justify sending Americans

into Bosnia, but the goals must be clear and the risks must be understood and weighed carefully.

Unfortunately, the administration has not yet made the case for its proposed operation. Many questions remain unanswered and many answers remain ambiguous.

The first task must be to persuade the Congress that this is the best option of the options available. And let me be clear, there are other options.

For over 3 years now, I have called for American leadership. For over 3 years now, I have called for NATO involvement. But, I am not convinced that exercising United States leadership and deploying NATO ground forces in support of a peace agreement that partitions Bosnia is the best or only option. We need to know: will American Forces be the guarantors of ethnic cleansing? Will they be used to prevent Moslem refugees from returning to their homes in what becomes the Bosnian Serb Republic?

With respect to the peace settlement, the administration must be able to ensure that any peace reached is a stable and sustainable peace—that there are defensible borders; that the Bosnian Government structure is viable; that this is not just the first step toward a greater Serbia.

If there is a genuine peace, there is a real question why tens of thousands of peacekeepers, including Americans, are needed? Moreover, how did the administration come up with the number 25,000 for the American ground force contribution? Is this solely the result of President Clinton's speech 2 years ago or is there a military rationale for it?

There is a lot of confusion as to what NATO's role will be. Will NATO ensure the territorial integrity of Bosnia? Who will accomplish the tasks that NATO does not wish to be involved in, such as facilitating the return of refugees, the conduct of free and fair elections, humanitarian operations?

What will this operation cost? What factors are current cost estimates based on? How does the administration plan to pay for such an operation? Was Secretary Perry serious when he said that the administration would take funds from missile defense programs—intended to protect Americans from the growing threat of missile defenses—for peacekeeping?

What are the criteria for success of this operation? What is the exit strategy? How do we ensure that the Bosnians can defend themselves once peacekeepers leave? Who will arm and or train the Bosnians?

It seems to me that developments in recent months have vindicated the overwhelming majority in Congress who argued that the Bosnians and the Croats were capable of defending themselves if armed. It has also demonstrated that NATO air power can be used effectively and that Bosnian Serb Forces are not invincible. The military balance began shifting in Bosnia, but I am not sure that it has stabilized. In my view, lifting the arms embargo on Bosnia is as relevant in a post-settlement situation as it is now. This matter cannot be avoided and must be resolved as part of any peace settlement.

The bottom line is that Congress is not yet in possession of the facts. Indeed, the administration is not in possession of the facts. There is no settlement yet. But, with that in mind, we must make sure that we do not deploy any forces without clear answers to these critical questions. I am deeply concerned that since current NATO plans call for initial deployments within a few days of a settlement being signed that we may not have all the answers—and that the administration will go ahead and deploy forces and try to figure out what they will be doing after they are already on the ground.

In view of these many unanswered questions—and those I have raised are by no means all-inclusive—I would strongly urge the administration to cooperate with the Congress and provide us with the information we need to make an informed judgment.

Furthermore, I strongly urge the administration to seek congressional authorization for any deployment of United States ground forces to Bosnia. This was my view prior to the gulf war, and it is now. It is essential that the American people are behind any undertaking that places thousands of our soldiers in a dangerous environment for a prolonged period of time.

Mr. President, let me also express my deep concern about other aspects of the

diplomatic process and the talks that are due to begin on August 31 in Dayton, OH. The agenda does not include Kosova which has been under martial law for over 6 years now. This is not just a matter of human rights, but a question of Kosova's status. Even in the former Yugoslavia, Kosova had autonomous status—the people and their assembly could make their own decisions. Today, there are 2 million Albanians there under an apartheid-like system—A large majority terrorized and oppressed by a small minority.

We cannot let Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic off the hook for Kosova, or for his continued support of paramilitary forces which are reported today to have slaughtered hundreds of Moslem men and boys in northern Bosnia. Milosevic is no peacemaker, rather the mastermind behind ethnic cleansing, oppression, and aggression in the former Yugoslavia. As early as 1992, senior U.S. Government officials accused him of war crimes. But today, he has been invited by this administration to the United States to participate in peace talks. I believe that this was a serious error in judgment which calls into question the administration's commitment to the prosecution of war criminals in the former Yugoslavia. Sure, Milosevic has not yet been indicted by the war crimes tribunal, but, there is no doubt that he has given support and safe haven to some of the most notorious war criminals. Slobodan Milosevic should not be issued a visa. If the administration insists on this, at the very least, it should ensure that any visa issued to Milosevic confines him to Wright Patterson Air Force Base. He does not deserve to be treated like other foreign dignitaries.

Finally, there should be no comprehensive sanctions relief on Serbia until there is a satisfactory resolution of the situation in Kosova. Unless there is a comprehensive settlement including Kosova, there will be no stability in the region—one of the key objectives presently being cited by the administration. The sanctions on Serbia are the only leverage the United States and the international community have been willing to use on the Belgrade regime.

Mr. President, I hope that the administration will address my concerns and those of my colleagues, and cooperate with the Congress so that together we can determine what is in the best interest of the United States.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended.

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

AUTHORIZING TROOPS IN BOSNIA

Mr. FEINGOLD. I, too, am about to speak about the situation in Bosnia and am glad to follow on the remarks of the majority leader and the Senator from West Virginia, both of whom have expressed a concern about the role of Congress as we go forward with this possible commitment of troops into the situation in Bosnia.

This week, administration officials testified before the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee, the Senate Armed Services Committee, the House International Relations Committee, and the House National Security Committee on the issue of the deployment of United States troops as a part of NATO's implementing force in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

While the testimony laid out some of the proposals the administration is contemplating, it opened up many, many questions for consideration, some of which the majority leader just listed. The most constructive forum, in my view, to debate those issues, though, is through the constitutional process embodied by the War Powers Act by which Congress is required to authorize the deployment of troops into imminent hostilities. For that reason, I am pleased that just today the President has indicated that he will seek congressional approval of the mission, as Senator BYRD just reported. I am not completely satisfied, however, that the President will request authorization prior to the time that he has actually made a commitment. I want to be sure that he does not sign a peace treaty with that commitment in it and then come back and say, "By the way, I need your approval to go forward."

If Congress is going to really be a partner in the process envisioned under the Constitution then we should either vote on an authorization prior to the commitment to deploy is made, or alternatively, the President should clearly state that any commitment he makes for U.S. troop deployment during negotiations is contingent upon congressional approval. One way or the other, the President has in effect rendered Congress' role meaningless.

To ensure that this most necessary exchange takes place in the most constructive sequence, Mr. President, I am going to introduce a sense-of-the-Senate resolution today which would express our intention to vote on a resolution of approval prior to the commitment to introduce United States forces in Bosnia as a part of IFOR. My resolution does not approve or disapprove of the administration's proposal. Rather, it requires the Senate to debate and vote on it before we are presented with a commitment to deploy. What I am trying to avoid, Mr. President, is being presented with a fait accompli to authorize a deployment, and therefore undermine the important debate that we should have had.

Mr. President, in many respects this is a bit of a rehash of the war powers debate, the debate about whether this body has the right and the responsibility to authorize the use of American troops. Indeed, the mere fact that this resolution is needed indicates the institutional crisis we face in this country about how we make the gravest of decisions—the decision about whether to send American men and women in harm's way overseas.

This is a debate we face every time American troops are called to active duty. Unfortunately, it is not a question we have seriously sought to resolve. Instead, we seem to muddle through each crisis and try to work out sort of a case-by-case understanding between the Congress and the President, somehow hoping that the skeleton of war powers will stay hidden in the closet just until the current crisis goes away, as if there is not going to be another crisis in the future.

Mr. President, the issue of war powers will not go away because its purpose really makes too much sense to ignore. While the War Powers Act has certainly failed as a mechanism for implementing article I of the Constitution, its intention should be heeded, and Bosnia is a perfect example of why.

The Constitution and the War Powers Act were both crafted to take advantage of the collective wisdom and power of both the President and the Congress in making some of the most serious decisions we face. Our democracy does not vest in one person so much power that he or she alone can use military force to accomplish their own goals. Rather, our system splits such an awesome power by charging the President with commanding the Army, the Navy, and giving Congress both the power to declare war and the responsibility to appropriate funds for military action.

Mr. President, Congress is not simply supposed to be consulted on such matters or just be a rubberstamp for such actions. Congress is supposed to be an active partner in this process.

Mr. President, I think this is shared power worth protecting. While I have no doubt of President Clinton's motives in committing 20,000 troops to Bosnia, I want to ensure that some other future President does not have the unilateral authority to send 80,000 troops for some reason that she or he alone supports. We have to remember that how we proceed here can and will set a precedence on how troops are deployed for other peacekeeping or peace-enforcing missions.

Mr. President, this process is also important for marshaling public support for any military operation—which, as any of our veterans will tell you, is a critical element for success for any mission. It is through the authorization process that the mission is explained and refined to the American

people generally, and specifically for those folks that are asked to serve their country and risk their lives. The questions are answered, fears are alleviated, and the American people are given an opportunity to air their views on what the mission means and is worth to them.

In this case, in this case of Bosnia, there are many, many, unanswered questions at this point, many good questions that the President will want to answer in building support for this mission.

Mr. President, these are very, very crucial questions. They are fair questions. Their answers hold great consequences for this country, for NATO, for the Balkans, and perhaps for the world.

Certainly, if we are going to do something as drastic as deploy U.S. troops, we have to create a process by which the Congress and the executive work together to forge a workable and attainable mission.

Mr. President, my main point is that consultations are not going to be enough. Authorization that comes just after a commitment to the parties has already been made is not sufficient, either. Congress has to have this debate before the President is authorized to commit troops, and any commitment he makes prior to congressional approval, I believe, has to be explicitly conditioned upon subsequent congressional consent.

This is the only way to ensure that article I of the Constitution is respected and that the awesome decision of placing U.S. troops into imminent hostility is one that is jointly made by the executive and the legislative branches. Our troops must have the confidence that, if they are going to be sent to Bosnia, they are doing it with the support of the American public through their elected Representatives. If they cannot get that, then perhaps we may actually say that their mission may not be worth the risk.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAIG). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

NATIONAL ENDOWMENTS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I find it both ironic and disheartening to be standing here 30 years after the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities—30 years distinguished by success in preserving and nurturing the arts and scholarship of our Nation—defending the very principles upon which the leg-

islation was created. As one of the founding sponsors of the legislation authorizing the National Endowments, I am deeply concerned about the future of these extraordinary agencies.

I am told that the old arguments no longer work. Opponents dismiss the overwhelming evidence that a national infrastructure results in greater public access to our culture. They gloss over the fact that American creative excellence influences the way we are perceived as a Nation and remembered when the history of our civilization is documented. They ignore the many studies which demonstrate how the arts have stimulated local economies by revitalizing downtown areas, attracting tourism and providing jobs and taxable income.

Yet, who can deny that Americans of all ages from every corner of the country have a tremendous thirst to learn, enjoy and participate in the great diversity of our Nation's culture? The public is aware that the Endowments have brought a great value to millions of Americans. The voices acknowledging this are no longer silent, but are being heard in increasing numbers. And what the people seek is not to be found in the commercial marketplace. Throughout the ages, the great legacies of art and scholarship have been created, sustained and preserved with some form of patronage. They should not now be expected to pay for themselves.

I am proud when our American artists are recognized for their excellence with invitations to demonstrate their work abroad. I am equally proud when a child remains in school and improves his grades as a result of the positive experience he has had with a school-based arts program. The National Endowment for the Arts fosters American creativity just as the National Endowment for the Humanities stimulates learning. I firmly believe that regardless of our differences of wealth, race, religion and political belief, our cultural development binds us together, develops our character as Americans and establishes our common heritage.

The Endowments were founded and have been sustained over the years with bipartisan support. Hearings before the full committee earlier this year demonstrated that the trend can continue. What has happened to this bipartisanship elsewhere in Congress? Why have the divisive tactics of a few led to so much time being devoted to such a small amount of money?

