

was a young Army lieutenant assigned to the unit. In the article, Paul reflects on a small research project I conducted for him involving the cost of fish in Saigon. It just goes to show that we never really escape the actions we take in this life.

At any rate, Mr. President, the piece brought back a great many memories and I am flattered Paul remembered such a small incident after all these years. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

COMMERCE OFFICIALS KNEW TWO CONGRESSMEN "BACK WHEN"

OLIA some time ago surveyed senior Commerce officials to determine if any had ever had any particularly memorable personal contacts with members of Congress. At least two of them most certainly had. One of our Commerce people had a hand in saving a Congressman's life. Another was a Senator's boss while both were young men serving in Vietnam.

Larry Irving, assistant secretary for communications and information, was a member of a delegation visiting Russia when Rep. Dana Rhorabacher, R-Calif., became quite ill. Irving administered some first aid procedures which helped bring him through the crisis.

Paul London, deputy under secretary, was a State Department aide seconded to the Agency for International Development when he first knew Larry Pressler, now a Republican Senator from South Dakota.

London recalls:

"I was head of a unit concerned with economic affairs and Larry was a young Army lieutenant assigned to us.

"One time, there were reports that the price of fish (a dietary staple in South Vietnam) might skyrocket because the Viet Cong were threatening to cut a coastal highway to Saigon. I had a feeling that most fish supplies to Saigon came from the Mekong Delta, rather than from the coast and I asked Larry to check it out.

"A couple of days later he reported that my surmise was exactly right. 'Far and away more fish on the Saigon market come from the Delta than from coastal fishing boats,' he reported.

"How did you verify that," I asked.

"I got up before dawn, went down to the market and asked the people there where the fish were coming from," he said.

"Right then, I thought: 'This guy is going to go places. He does things personally, doesn't depend on paper shuffling or second hand information to get to the heart of something.'"

The two have retained a cordial relationship ever since.

THE BUDGET

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, this week and next week, we are going to come down to the moment of truth on two issues. One issue has to do with putting the Federal Government on a budget like everybody else. The other issue has to do with fulfilling the Contract With America to let working people keep more of what they earn. I would like to briefly address both of these subjects.

In the 1994 election, in one of the most remarkable political occurrences

in the postwar period, House Republicans did something that is very unusual in the political process and that is they set out in plain English what they promised America they would do if the American people gave them a majority in the House of Representatives for the first time in 40 years.

I would add that while many people have forgotten it, Republican candidates for the Senate put out a joint statement where virtually every Republican challenger for the U.S. Senate in the country came to Washington and released a "Seven More In '94" document, where we outlined seven things we would do if the American people gave us a majority.

Two of those promised items had to do with balancing the budget and with letting working people keep more of what they earned. The House of Representatives has done something even more remarkable than making all these promises—they have actually done it. The House of Representatives has adopted the Contract With America. They have adopted 90 percent of the things they promised to simply vote on. And at the best universities in the land, you would grade that as an "A."

We are now down to the moment of truth in the U.S. Senate and that moment of truth basically has to do with whether or not we are going to pass the Contract With America and whether we can make the tough decisions necessary in order to do that. To balance the Federal budget over a 7-year period and at the same time to accommodate the tax cut contained in the Contract With America will require us, over a 7-year period, to limit the growth in Federal spending to approximately 3 percent a year.

Over the last 40 years, Federal spending has grown at 2½ times the growth of family budgets in America. Over the last 40 years, the Federal Government has increased its spending 2½ times as fast as the average family in America has been able to increase its spending. Now what would America look like if those trends had been reversed? Well, if the average family in America had seen its budget grow as fast as the Government has grown for the last 40 years, and the Government's budget had grown only as fast as the family budget has grown over the last 40 years, the average family in America today would be earning \$128,000 a year and the Government would be approximately one-third its current size.

I ask my colleagues, if you could choose between the America where the governments budget grew faster or an America where the family's budget grew faster—put me down as one who would favor having the average family in America make \$128,000 a year and have the Federal Government one-third its size.

Here is our dilemma. We have some of our colleagues who say, "I did not sign any Contract With America. That was the House of Representatives." As

I am fond of saying in our private meetings, that is a subtlety that is lost on the American people. They do not see this contract as having been a contract between just the House and the American people. They see it as a Republican contract. And, quite frankly, it is a Republican contract. It embodies everything that our party claims to stand for.

