

Both Africans and Americans have a great deal to lose—and perhaps even more to gain—by addressing environmental issues on the African Continent. These are not easy issues, but we must proceed as we would with any long-term security concern—with sensitivity, determination, and wisdom. If we do so, generations of Africans—and Americans—will benefit from a sustainable, diverse, and thriving natural world.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and appreciate the opportunity to speak on this issue at this time.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 20 minutes in morning business.

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

#### RETIREMENT OF SENATOR KASSEBAUM

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I likely will not have an opportunity to take the floor of the Senate again while the Senator from Kansas is in the Chamber. She just finished a discussion on a foreign policy issue, but I did want to say while I am in the Chamber and she is in the Chamber that this institution is going to miss her service.

There is a lot of discussion these days about the bickering between Republicans and Democrats, and the American people do not like to see that; they want to see a Congress that serves the interests of the American people. They want to see Democrats and Republicans think through ideas and work together to find the right course for our future.

Senator KASSEBAUM is one of those people in Congress, recognized by everyone serving here as an extraordinary Senator who cares a great deal about this country and has contributed immensely to this country's betterment. I for one have felt privileged to serve with her in the Senate while I have been here, and I will miss her.

#### A COMPETITION OF IDEAS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I mention the issue of ideas. It is a Presidential year. The Constitution of our country, drafted a couple of hundred years ago in a little room over in Constitution Hall by the Framers of the Constitution, described that every even-numbered year in our country the American people would grab the steering wheel and have an election and the American people would decide in which direction this country moved. It was not going to be a decision by a bunch of elitists, a bunch of big business folks, a bunch of labor people, a bunch of investors. It was going to be a decision by the American people to grab the American steering wheel with their vote and decide which way this country would move. It was quite an extraordinary

thing. The late Claude Pepper used to call it the miracle in the Constitution every even-numbered year.

What I expect the Framers of this democracy hoped would be is that in these elections we would have a competition of ideas, ideas advanced by different candidates from different positions, saying this is what we believe will advance the interests of our country. This is what we believe will improve America.

Regrettably, American politics and American elections have become much less a competition of ideas than a competition of slash and burn, 30-second ads telling the American people or people in a State or district how awful someone might be, how terrible someone has been, instead of what are my ideas, what do I think will improve this country.

I hope this election will be different. I guess there is no reason to believe it will be different until the American people decide to change elections in this country by saying to those who wage negative campaigns that we will not vote for you.

The minute negative campaigns do not work they will not be used. People use what works. Negative campaigns work, and they are used extensively, with great devastating effect in our country these days.

There was a debate about 2 years ago in a congressional district that I read about that I thought was quite fascinating. The two candidates for Congress came to the debate and were told by the debate organizers, by the way, we have a very simple, unusual rule that you will have to adhere to. The rule is in this debate between two people aspiring to be Members of Congress, you may not mention your opponent. You may not be critical of the other person in the debate, requiring therefore in this debate for you to spend your time telling the people what it is you stand for, what it is you intend to fight for, what you believe in.

I understand it was a fascinating discussion because it moved from a debate about which is the worst candidate to a debate about ideas, a competition of ideas and issues. I would like to see if we cannot get our political system back to a description of that kind of politics.

Having said all that, I am going to talk a little about the tax cut proposal offered by Senator Dole, not because I think Senator Dole is a bad candidate. I do not. I disagree with the ideas he is proposing, and I am going to describe why. Then I am going to talk about the ideas I think ought to be proposed to make this a better country.

I have said many times and will again now that Senator Dole was a remarkable Senator and contributed a great deal to this country in his public service. I happen to think Jack Kemp was an excellent public servant and has contributed a lot to this country. It is a credible team competing for the Presidency. I happen to disagree with

the central idea on which they are running. I am going to talk a little about it and then talk about what I think we ought to be discussing.

The proposal that is advanced first and foremost is an across-the-board tax cut. It is, 2 months from the election, a proposal that says vote for us because we propose a 15-percent across-the-board tax cut.

That sounds attractive, and if we were not bound by issues like you should not increase the Federal deficit, I would propose a 25- or 50-percent tax cut. Why settle for 15? Why not propose a 50-percent tax cut or 75-percent tax cut? But we are bound by something else. We are bound by a requirement that we have a fiscal policy that is in some reasonable balance.