While critics eager to further polarize our parties have focused on a very few controversial grants, perhaps they have missed the fact that the Arts Endowment Design Program led the way in convening a design panel to plan the post-bombing redevelopment of downtown Oklahoma City. Perhaps they did not know that a world-class American dance company performed in their

hometown or that young members of a string quartet gave a series of workshops in their schools. Perhaps they are unaware that many grateful constituents remember the role of both Endowments in bringing hope, joy, inspiration, knowledge and healing to their own communities.

Perhaps, too, the critics did not notice the valuable changes in the agency's procedures instituted by National Endowment for the Arts Chairman Jane Alexander last year that go a long way toward addressing the public's concerns by strengthening the Chairman's oversight of Endowment grantees and making the Endowment respond more effectively to the needs of the people. I fully understand that many Americans are troubled when they hear of works distasteful to them that are funded (or rumored to be funded) in part with their tax dollars. Nevertheless, while the Endowment has awarded well over 100,000 grants, fewer than 40 have resulted in any controversy. The remaining 99.96 percent of all grants made are testament to the Endowment's success.

As each of my colleagues know from their own constituents, the public's investment in a relatively small Endowment grant is often the key to stimulating the release of large amounts of State and local funds and private contributions. Unlike most Federal programs, the National Endowment for the Arts initiatives leverage 12 non-Federal dollars for each Federal dollar invested. Similarly, the National Endowment for the Humanities stimulates an average of \$70 million in private support annually. In all probability, this money would never have become available to the recipients without the initial Endowment recognition. Donors look to the Endowments for leadership when they decide how to allocate their funds, and it is these private funds that guarantee the survival of the best of our country's arts and scholarship. In short, removal of the national recognition and the stimulation of partnerships offered through Federal grants will dramatically reduce all forms of State and local cultural support.

Can we not move beyond the ideology of a few? Last July, the Committee on Labor and Human Resources voted 12 to 4 in favor of an amendment in the nature of a substitute to S. 856 to improve and extend the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, the Museum Services Act, and the Acts and Artifacts Indemnity Act. The committee report reaffirms the Government's commitment to, and interest in, supporting arts and humanities projects throughout the Nation well into the future. After four hearings and lengthy debate, the committee determined that the agencies do provide valuable service to the American public and should be maintained.

October is National Arts and Humanities Month. Let us use the occasion to reflect upon the eloquent words of President Kennedy delivered shortly before the Endowments were founded:

I see little of more importance to the future of our country and our civilization than full recognition of the place of the artist. * * * I look forward to an America which will reward achievement in the arts as we reward achievement in business and statecraft. I look forward to an America which will steadily raise its standards of artistic accomplishment and which will steadily enlarge cultural opportunities for all of its citizens.

I believe that the National Endowment for the Arts has been remarkably successful in furthering this ideal. Arts is no longer the privileged domain of a relatively few practitioners and connoisseurs; it no longer exists in a remote and rarefied atmosphere. It can no longer be considered as incidental or peripheral to our way of life. It is central to the life we cherish and to the beliefs we hold; for as a nation we are reaching toward maturity, and the surest sign of maturity lies in the growing expression of an indigenous and creative national culture.

The Arts Endowment provides critical assistance in creating and presenting our Nation's music, theater, dance, literature, painting, sculpture, photography, film and video, design arts and folk arts. Without this funding, many popular programs would simply not exist, let alone be made available to millions. Even the very limited funds appropriated for the Endowment help keep ticket prices reasonable, thus enabling lower income citizens, young people, the elderly and the disabled to gain access to our common culture.

The Humanities Endowment has supported and preserved the work of an extraordinary group of scholars and historians, and stimulated a wide array of new scholarship—all of which has served to expand our Nation's collective knowledge of history, literature, philosophy, languages, and religion. Many know of the agency's role in sponsoring thrilling interpretive exhibitions and informative films on public television. It has also helped to fund such diverse projects as a dictionary of American language, an encyclopedia of bioethics, the publication of George Washington's papers, the distribution of the "Civilization" series to 2,000 colleges, the microfilming of over 600,000 brittle books and repair of 100,000 additional volumes, training for conservators, summer seminars for teachers, the introduction of various new technologies to the classroom, and repairs to museum, library, and school collections damaged by Hurricane Andrew and the Midwest floods.

Parents and teachers know the importance of arts and humanities curricula; and studies confirm that they teach young people creativity, increase self-discipline, develop analytical and

communication skills, and are a critical means of passing on an understanding of American culture and civilization to the next generation.

I urge my colleagues to stop using the Endowments as pawns in an ideological war and move to reaffirm the Government's support of the arts and humanities. It is very important that we act on the reauthorization of the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities Act of 1995 this year and I fervently hope that our leadership will schedule a time to consider bill S. 856 as soon as possible.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. 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 referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:08 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2425. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to preserve and reform the Medicare Program.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The following enrolled bills, previously signed by the Speaker of the House, were signed on today, October 20, 1994, by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND]:

S. 227. An act to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide an exclusive right to perform sound recordings publicly by means of digital transmissions and for other purposes.

S. 268. An act to authorize the collection of fees for expenses for triploid grass carp certification inspections, and for other purposes.

S. 1111. An act to amend title 35, United States Code, with respect to patents on biotechnological processes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2425. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to preserve and reform the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Finance.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on October 20, 1995, he had presented to the President of the United States, the following enrolled bills:

S. 227. An act to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide an exclusive right to perform sound recordings publicly by means of digital transmissions, and for other purposes.

S. 268. An act to authorize the collection of fees for expenses for triploid grass carp certification inspections, and for other purposes.

S. 1111. An act to amend title 35, United States Code, with respect to patents on biotechnological processes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. STEVENS, from the Committee on Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 929. A bill to abolish the Department of Commerce (Rept. No. 104-164).

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. ABRAHAM (for himself, Mr. HEFLIN, Mr. LOTT, Mr. NICKLES, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. CRAIG, and Mr. KYL):

S. 1346. A bill to require the periodic review of Federal regulations; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. COATS:

S. 1347. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for the vessel *Captain Daryl*, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

S. 1348. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for the vessel *Alpha Tango*, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

S. 1349. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for the vessel *Old Hat*, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. FEINGOLD:

S. 1350. A bill to promote increased understanding of Federal regulations and increased voluntary compliance with such regulations by small entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN:

S. 1351. A bill to encourage the furnishing of health care services to low-income individuals by exempting health care professionals from liability for negligence for certain health care services provided without charge except in cases of gross negligence or willful misconduct, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'AMATO (for himself and Mr. MOYNIHAN):

S. 1352. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to make technical corrections in maps relating to the Coastal Barrier Re-

sources System; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. DORGAN (for himself, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. DEWINE, and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 1353. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to require the transfer of certain Federal highway funds to a State highway safety program if a State fails to prohibit open containers of alcoholic beverages and consumption of alcoholic beverages in the passenger area of motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. FEINGOLD:

S. Res. 187. A resolution to express the sense of the Senate that Congress should vote on the deployment of U.S. Armed Forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. ABRAHAM (for himself, Mr. HEFLIN, Mr. LOTT, Mr. NICKLES, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. CRAIG, and Mr. KYL):

S. 1346. A bill to require the periodic review of Federal regulations; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

THE REGULATORY REVIEW ACT OF 1995

• Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Regulatory Review Act of 1995, which I introduce today on behalf of myself and Senators HEFLIN, LOTT, NICKLES, HUTCHISON, CRAIG, and KYL.

It is only common sense that the utility of a rule may change as circumstances change. Under current law, however, a rule enjoys eternal life unless the agency that promulgated it takes affirmative steps to terminate it. And in fact agencies rarely choose to burden themselves with the task of re-examining the rules they have promulgated. As a result, our rulebooks are littered with rules that are obsolete, inconsistent with other rules, or just plain unnecessary.

The weight of this heap of outdated rules rests most heavily on the small businesses of this country. Unlike larger firms, small businesses cannot spread the costs of regulation over a large quantity of output. Nor can they pass their regulatory headaches on to an accounting department, legal counsel, or human resources division. Instead, in case after case the entrepreneur himself must spend innumerable hours attempting to comply with the mandates of Federal regulators. It comes as no surprise, then, that problems relating to regulation and Government paperwork were the fastest growing areas of concern in a recent survey conducted by the National Federation of Independent Businesses.

The Regulatory Review Act would solve the problems caused by unnecessary rules. Under the act, the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs in the Office of Management and Budget would coordinate and supervise agency reviews of covered rules, which largely would be rules that impose annual costs of \$100 million or more. Covered rules not reviewed by the end of their review period would terminate. The duration of review periods under the act would be up to 7 years, plus a possible extension of 6 months. Finally, the act itself would sunset after 10 years.

There are several reasons why OIRA should be given supervisory authority over the regulatory review process. Obviously, the review process will involve determinations as to whether the rules of one agency conflict with or duplicate those of another agency. Those determinations will require a global, interagency perspective that comes much more naturally to OIRA than to the individual agencies themselves. Additionally, vesting this authority in OIRA, rather than scattering it among the various agencies, will provide a timely reaffirmation of what Alexander Hamilton called the unity of the executive in Federalist No. 70.

It is also worth noting that the act avoids two areas of contention that arose during debate on S. 343, the regulatory reform bill. First, the act contains no decisional criteria; instead, rules would be reviewed according to whatever criteria already exist under current law. Second, the act would not affect the availability of, or standards for, judicial review of final agency action. Thus, at bottom, the act stands for the commonsense principle that agencies should be required to review their rules periodically.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to address this issue without delay. The small businesses represented by the National Federation of Independent Businesses, which strongly supports the Regulatory Review Act, demand no less. •

By Mr. COATS:

S. 1347. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for the vessel *Captain Daryl*, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

CERTIFICATION OF DOCUMENTATION LEGISLATION

• Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1347

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

SECTION 1. CERTIFICATE OF DOCUMENTATION.

Notwithstanding section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 U.S.C. App. 883), section 8 of the Act of June 19, 1886 (24 Stat. 81, chapter 421; 46 U.S.C. App. 289), and sections 12105 through 12108 of title 46, United States Code, the Secretary of Transportation may issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for the vessel *CAPTAIN DARYL*, United States official number 64320.●

By Mr. COATS:

S. 1348. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for the vessel *Alpha Tango*, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

CERTIFICATION OF DOCUMENTATION
LEGISLATION

● Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1348

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

SECTION 1. CERTIFICATE OF DOCUMENTATION.

Notwithstanding section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 U.S.C. App. 883), section 8 of the Act of June 19, 1886 (24 Stat. 81, chapter 421; 46 U.S.C. App. 289), and sections 12106 through 12108 of title 46, United States Code, the Secretary of Transportation may issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for the vessel *ALPHA TANGO*, United States official number 723340.●

By Mr. COATS:

S. 1349. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for the vessel *Old Hat*, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

CERTIFICATION OF DOCUMENTATION
LEGISLATION

● Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1349

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

SECTION 1. CERTIFICATE OF DOCUMENTATION.

Notwithstanding section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 U.S.C. App. 883), section 8 of the Act of June 19, 1886 (24 Stat. 81, chapter 421; 46 U.S.C. App. 289), and sections 12106 through 12108 of title 46, United States Code, the Secretary of Transportation may issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for the vessel *OLD HAT*, United States official number 508299.●

By Mr. FEINGOLD:

S. 1350. A bill to promote increased understanding of Federal regulations

and increased voluntary compliance with such regulations by small entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

THE SMALL BUSINESS FAIR TREATMENT ACT OF
1995

● Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce the Small Business Fair Treatment Act of 1995, a measure designed not only to afford regularly relief to our Nation's small businesses, but also to begin to change the attitude of Government regulators who are often viewed by small business as adversaries rather than as sources of help and guidance.

