

of their prowess in the fundraising arena.

So here we go. By the year 2045, the trustees' report shows that more than 14 percent of the GDP will go into Social Security and Medicare programs alone. And get this one: In the year 2030, there will have to be a 30 percent payroll tax to pay for Social Security. Oh, yes, you can get there; yes, you can; you can do it with more payroll tax; you can get there that way to pay for Social Security and Medicare.

And we here have done all this to ourselves. The President did not do it. President Clinton did not do it. President Bush did not do it. We did it. We have done it ourselves. We have served as pack horses to drag money back to our States, and we have done a magnificent job for 50 years. Just look at our record. The more you drag home, the more you get reelected. Now the people are waking up from a long slumber. Rip Van Winkle could not have matched it.

I plan to work hard with my good friend, BOB KERREY, to introduce legislation to shore up the Social Security and Medicare trust funds in order that it will not be in the cards to leave our children and grandchildren with the burden of paying payroll tax rates of 30 percent and beyond in all the years to come.

You can run but you cannot hide on this one. The tough votes will be coming, and it will be very interesting to see who casts them. My hunch is the people who give us the business about this and this and this item, which is really peanuts in the great scheme, will not cast the tough votes when they know we full well have to have those votes to stop runaway systems that we do not even vote on, which are up now to 68 percent of the entire national budget.

I earnestly hope that we will have a good bipartisan effort to resolve it. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has 22 minutes remaining.

WRONGHEADED PUBLIC POLICY DECISIONS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the discussion in Washington this week, and I suppose next week, and around the country during the Easter break will be the first 100 days. What do we make of the first 100 days in the change of majority status in the Congress, Republicans replacing Democrats as the majority party in the 1992 elections?

I said yesterday, and let me remind people again today, the score in 1992—in a democracy, those who win by one vote are still called winners—the score in 1992 at the end of the election process was the Republicans 20 percent, Democrats 19 percent and 61 percent of those eligible to vote said, "Count me out, I won't even participate." So with a 20 to 19 victory, the Republicans have claimed a mandate for their ideas, and

a mandate for something called the Contract With America.

The Contract With America contains a number of ideas that are interesting, provocative, in some cases radical, in my judgment. Some of the ideas in the Contract With America are ideas that I embrace, that I have voted for and have supported. Some of the ideas are ideas that the majority party, who now brings them to the floor, filibustered in the previous Congress and prevented coming for a vote because they felt apparently they will not support them and now they apparently do and even put them in a contract.

By whatever device they come to the floor of the Senate, a good idea is a good idea no matter who proposes it. A number of them have passed.

Unfunded mandates has passed the Senate and gone to the President. The Congressional Accountability Act has passed the Senate. The line-item veto has passed the Senate. A 45-day legislative veto, which makes good sense, on the subject of regulations and rules has passed the Senate. I voted for all of those issues, and I think they make good sense.

But the Contract With America is a mixture of good and bad. The fact is, some of the ideas in the Contract With America reinforce the stereotypical notions of what the majority party has always been about, and that is to keep their comfortable friends comfortable, even at the expense of those who in this country are struggling to make it.

I would like to talk just a few minutes about some of those items in the contract that we have had to fight and that we even now try to fight and reject because we think they are wrong-headed public policy decisions for this country.

One hundred years from now—not 100 days—but 100 years from now, you can look back and evaluate what this society decided was important by evaluating what it invested its money in, what did it spend money on, especially in the public sector, what did it invest in. That is the way to look back 100 years and determine what people felt was important, what people valued and treasured. Was it education? Was it defense? Was it the environment? Was it public safety? Fighting crime? You can evaluate what people felt was important at that point in their lives by what they spent their money on.

And so you can look at the Federal budget and look at the initiatives brought to the floor of the Senate and the House to increase here and cut over there and determine what do they view as valuable, what do they view as the most important investments.

The Contract With America, in the other body, had a debate recently by the majority party pushing the contract provision that said to the Defense Department, "We want to add \$600 million to your budget."

The Secretary of Defense said, "We don't want it, we don't need it, we're not asking for it."

The Republicans over in the House of Representatives said, "It doesn't matter to us, we want to increase the Defense Department budget by \$600 million. That is our priority. We don't care if you don't want it, don't need it or don't ask for it. We want to stick more money in the pockets of the Defense Department."

How are we going to get it? "We are going to pay for it," they said. "We simply will cut spending on job training for disadvantaged youth and we will cut spending on money that is needed to invest in schools that are in disrepair in low-income neighborhoods."

So they cut those accounts that would help poor kids in this country and said, "Let's use the money to stick it into the pockets of the Pentagon," at a time when the Pentagon and the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Perry, 50 feet from this floor in a meeting said, "We don't want it, we didn't ask for it, we don't need it." But the Contract With America folks said, "It's our priority, it's what we believe in, so we're going to shove money in your direction."

