

legislator in every State and the people at large, as to the awesome task that we take upon ourselves when we pass this measure. It is not going to be easy. It is probably one of the most difficult tasks that the Congress of the United States all during our history has ever saddled itself with. But saddle it we must if we are going to stop runaway deficits, skyrocketing national debts.

I think the first thing we have to have a full understanding with the people on, if they do not understand it now, is that there is a difference between the annual deficit and the national debt. I am afraid the people hear about the \$150 to \$350 billion annual deficit and then they hear about the skyrocketing national debt that was addressed earlier in the day by Senator DASCHLE, under \$1 trillion in 1980 and now it is \$4.7 trillion. They hear often that the fastest growing part of our budget is interest on the national debt.

I simply say that if we are going to balance the Federal budget by the year 2002, as is outlined in most of the measures that have been introduced thus far, we are going to have to cut \$1 trillion or more, depending on how much money we expend for tax decreases—worthy or unworthy, justified or unjustified. The political climate, it seems to me, is to make everybody happy we have to have a tax cut. Add that tax cut, if you will, to the \$1 trillion that I have already outlined and you see the monumental problem that we have on our hands.

Meanwhile back at the ranch we have all kinds of people, well-intentioned people, who are saying, "This has to be off limits. Of course that has to be off limits. We cannot touch this, we cannot touch that." I hope those of us who vote for a constitutional amendment to balance the budget recognize, as we must, that not all of us, maybe not a majority of us, will be here serving in the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives in the year 2002. Yet we are mandating what people will do then. We, therefore, in my view, have the responsibility to plow a straight furrow, to tell the people exactly what the situation is, to put the pain and suffering that is going to take place in making these cuts so they are clearly understood—to recognize that, of all things, we may even have to raise taxes sometime before 2002 to accomplish the ends we are about to vote for. When you mention the tax word around here, though, that is a no-no.

I simply say in tackling this proposition this Senator, and I expect two-thirds of the Senate, are strongly in support of and will pass a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. We have the responsibility, not only to vote but we have the responsibility

to fully understand what we are tackling and what we are taking on. Therefore, I want to make the point that this S. 9 is a far-reaching measure. It has to be passed, I believe, to bring some sanity to the Federal Government, to begin to balance income with out-go. Therefore it is a necessity. It is a very, very painful one and the people of the United States who send us here to do their bidding should understand when we do what they want us to do—the vast majority want a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. I say to the people of the United States of America, it is not going to be easy. I am afraid too many believe if we just eliminate the \$1,200 toilet seats and the \$500 hammer, and if we cut the salaries of the Members of the House and Senate and their staffs in half, we could do those things and everything would take care of itself. It would be balanced.

I heard a big debate on television last night about \$300 million for public radio and public television. That is what television shows are made of. The \$300 million that we spend on public broadcasting maybe should be cut. But it is a drop in the bucket. And we continue to focus on the little things, making believe if we do that, the problem is solved. It is a monumental problem of major proportions that all should understand, as we proceed down this dangerous course that in my view we must proceed on if we are ever going to bring outlays in line with expenditures.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. I make inquiry to the Chair on a matter, a parliamentary inquiry as to what the proceedings are before the Senate now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may speak for up to 10 minutes.

#### SENATOR DASCHLE'S IMPORTANT MESSAGES TO THE AMERICAN PUBLIC

Mr. REID. Mr. President, at the beginning of every session of Congress the Senate, both the minority and the majority, introduce five bills. These are deemed to be the most important bills of the two parties during a Congress. I would like to congratulate and applaud the minority leader, Senator DASCHLE of South Dakota, for the choice he made in the bills that are part of the legislation that will be addressed by this Congress. The bills he has introduced are important messages to the American public.

I first want to talk about S. 6. This is a bill dealing with the American work-

ing class. It is called the Working Americans Opportunity Act. We have made great strides, these past couple of years, in creating new jobs. Over 5 million new jobs have been created. We have the lowest inflation rate since John Kennedy was President. Three years in a row we have had a deficit reduction. We will have a reduction in our annual deficit this year, the third year in a row. This is the first time in 50 years this has happened.

Industrial production is the highest since the days of President Lyndon Baines Johnson. Real business investment is the highest since World War II.