But what I think is important for the Senate is not just that Republican candidates signed the contract, not just that every House Republican incumbent who signed the contract was re-elected but I think what is significant to us is that the American people signed that contract when they gave us a majority in both Houses of Congress for the first time in 40 years.

The question that we are going to have to answer in the next 3 weeks is, are we willing to limit the growth of Government spending to 2½ percent a year so that we can, over a 7-year period, balance the Federal budget and so that we can let working families keep more of what they earn? I believe that we can and I believe that we should. I think there are many Republicans in the Senate who sort of have a problem, in that they have one foot firmly implanted in the dramatic changes in Government policy that we promised the American people in 1994, and they have the other foot firmly implanted in the status quo. And, as those two things have moved further apart, we have had the predictable result.

I think it is time for us to choose. I believe in the next 3 weeks we are going to basically decide whether or not we meant it in November of 1994 when we told the American people that we were going to dramatically change the way Government does its business. I think the American people are convinced that we can limit the growth of Government spending to 2½ percent a year so that we can let families and businesses spend more of what they earn.

I know if the President were here, he would say this is a debate about how much money we are spending on our children; or how much money we are spending on education; or how much money we are spending on housing or nutrition.

But that is not what the debate is about. Everybody in America wants to spend money on children, housing, education, and nutrition. The debate we are about to have is not how much money is going to be spent on those things, but who is going to do the spending. Bill Clinton and the Democrats want Government to go on doing the spending. They want Government spending to continue to grow 2½ times as fast as the family budget grows.

I want to put the Federal Government on a diet. I want to slow down the rate of growth in Government spending so that we can let working families keep more of their own money to invest in their own children, in their own businesses, and in their own future.

This is not a debate about how much money we spend on the things that all Americans believe we should spend money on. It is a debate about who ought to do the spending. Bill Clinton and the Democrats want the Government to do the spending. We want the family to do the spending. We know the Government, and we know the family. And we know the difference.

Since we are investing in the future of America, I want to invest the future of America in our families and not in our Government.

I know that there is a lot of anguish in the Senate, even on our side of the aisle. But I think it is time to choose. I wanted my colleagues to know that I am for a budget that does two things: No. 1, over a 7-year period, limit the growth of Federal spending to about 3 percent a year so we can balance the budget in 7 years and let our colleagues do something that no current Member of the Senate, save two, has ever done before; that is, vote for a real honest-to-God balanced budget. We literally have the power, by having a 7-year binding budget, to let Members of the Senate vote to stop talking about balancing the budget and to start doing it.

Second, in addition to the controls on spending necessary to balance the budget, I want to limit the growth of spending not to 3 percent a year, but to 2½ percent a year so that we can let families keep more of what they earn, so that we can cut the capital gains tax rate, so that we can eliminate the marriage penalty, so that we can let families have a \$500 tax credit per child, so that, rather than having our Government spend our money for us, we can let working people spend their own money on their own children and on their own future.

As we look at this in perspective, let me give you three numbers. In 1950, the average family in America with two little children sent \$1 out of every \$50 it earned to Washington, DC, and thought it was too much. And it probably was. Today, that family is sending \$1 out of every \$4 it earns to Washington, DC, and if the Congress did not meet again for the next 20 years some people would applaud that prospect, but only because they do not understand our problems. If Congress did not meet again for the next 20 years and we did not start a single new program nor repeal any existing program, to pay for the Government that we have already committed to is going to require that in 20 years \$1 out of every \$3 earned by the average family in America with two children come to Washington, DC, to pay for the Government.

We are going to have to institute dramatic changes in spending simply to keep things the way they are. If we are to let working families keep more of what they earn, we are going to have to institute a dramatic change in Government policy. Mr. President, I am in favor of a dramatic change in Government policy. If our Budget Committee does not offer and adopt a budget that

balances the budget and that provides for tax cuts for families and for job creation, I intend to offer a substitute for that budget. I think we have to stop cutting deals with America's future. I think we have to stand up and tell the American people we meant it in November 1994 when we said you give us a Republican majority in both Houses of Congress and we will change the policy of American Government.