We are told that a proposal for a 15-percent across-the-board tax cut will result in a substantial benefit to all Americans and a balanced budget as well—a deficit that is coming down to a balance.

I was thinking about that last evening, and I thought I would show my colleagues what some feel is believable in our country.

I receive a lot of mail, as do all Americans. You open your postal box these days, and it is full of all kinds of unsolicited mail. Here is a letter I got from Dorothy Addeao. I do not know Dorothy Addeao from a cord of wood, never met her, never heard of her before. But she wrote to me to say this: "It's my pleasure to be the bearer of glad tidings. In just 5 weeks, we are scheduled to announce Byron L. Dorgan"—that is me—"is the winner of the 1995 \$10 million super prize in Publisher's Clearing House."

Now, it was not that she just wrote to me and said that they were going to announce that I had won \$10 million, the super prize. She also sent me a certificate, and it is stamped, has my name right here. It says, "\$10 million." My number by the way was 00016780.

Then she signed it.

That was not all. I mean, that is pretty improbable, I suppose, that someone would write to me and tell me I won \$10 million.

But I got another letter. This one was from Sweepstakes Priority. They told me that BYRON DORGAN wins a Hawaiian vacation and a new Lexus automobile. They have a number on it, and they said the Lexus automobile is set aside for my use, mine free. I thought that is pretty improbable—you win \$10 million and then a trip to Hawaii and a Lexus.

Then I got a letter from Time magazine, down in Tampa, FL. It says, "The results are in. Byron L. Dorgan"—that is me again—"has won one of our two latest \$1,666,675.00 prizes." And then underneath it says, "Byron L. Dorgan, winner, \$1,666,675.00," and then it says, "payment ready. Elizabeth Matthews." I do not know Elizabeth Matthews from a cord of wood; never met her. But out of the blue she tells me I won \$1.6 million.

If that was not enough, not knowing Ed McMahon or Dick Clark, having never met either, or never having received mail from either, they wrote me and said, "Byron Dorgan, it's confirmed, you are our new \$10,000,000 winner."

All of this for me.

As you can see, I have not opened these letters. We have certain gift rules in the Senate. I think it is a \$50 gift rule, and I felt I did not want to compromise anything here, so I have not mailed this thing in. But it looks to me like we are talking about \$21,600,000, a trip to Hawaii, and a new Lexus.

Improbable? Yes. I think all Americans know what I am talking about. I imagine there are 250 million winners of this \$21 million and the Lexus and the trip to Hawaii. But I suppose that if Dorothy—is that her name? Yes, Dorothy—and Elizabeth and Time magazine and Ed McMahon and Dick Clark believe that I and millions of others will think we have won millions of dollars, I suppose there is a reason to believe, in our political system, that one can propose we will balance the budget by increasing defense spending and proposing substantial across-the-board tax cuts. After all, it has been done before and some believed it before.

It is not much more credible than this. I kind of like Ed McMahon. I have not seen him for a while, but I used to like him on the "Tonight Show."

The proposal of an across-the-board tax cut, which sounds attractive, and I think most people would enjoy having, and that with an across-the-board cut in revenue, you will balance the budget, it could just as well be proposed by Ed McMahon telling us there is an easy way to solve problems. If your family has a deficit problem, you are spending more income than you have, what is the solution? Cut your income.

Let me, if I might, suggest that I think we need to cut our expenditures, and we have, and the deficit has been reduced 4 years in a row; the first time in 40 years, 4 years in a row, the deficit has been reduced. It was cut in half. Was it because those who now propose a tax cut did something to make that happen? No, we did not get one vote to help us do that, not one, not even by accident.

Those of us on this side of the aisle, including some who are no longer here, who lost their jobs because of it, voted to cut Federal spending and, yes, raise some taxes on the higher income people in this country. The result is, since that proposal, a very substantial reduction in the Federal budget deficit. I voted for that.

