

seriousness of the deteriorating weather. I recognize the subject being discussed is of paramount interest, but I hope we can strike a balance.

I thank the indulgence of my colleague.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand that my friend from the State of Oklahoma wishes to make a statement regarding one of his children. I will be happy to yield without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. I appreciate very much the Senator from Nevada yielding to me. I would like to inquire of the Chair, what is the regular order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is the Senator from Nevada has the floor.

#### BALANCING THE BUDGET

Mr. INHOFE. All right. Mr. President, I was interested in the statement that was made by the very distinguished Senator from Washington State a few minutes ago when he was talking about those who are not represented here and the moral issue of the conduct in which we have been conducting our country over the past 30 years.

I was reminded of an experience the other day of back when we had our prayer breakfast. This was the international prayer breakfast where we had people here from all over the world, and I was in charge of international visitors, when one of the visitors who was here from Moldavia, which was a former Soviet republic that had gained its freedom, came in and he asked me a question during one of our visits that we had.

He said, "Senator INHOFE, I have a question to ask you. In the United States, how much can you keep?" And I said, "I am sorry, I do not understand what you mean." He said, "How much money do you have to give the government?" Then I got a little better idea of what he was asking.

So I asked the question—in fact, I would be a little embarrassed to tell you the answer that I gave the gentleman that was here from Moldavia. He was so proud. And he said, "In Moldavia, we have a new democracy. We have new freedoms. And when we"—they have some type of a tax collection system where every 3 months or so they collect the taxes. And he said, "Every time we make a dollar, we get to keep 20 cents." In other words, they have to pay 80 cents out of every dollar to support the government there. And he was rejoicing because this was the new freedom that he had discovered.

I got to thinking and looking at the facts, that I do not think anyone will refute, and that is that if we do not do something now about changing this pattern that we established back in the Great Society days of the middle 1960's, that someone who is born today will

have to pay not 80 cents out of every dollar but 82 cents out of every dollar just to support government.

I bring that up today because today is a day that a very important person is to be born, and that person has the name or will have the name—and maybe as we speak has the name—of James Edward Rapert. This will be my third grandchild. So it becomes a much more personal thing when you think of someone coming into this world—such as the Presiding Officer who recently had a young child named Daniel born in his family—all of a sudden it becomes personal. It comes out of the realm of the normal discussion as to the various social programs that the various Senators have stood on the floor of this Senate today talking about—the education programs, the social programs, the poverty programs, the nutrition programs, and all of these—and it becomes an issue of, what are we willing to do to those who cannot be heard, those for whom there is no lobby, such as James Edward Rapert?

I understand that yesterday the House, by a very decisive margin, with many, many of the Democrats, voted to reaffirm the commitment we have to a balanced budget by the year 2002 using real figures, not smoke and mirrors, but using real figures and using the CBO figures. In fact, I cannot imagine when I go back to Oklahoma, such as I was this weekend, everybody saying, well, what is there to debate? I mean, we have the Democrats who ran for office on a balanced budget. We have a President of the United States who ran for office on a balanced budget to the Constitution. And everyone is for it. Who is against it? And I tried to explain the reality up here is not always what it seems to be at home because this, in fact, is Washington.

So we are in a situation—I know there are several who want to be heard tonight. I just want to make a comment about a statement that was made by a very distinguished Member of the other body, John Kasich. The other day he said, "We're in a frustrating situation where we have a balanced budget amendment or Balanced Budget Act that we passed in both the House and Senate, and it was vetoed by the President, and yet we don't have anything from him." And he said, "It is like going Christmas shopping and going up and saying, 'I want to buy this tie. How much is it?' And they will not tell you.

So he said, 'I will give you \$100.' They said, 'No, that's not enough.' 'How much more?' Well, they will not tell you."

That is the situation we find ourselves in right now. So we have probably the second most significant issue facing us that we will face for maybe the last 10 years, and that is doing something about a balanced budget. We have an opportunity that is coming up any hour now, any day, certainly I hope it is going to happen prior to Christmas. When that time comes, I

hope we will all remember not ourselves, not all the nutritional programs, not all the things we talk about and how we can wisely spend the people's money that we are borrowing from future generations, but I hope we think of James Edward Rapert who will be paying for all this fun that we are having.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

#### THE BUDGET

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my friend from Washington said a number of things that I want to respond to. I have a great deal of respect for the senior Senator from Washington, and he and I serve together as chairman and ranking member of an appropriations subcommittee. I have found him to be an extremely easy person to work with, and I have developed during that process great respect for his legislative abilities. But I think it is important to mention a number of things that I think need to be responded to in regard to his statement.

