

were in the best interests of the American people.

The third thing that Senator KENNEDY said about Senator Dole that I think was misleading, and it was a misrepresentation of his position, was in reference to tax cuts. It is true that Senator Dole, if elected President, wants to come to Congress, which I believe will still be controlled by the Republicans, and come with tax cuts.

He outlined five major tax cuts. I am very supportive of all five of those tax cuts. People ask, how are you going to pay for them? I think people forget about the fact that three decades in the last 100 years Presidents have decided to have tax cuts, and in all three decades it has dramatically increased the revenues.

It is ironic that Senator KENNEDY would be talking about tax cuts and all the damage that is being done when it was John Kennedy in 1962, when he was President of the United States, who said, and I quote:

In short, it is a paradoxical truth that tax rates are too high today and tax revenues are too low. And the soundest way to raise the revenues in the long run is to cut rates now. The purpose of cutting taxes now is not to incur a budget deficit, but to achieve the more prosperous, expanding economy which can bring a budget surplus.

That was what President Kennedy said in 1962. And that is exactly what happened during the 1960's with the massive tax reductions, and we were able to have revenue increases—revenue increases.

Look what happened. The marginal rates of our tax system in 1980 produced \$244 billion. In 1990, it almost doubled to \$466 billion, and that was during a 10-year period when we had the most massive cuts in our tax revenues.

So I think that it would be good to go back and look at history and see that this country, when it has been overtaxed in the past, that they reduced taxes and had the result of increasing revenues. Certainly, we are in an overtaxed posture right now.

I have often said there are three things that make this country non-productive, on a global basis, and non-competitive: One is our high tax rates; one is overregulation; the other is our tort laws. There is not time in this brief time to cover that.

I conclude, Mr. President, by saying when Senator KENNEDY assailed Senator Dole for talking about tax cuts, that he start realizing those individuals—those of us who want to have tax reductions—are the same ones that were trying to stop the 1993 tax increase. In 1993, when President Clinton had control of both the House and the Senate, he passed a tax increase that was characterized not by Republicans but by the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, which was Senator MOYNIHAN, who said it was the largest single tax increase in the history of public finance in America or any place in the world.

I think, essentially, what we—what Senator Dole, and what the Republicans and the conservatives in this body and in the other body—want to do is merely undo the damage that was done by that massive tax increase and actually repeal the taxes that were increased in 1993. Essentially, that is what Senator Dole wants to do. I believe that is an accurate characterization of his program.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 5, 1996]

MEDAGOGUES

We print today a letter from House minority leader Richard Gephardt, taking exception to an editorial that accused the Democrats of demagoguing on Medicare. The letter itself seems to us to be more of the same. It tells you just about everything the Democrats think about Medicare except how to cut the cost. That aspect of the subject it puts largely out of bounds, on grounds that Medicare is "an insurance program, not a welfare program," and "to slash the program to balance the budget" or presumably for any purpose other than to shore up the trust fund is "not just a threat to . . . seniors, families, hospitals" etc. but "a violation of a sacred trust."

That's bullfeathers, and Mr. Gephardt knows it. Congress has been sticking the budget knife to Medicare on a regular basis for years. Billions of dollars have been cut from the program; both parties have voted for the cutting. Most years the cuts have had nothing to do with the trust funds, which, despite all the rhetoric, both parties understand to be little more than accounting devices and possible warning lights as to program costs. Rather, the goal has been to reduce the deficit. It made sense to turn to Medicare because Medicare is a major part of the problem. It and Medicaid together are now a sixth of the budget and a fourth of all spending for other than interest and defense. If nothing is done those shares are going to rise, particularly as the baby-boomers begin to retire early in the next century.

There are only four choices, none of them pleasant. Congress can let the health care programs continue to drive up the deficit, or it can let them continue to crowd out other programs or it can pay for them with higher taxes. Or it can cut them back.