I think we are now down to a moment of truth. Are we going to fulfill the commitment we made in that election, or are we basically going to defend the status quo? The status quo means less opportunity, future jobs, and an America that is not the America that I want my children and my grandchildren to have. I am ready to change the status quo. I am ready to cut the growth in Government spending, not just to balance the budget, but to cut taxes. And what I want my colleagues to know today is I want to work with the Budget Committee, I want to work with our leadership. I am hopeful that we can put together as a party position a budget that balances the budget over a 7-year period and that mandates tax cuts contained in the contract. But, if our leadership is not ready to bring that budget forward, if they cannot muster the courage to control Government spending to make it possible, I will muster that courage, and will offer a substitute and give my colleagues the opportunity to join me, and to join America in that process.

Finally, let me say, Mr. President, I simply want to remind my colleagues that the Contract With America was in fact signed by House Members, but there are two additional points. First, it was not distinctly different from the "Seven More in '94" contract that our candidates agreed to here on the north front of the Capitol. Second, the important part of that contract is not the fact that the House signed it. The important part of that contract is that America signed it. The important part of that contract is it was the document that defined what the 1994 election was all about.

The question now, the question that will be before us for the next 3 weeks is, Did we simply want to be for dramatic changes in Government at election time, or are we willing to put our votes where our mouth is? Are we really more wedded to funding for programs such as public television, or are we more wedded to letting working people keep more of what they earn? Do we really believe that Government knows best and that we need not only a \$1.6 trillion Federal budget but that we need it to grow by 7.5 percent a year while the family budget is growing at less than half that rate?

I think that is the decision. I think the answer of every Republican in the Senate ought to be clear. And that answer ought to be we can change the status quo, we can limit the growth of Government spending, we can terminate programs, and we can and will not

only balance the budget but let working families keep more of what they earn to invest in their own children, in their own businesses and their own future, and that we ought to cut taxes on American business to provide incentives for people to work, save, and invest. That is what I am for. I believe that is what America is for.

I thank the Chair.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I thought I would take less than maybe 5 minutes to respond to my colleague from Texas.

First of all, Mr. President, I look forward to this debate that we are going to have because I think what we have seen too much of here is an attempt to dance at two weddings at the same time, and I think that citizens in this country are going to hold us all accountable.

As I said earlier, I do not understand how the arithmetic of this adds up, and I think there are colleagues on the other side of the aisle who would agree with me. It is very difficult to talk about broad-based tax cuts, with the estimates that maybe this is up to \$700 billion over the next 10 years, and talk about no cuts in the Pentagon budget.

Mr. President, I hear precious little discussion of what we call tax expenditures. And for those who are listening to this debate, I am talking about various loopholes, deductions, sometimes outright giveaways—oil companies, tobacco companies, pharmaceutical companies, insurance companies. I see precious little discussion about any of that being on the table. We are going to pay the interest on the debt. We are going to put Social Security off the table, Mr. President. According to some of my colleagues, in addition, we are going to balance the budget by 2002.

I also hear the same colleagues saying but, students, do not worry about being able to afford higher education; veterans, do not worry, there will be no deep cuts there. I doubt whether senior citizens will take great comfort from the remarks of my colleague from Texas because it is quite one thing to talk about a 2-percent increase a year but when the trend line is in fact that more and more of our citizens are 65 years of age and over with more serious health care costs going far beyond 2 percent, then what we are really talking about is eroding again what I talked about earlier here, a contract with senior citizens, the Medicare Program.

Mr. President, first of all, let me make the point that to be proposing some rather deep cuts in some programs that are critically important to the concerns and circumstances of people's lives in our country all for the

sake of broad-based tax cuts flowing disproportionately to those on the top does not strike me as something that will meet the standard of fairness I think people demand of us.

Second of all, Mr. President, let me just simply say that this argument that when it comes to the most pressing issues of people's lives there is nothing the Government can or should do is a wonderful argument if you own your own large corporation, but as a matter of fact, there are certain decisive areas of life, education being one of them, where we have decided we make an investment as a people to make sure we do live up to our dream of equality of opportunity.

So I would simply say, Mr. President, because otherwise I will go on for hours and hours, if you want to talk about real welfare reform, the answer is good jobs and good education. If you want to talk about how to reduce poverty in this country—1 out of every 4 children are poor, 1 out of every 2 children of color are poor—then the answer is good education and good jobs.