Mr. President, the regulatory structure that has developed over the years performs important safety, health, and consumer protection functions.

Just 2 years ago, a cryptosporidium outbreak in the city of Milwaukee's water supply left 104 people dead and over 400,000 people seriously ill.

That was a tragic reminder of how just one small crack in the regulatory process can have devastating consequences for a community that until then had never experienced any such problems.

The need for strong, effective regulations is undeniable.

At the same time, few would dispute that the current regulatory system needs meaningful reform.

Mr. President, I have held over 175 listening sessions in my home State of Wisconsin during the 2½ years that I have been a Member of this body.

Countless times I have had constituents stand up at these meetings and express their tremendous frustration and anger with a regulatory process that too often is impractical, impersonal, and needlessly burdensome.

This body debated a regulatory reform proposal earlier this summer that sought to respond to this widespread frustration and anger.

But many of the proposals that were offered on the floor of the Senate during that regulatory relief debate earlier this summer focused more on changes in the actual rulemaking process and featured solutions that if not entirely Washington-based at least took a Washington perspective in addressing the issue.

The central devices that evolved in that debate as the tools by which the regulatory process would be improved, such as judicial review and the petition process, were approaches to regulatory relief that reflected a large corporation, Washington lobbyist, Washington law firm based approach to solutions.

Mr. President, there certainly is a role for our Nation's larger corporate citizens to play in the regulatory climate of this country, but those interests do not always represent the interests of all businesses, and the solutions to the regulatory problems of large businesses are not always appropriate or effective for smaller businesses.

While a multinational corporation with substantial resources might find it reasonable to devote funds to an enhanced petition process, that kind of solution might mean little for a small, family owned business with a fraction of the resources of a large firm, and little working knowledge of the rule-making process.

As well, Mr. President, solutions proposed during the regulatory relief debate did little to focus on the day-to-day, practical problems of regulation with which small businesses must contend.

By contrast, this legislation focuses on small business, and on the practical problems of dealing with Government agencies and regulations.

It contains a number of provisions that make it easier for small businesses to comply with Government regulations, including several that are similar to some excellent ideas offered as part of legislation sponsored by the chair of the Senate Small Business Committee, Mr. BOND, as well as ideas that have been implemented at the direction of President Clinton.

The bill requires agencies to publish compliance guides that provide a straightforward, plain language description of a rule or regulation with which a small business must comply.

These guides would be required to be published and disseminated by the agency before any enforcement action was brought.

Beyond the obvious help these guides could be for businesses affected by a Government regulation, requiring an agency to think out and describe a new regulation in a clear and understandable way will only enhance the ability of that agency to administer the regulation.

The bill also requires agencies to establish procedures for the use of so-called no action letters. These are letters issued by an agency in response to a specific request of clarification from a small business trying to comply with that agency's regulations.

The bill requires agencies to make a timely determination whether or not to issue such a no action letter, and if such a letter is issued, the bill establishes that the business could rely on it in an enforcement action related to matters laid out in the letter.

In addition to providing specific direction to a small business in dealing with subjective interpretations of agency regulations, a no action letter also establishes a record to which other businesses can turn in seeking guidance on how a particular regulation should be interpreted.

A body of no action letters also ensures consistency in the interpretation of regulations by an agency, something that can only further enhance compliance.

Mr. President, the bill also allows small businesses to request an audit

from a regulator without the fear that the findings of such an audit would be used in any enforcement action.

The findings from such an audit would not be used in any enforcement action, if correction of any identified problem were made within 180 days, except if the basis of the enforcement action were a violation of criminal law, or if the voluntary audit was requested for the purpose of avoiding disclosure of information required for an investigative, administrative, or judicial proceeding that, at the time of the audit, was imminent or in progress.

In listening to small businessmen and women in Wisconsin, one of the most troubling complaints that is raised with respect to Government regulation is the feeling that Government agencies too often take a confrontational or adversarial approach in dealing with the business.

Whether or not this feeling is justified in every instance, in many instances, or in only a few, it is honestly felt and reveals a problem that needs fixing.

When the relationship between those who oversee and enforce regulations and those who must observe them deteriorates in this manner, it only hinders compliance.

By allowing businesses to request a review of their operations, without fear that the results would be used against them, we can begin to improve that relationship, and change the way business perceives regulators from adversaries to sources of help.

Mr. President, another provision in the bill allows small business a 6-month grace period to correct violations of Environmental Protection Agency regulations after they have been identified, unless there is imminent risk to public health or worker safety.

This proposal has already been implemented at the direction of President Clinton, and in my own State of Wisconsin, small businesses have informed me that this extra time has allowed them to work with EPA to develop a plan of action to deal with an identified problem.

We should codify this directive, and this bill does just that.

Another Presidential directive that we should codify is allowing regulators to waive up to 100 percent of the punitive fines on small businesses for first-time violations where the firm acts quickly and sincerely to correct the problem.

While as a general rule, we should ensure that rules and regulations are enforced uniformly, it makes sense to provide regulators some flexibility in addressing the first-time regulatory infractions of a small business.

Small businesses trying to comply with regulations should be allowed to devote scarce resources to correcting problems instead of paying fines.

Here again the target of this measure is not only to provide regulatory relief to small business, it is to improve and enhance the relationship between small businesses and Government agencies.

Though these last two provisions have been implemented by executive order, enacting them into law will give them permanence, and will prevent future Presidents from simply rescinding them through subsequent Executive order.

An additional directive of the President's that merits the full force of Federal law is a prohibition against using personnel practices that reward agency employees, directly or indirectly, based on the number of contacts made with small entities in pursuit of enforcement actions, or on the amount of fines levied against small entities to enforce agency regulations.

The section responds to comments made to my office by small business people who have reported that agency personnel have felt compelled to find something wrong, even if it is small, in order to justify their visit to the firm.

This goes to the heart of what the role of a regulator is. Personnel practices based on these two kinds of performance incentives may quite naturally provoke adversarial relationships. Regulators need to remain independent from the entities they oversee, but unnecessary antagonism can actually hinder efforts to ensure compliance with the rules.

Mr. President, I want to reiterate my sincere and spirited support for reforming the regulatory process that is currently in place.

The current system is not acceptable; the need for reform is clear and imperative.

And though the larger regulatory reform legislation has bogged down, I very much hope a compromise can be worked out and a meaningful reform package can be enacted into law.

But, Mr. President, even if a compromise can be hammered out, it is likely that it will still reflect a process-oriented approach that may provide large corporate interests with avenues for relief, but does little to address the day-to-day problems facing small business.

Nor does such legislation address the very real feeling of small businesses that Government regulators too often act as adversaries rather than to provide guidance in helping firms to comply with the law.

Mr. President, the provisions of this bill are designed to help do just that.

The provisions outlined in this measure both provide some practical regulatory relief and can improve the relationship between businesses and agencies. The process reforms of other regulatory reform measures merit our consideration, but I urge my colleagues not to allow that approach to dominate

a debate which should rightly be focused on that portion of the business world that is most severely burdened by Government regulation—small business.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1350

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Small Business Fair Treatment Act of 1995".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title.
- Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—REGULATORY SIMPLIFICATION AND VOLUNTARY COMPLIANCE

- Sec. 101. Definitions.
- Sec. 102. Compliance guides.
- Sec. 103. No action letter.
- Sec. 104. Voluntary self-audits.

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

- Sec. 201. Performance measures.
- Sec. 202. Grace period for correction of violations of Environmental Protection Agency regulations.
- Sec. 203. Waiver of punitive fines for small entities.

TITLE I—REGULATORY SIMPLIFICATION AND VOLUNTARY COMPLIANCE

SEC. 101. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) COMPLIANCE GUIDE.—The term "compliance guide" means a publication made by a covered agency under section 102(a).

(2) COVERED AGENCY.—The term "covered agency" means any agency that, on the date of enactment of this Act, has promulgated any rule for which a regulatory flexibility analysis was required under section 605 of title 5, United States Code, and any other agency that promulgates any such rule, as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) NO ACTION LETTER.—The term "no action letter" means a written determination from a covered agency stating that, based on a no action request submitted to the agency by a small entity, the agency will not take enforcement action against the small entity under the rules of the covered agency.

(4) NO ACTION REQUEST.—The term "no action request" means a written correspondence submitted by a small entity to a covered agency—

- (A) stating a set of facts; and
- (B) requesting a determination by the agency of whether the agency would take an enforcement action against the small entity based on such facts and the application of any rule of the agency.

(5) RULE.—The term "rule" has the same meaning as in section 601(2) of title 5, United States Code.

(6) SMALL ENTITY.—The term "small entity" has the same meaning as in section 601(6) of title 5, United States Code.

(7) SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN.—The term "small business concern" has the same meaning as in section 3 of the Small Business Act.

(8) VOLUNTARY SELF-AUDIT.—The term "voluntary self-audit" means an audit, assessment, or review of any operation, practice, or condition of a small entity that—

(A) is initiated by an officer, employee, or agent of the small entity; and
(B) is not required by law.

SEC. 102. COMPLIANCE GUIDES.

(a) **COMPLIANCE GUIDE.**—

(1) **PUBLICATION.**—If a covered agency is required to prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis for a rule or group of related rules under section 603 of title 5, United States Code, the agency shall publish a compliance guide for such rule or group of related rules.
(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—Each compliance guide published under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) contain a summary description of the rule or group of related rules;
(B) contain a citation to the location of the complete rule or group of related rules in the Federal Register;

(C) provide notice to small entities of the requirements under the rule or group of related rules and explain the actions that a small entity is required to take to comply with the rule or group of related rules;
(D) be written in a manner to be understood by the average owner or manager of a small entity; and
(E) be updated as required to reflect changes in the rule.

(b) **DISSEMINATION.**—
(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Each covered agency shall establish a system to ensure that compliance guides required under this section are published, disseminated, and made easily available to small entities.
(2) **SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS.**—In carrying out this subsection, each covered agency shall provide sufficient numbers of compliance guides to small business development centers for distribution to small businesses concerns.

(c) **LIMITATION ON ENFORCEMENT.**—
(1) **IN GENERAL.**—No covered agency may bring an enforcement action in any Federal court or in any Federal administrative proceeding against a small entity to enforce a rule for which a compliance guide is not published and disseminated by the covered agency as required under this section.
(2) **EFFECTIVE DATES.**—This subsection shall take effect—

(A) 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act with regard to a final regulation in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and
(B) on the date of the enactment of this Act with regard to a regulation that takes effect as a final regulation after such date of enactment.

SEC. 103. NO ACTION LETTER.

(a) **APPLICATION.**—This section applies to all covered agencies, except—
(1) the Federal Trade Commission;
(2) the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission; and
(3) the Consumer Product Safety Commission.
(b) **ISSUANCE OF NO ACTION LETTER.**—Not later than 90 days after the date on which a covered agency receives a no action request, the agency shall—

(1) make a determination regarding whether to grant the no action request, deny the no action request, or seek further information regarding the no action request; and
(2) if the agency makes a determination under paragraph (1) to grant the no action request, issue a no action letter and transmit the letter to the requesting small entity.
(c) **RELIANCE ON NO ACTION LETTER OR COMPLIANCE GUIDE.**—In any enforcement action brought by a covered agency in any Federal court or Federal administrative proceeding against a small entity, the small entity shall have a complete defense to any allegation of

noncompliance or violation of a rule if the small entity affirmatively pleads and proves by a preponderance of the evidence that the act or omission constituting the alleged non-compliance or violation was taken in good faith with and in reliance on—

(1) a no action letter from that agency; or
(2) a compliance guide of the applicable rule published by the agency under section 102(a).

SEC. 104. VOLUNTARY SELF-AUDITS.

