

United States, the Secretary of Commerce may recommend to the President appropriate action against such person, which may include modification of the authorization to export crude oil.

"(6) Administrative action with respect to an authorization under this subsection is not subject to sections 551 and 553 through 559 of title 5, United States Code.

**"SEC. 203. ANNUAL REPORT.**

"Section 103(f) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6212(f)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"In the first quarter report for each new calendar year, the President shall indicate whether independent refiners in Petroleum Administration for Defense District V have been unable to secure adequate supplies of crude oil as a result of exports of Alaskan North Slope crude oil in the prior calendar year and shall make such recommendations to the Congress as may be appropriate."

**"SEC. 204. GAO REPORT.**

"The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a review of energy production in California and Alaska and the effects of Alaskan North Slope crude oil exports, if any, on consumers, independent refiners, and shipbuilding and ship repair yards on the West Coast. The Comptroller General shall commence this review four years after the date of enactment of this Act and, within one year after commencing the review, shall provide a report to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources in the Senate and the Committee on Resources in the House of Representatives. The report shall contain a statement of the principal findings of the review and such recommendations for consideration by the Congress as may be appropriate.

**"SEC. 205. EFFECTIVE DATE.**

"This title and the amendments made by it shall take effect on the date of enactment."

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

**AMENDMENT NO. 1105 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1104**

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI], for Mr. HATFIELD, proposes an amendment numbered 1105 to amendment No. 1104.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the amendment add the following new section:

**SEC. 206. RETIREMENT OF CERTAIN COSTS INCURRED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF NON-FEDERAL PUBLICLY OWNED SHIPYARDS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Energy shall—

(1) deposit proceeds of sales out of the Naval Petroleum Reserve in a special ac-

count in amounts sufficient to make payments under subsections (b) and (c); and

(2) out of the account described in paragraph (1), provide, in accordance with subsections (b) and (c), financial assistance to a port authority that—

(A) manages a non-Federal publicly owned shipyard on the United States west coast that is capable of handling very large crude carrier tankers; and

(B) has obligations outstanding as of May 15, 1995, that were issued on June 1, 1977, and are related to the acquisition of non-Federal publicly owned dry docks that were originally financed through public bonds.

(b) ACQUISITION AND REFURBISHMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE.—The Secretary shall provide, for acquisition of infrastructure and refurbishment of existing infrastructure, \$10,000,000 in fiscal year 1996.

(c) RETIREMENT OF OBLIGATIONS.—The Secretary shall provide, for retirement of obligations outstanding as of May 15, 1995, that were issued on June 1, 1977, and are related to the acquisition of non-Federal publicly owned dry docks that were originally financed through public bonds—

- (1) \$6,000,000 in fiscal year 1996;
- (2) \$13,000,000 in fiscal year 1997;
- (3) \$10,000,000 in fiscal year 1998;
- (4) \$8,000,000 in fiscal year 1999;
- (5) \$6,000,000 in fiscal year 2000;
- (6) \$3,500,000 in fiscal year 2001; and
- (7) \$3,500,000 in fiscal year 2002.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I am offering this amendment on behalf of Senator HATFIELD and respectfully urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1105) was agreed to.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SNOWE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 10 minutes as in morning business.

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

### THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. DORGAN. In the next several days, we will have on the floor of the Senate a budget resolution. This has been much discussed and anticipated because we have had substantial debate here in the Senate and in the House of Representatives and in the country as a whole about the need to deal with this country's fiscal policy problems. No one, I think, will deny that our country is off track in fiscal policy. We spend more than we have. We routinely charge the balance to our children and

grandchildren, and we must change priorities and fiscal policy to balance the Federal budget.

The Federal budget that we deal with and the budget resolution coming from the Budget Committee is a critically important document. A hundred years from now, if historians then could look back 100 years and view us, they could evaluate our priorities by what we spent our money on. They can look at our Federal Government and look at a \$1.5 trillion budget and determine what was important to us by how we spent our money. What did we hold dear? What did we treasure, value, and what kind of investments did we think were important? That is what they will be able to tell about us. That is what is in the budget resolution. It represents our priorities, values, and what we think is important for our country.

A lot of people view this as just politics, just the same old thing, Republican versus Democrat. It is not that at all. It is much, much more important than that. It is the establishment of a set of principles by which we determine how we spend the public's money. I recall a story in the Washington Post, I believe, once where two people were quoted from Congress and one said—speaking of some other dispute—"This has degenerated into an argument about principle." I thought to myself, I hope so. That is what this is all about. That is what the budget resolution ought to be about.

I was at the White House this morning with a group of my colleagues meeting with President Clinton. He made a point about the budget resolution that I happen to agree with, which is that his problem with the budget resolution that is going to come to the floor of the Senate is that the priorities in that budget resolution do not match the needs of the country.

The budget resolution from the House of Representatives calls for a very large tax cut. The benefits of the tax cut will largely go to the wealthiest in America. If you take a look at who benefits from the tax break by the House of Representatives, the numbers show up like this: If you are a family earning under \$30,000 a year, you get a tax break of \$120. If you are a family over \$200,000 a year in income, you get a tax break of around \$11,000. It is pretty clear who benefits from that kind of policy.

In order to pay for a very expensive tax break, the bulk of which goes to the most affluent Americans, what do you have to cut in spending to do it? Well, they cut Medicare. They make it more expensive for someone to go to college. They cut education. They make it more difficult for the elderly to get health care. They cut earned-income tax benefits for the working poor, which means higher taxes for the working poor.

I happen to think those priorities do not match what our needs are. My own view is we ought not at this point have

a tax cut. I would like to see everybody pay far less taxes than they now pay. But the first obligation, I think, for our country, is to balance the Federal budget.

