

addresses in suitable illustrated book-length editions;

Whereas between 1988 and 1994, Senator Byrd meticulously supervised preparation of 4 volumes, including a 39 chapter chronological history, a 28 chapter topical history, a compilation of 46 classic Senate speeches, and a 700 page volume of historical statistics;

Whereas volumes in the series have received national awards for distinction from organizations such as the American Library Association and the Society for History in the Federal Government;

Whereas the 4 volume work, entitled "The History of the United States Senate", is the most comprehensive history of the Senate that has been written and published;

Whereas Senator Byrd has devoted tireless energy and tremendous effort to the preparation and publication of the historical books, enabling citizens of the United States to better understand the history, traditions, and uniqueness of the Senate; and

Whereas a better understanding by people of the Senate and the role of the Senate in our constitutional system of government will foster respect and appreciation for the democratic traditions of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Senate extends congratulations and appreciation to Senator Robert C. Byrd for completing "The History of the United States Senate", a monumental achievement that will educate and inspire citizens of the United States about the Senate for generations to come.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SOCIAL SECURITY AND FAMILY POLICY

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Social Security and Family Policy of the Finance Committee be permitted to meet on Friday, April 7, 1995, beginning at 9:30 a.m. in room SD-215, to conduct a hearing on 1995 Board of Trustees annual report of the Social Security and disability trust funds.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

• Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues who have expressed their congratulations to our counterparts in the House who this week completed work on the "Contract With America."

In the past few days, Mr. President, I have heard some powerful and stirring remarks from the other side about the nature of the "Contract With America." I have heard allegations that Republicans are plotting to break ketchup bottles over children's heads, to snatch their school lunches from their grasping mouths, and to send the seniors of America into the streets to forage from garbage cans.

Of course, this is an attempt to cast a judgment on the substance of the legislation that was brought forth under the contract. I would instead prefer to

focus my remarks on what I consider to be the real point of the contract, which was a commitment by newly elected leaders to—hold on to your hats—to keep their campaign promises.

Small wonder that this effort has produced so much discomfiture and fury on the other side. I remember a Presidential election in 1992, in which a Democratic Presidential candidate campaigned against the Bush policy in China, against the Bush policy in Bosnia, promised massive tax cuts—then delivered unprecedented tax increases—and on and on and on. And this is, to the mindset of the other side, what "responsibility" is all about. You don't keep your campaign promises, because it would be "irresponsible" to do so.

My view is rather quite different. My view of responsibility is that, while campaigning, one only makes promises that one intends to keep. But apparently it is a novel idea in Washington, and is described by phrases such as "pandering" and "irresponsibility."

Now also, before discussing the substance of the contract itself, let me also commend by House colleagues for adhering to the principle that, whether or not the votes were there to pass these items, these matters should be brought forth for a vote. That was the real point of the contract—to bring matters up for a vote.

I need not tell American citizens why that is so important, but I would like to refresh my colleagues' understanding of that point. The point is simply that the American public has a right to know where its representatives truly stand on these issues. That is a fundamental responsibility of representative democracy.

This principle should be supported by all legislators, whether or not they agreed with all of the substantive content of the "contract." Clearly, these were matters of importance to the American people. Many legislators—on both sides of the aisle—have run for office claiming that they supported such measures. They would say that they favored balanced budgets, favored the line-item veto, favored term limits, favored holding Congress accountable to the laws that it passed—and yet these measures were never passed. Those who voted for these legislators had a right to know who really favored these measures and who did not.

I think it is a measure of how truly "out of touch" Washington has become if the definition of "responsibility" has become—"refusing to vote on matters of importance to the American people." What House Republicans have accomplished, essentially, is to demonstrate that they believed that Americans did have a right to know where their legislators really stood, instead of Congress' engaging in the age-old practice of refusing to bring matters to a vote simply because it was feared they would pass. That is not my idea of representative democracy—gimmicking the system to avoid having to cast

a politically unpopular vote. And we saw a terrible lot of that in the House for 40 years.

Finally, I would like to address the rather silly charge that the "Contract With America" was a special boon for rich Americans only.

If we run down the various items of the contract—and I do not support every single one of them—we see several measures that have nothing to do with being "rich" or "poor." We simply see measures designed to give Washington some long-overdue accountability to the people we represent.

