

should recognize it simply for what it is.

Now, the oil industry is big business in the United States. It provides jobs. It provides our Nation with energy security, as well.

We should not kid ourselves. The battle here is in many aspects between the very rich national environmental lobbyists and some of our poor Alaska Native people who want alternative lifestyles. They want to have running water. They want to have sewage disposal rather than honey buckets. They want to have jobs. They want to relieve themselves of the dependence on welfare. They are being deprived of these opportunities by the suggestion that we cannot open up this area safely.

Sometimes we see a double standard, a standard that suggests that this idealistic election of not allowing responsible development—there is no consideration of the human element, there is no consideration of the people that live in the area of what they feel they should have is a right to a job, a right to a good education, a right to have a future for their children, other than welfare.

As a consequence, Mr. President, there is one overwhelming fact in this debate. All Americans stand to benefit from ANWR exploration. Those benefits are: Jobs, as I have already outlined; security, by eliminating the necessity of our increased dependence on imported oil, which is already 51 percent. We can do it without any significant harm to the environment, using our technology, our engineering skills, our can-do capability. And one other item that this body spends a lot of time and effort on, and that is the concern over the deficit, balance of payments. In other words, the fact we are buying more overseas than people are buying from us.

What is that deficit made up of? Nearly \$56 billion, half of it, is the price of imported oil. The other half is our trade imbalance with Japan. So, here we have, in this particular issue, responsibly opening up this area in our State with a very small footprint, utilizing our technological capability, an opportunity to address some concerns that we all have—jobs, national security, the ability to develop this in harmony with the environment, and an opportunity to balance the budget.

I was also considering the merits of two articles that appeared in the Wall Street Journal and New York Times on October 27. They both concern themselves with the increase in the price of oil, to show you how fragile the world of oil is relative to any crisis that exists throughout the world. We have seen crises in the Mideast in the last few days, but we are also seeing one in Russia. "Concerns About Yeltsin's Health Help To Push Oil Prices Higher." "Prices of Oil Futures Jump on Report of Yeltsin Having Health Problems." Clearly, the former Soviet Union has a tremendous capability to produce oil. On the other hand, their

infrastructure is such it is not a very attractive market.

Finally, let me just comment on one point relative to the people of the area, because the people of the area are so often left out of any equation that affects the environment or the ecology.

The people of Kaktovik, the people of Point Barrow, the Eskimo people, these are people working their way out of Federal dependency. Because of our success, we are now opposed, seemingly at every turn, by, among others, a Secretary for Indian Affairs, Ada Deer. She now has gone on record as opposing successful Native corporations and organizations that are developing the resources in our State. She wants us to go back, and our people to go back, and be dependent on the Bureau of Indian Affairs. But, as we have seen, dependency brings despondence, it brings a dependence, it kills self-initiative, it breeds a welfare society. Alaska's Native and Eskimo people want to follow the American way, the way of independence, the way of self-help, individual responsibility, family values, a sense of community. Yet we are seeing spokespersons, including the Secretary of the Interior and Ada Deer, Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, actively opposing this development in the area where these people live.

This is a tragic day, in a sense, for the nearly 8,000 Eskimo people, because this is the first time any Secretary of the Interior has rejected his trust responsibility to pursue the naked political objectives of those opposed to the interests of Native Americans. It seems like the Secretary is almost penalizing hard work and success. On one hand they champion dependency, welfare and allegiance to an incompetent Bureau of Indian Affairs. Then, on the other, they put commercial fundraising interests of environmental organization over those of the Eskimo people who need help, who need this opportunity.

So, we see an administration, now, that opposes opening the coastal plain. Yet they are actively selling OCS oil and gas leases in the Arctic Ocean adjacent to the coastal plain. They say that is OK, that is all right. Secretary Babbitt and the others have their priorities backwards. Oil development on the land is safe. Oil development in the isolated wind-driven reaches of the ocean is risky; it can be hazardous.

Mr. President, I see my time is up. I thank the Chair. I appreciate the indulgence of my colleagues. Tomorrow, or the first opportunity I can get time in morning business, I intend to comment at some length on the issue of environmentalism as big business in the United States, what it consists of, who it involves, what salaries are being paid, and a list of the assets of the various organizations so the public can understand the other side of the issue. On one side we have big business and oil. On the other side we have big business and the environmental community.

