

gallon in 1994—without adjusting for inflation.

Another contributing factor in the loss of dairy farms is price volatility. Prices can decline by \$2 per hundred in less than 3 months. These price swings add serious uncertainty to a farmer's daily existence, making it difficult for the farmer to plan strategically or to raise capital when needed.

The State of Maine attempted to address this serious problem by establishing a dairy vendor's fee that stabilized the price that farmers in Maine received for their milk. The vendor's fee enjoyed the strong support of both farmers and consumers in Maine, but a Federal court struck it down in 1994 as a violation of interstate commerce. According to the Maine Department of Agriculture, the inevitable result of the court's action will be an accelerating decline in family dairy farms.

Faced with similar problems throughout the region, the six New England States banded together to develop a joint regional solution. They negotiated an interstate dairy compact that will ensure a more reasonable and stable price for dairy farmers in the region. But it is a pricing program that also protects the interests of consumers in the region. As evidence of the balance and fairness achieved by the compact, both the net-producing and net-consuming States in the region all approved it with strong support.

The compact creates a regional commission which has the authority to set minimum prices paid to farmers for fluid, or class I milk. Delegations from each State comprise the voting membership of the commission, and these delegations in turn will include both farmer and consumer representatives. The minimum price established by the commission is the Federal market order price plus a small over-order differential that would be paid by milk processing plants. This over-order price is capped in the compact, and a two-thirds voting majority of the commission is required before any over-order price can be instituted.

Mr. President, until the court struck down the Maine dairy vendor's fee, milk in my State was priced by a mechanism that is similar to that which could be utilized by the compact commission. Maine's experience was uniformly positive. Farm prices were stable, and they were higher, but only modestly higher. No farmers got rich on the minimal adjustment provided by the over-order price under the vendor's fee program. It helped them keep their heads above water. Dairy processors and vendors maintained their business, and consumers did not see any significant increases in the price of milk. It was a win-win proposition for everyone in Maine, and I am confident that the compact will achieve the same success throughout New England without violating the Constitution's interstate commerce clause.

Although the compact affects only the participating States, the cospon-

sors decided to remove any doubt by including language in the resolution that provides explicit assurances to farmers and processors in States outside the region. These assurances further specify that the over-order price can only be established for class I fluid milk, that no new States can join the compact without the formal approval of both Houses of Congress, that out-of-region farmers who sell milk in the compact region will get the same price as farmers in the region, that the commission's pricing authority is strictly limited, and that the commission must develop a plan to ensure that over-order prices do not lead to increases in production.

In the debates held so far in this Congress, and surely in the debates to come, we have heard and will hear many Members argue that the States are often best-positioned to solve their own problems, and that they should be allowed to do so without interference from Washington. I couldn't agree more.

With the Northeast Interstate Dairy Compact bill being introduced today, Senators will have an opportunity to match words on this concept with deeds. The compact represents a regional response to a regional problem. It affects only those States that belong to the compact. Why should the Federal Government deny the States an opportunity to solve their own problems? The answer is that we shouldn't. We should praise the States for their self-reliance and ingenuity. I hope that Senators will recognize the value in this kind of State-based problem-solving, and support the compact when it comes to the floor for a vote.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 22

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 22, a bill to require Federal agencies to prepare private property taking impact analyses.

S. 96

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 96, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the conduct of expanded studies and the establishment of innovative programs with respect to traumatic brain injury, and for other purposes.

S. 198

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the names of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY] were added as cosponsors of S. 198, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit medicare select policies to be offered in all States, and for other purposes.

S. 241

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr.

COATS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 241, a bill to increase the penalties for sexual exploitation of children, and for other purposes.

S. 250

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 250, a bill to amend chapter 41 of title 28, United States Code, to provide for an analysis of certain bills and resolutions pending before the Congress by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, and for other purposes.

S. 256

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the name of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 256, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish procedures for determining the status of certain missing members of the Armed Forces and certain civilians, and for other purposes.

S. 295

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the name of the Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 295, a bill to permit labor management cooperative efforts that improve America's economic competitiveness to continue to thrive, and for other purposes.

S. 302

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM] was added as a cosponsor of S. 302, a bill to make a technical correction to section 11501(h)(2) of title 49, United States Code.

S. 332

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 332, a bill to provide means of limiting the exposure of children to violent programming on television, and for other purposes.

S. 388

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the names of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. THOMPSON] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] were added as cosponsors of S. 388, a bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to eliminate the penalties for noncompliance by States with a program requiring the use of motorcycle helmets, and for other purposes.

S. 390

At the request of Mr. KYL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 390, a bill to improve the ability of the United States to respond to the international terrorist threat.

S. 391

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the names of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN] were added as cosponsors of S. 391, a bill to authorize and direct the

Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to undertake activities to halt and reverse the decline in forest health on Federal lands, and for other purposes.

