

"SECTION 6. The Congress shall enforce and implement this article by appropriate legislation, which may rely on estimates of outlays and receipts.

"SECTION 7. Total outlays shall include all outlays of the United States Government except for those for repayment of debt principal and those dedicated to a capital budget. The capital budget shall include only major public physical capital investments. For each fiscal year, outlays dedicated to the capital budget shall not exceed an amount equal to 10 percent of the total outlays for that year, which amount shall not be counted for purposes of section 2. Three-fifths of each House may provide by law for capital budget outlays in excess of 10 percent for a fiscal year.

"Total receipts shall include all receipts of the United States Government except those derived from borrowing and the disposition of major public physical capital assets.

"SECTION 8. The receipts (including attributable interest) and outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund used to provide old age, survivors, and disabilities benefits shall not be counted as receipts or outlays for purposes of this article.

"SECTION 9. This article shall take effect beginning with fiscal year 2002 or with the second fiscal year beginning after its ratification, whichever is later."

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet at 11 a.m. on Wednesday, February 22, 1995, in closed session, to vote on the nominations of the Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 22, 1995, to conduct a hearing on the Federal Reserve's first monetary policy report for 1995.

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

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the Governmental Affairs Committee to meet on Wednesday, February 22, 1995, at 9:30 a.m. for a hearing on S. 219, the Regulatory Transition Act of 1995.

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

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Human Resources be authorized to meet for a hearing on Ryan White Care Act reauthorization, during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 22, 1995 at 9:30 a.m.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select

Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 22, 1995 at 2 p.m. to hold a closed hearing on Intelligence matters.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE OVERSIGHT AND THE COURTS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts, U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary, be authorized to meet during a session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 22, 1995, at 9:30 a.m., in Senate Dirksen room 226, on S. 343, the Comprehensive Regulatory Reform Act of 1995 and regulatory relief.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THROWING SAND IN SOCIETY'S MACHINERY

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, Jim Wright served as Speaker of the House of Representatives and, prior to that, majority leader of the House.

I had the privilege of working with him on a number of things and found him to be a genuine leader, not just someone who holds the title of leader.

Not long ago, I read a reference about a column that he had done for the Fort Worth Star Telegram on the subject of civility.

I wrote to him and asked for a copy of a column, and it is the kind of enlightened common sense that you would expect from Jim Wright.

The first paragraph of his column sums up our situation beautifully:

Civility. The word is little used these days, the quality it describes too little practiced. It is a necessary lubricating oil for the machinery of a free society. In its absence, the gears of democracy grind in noisy dissonance to a screeching halt.

I ask that the entire Jim Wright column be printed in the RECORD.

The column follows:

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Oct. 23, 1994]

THROWING SAND IN SOCIETY'S MACHINERY

Civility. The word is little used these days, the quality it describes too little practiced. It is the necessary lubricating oil for the machinery of a free society. In its absence, the gears of democracy grind in noisy dissonance to a screeching halt.

Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary defines civility as the state of being civilized. Its marks, the dictionary notes, are politeness, consideration, courtesy. The modern term grew from a Latin word, *civilitas*. In its original form, it signified "the art of government."

The preservation of liberties—free speech, free press, free religious expression—has always exacted a price. Part of that price is civility, respect for the institutions of our government and fellow citizens with whom we disagree. Deprived of its oxygen, the lungs of a democratic society would ultimately collapse.

Too much of what passes for debate in this election year, protected by the liberties to

which we pay homage, pollutes the public dialogue as noxiously as carbon monoxide contaminates a living environment.

The hallmark of a civilized human order is the ability to disagree without being disagreeable. We seem to be losing this. Instead of reasoned disputation, we hear increasingly hateful and unreasoning allegations brandished like weapons designed to inflict injury and mortal hurt.

The mail last week brought astonished recipients a fund-raising appeal so rotten and rancid with hate as to offend the very garbage cans into which it should be forthrightly consigned.

On an official-looking letterhead with a Washington address, the plea for contributions begins with the following outrageous claim: "I have in my possession compelling evidence that proves beyond all shadow of a doubt that White House aid [sic] Vincent Foster was murdered * * * vital clues that lead right to the Oval Office."