If you want to talk about reducing violence in our communities, talk to your judges, talk to your police chiefs, talk to your sheriffs, much less talk to people in those communities, and they will tell you we will never stop the cycle of violence unless we invest in good education and there are good jobs for people.

If you want to talk about how to build community, the same thing—good education and good jobs. If you want to talk about how we have a democracy where men and women are able to think on their own two feet, they understand the world they live in, they understand the country they live in, they understand the community they live in, and they understand what they can do to make it a better community or a better country or a better world, then I am telling you, we have to invest in good education.

I have to tell you right now that when I travel around the State of Minnesota, a State which values education, I meet too many students who sell their plasma at the beginning of the semester to buy their textbooks; I meet too many students who are going to school 6 years because they are working 35 and 40 hours a week, and we hear proposals that they are going to have to start paying interest on their debt throughout their years of graduate or undergraduate work. In addition, we hear about proposals of cutbacks in work-study and various low-interest loan programs, Pell grant programs.

I could go on and on. I could just tell you, these are middle-class programs. These are programs that have made the United States of America a better country, a more just country, a country with more fairness.

So let us be crystal clear. The issue is, who decides who benefits and who is asked to sacrifice? The question will be asked, who decides to cut Medicare and who has health care coverage that is

good coverage? All of us who are in the Senate. And who decides to cut some of the programs that enable students to be able to afford higher education and whose children get a decent education?

I could go right across the board, but I simply say to people in this country, hold us all accountable and make sure you are good at addition and you are good at subtraction and you are good at arithmetic, because I think it is a bit of a shell game here. We are going to have broad-based tax cuts and, in addition, we are not cutting the Pentagon budget, and we are paying the interest on the debt and not touching Social Security, but we are going to balance the budget, cutting. I do not know, \$1.3 trillion, \$1.7 trillion, by the year 2002. But, veterans, do not worry about your health care; you do not need to worry that you are waiting 2½, 3 years for just compensation right now with the veterans appeal board. And, students, do not worry because we are not going to cut into higher education and children. No, we would not do anything that would affect nutrition programs, but we are going to balance the budget by 2002. We are not going to make a distinction between operating budget and capital budget. We are not going to go after corporate welfare. Maybe we will. I hope we do. Everything should be on the table. But we are going to balance the budget.

I just simply say this argument about there is the Government and there is us, as a matter of fact, is a wonderful philosophy. When it comes to the issues important to your lives, what the Government should do or could do is great if you make \$200,000 a year. It is great if you own your own large company. It is great if you are in the Senate and make \$130,000 a year. It is not so great if you are a regular, ordinary American.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAMM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. I am so moved that I would like to just respond to that.

First of all, if you are rich, if you own your own corporation, you are not too much affected by these changes. And let me explain why. In 1950, rich people paid a lot of taxes. Rich people pay a lot of taxes today. In 1950, poor people did not pay any taxes. Poor people do not pay any taxes today.

What has happened since 1950 is that the tax burden on average working Americans has exploded to pay for all of this Government that our dear colleague from Minnesota sees as the salvation of the American people. We have spent more money on welfare since 1965 than we have spent in fighting all the wars the Nation has been involved in this century, and there are more poor people today than there were when we started this program. They are poorer today than they were when we started this program. They are more dependent today than they were when we started this program.

The illegitimacy rate among the poor is three times what it was when we started this program. The crime rate has exploded. And by every index on the planet, they are worse off today than they were when we started the war on poverty.

But are my colleagues dismayed? Are they the least bit unhappy? No. If we could just spend another trillion, if we could just let Government do more, everything would be wonderful.

There is only one problem that our dear colleague has, and that is the American people do not believe it anymore. The American people have rejected that idea.

In terms of health care, our colleague last year, along with our President, had an opportunity to convince the American people it just made great sense to tear down the greatest health care system the world had ever known to rebuild it in the image of the Post Office. And remarkably, for a while, it looked as if that was going to succeed. But finally, a few Members—and I am very proud to be able to say I was one of them—stood up and said, "Over my cold, dead, political body."

When we reached that point in the battle when the American people came to understand that this was not a debate about health care and jobs, but instead a debate about freedom, that one little stone slew Goliath.