S. 426

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the name of the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM] was added as a cosponsor of S. 426, a bill to authorize the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity to establish a memorial to Martin Luther King, Jr., in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 82—TO PETITION THE STATES TO CONVENE A CONFERENCE OF THE STATES

Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. HELMS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 82

Whereas Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America provides that the Congress is vested with the authority to lay and collect taxes, to pay the debts of the United States, to borrow money on the credit of the United States, and to appropriate money from the Treasury;

Whereas for the past quarter century Congress has been unable to balance the Nation's budget in any year;

Whereas the President of the United States has submitted a budget which increases the deficit in future years;

Whereas Members of Congress have been unable to agree on language for an Amendment to the Constitution which would require a balanced budget; and

Whereas Congress has therefore attempted to deny the several States of the United States the opportunity to vote on a Constitutional Amendment requiring a balanced budget: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Congress hereby petitions the several States of the United States of America to convene a Conference of the States for the express and exclusive purpose of drafting an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring a balanced budget and prohibiting the imposition of unfunded mandates on the States, and that such States then consider whether it is necessary for the States to convene a Constitutional Convention pursuant to Article V of the Constitution of the United States in order to adopt such Amendment.

SENATE RESOLUTION 83—RELATIVE TO THE FEDERAL BUDGET

Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself and Mr. BUMPERS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Governmental Affairs, jointly, pursuant to the order of August 4, 1977, with instructions that if one committee reports, the other committee have 30 days to report or be discharged:

S. RES. 83

Whereas the Federal budget according to the most recent estimates of the Congressional Budget Office continues to be in deficit in excess of \$190 billion;

Whereas continuing annual Federal budget deficits add to the Federal debt which soon is projected to exceed \$5 trillion;

Whereas continuing Federal budget deficits and growing Federal debt reduce savings and capital formation;

Whereas continuing Federal budget deficits contribute to a higher level of interest rates than would otherwise occur, raising capital costs and curtailing total investment;

Whereas continuing Federal budget deficits also contribute to significant trade deficits and dependence on foreign capital;

Whereas the Federal debt that results from persistent Federal deficits transfers a potentially crushing burden to future generations, making their living standards lower than they otherwise would have been;

Whereas efforts to reduce the Federal deficit should be among the highest economic priorities of the 104th Congress; and,

Whereas enacting across-the-board or so-called middle class tax cut measures could impede efforts during the 104th Congress to significantly reduce the Federal deficit:

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the Sense of the Senate that reducing the Federal deficit should be one of the nation's highest priorities, that enacting an across-the-board so-called middle class tax cut during the 104th Congress would hinder efforts to significantly reduce the Federal deficit.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, today I am pleased to join with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] to submit a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that enacting an across-the-board or so-called middle-class tax cut during the 104th Congress would hinder efforts to reduce the Federal deficit.

Mr. President, though I would certainly like to support a tax cut measure, especially one that provides a Well Deserved tax break to middle-class Americans, supporting that kind of proposal is simply not responsible right now, especially given the recent developments with respect to the balanced budget amendment.

During a month of telling debate on the proposal, we have not done one thing that will actually help us achieve the widely shared goal of a balanced budget.

Mr. President, it is time we did.

We have been making some headway in reducing the deficit.

President Clinton's 1993 deficit reduction package was a critical turning point in our fight to reduce the deficit, and we are now in the third straight year of progressively lower deficits.

However, we need to do more, and I firmly believe we not only undermine those needed future efforts but could also jeopardize the progress we have already made if we rush along now and do tax cuts.

Mr. President, let me emphasize that my opposition to tax cuts is bipartisan—the tax cut proposals of both parties are wrong.

I publicly opposed the President's proposed tax cuts the same day he even announced them.

An I think opposition to the tax cuts proposals of both parties has bipartisan support.

In fact, I would like to take this opportunity to publicly thank the Senator from Oregon [Mr. PACKWOOD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr.

CHAFEE], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN] for their support of a similar effort that I made as part of the debate on the balanced budget amendment.

Their support was particularly heartening, and I think it reveals a growing consensus that deficit reduction must be a higher priority than tax cuts right now.

As part of his fiscal year 1996 budget, the President, has proposed about \$63 billion in tax cut over the next 5 years, and that is a figure that grows to \$174 billion over 10 years.

Even more troubling the Republican contract with America has proposed tax cuts totaling \$196 billion over 5 years and the whopping figure of \$704 billion over 10 years.

To me, all of those figures represent the cost of a lost opportunity.

The President's tax cuts are part of his budget package, and he has indicated that they are more than offset by \$184 billion in spending cuts.

And at least some of those supporting the Republican Contract With America tax cut package have indicated they too would be offsetting the cost of those tax cuts with spending cuts.

However, even if they are fully offset—I hope we would agree that to be an absolute minimum requirement—we would do much better to forego those tax cuts.

Eliminating the President's tax cut proposals, while doing nothing else to his budget, would result in \$72 billion in additional deficit reduction over the next 5 years—the \$63 billion in foregone tax cuts plus \$9 billion in interest savings.

Just doing that, and nothing more, would produce a Federal budget deficit of \$170 billion in fiscal year 2000, \$24 billion lower than the \$194 billion projected as part of the President's budget.

In fact, the figures for the Contract With America tax cuts are very dramatic.

Assuming spending cuts are produced to offset that tax cut package, and then assuming we decided not to adopt those tax cuts, doing nothing else to the President's budget would result in \$217 billion in additional deficit reduction over the next 5 years—\$196 billion in foregone tax cuts plus \$21 billion in interest savings.

Just doing that, and nothing more, would produce a Federal budget deficit of \$114 billion in the year 2000, \$80 billion less than what the President projected.

Over 10 years, just under this scenario, we would save \$178 billion in interest costs alone by not adopting the Contract With America tax cut package, and could produce \$882 billion in deficit reduction.

Let me conclude by noting that tax cut proposals are grounded in the old politics of the free lunch—promise the people a tax cut and a balanced budget.