For instance—the Congressional Accountability Act. I do not understand why it would be catering to the "rich" to make Congress accountable to the laws that it passes.

Nor do I understand why a halt to unfunded Federal mandates is a special benefit for "the rich." It is an irrelevant, nonsensical argument to say that somehow it is the height of egalitarianism for Washington to send endless unfunded mandates on to the States.

The balanced budget amendment; there's another one. Simply the proposition that Government should live within its means. I would be very curious to know what tenet of economic theory holds that it is necessary for Government to go into hundreds of billions in debt every year in order to treat "rich" and "poor" appropriately.

Even many of the attacks on the proposed tax cuts struck me as disingenuous, at times even hypocritical. Many Congressmen and Senators waxed eloquent about how unfair it was to give any sort of tax break to the "rich," but when it comes to shelling out billions in Federal entitlement benefits to the "rich," they are strangely silent. If it is unjust to have any sort of tax relief affecting anyone of means, please explain to me why a billionaire should get a full Social Security COLA, or to have 75 percent of his Medicare part B premium paid by the taxpayer. If you want to know where we have really indulged the "rich," it's not through the Tax Code. It's through Government spending.

So this was never about "rich" versus "poor." It was about big Government versus small Government.

In the end, Mr. President, many of the attacks on the Republican legislative effort are nothing more than the same shopworn, trite, ridiculous rhetoric of class warfare that got us into this spending nightmare, and most assuredly will not get us out.

We will hear much more of it in the weeks to come.

When we attempt to hold the growth of Government spending to a reasonable level—not to cut it, but just to restrain its growth—we will hear how we are "cutting" and "slashing" and so forth.

I just cannot believe—and I say this in all earnestness to my Democratic colleagues and their pollsters—that the American people will swallow that one. I remember those charges during the

Reagan years. Last I looked, we had a Federal budget of, now, \$1.6 trillion. Doesn't look like a lot of "slashing" and "cutting" to me. Does anyone seriously believe that the American public will buy the notion that we are tearing spending to ribbons when we have a Federal budget of \$1.6 trillion? Something just doesn't add up there.

The reality is that we have programs like Head Start that are going up 140 percent over the course of 6 years—and the opposition comes down here, still, to charge that it is being torn apart by Republican budget cuts.

It is a mode of argument that simply will not work anymore. There is simply too much clear evidence to the contrary.

There is still much to do to bring our Government's house into order. But by any measure, the first 100 days of this Congress have been a darn good start. We owe the House our rich congratulations.●

SHORTSIGHTED RESCISSIONS

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the rescission bill approved by the Senate last night included a very short-sighted cut, which I strongly opposed. The bill we sent to conference with the House rescinds \$93.5 million for the base realignment and closure account for the 1993 round of military facility closures, and another \$10.6 million for the base realignment and closure account for the 1991 round of facility closures. These BRAC accounts provide the funds to close and realign military bases including, most urgently, to clean up an environmental contamination that the military services caused while they occupied those facilities.

During consideration of the bill, I voted for the Mikulski amendment, which would have restored funds for cleanup of closing bases and funds for other important national programs. Now, I strongly encourage the conference committee to restore these funds.

When we voted for base closures over the last 5 years, we also committed to complete environmental restoration and remediation at those facilities quickly, in fact within a maximum of 5 years from the time closure was approved. I consider that a solemn commitment from us, and from President Clinton to the affected communities, which spent years as good neighbors to the military, providing all kinds of support. Each of those communities was serving our country with their support of local military facilities. The President and Department of Defense have tried to keep this commitment by requesting full funding for BRAC activities. We appropriated most of what was asked for last year. It would be a mistake to rescind more funding.

Mr. President, not only is it wrong to renege on the commitment we made to cleanup swiftly the military bases we have ordered to close, so that reuse there is possible. Underfunding this ac-

tivity by rescinding fiscal year 1995 BRAC funds is also short-sighted. It's probably not even penny-wise, but it is certainly pound-foolish.

In many cases, Federal and State laws require this cleanup. At some bases, consent agreements now dictate specific cleanup activities and deadlines, the cost of which must be paid from the BRAC accounts. So BRAC rescissions are false savings. We still have to complete these environmental restoration activities. When we delay, it becomes more expensive, because the contamination in many cases gets worse. Soil and groundwater contamination can spread. And if consent agreements are violated because of lack of funds, the Federal Facilities Compliance Act says the Federal Government may be subject to fines and penalties.

