

and the second one, which I really want to talk about and hope that there will be some change and restore some of the funding for this program. The other has to do with the job training and education programs.

Mr. President, the only disagreement—and I believe it will be worked out—has to do with a counseling program which, I say to my colleague from Missouri, I would like to talk about for a long time. I will not, because other colleagues want to speak, and I will get a chance to speak later.

This is an interesting program, Mr. President. The ratio, Members will like this, of paid staff to beneficiaries is 1 to 2,000. It is not topped down. It is out in the States. This is a program that is extremely important. It is what we are all about. It is basically a few paid staff that in turn nurture a lot of volunteers that in turn provide seniors with just basic information about their health care coverage. People sometimes find that bewildering, and sometimes there is unfortunately some rip-off when it comes to supplementary Medicare coverage. It is extremely successful.

The majority leader said last night, and he is quite correct, that he has now been working with us and actually is helping me to restore the funding to this program. It does not require a lot of resources. We are talking about restoring \$5 million. It was a \$10 million program. By the way, Mr. President, sometimes these numbers seem small to Members but this program makes a huge and positive impact in the lives of a good many very vulnerable citizens.

The only confusion and disagreement was that I was waiting for the reprogramming of this. I thank the White House for their help. I certainly would like to thank the minority leader. What I wanted to be careful about, and this just simply had not been worked out yet, is that the reprogramming was not a "rob Peter to pay Paul." I did not want to take this money from another program that was extremely helpful, for example, to seniors.

So, Mr. President, the only delay, and I think it is a very slight delay, and I see no reason why we cannot go forward, is to make sure we have a reprogramming done. I also wanted to make sure that my colleagues had some understanding on appropriations. I mean, both the majority chair of the committee, Senator HATFIELD, and the minority chair, Senator BYRD, I wanted to make sure that they were fully apprised of where we were going on the reprogramming. That just did not happen last night. That is the one missing piece. It all goes together. There would not be a need for a third amendment if we work that out. I think we will.

Mr. President, I will just say what I have said all along, which is—I am speaking for myself; I think Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN would say the same thing—we really believed that it was important that the bill not just go

through here without some debate and discussion. We wanted an opportunity to have some amendments. We have agreed to a limited time. We are ready to go forward, and I think we can.

Again, I say to the majority leader and I say to colleagues, at this point in time we have one piece to work out. I believe that will happen this morning. I see there is no reason why we cannot get the reprogramming part taken care of—that will be the piece that the majority leader and I are now working together on, which is of course always the best way to proceed, if you can—and then we will have a limit, time limit on two amendments that will deal with the two other areas. Then we will have a vote.

Mr. President, I say this morning because I am quite confident that we can move forward and I will be ready to do so when the majority leader is ready to do so. We will just wait to work this out on the reprogramming part, and then we should be ready to go. That is what we have been aiming for all along.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

THE RESCISSIONS BILL

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I am encouraged that we could have some movement on the rescissions bill. There are many important issues that are facing this body right now. I happen to think that regulatory reform is extremely important, not only for small businesses, for farmers, but for the growth of our American economy.

But, as we look at these long-range programs, we have a very severe short-term problem. I have the distinction of chairing the Veterans Administration, HUD, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee. This so-called rescissions bill is actually an emergency and rescissions bill. It is the supplemental emergency bill because the Federal Emergency Management Agency is getting very close to running out of money. We have had disasters, such as the California earthquakes and fires and floods, we have had the bombing in Oklahoma City, we have had floods in the Midwest, and the money available for FEMA is about at its end. Nobody expects a disaster to occur and the Feds to say, "Sorry, we cannot come. We do not have any money." But we are about at that point.

That is why this bill, the emergency supplemental and emergency rescissions bill, is vitally important. That is No. 1.

Second, we have had our defense budget drawn down because of police actions, responding to needs in various parts of the country. The distinguished chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee will tell you, if we do not get this bill through, in September we are going to have to shut down operations for ships, for airplanes. That means that American pi-

lots, who have to maintain their currency, will not be getting that currency. It will be dangerous to them.