The Republicans want to cut Medicare. It is a gutsy step. This is not just a middle-class entitlement; the entire society looks to the program, and earlier in the year a lot of the smart money said the Republicans would never take it on. They have. Mr. Gephardt is right that a lot of their plan is still gauzy. It is not year clear how tough it will finally be; on alternate days you hear it criticized on grounds that it seeks to cut too much from the program and on grounds that it won't cut all it seeks. Maybe both will turn out to be true; we have no doubt the plan will turn out to have other flaws as well.

They have nonetheless—in our judgement—stepped up to the issue. They have taken a huge political risk just in calling for the cuts they have. What the Democrats have done in turn is confirm the risk. The Republicans are going to take away your Medicare. That's their only message. They have no plan. Mr. Gephardt says they can't offer one because the Republicans would simply pocket the money to finance their tax cut. It's the perfect defense; the Democrats can't do the right thing because the Republicans would then do the wrong one. It's absolutely the case that there ought not be a tax cut, and certainly not the indiscriminate cut the Republicans propose. But that has nothing to

do with Medicare. The Democrats have fabricated the Medicare-tax cut connection because it is useful politically. It allows them to attack and to duck responsibility, both at the same time. We think it's wrong.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHCROFT). The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes in morning business, and following my remarks, that Senator GRAHAM of Florida be recognized for up to 15 minutes.

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

UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD INDONESIA

Mr. FEINGOLD. Thank you, Mr. President. I rise today to make a few brief remarks about United States policy in Indonesia.

I am deeply concerned about some of the views being expressed by some members of the Clinton administration, and am particularly concerned because the administration has been quite culpable in the past with regard to aspects of our Indonesia policy. Despite a violent crackdown in Jakarta on July 27—not quite 2 months ago—this administration says it still intends to go forward with the sale of nine F-16 fighter jets to Indonesia.

Mr. President, the administration had fully intended to send up notification of this sale earlier this month. Fortunately, objections from myself and many of my colleagues convinced the administration that now was not the right time to announce officially the intention to sell fighter jets to Indonesia.

I am pleased that—for the time being—this sale cannot move forward, at least until Congress reconvenes in January.

But what concerns me today, Mr. President, are recent statements that suggest that the administration necessarily will attempt to notify Congress again in January—apparently without conditioning this move on any actions by the Indonesian authorities either in the past or in the coming months.

Given the history of human right abuses in Indonesia, as well as the events of July 27, I find this attitude difficult to accept.

Last week, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee held a hearing on United States policy toward Indonesia. We heard from two very capable administration witnesses and four distinguished private panelists, including a political science professor from the University of Wisconsin, Madison.

As one of the witnesses commented, this may have been the first hearing in many years to look at the full scope of American ties to Indonesia.

Mr. President, I recognize that Indonesia is an important country and a valuable ally. It is the largest country in Southeast Asia, and its population

of more than 200 million people is the fourth largest in the world. It plays a significant role in Asian affairs, and has been instrumental in conflict resolution efforts in the region. It also has been an important ally of the United States in international forums, such as the United Nations.

I also salute Indonesia's economic success, and believe there are many valuable lessons in Indonesia's experience which can be applied to other developing countries across the world.

Mr. President, these achievements cannot—and do not—excuse Indonesia's consistently dismal record on human rights and its continuous assault on democratic freedoms.

Mr. President, I am particularly concerned about the massive human rights abuses that continue in East Timor.

As we all know, Indonesia has sustained a brutal military occupation of East Timor since 1975. Human rights organizations from around the world, as well as our own State Department, continue to report substantial human rights violations by the Indonesian military—including arbitrary arrests and detentions, curbs on freedom of expression and association, and the use of torture and summary killings of civilians.

More recently, we have heard reports of the Indonesian military conducting systematic training of East Timorese youth to take part in local militia groups. We also have heard disturbing reports of increasing religious and ethnic tension in East Timor, which at times is exacerbated by government inaction.

On top of the ongoing pattern in East Timor, the July 27 events in Jakarta reinforce my perception of an Indonesian regime that squashes alternative political discourse.