So I think we have had plenty of debate about health care. If I might say, I reintroduced my health care bill. Bill Clinton did not reintroduce his. Obviously, there was a belief that mine was supported by the American people; he concluded that his was not.

Now, in terms of this Pentagon budget issue, the plain truth, as we all know, is that since 1985, we have cut defense spending by over a third. If we had cut Government spending in total half as much as we cut defense budgets, we would have a Federal surplus.

Even the President says today that his defense budget will not fund the level of defense that he claims the Nation needs.

So this idea that we can go around talking about how can we write a budget without cutting defense, I remind my colleagues we have already cut defense. The problem is we did not cut anything else. We have already cut defense and raised taxes. The problem is we spent every penny of the tax increase so that now the Congressional Budget Office says that the underlying budget and the underlying deficit is no different today than it was before Bill Clinton imposed the largest tax increase in American history.

Now, how can you have the largest tax increase in the history of the country, the lowest levels of defense and not have the deficit go down? There is only one way. And that is you spend all the money, which is exactly what we have done.

In terms of Medicare, can anybody stand here and say that we are going to able to keep Medicare as it is? Last

year, Medicare spending grew by 10.5 percent a year. Last year, the average insurance policy held by a worker in the private sector did not have his premium go up. Competition improved efficiency. Cost consciousness meant that the private sector part of medicine saw no cost increase and yet the public sector part of medicine grew by 10.5 percent.

Does anybody believe that either the taxpayer or our senior citizens can sustain that rate of growth in a program that jointly they are paying for? Does anybody believe that we should not try to reform that program and bring efficiencies and economies and choices into it or that we cannot do it?

I remind my colleagues that the Medicare trustees, appointed by President Clinton to look at the financial problems of Medicare, concluded that Medicare was going to be broke by the year 2002, the year that we hope to balance the Federal budget. What we are asking is that we respond to the urgent call by the two independent members of the Commission who urge Congress to address this problem.

Now, as for the old tax-cut-to-the-rich song, let me remind my colleagues that we are talking about a \$500 tax credit per child so that families can invest their own money in their own children. No one has failed to conclude that at least 75 percent of that tax cut will go to families that make \$70,000 or less.

But look at the capital gains tax rate. I know my colleagues will say, "Well, if you cut the capital gains tax rate, rich people are going to immobilize their capital and they are going to invest and they are going to create jobs and, if they are successful, they are going to earn profit."

Welcome to America. Welcome to America. That is how our system works. If America is going to be saved, it is going to be saved at a profit.

I was thinking the other day, as I listened to our President make a similar statement to that our colleague has made, I have had a lot of jobs in my life. When I was growing up, I was very fortunate to have a lot of jobs. I worked for a peanut processor, I worked in cabinet shop, I worked in a boat factory, in addition to the same jobs we all had, throwing papers and working at the grocery store.

No poor person ever hired me. Never in my life has a poor person ever hired me. Every job I ever had, and I suspect the same is true for virtually every American, every job I ever had I got because somebody beat me to the bottom rung of the economic ladder, climbed up, invested their money wisely, created jobs, and made it possible for someone like me to get my foot on the bottom rung of the economic ladder and climb up.

What is wrong with encouraging people to invest to create jobs, growth, and opportunity?

In terms of corporate welfare, if my colleague means by that subsidizing

corporate America to invest in a technology the Government chooses or subsidizing American business to invest in areas that the Government chooses, one of the things that I want to do in the budget, and one of the things I will do if I have to offer a substitute, is dramatically cut the \$86 billion of Government spending where Government tells business where to invest. That is how I would like to fund cutting the capital gains tax rate and indexing so that we can let the market system and not the Government decide where that investment will occur.

As far as children, it is interesting to me that after all these years of exploding Government, after all these years of the failure of Government, that we still see Government as the solution to every problem involving the American child.

In fact, American Government is doing such a great job that now President Clinton wants the United Nations to get into the act. His administration has now signed the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child and he is going to ask us to ratify it. And it supersedes State law. So now not only are we going to help raise every child in America by the Federal Government, but we are going to let the United Nations do it. We are doing such a great job now, I guess we think the United Nations can help us do even better.

Forgotten in this whole argument is that child rearing is a parental concern. Parents ought to make decisions about children. And part of our problem is over the last 40 years we have taken more and more money from parents, we have spent their money on their own children, and we have done a much poorer job than they would have done had we simply allowed them to spend their own money on their own children.

