

Rabbi Haberman is a graduate of the University of Cincinnati, he was ordained as rabbi at the Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion in Cincinnati, OH, where he also earned the degree of doctor of Hebrew letters. Also of interest regarding his academic background is the fact that he is the last Austrian to be enrolled for rabbinic studies at the Jewish Theological Institute of Vienna and he later left the institute following the Nazi invasion in 1938 and continued his studies in the United States.

He is a member of the board of alumni overseers of the HUC-JIR and he has served on the executive board of the Central Conference of American Rabbis. In addition he was the cochairman of the North American board of the World Union for Progressive Judaism.

Rabbi Haberman's academic accomplishments include authoring a book titled, "The God I Believe In," which is conversations about Judaism with 14 prominent Jews in our society. He has also authored an academic work titled, "Philosopher of Revelation: The Life and Thought of S.L. Steinheim." In addition to being an author, Rabbi Haberman has served as an adjunct professor at many institutions including: Georgetown, Wesley Theological Seminary, American University, and Rutgers.

Rabbi Haberman was also instrumental in developing a very important religious dialog with the Roman Catholic diocese of Washington, DC, and evangelical Christian leaders as well. In addition to his ecumenical work, he initiated a Moslem-Jewish dialog with Imam Wallace D. Muhammad of the World Community of Islam in the West. The two above-mentioned accomplishments demonstrate Rabbi Haberman's dedication to working across religious and cultural barriers. They demonstrate the rabbi's willingness to leave his comfort zone and build bridges with those of different religious and cultural affiliations.

It is evident by these accomplishments that he is a man who is truly driven by his religious convictions rather than ideological associations. He has demonstrated that his life is wholly affected by his religious commitments. It is an honor to share the floor with him.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COCHRAN. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I understand the status of the situation on the floor is that we are in morning business; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

THE BUDGET AND THE CHALLENGE OF CONTROLLING DEFICITS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, to put this debate on the budget situation in context, I hope that we will keep in mind the difficulty that Congress has had over the years, and each administration in recent years, in trying to cope with this very, very difficult challenge of controlling deficits.

In 1960, for example, interest payments on our national debt amounted to 6 percent of the Federal budget. Today, that figure has grown to 16 percent. That is the percentage of the total expenditures that will be required to be appropriated and paid in interest on the current debt in the next fiscal year, according to the President's budget.

Last year, the Federal Government paid a total of \$203 billion in interest on the existing debt. The budget just submitted by the President calls for spending \$257 billion in the next fiscal year on interest on the accumulated debt.

By comparison, Senators might be interested to know that if these interest costs are as they are projected to be next year by the President's budget, we will spend just about as much on interest payments as we will on national defense.

The national defense dollars that are requested by the President to be appropriated for our Nation's security next year are at \$262 billion in the President's budget; the interest payments, \$257 billion, a \$5 billion difference. In a \$1.6 trillion budget, the percentage is about the same, 16 percent.

It seems to me that to believe we are going to be able to meet this challenge of controlling deficits more effectively without some requirement to do so or some new procedures in place such as this constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget is a triumph of hope over experience.

One item that I received in my mail this week from a constituent was very interesting from a historical perspective. Andy Halbrook is a resident of Greenville, MS. His father, David Halbrook, has been a member of our State legislature for a number of years and one of our important influences in State government. He sent me a Reader's Digest article of July 1979 which talked about the origin of the movement for State legislators to petition the Government for a constitutional convention to require a balanced budget.

I am going to read the first paragraph and put the rest of it in the RECORD with this letter for the information of Senators.

In Ollie Mohamed's Belzoni, Miss., department store—

Ollie Mohamed was a State Senator at the time—

a group was discussing Federal spending, inflation and Congress's perennial inability to balance the budget. State legislator David Halbrook spoke of his new grandchild: "That

baby is going to have to pay for the things I'm enjoying. It ought to be the other way around. I ought to leave the world a little better for him."