On that day, hundreds of people rioted after President Soeharto attempted to oust Megawati Sukarnoputri, a popular opposition leader, from her position as chair of the Indonesian Democratic Party, or PDI.

During the riot, arson-led fires caused considerable property damage. At least five people were killed, at least 149 injured, and hundreds arrested. But, as Human Rights Watch reports, many of those arrested did not appear to be responsible for initiating the riot. Instead, most were linked, or accused of being linked, to the reform movement or specifically to the Megawati camp.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a September 20, 1996, article from the Washington Post which describes how difficult it is for Megawati to operate as an opposition candidate after government officials ousted her as party leader, threatened to shut down party headquarters, and arrested many of her supporters.

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

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 20, 1996]
INDONESIAN SAYS SLOW APPROACH AVOIDS A TRAP

(By Keith B. Richburg)

JAKARTA, INDONESIA, Sept. 19—Police are still hauling in her supporters for questioning. Already more than 100 languish in jail, and dozens others are missing. A member of parliament, she has been left off the list of candidates for next year's parliamentary elections, meaning she may lose her only official platform for challenging the government. Now the police say they will shut down her new headquarters because it violates local zoning laws.

These are trying times for Indonesia's premier opposition leader, Megawati Sukarnoputri. Just a few months after she emerged from virtual obscurity to become the first real rallying point for opposition to President Suharto's 30-year rule, Sukarnoputri finds herself besieged, harassed, called in for questioning like a common criminal, facing the likelihood of being sidelined from her country's tightly controlled political process—and grappling with the mounting impatience of her own supporters.

But even with these pressures weighing on her, Sukarnoputri remains surprisingly sanguine, unhurried, almost eerily serene. She is not out on the streets, not leading rallies, not exhorting her followers. This morning, she is seated at the dining room table of her spacious house in Jakarta's south suburbs, taking a Spanish lesson from her regular tutor.

What has learning Spanish got to do with leading a "people power" movement against Asia's longest-serving and most durable leader?

"I think it will be easier for me to communicate with Latin American people," Sukarnoputri explains later, after the tutor has left for the day. "And also Spanish is more important in the United States," she adds, citing the increasing Hispanic population there.

Sukarnoputri clearly has her own agenda. And while her backers and sympathizers may be growing frustrated, she is determined to proceed at her own slow and steady pace, careful not to engage the government in direct confrontation and not be goaded by her more radical followers.

"They want me to do something more concrete, like have a rally," she said. "But at the moment, I think that is not a good tactic, because so many people are still intimidated."

She said the political situation remains tense after a July 27 riot—prompted by a government raid—in which five people were killed and several banks and government offices gutted by fire. The government used the riot as a pretext to launch a widespread crackdown on opposition organizers, labor leaders, human rights activists and anyone else suspected of links to the long-dormant and outlawed Indonesian Communist Party, which tried to foment revolution here three decades ago.

The most serious anti-government outburst in recent memory, the July riot erupted after police backed by army troops raided the old headquarters of the officially sanctioned Indonesian Democratic Party, or PDI, to oust a group of Sukarnoputri supporters who had occupied the building in protest of a government-orchestrated party coup that replaced her as party leader. The government apparently feared that Sukarnoputri, the daughter of Indonesia's charismatic first president, Sukarno, could become a potent challenger to the incumbent Suharto.

Sukarnoputri said today that she did not believe her supporters were involved in the

rioting, but that the violence was sparked by government agents who wanted to discredit her movement and use the unrest as the pretext for the wider crackdown that followed. "It could not have been common people," she said. "It must have been professionals. . . . I think there was some engineering. How could common people burn so many high buildings in such a short time? I think they wanted to make a trigger, a trap, for people who are pro-democracy."

Sukarnoputri said her go slowly, softly approach—for example, not calling any new street protests and, thus, not defying a government ban on rallies—is to avoid falling into another "trap." She said: "So many people try to make moves, to push, to push PDI to use violence or hard action. But if we do, they will trap us, just like that riot."

Some observers here—Western diplomats, journalists, academics—say Sukarnoputri may be correct, that moving too quickly with mass actions will expose more of her supporters to arrest, prison, or worse.