In terms of good jobs, where do good jobs come from? Does anybody believe that Government can create jobs? Does anybody believe, as Bill Clinton says, that Government can empower people? Freedom empowers people. Government entraps people.

Finally, in terms of this whole debate about Government, we are not talking about eliminating the Government. We are talking about a budget that, if we fulfill the Contract With America, Government will spend about 2½ percent more each year for the next 7 years.

Now I know, for those who want Government spending to grow at three or four times as fast as the family budget, that that is cruel and unusual punishment. It means Government has to make decisions.

But there are a lot of businesses in America that have had to make a lot tougher choices than limiting their budgets to 2½ percent growth a year. And they have had to do it just to keep their doors open. There are a lot of families in America that make much tougher choices than that.

All we are asking Government to do is to live in the real world with every-

body else where you have to make tough decisions.

So, I think that we can see that this is going to be an interesting debate. And it is a defining debate. I respect my colleague from Minnesota because, basically, his view is the view of his party. Not all the members of his party are so honest as he is to basically point out that they believe that Government is the answer; that they really believe that if we can make Government bigger, if Government could make more decisions, if we could spend more money at the Federal level, that America could deal with every problem we have.

I do not believe that. I believe that if we can put the Federal Government on a budget, if we can let working people keep more of what they earn, if we can make hard choices at the Federal level, if we can reform welfare to demand that people, able-bodied people riding in the wagon get out of the wagon and help the rest of us pull, if we can demand that we end this situation where we are subsidizing people to have more and more children on welfare, and if we can end the absurdity where millions of people are getting more money riding in the wagon than millions of other Americans are getting for pulling the wagon, then I think we can make America right again.

The point is, we have two distinct visions for the future of America. Our dear colleague from Minnesota and most Democrats, including the President, believe that the vision that leads us home, the vision that brings back the American dream, the vision that shares the dream with people who missed it the first time around is more Government, more spending at the Federal level on education, more spending at the Federal level on health, more spending at the Federal level on nutrition and housing and training.

Of course, how are we going to pay for it? Well, of course, we are going to raise taxes. And who are we going to raise taxes on? Rich people. And who are rich people? Anybody who works. That is their vision.

My vision, the vision of most Republicans, is exactly the opposite. We want less Government and more freedom. In fact, I would not want the Government we have today even if it were free. If you could give us this Government, I would not want it because I think the Government is too big and too powerful. It makes too many decisions.

Free people should make more decisions for themselves and they should not have their Government making decisions for them. And we are not just talking about freedom and efficiency, we are talking about virtue.

It is not good that people turn to the Government to fix every problem they have, to indemnify every mistake they make because in turning to Caesar, they turn away from God, they turn away from their family, they turn

away from themselves as problem solvers for themselves. As a result, they become dependent, and when they become dependent, they become less free. That is what this debate is all about.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I actually promised my colleague from Illinois that I would limit my response to 5 minutes, but I am so moved by what my colleague from Texas had to say, I would like to respond.

Mr. President, I hardly know where to start, but I can assure my colleague that it is quite possible to turn toward God and to turn toward religion and to have values and spirituality in your life and believe, as the Committee on Economic Development believed, a business organization which issued a report a few years ago, that one of the ways that we do well with an effective, successful private sector is to make sure that we invest in our children when they are young.

It is simply the case that if we do not invest in our children when they are young, making sure that each and every child has that equality of opportunity, which is what my parents taught me was what America was all about, then we pay the interest later on with high rates of illiteracy and dropout and drug addiction and crime and all of the rest.

Mr. President, when we talk about will there be a higher minimum wage, the answer from my colleague from Texas is no. From what I think I just heard my colleague say, when we talk about whether or not higher education will be affordable, for some sort of reason there is nothing the Government can do, we do not really need to have Pell grants or low-interest loans or work study, but, Mr. President, what has made this country a greater country is to make sure that each and every young person has that opportunity.

Nobody talked about the Government doing everything. That is a caricature. That is just sort of political debate.

We have a strong private sector, and that is what makes this country go round, but we also think there is a role for the public sector, and that is to make sure that we live up to the promise of this Nation, which is equality of opportunity.