This article goes on to talk about the conversation that then led to, well, what are we going to do about it? And one of them got the Constitution down and read here where it is provided the State legislatures can petition the Congress to convene a constitutional convention to amend the Constitution, and they decided that it ought to be done. And so David Halbrook led the effort in the Mississippi legislature to have that resolution passed. Then some other States got involved. The National Taxpayers Union got involved. And according to this article, over a period of years they almost reached the point where they were successful. They were four States short at the time this article was written in 1979.

Andrew—"Andy"—Halbrook, David's son, suggests that we ought to name this legislation the "David Halbrook Act," requiring the Congress to balance the budget as a matter of constitutional amendment. I think it is a good suggestion.

I ask unanimous consent that Andy Halbrook's letter be printed in the RECORD, along with the article from the Reader's Digest.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREENVILLE, MS,
February 2, 1995.

Hon. THAD COCHRAN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Dear SENATOR COCHRAN: The balanced budget amendment is one of the most important pieces of legislation that will be considered in my lifetime and possibly in the lifetime of my children. It will have a much tougher row to hoe in the Senate than in the House. In light of this I would like to offer a suggestion that could perhaps significantly help to assure its passage.

In positioning for public approval, acceptance and support a product or a service or even a piece of legislation, perception is reality. Unless the populace can be overwhelmingly convinced to support something as broad-ranging as the balanced budget amendment it may be doomed to failure no matter how good its attributes. The way to get the popular support needed to be indomitably successful in this venture is to personalize it and to make everyone realize this is a grassroots idea from outside the beltway. In light of this please consider the following:

The balanced budget amendment was spawned in Belzoni, Mississippi by my father, Rep. David Halbrook and former Senator Ollie Mohamed. Please see the attached Reader's Digest article in testimony to this fact.

Due to his continuity of service in the Mississippi Legislature and active leadership roles in the American Legislative Exchange Council, the National Conference of State Legislators, the Southern Legislative Conference and other organizations, David Halbrook has been the torch-bearer for this idea since its inception.

Based on these facts I am asking that you consider naming the balanced budget amendment "The Halbrook Amendment". This will do many things to accelerate and maintain the momentum of this legislation.

David Halbrook is a life-long Democrat. Putting his name on this amendment could greatly enhance bipartisan support of this endeavor.

David Halbrook is a common man with uncommon talents and ideas, a business man, a farmer and a father concerned about his children's and grandchildren's future. The mainstream will immediately identify with him and his purpose for starting this process.

By putting a name and a face with something that can be as nebulous to the common man as a piece of federal legislation, such as was done with the Brady Bill, the public's perception of the process at hand can be immediately transformed into a tidal wave of support.

David Halbrook is a life-long Mississippian. Mississippi is in the midst of one of the most dynamic economic growth cycles in the nation. These factors could be coupled when titling this legislation the Halbrook Amendment to bring recognition to your leadership in bringing Mississippi to its current status as a good place to do business.

Finally, David Halbrook deserves this honor. He personally laid much of the groundwork for what is being debated today on Capitol Hill. I well remember his many trips to testify before one state legislative assembly after another in order to get them to put forth the call for a constitutional convention to take up this matter. As a seven term Democrat he is the senior member of the Mississippi House of Representatives. This adds credibility to his commonality. Most importantly, he is a loving and devoted father that has always tried to do the right thing by making this world a better place for his children along with everyone else.

In closing, I am requesting this not only because I have been taught to "honor thy father and thy mother", but I have also been taught to do the right thing. In my opinion, a balanced budget amendment is the right thing to do, and by personalizing this piece of legislation, its chances of passage will be greatly enhanced. I appreciate your consideration of my request and ideas.

Sincerely,

ANDREW L. "ANDY" HALBROOK,
Concerned Constituent.

[From the Reader's Digest, July 1979]

A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO BALANCE THE BUDGET?