(a) **PROCEDURES.**—Each agency shall establish voluntary self-audit procedures for small entities regulated by the agency.
(b) **INADMISSIBILITY OF EVIDENCE AND LIMITATION ON DISCOVERY.**—If action to address a violation is taken not later than 180 days after the date on which a voluntary self-audit is concluded, the evidence described in subsection (c)—

(1) shall not be admissible, unless agreed to by the small entity, in any enforcement action brought against a small entity by a Federal agency in any Federal—
(A) court; or
(B) administrative proceeding; and
(2) may not be the subject of discovery in any enforcement action brought against a small entity by a Federal agency in any Federal—
(A) court; or
(B) administrative proceeding.

(c) **APPLICATION.**—For purposes of subsection (b), the evidence described in this subsection is—
(1) a voluntary self-audit made in good faith; and
(2) any report, finding, opinion, or any other oral or written communication made in good faith relating to such voluntary self-audit.

(d) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Subsection (b) shall not apply if—
(1) the act or omission that forms the basis of the enforcement action is a violation of criminal law; or
(2) the voluntary self-audit or the report, finding, opinion, or other oral or written communication was prepared for the purpose of avoiding disclosure of information required for an investigative, administrative, or judicial proceeding that, at the time of preparation, was imminent or in progress.

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. PERFORMANCE MEASURES.

No covered agency shall establish or enforce agency personnel practices that reward agency employees, directly or indirectly, based on the number of contacts made with small entities in pursuit of enforcement actions or on the amount of fines levied against small entities to enforce agency regulations.
SEC. 202. GRACE PERIOD FOR CORRECTION OF VIOLATIONS OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGULATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subsection (b), for violations of regulations identified on or after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall afford small entities 180 days after the date on which the violation is identified to correct such violation.
(b) **EXCEPTION.**—Subsection (a) shall not apply—
(1) if the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency determines that there is an imminent risk to public health or worker safety; or
(2) to a violation of a regulation for which criminal liability may be imposed.

SEC. 203. WAIVER OF PUNITIVE FINES FOR SMALL ENTITIES.

Notwithstanding any other law, policy, or practice, a covered agency may waive all or part of a punitive fine that would otherwise be imposed on a small entity if—

(1) the fine is for a first time violation of a law or regulation; and
(2) the small entity acts quickly and in good faith to correct the violation.●

By Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN:

S. 1351. A bill to encourage the furnishing of health care services to low-income individuals by exempting health care professionals from liability for negligence for certain health care services provided without charge except in cases of gross negligence or willful misconduct, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE CHARITABLE MEDICAL CARE ACT OF 1995

● Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce the Charitable Medical Care Act of 1995. This legislation is designed to ensure that licensed providers, who, in good faith, provide medical treatment without compensation, are not sued. Currently, because of malpractice concerns, health care professionals have a disincentive to volunteer their services. This act does not apply in situations of gross negligence or willful misconduct.

Protection from liability for voluntarily providing uncompensated care is not a new idea. Currently, eight States, including my home State of Illinois, have laws in place that free doctors, who practice voluntarily and in good faith, from at least some part of malpractice liability. These States include: Virginia, Utah, North Carolina, Florida, Kentucky, South Carolina, Iowa, and Washington, DC.

My legislation builds upon existing Good Samaritan laws. Good Samaritan laws prevent an individual who acted in good faith from liability in the event a mishap occurs. In 1959, California enacted the Nation's first Good Samaritan statute. Today, all 50 States, and Washington, DC, have adopted some form of a Good Samaritan statute. These statutes exempt the volunteers from tort liability for ordinary negligence in rendering emergency aid to an individual. The rationale for these laws is to encourage health professionals to aid persons in need of assistance.

The need for free clinics and volunteerism by health professionals has never been more striking. There were 41 million uninsured Americans in this country last year. Volunteerism by health care professionals has been instrumental in providing health care to the uninsured. Free clinics have a preventative and primary care focus. They offer an alternative to emergency rooms, which have become family doctors to far too many. They also represent an enormous savings to the entire health

care system. In the tradition of family doctors, these clinics offer a primary care continuum.

Free clinics supplement community clinics that provide care to those without insurance as well as those on Medicaid. Together these clinics provide the majority of care in underserved communities. More than 1,500 free and community clinics serve over 10 million individuals each year in this country. In my State of Illinois last year, 17,350 people were served and over \$600,000 worth of care was provided. The potential impact of charitable care is not insignificant. It is estimated that charitable medical care provides care to 30 percent of the currently uninsured population.

Free clinics have served a valuable service and will continue to provide vital access to health care to the poor. While I am a firm supporter of universal coverage, it appears that, at least for a while, millions of Americans will remain uncovered. The number of uninsured Americans increased from 37.4 million in 1993 to 41 million in 1994, an increase of nearly 4 million individuals. Proposed changes in Medicaid and Medicare will most certainly increase this number.

The role of free clinics and volunteerism by professionals is, and will remain, an important part of the health care delivery system. This is particularly true in urban and rural underserved areas. Thus far, free clinics have been very successful in serving the community. Their success is due to their broad-based community support and the voluntarism of the medical community. Medical liability suits are very rare.

Doctors and other medical personnel who voluntarily provide quality medical care to the poor are an essential component of free/community clinics. Free clinics cannot provide services, however, if barriers to voluntarism remain. One of the best ways to increase voluntarism is through some protection from liability. It is critical that we encourage doctors to volunteer their services to those who cannot afford such care. I believe the legislation I am introducing today will go a long way toward achieving this goal.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important legislation.●

By Mr. D'AMATO (for himself and Mr. MOYNIHAN):

S. 1352. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to make technical corrections in maps relating to the Coastal Barrier Resources System; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM
LEGISLATION

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I introduce legislation with my friend and colleague, Senator MOYNIHAN, which would correct a technical error that

has prevented certain residents of my State from participating in the National Flood Insurance Program. Specifically, this bill would direct the Secretary of the Interior to make technical corrections in the current maps of the Coastal Barrier Resources System [COBRA]. A companion to this bill, H.R. 2005, was introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman MICHAEL FORBES on July 11, 1995, and was approved by the House Committee on Resources on September 27, 1995. This necessary legislation is supported by the administration.

In 1990, the Department of the Interior's Fish and Wildlife Service made a technical error when it designated part of the Point O'Woods community on Fire Island in New York as part of an otherwise protected area [OPA]. As a result of this technical error, homeowners in this part of the country are restricted from protecting their properties through the purchase of Federal flood insurance.

Mr. President, the Fish and Wildlife Service concedes that the designation of these residences as part of an OPA was erroneous. The administration testified in support of the House version of this legislation before the Oceans, Fisheries, and Wildlife Subcommittee of the House Committee on Resources. The inadvertent error in the COBRA map has greatly complicated community efforts to relocate houses away from high erosion zones and otherwise practice effective coastal barrier management. This legislation would allow the Point O'Woods community the opportunity, which other American homeowners in similar areas currently have, to participate in the Federal Flood Insurance Program. The Federal Government actively encourages participation in this important program in order to minimize taxpayer costs in the event of a natural disaster.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of a letter written to me by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in support of this correction and the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1352

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

SECTION 1. CORRECTION TO MAP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall, before the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, make such corrections to the map described in subsection (b) as are necessary—

(1) to move on that map the eastern boundary of the excluded area covering Ocean Beach, Seaview, Ocean Bay Park, and part of Point O'Woods to the western boundary of the Sunken Forest Preserve; and

(2) to ensure that on that map the depiction of areas as "otherwise protected areas"

does not include any area that is owned by the Point O'Woods Association (a privately held corporation under the laws of the State of New York).

(b) MAP DESCRIBED.—The map described in this subsection is the map that is included in a set of maps entitled "Coastal Barrier Resources System", dated October 24, 1990, that relates to the unit of the Coastal Barrier Resources System entitled Fire Island Unit NY-59P.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE,
Washington, DC, October 20, 1995.

Senator ALFONSE M. D'AMATO,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR D'AMATO, At the request of staff on the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, I am writing to inform you of the position of the Department of the Interior on legislation to modify unit NY59P of the Coastal Barrier Resources System. This letter is consistent with testimony before the House Committee on Resources, which I have enclosed.

The House Resources Committee is in the process of reviewing H.R. 2005, a bill introduced by Congressman Forbes making technical corrections to maps relating to the Coastal Barrier Resources System. The U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service supports passage of H.R. 2005 in its current form and agrees with the removal of a portion of unit NY59P from the Coastal Barrier System to correct a technical error. However, we would oppose the addition of other provisions dealing with any other units to this bill without full opportunity for Service review.

H.R. 2005 seeks to remove a portion of unit NY59P, Fire Island, New York, from the Coastal Barrier System. This unit is part of the Fire Island National seashore and is mapped as an otherwise protected area. Otherwise protected areas are defined by the CBRA as coastal barriers which are "included within the boundaries of an area established under Federal, State, or local law, or held by a qualified organization as defined in Section 170(h)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, primarily for wildlife refuge, sanctuary, recreational, or natural resource conservation purposes." The Department of the Interior recommended to Congress that otherwise protected areas not be included in the System and therefore no further refinement of the mapped boundaries were made. However, with the passage of the 1990 legislation, Congress prohibited the sale of Federal flood insurance within otherwise protected areas thus retaining these units in the System. The property owned by the Point O'Woods Association in unit NY59P is not part of this otherwise protected area and therefore, was mistakenly included in the System.

The Service recommends that the boundary of NY59P be modified to remove the Point O'Woods property from within the boundary of NY59P, and we support H.R. 2005 in its current form. Please feel free to contact me or our Office of Congressional and Legislative Services if you have questions or require further information.

Sincerely,

Assistant Director, External Affairs.●

By Mr. DORGAN (for himself, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. DEWINE, and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 1353. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to require the transfer

of certain Federal highway funds to a State highway safety program if a State fails to prohibit open containers of alcoholic beverages and consumption of alcoholic beverages in the passenger area of motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

THE NATIONAL DRUNK DRIVING PREVENTION ACT
 • Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I rise today to offer the National Drunk Driving Prevention Act which will put an end to our Nation's policy of tolerating open alcoholic containers in vehicles. I am pleased that a strong bipartisan group of my colleagues are joining me in this effort as original co-sponsors: Senator BOXER, Senator BUMPERS, Senator CHAFEE, Senator DEWINE, Senator LAUTENBERG, and Senator MURRAY.

According to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, it is still legal in 26 States in this country for passengers in a vehicle to have open containers of alcoholic beverages in vehicles while the vehicle is in operation. In six States it is perfectly legal for a driver of a car to put one hand on the steering wheel and with the other, grab a bottle of whisky and drive off drinking. In my judgment, this is unacceptable.

It seems to me that we should make it a matter of national policy that there ought to be a strict separation between drinking and driving. By tolerating drinking of alcoholic beverages in cars we are ignoring one of the most deadly causes of traffic deaths in this country—people drinking while they drive.

During the period 1982 through 1993, approximately 266,000 persons lost their lives in alcohol-related traffic accidents. In 1993, over 17,000 people died on our Nation's roads in alcohol-related accidents—that's an average of 1 every 30 minutes. That figure is about 40 percent of the total number of traffic fatalities in the United States in 1993. The National Highway Transportation Safety Administration [NHTSA], estimates that over 1 million persons a year are injured in alcohol-related crashes—an average of 1 person every 26 seconds.

Especially disturbing is the fact that drunk driving is a major killer of youths. According to the National Commission Against Drunk Driving, alcohol-related traffic fatalities hit the youth more than any other group. In 1993, youths were killed at a rate of 11 alcohol-related traffic fatalities per 100,000 license drivers compared to 8 per 100,000 for adult drivers. Traffic crashes are the greatest single cause of death for every age between the ages of 6 and 32—almost half of these crashes are alcohol-related.

This legislation would make the roads throughout the Nation safer by requiring all States to enact open container laws. If a State does not comply

within 4 years, 1.5 percent of its Federal highway construction funds would be transferred to its Federal allocation of highway safety funds.