Was it popular? No. Would it have been politically better to vote against it? Yes, of course. I voted for it, and I am pleased I did because it was the right thing to do. But the deficit is not erased or eliminated. The deficit has come down 4 years in a row. It has been cut in half, but it is not gone and the job is not done. The remainder of the job is to reduce that budget deficit to

zero, to balance the budget, balance what we are bringing in with what we are spending so we are not saddling our children and grandchildren with debt as a result of our consumption today.

That job is not done and that is why these proposals, 60 days before the election, for across-the-board tax cuts sound very attractive but are not going to be good for the American people and good for this country if we really want to balance the Federal budget.

Yesterday we held a hearing in the Senate—the Democratic Policy Committee held a hearing. I want to share with my colleagues some of the testimony at this hearing. Benjamin Friedman, he is the William Joseph Maier professor of Political Economy at Harvard University, Benjamin Friedman says:

The Dole-Kemp proposal is a reprise of a gamble that failed. Our government tried that idea in the 1980's. The result was record-sized budget deficits, borrowing, and higher real interest rates, reduced investment and disappointing productivity. And it left behind a legacy of swollen government debt, a shrunken capital stock, depressed productivity, and a large net balance that we now owe to foreigners.

It is 20 years of testimony telling us why this would not be good for our country.

Dr. Joel Prakken, chairman, macro-economic adviser, in many pages of testimony, tells us the same thing. This is a proposal that does not add up. This is a proposal that will increase the Federal deficit. It does not add up, and it is not good for this country.

Charles Schultze, the Brookings Institution, testifies with exactly the same kind of testimony. First-rate economist, great economist, telling us this does not add up. Joel Prakken, Richard Cogan, all of them say this does not add up.

We are talking about a proposal for a tax cut. I would like to see a tax cut in this country, when we finish the job of balancing the budget. Then we ought to talk about our tax system, and the tax cuts ought to go to working families in this country.

I saw in the paper this morning Jack Kemp. I like Jack. He is a friend of mine, a good guy. "Kemp Records Show Big Jump in Income, Candidate Has Earned \$2 Million a Year Since Leaving Government." No wonder he smiles all the time. I wondered why he is always smiling, always so optimistic. With \$2 million a year, you understand a little bit where people come from who are out there pushing for a flat tax or tax cuts. If you are making \$2 million a year, I suppose you have a substantial interest in that.

But I think, honestly, we would be better off addressing, perhaps, some targeted areas where we might be of help, in education, tax cuts, in some other areas, although I would prefer even to wait on most of those until we have solved the deficit problem completely. Let us not leave this job when it is half done. Let us finish the job of eliminating the budget deficit. This job

is half done. Let us finish the job, and then let us talk about the Tax Code, and there is plenty to talk about in the Tax Code and plenty of changes we ought to make.

Let me just, for a couple of minutes, talk about the things I hope we will hear about in the Presidential campaign, things other than a tax cut. I hope that one of the central questions in this campaign, and it ought to be a central question in the Presidential campaign in this country, is: What about America's education system?

Is there anything that is more important to this country's future than its education system? Does anyone believe America's future is affected by anything more than it is affected by our education system?

Thomas Jefferson said, anyone who believes a country can be both ignorant and free believes in something that never was and never can be. This country ought to aspire and our Presidential contest ought to aspire to have the finest education system in the world and debate policies that will accomplish that.

What kind of policies will accomplish us having the best education system in the world, the feeling that at the end of the day we have sent our kids to the best schools anywhere in the world? There is some evidence that in some areas we have the best schools in the world. If you want to go to world class universities, most of them are in the United States, not elsewhere.

We don't see people boarding planes to get educated elsewhere. America has most of the major world class universities in this country. There is a lot to commend this country's education system, and there is a lot to criticize.

The central question, however, ought to be as we compete with shrewd, tough international competitors for economic growth and jobs and expanded economies in the future—and I am including Japan, Germany, and others—the central question is how do we do that in our education system?

In Japan and Germany and other countries, kids are going to school 240 days a year; in our country, 180 days a year. I can go through a litany of things that concern us relative to the question of competition and whether we are keeping pace in the education system. But I do know this. No one advances this country's education system by believing that we ought to decide to cut back on Pell grants, cut back on guaranteed student loans, decide to underfund the opportunity for kids to get an education.