(By Eugene H. Methvin)

In OLLIE MOHAMED's Belzoni, Miss., department store, a group was discussing federal spending, inflation and Congress's perennial inability to balance the budget. State legislator David Halbrook spoke of his new grandchild: "That baby is going to have to pay for the things I'm enjoying. It ought to be the other way around. I ought to leave the world a little better for him."

That gave Mohamed, a former legislator, an idea. He found a copy of the Constitution and began to read from Article V: "The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case shall be valid * * * when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States. * * *"

That day in 1974, a national crusade was born to compel Congress by constitutional amendment to balance the federal budget. (An exception would occur in national emergencies, when both houses could agree by two-thirds vote to permit deficit spending.) A few months later, Representative Halbrook got the Mississippi state legislature to pass a resolution calling for a con-

stitutional convention. Acting independently, lawmakers in Maryland, Delaware and North Dakota passed similar resolutions. The National Taxpayers Union, a feisty new citizens' lobby, took up the cause, and by April 1979 convention-call resolutions had been passed by 30 states. If four more act, Congress will be required to call a constitutional convention.

The pressure is growing. CBS and the New York Times interviewed voters last November and found that 82 percent of Democrats and 86 percent of Republicans favor a balanced-budget amendment. Five Presidential contenders (Republicans Reagan, Connally, Dole, Baker and Democrat Brown) have endorsed it. Observed Oregon senate president Jason Boe, "This thing is coming like a 100-car freight train at Congress, and they haven't done a thing about it."

The realization that the budget-balancers are only four states away from a constitutional convention has startled and disturbed many Washington politicians. Senate Budget Committee Chairman Edmund Muskie (D., Maine) growled that if state legislators continued their rebellion, Congress might balance the budget by cutting the \$83 billion in grants and revenue sharing it gives states and localities. House Speaker Tip O'Neill's son Thomas, the Massachusetts lieutenant governor, took the lead in organizing an anti-amendment coalition of the special-interest groups that benefit most from deficit spending, including the AFL-CIO, the National Education Association and other public employee unions. President Carter assailed the proposition as "political gimmickry" and formed a White House task force to lobby state legislators.

Washington mobilization had effect. The Montana senate bowed to lobbying efforts and in March defeated an amendment resolution. And the Administration has promised an all-out fight in each of the 15 state legislatures that have yet to act.

Clearly, the battle lines are drawn between the Washington establishment and a disillusioned grassroots groundswell. Never before in the nation's history has so widespread a movement for constitutional change developed over such fundamental issues as the proper size of government and the way our elected representatives wield the powers to tax and spend. If the convention drive succeeds, says The Wall Street Journal the people would be saying that they have finally decided Congress can't be trusted with their money."

Few even on Capitol Hill dispute that there is genuine ground for wondering these days. Between 1946 and 1961, Congress managed seven deficits and seven surpluses, with an overall approximate balance—and low inflation. But in the 19 years since, Congress has balanced the budget only once, in 1919, and the net deficit over those years has been a staggering \$377 billion. Washington has continued the deficits in boom times as well as bust. This year, President Carter offered a 1980 budget with a \$29 billion deficit—plus \$12 billion more in "off budget items—and called it "austere."

Two decades of Congressional and White House profligacy have helped produce severe inflation that threatens to halve the value of every dollar in five and a half years. Obvious victims include the poor and the elderly, but in the end, everybody suffers. The average family last year paid almost \$800 interest on past government deficits, and inflation robbed another \$800 from its purchasing power.

In 1976, running against the Washington establishment, candidate Jimmy Carter promised to balance the budget by 1979. Now that President Carter has proffered a \$29 billion deficit, the public is turning to the constitu-

tional amendment as a solution. The Associated Press found in a poll last February that "distrust of politicians is so deep that Americans do not believe their elected officials will act. Seventy percent said politicians will not work to wipe out the deficit."