The 1991 ISTEA legislation—Intermodal Surface Transportation and Efficiency Act—authorized incentive grants to States which would allow States a 5-percent increase in highway traffic safety allocations if that State has enacted legislation prohibiting open containers. The fact is that incentive grants have not worked—over half of the States continue to permit open containers in vehicles. I think the results speak for themselves.

It seems to me that stronger efforts must be made. Since half the States have not enacted open container laws, the Congress must do something at the Federal level to urge States to take action. Incentive grants have been available for some time and we seem to have not made much progress under that approach.

Earlier this year, I offered an amendment to S. 440, the National Highways Systems Designation Act, which was very similar to this legislation. This bill differs in that it provides States with 2 more years to comply. Under this legislation, States would have until 1999 to enact laws prohibiting open containers in vehicles.

Drinking and driving cannot be seen as a personal moral decision. When someone decides to drink and drive, that person is not simply putting himself and others in danger. That person is a threat to innocent drivers, passengers, and pedestrians. The odds are that 2 out of every 5 Americans will be involved in an alcohol-related traffic accident, regardless of their drinking habits.

The fact is that every third drunk driving fatality is an innocent victim—a nondrinking driver, passenger, or pedestrian. Under the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, the Federal Government is requiring States to enact laws requiring the use of seat belts and helmets, which are matters of personal safety, in the interest of traffic safety. Allowing individuals to mix drinking and driving is not just a matter of personal safety—it is a matter of public safety with serious public concerns. All the more reason, I believe, for the Congress to require States to address this concern.

This legislation takes a positive step and makes good public policy. This bill provides a strong incentive for States to enact laws prohibiting the insane behavior of drinking in a moving vehicle. If States fail to comply, States would not lose any Federal funds. Rather, States would have 1.5 percent—in fiscal year 1999—or 3 percent—in any fiscal years thereafter—transferred to its Federal allocation of highway safety funds.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and I ask unanimous con-

sent that the full text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1353

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Drunk Driving Prevention Act of 1995".

SEC. 2. OPEN CONTAINER LAWS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

§ 161. Open container requirements

“(a) PENALTY.—

“(1) GENERAL RULE.—

“(A) FISCAL YEAR 2000.—If, at any time in fiscal year 2000, a State does not have in effect a law described in subsection (b), the Secretary shall transfer 1.5 percent of the funds apportioned to the State for fiscal year 2001 under each of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 104(b) to the apportionment of the State under section 402.

“(B) FISCAL YEARS THEREAFTER.—If, at any time in a fiscal year beginning after September 30, 2000, a State does not have in effect a law described in subsection (b), the Secretary shall transfer 3 percent of the funds apportioned to the State for the succeeding fiscal year under each of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 104(b) to the apportionment of the State under section 402.

“(b) OPEN CONTAINER LAWS.—For the purposes of this section, each State shall have in effect a law that prohibits the possession of any open alcoholic beverage container, or the consumption of any alcoholic beverage, in the passenger area of any motor vehicle (including possession or consumption by the driver of the vehicle) located on a public highway, or the right-of-way of a public highway, in the State. If a State has in effect a law that makes the possession of any open alcoholic beverage container unlawful in the passenger area by the driver (but not by a passenger) of a motor vehicle designed to transport more than 10 passengers (including the driver) while being used to provide charter transportation of passengers, the State shall be deemed in compliance with subsection (a) with respect to the motor vehicle for each fiscal year during which the law is in effect.

“(c) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of any project carried out under section 402 with funds transferred under subsection (a) to the apportionment of a State under section 402 shall be 100 percent.

“(d) TRANSFER OF OBLIGATION AUTHORITY.—If the Secretary transfers under subsection (a) any funds to the apportionment of a State under section 402 for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall allocate an amount of obligation authority distributed for the fiscal year to the State for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs for carrying out only projects under section 402 that is determined by multiplying—

“(1) the amount of funds transferred under subsection (a) to the apportionment of the State under section 402 for the fiscal year; and

“(2) the ratio of the amount of obligation authority distributed for the fiscal year to the State for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs to the total of the sums apportioned to the State for Federal-aid highways and highway safety

construction (excluding sums not subject to any obligation limitation) for the fiscal year.

"(e) LIMITATION ON APPLICABILITY OF HIGHWAY SAFETY OBLIGATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other law, no limitation on the total of obligations for highway safety programs carried out by the Secretary under section 402 shall apply to funds transferred under subsection (a) to the apportionment of a State under section 402.

"(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) ALOCOHOLIC BEVERAGE.—The term 'alcoholic beverage' has the meaning provided in section 158(c).

"(2) MOTOR VEHICLE.—The term 'motor vehicle' has the meaning provided in section 154(b).

"(3) OPEN ALOCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTAINER.—The term 'open alcoholic beverage container' has the meaning provided in section 410.

"(4) PASSENGER AREA.—The term 'passenger area' shall have the meaning provided by the Secretary by regulation."

"(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following.

"161. Open container requirements".•

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 295

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the names of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRIST] were added as cosponsors of S. 295, a bill to permit labor management cooperative efforts that improve America's economic competitiveness to continue to thrive, and for other purposes.

S. 309

At the request of Mr. BENNETT, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 309, a bill to reform the concession policies of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 490

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. ASHCROFT] was added as a cosponsor of S. 490, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to exempt agriculture-related facilities from certain permitting requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 939

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 939, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to ban partial-birth abortions.

S. 953

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the names of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] were added as cosponsors of S. 953, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of black revolutionary war patriots.

S. 1091

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the names of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS] were added as cosponsors of S. 1091, a bill to finance and implement a program of research, promotion, market development, and industry and consumer information to enhance demand for and increase the profitability of canola and rapeseed products in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1095

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1095, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend permanently the exclusion for educational assistance provided by employers to employees.

S. 1135

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1135, a bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to include seed crops among the list of crops specifically covered under the noninsured crop disaster assistance program, and for other purposes.

S. 1322

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1322, a bill to provide for the relocation of the United States Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem, and for other purposes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 85

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the names of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 85, a resolution to express the sense of the Senate that obstetrician-gynecologists should be included in Federal laws relating to the provision of health care.

SENATE RESOLUTION 187—RELATIVE TO A DEPLOYMENT OF TROOPS

Mr. FEINGOLD submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 187

Resolved: It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should vote on a measure regarding the deployment of U.S. Armed Forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina as part of the Implementation Force of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, prior to the United States entering into a commitment to carry out such deployment.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES, SUBCOMMITTEE ON PARKS, HISTORIC PRESERVATION, AND RECREATION

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the infor-

mation of the Senate and the public that the October 26, 1995, hearing which had been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources to receive testimony on S. 231, a bill to modify the boundaries of Walnut Canyon National Monument in the State of Arizona; H.R. 562, a bill to modify the boundaries of Walnut Canyon National Monument in the State of Arizona; S. 342, a bill to establish the Cache La Poudre River National Water Heritage area in the State of Colorado; S. 364, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the operation of certain visitor facilities associated with, but outside the boundaries of, Rocky Mountain National Park in the State of Colorado; S. 489, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an appropriate form of agreement with the town of Grand Lake, CO, authorizing the town to maintain permanently a cemetery in the Rocky Mountain National Park; and S. 608, a bill to establish the New Bedford Whaling National Historic Park in New Bedford, MA, has been postponed.

The hearing will now take place on Thursday, November 9, 1995, at 2 p.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

H.R. 629, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the operation of certain visitor facilities associated with, but outside the boundaries of, Rocky Mountain National Park in the State of Colorado has been added to the hearing agenda.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Subcommittee on Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, 364 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510-6150.

For further information, please contact Jim O'Toole of the subcommittee staff at (202) 224-5161.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Friday, October 20, 1995, at 10 a.m., to hold a hearing on religious liberty.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY

• Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, with the rise of democracy all over the world,

U.S. companies are facing greater competition than ever before in international markets. Over the next several decades, Asia will represent one-half of the world's new electric capacity. As India and Pakistan move to free market economies they will quadruple their electricity supply over the next 20 years.

As emerging nations design energy policy and negotiate global security, they look to the United States for counsel. Secretary O'Leary's expertise has been sought to lead energy discussions in international forums by world leaders such as Indian Prime Minister Rao, Pakistan Prime Minister Bhutto, and South African President Nelson Mandela. As the United States competes aggressively for market share against European companies, Secretary O'Leary's personal visits to these distant markets have given American business a competitive advantage.

Past trade missions to India led to \$10 billion in trade agreements between the United States and India, as well as opened the channels of communication for an ongoing discussion on nuclear safety and developing a sustainable energy future for India.

During her 1994 visit to Pakistan, Secretary O'Leary advanced \$4 billion in United States business and signed three agreements designed to encourage the global exchange of ideas. Her involvement also helped create the United States-Pakistan Energy Committee which looks to expand commercial activities in the environmental sector in both countries.

Secretary O'Leary's 1995 visit to China culminated in 4.6 billion dollars' worth of trade agreements, averaging nearly 20,000 jobs in the United States. During this trip, the Secretary signed five agreements between the DOE and the Government of China to encourage energy efficiency and rural electrification.

Secretary O'Leary has brought together the best of American energy companies and government specialists to expand U.S. influence in the growing global market. Her visits have created thousands of jobs here in the United States, as well as promoted sustainable energy development in emerging nations. We should applaud Secretary O'Leary's outstanding efforts on behalf of U.S. energy interests in international markets. Her past achievements and future accomplishments are worthy of bipartisan support.●

TRIBUTE TO KICKAPOO HIGH SCHOOL

● Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to pay special tribute to Kickapoo High School in Springfield, MO. On October 25, Kickapoo High School will celebrate its 25th anniversary. Since opening its doors in 1971, over 8,000 students have graduated from

Kickapoo High School, and about 75 percent of those graduates have gone on to attend college.

These graduating students have attained many honors and excelled in many areas ranging from earning exceptional scholastic achievements to participating in community service programs for credit. Students have also benefited from independent study programs in advanced and specialized fields, foreign language programs, and the Career Center and the Learning Resource Center designed for students with special needs.

Kickapoo High School was designated by the U.S. Department of Education as a secondary school that represents educational excellence. It has received a AAA classification by the Missouri State Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. I commend Kickapoo High School for its dedication to providing the highest quality education to our young people. I also congratulate the men and women educators for 25 years of service and wish them only success in the next 25 years.●

TRIBUTE TO REV. JOE VICKERS

● Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize a Tennessean who has played an important role in the community of Goodlettsville for nearly 35 years. Since 1961, Rev. Joe Vickers has been the pastor of Goodlettsville Cumberland Presbyterian Church. On Sunday, October 29, Reverend Vickers is retiring as pastor and beginning a new stage of his life. Today, I would like to thank Joe Vickers for his longstanding commitment to his church, his family, and his community, and wish him well as he begins his retirement.

Originally from Memphis, TN, Reverend Vickers graduated from the University of Mississippi on a football scholarship. After serving in the Army, Vickers entered the 4-year seminary program at Bethel College and became a Presbyterian minister.

Mr. President, when Joe Vickers came to Goodlettsville, his church had 70 members. During his tenure as pastor, the Goodlettsville Cumberland Presbyterian membership has grown dramatically. Now, that church is 1,000 members strong, and should continue to thrive in the years to come.

As a minister, Reverend Vickers nurtured his congregation well, but he also nurtured his community. For 35 years, Vickers was a neighbor, an adviser, a leader, and a friend to the people of Goodlettsville. His service to the community and church was an example of strong faith for many children and youth. He joined couples in marriage, consoled those who experienced a physical, emotional, or spiritual loss, and taught the lessons of life alongside of the lessons of Christ. Those who know

Joe Vickers know that even in retirement, he will remain a friend, an adviser and a leader to many people in the area.