Then they come out on the floor of the Senate and the House and stand up and crow about what big deficit cutters they are, how they dislike public spending, how much they want to cut the budget deficit, how everybody else are the big spenders but they are the frugal folks. Right. They are the folks who are trying to stuff money in the pockets of the Defense Department that the Defense Department says they do not want.

How do they get it? It takes it from poor kids. Now, that says something about values. That says something about priorities, I think.

Now, do we oppose that? Of course we do. Some Members stand up and say we do not think that is the right way to legislate. We do not think we ought to give a Federal agency more money than it needs. If the head of the agency says we do not need or want this money, do Members think the legislature ought to be throwing money? I do not.

Now, we have a number of things in the Contract With America that represent, in my judgment, wrong-headed priorities. I think we are duty-bound to create the debate on these subjects. That is what a democratic system is.

When we disagree, bring all the ideas here and have the competition for ideas, and strong aggressive public debate. Respectful, but strong public debate and see where the votes are.

We had a case in the House of Representatives under the contract where the notion is that all Federal rules and regulations are essentially bad and we should dump them. They did not quite say it that way, but this is pretty much what they meant.

I think there is a general understanding that rules and regulations in many areas have gone too far and have strangled initiative, and have been created by bureaucrats who do not understand

the effect of them, and that we ought to streamline them.

So, here in the Senate we passed, with my help, out of the Governmental Affairs Committee, a risk assessment bill which I voted for and helped write. We passed a 45-day legislative veto which I voted for, and I am pleased to do that because we need to address that.

In the House, what they did is they got a bunch of corporate folks, a bunch of big business folks in a room and said, "Why do you not help write this? What bothers you? See if we can write something that satisfies your interest."

Then they bring it to the floor, called a moratorium. It is beyond the dreams of the big special interest folks to put a moratorium on every conceivable rule and regulation that has yet to be issued.

It is like saying to the biggest businesses in the country, "You can come in and write your own ticket. It does not matter. Just come in and write it up and we will legislate it." We have been through this. There needs to be in a free enterprise society like ours, some oversight, some sense of responsibility, as well.

I told on the floor of the Senate the other day about the early days of this century when people did not know what kind of meat they were eating. When a noted author wrote a book that lit the fuse that started the chain reaction that led to the meat inspection programs in this country.

The investigations in the slaughterhouses in the meat packing plants where they had rat problems, and they take a slice of bread or loaves of bread and lace it with rat poison and lay it out to kill the rats in the meat packing plants. They put the dead rats, bread, and rat poison all down the same chute with the meat and pump out the "mystery meat" that people got a chance to eat in this country.

Finally, understanding that the captains of that industry at least were more interested in profit than they were in public health, there was a decision that we ought to do something about that. Now, when we eat meat in this country that has been inspected, we have some notion that it is safe. Safe to eat. Why is that? Because of regulations. Regulations in many cases are essential to public health and public safety.

No one would want to get on an airline today that does not have a requirement to subscribe to some minimum safety standards in which there are not some air traffic controllers adopting public regulations to determine at what altitudes to fly when heading east and what altitudes to fly when heading west.

Regulations in many cases are critically important. The right kind of regulations. It we have the captains of industry in this country deciding to write the regulations they want, it will, in my judgment, always impose

profit as a virtue ahead of public safety and public health.

We need to care a little about that. Those who say, well, we will open our offices to the captains of industry to write the regulation, and we bring them to the floor and push them to the floor under something called the Contract With America, some are duty bound to stand up and say, no, no, there is a public interest involved here as well.

We must urge the private interest and the public interest to be sure that we care about public health and public safety.

Now, those same people in the Contract With America say that they are the ones that care about public spending. They say we will take the \$10 billion in the crime bill and decide to move that as a block grant to State and local government.

We will send it back to the States. They are capable of better spending it than we are. Remember what happened when we did that before with the Law Enforcement Assistance Act? You separate where you raise money from where you spend it, I guarantee you will promote the biggest waste in Government.

Under the old LEAA Act, local governments got money and one had a study, and that was to try to determine why people in prison tried to get out. What would make people in prison try to escape? Well, we do not have to spend \$25 million to study that. I tell you why—because they are locked up, for God's sake. That is why people in prison try to escape.

Why would someone want to spend public money to determine why prisoners want to escape? Because it was free. The money came from the Federal Government.

This notion about block grants in which we separate where money is raised from where money is spent and in which the Federal Government raises the money and sends it to the Governors to say, "Here, you go ahead and spend it the way you want, no strings attached. Crime, spend it on roads if you want."