But many also say that with her quiet approach, Sukarnoputri may have let her moment pass, that the momentum and publicity generated by the government's heavy-handed takeover of party headquarters may already be lost.

"I don't think she's in an enviable position," a Western diplomat said. "She can maintain her status as a symbol of opposition, but without doing anything, that fades."

The other legal challenges and obstacles Sukarnoputri faces may prove even more damaging to her long-term ability to mount a credible challenge to the regime.

On Monday, the day for filing candidate lists for next June's parliamentary elections, the anti-Sukarnoputri faction of the Democratic Party showed up early in the morning at the National Election Commission offices with a list of names that did not include Sukarnoputri or any of her supporters. When a Sukarnoputri deputy came that afternoon with a separate "Megawati slate," election officials refused to accept it.

Sukarnoputri is challenging her ouster as party leader in Indonesian courts, and she said she also will file suit to have her candidates' list accepted. If she is not a candidate next year, she will lose her seat and whatever slim chance she may have had of running against Suharto for the presidency in the next election in two years. (The Indonesian president is not directly elected but voted on by a people's assembly.) Under Indonesia's restricted political system, if Sukarnoputri loses her current parliamentary seat, she will be unable to gather supporters, make speeches or call political rallies.

But Sukarnoputri is undeterred. She said she insists on exhausting all legal remedies first, mainly as a way to test the independence of the country's judiciary. If she is prevented from running for office next year, she said, her exclusion will serve to point out flaws in the electoral process.

"It will be a big problem for the government," she said. "There are already so many people protesting to the government [about] why I, a popular and sympathetic person in the country, am not on the national list. People will see the election is not free and fair."

But even if she loses, Sukarnoputri disagrees with the analysis that her stature will fade.

In our culture, there is not only a formal leader. There is also an informal leader," she said. "Sometimes the informal leader can be more powerful than the formal leader. You can see how my father, even though he has already passed away, in spirit still lives inside the Indonesian people."

She added, "I'm sure about that."

Mr. FEINGOLD. The climate described in the article clearly is not one that supports freedom of expression, freedom of the press or freedom of association.

The events of July 27 underscore the Government's intention to foster a repressive climate in the months leading up to the 1997 parliamentary elections.

As the New York Times declared in a recent editorial, "This is no time to be selling high-performance warplanes to Indonesia."

The administration says its policy is "to make available to Indonesia military equipment that will support legitimate external defense needs." At the same time, the United States will not export or transfer to Indonesia small arms, crowd control equipment or armored personnel carriers until we have seen significant improvement in human rights in the country, particularly in East Timor.

Mr. President, I am pleased that the Congress and the administration have worked together to develop a policy linking the sale of small arms to Indonesia to its human rights record. This policy evolved from an amendment that I offered to the foreign aid appropriations bill several years ago.

But I believe that we are missing an important opportunity to apply pressure to the Indonesian regime by failing to impose comparable conditions on the F-16 sale. In fact, in public statements since congressional notification was delayed, the administration has not even mentioned human rights or democratic values in connection with the sale.

Instead, it continues to state publicly that it intends to go through with the sale as early as January.

I believe official advocacy of the F-16 sale sends the wrong message to the Indonesian military. It sends the message that—despite our concerns about the lack of respect for human rights in East Timor and despite the continued failure of the Indonesian military to respond substantively to these concerns—the United States will continue to supply substantial amounts of lethal military equipment to Indonesia.

If the events of July 27 tell us nothing else, they should signal to us that Indonesia still has a long way to go in terms of respect for human rights and democratic values.

I believe that we should support progress in these areas—only when real progress actually is achieved. Instead, within weeks of a major crackdown by the Indonesian authorities, the administration persists in its plans to provide Indonesia with nine advanced military planes.

I do not think now is the time to be rewarding Indonesia with nine planes. Only when we see some improvement in Indonesia's conduct should we be elevating the level of our military ties to the country.