Mr. President, after he retires, Joe Vickers will continue to live in Goodlettsville with his wife Mary Catherine, and will remain active in the church as its minister emeritus. He will also remain a vital part of the community. And on Sunday, October 29, members of Reverend Vickers' family, his church family, and his friends in the community will gather to honor this man and his accomplishments. And as he retires, they will look at the foundation Reverend Vickers has laid for his family, his church, and the city of Goodlettsville, and they will see that it is strong and solid.●

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1995

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 10 a.m. on Monday, October 23; that, following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, no resolutions come over under the rule, the call of the calendar be dispensed with, morning hour be deemed to have expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and then there be a period for morning business until the hour of 12 noon with Senators to speak for up to 5 minutes each with the exception of the following: Senator DASCHLE for 60 minutes, Senator SHELBY for 10 minutes, and Senator COCHRAN for 50 minutes.

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, we are waiting for one response from the other side of the Senate, but it will be my intention to ask for consent that at 12 noon the Senate proceed to S. 1322 regarding the Embassy in Israel. Therefore, votes can be expected to occur in relation to that bill, but not to occur prior to the hour of 5 p.m. Monday. I will not make that request at this time because we are waiting for one call.

But in addition to that bill, the Senate could be asked to turn to any of the following items on Monday and Tuesday of next week: S. 1328, regarding Federal judgeships; S. 1004, Coast Guard authorization; S. 325, technical corrections in laws relating to native Americans.

By Wednesday of next week it will be the leader's intention to begin the reconciliation bill, which all Members know has a statutory limitation of 20 hours. Therefore, late nights can be expected next week.

Mr. President, let me state that it was our intention to bring up S. 1322

today. But we have been in negotiations most of the morning in my office and part of this afternoon, and there are negotiations going on now with interested parties, parties interested in S. 1322, with representatives at the White House, representatives of the President, and we believe that by Monday we will be in a position to indicate to our colleagues on both sides that we have reached some agreement. But, if not, we will proceed with S. 1322 in its present form. The reason for asking consent—which we are still waiting for—is that otherwise I would need to file cloture today on a motion to proceed. So, if consent is not obtained, then we will proceed on that. I think we will have consent here momentarily.

So if we can obtain that consent, there would be no further business to come before the Senate except brief remarks by the Senator from South Dakota, the Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The Chair advises the Senator from North Dakota that we have been operating in morning business on a Senator-by-Senator basis, so if he can ask unanimous consent for the time he will need.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield? Will he ask in his request that the Senator from California be allowed 15 minutes following the Senator?

Mr. CONRAD. And I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from California be granted 15 minutes after I conclude.

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

BUDGET RECONCILIATION

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, we have just had a rather extraordinary experience in the Senate Budget Committee with the chairman putting that committee into adjournment after a very short discussion of the reconciliation measure that was before the committee.

We had hoped that there would be an opportunity to discuss this afternoon and Monday what is in this budget reconciliation package that has been put forward by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. We believe that the American people deserve a chance to hear precisely what this package will mean. We believe it has severe con-

sequences for the people in this country. We believe there are very sharp cuts in Medicare and Medicaid that are going to mean increased burdens for our senior citizens, are going to mean hospital closures all across America, and especially in rural America, that there are going to be many people who are elderly, who are ill, who are not going to have the kind of care that they deserve.

Much of that is being done in order to provide a tax reduction that will go disproportionately to the wealthiest among us. Many on our side of the aisle, I believe everyone on our side of the aisle, believes that is an inappropriate set of priorities.

One thing our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have said, and said repeatedly, is that they are balancing the budget by the year 2002. Mr. President, that is not accurate. Senator DORGAN and I, 2 days ago asked the head of the Congressional Budget Office for an analysis, if the law of the United States is followed, will the reconciliation plan put forward by the Republicans balance the budget in the year 2002 or not?

The head of the Congressional Budget Office reported to us in a letter yesterday, with a revised letter today, that if the law of the United States is followed—that is, if Social Security surpluses are not included in the calculation, which under our law is specifically excluded; that is, we are not to count Social Security surpluses in determining whether or not the budget of the United States is in balance—when that calculation is made, the head of the budget office told us in a letter dated today, “excluding an estimated off-budget surplus of \$115 billion in 2002.”

Again, let me read that phrase, “excluding an estimated off-budget surplus of \$115 billion in 2002,” that is primarily Social Security surpluses, if those are excluded “from the calculation, CBO would project an on-budget deficit of \$105 billion in the year 2002.” Not a surplus, not a balanced budget, a \$105 billion deficit in 2002.

Let me just say, I think anybody who knows anything about accounting would understand you do not count Social Security surpluses in calculating whether you have balanced the budget or not. Why is that? That is because the Social Security trust fund has been set up to run surpluses in preparation for the time the baby boom generation retires.

Unfortunately, all those surpluses are being spent, and what is happening is we are using that money today instead of saving it or paying down the existing debt to better prepare ourselves to meet that demographic time bomb. That is a profound mistake.

Let me just make clear, if any company in the United States tried to take the retirement funds of its employees

and put them into the pot to balance the budget, they would be in violation of Federal law. Indeed, that is precisely what has been happening in the United States. It has been going on since 1983. It should not be permitted to continue. We have already run up almost \$500 billion of IOU's, but that is going to grow geometrically over the next 18 years.

We have a chance to get our house in order. We have a narrow window of opportunity, and we ought to take advantage of it. We should not be looting and raiding the Social Security trust funds in order to assert that we are balancing the budget. That is not truthful. And I am pleased to say the Congressional Budget Office has now acknowledged that the budget will not be in balance by 2002 but, in fact, will have a \$105 billion deficit in that year.

I think there are other reasons the Republicans in the Budget Committee at least were not eager to have a further discussion of the reconciliation bill. I think there are a lot of things they would prefer the American people not hear before votes are held and cast on that measure.

One of the things they may not be eager for the American people to hear is that there is going to be a \$1.3 trillion increase in the national debt under the Republican plan. That is the cumulative increase in the debt that is being added to the \$4.9 trillion in debt we already have in this country. They are going to add, under their plan, another \$1.3 trillion of debt. Yet, they insist on a tax reduction, a tax cut, primarily going to the wealthiest among us, which will add to this debt.

What sense does that make? I can say to my colleagues that when I queried the people of my State, they made it clear to me to balance the budget first before there is any tax cut. We can have tax cuts after we balance the budget. We are not balancing the budget, No. 1; No. 2, we are adding \$1.3 trillion to the national debt, and \$245 billion of that is tax cuts which, again, primarily go to the wealthiest among us.

Let me just go a little further so that people have a chance to hear what is in this tax package that has just passed, because we have heard on the other side of the aisle the assertion that this is a significant tax cut that would go to American families. I wish that were true. I wish it were true that it was really directed at the middle class, because while I believe it is not the time for tax cuts, when you are adding \$1.3 trillion to the national debt and you have not really balanced the budget in 7 years, and even with that I think we could look more kindly upon a tax cut if it were really directed at the middle class. That is not where this tax cut is directed.

In fact, what we learned yesterday is that the Senate Republican plan would mean tax increases for everyone earning under \$30,000 a year. Those earning

under \$30,000 a year, which are 51 percent of the American people, get a tax hike. They get their taxes increased. I

will demonstrate that point by asking unanimous consent that the tables be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAX PROVISIONS IN THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE, CHAIRMAN'S MARK FOR REVENUE RECONCILIATION AND THE EITC PROVISIONS PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE¹
[1996 INCOME LEVELS]

Family economic income class ⁴ (thousands)	Federal taxes under current law ²			Change in Federal taxes ³			Total Federal taxes after change		
	Amount (billion)	As a percent of pre-tax income	As a percent of after-tax income	Amount (billion)	As a percent of pre-tax income	As a percent of after-tax income	Amount (billion)	As a percent of pre-tax income	As a percent of after-tax income
0 to 10	\$5.7	8.0	8.7	\$0.2	0.3	0.4	\$5.9	8.4	9.1
10 to 20	21.5	8.8	9.7	0.8	0.3	0.3	22.2	9.1	10.0
20 to 30	50.1	13.3	15.4	1.3	0.4	0.4	51.4	13.7	15.8
30 to 50	156.3	17.5	21.2	-5.7	(0.6)	(0.8)	150.6	16.8	20.4
50 to 75	224.0	19.9	24.8	-10.4	(0.9)	(1.1)	213.6	19.0	23.7
75 to 100	196.1	21.1	26.7	-10.0	(1.1)	(1.4)	186.1	20.0	25.3
100 to 200	303.0	22.0	28.1	-12.5	(0.9)	(1.2)	290.5	21.1	27.0
200 and over	316.6	23.7	31.1	-9.5	(0.7)	(0.9)	307.1	23.0	30.1
Total ⁵	1 275.1	20.1	25.2	-45.8	(0.7)	(0.9)	1 229.3	19.4	24.3

Source: Department of the Treasury Office of Tax Analysis, October 18, 1995.

¹ This table distributes the estimated change in tax burdens due to the tax provisions in the Senate Finance Committee Chairman's Mark (JCX-44-95, September 16 1995); and the EITC provisions adopted by the Committee on September 30, 1995.

² The taxes included are individual and corporate income, payroll (Social Security and unemployment) and excises. Estate and gift taxes and customs duties are excluded. The individual income tax is assumed to be borne by payors, the corporate income tax by capital income generally, payroll taxes (employer and employee shares) by labor (wages and self-employment income) excises on purchases by individuals by the purchaser, and excises on purchases by business in proportion to total consumption expenditures. Taxes due to provisions that expire prior to the end of the Budget period are excluded.

³ The change in Federal taxes is estimated at 1996 income levels but assuming fully phased in law and long-run behavior. The effect of the IRA proposal is measured as the present value of tax savings on one year's contributions. The effect on tax burdens of the proposed capital gains exclusion is based on the level of capital gains realizations under current law. Provisions which expire before the end of the budget period and provisions which affect the timing of tax payments but not liabilities are not distributed. The incidence assumptions for tax changes the same as for current law taxes (see footnote 2).

⁴ Family Economic Income (FEI) is a broad-based income concept. FEI is constructed by adding to AGI unreported and underreported income, IRA and Keogh deductions, nontaxable transfer payments, such as Social Security and AFDC employer-provided fringe benefits, inside build-up on pensions, IRAs, Keoghs, and life insurance tax-exempt interest, and imputed rent on owner occupied housing. Capital gains are computed on an accrual basis, adjusted for inflation to the extent reliable data allow, inflationary losses of lenders are subtracted and of borrowers are added. There is also an adjustment for accelerated depreciation of noncorporate businesses. FEI is spent on a family rather than on a tax return basis. The economic incomes of all members of a family unit are added to arrive at the family's economic income used in the distribution.

⁵ Families with negative incomes are included in the total line but not shown separately.

DISTRIBUTIONAL EFFECTS OF REVENUE RECONCILIATION PROVISIONS OF THE CHAIRMAN'S MARK SCHEDULED FOR MARKUP IN THE FINANCE COMMITTEE ON OCTOBER 18, 1995 AND PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED CHANGES IN THE EITC¹
[Calendar year 2000]

Income category ²	Change in Federal taxes ³		Federal taxes ³ under present law		Federal taxes ³ under proposal		Effective tax rate ⁴	
	Millions	Percent	Billions	Percent	Billions	Percent	Present law (percent)	Proposal (percent)
Less than \$10,000	\$879	9.6	\$9	0.7	\$10	0.7	8.6	9.4
\$10,000 to \$20,000	922	2.2	42	3.0	43	3.1	9.0	9.2
\$20,000 to \$30,000	417	0.5	86	6.1	87	6.3	13.6	13.6
\$30,000 to \$40,000	-4,221	-3.4	125	8.9	121	8.8	16.7	16.2
\$40,000 to \$50,000	-5,347	-4.0	132	9.4	127	9.2	18.4	17.6
\$50,000 to \$75,000	-11,740	-4.2	280	19.9	269	19.5	20.5	19.5
\$75,000 to \$100,000	-5,814	-2.8	209	14.8	203	14.8	22.9	22.1
\$100,000 to \$200,000	-3,850	-1.6	246	17.5	242	17.6	24.1	23.4
\$200,000 and over	-2,792	-1.0	277	19.7	274	19.9	29.8	28.8
Total, all taxpayers	-31,546	-2.2	1,407	100.0	1,375	100.0	20.4	19.7

¹ Includes the tax credit for children under age 18, student loan interest credit, marriage penalty relief, IRA changes, long term care, capital gains deduction, treatment of adoption expense, aviation fuel exemption, and repeal of the wine and flavors credit as well as EITC changes previously adopted by the Senate Finance Committee.