I thank the Chair and wish the Chair a good day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

YITZHAK RABIN

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise to extend my deepest personal sympathies and condolences to Mrs. Rabin, Mr. Rabin's children and grandchildren, to the people of Israel, and to the Jewish community of Missouri and the United States.

Yitzhak Rabin was a warrior. As a young man, he left behind boyhood dreams and assumed the mantle of a soldier for a country that was still a dream to him and many others. He helped liberate 200 of his brothers in a heroic and legendary raid. He fought in the siege of Jerusalem and kept open the vital lines of supply. In 1967, it was General Rabin who was the architect of the determined fury of an Israeli Army that was victorious over three substantial enemies in what would become known as the Six Day War.

Nevertheless, his prowess as a warrior was exceeded only by his courage as a peacemaker. He was an Ambassador to the United States. He made the first visit ever by an Israeli Prime Minister to West Germany. He tried to open peace negotiations with King Hussein of Jordan in the late 1970's. And, in a move that would ultimately cost him his life, he made peace with some of Israel's most substantial enemies.

He need not have been a peacemaker. He could have gone quietly into the annals of history as a warrior, a Prime Minister, a father, and a grandfather. But Yitzhak Rabin was, from his earliest days, a Zionist. His goal, both in war and in peace, was the preservation of a land that God had promised. In the end, he saw in peace and through diplomacy what military victory might never bring—security for his home, for his land, for his nation.

Unfortunately, it was not a journey which he was able to see through to completion. In his life, Yitzhak Rabin defined courage—the courage to fight in war and the courage to fight for peace. His legacy will be judged finally not only by what he started, but also by what Israel and her neighbors will eventually accomplish and achieve.

That is a task which they must pursue and that they must complete. It is a task for which we will all be held accountable. So, when the mourning is completed—and mourn we must and should—may we resolve to do what he started and may the resolve linger in all of us to complete that which he began.

As a boy, Yitzhak Rabin wanted to learn how to make the fertile soil of his land produce crops more abundantly. As a man and as a leader, Prime Minister Rabin plowed and harrowed the rocky ground of peace. It was both his hope and his vision that out of that ground would grow a tree bearing the unknown fruit of peace in a

land and for a people that had seen so little of it.

In his finest hour, 2 years ago, at the White House, Prime Minister Rabin acknowledged this aspiration, as he said:

Let me say to you, the Palestinians, we are destined to live together on the same soil in the same land. . . . We have no desire for revenge. We harbor no hatred towards you. We, like you, are people—people who want to build a home. To plant a tree. To love—live side by side with you. In dignity. In empathy. As human beings. As free men.

It is all of our prayers that his dream will live on.

Mr. President, I thank you.

Mr. GRAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Minnesota.

PRESIDENT CLINTON AND THE FORGOTTEN MIDDLE CLASS

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, if you had been in New Hampshire on Thursday, January 9, 1992, and had been near a television, you might have seen the premiere of a new political advertisement—the first, early ad of the presidential campaign for a candidate who was not yet a familiar face.

The setting is an office. Piano music plays gently in the background, and the candidate speaks to the camera with an American flag as his backdrop.

"In the 80's," he begins, "the rich got richer, the middle class declined, poverty exploded, politicians in Washington raised their pay and pointed fingers, but no one took responsibility."

The candidate promises a tax cut for the middle class, even offers viewers a copy of his "Plan for America's Future" if they call the number on their television screen.

"I hope you'll join us in this crusade for change," he says earnestly.

Together we can put government back on the side of the forgotten middle class and restore the American dream.

I'm Bill Clinton, and I believe you deserve more than 30-second ads or vague promises.

Mr. President, Bill Clinton evoked the image of the forgotten middle class throughout his campaign for the White House, tantalizing the voters—while separating himself from the rest of his Democratic opponents—by promising he would cut taxes for working-class Americans.

"I am not in this thing to pander," he told *Business Week* in a June 1992 interview.

The way I came to the across-the-board, middle-class tax cut didn't have a relationship to the polls. . . . I came back to the middle-class tax cut as a down payment on fairness.