I give credit to the budget resolution and those who framed it because it includes some recommendations that I support. There is a part of the budget recommendation that comes to the floor of the Senate that I think makes eminent good sense, and I support it. I say congratulations. I sent 800 billion dollars' worth of spending cut recommendations to the Budget Committee. I believe in this. We need to balance the Federal budget, and not with smoke and mirrors but with real spending cuts in real ways. And, yes, also in some areas with real revenue. But I believe in some areas you must balance the Federal budget.

I do not believe, however, with the kind of deficits we have, the way to start balancing the Federal budget is to first start talking about tax cuts. I understand the Senate budget resolution does not specifically prescribe tax cuts, but I also understand it specifically sets aside \$170 billion to be sent to the Finance Committee specifically for cuts. So this budget resolution, like the House resolution, will accomplish the same things. It will cut taxes. And it will pay for that tax cut by providing less for Medicare, by cutting the earned-income tax credit and therefore raising taxes on low-income working families, and by slashing spending for education, especially the education money available to help young people go to college.

I think those priorities are wrong. There must be spending cuts in a whole range of areas. Will we have to limit the rate of growth in Medicare and Medicaid? Yes, I believe we will, in the context of reforming the whole health care system in some reasonable way, without limiting people's choice. But the fact is you cannot continue seeing skyrocketing health care costs across the country without some interruption. The Federal budget cannot stand that, the family budget cannot stand that, nor can a business budget stand that. So we must respond to that problem.

But we ought not, under any condition, decide to take several hundreds of billions of dollars out of Medicare and Medicaid, both of them, and do that at least in part so we can give a very big tax cut to some of the wealthiest Americans. That makes no sense at all.

I would say, on the issue of education, to the extent anything is important in our country, we must decide as a country to invest so our kids can go to school. Investing in education for our children is an investment in this country's future. It yields dividends of enormous importance to the future of this country.

So, when we decide we are going to make a trade here and we are going to do classic trickle-down economics, and that means we do not have enough money to provide for financial help for

somebody going to college, that is a trade that in my judgment injures our country's economy.

Some people say this is new, that this is reform. This is not new. There is nothing new about this. This is 15 years old and it is 50 years old. It is: run an election, win, write a contract, give tax breaks for the rich, and have the rest of us pay for it somehow, with less medical care and less help for their kids to go to school and higher taxes for the working poor. That is not new. That is Herbert Hoover.

We have been through this before. Trickle-down economics—that is the notion where you pour the money in at the top somehow and, if you make the top generous enough or affluent enough, somehow it all trickles down and rains on everybody else in America.

Another Member who served in this body many, many years ago described trickle-down economics. He said it is the concept that if you feed the horse some hay, sometime down the road the sparrows will have something to eat—trickle-down economics. That is not a notion that I think makes sense for the economy engine of this country. Our goal is not to make the comfortable more comfortable. It is to provide working people in this country with something to make a good living: jobs, opportunities, education. That is what drives the American economy. It is not trickle-down economics, it is percolate-up economics.

I think what we ought to do when we bring this budget resolution to the floor of the Senate, I would like to see on a bipartisan basis for all of us to do something very serious and very quickly. I would like to see us decide immediately. The first test is to decide to balance the budget using spending cuts. Do that. Debate about the priorities, what are the values here, what are the things we hold dear, what should we invest in, what about our children—go through that debate. Set the tax cuts aside and say, let us not do tax cuts. Let us just deep six all that stuff. And then let us do honest, real spending cuts and balance the Federal budget.

Then, when we have done that, we have rolled up our sleeves and done the honest work, then we can turn to the other issues. But I think it is wrong to engage in a political exercise and balance the budget by beginning with a very large tax cut for the affluent, which means we must take more from Medicare for the elderly, more from programs to help those who want to go to school, more from the working poor by scaling back the earned-income tax credit, and so on. That, in my judgment, is not the right way for this country to proceed.

I noted some columnists have said the Democrats in the Chamber do not seem to be as ambitious in dealing with the budget deficit as some others. I do not think we need to take great instruction from columnists about our interest in deficit reduction. Those of

us who, in 1993, voted on the floor of this Senate for \$500 billion of deficit reduction, some of which was very unpopular, all of which was pretty controversial—those of us who were willing to do that without any help at all, not even one accidental vote from the other side of the aisle, do not need lectures about deficit reduction.

I believe in deficit reduction. I am glad I voted for it in 1993. I will vote for much more deficit reduction offered by either side of the aisle. If it is responsible cutting of what represents excesses in the Federal budget, count me in and sign me up because I am willing to do it.

Also, as I said, I sent \$800 billion in deficit reduction recommendations to the Budget Committee, mostly spending cuts, some additional revenue increases, saying: Here is a jump start on how we ought to do this.

Much of that is in the mark that will come to the floor by Senator DOMENICI. And I will support those portions of the budget. But I do believe the broader priorities, especially the priorities these days in something called the Contract With America, are priorities that I do not share. We must, it seems to me, understand how to provide decent health care for our elderly in this country and we must understand and make a commitment to provide health care for those in America who are disadvantaged and who are poor.

That is not something we ought to debate much about. Yes, we can debate about how to control costs or how to bring down the rate of increase. But we ought not trade off the health care needs of the elderly or the health care needs of the American poor with tax cuts for the most affluent Americans. That is not a trade that makes sense for this country.

I hope in the coming week, when we resolve this budget issue, that we will on a bipartisan basis decide, in a serious, sober, thoughtful, reflective way, to honestly cut Federal spending where we are spending too much; honestly put this country back on track toward a balanced budget, and do that first by spending cuts and not talk about, again, tax cuts for the most affluent Americans.

Madam President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION ASSET SALE AND TERMINATION ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.