He talks about the second crisis. The first crisis and the second crisis were caused not by the minority, which is the Democrats. The fact of the matter is that by October 1 of each year, it is the responsibility of the Congress to pass appropriations bills. The record is very clear. By October 1 of this year, the majority in the House and in the Senate had not passed bills that could be sent to the President.

The second crisis referred to by the Senator from Washington again was not created by virtue of something that the Democrats did that was wrong, the minority did that was wrong. The fact of the matter is that the majority did not pass appropriations bills. This crisis that we have is not something caused by the minority. The fact of the matter is, on October 1 the bills were not passed.

I also think it is important to acknowledge again on this floor, we hear constant talk about the fact that the majority is now pushing for a balanced budget. I think that is good. I think that is important. But the fact of the matter is that the 1993 budget plan that was passed in this body and the other body—it was the so-called Clinton plan—was the largest deficit-reduction plan in the history of this country. It reduced the deficit over \$500 billion over a 5-year period of time, the largest deficit-reduction program in the history of this country.

Yesterday it was an unusual day in the last couple years in this country. It was unusual because the stock market went down. It was an extremely unusual day that the market went down. Today it went back up. But the stock market is over 5,000, Dow Jones. The stock market has been hot. Why? Because the economy has been doing extremely well.

We have had the lowest unemployment, lowest inflation in 40 or 50 years;

highest economic growth since the days of John Kennedy; corporate profits have never been higher. There has been a time or two in the past 200 years when they have been as high, but never higher than they are today.

The Federal work force has been reduced by 175,000 people in the last 2½ years, excluding the military; civilian reduction by 175,000. No wonder the economy is doing fine.

That does not mean that we should not do some very important things regarding the annual deficits. They are too high, even though it is the largest deficit reduction plan in the history of this country. The deficits are too high and we should do better.

There has been talk by a number of Senators from the other side about why did we not just approve this resolution that came from the House that calls for a balanced budget? The reason it was not approved, as indicated in the dialog between the majority and minority leader, is that the resolution needs an amendment. Why? Because it needs to protect priorities that we on this side feel are important: Medicare, Medicaid, veterans' benefits, education, the environment.

Maybe it was an oversight. Whatever it is, if you are going to have a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, a sense-of-this-Congress resolution, as to what we want, then you have to include the fact that we are willing to go for a 7-year balanced budget, but in the process of doing that, we want Medicare protected, we want Medicaid protected, veterans' benefits, environment, and education.

So the resolution will pass tomorrow. We will stick those things in it and it will pass, as indicated by the majority leader and the minority leader.

The reason we hang out and talk about certain things being important is because they are important. My friend, the minority whip, who has left the floor, has long been a supporter of a balanced budget, as has been many people in this Chamber, including the ranking member of the Budget Committee. I would put the balanced budget credentials of the senior Senator from Nebraska up against anybody in this Congress. It is not something that my friend from Nebraska suddenly said this year, "I'm retiring from Congress in a couple years. I think I'll come out for a balanced budget amendment." From the day he stepped in here, after his service as Governor of Nebraska, he started talking about a balanced budget.

He has voted for balanced budgets. A constitutional amendment to balance the budget would have passed by probably 80 votes this year if—if—we had excluded Social Security trust funds. As a result of the majority not being willing to exclude the Social Security trust funds, the constitutional amendment failed, as well it should have failed.

We are very concerned about Medicare. Why? Because today Medicare

provides coverage for over 37 million Americans. Medicare has been successful in fulfilling its mission to provide health insurance coverage to America's senior citizens.

Today, 99 percent of senior citizens have health care coverage. Why? Because of Medicare. That is not the way it was 30-odd years ago. Around 40 percent of the people who were senior citizens then had health insurance.

It has been good. It has been good not only giving people peace of mind but it has extended their lives. For those 65 and older in the United States, life expectancy is now higher than in any country in the world, with the simple exception of Japan. And why? Most people who understand what has happened in this country in the last 30 years say it is because of Medicare.

Medicare has been one of the primary reasons that poverty has been reduced among the elderly. When Medicare came into being, almost 30 percent of senior citizens were below the poverty level. Now, Mr. President, it is about 12.5 percent—a dramatic reduction. One of the main reasons is because of Medicare.