These are the needs for the emergency supplemental. But let me tell you first hand, as one who worries every day about funding the vitally important functions of assisted housing, of medical care for veterans, of EPA, NASA, and others, what is going to happen if we do not pass the rescissions bill. This is not a question of reprogramming and we are going to fine tune things here and there. We have taken a rescission hit. We have, in this rescissions bill, given up \$8 billion in budget authority. That is money appropriated for the current year but which will not be spent until future years.

The reason we had to do that is because HUD, primarily, has been spending out of control. And, in HUD, when you appropriate money 1 year, you get the budget authority out there but it starts spending out in future years. So 60 percent of the dollars that will be spent next year in the subcommittee that I chair are spent as a result of previous years' appropriations. And our limit, what we can spend in that year, is determined by the actual outlays.

We have, in all, over \$6 billion of budget authority rescinded in HUD under this bill. We have worked with Housing and Urban Development, we have worked with our colleagues on the other side, and while nobody likes to cut budget authority, they have agreed that this is the least harmful.

Let me tell you what happens if that rescissions bill does not go through. If that rescissions bill does not go through, we have another billion dollars of outlays in the Department of Housing and Urban Development that we cannot control. And that is likely to mean that we will not have the money to continue to provide public housing in federally assisted housing for all of the 4.8 million families that depend upon HUD funding for their housing during the coming fiscal year of 1996. We are going to be hard pressed to fund that housing and other vitally important programs like CDBG, and HOME, and the work of the Veterans Administration and NASA, as it is. I think we can do it if this rescissions bill passes.

If this rescissions bill continues to languish as people try to work out reprogramming for the last 2½ months of this fiscal year, if we do not get the rescissions bill, those who hold up the rescissions bill will have to go home and explain why some people are going to be thrown out, thrown out of federally assisted housing they now occupy.

The subcommittee on Labor and HHS has \$1.3 billion in outlays that depend upon this bill. This rescissions bill is vitally important. I urge my colleagues to move it.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes in morning business.

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

THE LINE-ITEM VETO

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, this has been a very interesting year in Congress with the change in control in both the House and the Senate; in some ways refreshing, in some ways very disappointing. This is the year of reform and change. Many of the changes and reforms are useful and interesting. Many others are just downright nutty. I will give you an example of some.

The notion that when the Soviet Union is now gone we should start to build star wars with money we do not have at a time when this project clearly is not necessary. In my judgment, that's a nutty idea.

We stick \$9 billion into defense that the Department of Defense says it does not want or does not need. That makes no sense to me. That is not reform or change.

Maybe, as one had suggested, charge admission to tour the U.S. Capitol. In other words, charge the American citizens admission to take tours in the U.S. Capitol in order to raise money to reduce the deficit? It seems to me that qualifies as a nutty idea.

Provide laptop computers for poor kids at a time when you are cutting school lunches? Another nutty idea.

I have said there are a lot of goofy ideas. There are some good ideas, some of which I have supported, one of which is the line-item veto. I want to ask some questions about that this morning.

On February 6 of this year, this Senate passed a bipartisan proposal on the line-item veto. I happen to think, and have thought for a long while, it makes sense for a President to have a line-item veto. Most Governors have it. The President ought to have it.

We passed a line-item veto here in the Senate on March 23. The House passed it on February 6. It is now over 120 days, and the question is, where is the line-item veto?

Today we are going to start on our first appropriations bill. Soon those appropriations bills will go to the White House. My guess is that those who wrote the Contract With America and included the line-item veto in the contract, those who were so urgent about the need for a line-item veto as they spoke on the floor of the Senate and the House, are now less interested in really having a line-item veto if it means that a Democratic President in the White House has a line-item veto to get rid of Republican pork in appropriations bills.

I noticed yesterday, in a newspaper, "Gingrich Gets \$200 Million in New Pork," it says in the headline. I do not know what this is about. It is just "pork" in an appropriations bill—"Gingrich Gets \$200 Million in New Pork," in an appropriations bill.