Mr. President, we have 100,000 fewer Federal employees than we had years ago. Corporate profits soared 45 percent in the last quarter. Productivity as I indicated is skyrocketing.

What then is the problem? The problem is that the American public generally is not benefiting from the gains that are being made.

Let me read from a speech that was given by the Secretary of Labor very recently. He said among other things, and I quote:

The old middle class has become an anxious class—worried not only about sustaining their incomes but also about keeping their jobs and their health insurance. Our large corporations continue to improve productivity by investing in technology and cutting payrolls. In a recent survey three out of four employers say their own employees fear losing their jobs. Meanwhile, 1994 is on track to become history's second-biggest year for mergers and acquisitions. But who wins in this \$300 billion deal? Certainly not the average American worker. When two industry giants merge, the advantages of the deal often come from layoffs. Across America, I hear the same refrain: "I've given this company the best years of my life, and now they dispose of me like a piece of rusted machinery." What has happened to the men and women who have lost their jobs? Some have navigated their way to new and better opportunities. But nearly one out of five who lost a full-time job since 1991 is still without work. And among those Americans who have landed new jobs, almost half—47 percent—are now earning less than they did before.

In sum, tens of millions of middle-class Americans continue to experience what they began to face in the late 1970's—downward mobility. They know that recoveries are cyclical, but fear that the underlying trend is permanent. They voted for change in '94 just as they voted for change in '92, and they will do it again and again until they feel that downward slide is reversing. But what so many Americans find shocking about today's economy is the seeming randomness of their fates.

On a recent poll, 55 percent of American adults said they no longer believe that you can build a better life for yourself and your family by working hard and playing by the rules. Of those without college degrees, 68 percent no longer believe it. Because they

have been working hard and they are still falling behind.

Mr. President, sure things are happening. Corporate profits are up 45 percent, and I am happy. That is the way it should be. We have added new jobs. But the problem is, I repeat, the middle class is not benefiting from what is taking place. That is why we had the vote in 1992 that was a minirevolution, and a vote in 1994 that was an outright revolution. People of the middle class that make up the vast majority of the people of this country are dissatisfied with what is going on.

Last year alone the top 20 percent of American households took home a record 48 percent of this Nation's total income. This same group, the top 20 percent of American households, pocketed 72 percent of the growth in incomes that took place. The top 5 percent of people who work in America took home 20 percent of the Nation's total income and more than 40 percent of all the growth that took place in income in this country. We know about rising interest rates that are also hitting the middle class with higher car payments, mortgages, and credit card payments.

Mr. President, men who lack a college degree—nearly three out of four working men—have suffered a decline in average real income since 1979 and women have just barely stayed even.

So as to the bill, the Working Americans Opportunity Act, I will not repeat what my colleague from Louisiana, Senator BREAX, said, but I believe, as Senator BREAX believes, that it is one of the most important pieces of legislation introduced in these Chambers in decades. Why? Because it is directly related to the American middle class. The bill will take bold steps, Mr. President, to complete the responsibility for economic viability for all American citizens. The bill will replace nine Federal job training programs. I mentioned nine job training programs. Each of these job training programs have a series of subcategories under them, dozens, as Senator BREAX said. Many of them are not relevant to the people that are coming to them seeking help. We want to replace these nine Federal job training programs with a new training account system for working Americans.

Mr. President, the vast majority of the people in America do not go to college. There is nothing wrong with that. I am not going to get into a debate about how our high schools only generally push college courses. I think that we should be more in tune with what people want and need in this country. But suffice it to say, the vast majority of people in this country do not go to college. We need people that do not go to college to be able to compete in the modern-day American workplace, and many people are not. They are being lost in the cracks. They go to find help from an agency that is supposed to help them and retrain them. They have lost jobs. They do not

have a job. They are lost. The job agencies simply do not give them the help they need.

These workers will be given a voucher. It is not welfare. We will save money in this program. Instead of giving this money to a Government bureaucrat we will give the money to an individual. That individual can look around and find a program that is in keeping with what they should do, what they want to do.

Mr. President, this is the way that we used to do things. We should now again take up what worked before.

They will receive training vouchers for job training and employment-related services. This legislation will offer workers who seek assistance a list of State-certified places to obtain job training and employment services. The places they will go will have been certified, and they will have a report card, so to speak, to indicate their success and failures.