Medicare is a very efficient program. We bash Government programs. I have done a little of it myself, but do not bash Medicare, because it is a very good and it is a very efficient program. Medicare administrative costs average 2 percent of program outlays, compared with 5 percent for large group plans and as much as 25 percent for small group plans in the private sector. Medicare works and it works well, and it benefits all Americans regardless of income status.

Mr. President, 83 percent of outlays go to beneficiaries with incomes of \$25,000 or less. Only 3 percent goes to elderly individuals or couples with income in excess of \$50,000. The No. 1 priority, Mr. President, for the minority is that any budget plan must continue Medicare's guarantee of high-quality medical care for senior citizens and people with disabilities by ensuring trust fund solvency and protecting beneficiaries.

I have heard numerous statements on this floor of people coming and saying, "The reason we're making all these punitive changes is because the Medicare trustees have said we have to do something or Medicare is going to go broke."

For 27 years, we have had Medicare in existence. Twenty-five of the twenty-seven years the trustees have reported the program is going to go broke and, as a result of that—it is a pay-as-you-go system—we have had to change the way that we fund Medicare, and we need to do it now.

Any plan that we come up with must ensure the viability of the Medicare trust fund for at least 10 years, must protect Medicare beneficiaries from premium increases beyond current law, and promote changes that would not drive up overall costs.

We must keep Medicare a first-class program, something we are all proud of

and especially something senior citizens are proud of. In doing that, we must ensure the viability of hospitals and other critical care health care providers in rural and urban areas.

I think it is important that we understand that we, the minority, have been fighting to protect Medicare. Why? Because some of the leaders, Mr. President, on the other side are talking about Medicare withering on the vine, and the GOP plan threatens to have Medicare wither on the vine by encouraging doctors to leave the current Medicare program and penalizing seniors who choose to stay. They are extreme cuts—\$270 billion. They may have been dropped, with the latest CBO numbers, but they are large cuts and budget gimmicks.

One of the things that is suggested in the plan by the majority is that there be group health care plans that allow managed care. That is fine, but the fine print says that the \$50 billion that the majority says will be saved with that program, if they are not saved, if those savings do not come, there will be across-the-board cuts in Medicare.

So we have to watch very closely that these plans do not use budget gimmickry. We talk about more choice. We have to make sure there are not bad choices.

Mr. President, I want to just mention a couple things, and I do this because we have people coming on the floor and saying, "Democrats don't want to balance the budget. The minority doesn't want to balance the budget." We want to balance the budget. We have voted for a 7-year balanced budget plan, but we want to protect Medicare, we want to protect Medicaid, and the program the majority has put out repeals the current Medicaid program which serves 36 million needy and vulnerable Americans and replaces it with an underfunded and inflexible block grant.

The majority proposal ends a guarantee for 18 million children and 8 million women who receive preventive and primary care, 4 million elderly Americans who get help with Medicare payments—it would end that—6 million disabled Americans, who receive coverage for physician and hospital and specialized services. The cuts there are as much as \$420 billion because, remember, any money that goes to the States from the Federal Government is matched by the States. So it is a double loss for recipients.

Mr. President, I know the hour is late. I know the streets are icy, but I have been waiting to get the floor. I want the RECORD to make sure that it reflects that the minority believes in certain standards. We believe in not devastating Medicare, and we want to maintain Medicaid so that it is a system that does not—as the report says by the Consumers' Union and the National Senior Citizens Law Center, some 395,000 nursing home patients could lose their Medicaid coverage under the proposal the majority has put out. Without these payments, nursing homes could force patients to leave

unless the families pay for care. This was not just dreamed up. If you read the Washington Post and other major newspapers, that came out yesterday, and that is what the story says. Families are going to have to start paying.

Mr. President, I have a lot more to say. I am only going to say that we have a lot of problems with the deficit that comes every year. We have a bigger problem with the debt that is accumulating. That was not done with the Democratic administrations. We have \$5 trillion in debt. I hope that we will not only talk about balancing the budget on a yearly basis but we talk about doing something with the underlying debt. I hope that is something that is addressed in the immediate future. Not only should we be concerned about the annual deficits, but the underlying \$5 trillion in debt is something we must address.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

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

#### 1995 YEAR END REPORT

The mailing and filing date of the 1995 year end report required by the Federal Election Campaign Act, as amended, is Wednesday, January 31, 1996. Principal campaign committees supporting Senate candidates file their reports with 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 7 p.m. on the filing date to accept these filings. In general, reports will be available the day after receipt. For further information, please contact the Public Records Office on (202) 224-0322.