In the House of Representatives, they had an amendment on the floor that says at least with respect to this crime money communities ought not be able to spend it on roads. Guess what? They defeated the amendment. They said, no, we would not restrict that. We can send money back in which there is a problem to deal with the epidemic of violent crime, and they can spend it on roads. Those are the kind of things that make no sense.

The previous speaker this morning spoke briefly about the hot lunch program. He said, "Gee, it will increase." Yes, it is true, it will increase. The cost of food goes up, we increase the amount of the hot lunch program by exactly the amount of increase in the cost of food.

Guess what? More children are coming into our school system that are eligible for hot lunch, and there is not

enough money to provide hot lunches for all those kids. And some kids come up and say, "I want a hot lunch, or I need a hot lunch," and they are told, "well, gee, one of the Senators said we increased funding so there certainly should be enough money available for you."

Well, they did not increase funding enough to provide the money for all of the new kids coming into the hot lunch program. And besides, they in the contract for America provide that they will remove the entitlement for a hot lunch for poor kids.

Now, what sense does that make? Poor kids in this country often find that the only hot lunch they receive during the entire day is a hot lunch they received at school. I recall a statement made by the Presiding Officer, about that very subject.

I know the Presiding Officer happens to share my view, the hot lunch program is a critically important program. An entitlement for poor kids to get a hot lunch at school is an entitlement we ought to keep. Any country as big and generous as this country, can certainly be generous enough to be sure that poor kids in this country get a hot lunch in the middle of the day at school.

So people say, "Well, gee, why are you against all these? What are you for?" I am for a hot lunch for poor kids. It seems to me you start with those kinds of notions, and you fight for those things against someone who will decide that we ought not have an entitlement for a hot lunch at school for poor kids. That is what I am for and that is what I am against.

Now, words have meanings, and legislation has consequences. We can talk all we want about what legislation does or does not do. Here is the first 100 ways in the first 100 days that the Contract With America decides it is more comfortable to help the wealthy, help the big special interests, and to do so at the expense of a lot of folks in this country who are vulnerable.

There is a difference in how we believe we ought to discharge our responsibilities. I think we ought to cut Federal spending and we ought to cut it in an aggressive way. But there is plenty of waste and plenty of Federal spending we ought to cut without hurting the vulnerable in our society. We can do that. It simply is a matter of priority.

When those who push the Contract With America decide we want to shove \$600 million at the Defense Department that they do not want or they do not need or they did not ask for, and, at the same time, they say, we want you to remove the entitlement to a hot lunch, for American school kids who are disadvantaged. And there is something wrong, in my judgment, with the value system that creates those regulations.

I hope we can talk about all of that this week, because that is the standard by which we judge the first 100 days—some good, some bad. We accept the

good, vote to pass it along and improve things in the country. The bad we fight, because this country can do better than that. This country can do better than to compromise health and safety standards, than to say that poor kids in school, your hot lunch does not matter.

I just touched on a couple of areas here. There are dozens and dozens of them that make no sense. I hope during this coming week, we can decide to explore some of those in depth and explore the reasons why we feel it is important to stand up and speak out on behalf of some of those as well.

I yield to the Senator from Vermont, Senator LEAHY, who has done an enormous amount of work in this area.

Mr. President, I yield him the remainder of my time, and he may wish to add to that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has 6 minutes and 20 seconds.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we add 12 minutes to my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if I may ask the Senator from Vermont if I might address a question through the Chair, I think in the order of business I was to be recognized for up to 15 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is correct. He has 15 minutes reserved.

Mr. COVERDELL. Would morning business still allow that?

Mr. LEAHY. I was aware of the order regarding the Senator from Georgia. The Chair will correct me if my addition is not right. It would make sure he would still have his full 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are still several Senators who have reserved time. The Senator from Indiana has 10 minutes; the Senator from Georgia has also 10 minutes.

Is there objection?

Mr. COVERDELL. As long as I will have time, with the time remaining, for my remarks, I will not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

WINNERS AND LOSERS UNDER THE CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have heard from schoolteachers and I have had heard from parents and doctors and day care providers and advocates for children around the Nation. Many of them have called me because, during the past 20 years as chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, I have been intimately involved with almost all nutrition legislation in this country.

Certainly, during the last dozen years, there has not been any piece of nutrition legislation that has passed the Congress and has been signed into law by the President that has not ei-

ther been authored by me or cosponsored by me.

I have heard from many Vermonters, from dietitians, dairy farmers, the Governor of Vermont, and volunteers of Vermont food shelves. They feel worried and betrayed. They want welfare reform; they want able-bodied adults to work, as do I. But they do not want to see hunger return in this country with a vengeance.

They do not want to see a country, blessed as no other nation on Earth has ever been blessed with its ability to produce food, have millions of hungry Americans. And they do not want the Contract With America. They believe the Contract With America is antichild and antifamily, and so do I.