Even without a constitutional convention, the budget-balancers may get what they want. State legislatures have used the convention call in the past to lever balky Congresses into proposing needed amendments. In fact, no amendment has ever come directly from the convention approach. State convention calls have helped prompt Congress to submit amendments to provide for direct election of Senators, repeal Prohibition, limit a President to two terms and provide for Presidential succession in case of disability.

In this session of Congress, 203 Representatives and 39 Senators support a wide variety of amendment proposals which they want Congress to submit directly to the states, circumventing a convention call. (Three-fourths of the state legislature, 38, are required to ratify an amendment.) One group would require a "super-majority" of either two-thirds or three-fourths of the members of Congress, in an emergency such as war or deep depression, to vote for a deficit budget. Otherwise, the legislators would have to match outlays with revenues. If revenues fell short, Congress would have to slash spending or impose a surtax. Knowing they would have to go on record in favor of higher taxes, the legislators would be certain to look harder at some of their spending ideas.

Another proposal has come from Senators Richard Stone (D., Fla.) and H. John Heinz (R., Pa.). Their amendment, drafted by a group including Nobel Prize-winning economist Milton Friedman, would limit federal spending increases to the growth in the Gross National Product. If inflation is greater than three percent, the proposal would impose an even tighter limit on spending.

President Carter and Democratic leaders in Congress protest that any constitutional amendment would "tie the hands" of the nation in time of crisis, since a determined minority of either house could block needed appropriations. Proponents respond that a stubborn minority blocking obviously needed action would be swiftly punished at the polls. Congress could still act by majority vote in an emergency by levying taxes to finance needed spending; a minority could only block deficit spending.

Whatever the outcome of these proposed amendments, and the call for a constitutional convention, the balance-the-budget movement has triggered a mighty debate. Says the National Taxpayers Union's Jim Davidson: "As people see their real spending power decline, this issue will not fade away." Adds Sen. Gary Hart (D., Colo.), "It's a sorry state of affairs when the American people are demanding a constitutional convention because they don't trust us, and Congress is saying, 'No, you can't have one because we don't trust you.'"

This contentious scene would not faze the men who wrote the Constitution, for the debate has focused public attention once again on some eternal verities about public power, its exercise, abuse and safeguards. What healthier way for Americans to celebrate the approaching 200th birthday of their Constitution.

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

Mr. CRAIG. What is the order of business we are in at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business.

MOVEMENT TO A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Mississippi has just spoken of, the issue of the State legislator beginning the movement to petition Congress.

When I was a State senator in Idaho in the 1970's, I became involved in that very movement and actually brought a resolution before the State senate, and it passed the Idaho Legislature, to petition Congress for a balanced budget amendment because clearly at that time, at the State legislative level, as we were looking at what the Congress of the United States was doing and what the Federal Government was doing, we were growing increasingly fearful that debt would continue to mount and power of the Government at the central level in Washington would continue to grow, and it would, if you will, deny or weaken the ability of State legislatures and State governments to act responsibly.

When I then came to Congress in 1980 and started serving in 1981, that movement was well underway. And as the Senator from Mississippi has just mentioned, we were at that time four States short of the necessary requirements under article V of the Constitution from petitioning and therefore forcing the Congress to bring forth a resolution convening a constitutional convention.

Citizens across the country, though, at that time grew increasingly fearful of a constitutional convention, as to whether you could limit it to a single issue like a balanced budget amendment, and that if you opened up a constitutional convention and Congress in essence handed the power to craft a constitutional amendment to an autonomous body, we might see other issues come forth that many of us would not like.

So that movement stalled out at about a remaining two States and it began to back off. Congresswoman Barbara Conable of New York at that time was a leader. I became a leader involved and traveled around to the States encouraging them to continue to do so, not because I wanted a constitutional convention but because I thought it was terribly important we show that the second portion of article V of the Constitution remains a viable power inside the Constitution but that the alternative—and that is the first portion of article V—would be that Congress can propose amendments to the citizens on the Constitution and that we were in essence the always-standing, always-in-power constitutional convention, that at any time with the necessary supermajority vote, the Congress itself could bring forth an amendment to be ratified by the States.