No one I know does a service by standing in this well of the Senate saying, "By the way, tomorrow is Tax Freedom Day. The burden of paying taxes is now lifted from my shoulders. Hosanna."

I stand up and wonder, why do you consider it a burden to pay taxes to have a school your child can attend. Do you really consider it a burden to send

your kid to school? I happen to consider it an opportunity. Do I like paying taxes? No. Do I believe paying taxes to build good schools to educate my children represents a good investment for me and my country? Absolutely.

I have two kids in school this afternoon, and they are wonderful young children who I want to have the best education in the world. They are in a public school system. It is a good public school system. Both have good teachers, and we do not advance the interests of that education system by tearing down those teachers.

The way you fix an education system, the way an education system can work is if you have a parent who cares about their child's education, a child that is willing to learn and a teacher who really knows how to teach. Those combinations mean that kids advance in our school system and become the very best they can be.

Last evening, I, like a lot of parents, put my children to bed by reading them a story. We do that every evening, but there are a lot of kids in this country, a lot of children in this country who have no one to read them a story. They have no books to read. Some have no bed to sleep in. Some I described before, like David Bright, age 10, a young man who lived in a homeless shelter in New York, told us some can't do well in school because they are hungry. David said, "No child like me should have to put their head down on their desk in the middle of the day at school because it hurts to be hungry."

How do you learn in that environment? Those are the issues we ought to discuss in the Presidential campaign.

What about our education system, not just for kids who are privileged, but for all children? This country does not move ahead by leaving some behind. What do we do about our education system to make it the best in the world and to guarantee that it is available for all Americans?

I think it is interesting that we hear now on the news and read in the newspapers about an athlete who is 7 feet 2 inches tall who can dunk a basketball. He is going to be paid \$115 million over 7 years to play basketball. Do you know what \$115 million will pay for? Nearly 4,000 elementary schoolteachers, for one 7-foot-2-inch basketball player. Think of what historians will understand about that 100 years from now looking back and trying to understand what was our value system.

The point of all this is to say I hope that the Presidential campaign centers not just around an idea about a tax cut that is going to increase the deficit and retard our economic future, but the ideas of education, what do we do about advancing our education system, investing in education, making our education system the best in the world.

How about crime? Let's have a Presidential campaign waged on the issue of what really to do about crime. We have done a lot, and Republicans and Demo-

crats have joined together to do a fair amount on the issue of crime. But much remains to be done, and some simple things can be done.

We ought to distinguish instantly, right now, in both the Federal system and in the State and local criminal justice system, that there is a difference between those who commit violent acts and those who do not. Those who commit violent acts we send to prison in order to keep them away from others, to provide for the safety of other Americans, as well as to punish them.

We ought to decide immediately those who commit violent acts in this country will go to prison and not get out before the end of their term. Period. People who commit violent crimes ought not get time off for good behavior, early release, early parole. People who commit violent crimes in the Federal system and the State and local justice system ought to stay in prison until the end of their term. I can cite chapter and verse about dozens of murders.

In fact, there are 3,000 murders that have recently been committed by people who should have been in jail but let out early to murder 3,000 innocent Americans. We ought to make a decision on dealing with violent criminals in this country in a manner differently than we deal with other criminals.

We ought to have instantly in this country a decision by our entire country that we will put on a computer list the name and the record of everyone who has committed a felony in America. If you go downtown and buy a shirt in the department store, they will run your credit card through a magnetic imager, and they will find out in 20 seconds whether your credit card is good.

There is nowhere in America you can type in the name of an individual and find out if this individual has committed 6, 8, 10 felonies in 5 different States, because we do not have a composite list of criminals who committed felonies in this country. We have a list, the NCIC, at the FBI. It does not contain 80 percent of the records it would have to contain to be an accurate list of an updated computer list of all those who committed felonies in our country. We ought to have that.

Crime ought to be part of the Presidential campaign. How we address crime ought to be the competition of ideas in a Presidential campaign.

Jobs. That also ought to be part of the Presidential campaign. I intend to offer a proposal which I offered before which the Senate has rejected. It is a very simple little proposal.

We have a tax incentive in this country that is \$2.2 billion in tax forgiveness for companies who move American jobs overseas. Now, is there any reason, can anyone sober in this country give me one reason that we ought to have any incentive at all for any company to move jobs from America to a foreign country?