The Contract With America is good for big corporations, for huge tax cuts for the rich, and for special interests. I thought we ought to see who are the top 10 winners under the Contract With America. So I put together a chart that explains the top 10 winners.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two lists of winners and losers, under the Contract With America, be printed in the RECORD.

TOP 10 WINNERS DURING THE FIRST 100 DAYS OF THE CONTRACT

10. The Coca-Cola Company and the Pepsi Cola Company—soft drinks instead of milk could be served with school lunches. Children and dairy farmers, in contrast, are very big losers.

Pepsi is a big winner since its Taco Bell and Pizza Hut subsidiaries could take over school lunch programs, and other fast food companies are not far behind.

9. Pesticide manufacturers—the chemical giants stand to make millions of dollars with planned cuts in federal regulations that protect the environment. I hope families that drink water in rural areas like the taste of alachlor, atrazine, and cyanazine.

8. Criminals—Republicans plan to stop the President's efforts to put 100,000 new police officers on the streets. All communities who would have gotten those new officers will be big losers.

In Houston, violent crimes have been reduced by 17 percent because of cops on the beat; in New York City, community policing has cut violent street crimes by 7 percent.

7. Four drug giants—the House bill could transfer up to \$1.1 billion to infant formula manufacturers by eliminating the requirement that infant formula be bought at the best price for the WIC program.

Current competitive bidding procedures keep 1.5 million pregnant women, infants and children on WIC at no additional cost to taxpayers. Those up to 1.5 million infants, women and children are losers under the House bill.

6. Locksmiths—funding for child day care is slashed, which means that low-income mothers who want to work may have to let tens of thousands of kids stay home by themselves.

5. Water and air polluters, unwholesome meat and poultry packers—House Republicans plan to cut regulations that protect the environment, air quality, water quality and food safety.

Families that breathe air, drink water and eat food are the big losers.

4. Large corporations—corporations will enjoy huge tax loopholes (such as eliminating the alternative minimum tax which will give corporations \$35 billion over 10 years), defense conglomerates will make large prof-

its, and meat and poultry plants will not have to worry about selling contaminated meats since that will be allowed.

3. The wealthiest 12 percent of Americans—over half the benefits of the tax breaks in the Contract With America go to the wealthiest 12 percent of Americans, those earning over \$100,000 a year.

In contrast, children do not vote and have been targeted for the worst cuts by the Contract With America. Included in the list of Federal funding slashed or totally eliminated is funding for: disabled children, food for homeless children living in emergency shelters, day care for the children of low-income parents who want to work, food for children in over 150,000 day care homes, summer jobs and food service programs, PBS children's programs, and other programs for children.

2. Lawyers—lawyers will make a fortune exploiting all the environmental, tax, and worker protection loopholes in the Contract.

The Republicans create 101 new ways for lawyers to delay environmental, health and food safety regulations.

1. Anyone making over \$349,000 a year—the House Republican proposals give the wealthy an average tax break of \$20,362 through huge capital gains tax cuts, estate tax breaks for the wealthy, and corporate tax loopholes. In addition, U.S. billionaires who renounce U.S. citizenship will be given huge tax writeoffs—\$3.9 billion worth over the next 10 years.

These tax entitlements for the rich, and for corporations, are provided while cutting aid to children, to low-income students who want to stay in college, and to the national service program that provides college scholarships.

TOP 10 LOSERS DURING THE FIRST 100 DAYS OF THE CONTRACT

10. Newborn children—the Contract throws up to 1.5 million pregnant women, infants and children off the WIC program, threatens to make millions go hungry, and provides for major funding cuts for programs that help disabled children, children in child care and homeless children.

9. Children who drink tap water—the House delays regulations that protect drinking water from being contaminated with dangerous chemicals.

8. Children who breathe—the House bill hampers clean air protections which will especially hurt more vulnerable populations such as children.

7. Children who need child care—child care food program funding is cut in half which will likely throw over 150,000 day care homes off the program.

6. Children with mothers who work—the Contract slashes funding for child care for low-income parents who are trying to stay off welfare, get off welfare, or find a job.

5. Children with fathers who work—the Contract eliminates the safety net for families when they most need help during a recession. Benefits to millions of children could be significantly cut during hard times.

4. Children who go to school—funding for educational programs for grade school and secondary schools, funding for the Learn and Serve Program, and funding for AmeriCorps college scholarships is slashed.

3. Children who eat hamburgers—The House bill delays rules on food safety for at least one year. These rules are designed to prevent foodborne illness outbreaks like the one that killed several children in Western states in 1991.

2. Children who are not rich—House tax cuts for wealthy Americans and corporations will make it more difficult to balance the budget, our children will have to pay the bill