I am going to go to a markup in 10 minutes, in which I know there are about five or six provisions in this authorization bill that represent special little projects in someone's State.

So what happens to the line-item veto? Why do we not have a line-item veto moving so that the President might sign the bill and have the authority to remove this pork with a line-item veto in appropriations bills this Congress is going to pass?

I think I know what has happened to it. The House of Representatives 120 days later has not even appointed conferees to go to a conference with the Senate on the line-item veto. Why have they not appointed conferees? Because I do not think they really want a line-item veto. I do. I voted for it. I voted for it many times in Congress. And I felt in March of this year when the Senate passed it, and the month before when the House passed it, that maybe those who said it was an urgent priority on the other side of the aisle were serious. It now appears they were not serious at all. It now appears to me they were much more interested in producing pork than producing a line-item veto bill.

If there is a lost and found department in the Congress, I hope someone will call and ask, where is the line-item veto bill?

One of our colleagues has treated us to a big yellow sign every day which says, "Where is Bill?"—which is not in my judgment a very respectful reference to the President. But "Where is Bill?"—asking, "Where is the President's budget?"

I guess, if I were inclined with that sort of approach, I could bring a chart here that says, "Where is the bill?"—and hang up "120 days" on the chart to ask the question, "Where is the line-item veto bill?"

We passed it. The House passed it. And there is no conference because the House has not even appointed conferees. Is the reason they have not appointed conferees because they want to lard up the appropriations bills with pork, \$200 million in pork by the Speaker of the House and they do not want a Democratic President to veto the pork out of these bills? If that is the reason, they are wallflowers when it comes to fighting the deficit.

Let us decide to cast this line-item veto bill, get it through conference, and get the President to sign it. Let us have a bite at these appropriation bills right now with this deficit. If you care about public policy and about the line-item veto, if you voted for it in the Senate, as I did, if you voted for it in the House, as the majority did, I hope they would start asking the question, "Where is the line-item veto?" Why do we not expect the Speaker to appoint conferees? Why do we not have a conference report, bring it from the House, have the Senate pass it, and get it back to the President so that he can exercise the line-item veto on these bills?

THE ORGANIZATION OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I would like to go to one other subject today briefly. It is one that almost no one knows anything about, including the Presiding Officer. It is called the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development or OECD. It is an international organization that we pay 25 percent of the total cost. I do not think anybody in here really knows much about it. There are a lot of international organizations.

This year the United States will contribute about \$62 million to fund the OECD. We are a member of the OECD. I am told that they meet in the finest places in the world and are headquartered in Paris. When they hold a meeting, they hold a meeting in a fine, great hotel in one of the great cities of the world. Folks come from all over the world to attend OECD meetings, the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development.

One of the things they did recently is approve a report, a document statement, in which this country participated and signed, that talked about how you apportion the tax burden of international corporations among the countries in which they do business.

This little document said the OECD, with the United States signing the document, rejects something called global formulary apportionment. It does not mean much to anybody. But what it means to me is this country signs on a dotted line, along with the other member countries of the OECD, saying the United States is willing to give up or forgive about \$15 billion a year in taxes that ought to be paid to America that will not be paid.

Seventy-three percent of the foreign-based corporations doing business in the United States pays zero in Federal income taxes, despite the fact they earn hundreds of billions of dollars here. There are companies that sell cars, VCR's, television sets, and other products—whose names you would recognize instantly—that do business here every day earning billions of dollars and pay zero in U.S. income taxes. Not pay a little bit—pay nothing in Federal income taxes.

Why is that? It is because the IRS is stuck with an outdated tax enforcement system which the foreign corporations love, and which foreign governments love as well. It is called the arm's-length method, which is used to evaluate transfer pricing that exists between related corporations. Tens of thousands of foreign corporations do business in the United States through U.S. subsidiaries that they own and control. These integrated companies sell things to themselves back and forth, and establish their own prices on those transactions. That is why we have examples of tractor tires being sold between corporations that are related for \$7.50 for a tractor tire; a piano