Can anyone give me one reason for that? If so, I would like to hear it. And

if not, we ought to change the Tax Code to stop providing tax incentives for those who move jobs out of this country.

Why does that proposal fail when it comes to the floor of the Senate? Because the biggest corporations in America lobby furiously to keep that tax break. They lobby furiously to keep it, and they are all over this town now rallying to defeat a proposal like that once again.

I hope we will have a discussion about values in the Presidential campaign. In fact, Senator Dole and President Clinton have talked about television, the menu of violence and trash on television that is offered to our children. Does that advance the interests of our children? No. Do I believe in censorship? No, I don't, but I believe in responsibility, and there are things we can do in this country as parents, as communities and, yes, even as a U.S. Senate and, hopefully, as President to deal with this issue of what is television doing in this country to our children.

It is one thing to entertain adults. It is another thing to entertain adults and hurt our children at the same time. You all know the statistics that persuaded a number of us, including my colleagues, Senator CONRAD from North Dakota, Senator SIMON, and others to push a bill providing for a V-chip and to push bills providing for television violence report cards and other issues to deal with this matter. Some cry censorship. It has nothing to do with censorship. I am not interested in censoring. I am interested in providing there be responsibility by people who produce this and send it into our living room and to our children.

Let me just conclude. I wanted to visit a bit today about the tax proposals because a number of Members of the Senate came, in a rather orchestrated attempt today, to make a case for it. I understand the case, and I just disagree with it. I want to just finish with another comment.

I had some town meetings recently during the August break in North Dakota. In the middle of them, I suggested that while we would likely spend a fair amount of time at the town meeting talking about what was wrong, what was broken, what needed fixing, what did not work, and why America was moving backward, I said, let us do something else, just for a few minutes, let us train ourselves to think just for a minute, why do some people talk about building a fence to keep people out of America because too many people want to come here? Why would that be? Because this country is a remarkable beacon of hope for the rest of the people around the world. They see it as a country full of opportunity, and they all want to come here.

If that is the case, we must be a country full of things that work and we must be a country full of good news as well. So I have told the town meetings at times, let us spend the next 30 minutes talking about what works, just for

a moment let us think about what works in this country, what is good in your life, in your home, in your family, in your community, your city, what is good in the Federal Government, what programs work, what makes life better.

It is fascinating, once you start thinking in those terms, how you get people to start evaluating what is of value. You never think about the kind of road system we have in this country. But drive anywhere else in the world, and then drive in most parts of this country and take a look at the transportation system. Mail a letter in Tegucigalpa or Krakow, and then mail a letter in Chicago, and see which postal system gets it there. I mean, I could go through chapter and verse of the discussions.

One woman at a town meeting said to me, "Well, I'll tell you what works, my son's teacher. She called me and had a long discussion with me about the circumstances of my son in her class and really helped us a great deal. He has a wonderful teacher." I said, "Have you called the teacher and told her how you feel about that? You ought to do that." But it is a fascinating thing to discuss, not about what is wrong, but about what is right, not what needs fixing—and we spend almost all of our time on that—but what works in this country.

I hope in the context also of these political campaigns we can engage in a bit of hope and a description of opportunity in a way that emphasizes the good things, not just what is wrong.

I talked about Jack Kemp. Jack Kemp is an effervescent optimist. We need more effervescent optimists talking about the potential of this country and the future of this country. If I did not think that we were going to have a better future and that our best days are still ahead of us, I would hardly have the energy to be in public service. But I, every single day, take a look at my 9-year-old son who trudges off to school now in September, and I think, what a remarkable opportunity it is for us to be here, for him to go to that school, what a remarkable opportunity he is going to have, hopefully in a country that is going to continue to lead the way in this world.

This week, this President took action in Iraq. I know there is a real disconnection. People say, what on Earth do we have to do with Iraq? This country is a world leader, and it will be a world leader, and it must take responsible action in dealing with international outlaws like Saddam Hussein. And we will, it seems to me, under the stewardship of Democrats and Republicans who come together at the right time, believing through aggressive debate we can find better ways and we can find things that at the end of the day when the dust settles that will advance this country's standard of living, we will continue to maintain a country that most people see as the beacon of hope all around the globe.

