

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 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 Jerusalem 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 nondefense 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 any-

more. 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 Medicaid 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)