In sum, I continue to believe that—in Indonesia, as elsewhere—we must con-

sider a military's human rights record as one of the determining factors in deciding whether or not the U.S. Government should license or facilitate a foreign arms sale.

As a result, I oppose the administration's plans to allow the transfer of the F-16's to Indonesia at this time, or in the near future, and I intend to work with a number of other Members of the Senate who share that view to persuade the administration that a change in policy is warranted here.

Mr. GRAHAM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. GRAHAM pertaining to the introduction of S. 2121 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

HONORING THE ZOLLER'S ON THEIR 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, families are the cornerstone of America. The data are undeniable: Individuals from strong families contribute to the society. In an era when nearly half of all couples married today will see their union dissolve into divorce, I believe it is both instructive and important to honor those who have taken the commitment of "till death us do part" seriously, demonstrating successfully the timeless principles of love, honor, and fidelity. These characteristics make our country strong.

For these important reasons, I rise today to honor Bill and Mable Zoller of Billings, MO, who on September 22, 1996 celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary. My wife, Janet, and I look forward to the day we can celebrate a similar milestone. Bill and Mable's commitment to the principles and values of their marriage deserves to be saluted and recognized.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR BENNETT JOHNSTON

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, with the scheduled adjournment of the 104th Congress quickly approaching, I wanted to say a few words about a very accomplished legislator who, unfortunately, will not be returning to this body next January: Senator BENNETT JOHNSTON.

I was saddened to hear of his decision to retire at the conclusion of this Congress, and I know he will be missed by his colleagues as well as his constituents in Louisiana. Senator JOHNSTON does not depart, however, without leaving a significant legacy of accomplishment. He is a skilled negotiator, and has demonstrated a tremendous ability to navigate the tumultuous legislative waters, even when faced with the most difficult obstacles.

I had the privilege of working closely with Senator JOHNSTON while I served on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee with him during my first

term as a Senator. As chairman of the Energy Committee, and now ranking member, Senator JOHNSTON has been a leading advocate of a comprehensive national energy strategy. Under his leadership, Congress passed the landmark 1992 Energy Policy Act, which promoted increased conservation, increased competition in the wholesale electricity markets, and encouraged additional development of domestic sources of energy. With this country now importing more than 50 percent of the oil we consume every year, Senator JOHNSTON has been fully committed to developing new domestic sources of energy to help reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

Senator JOHNSTON has also addressed a myriad of other energy-related issues during his distinguished Senate career. He shepherded deregulation of the natural gas industry through the Congress; he helped defeat the ill-conceived Btu tax; and he has been a leading advocate of maintaining our Strategic Petroleum Reserve, an important investment in protecting our Nation's energy supply from disruption.

Senator JOHNSTON's work in the Senate has not been limited to energy issues. I have also had the privilege of serving with the Senator on the Budget Committee, where he has served with great distinction. As the past chairman, and now ranking member, of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator JOHNSTON has demonstrated a strong commitment to developing and maintaining our Nation's water resources, an issue of great importance to Western States like North Dakota. Senator JOHNSTON has also been a leading advocate of maintaining an adequate B-52 bomber fleet, our most cost-effective, reliable, and only battle-tested bomber.

Mr. President, Senator JOHNSTON will be long-remembered as an extremely capable and responsible public servant, who addressed issues with a zeal few can bring to this body. All in public life owe Senator JOHNSTON a debt of gratitude for his tremendous contributions, and I wish the senior Senator from Louisiana all the best in his future endeavors, no matter what path he chooses to follow upon departing this body.

HONORING WALTER DROSKIE

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, last Wednesday night, as I looked around the Russell Caucus Room at the many wonderful people that have served on my staff these past 18 years, I was filled with pride. I will always remember the loyalty and hard work of my staff—the greatest in the Senate. Today I would like to honor one such staffer, Walter Edwin Droskie.

Walter Droskie is retiring at the end of the 104th Congress after 35 years as a Senate employee, serving 6 senators over the years. In 1962, Senator Patrick McNamara from Michigan, was the