Mr. President, I have covered a fair amount of ground. And I notice my col-

league from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, is here, and other colleagues I believe are coming to speak on other issues. I intend to continue to visit about a couple of these issues next Monday. But with that, I yield the floor. I thank the President for his attention.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

(During today's session of the Senate, the following morning business was transacted.)

#### EXPLANATION OF VOTE—SENATE RESOLUTION 288

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, last evening my vote was the only negative vote on the resolution relating to the President's military intervention earlier this week in Iraq. As there was little if any time last night to explain the reason for that vote, I intend to do it at this time.

It is the conventional wisdom, led perhaps by the President of the United States, that George Bush severely erred in not completing the war in the gulf against Iraq by the total defeat of its armed forces and the replacement of the Saddam Hussein government. Because I did not make such a criticism at the time, I do not join in that criticism now and regard it as essentially irrelevant to the activities of this week.

President Clinton, when he took that office, inherited the situation as it existed then, when that was no longer a real possibility. Since taking office, however, President Clinton's policies have caused the deterioration, if not the entire unraveling, of the coalition that was put together against Iraq at the time of the war in the gulf. Most particularly, his administration's indifference to the peculiar burdens imposed upon our ally, Turkey, and the particular problems and challenges that it faces, have caused us to be in a position in which we have been unable to use our bases in that country for any kind of response to Iraq. In fact, the coalition has unraveled to such an extent that we were not permitted to use the bases of any of our allies other than the United Kingdom in that response.

Earlier this summer we totally and completely ignored an incursion by Iranian forces, aimed to support its Kurdish partisans, into Iraq, across an international border. Earlier this summer we completely ignored Iraq's defiance of a U.N. search for prohibited weapons, both chemical and nuclear in nature.

Nevertheless, we did respond in a military fashion to a contest between Iraqi-backed Kurds and Iranian-backed Kurds earlier this week, and we responded, Mr. President, in a totally inappropriate fashion.

It seems to this Senator that at the time of the recent Iraqi incursion in support of its own faction in Kurdistan, we had essentially two choices: We

could have made the choice that we have no dog in that fight, that there was no favorite in a contest between a group backed by Iran and a group backed by Iraq. On the other hand, we could have responded militarily by showing that aggression does not pay. Under those circumstances, however, the only appropriate military response would be one which would exact a price substantially greater than the hoped-for goals of the aggression itself on the part of Iraq.

We did neither. We responded to this fight among Kurdish partisans in a way that could not possibly help the victims of that Iraqi aggression. In fact, we clearly stated that we were not attempting to reverse what Saddam Hussein was doing in the northern part of his own country.

The net result is this: The net result is that Iraq has regained control over much of Iraqi Kurdistan. It has slaughtered its rebels, many of whom were under our implicit protection and have been abandoned by us. It has shown the United States to be a paper tiger. And what cost has it paid, Mr. President? A handful of radar sites.

We have been abandoned by all of our allies in the Middle East, none of whom was willing to publicly support our military response. We have been repudiated by France with respect to our new no-flight zone. Our President has now terminated the military adventure and has proclaimed victory.

Mr. President, a few more victories like this and we will be announcing a no-flight zone over Riyadh.

The best analogy I can think of is this one: It is as if the Mayor of the District of Columbia was warned of an incipient drug war in some part of this city and expressed severe warnings against any violence in connection with that drug war. Faced with great violence and a number of murders, the Mayor then imposed \$100 fines on each one of the murderers and announced that the drug war was over and that the streets of Washington, DC, were safe. That, in effect, has been what our response was.

Mr. President, the United States has been defeated and humiliated. We have added to the instability of the Middle East and have whetted Saddam Hussein's appetite for further adventures.

No consultation, no advance notification was given to any Member of Congress in connection with this adventure. Under the circumstances, Mr. President, I do not believe that any resolution of support, even one so cautious, so reluctant, so absent in praise as the one passing last night was warranted.

I believe that within a short period of time, a majority of my colleagues will wish that they had voted the way in which I voted last night. It was an inappropriate resolution, an inappropriate response to an inappropriate action on the part of the President of the United States.