

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 Government 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—that 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 on 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 towards 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.