Begging for money to spew out more such bile, the writer promises to prosecute a case of impeachment against President Clinton, presumably for the murder of his lifelong friend.

Really, this is beyond the pale. No president of the United States should have to contend with such inflammatory and unfounded libel. It is not enough that special counsel Robert B. Fiske, a Republican and no friend of Clinton's looked carefully into this bizarre allegation concerning poor Foster's suicide and reported it to be just that.

Tasting blood and heedless of the proven emptiness of their brazen claim or the hurt it inflicts upon loved ones and friends of the late presidential aide, professional purveyors of venom continue their calculated campaign of calumny against the president.

Hate-Clinton solicitation letters have become a cottage industry. For some the good is political power. For others it's just a way to fill greedy coffers with contributions bilked from innocent, well-meaning Americans gullibly alarmed by the strident claims of right-wing media personalities such as Rush Limbaugh and the Rev. Jerry Falwell.

Preachments of hate, prejudgments of guilt and eagerness to repeat the vilest slanders are not new to American society. But they do seem to have reached preposterous proportions in this election year.

Twenty-six years ago, Lyndon B. Johnson deplored the incivility of some anti-war demonstrators who shouted slogans to drown out opposition. "They are chiefly united in the certainty with which they advance their views," he said, "and in the vehemence with which they mock the views of others."

Thomas Jefferson 160 years earlier compared political extremists to "patients of Bedlam, needing medical more than moral counsel." He despaired of "any attempt to set one of these zealots to right, either in fact or principle."

Presently, things are going better. American policy is working. In Haiti and Iraq our will prevails without war. North Korea, after 40 years of implacable hostility, agrees to remove its nuclear threat. World tensions abate. Israel and Jordan proclaim a historic peace. At home the economy grows, unemployment falls, prices are stable. We should rejoice, but we don't.

Pollsters report a sour mood, agitated to anger by apostles of discontent. Seldom have political partisans so boldly boasted of obstruction, so viciously attacked colleagues and their own institutions. What's missing is civility.

The assault on mutual respect has pervaded Congress. Republicans, desperate after 40 years in the minority, are turning ever more negative. Some nervous Democrats follow suit. Not only do dissident members attack the personal integrity of our president, but they seem out to weaken and destroy Congress itself. Absurdly, they think this is what the public wants.

Senate Republican Leader Bob Dole and House Whip Newt Gingrich recently pledged support on the Capitol steps for a constitutional amendment to limit congressional terms. House members should not be trusted, the argument goes, to serve faithfully for more than six years, nor senators for more than 12.

But at the heart of this gimmicky assault on the Constitution lies an unspoken assumption that the public cannot be trusted to choose wisely. The hypocrisy of the position that these two publicly profess is transparent in the fact that Dole has been in Congress continuously since 1960, and Gingrich, who would limit future colleagues to no more than three terms, is seeking his ninth.

If their logic should ever prevail, the legislative branch will be vastly weakened, bereft of strong and experienced leaders, much more at the mercy of an authoritative executive branch. There will be no Sam Rayburns, no Robert A. Tafts, no Arthur Vandenberg or Barry Goldwaters to curb the presidential appetite for power or to soften its occasional rashness with their wisdom. And civility.●

NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise today to draw to the attention of the Senate my concern about declines in recent decades in voter participation in local and national elections. In the 1988 election, only about half of those citizens eligible to vote went to the polls. While turnout improved during the last Presidential election, voter participation remains low in this country compared to other advanced democratic countries. According to the Congressional Research Service, only 61 percent of U.S. citizens eligible to vote are registered. While there are many reasons why people do not vote, studies indicate that the major reason is that they are not registered. In fact, the Bureau of Census reports that voter turnout of registered voters in Presidential elections typically exceeds 85 percent.

Recognizing the need to establish uniform national voter registration procedures to allow greater opportunities for all eligible citizens to participate in the electoral process, the U.S. Congress adopted the National Voter Registration Act early in the 103d Congress, legislation I was proud to support. The National Voter Registration Act, also known as the motor-voter bill, provides greater opportunities for all eligible citizens to participate in the electoral process.