It will establish through Federal grant programs to States a one-stop information center that provides easy access to a full range of job training and placement services. It will establish in the labor market an information system providing current data on available jobs and training to help working Americans keep pace with the changing workplace.

This legislation should receive bipartisan support. I am hopeful and I am confident that it will. There is no reason that we cannot join together in this. It does a number of things. It reduces the bureaucracy, returns programs to the State level, and gives individuals choice in how they are going to be able to complete the rest of their lives. There will not be meaningless programs that they are sent to for re-training.

So I do hope very much, Mr. President, that we can receive bipartisan support for this legislation that has been introduced by Senator DASCHLE.

Also part of Senator DASCHLE's legislation is the Family Health Insurance Protection Act. We all know that the work that was done in the hours and days and weeks and months spent on this floor and in the other body on health care reform bore no fruit. We can pass a lot of blame as to why.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for an additional 5 minutes.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if we had to pick winners and losers in the health care debate, the winner clearly is the health insurance industry. They set out to confuse and frighten the American public, and they did that. I have to tell them that I think they did a good job. But that does not take away from the fact that we still now have problems with health care in this country.

Senator DASCHLE has recognized this in his legislation which continues a commitment to provide Americans

with accessible and affordable health care by addressing those pressing concerns of working families. This legislation will clamp down on insurance practices that often cause families and small businesses to lose their coverage.

I learned in this health care debate that we did not spend enough time trying to look out for small businesses. This legislation does that.

The elements in this bill are those areas upon which there is I believe, and Senator DASCHLE believes, broad bipartisan consensus to do some health care reform.

This bill will ensure portability, eliminate preexisting conditions exclusions, and prohibit companies from charging consumers higher rates than others with the same policy or raising rates after consumers get sick. This bill will also require all insurers to offer at least one plan that will give benefits similar to what Members of Congress have.

Also, I think very important—and I believe this is the most important part of Senator DASCHLE's bill—if we pass no other part, we should pass the part that says: This bill will return buying power to consumers by requiring health care providers, health plans, to make cost and quality information available to consumers so they can compare plans and make informed choices about the coverage.

We would require that the health care providers, in effect, have a report card so consumers can make an intelligent choice. We want to also reduce paperwork and have administrative simplification and reform of malpractice. I believe this is another piece of legislation on which we can join with our neighbors across the aisle and reform health care in America today.

Another piece of legislation is the Teen Pregnancy Prevention and Parent Responsibility Act. I am concerned about this issue. I am not proud of the fact, but the State of Nevada, in 1990, ranked No. 2 in the Nation in teenage pregnancy rates. There is only one other State in the Union that has a higher teenage pregnancy rate than the State of Nevada.

We have to address welfare reform generally. This legislation does this, with emphasis on the problems we have with teen pregnancy and establishes parent responsibility. We must have the parents of these children responsible for their well-being.

It is important to note, Mr. President, that 70 percent of births to teenage mothers were fathered by men who were 21 years of age and older. They should pay and be responsible. We know what is going on in our country today. It is devastating and it is hurting the moral fabric of this country. This legislation addresses that.

Because of the lack of time, I am not going to go into detail, but I say to my friends on the other side of the aisle that this is the third piece of legislation I have talked about today where we should have bipartisan support.

Senator EXON talked about joining the Republican colleagues on the balanced budget amendment. We need to do that.

The last part of the legislation that the minority leader introduced as part of the Democratic legislation is congressional coverage reform. It is important that we deal with Senate coverage. We are going to do that. That is going to be a bipartisan effort. I worked as chairman of a task force last year to report to the majority leader, and then the minority leader Senator DOLE, and I think much that we did on the bipartisan task force is going to be part of the legislation. Lobbying reform, gift ban and campaign finance reform are a part of Senator DASCHLE's legislation. I recommend it to my colleagues on this side and the other side of the aisle and say to the American public I think this is the year we are going to accomplish something through teamwork.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I have been pleased to listen to the statement of the distinguished Senator from Nevada, and I am very encouraged to hear his comments. I am satisfied that there are going to be many issues we will work together on, and I believe there are going to be many opportunities for cooperation in a bipartisan way this year.