As that "down payment on fairness" took shape, Bill Clinton reached out to the overtaxed middle class by focusing his tax cut plan on families, advocating ideas that seemed more in line with the Republican vision than the Democrat policies of the past. "It is very much harder to raise a child for a middle-class family today than it was 40 years

ago," said candidate Clinton. "Our country used to take the position that the way to build strong families was to enable the working people to have enough money to raise their families."

"We're still getting a disproportionate amount of taxes from the middle class," he emphasized.

During the Presidential campaign, candidate Clinton promised to reduce the taxes paid by families and shield them from future tax increases.

"Virtually every industrialized nation recognizes the importance of strong families in its tax code; we should too," he wrote in "Putting People First," his campaign's economic outline for the country.

"We will lower the tax burden on middle-class Americans."

Mr. Clinton's plan began to take shape with a focus on tax relief for families with children. "The main portion of the middle-class tax cut for me in its present form is the children's tax credit," he said back in 1992.

He promised that he would cut taxes for average, middle-class families by 10 percent, giving them a choice between a phased-in, \$800 per-child tax credit or a "significant reduction in their income tax rate."

Those election-year promises helped turn candidate Bill Clinton into President Bill Clinton when frustrated Americans went to the polls that November.

But like so many promises made in the political heat of an election year, Mr. Clinton's tax-cut intentions of 1992 melted like summer snow in 1993.

By then, Republicans in Congress were rallying around the \$500 per-child tax credit I had authored as a Member of the House, making it the centerpiece of our budget alternatives in both the House and Senate.

But the Democrats, led by the President, pushed through a package of tax hikes on the middle class—a historic tax increase that affected every segment of American society.

Promises made, promises broken.

Mr. President, in 1995, this Congress has not forgotten our promise to the middle class.

We have passed a budget that recognizes, just as President Clinton did in 1992, that working-class Americans have paid more than their fair share of taxes over the last 40 years.

Families in 1950 sent just \$1 of every \$50 they earned to Washington, but families today are turning over \$1 out of every \$4.

That is money they could have spent for a child's education, health insurance, groceries for an elderly parent, or something as simple as birthday presents and Christmas gifts.

But instead, they are handing it over to the Washington bureaucrats, who spend it for them—often recklessly—in ways that often have no benefit at all to the folks who foot the Government's bills.

For more than 40 years, the only economic and fiscal discipline exercised by

Congress has come at the expense of the American taxpayers.

The budget plan we will soon be sending to the President is based on our deeply held belief that the weekly paycheck is not the Government's money—that families can spend their own money better than a Government that demands those dollars to spend on their behalf.

We are certain that 250 million Americans, empowered to make their own spending decisions, will make better choices than Congress and the President could ever make for them.

With our budget, Congress is dedicating \$245 billion to tax relief, the vast majority of which will go to working-class American families through the \$500-per-child tax credit.

The child tax credit means Minnesota families would get to keep \$477 million of their own dollars every year, to spend wherever they needed help the most.

The \$500-per-child tax credit would return \$150 million annually to families in President Clinton's own State of Arkansas. And it would completely erase the tax liability for 38,411 Arkansas residents.

Well, it has been nearly 4 years since that first campaign commercial in New Hampshire promised tax relief for the beleaguered middle class. An election is on the horizon, and once again, like the swallows returning to Capistrano, candidate Clinton is talking about cutting taxes.

He laid out the framework in his most recent State of the Union address. He said: "I have proposed the middle-class bill of rights * * * It will give needed tax relief and raise incomes in both the short run and the long run, in a way that benefits all of us."

We say "welcome back aboard" to the President. We need President Clinton with us as the budget process continues. He has a critical role as we move forward.

We cannot enact our groundbreaking legislation without his signature. We cannot carry out the people's agenda without the people's President behind us.

And President Clinton needs us, too. So we have prepared a budget that meets the objectives outlined at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue. Yes, Congress and the President may disagree about some of the specifics, but not our goals.

The budget must balance. It must protect and preserve Medicare. It must restore hope to those who have been trapped in the welfare system. And it must cut taxes for the middle-class, with the same child tax credit President Clinton promised in 1992, and again this year.

President Clinton considered family tax relief such a fundamental concept that he outlined it as a priority in that very first television ad of his Presidential campaign. "Together we can put government back on the side of the