The methods for voter registration established by the legislation—by mail, as part of drivers license renewal, and when visiting Government agencies—are well tested and successful methods for registering voters. And, in fact, States which have implemented the motor-voter provisions have experienced significant increases in voter

registration. About 3,700 voters were registered in Washington State within the first 7 days of motor-voter operation. Florida has been averaging more than 3,000 new voter registrations per day from people obtaining drivers licenses. The successes continue to be documented in other States such as Georgia, where more than 18,000 people have been registered under the new procedures since January 1, 1995, and in Kentucky where 10,000 new voters were registered in the first 10 days of implementation. In my own State of Maryland, approximately 90,000 people have been registered through the Motor Vehicle Administration in 1995 alone, and Maryland election officials expect an additional 900,000 citizens to register under the new system.

While some critics of this legislation have charged that by making voter registration easier, there may be increased opportunities for fraud, the bill includes important safeguards to prevent such fraud. The mail registration form requires a statement of eligibility to vote, an attestation that the applicant meets each requirement of eligibility to vote, and the signature of the applicant under penalty of perjury.

Mr. President, there are further misconceptions surrounding this bill that should be clarified. First, though agencies are required to provide registrants with assistance when requested, the National Voter Registration Act does not require agency personnel to fill out registration forms—it is the applicant who fills out the form. Second, the legislation requires that an applicant be informed that the quality and quantity of Government assistance they receive will not be effected by their willingness or refusal to register. Third, the legislation protects the privacy of the applicant by restricting the use of voter registration information. An applicant has the option of completing the form at home and returning it by mail, and agency employees may not force an individual to register or attempt to persuade an applicant to join a particular political party.

I understand that concerns have also been raised about potential additional costs for State and local governments to implement this legislation. I would simply note that any increased costs for a State to comply with the uniform voter registration standards provided by this legislation would be relatively small, particularly in those States, such as Maryland, that have already taken steps to increase the opportunity for citizens to register to vote. In addition, the legislation provides relief to all States in the form of a postal rate reduction for State and local election officials which will save State and local governments more than \$4 million per year. There are also expected to be savings through the use of uniform registration forms in those States that have not yet adopted uniformity between jurisdictions and because voter registration is now likely to be spread out over the year as people

renew drivers licenses. Consequently, there will be less need to hire additional registrars to handle the higher volume of registration that typically occurs in some States before registration deadlines.

Mr. President, it is my strongly held view that we must be careful about attaching price tags to civil rights. Imagine if we had decided not to extend the right to vote to 18-year-olds, women, or other minorities because it would place a burden on the States due to an increased workload or the purchasing of new voting machines. The National Voter Registration Act is already making it easier for citizens to exercise one of the most fundamental rights of a democracy—the right to vote. A healthy democracy thrives on the active participation of the governed.

This important new law is clearly working and should not be repealed nor should its implementation be delayed as some have proposed.●

CUBAN LIBERTY AND DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY ACT—S. 381

● Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join several of my colleagues as a cosponsor of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act, although I have reservations concerning the trade sanctions included in the legislation. Fidel Castro's 36-year dictatorship has been catastrophic for Cuba's society and economy. Agricultural and industrial production have been stymied by authoritarian state control. Many of Cuba's most skilled and talented citizens have chosen to risk their lives to achieve freedom elsewhere, including the United States. Meanwhile, living standards for those who remained have fallen steadily. The backward direction of Cuba's development stands in sharp contrast to other states in Central and South America, who have flourished under policies of market and democratic liberalization. Castro is among the last adherents to the bankrupt philosophy of Communist authoritarianism. The Cuban people cannot move forward to the prosperity which their human and natural resources entitle them as long as Castro's authoritarian rule remains intact. The United States must continue to do what it can to help the Cuban people in their struggle for economic and political freedom and to reestablish the rule of law.

We also have an obligation to American citizens, many of whom have unresolved property claims against the Castro government, to work for justice on their behalf. At the same time, I believe the United States must balance its goals in Cuba with other important foreign policy objectives, such as free trade and support for market and political reforms in other countries. Accordingly, I associate myself with the objectives of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act and look forward to working with my colleagues to improve the bill particularly in the