² The income concept used to place tax returns into income categories is adjusted gross income (AGI) plus: [1] tax-exempt interest, [2] employer contributions for health plans and life insurance, [3] employer share of FICA tax, [4] worker's compensation, [5] nontaxable social security benefits, [6] insurance value of Medicare benefits, [7] alternative minimum tax preference items, and [8] excluded income of U.S. citizens living abroad. Categories are measured at 1995 levels.

³ Federal taxes are equal to individual income tax (including the outlay portion of the EITC), employment tax (attributed to employees), and excise taxes (attributed to consumers). Corporate income tax is not included due to uncertainty concerning the incidence of the tax. Individuals who are dependents of other taxpayers and taxpayers with negative income are excluded from the analysis.

⁴ The effective tax rate is equal to Federal taxes described in footnote (3) divided by income described in footnote (2) plus additional income attributable to the proposal.

Source: Joint Committee on Taxation. Detail may not add to total due to rounding.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, when we look at where the breaks go, because there are \$245 billion of tax cuts in this package. Where do they go? They go, disproportionately, to the wealthiest among us; 48 percent goes to people earning over \$100,000 a year. We can see on this chart that the top 5 percent of the people, 2.8 million families making over \$200,000, get, on average, a \$3,400 tax break. People earning over \$200,000 a year get a \$3,400 tax break. The richest 1 million families in America, those making over \$350,000, get a \$5,600 tax break.

Mr. President, I say to you, I do not think that is fair. I do not think it is fair to increase the taxes of those earning less than \$30,000 a year in order to concentrate tax breaks on those who are the wealthiest among us, to give a \$3,400 tax break to the top 5 percent, those earning over \$200,000, and a \$5,600

tax break to the top 1 percent, those earning over \$350,000 a year.

Mr. President, this is the chart that was provided for us yesterday that shows the distributional effect of tax provisions in the Senate Finance Committee chairman's mark for revenue reconciliation and the earned income tax provisions previously adopted by the committee. When you take into consideration previous changes in the earned income tax credit and the changes in this package, one finds that people earning up to \$30,000 all experience a slight tax increase under this plan. But those who are earning above that amount experience a tax reduction. But let us see who gets what. Those earning from \$30,000 to \$50,000 a year get less than \$250 of tax reduction a year, while those earning over \$200,000 a year, get \$3,400 in tax reduction. That does not strike me as fair. It does not strike me as balanced. It does

not strike me as the kind of targeted tax relief that is seriously intended to help hard-pressed middle income families in this country.

Mr. President, this redistributional effect, taking from those who are of more modest income, those earning up to \$30,000 a year, and giving them a tax increase and reducing taxes for the wealthiest among us, giving 48 percent of the benefit to those who are earning over \$100,000 a year, continues a trend that I think ought to concern us all, and that is the concentration of wealth in this country in the hands of fewer and fewer people.

This chart shows the share of wealth of the top 1 percent of the households in America. In 1969, 20 percent of the wealth in this country was in the hands of the top 1 percent. By 1979, 30 percent of the wealth of this country was controlled by the top 1 percent. But by

1989, 39 percent of the wealth of America was held in the top 1 percent of this country.

Mr. President, anybody who has studied history knows what this trend means. When wealth is increasingly concentrated in the hands of a few, it leads to political instability, it leads to, I think, a threat to all of our institutions. It is no wonder that people are angry across America, as they see the wealth of the Nation concentrated in fewer and fewer hands. Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been quick to accuse the Democrats of being for redistribution of income. Let me say that our friends on the other side of the aisle have been the champions of income and wealth redistribution.

Over and over and over, in committee after committee, our friends on the other side of the aisle have pursued policies that concentrate wealth in the hands of those who are already the wealthiest among us. I ask the simple question, how much wealth do the top 1 percent want to have in their hands? They have nearly 40 percent now. Do they want 60 percent of the wealth of America in the hands of just 1 percent of the people? Do they insist on 80 percent of the wealth in the hands of just 1 percent of the people? I do not think this is good social policy. I do not think it is good economic policy. I do not think it threatens the future of the country.

Mr. President, 73 percent of the American people pay more taxes in payroll taxes than they pay in income taxes. Yet, what is happening under the Republican plan is to take payroll taxes—the only way to justify payroll taxes at their current levels is if you are building surpluses to prepare for the day when the baby boom generation retires. But all of those moneys are being spent, not saved. They are being taken and spent in other areas of the budget. And so what is really happening is an enormous redistribution of wealth. Make no mistake about it. We are taking payroll tax money, generating surpluses and not saving them, but spending them. And we are spending part of them to give a big tax reduction to the wealthiest among us, so we are taking payroll taxes that are regressive. That simply means lower income people pay a higher percentage of their income in payroll taxes, taking money from them and flushing it back out in a tax cut to the wealthiest among us. Forty-eight percent of the benefit goes to the top 1 percent.

That is what is going on here. It is an enormous redistribution of wealth, going from middle-income people, because under the Republican plan, 51 percent of the people, those earning less than \$30,000 a year, are going to experience a tax increase. The money is being taken from them in payroll taxes and other taxes, and part of it is then being used to give a big tax cut to the

wealthiest among us. I do not think that is fair or right. I do not think it represents American values.

Mr. President, I think that is the reason the chairman of the Budget Committee was so swift to gavel the Budget Committee into adjournment, because they did not want to see and hear these facts being provided to the American people.

They want to pass this in the dead of night without a chance for the American people to see and hear what these plans will mean for the people of this country.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. CRAIG. Would the Senator from California yield to me for a few moments to put the final words in the RECORD?

Mrs. BOXER. Of course, as long as I do not lose my right to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELMS). The Senator's rights will be preserved.

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object, I want to make sure Senator MURRAY has 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's rights will be preserved.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1995

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until the hour of 11 a.m. on Monday, October 23; that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, no resolutions come over under the rule, the call of the calendar be dispensed with, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and that there then be a period for morning business until the hour of 2 p.m., with Senators to speak for up to 5 minutes each with the exception of the following: Senator DASCHLE for 60 minutes, Senator SHELBY for 10, and Senator COCHRAN for 50 minutes.

Mr. CONRAD. Would the Senator yield, and add Senator CONRAD for 15 minutes, as well?

Mr. CRAIG. And Senator CONRAD for 15 minutes.

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

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 2 p.m. the Senate proceed to S. 1322, regarding the Embassy in Israel. Therefore, votes can be expected to occur in relation to that bill but will not occur prior to the hour of 5 p.m. on Monday.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. CRAIG. For the information of all Senators, in addition to the Jerusa-

lem bill, the Senate could be asked to turn to any of the following items for the next week: S. 1328, regarding Federal judgeships; S. 1004, Coast Guard authorization; S. 325, technical corrections in laws relating to native Americans.

By Wednesday of next week it will be the leader's intention to begin the reconciliation bill, which all Members know has a statutory limitation of 20 hours. Therefore, late nights can be expected.

I yield the floor.

BUDGET RECONCILIATION

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you, Mr. President. It is unusual for Senators to take to the floor on a Friday afternoon long after the Senate has concluded most of its business when there are no votes.

Today is an unusual day for members of the Budget Committee. We have heard from the Senator from North Dakota who has worked so long and hard to present a truly balanced budget—not only to the committee but to the Senate and to the American people. It was my privilege to support him.

He showed, as did Senator BRADLEY from New Jersey, that it is, in fact, possible to balance the budget in America over 7 years, do it truthfully, not relying on Social Security surplus, and do it with a heart and with compassion, with common sense, with caring, with pride, that really reflects the values of America.

What are those values? You reward hard work, as in the earned-income tax credit. You make sure that your children have a chance to get the proper immunizations as in Medicaid. We make sure that when our kids are students they could get college loans. We make sure that if our people run into trouble and they have to collect child support, that the Government does not penalize them for it.

We make sure that large corporations pay a tax, as in the alternative minimum tax, which is repealed by the Republicans. We make sure large corporations are good citizens and do not raid pension funds. Republicans do that, too.

And we make sure that when our people reach the age of 65, they can count on Medicare. If they are having to go into a nursing home, that there are decent standards for those nursing homes, which are repealed by the Republicans. I will talk more about that.

Today, the Democrats and the Republicans came around a long table in the Budget Committee. When we walked in, we saw a bill that was so tall—of course, I am not very tall, that is true—but this bill was so tall that I could barely see my next door neighbor on the committee, Senator MURRAY. I kind of used it as a chin rest.

That is the size of this Republican revolution. That is the number of

things they are doing in this budget reconciliation bill. That is why we Democrats felt it was important to hear from some of the people who represent those in America, our great country, who will be impacted by this 1992 revolution, if you will.

So our ranking member, Senator EXON, a Senator who has served here with great distinction—and I might add, is in his senior years—asked in a very nice way if, in fact, four people could be heard before we start to vote on this package.

Who are those four people? One was an honor student who happens to be in a wheelchair, a quadriplegic, who counts on Medicaid for his very breath. We found out that in the Republican plan—and I ask my friend to correct me if I am incorrect in this—the Medicaid cuts are so deep that no longer will people like that who are trying so hard to build the American dream—an honor student—will not be able to count on their oxygen supply.

I found that out today. I did not know it when I walked into the room. We needed more time. I told my friend in North Dakota, and I am sure he would help me, along with my friend from Washington State, that we ought to have an amendment, take away 5 cents a year from the people over \$350,000, from the tax break they are getting, and pay for oxygen for people like this.

Who else wanted to speak? Two elderly women who live on Medicare. By the way, in my home State of California, the average woman of 65 earns \$8,500 a year. In California, that is brutally hard. She already spends a third of her income on health care. Think about that. Do the math on that.

How could she possibly be asked to spend another \$1,000 to \$2,000 a year? That is what the Republican plan calls for. We in the Budget Committee, Democrats, wanted to hear from a person who could give us the truth.

Then there was a woman who had served 20 years in the military. Her child is very ill. On a military salary she needs to count on Medicaid for her child. We wanted her to be here. Well, no. It was interesting, because it was the first time in my life—I have been in the Congress for 13 years—that a chairman of a committee adjourned us without allowing us to vote on whether to hear these people. He ruled that they had no right to be heard, and when we appealed the ruling of the Chair he refused to honor that and gavelled us down. He said he was very disappointed we did not just vote on that budget.

Well I am glad we have the weekend for Americans to look at what is in it.

I am going to go to a couple of charts to give the big picture on this. This is the basic bill that already passed the House of Representatives, a \$58 billion increase in the military. We are talking here between 1996 and 2002, 7

years—that is \$30 billion more than the Pentagon asked for.

All the admirals and generals said "Yes, we need some more," but Republicans gave them \$58 billion. The non-defense money that we spend on education and transportation, environmental protection, food safety, highways, airport safety, those kind of things, on a cut of \$499 billion, how is that for symmetry?

Now we move to what we call entitlements, things we do to help people because this is America and we want everyone to get a chance. So, \$270 billion cut in Medicare, \$182 billion cut in Medicaid, \$13 billion cut in ag, \$10 billion cut in student loans, welfare, earned income tax credits. Food stamps, that is another \$100 billion. That is the budget that they are so proud of.

