shells, and over an extended period of time, when food stamps came in, where they qualified. So there was a transition. After food stamps came in they did not have to depend to the same extent on subsistence.

I am reminded, I might say by my staff, I said that the Secretary was representing about 10 percent of Alaska's Native people. I am told Gwich'ins consist of about 1 percent of the Native people. So, it is even smaller. But my point is, in this transition of the Native people of our State, as a consequence of food stamps, they have become less dependent on subsistence. Subsistence played a vital role, but they did not have the total dependence. So, as a consequence, trapping was reduced and a little later we began to expand the welfare system.

So, today in Alaska we have a significant portion of our rural residents, most of them Native residents, dependent on subsistence and welfare. Now we are going to cut welfare. Welfare is going to be reduced. We all know that. The BIA, that plays a major role in the lives of many of Alaska's Native people, is going to be cut. Now, these people want jobs. They want jobs at home. These are good-paying jobs associated with resource development, oil and gas. So 99 percent of America's Native people, I should say 99 percent of Alaska's Native people, support, through their Federation of Natives, or thereabouts, opening this area. We have job training capabilities in Alaska.

We have a Job Corps center. We have a good experience of utilizing some of our Native people in Prudhoe Bay. But here is a long-term job opportunity. And the Secretary of the Interior has taken a position against a majority of Alaska's Native people in favor of that 1 percent, the Gwich'ins people who oppose opening up this area for competitive leasing. The justification for that is going to have to be the Secretary explaining to the Native people of Alaska why he has chosen to represent this minority.

Mr. President, I am going to be talking further next week on some aspects that I feel are important to this body. I think what we will do the first of the week is to go into some of the fact and fiction, because America's environmental community has found this issue to be very attractive in raising funding-generated membership.

I was in one Senator's office the other day. The Sierra Club had evidently contracted with one of our Nation's communications firms. The way it worked is that the Sierra Club provided the communications firm with telephone numbers of people who were members of the Sierra Club in that particular State.

They were able to dial in simultaneously, two calls in one. They would phone a Mr. Brown in the State of Arkansas and say, ''Mr. Brown, we have the Senator's office on the line. We would like you to express your opinion about the possible drilling in the Arctic oil reserve which would ruin this area and wipe out the animals in the area.'' Immediately, the call would come in—Mr. Brown would be on the phone—to the Senator's office and be able to log in a call.

This is a pretty significant effort. It costs a lot of money. We do not have those capabilities to explain our side of the story. What we do have is 18 years of experience producing oil from Prudhoe Bay. Where would this Nation be today without that oil, that 25 percent? We would be even more dependent on the Persian Gulf.

We have the finest oilfield in the world in Prudhoe Bay, and we are proud of that. We built an expertise in the Arctic with our geologists, with our USGS personnel showing that we can open this area safely, we can do it compatibly with the environment and the ecology, as evidenced by this picture of the caribou flourishing in Prudhoe Bay. The same set of circumstances can happen in ANWR.

So we have the can-do spirit. The only difference is today we have nearly 20 years of experience. We can make the footprints smaller. We can provide more jobs in this Nation. We can reduce our national security exposure to more dependence on the Mideast. We can provide for the largest single identification of jobs in the United States which will help our unions, help our economy, and, lastly, Mr. President, what it will do is it will address our balance of payment deficits. Half the balance of payment deficit is the price of imported oil.

I want to thank the President for his attention, and I wish he and my colleagues a good day.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN W. ANDERSON

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I want to pay tribute to an outstanding longtime member and president of the Alabama Farmers Cooperative [AFC], John W. Anderson, who retired from his post effective September 30, 1995.

John was named president of AFC on December 13, 1989. He became a member in 1969. During those 26 years, he served in various capacities at AFC, including his management of the Anderson's Peanuts Division from 1984 to 1989.

Anderson's Peanuts was founded in 1933 by John's father, Robert B. Anderson, and acquired by AFC in 1969. Since that time, the peanut division has grown steadily and now includes buying points, shelling plants, and storage facilities in more than 20 locations. It is a major supplier of both domestic and export peanuts.