#### REGISTRATION OF MASS MAILINGS

The filing date for 1995 fourth quarter mass mailings is January 25, 1996. 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.

#### TRIBUTE TO REV. RICHARD C. HALVERSON

Mr. MACK. I rise today to extend my heartfelt condolences to the family of

Rev. Richard Halverson. In his position as the U.S. Senate Chaplain for the past 14 years, Reverend Halverson acted as spiritual leader to me personally, as well as to the entire Senate. His unwavering devotion, knowledge, and guidance have been a powerful example of living by one's convictions. It is an example from which we should derive inspiration as we search for the true meaning in our lives. I will keep the family of Reverend Halverson in my thoughts and prayers during their time of grief.

#### THE IMMIGRATION REFORM DEBATE

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I would like to set forth my general concerns about S. 1394, a bill passed out of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration a few weeks ago. In general, this bill would combine measures aimed at reducing illegal immigration with dramatic reductions in legal immigration. In my view, illegal and legal immigration are very different issues. Illegal immigration is a significant national problem, one that we should address by discussing ways to deal with people who cross our borders unlawfully. In contrast, legal immigrants are overwhelmingly law-abiding and hardworking people who contribute to our economy and our society. We should deal with the real problem of illegal immigration without retreating from America's historic commitment to legal immigration.

Mr. President, I would like to make an obvious point: America is a land of immigrants. For most of our history we have welcomed anyone with the desire and fortitude necessary to come here in search of a better life.

Lady Liberty has held our door open to the teeming masses of the world, not out of pity, but out of respect for our Nation's immigrant roots, and in the knowledge that immigrants made this country strong and prosperous, and will continue to do so, so long as we let them.

We as a people will remain a vibrant, shining example to the world, so long as we continue to look out to that world, welcoming those who would join us in building a free and open society.

We have every right and even responsibility to expect those who come to our land to live up to our standards of decency and responsibility. We can and should expect able-bodied immigrants to work. We can and should expect them to forego the often debilitating effects of welfare.

But we should not slam the door shut to people yearning to be free, and to build a better life for themselves and their families.

My grandparents were all immigrants. They came to this country from Lebanon about a century ago in search of freedom. None of the four could speak English. And they had few material resources to speak of. But they came to America because they

wanted to live in a country that was free and they wanted their children and their grandchildren to live in a nation that was free. My grandparents did not come here pursuing government benefits. They believed in their own capacity to do things, and they wanted a place where they would have a chance to enjoy the freedom to do the things they wanted.

My parents did better in America than their parents. My parents were very hard-working folks. Neither of them had a college education. My dad worked almost 20 years as a UAW member on an assembly line in an Oldsmobile factory in Lansing, MI. After that, he and my mom started a small business. They worked hard; 6 sometimes 7 days a week in order to give me and my sisters a chance to share in the American Dream—to have more freedom and opportunity than they did. Their hard work has allowed me to succeed in turn; I was the first child in our family to go to college.

Unfortunately, I believe that this bill will make it more difficult for people like my grandparents to come to America.

Specifically, S. 1394 would significantly reduce the quotas for legal immigration, restrict immigration as a means to re-unite separated families, and eliminate whole categories of legal immigration.

I believe these measures will cause real harm to our economy and to our Nation as a whole. Most damaging, they will keep us from benefiting from the hard work, experience and expertise of legal immigrants.

Immigrants are the ultimate entrepreneurs. They are people willing to risk it all in a new and different land. They are self-selected and seek to make a better life for themselves and their families.

As economist Thomas Sowell writes in his *Ethnic America: A History*:

The fact that immigrants not only equal, but eventually surpass, their native-born counterparts suggests that they brought some advantage in terms of human capital, that migration is a selective process, bringing the more ambitious or venturesome or able elements of a population.

Mr. President, these are the kind of people we want to become Americans. These are the kind of people who sacrifice so their children can rise to the top of their class.

Immigrants also create a brain gain for the United States. One in three people who have graduated from college in engineering in this country is an immigrant, according to the National Research Center.

Immigrant expertise is widespread and impressive. In the 20th century between 20 and 50 percent of all Nobel Prize winners, depending on the discipline involved, have been immigrants to the United States. As of 1988 there were more Russian Nobel Prize winners living in the United States than living in Russia.