Now, what happened was that NEWT GINGRICH promised the crown jewel of the Republican contract would be a tax break for the wealthiest people in America. And he had to figure out a way to get the money for it, because it was going to cost a lot of money. He wanted the people over \$350,000 to get back about \$20,000 a year. By the way, he settled for about \$5,500 a year.

Let me repeat that. NEWT GINGRICH wanted the people who earn over \$350,000 a year to get back \$20,000 a year, and he had to find the money. So he thought, how can I find the money? Aha, where is there money? Medicare and Medicaid. So let us try and scare the people into thinking we have to cut that much out of it, and then we will turn around and just give all that money to the wealthiest among us.

What I have here is the trustees' reports on the Medicare trust fund, going back to 1970. I want to point out that, from 1970 to the present, it was only twice that the trustees reported we did not have to do something to save Medicare. In other words, this is a routine thing that happens with the trust fund. But people do not know this. So the Republicans said, "Let's make a big hoopla out of this year's trustees' report."

So, clearly, we know we have to act to save Medicare. We know how much we have to cut. In order to save Medicare we need to cut \$89 billion. We need to cut \$89 billion out of Medicare. And, by the way, it is not that easy to do it, but we can find the savings. We can make the adjustments. My goodness, there is enough fraud there we can go after, so we think we can do that without pain. So, remember that number, \$89 billion is what we need to save Medicare.

But, remember what I told you, they need a lot of money for a tax cut. So they decided to cut \$270 billion from Medicare. Keep it in mind. We needed \$89 billion; they are cutting \$270 billion. And why? Not because the trustees' report says to do that. We know

the trustees' report indicates where we need to cut \$89 billion. Here is why, the next chart will show it.

They need \$245 billion for their tax cut. For their tax cut. But, guess what, in their zeal they made a big mistake, as the Senator from North Dakota has said. They did not really do their homework, because in the end they are producing a tax increase for 51 percent of the people, according to the Wall Street Journal. The Wall Street Journal is, in fact, a party that is not known to stand up and fight for Democrats. On the contrary. And the Wall Street Journal says those earning \$30,000 and below, in our country, will see a tax increase as a result of NEWT GINGRICH's revolution. And who will benefit the most? The people who earn over \$350,000 a year. And let me tell you, they are chilling the champagne bottles tonight in those board rooms and those penthouses.

Now, we set them back a little because we stopped it in the Budget Committee. We said the American people have to see the truth. We took the light and we shined it on this budget, and we are telling the American people, in dollars and cents, what it means.

I want to show you a chart that reflects what has happened in America with our tax policy since the 1940's. It is very interesting. I got this chart out of a story in the New Yorker that basically asked the question, "What has happened to the middle class?" The middle class is going away.

It is fascinating to see this chart. From 1947 to 1973, taxpayers in every single quintile—and each quintile represents an income bracket. So from the very lowest income bracket, No. 1, to the highest, No. 5, every one went up at about the same rate, from 1947 to 1973. What does that mean? We all prospered together. We all are in this together and we all did well together.

I always thought there was an agreement among Republicans and Democrats that that was best for our country. Yes, when the poor do well and the middle class do well and the wealthy do well, we are all benefiting from this great Nation. That is the way it should be.

Look what happened, starting in 1973, to 1993. We turned this picket fence into a staircase. But look at it. It is Robin Hood in reverse. The ones who were doing the worst are poorest, the first two quintiles. And by far, this little cat—some might say fat cat—sitting on the last quintile, that is the one that goes up to millions and billions, that did by far the best.

What America is better for our people? One in which we all prosper, or one in which only the very wealthy prosper? That is the question I want the American people and the people of California to ponder over this weekend. Since we were able to get a little bit of

time, we are taking the floor of the U.S. Senate to bring these issues home.

Let me tell you, buried in this budget are some awful things for folks. I have heard from hospitals in my State of California who are desperate, desperate about the cuts that will come to them, from seniors who are frightened about the cuts that will come to them, from people who have moms and dads in nursing homes who are frightened to death what will happen to their parents.

By the way, we call them the sandwich generation. They are caught in the middle. Their teenage kids have to go to college. How can they experience a day in peace, worrying about their kids on the one hand and all the challenges we have, economic and otherwise, raising our kids, and our parents on the other.

I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HUTCHISON). Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator is granted 2 additional minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you very much, Madam President.

So, this budget is a slam at American values. It is a slam at family values. It repeals nursing home standards. Why do we have them? Because we learned in the 1980's what happens to old people who are helpless. And we needed to put national standards in place so they would not get bed sores, so they would not be scalded, so they would not be abused physically, sexually, so they could have a little dignity in a very difficult time, after they raised their kids.

Family values? This is the opposite of family values. This is turning our backs on our people whom we are here to fight for. Nursing homeowners? Or the people? I do not know what is popular today or what is unpopular. But I know where I stand. I stand with my colleague for the people, for the people of my State and the people of my Nation. I am a first-generation American. I was taught by my parents hard work, play by the rules, stand up and fight for what you believe in, honor the children, honor the elderly, and have love in your heart for those who may not be as fortunate as you.

So this budget debate is very important. And when the budget chairman slammed down that gavel and said "adjourned, we are not listening anymore, we do not want to hear it, we do not want to hear it," it sent a chill up and down my spine. But I believe that my Democratic colleagues on that committee are more resolved than ever to show that we can balance the budget and do it in a smart way.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, might I have 30 seconds?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Thank you, Madam President.

I just want to thank my colleague from California. I hope the people from California know what a fighter they have in the Senator from California, Senator BOXER. I am so proud to be a member of the Budget Committee with her because over and over during these discussions and debates, she has stood up and fought for the middle class and the working families, and said, "Now, wait a minute. Let us understand what the implications are of these policies that are being pursued. Who wins? Who loses? Who is helped? Who is hurt?"

I just want to say once again that I appreciate the strong stance she has taken to say we ought to have a policy that is fair. That is an American standard; that is an American value; that we stand up and fight for something that is fair in this country, that asks everybody to contribute in this budget battle, not just to say to the working class and middle-income people get in the front lines of this budget battle, but to say to those who are the wealthiest among us as well that you ought to participate, too. That is the American way.

Mrs. MURRAY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Thank you, Madam President. I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for 5 minutes.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Thank you.

Madam President, I am here today to join my colleague from North Dakota and my colleague from California to express my surprise and outrage at the actions of the Budget Committee today. To have citizens of this country come before us to tell us their personal stories about how this budget would impact their lives, their very fragile lives, and not allow them the opportunity to speak for 5 minutes each to me was very un-American and a very sad moment in this Senate's history.

These people represent literally thousands of people across this country who are as concerned as we are about the real life impacts of this budget. We did not hear from the senior citizen. We did not hear from a young man in a wheelchair who uses Medicaid dollars to continue breathing. We did not hear from a young man who is trying to get his education who is fearful that his student loan is going to go away and he will not be given that American dream, that American opportunity to finish his college education. We, in fact, have not heard from that welfare mother, that single mother who is off welfare with two little children in this country. She does not have the time to fly out here. She does not have the ability to pay. We have not heard from them. And this budget is going to impact them throughout America.

Madam President, I ran for the Senate in 1992. I moved from my home State 3,000 miles away and brought my family with me to do this terrifically difficult job because I sat at home one day not that long ago, 3 years ago, and I looked across this country, and I said, "Is anybody on that floor addressing the real issues that affect people like me?" I am that sandwich generation. I have two kids at home. I have two parents who are seriously ill who rely on Medicare to continue living. And I know what it is like to worry about whether or not my kids will have the ability to go to college because of money. I know what it is like to get that phone call from a parent who says, "I do not have enough money to go to the doctor." I know what it is like for my husband and I to both work every single day to pay our mortgage, to put food on the table, and who do not have time, like thousands of American citizens, to know what is in this budget.

Yet, we are to know what is in that budget when it came before us before the Budget Committee in a stack this high, and we were told we had to vote on it in that minute. This budget will impact the lives of every single American working family in a dramatic and difficult way. It will mean that our kids will not have preschool education and Head Start. It will mean that there will be kids without immunization. It will mean kids who cannot go to college. It will mean Medicaid recipients—one out of five children in my State—who will not have health care coverage. It means senior citizens who will not have health care in this country anymore. And it means that those of us who will have to make a difficult decision about whether or not our parents need to go into a nursing home will not be able to know what the standard of care is there for them when they need it.

This budget is what I came back here to fight for. As a U.S. Senator, we deserve the time, both as citizens in this country who come here to testify and as citizens on the floor of this Senate and as U.S. Senators, to have the opportunity to tell the American people what is in this budget.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield? I just want to say to the Senator before I leave the floor how much I appreciate her contribution to this U.S. Senate. She ran as a mom in tennis shoes. She stayed true to the reason she came to this Senate. The fact that she was sitting on the committee that will make these decisions is a great tribute to this Nation. And she and I know if we were not here tonight, if we were not speaking out against this budget, we would not be true to ourselves. I just want to thank her for adding a voice in this debate.

Mrs. MURRAY. I thank the Senator from California.

I just want to point out, because I think this is the family who has been forgotten—we talked about them in the welfare debate. We said their mother has to go to work in this country. We passed that bill out of the Senate. It is passed out of the House. This is the single mother with two children who earns \$12,000 a year. This is how this budget will impact this mother. She is going to lose her earned income tax credit. She is going to lose \$373 a year under this budget. This mother is going to lose \$300 a year on food stamps. This mother is going to lose \$2,400 a year that pays for Medicaid and health care coverage for her children. And she is going to have to pay \$480 to her State in order to collect child support from her missing husband.

This budget will cost this single mother with two young children \$3,553. As my colleagues have pointed out, she is going to lose. And who is going to win? The richest 1 percent of Americans will get a tax break every single year.

I ask my colleagues. Who do we value in this country? Do we value a young mother who is working and trying to raise her kids? Are we going to ignore her in this budget process? I think it is critical that we take the time to evaluate it, and it is critical that we listen to the people across this country about the priorities that we are going to set in the future.

I join my colleagues on the Budget Committee in expressing our outrage

at what is occurring. I thank my colleague.

I yield the floor.
Mr. CONRAD addressed the Chair.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I would like to thank my colleague from Washington for the great work she has done on the Budget Committee.

At its root, at its bottom, a budget is the priorities of America. This represents the choices we make about the priorities for the money that we are going to spend over the next 7 years.

These are critically important choices, and the Senator from Washington has been loud and clear with respect to what those priorities ought to be—priorities that favor the middle class and working families in this country who are struggling to get by, saying to the students who want to further their education there ought to be an opportunity for a student loan. We should not, as the Republican plan calls for, increase the cost of that student loan \$3,100 over the next 7 years.

It says to that struggling senior, yes, there have to be savings out of Medicare; we understand that, but not these kinds of draconian cuts that mean a further burden on seniors and that will threaten the closing of hospitals throughout the rural parts of America.

To say to others who count on Federal programs in order to survive, as that young man who was in the wheelchair this afternoon who relies on Med-

icaid for his very breath, that is an American priority, that is someone we care about in the American family.

Senator MURRAY has been right there making these points and carrying this fight. I thank her very much for the effort she makes every day to make certain that the budget reflects the priorities of the American people.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M.
MONDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1995

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:30 p.m., adjourned until Monday, October 23, 1995, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 20, 1995:

THE JUDICIARY

NANETTE K. LAUGHREY, OF MISSOURI, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN AND WESTERN DISTRICTS OF MISSOURI, VICE JOSEPH E. STEVENS, JR., RETIRED.

U.S. INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
COOPERATION AGENCY

LOTTIE LEE SHACKELFORD, OF ARKANSAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 17, 1998. (REAPPOINTMENT)