The Governor of California, Pete Wilson, recently wrote to the Secretary of Defense on this subject, saying:

The continued erosion of cleanup funding inevitably will threaten the health of armed services personnel and civilians who work at military bases where contamination is present. It will also exacerbate economic suffering in communities that are struggling to redevelop closing bases. And, if the federal government will not meet its cleanup obligation, how can we expect private industry to do so? DOD is contractually obligated to seek sufficient funding to permit environmental work to proceed according to the schedules contained in those agreements. California will not hesitate to assert its right under those agreements to seek fines, penalties and judicial orders compelling DOD to conduct required environmental work.

The attorney general of Texas expressed similar sentiments in a letter to the Pentagon, saying:

If, in other words, the DOD and the federal government do not comply with all applicable cleanup laws, then other entities may begin to question why they should comply with cleanup laws. Hopefully, we have not reached the point of the federal government taking the position of "do as I say, and not as I do."

I would ask that the entire letter of January 25, 1995 from Governor Wilson to Secretary Perry, and the December 29, 1994 letter from Attorney General Dan Morales to Under Secretary of Defense Sherri Wasserman Goodman be printed in the RECORD.

SACRAMENTO, CA,
January 25, 1995.

Hon. WILLIAM PERRY,
Secretary of Defense, The Pentagon,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY PERRY: I would like to express my deep concern about recent actions at the Department of Defense (DOD) and in Congress regarding cuts in funding for environmental restoration of military bases.

The recent decision by Congress to cut \$400 million from the Defense Environmental Restoration Account (DERA) for FY95 continues a disturbing trend begun last year when Congress rescinded \$507 million from the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Account. California was reassured that the BRAC rescission would not affect environmental work at closing military bases, but work was indeed scaled back at several California military bases due to the cut. The DERA cut presumably means that DOD will

seek to postpone or eliminate environmental work at operational military bases.

At the same time, the DOD Comptroller has announced an additional \$437 million in cuts for cleanup programs through FY97. Such actions can only encourage members of Congress who would like to redirect DOD environmental spending into more traditional defense programs.

The continued erosion of cleanup funding inevitably will threaten the health of armed services personnel and civilians who work at military bases where contamination is present. It will also exacerbate economic suffering in communities that are struggling to redevelop closing bases. And, if the federal government will not meet its cleanup obligation, how can we expect private industry to do so?

California expects DOD to comply with the federal/state cleanup agreements it has signed at California military bases. DOD is contractually obligated to seek sufficient funding to permit environmental work to proceed according to the schedules contained in those agreements. California will not hesitate to assert its right under those agreements to seek fines, penalties and judicial orders compelling DOD to conduct required environmental work.

I would be happy to work with you to strengthen support in Washington for full funding of DOD cleanup work. One way to reduce oversight costs would be to delist military bases from the National Priorities List and give states the exclusive responsibility for overseeing base cleanups. Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of assistance in these areas.

Sincerely,

PETE WILSON.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Austin, TX, December 29, 1994.

Re additional comments to the Defense environmental response task force fiscal year 1994 annual report to Congress.

Ms. Sherri Wasserman Goodman,
Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Environmental Security), Defense Pentagon, Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. GOODMAN: I continue to believe that much progress has been made in the cleanup program of the Department of Defense ("DoD") as a result of the work done by you and your office. It is important, however, that the policies declared at the headquarters level continue to permeate down through the Services to the base or facility level. I am not quite sure at this point, in other words, that all of the policies and efforts set forth at the headquarters level have been fully embraced or implemented at the facility level.

Because of possible adverse effects on future cleanups at closing bases, I am deeply concerned about recent action taken by the DoD Comptroller with regard to the DoD environmental remediation and compliance budget. I understand that the Comptroller desires to cut over a half-billion dollars from the DoD's request for environmental cleanup and compliance. Not only would such a cut be short-sighted, I firmly believe that it would be unlawful if it is the case that all of the legal requirements facing the DoD could not be met (as a financial or budgeting matter) in accordance with Executive Order 12088 (Federal Compliance with Pollution Control Standards (Oct. 10, 1978)) and the many federal facility and state cleanup agreements entered into in good faith by the DoD. While saving taxpayers' money and ensuring military readiness are surely critically important objectives, the compliance by DoD with all applicable laws purposed at protecting