John currently serves on the board of directors of the Mississippi Chemical Corp., and has previously served on the boards of the National Peanut Council, the Southeastern Peanut Association, Commercial Bank, and Andalusia Hospital. He is a past president of the Alabama Crop Improvement Association and was selected as its Man of the Year in 1988.

A native of Andalusia, AL, John and his wife, the former Evelyn Wilder, have three grown children and five grandchildren. He has a degree in industrial management from Auburn University. He will spend—and no doubt enjoy—his retirement in Destin, FL, near two of the children. So, they will be properly surrounded by grandchildren.

John's leadership at AFC will be sorely missed, but his friendship, guidance, and example will continue to benefit the organization for many years to come. I commend him for a job well done, and wish him all the best for a long, happy, and healthy retirement.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, it is my understanding we are functioning in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct, in 5 minute intervals.

TAX BURDEN ON AMERICAN FAMILIES

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, several months ago, I was reviewing some data about the tax burden on the American family. I have mentioned it more than once here, but it was absolutely intriguing—one of the thousands of pie charts we see around here—showing the growth of taxes from 1950 to 1970, 1970 to 1980, and so on.

I was struck by this because in 1950—it always makes me think of Ozzie and Harriet, the sort of television portrayal of the average family of that time—and that family, Ozzie and Harriet, would have been sending, of every dollar they earned, 2 cents to Washington—2 cents. And outside of their local taxes and the like, the balance of what they earned they used to house that family, clothe that family, educate that family and provide for the health of the family.

What was stunning to me was if Ozzie was here today in 1995, he would be sending 24 cents of that dollar to Washington and about that much to the State and local government. So that family has lost enormous resources. They work over half the year now for one of the governments; a quarter of the year just for the Federal Government.

When I was a youngster, everybody always told me that the largest investment that an American family will ever make is for the home. That is the single largest investment by far the vast majority of Americans will ever make. That is not true anymore. Now the largest investment they will ever make is to the tax collector. That is the single largest consumer of the earnings of an American family today—the Government.

It made me curious because that is an enormous force and pressure on that

family. If somebody comes by the door and takes half of what you have, it is bound to have an effect. So I started looking for what that effect may have been.

One of the first things that comes to mind, as we all know, is that there are far more families with both parents working today in 1995 than there were in 1950. So I began to measure the growth line of taxes, because I had it in the back of my mind, ''I will bet you that line is absolutely identical to the number of families that have decided both parents have to work.''

Sure enough, the lines are absolutely parallel, within 6 percentage points. As we took more from the family, more of those families had to put both parents in the workplace and, of course, we all know the problems that follow that.

Everybody has a different reason for the altered behavior of the American family today. Our leader suggested maybe it was Hollywood. The First Lady is suggesting it is capitalism, turbocharged capitalism, that is affecting the American family. A lot of writers today think it is greed, that the American family has to have another electric can opener or an addition on the house or another car, and that is what has caused so much change in the behavior of the American family.

I reject all of those. I am sure they have had their effect, but nothing has had the effect—nothing—no institution has had the effect comparable to the Government that has taken so much of the resources out of the family. The effect is that we have marginalized those families.

How often have you read, Mr. President, that the American family is not saving today? What is left to save?

If you take an average family of $40,000 a year and take half of it, and they have $20,000 to $24,000 to provide for all of the needs of the family, of course they are not saving. About every way you look at that family—two parents working, savings down, divorce up—the impact has been staggering.

Mr. President, the point I am making is that it is absolutely appropriate in our deliberations over balanced budgets that a major piece of the equation be to lower—to lower—the tax burden on the average family, to push it down, to give more resources to the family, which is a central component of building American life, give them the resources to do it.

The balanced budget bill that we passed just last Friday, a week ago today, does just that. It has the effect on the average family of putting around $2,000 in disposable income on that kitchen table, or increasing the disposable income of the American family an average of 10 to 20 percent.