I do not think the people in the United States of America believe that whether or not you receive adequate health care or not should be based upon whether or not you have an income. I think people believe that each and every citizen ought to have decent health care. I heard my colleague criticize the post office. I can tell you one thing, at least they do not deliver mail according to your income. Everybody gets their mail regardless of their income.

I heard my colleague talk about welfare. My God, you would think AFDC families caused the debt, caused the

deficit. I was not here during the years some of my colleague served here, but if my memory serves me correctly, in the early 1980's, we were told what you want to do is dramatically reduce taxes—that was euphemistically called—I ask my colleague from Illinois, I think I am correct—the Economic Recovery Act. What happened was we eroded the revenue base and moved away from any principle of progressivity, I say to my colleague. I am sorry he is not here.

Poor people do pay taxes. Many people are poor in the United States of America, work 40 hours a week, if not more, 52 weeks a year, and they pay Social Security taxes. More wage earners, more ordinary Americans pay more in Social Security taxes than in taxes. We have dramatically reduced the corporate rates and, indeed, there has been too much of a pressure on middle-income and working families. But this argument that the problem is that we have relied too much on an income tax just simply does not hold up by any kind of standard if you look at it with any rigor.

I think the welfare benefits, the AFDC benefits in some States—I cannot remember Texas—are about 20 percent of poverty. People in the United States of America believe the children have a right to be all that they can be. People in the United States of America believe we should invest in higher education. People in the United States of America believe that an educated, high-morale work force is critical to economic performance. And people in the United States of America believe that it is a combination of a strong private sector and also a Government that can effect good public policy that can lead to the improvement of lives of people in our communities that makes the difference. That is what this debate is about.

I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

BATTLE AGAINST POVERTY

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I will try not to strain the patience of my colleague from Washington.

First, in response to the dialog that has just taken place between the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Minnesota, the Government clearly is not the answer for all of our problems. But I would point out that when we had what was called a war on poverty—which was really not a war on poverty, but at least a battle against poverty—we ended up at one point with 16 percent of the children of America living in poverty, down from 23 percent. We are now back up to 23 percent, and we ought to do better. That is Government policy, it is private sector, it is all of us working together.

PEACEKEEPING CONTRIBUTION

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, Sunday's New York Times has an article entitled "Poll Finds American Support for Peacekeeping by U.N.," written by Barbara Crossette. It is a poll conducted of 1,204 people by the Center for International and Security Studies at the University of Maryland and by the Independent Center for the Study of Policy Attitudes in Washington.

Let me just read a couple of paragraphs:

There was a general perception among those polled that about 40 percent of United Nations peacekeeping troops are American, and that this should be halved to 20 percent. In fact, 4 percent of peacekeepers are American.

I do not know where the 4 percent figure in the Times comes from. The last figure I saw was as of March 6 and at that point, the United States was No. 20 in its contribution and less than 4 percent. Jordan, with 3 million people, was contributing more than twice as many peacekeepers as the United States with 250 million people. Nepal was ahead of us at that point.

The article also says:

Asked about the cost of the Federal budget of international peacekeeping, half of the sample in the poll gave a median estimate of 22 percent. Less than 1 percent of the military budget is actually spent on these operations . . .

Mr. President, we do have a choice here, and that is whether we are going to work with those countries or whether we are not. To use the old overworked phrase, if the United States is not going to be the policeman of the world, we have to work with other countries.

Here let me add that one of the things that we get all emotionally hung up about is whether U.S. troops can be under a non-U.S. commander. The reality is that back since George Washington had troops under a French commander, we have had troops under foreign commanders. I do not know why we get so hung up on this. It does not bother me, frankly, if the next NATO commander should be a Canadian, or a Brit, or an Italian, or one of the other NATO countries. I think that is a perfectly plausible thing.

If we want other countries to work with us around the world, we will, on occasion, have to have American troops under foreign commanders.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the New York Times article.

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

[From the New York Times, Apr. 30, 1995]

POLL FINDS AMERICAN SUPPORT FOR
PEACEKEEPING BY THE UNITED NATIONS

(By Barbara Crossette)

UNITED NATIONS, April 28.—As Congress considers making significant cuts in contributions to United Nations peacekeeping, the findings of a new study show that Americans may not only be supportive of such operations but are also willing to see missions