I say to the Senator from Mississippi, as he well knows, that is exactly what we are doing at this time, and that is why some of us have worked as long as

we have to assure that this process go forward and why we are so concerned today we do not put anything in the path of this amendment that could trip it up in what is, I believe, a constitutional responsibility on our part to provide a clean, simply directed amendment to the people.

We have seen an amendment—and thank goodness just this week the Senate has denied it—that would have said prior to sending forth an amendment we have to do the following things. That is not what article V says. It says you put forth an amendment and it goes straight to the States because we can only propose. It is the States that have the responsibility, or in essence the citizens themselves, to ratify an amendment because the Constitution as the organic law of our land is the people's law. We operate under it.

That is why we are here today and will be for the next week or so debating a balanced budget amendment to our Constitution because it is the adjusting, if you will, of the organic law of our land that governs us, that governs the central government, that controls the Congress of the United States, and it is the ability of the people to speak up. So what we are doing here is extending or offering to the people of this country the opportunity to speak on the issue of how the Federal Government manages its fiscal house and its budget. And I wish to thank the Senator from Mississippi for recognizing as he has that on all of these kinds of issues they really begin at the grassroots. It is the people at the very lowest level of our governments stepping forward and saying we believe the central government ought to change; it is doing things in an improper way, and the way we will change them is to adjust the Constitution of our country to cause them to act differently.

That was back in the 1970's, and it has taken now over two decades to bring forth this issue to the point where it has now passed the House of Representatives and we are within weeks of voting on it here with a strong likelihood that it can pass the Congress of the United States and pass the Senate and it will go forth to the people. So those citizens of Mississippi, through their State legislators, will have an opportunity to decide how the central government of our country ought to be run in the area of its fiscal responsibilities and matters.

CFTC REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar item No. 20, S. 178, a bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to extend the authorization for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission; that the bill be deemed read a third time, passed, and a motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to

the bill be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

Mr. President, let me say this has been cleared by the minority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, today, we consider S. 178, the CFTC Reauthorization Act of 1995. This legislation was sponsored by myself and Senator LEAHY, and requested by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. The only provision of this legislation is to authorize appropriations for the CFTC through fiscal year 2000. While enactment of S. 178 merely continues the CFTC's responsibilities under existing law, it is important that Congress act now to leave no doubt about the continuing role of the CFTC. Further, Congress spent considerable time and effort addressing futures related issues before enacting the Futures Trading Practices Act of 1992. The bill before us will give the Commission adequate time to complete implementation of the 1992 act and allow time for review by Congress of that implementation and the CFTC's overall performance.

A hearing on this legislation was held on Thursday, January 26, to review the CFTC's performance to date in implementing the requirements of the 1992 act, as well as access its operations generally. Testimony was taken from the CFTC, the four largest U.S. futures exchanges, two futures industry trade groups, and the National Futures Association, a self-regulatory organization.

Concerns had been raised by some exchanges about the implementation of the enhanced audit trail requirements in the 1992 act which go into effect in October of this year. However, in the testimony of the CFTC Chairman, and in her responses to questions, it was made clear that the CFTC has not held that an electronic hand-held device is necessary to meet the enhanced requirements. Further, the CFTC Chairman assured the committee that after the exchanges have attained a high level of compliance, further incremental improvements will only be required as practicable and the cost of the improvements will certainly be an issue in determining what is practicable. In short, common sense prevailed. All witnesses at the hearing supported the reauthorization without amendments. In addition to the futures industry, this legislation has received the support of a number of agricultural groups including the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grain Trade Council, the American Cotton Shippers Association, and the National Grain and Feed Association. No futures industry groups, or agricultural groups have notified the committee of their opposition to this bill.

The committee held a business meeting on February 1 to consider the bill. No amendments were offered and S. 178 was ordered reported favorably by the committee.