I want to commend our new Republican majority leader for scheduling as the first piece of legislation we will take up the Congressional Accountability Act. We will have bipartisan support for that effort, and I think it is appropriate that we begin this year by saying we are going to have all the Federal laws that apply to the American people—in the States of Nevada, Tennessee, Mississippi, all across the country, apply to us also. So we will begin that debate on the first full legislative day of this year, and hopefully we will be able to reach an early agreement and pass that legislation quickly—perhaps in the next 2 days, or certainly by early next week. I look forward to working with the Senator from Nevada and others. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. I say to the Senator, my friend from Mississippi, through the Chair, that I congratulate him on his recent leadership position. I am glad to see that my former colleague from the House is doing well. He had good training there. I served in the House when the Senator from Mississippi was minority whip. He did a fine job there, as I am sure he will do here. I wish him the very best in this Congress.

Mr. BRADLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed as if in morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. LOTT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President.

Just for clarification, under a previous unanimous-consent agreement, there was a time agreement, I believe, for an hour and 20 minutes on each side. What is the present status of that time? All time has expired on the minority side. How much time is remaining on the majority side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority has 28 minutes and 16 seconds, and the minority is out of time.

Mr. LOTT. And when all time is used or yielded back, is the next order of business a statement by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN], on his amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next order of business would be to resume consideration of Senate Resolution 14.

Mr. LOTT. I thank you, Mr. President.

I withdraw my reservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. BRADLEY pertaining to the introduction of legislation are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNER). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FEINGOLD. 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. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for up to 10 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### TAX CUT—WRONG THING TO DO

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, as the bipartisan stampede for tax cuts begins here in the 104th Congress, I would like to raise a dissenting voice. Like every other elected official, I would really like to be able to support a tax cut for middle-class Americans. In fact, it would be great to be able to support a tax cut for all Americans. That is usually a very pleasant opportunity for an elected official to vote for that kind of tax cut.

I think it is the wrong thing to do right now, when we have just begun to make headway on reducing the Federal deficit. This new tax cut fever is just the most recent example of how far we seem to be straying in the path toward economic stability. We started moving in the right direction with deficit reduction in 1993, but I think in 1994, we started to stray from the path a little. Now, there are just far too many signs that not only are we straying from the path, but that we are about to make a

complete U-turn and head back toward soaring deficits, a mounting national debt, and putting off until tomorrow the fiscal housecleaning that is so desperately needed today. Let me just tick off very quickly some of the bad signs that we are about to move in the wrong direction.

One is that the Republican Contract With America, frankly, lays out what I think is an irresponsible plan that proposes a balanced Federal budget and, at the same time, says we are going to have major tax cuts and a significant increase in military spending. This is a proposal that Nixon's economic adviser, Herbert Stein, labeled hypocritical. So that is one sign—the Re-publican contract.

The second sign is that some folks are also saying we should use something called dynamic scoring techniques. I think this dynamic scoring technique is a bit of fiscal hocus-pocus. Business Week described it this way:

\* \* \* as the most dangerous thing to hit Washington since politicians discovered how to print money.

Dynamic scoring would abandon the tough pay-as-you-go budget rules that we have used in the past several years to bring down the Federal deficit. So I think that is a bad idea. In fact, we have seen voodoo economics in the past. I see this as voodoo mathematics.

Just so it is clear this is not just a partisan statement by any means, there is a third sign that we are moving in the wrong direction, and that is that President Clinton himself has proposed a \$25 billion increase in spending for a military budget that, in my view, is already bloated with obsolete, cold-war-era weapons systems.

Another sign: Members of both parties in this Senate just voted to waive the budget rules for the GATT implementing legislation. There are many other merits to it, but the fact is the measure does not offset the cost of the loss of tariffs of some \$40 billion over the next 10 years. So much of the progress we made on reducing the deficit could be lost because of the failure to pay for the GATT agreement.

The same goes, finally, for the proposal, the reaction to the Kerrey-Danforth Commission. People essentially ignore the important message that all things have to be on the table. Both discretionary spending and entitlements have to be on the table. You cannot have it only defense spending, only discretionary spending, or only entitlements if we are going to attack the deficit.

But perhaps the greatest risk to our efforts on the Federal deficit is the latest effort to try to come up with these tax cuts. That frenzy of tax cuts, particularly creating the tax breaks for special interests, gave us the biggest deficit in our history, a deficit that we have just begun to cut, with considerable pain and sacrifice for Americans. I do not think our economy can sustain another round of this political self-indulgence.