How do we do that? Well, interest rates are dropping because of the balanced budget battle. If they have an average mortgage of $50,000, we will save them over $1,000 a year in reduced interest payments. We will save them almost $200 a year on the interest payments on their car. We will save them $200 a year on the interest payments on the credit cards, or the addition on the house, or the student loan.

The average family has two children. They are going to save $1,000 a year right off the top of the tax bill with the children's tax credit of $500 per child. That is $2,000 to $3,000 for the average family. That is where the work of America is done. That is who we depend on to house a family, that is who we depend on to educate, that is who we depend upon to provide the health. It is our duty to find our way, Mr. President, to get the resources back to that family.

It is almost unbelievable that we have come to the point that the largest single investment an American family makes is to the tax collector. It used to be the home, as I said earlier. That was the single largest investment a family ever made. Not so anymore. No, it is Washington. Twenty-four percent of every dime they earn, we bring to this city. I have to tell you, Mr. President, as good sounding as all these bills you hear about are here—to educate, to house, health—no one, certainly not a Washington program, does as much for taking care of America as does her families. That is where we need to get the resources, Mr. President. That is why the reduction in taxes that we have talked about in this balanced budget resolution is so terribly important.

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 bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, am I correct that I have been designated for 20 minutes during morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. Under the previous order, the Senator from Florida is recognized for up to 20 minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the Chair.

AN AMERICAN SUCCESS STORY

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, for the past 30 years, the Medicaid Program has been the lifeblood of the United States health and long-term care delivery system for millions of Americans. Today, I will begin a series of presentations on the Medicaid Program. Today, I will be refuting the false notion that the Medicaid Program has been a failure and that it should therefore be abandoned. The fact is that Medicaid is an American success story.

Next week, I will continue by exposing the bogus economic basis upon which the block grant proposal is built and which is used as a purported replacement of our current Federal-State Medicaid partnership. I will suggest to the Senate through a side-by-side analysis what we know to be the demand for health care services under Medicaid and what has actually been provided under the Senate-passed bill.

Finally, I will conclude with a proposal on how a consensus can be reached which would accomplish an objective of reducing the cost of the Medicaid Program, potentially by tens of billions of dollars, over the next 7 years without destroying the essential Federal-State partnership.

The word ''failure'' has been used frequently and casually as a justification for why this country must abandon the Federal-State partnership in health care for poor children and their mothers, for the frail elderly, and for the disabled. Critics have bellowed that Medicaid is a failure, and in the next breath they say that since Medicaid is a failure we can go ahead and back out $187 billion from what has been projected as the necessary amount of money to meet the needs of those traditionally served under Medicaid.

There is a story that needs to be told. That story is an American success story, and the name of that American success story is Medicaid.

If my colleagues truly pondered the significance of this Federal-State partnership, they would not seek to plunder $187 billion from Medicaid at the expense of the health and safety of the 37 million—I repeat, 37 million—Americans who depend upon Medicaid.

The Medicaid Program truly is an American success story. The Senate should be building upon that success story, not retreating from it. The truth is the Medicaid Program has been a lifesaver. One need only look at the role Medicaid has played in reducing infant mortality in America.

When I was Governor of the State of Florida, the Southern Governors Association under the leadership of the then Governor of South Carolina and now Secretary of Education, Richard Riley, decided to tackle the unacceptably high infant mortality rate among Southern States—a rate which put the Southern States on par with some developing countries around the world. So in 1984, we formed the southern regional infant mortality project. We decided to tackle infant mortality through enhancing prenatal care, screening pregnant mothers to identify at-risk babies, and making sure that nutrition services and other resources were brought to bear on the infant mortality rate.

During the period 1984 to 1992, national infant mortality decreased 21 percent. A great deal of that progress was due to the improved performance of the Southern States. My own State of Florida knew that it had a scandalously high infant mortality rate so that it made a conscious decision to decrease infant mortality, low birthweight deliveries, and the number of women lacking prenatal care. The Federal Government was a full partner